

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמַם 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)

with Matthew 12:40 “three days and three nights” as a test case.

With the Sabbath resurrection only one interpretation can be put on Matthew 12:40, and the possibility of a shorter period is denied as a possible meaning of the phrase. Under this assertion, Matthew 12:40 is unambiguous. It is plain and clear. Under a Friday-Sunday scenario, Mathew 12:40 is interpreted to be shorter, but it is still admitted by proponents that the phrase itself applied elsewhere *could* mean three literal nights. That is, they have not proved that it only means three days and two nights in all situations. Thus in the Friday-Sunday view, Matthew 12:40 lacks clarity, and this would contradict the principle that Scripture is clear.

Let us move to the next test case. It is evident that the literal texts say “one of the Sabbaths,” which according to the Sabbath resurrection only means the number one sabbath in counting seven sabbaths after Passover, i.e. the “first of the Sabbaths”³⁸². Using Lev. 23:15 it is clear what this means. Also it is denied that Sabbath means week. Thus, the Sabbath resurrection has full clarity.

The Friday-Sunday view introduces the black box tradition that Sabbath means week. However, it is admitted that the word Sabbath still means Sabbath in other contexts. Thus the Friday-Sunday view lacks clarity. It is proposing additional ambiguity to the word “sabbath” that does not exist with the Sabbath resurrection. Furthermore, even Sunday Christians have argued that Sunday is the Sabbath based on the use of the word Sabbath in the key phrase: *μᾶ τῶν σαββάτων*. That means that in the Friday-Sunday view, it is as clear as mud which day is meant. The view lacks clarity, and thus contradicts the principle that the purpose of the Scripture is to clarify.

Let us take “on the third day” as another example. In this case the Sabbath resurrection says on the third calendar day using a daybreak to daybreak day. The Friday-Sunday view can use the same type of day or a sunset to sunset calendar day, or a daylight day (dawn to dusk). However, all definitions of day are admitted by both sides, so neither view is more clear or less clear than the other on this point.

When we come to “after three days” (Mark 8:31) the situation is

³⁸² For the purpose of analyzing the assertions, this is the same as “one day of the sabbaths” or “first day of the sabbaths.”

different. The Sabbath resurrection simply explains “day” here to refer to a daylight day, i.e. dawn to dusk (or twenty-four hour sunset to sunset day ending with the daylight part), and denies that “after” ever means “on.” The Friday-Sunday view asserts that “after” means “on” in order to explain the text, but at the same time, advocates admit elsewhere that “after N days” could be after the N^{th} day is ended. Therefore, in the Friday-Sunday view, the phrase “after three days” lacks clarity, where as with the Sabbath resurrection it is plain. And what is plain agrees with the principle that the word is given to make plain, and not to confuse.

When people truly appreciate the evidence and are exposed to all the facts, they often say, you have your view, and I have mine. That is they admit to the possibility of the other view, but choose to follow their own. This is a position that is based on a lack of clarity. But if we truly understand that the Scripture comes to clarify then such a position is not Scriptural. The proper think for said person is to continue to seek until it is understood which view is clear and which view is ambiguous.

One of the reasons that the principle of Scriptural clarity works is that it is easier to introduce a false assumption than to completely eliminate the original truth. The original truth therefore continues to be evidenced in other contexts to even the holders of the false view. The false view can be recognized as such because it is ambiguous. It cannot demonstrate that the false view is the only absolute.

This is a key point in recognizing that while Friday-Sunday can introduce interpretations to Matthew 12:40, Mark 8:31, and the “first of the Sabbaths” passages to allow their view, they cannot disprove or eliminate the opposing view. They have only increased the entropy (disorder) in the system by increasing the ambiguities. The entropy is eliminated on the correct view because the traditional assertions supporting Friday-Sunday that come out of the “black box” are denied to be valid. While in this book, I have offered an explanation of the contents of the “black box” in the second century, the real proof of nefarious corruption in that time period is based on the principle that the Scripture is plain and clear and not confused.

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

