

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמֵם יֵשׁוּעַ
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּתִים



**The Resurrection Day
Of Messiah Yeshua**

When It Happened

According To The Original
Texts

Order From:

<http://www.torahtimes.org/>

Preview is on next two Pages
(laid out in book order)

wave offering) seven restings—complete they shall be— 16 until **in** the day after the seventh resting you are counting a fiftieth day; then you shall present a new grain offering to Yāhweh.

Let me simplify the sentence, “And you count . . . **in** the day after the resting . . . seven restings.” It is clear that “**in** the day after” = “**in** the time after.” This is clarified by the parenthetical statement, “(from the day. . .).” This explains that “**in** the day after” means the time period “from the day when,” and in this case “from the day when” (מִיּוֹם) is extensive.

Now while the ambiguity remains, and I have sided with the Nisan 16 interpretation here, the important point to remember after all this is that the Karaite argument no longer has a proof text in Lev. 23:16. The skeptic that wishes to remain in this position only has an interpretation, but it is inconsistent with the overall chronology of scripture, and certainly the resurrection passages contradict the Karaite notion of when the “first of the sabbaths” is to be counted.

It is not consistent to insist on the literal translation of Sabbath in Lev. 23:15 and then to accept the mistranslation “weeks” at face value in Mat. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 18:12, 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2). Nor is it consistent to accept the translation “from” in Lev. 23:15 while disallowing it in vs. 16. Nor is it consistent to allow “in the time after” for the masculine מָחָר, but then to insist that the noun loses the possibility of that meaning just because it is feminine. Nor is it consistent to posit that “in the time after” is too rare a sense when all the translators were forced to insert “from” into the text of vs. 15 to prevent the contradiction that seven sabbaths cannot be literally counted “in the morrow” or “in the day after”—except in the Hebrew sense “time after,” which clearly is allowed.

The definition given here “in the time after” is explained in Samuel Lee’s Hebrew Lexicon this way:

מָחָר, m. מְחָרָת, f. } plur. non occ. constr. fem. מְחָרָת.
The primitive notion seems to consist in *proceeding forwards*;
which, applied to time, may designate the (a) **Morrow**, or day
following some other day previously expressed *or* implied. (b)

Hereafter, henceforward, Gen xxx. 33; Exo. xiii. 14; Deut. vi 20; Josh. iv. 6.21: so Matt. vi. 34, εἰς τὴν αὐριον.¹⁸⁹

Yeshua says, “do not be anxious for tomorrow; for tomorrow will care for itself” (Mat. 6:34). Clearly here he includes the “hereafter” in the meaning of “tomorrow.”

Lee’s definition is excellent. The sense “hereafter” or “henceforward” only needs a bit of modernization to “in the time after,” or “time to come.” So a literal translation of Lev. 23:15-16 using Lee’s gloss:

15 ‘And you count for yourselves in the **hereafter** of the resting (from the day when you brought in the sheaf of the wave offering) seven restings—complete they shall be— 16 until in the **hereafter** of the seventh resting you are counting a fiftieth day; then you shall present a new grain offering to Yāhweh.

OR using “out of”.

15 ‘And you count for yourselves out of the **hereafter** of the resting (from the day when you brought in the sheaf of the wave offering) seven restings—complete they shall be— 16 until out of the **hereafter** of the seventh resting you are counting a fiftieth day; then you shall present a new grain offering to Yāhweh.

KARAITE CRITICISMS REVIEWED

Fixed Date Argument:

A popular Karaite criticism is that if Shavuot always comes on Sivan 6, a fixed day in the Rabbinic calendar, then wouldn’t the scripture have specified the fixed day “Sivan 6” for Shavuot rather than requiring counting? This would be a valid point if the calendar for the biblical period were the same as the modern Rabbinic

¹⁸⁹ *A Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English*, Samuel Lee, London, 1840; 664 pages. The bold emphasis is mine and the evidence for definition (a) has been omitted as there will be no dispute about it.

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

<http://www.torahtimes.org/pbook>

