## Chapter Seven: A Linguistic Fortress

## More on the First Sabbath A deeper Analysis

§314 The present English texts read, "The first day of the week," which has always been Sunday for the Church. Not only that, but "the first day" was also the same day for the Jews. The Jews numbered the days of the week from one to seven, and then they began again at "one" after the seventh day of the week. So for the Jews "the first day" was the day after the Sabbath, or the day which Genitles call "Sunday." ${ }^{1}$
§315 Not all English translations have put "first day of the week." In fact, some very famous translations have rendered the texts differently. That is not to say they understood them differently, but they did render them differently. For example, the Coverdale Quarto Bible of 1537 renders Matthew 28:1:

On the evenynge of the Sabboth holy daye, which dawneth the morowe of the first day of the Sabbathes came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.
§316 The reader should notice that Coverdale rendered the day in question as "the first day of the Sabbathes." Most likely Coverdale, and His readers, thought that Sunday was the day meant here, because they understood "Sabbathes" to mean "week." Hence, "first day of the week."
§317
Other more recent scholars are not so sure. The Anchor Bible makes the matter ambiguous:

The Greek phrase $\mu 1 \alpha \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ is not as obvious an indication of a particular "day" or a "week" as the English suggests. The notes of time in our gospels make it hazardous to say whether the evangelists wished us to understand Saturday or Sunday at this point.
§318 That is what the multi volume Anchor Bible has to say about Matthew 28:1. The phrase in question is given in Greek by the Anchor Bible, so we will give an interlinear translation for the sake of those who do not know Greek:

[^0]| gBAG3.5 | gt | dfs | pPa dfs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oүع $\boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ | $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$, | $\tau \eta$ | $\varepsilon \pi \iota \varphi \omega \sigma \kappa 0 \cup \sigma \eta$ | ع15 |
| Later | t of-Sabbaths |  | on-lighting |  |


| afs | gtp |  |  | Aa 3s | nfs | nfs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mu 1 \alpha v$ | $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha$ |  |  | $\lambda$ Oov | M $\alpha \rho 1 \alpha \mu$ | $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ |
| one | of-Sabba |  |  | me | Mariam | the |
| nfs |  | CC | nfs | Anfs | nfs | nAa |
| M $\alpha \gamma \delta$ | $\delta \alpha \lambda \eta \vee \eta$ | K $\alpha 1$ |  | $\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta$ | $\mathbf{M \alpha}$ 人1 $\alpha \mu$ | $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \eta \sigma \alpha 1$ |
| Magda | lene | and | the | other | Mariam | to-see |
| ams ams |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\tau 0 v \tau \alpha \varphi 0 \vee$.
the tomb.
§319 Literally the Greek means "one of the Sabbaths," which is equivalent to a Sabbath day. It is important to analyze the key words here both linguistically and grammatically. You will see above each Greek line a line of coded letters, which we will refer to. The code was designed for one of my other books, so here I will give only what is necessary for the key words in this text. The "g" stands for the genitive case, meaning the word under it is in the genitive case. The " t " is neuter. The " f " is feminine, and the " m " is masculine. The " p " is plural, and " s " singular. The " a " is accusative; the " d " dative, and " n " nominative.
§320 So the Greek word $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\zeta}$ at the end of the first line is in the accusative case, and the $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ following it is accusative-femininesingular. $\Sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ is genitive-neuter-plural.

First we will analyze the lexical components. According to Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich the word $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ means, "1. Sabbath, the seventh day of the week in the Jewish calendar, marked by rest fr. work and by special religious ceremonies ... 2. week."

The first definition Sabbath is used 50 times in the New Testament. The second definition is used in the King James Version only 9 times. ${ }^{1}$ The Septuagint uses the first definition over 50 times in the first five books alone. It is used in some translations to mean week less than 5 times. We will show that it should be so translated zero times (Luke 18:12 might be an exception).
§323 The first and most common meaning of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}$ is Sabbath, the seventh day of the week. This is the meaning we should use unless contradicted by the context of Scripture. And we will assume so througout this book, showing that no fact contradicts said assumption.
§324
The text before us, Matthew 28:1, however, has $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha \beta \boldsymbol{\beta} \tau \omega v$ in the plural, which means "Sabbaths." Linguistically a plural should
always have some significance. It could be a plural in number or a plural of majesty, or it could just indicate a collective word, but the most common meaning of plural is plural in number. I would emphasize "most common meaning" because it is most reasonable and logical to presume the most common meaning as correct unless it proves otherwise. Sabbaths, which means more than one Sabbath is in the thought here. If we were to have assumed the meaning of week, then it would have to be weeks, in the plural, by this secondary consideration. And what does "one of the weeks" mean or "first of the weeks." I leave that for the traditionalists to defend. It sufficies to say that we choose what is customary and usual twice, while they ignore what is customary and usual twice. Sabbaths we will turn to the word in front of it which modifies it: $\mu \mathrm{l} \alpha$. According to Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich the word means "one." The lexical entry reads, " $\varepsilon \imath n, \mu 1 \alpha, \varepsilon \mu$, gen. $\varepsilon \mu \circ \varsigma, \mu i \alpha \varsigma$, $\varepsilon \mu \circ \varsigma$ numeral one." The King James Version translates the word as one some 116 times, but it translates first 8 times. It also translates $\mu \iota \alpha$ as "a," or "an" 12 times. "But the Greek made an approach to the modern indefinite article in the use of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} 1 \boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ (pg. 796 Robertson)." So $\mu \mathrm{l} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ can mean one, or $a(a n)$. There is yet an additional usage of $\mu \mu \alpha$ which concerns us. Abbott-Smith has, " 5 . As ordinal $=\pi \rho \omega \tau 0 \varsigma$ (like Heb. אחד ...), first. The range of meaning for $\mu \mathrm{l} \alpha$ then is \{one, a (an), first $\}$. week $\}$. Now that we have finished with the lexical elements of the phrase, we will turn to the grammatical elements.

The word $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ is in the genitive case. The most usual translation of the genitive case is to affix an of before the word. Hence of-Sabbaths. Now the of really comes at the end of the word, because the genitive case is formed on the end of the word. So literally it would be Sabbaths-of, but in Greek thought, for the usual part, it is the same as of-Sabbaths in the English word order. And so the translators regularly render it that way.
§330
For example the Rheims Version (1582) renders the phrase in question, "first of the Sabboth[s]" in Matthew 28:1, Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1, John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7, and I Corinthians 16:2. They have translated the genitive case with of.
§331
Therefore using the customary rules and definitions, $\mu \mathrm{l} \alpha \nu$ $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ would have to be translated as, one of-Sabbaths. That is, one of the 52 Sabbaths in the year. Equivalently a Sabbath day. The Coverdale Quarto Bible (1537) translates exactly this way in
a few passages:

## But upon one of the Sabbathes ... (Luke 24:1). On one day of the Sabbath ... (John 20:1).

The reader may have noticed the word day in the translations. Sometimes it is in italics. The itallics indicate that the word is not present in the Greek. Nevertheless, the word day is implied. It is nearly like our English usage, "first of the month" vs. "first [day] of the month."

The Greek, even more so, implies the word day however. Unlike English the Greek language has gender, and a usual rule of grammar which says that all adjectives must agree in number and gender with the nouns they modify. The Greek cardinal number $\mu \iota \alpha \nu$ here is feminine in gender whilst the noun $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ is neuter (no gender). The Greek does have a neuter form for the numeral one, but it did not use it. Rather the author chose to use a feminine cardinal number, one with a no-gender (neuter) noun, Sabbaths.
§334 Why? Because the Greek not only implies the word day, it requires it. The word day in Greek is feminine in gender. The feminine word for day in Greek is $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$. Thus one of-Sabbaths is the short form of the full thought one day of-Sabbaths. The meaning is still equivalent to one Sabbath day. The plural is to be explained as the day on which the 52 Sabbaths of the year occur, or fall. That would be the seventh day of the week.
§335
Now that we have seen the full form of the phrase, it is possible for the cardinal adjective $\mu \nu \alpha v$ to function as an indefinite article. Hence a day of-Sabbaths. The day of Sabbaths (plural) is one of the 52 Sabbaths in the year, or the day on which the Sabbaths occur, namely the seventh day of the week. And this is, in fact, the Greek language's way of thinking about the Sabbath day. It uses the plural to single out one Sabbath day from the many Sabbath days.
§336 The reader is to be reminded that the most customary rendering of the phrase $\mu 1 \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ is one of-Sabbaths, or one day ofSabbaths. In English, "one of the Sabbaths," or "one of the Sabbath days." Even in the English, we note that the plural is not meaningless. However, from the traditional translations, one does get the impression that the plural in Greek is a meaningless nuisance to the translators - to be discarded on the whim of theological prejudice.
$\S 337$ Now even though the most common meaning of $\mu \mathrm{l} \alpha \mathrm{v}$ is one, this does does not mean that the meaning first is incorrect in this case. For the Hebrew language, and hence the Septuagint also commonly used the cardinal numeral one in the ordinal sense of first. This usage comes from the influence of the Hebrew cardinal numeral for one, אחד. Also it is a bit unusual for the evangelists to affix a one or $a$ to the Sabbath day when they did not usually do so. It is not unheard of, but in the Resurrection passages it would be a
bit unusual.
§338
The balance is firmly tipped in favor of first rather than one by the parallel parallel passages in Mark, Luke, and John. In those passages the definite article is added to the context. For example Mark has $\tau \eta \mu \nu \alpha$ instead of just $\mu \nu \alpha$. The $\mu \iota \alpha$, thus, can no longer signify indefiniteness lest it contradict the definite article placed before it. So we must interpret $\mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ in the ordinal sense first following the Hebrew usage of אחד.
§339 We have gone through the step of translating one of-Sabbaths already. Now when another word is added to the context, we find that it must be the first. Normally the native Greek speaker would automatically and subconsciously eliminate the idea of indefiniteness from the context upon seeing the definite article. However, we had to go through the intermediate step manually to show that the logic of biblical interpretation following one absolute rule: context. First we suppose the most common definition to be correct, then when the context requires another, or is more meaningful with a secondary definition, then and only then do we choose the secondary meaning.
§340 So now the Greek $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \beta \beta \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega v$ in Matthew $28: 1$ is shown to have the sense of first of-Sabbaths or in the full form first [day] of-Sabbaths. This was gathered from the parallel passage in Mark where the Greek is $\tau \eta \mu \iota \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$, which literally means the one [day] of-the Sabbaths. The phrase the one [day] means the first [day]. Recall that the gender of $\mu \mathrm{l} \alpha$ requires [day].
§341 We belabor this point to beat it to death from all aspects. The Bishop's Bible (1568) came to the same conclusion. They translated "first day of the Sabbaths" in Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1, John 20:1, and John 20:19. The Nestle-Aland NOVUM TESTAMENTUM LATINE also has the same in Latin:

| in | prima(m) $\quad$ Sabbati | (Mathew 28:1; Mark 16:9) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| on | first | (I Corinthians 16:2) |

§342 Early translators of the Vulgate generally translated the Latin literally, which accounts for most of the English versions with "first of the Sabbaths." Latin, of course, is the language used by the Roman Catholic Church, but when the Church adopted the Latin tongue, the old Latin versions called the itala were already in existence, so the Church could do nothing about it. Nearly all Latin MSS read "first of the Sabbaths."
§343 Even John Wycliffe followed the Latin, i.e. "oon of the sabotis" in John 20:19, and "day of saboth" in Acts 20:7, 1st ed. Although in His later versions he was bound to put week instead of Sabbaths. The power of tradition was so great at that time that the accuarate translation was noticed by few. Most of Wycliffe's followers recanted or were burned at the stake. Of the man himself, His body was burned and the ashes sown in the rivers of Britain. It was all over a matter called transubstantiation. They had little time to think that the Sabbath was really meant in these passages.
§344 J.W. Bright in The Gospel of Saint John in West-Saxon, London: D.C. Heath \& Co, 1904, accuses the ca. 1050 A.D. MSS, which he was translating, of rendering too literally:

The Graecism una sabbatorum (which fails to convey the required meaning, "the first day of the week") is rendered too literally; so too in Wiclif: "Therefor whanne it was eue in that dai, oon of the sabtis," (pg. 178).
§345 The Resurrection passages, therefore, recomend the following interlinear translations:

| $\varepsilon 1 \varsigma \mu t \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ on first of-Sabbaths (= the first Sabbaths day) | (Matthew 28:1) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\tau \eta \mu \nu \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ the first of-the Sabbaths (= the first of the Sabbaths day) | (Mark 16:2) |
| $\underset{\text { first }}{\pi \rho \omega \tau \eta} \underset{\text { Sabbath }}{\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau 0}$ | (Mark 16:9, disputed ending) |
| $\tau \eta \delta \varepsilon \mu i \alpha \quad \tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ the yet first of-the Sabbaths (= And the first Sabbath day) | (Luke 24:1; John 20:1) |
|  | (John 20:19) |

§346 There are two more passages with the same meaning, making a total of eight passages. This covers all the so called "first day" passages.

$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \quad \mu \iota \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$
On first Sabbath
(I Corinthians 16:2, TR)

For now it is enough to say that the first Sabbath in a known series of Sabbaths is meant by all of these passages (except Mark 16:9, which has merely "first Sabbath" in the singular). The last quote above should give us a clue into the attitude of some traditionalists. What is the required meaning of una sabbatorum or $\mu \nu \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ ? Why does it fail to convey the meaning they wish for? And how can something be "too literal" which makes good sense as is? We shall see in the next section.

## End Notes

§347.1 Reader may read section on Acts 20:7 for necessary background to this note.
§347.2 E.W. Bullinger, in The Companion Bible, advances a view equivalent to translating first day of the weeks with the plural weeks. On Acts 20:7 he says:

> First day of the Sabbaths, i.e. the first day for reckoning the seven Sabbaths to Pentecost. It depended upon the harvest (Deut. 16.9) and was always from the morrow after the weekly Sabbath when the Wave Sheaf was presented (Lev. 23.15). In John 20.1 this was the fourth day after the Crucifixion, "the Lord's Passover." Cp. Ap. 156. This was by divine ordering. But in A.D. 57 it was twelve days after the week of unleavened bread, and therefore more than a fortnight later than in A.D. 29." (compare Bullinger's comment on John 20.1).
§347.3 Bullinger it totally mixed up here, mixing truth and error. The truths are, 1) A.D. 57 is the correct year for Acts 20:7. The errors are, 1) Lev. 23:11, 15 do speak of the Passover Sabbath, not the weekly, 2) He failed to note that the word ov in the Greek was accented wrong in Acts 20:6b, and so came up with too many days after Passover, 3) He interprets Acts 20:6a wrong also, 4) Harvest did not determine the month of Aviv, but spring did.
§347.4 It is apparent from this that Bullinger was like the Sadducees in interpreting Lev. 23:11 as the weekly Sabbath. But even here he departs from the regular Sadducean computation of Pentecost, because the Sadducees always used the weekly Sabbath in Passover week, not one "twelve days later."
§347.4 The first day of the weeks could be any day of the week according to the Rabbinical computation, but it was always the 16th of Nisan, the day after the Passover Sabbath.
§347.5 It is a little known fact that Bullinger recanted his whole Wednesday-Sabbath Afternoon chronology. This can be discovered by reading his book Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, Matthew 12:40:

From all this it is perfectly clear that nothing is to be gained by forcing the one passage (Matt. xii. 40) to have a literal meaning, in the face of all these other passages which distinctly state that the

Lord died and was buried the day before the Sabbath and rose the day after it, viz., on the first day of the week. These many statements are literal and are history: but the one passage is an idiom which means any part of "three days and three nights." The one complete day and night ( 24 hours) and the parts of two nights ( 36 hours in all) fully satisfy both the idiom and the history (pg. 846-847)
§347.6 The passages which he alludes to, and which he bases his recantation on we have already discussed (I Sam. 30:11-13; Est. 4:16; Matt. 27:62-63; John 2:19; I Cor. 15:4; Luke 23:54; Mark 15:42; Luke 24:21). Thirty-Six hours does not explain the idiom. At least forty-eight hours plus a fraction is required to contain parts of three nights as well as three days.
§349 Now it is necessary to study the usual rendering of the Sabbath day in the Septuagint in order to refute the traditional interpretation of $\mu \mathrm{l} \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$. We have already demonstrated the full form of this phrase is $\mu \mathrm{L} \nu \nu$ [ $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha] \tau \omega v$ $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$.
§350 There is more than one traditional line of reasoning to arrive at the equivalent of first day of the week. The easiest way, of course, is simply to render $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ as week. We have already pointed out that this does not do any justice to the plural form of $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$. It also ignores the more customary meaning of the word. And most importantly, and most fatally to it, it ignores the true meaning of the full form of the phrase $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$. For the word day is required, and before interpreting the $\mu \iota \alpha$ preceeding the phrase $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$, we must interpret the phrase itself.
$\S 351$ Whatever $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ means, all the word first ( $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ) can do is count it, or enumerate it. Let "bleep" stand for the phrase. Then we have one bleep or the first bleep. Now we must interpret bleep. For in language the customary meanings of the smaller units govern the meaning of the whole.
$\S 352$ First we sought the meaning of $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$, and found it to mean Sabbaths. Now we add the most immediate context to the word. Preceeding context always governs, so it will be the word before: $\tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$. The phrase customarily means of-the Sabbaths with no contradiction by the context. Now the grammar in the context tells us that $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ (day) is the next word to be considered. So we arrive at day of-the Sabbaths.
§353 To summarize the steps of building the context:

1) $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu=$ Sabbaths
2) $\tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu=$ of the Sabbaths
3) $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v=$ day of the Sabbaths
§354 Now for step 1 all of the occurances of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha \beta \beta \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega \nu$ easily mean Sabbaths. For step 2, we find the same using the NT and LXX as our base: all of the occurances of $\tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ are consistent with the translation we give. But what happens when the word day $(\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha)$ is introduced into the context?

## §355

Does usage dictate:
3b) $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v=$ day of the week ?
3c) $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu=$ day of the weeks ?
3d) $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v=$ day from the Sabbath?
3e) $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v=$ day in the week ?

All of these suggestions have been advanced by various scholars. Option 3b is the usual traditional choice. Option 3c is advanced by some who think the first day of the 50 days in the "weeks" to Pentecost is meant. In the Rabbinic computation it could be any day of the week, but by the Sadducees, who controlled nothing, it would always be Sunday. Option 3d is suggested by some (cf. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon) by a rare ablative interpretation of the genitive (rare for the NT). And 3e by some who think that any day of the week was meant (and $\mu \iota \alpha$ does not solve their problem either; for all it does is give a day in the week!).
§357 Rather than speculate, it would be better to base our interpretation on the many of occurances in the LXX and NT of $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ $\tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$, the phrase in question.
§358
Where do we first run into the phrase? In the Ten Commandments. To be precise in the fourth commandment! Viz., Exodous 20:8:
$\underset{\text { Remember }}{\operatorname{Mv\eta \sigma \theta \eta \tau ı}} \underset{\text { the }}{\tau \eta \nu} \underset{\text { day }}{\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \nu} \underset{\text { of-the }}{\tau \omega \nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu}$
§359 Here we list the remaining occurances in the LXX (some LXX MSS differ):

| $\begin{aligned} & \tau \eta \\ & \text { the } \end{aligned}$ | $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ day | $\tau 0 v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \circ v$ of-the Sabbath | (Exodus 31:15) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| יום השׁבת= |  |  |  |
| $\tau \eta$ | $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ | $\tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ |  |
| the | day | of-the Sabbaths | (Exodus 35:3) |
| $\tau \eta$ <br> the | $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ day | $\tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ <br> of-the Sabbaths | (Exodus 24:8) |
| $\tau \eta$ <br> the | $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ day | $\tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ <br> of-the Sabbaths | (Numbers 15:32) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \tau \eta \\ & \text { the } \end{aligned}$ | $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ day | $\tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ <br> of-the Sabbaths | (Numbers 15:33) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \tau \eta \\ & \text { the } \end{aligned}$ | $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ day | $\tau \omega v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ <br> of-the Sabbaths | (Numbers 28:9) |

Deut. 5:12, 15; Neh. 10:31 (32); 13:15, 17, 19, 22; Judith 10:2 Ps. 91 (92) tit.; Jer. 17:21, 22 (2x), 24 (2x), 27 (2x); Ezek. 46:1, 4, 12 I Mac. 2:32, 34, 41; 9:34, 43; II Mac. 5:25. New Testament: Luke 4:16 13:14, 16; 14:5; John 19:31; Acts 16:13
§360 In every case where the word day is used or implied by the context, one and only one day is meant: the seventh day of the
week, the Sabbath. There are no exceptions to this rule to be found in Scripture. The Greek phrase $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ always means the Sabbath day. Literally it is day of-the Sabbaths, and it is equivalent in meaning to $a$ Sabbath day.
§361 Now what happens when we put the word first $(\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ into the context? Prefixing first to the phrase merely means that which follows is now enumerated, i.e. first Sabbath day, or first of the Sabbaths.
§362 A study of three passages will show that the addition of the word first does not change the day involved; it only counts the day involved.

| Matthew 26:17: $\mathbf{T \eta}$ | $\boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ | $\pi \rho \omega \tau \eta \quad \tau \omega \nu \quad \alpha \zeta \nu \mu \omega \nu$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On-the | yet | first [day]of-the unleavens |



Luke 22:7: $\mathbf{H} \lambda \theta \varepsilon v \delta \varepsilon \quad \eta \quad \eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \quad \alpha \zeta \nu \mu \omega \nu$ Came yet the day of-theunleavens
§363 First we must define "the day of the unleavens". This idiom is just like "the day of the Sabbaths". Remember that in Greek thought "the day of the Sabbaths" is the seventh day of the week. The idiom is plural "Sabbaths" because the seventh day keeps recurring. It can be rendered "Sabbaths day," or "Sabbath day".
§364
The case is the same with "day of unleavens". It is equivalent to "the unleavened bread day," as opposed to an ordinary day. It is not to be confused with "the days of the unleavens" (Acts 20:6), which is plural in the word days (see §289). For "the day of the unleavens" refers to only one of those days, i.e. the chief or principle day of the unleavens. "Unleavens," i.e. unleavened things, were eaten for seven days according to Law, but "a day," or "the day" of unleavens is but one of those days. Likewise "day of the Sabbaths" is but one of the Sabbaths days.
§365 Now, the principle day of unleavened things was the first day of the feast, when the Passover Seder was eaten, not to be confused with the day of preparation when the lamb was sacrificed. That is why Matthew, Mark and Luke use different idioms, "first of unleavened things," "first day of unleavened things," and "day of unleavened things," all mean the same day, i.e. the day on which Yeshua ate the Seder.
§366 The addition of the word "first" changes the day not. The deletion of "day" changes it not. The addition of "first" only counts the day. The omitted "day" is implied by the feminine gender of "first." Hence, if we are to use this knowledge, then it is evident that "day of the Sabbaths," does not mutate to "first day of the week," or
"first day from the Sabbath," or "a day of the week," or "first day of the weeks," e.t.c. by the addition of "first." There is no evolution to Sunday.
§367 Lest the reader be confused, the dispersion Jews celebrated two "first day of unleavened things" out of doubt upon which day was the correct day, due to doubt as to the exact day of the new moon. The first first day was thus the day of preparation for the second first day of unleavened things. Yeshua ate the Seder on the first first day out of traditional habit. The actual first day was the next day, as John makes clear.

## Counting Days of the Week to the Sabbath

§368 Sometimes an appeal is deceptively made to the Rabbinic convention for enumerating the days of the week. Many have claimed that the Jews counted days from the Sabbath, no doubt influenced by the need for an excuse to translate the resurrection passages "first day of the week," with the idea of "first day [from] the sabbath" in mind. The truth is that the Jews did not and do not count days "from" the sabbath. They count them toward the Sabbath. This truth is supressed because it is impossible to get "to" or "toward" out of the Greek. It is only possible to get "of" or "from." And clearly, it is not "from," because the Jews did not count days "from" the Sabbath! I myself was mislead by this subterfuge until I read Dr. Jones Chart of the Week.

The attempt to muster Jewish traditional support for the rendering "first day of the week" goes as follows: The assumption is made that the Greek in our Resurrection passages is a direct translation of similar Rabbinic usage for counting the days of the week. For instance, The Theological Dictionary of The New Testament (edited by Hitler's theological hatchet man, Gerhard Kittel) says:

The terms for the days of the week in bShab., 156a: בחד בשבבא (on the first day of the week); בתרי בשבׁא (on the second day of the week); (on the third day of the week); בארבעא בשׁבא (on the fourth day of the week); בחמשׂא בשׁבא (on the fifth day of the week); במעלי בשׁבתא (on the preparation for the Sabbath); בשׁבתא (on the Sabbath). (TDNT, Vol. VII, pg. 6, note 38 ).

The examples here are from the Talmud. This means they do not predate the second century. Also they are in Aramaic, not Hebrew. It also needs to be pointed out that שבת does not translate "week" as in TDNT. It is still "Sabbath." The ב commonly means "into" (Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament); also, "4. often pregn. with verbs of motion, when the movement to a place results in rest in it, into" (BDB). In that case all of the examples here would be, "one to[ward] Sabbath," "two to[ward] Sabbath," "three to[ward] Sabbath," "four to[ward] Sabbath," "five to[ward] Sabbath," "on preparation by Sabbath," and "on Sabbath." So the days are merely measured to the Sabbath, and Sabbath does not really mean, "week" as TDNT claims. In fact, TDNT, and all similar sources that claim the Jews counted the days so that the word meant "week" are lying: "Each day proceeds on, and belongs to the Sabbath. This is the meaning in all the languages where 'into Sabbath' or 'into the Sabbath' is employed" (William Mead Jones, D.D., A Chart of the Week).
§370 Here is another example of deception, this time from Lange's Commentary:

The term $\mu \iota \alpha \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ agrees with the Rab-

binical signification of the days of the week: בשׁבת אחד, Sunday; ששי בשׁבת, Monday; ששׁישׁי בשבת, Tuesday, etc. See Lightfoot, p. 500. As $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \alpha$ in the second clause certainly means week and not the Sabbath day, it seems natural to understand it the same way in the first clause. (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Vol. 8, pg. 544, note 2, Matthew 28:1).
§371 Again, in the examples cited, the Hebrew ב means "to," "into," or "toward" the "Sabbath." So the Hebrew word שבת does not really mean "week." In fact the Hebrew already has a word for "week," which is a derivative of the word "seven": שבוע:
§372 Now the Greek of our Resurrection passages does not, in fact, translate into the Hebrew or Aramaic which would be used to enumerate the days of the week. The literal Hebrew equivalent of $\mu 1 \alpha \eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ is not אחד בשׁבת. Rather it is אחד יום השבתות. If we are to backtranslate, then we must keep "Sabbaths" plural. We must retain the definite article. And we must use the construct state to properly render the genitive. The typical Hebrew designation for the Sabbath day is: יום הששבת. It literally means day of-the-Sabbaths. To repeat, the Hebrew אחד בשׁבת is naturally understood as "one to the Sabbath," that is "one day toward the Sabbath," but the Hebrew אחד הששבת is naturally understood as
"one day of the Sabbath." The critical difference is in whether the article, $\boldsymbol{i}$ in Hebrew, is used, or the preposition, ב in Hebrew, is used. $\beth$ and only the preposition $\beth$ is used in those contexts where a day other than the Sabbath is required. Otherwise, the definite article is used with the word day in the construct state. And then only the Sabbath is meant. Adding Hebrew cardinal numbers (one, two, three, ...) can only count the Sabbaths involved. In such case they function as ordinal numbers (first, second, third ...).

It is impossible to translate the Greek of our Resurrection passages as "one [day] to the Sabbath," because the genitive case will not allow such a translation. If such were meant, then it could have been said easily another way. The Jewish traditional evidence is corrupted into counting days "from" the Sabbath because the Greek of the Ressurection passages cannot be forced to conform to the true Jewish method. For example, "Prof. Sophocles regards the gen. (dependent on $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ ) in such exx. as those that follow (cf. Mk. xvi. 9 above) as equiv. to $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mathrm{w}$. an accu., the first day after the sabbath; see his Lex. pg. 43 par. 6" ( $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau 0 v$, Thayer's Lexicon).

Actually, it does not make sense to count days from the Sabbath, because one naturally looks forward to a coming sabbath, not back to one that is already past. At one time I thought to translate Luke 18:12, "I fast twice from the Sabbath," but it is not likely anymore, unless it can mean "I fast twice to the Sabbath." And so far I don't know of any cases where the genitive (the case ending here) can mean "to" or "toward."
§372.1 Luke 18:12 is often offered as an iron-clad example of "Sabbath" having the meaning of "week." It reads in most translations, "I fast twice a week." Traditionally it is known that the Pharisees did actually fast twice a week, on Mondays and Thursdays, so it appears that a meaning of "week" is required. But the literal translation of the passage with the context it: "I fast twice the Sabbath I tithe all, as much as Iget." Rather than translate "Sabbath" "week," it would be better to place it with the following sentence, so that the monetary thithe is given on Sabbath, viz. "I fast twice. On the Sabbath I tithe all, as much as I get." For the wealthiest of the Pharisees would convert the tithes to money by adding $5 \%$, and then they would give the money into the box on Sabbath, no doubt in such a manner as to impress their peers.

Now if it is insisted that "Sabbath" musthere mean "week," then it must be pointed out that this would be the only place in the entire Bible that it could mean that without creating a contradiction of some other Biblical fact. Furthermore, the Greek in Luke 18:12, $\tau 00 \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \circ 0$, is singular, and the word "day" is neither present nor implied, so that this phrase does not compare directly with "first [day] of the Sabbaths" ( $\mu 1 \alpha[\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha] \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ ).
§372.2 Sometimes an appeal is made to the titles in the LXX (Septuagint) for some of the Psalms. For example, the Greek title for Psalm 94 is: $\Psi \alpha \lambda \mu \circ \varsigma \tau \omega \Delta \alpha v \imath \delta \tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \alpha \delta \imath \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \circ v$, which may translate as, "A Psalm of David, third [day] from Sabbath." It is clear that this

Psalm title, and the few others like it, formed no part of the original text. In fact, we do not have the Septuagint version that Yeshua and His disciples would have seen. The oldest complete version is Codex Sinacticus which dates from the fourth century. And that was long after the Jews rejected the Septuagint. But before Sinacticus, it is admitted that "In the course of time Christian insertions crept into the text, as in ... Ps. 13, Ps. 95, etc. ${ }^{7}$ [7. On the Christian insertions (additamenta christiana), cf. A. Rahlfs, Psalmi cum Odis (1931), pp. 30-32]" (pg. 53, "The Septuagint," The Text of the Old Testament, Ernst Wurthwein, Eerdmans, 1979). Also, "The number of competing versions in addition to the original text [which we do not have] was undoubtedly confusing, especially in discussions with the Jews ... Eusebius reports that in the Psalms Origen [A.D. 230-240] added a fifth, sixth, and seventh version" (ibid., pg. 55) to his Hexapla. "But Origen also interfered with the text ... without indicating it" (pg. 56) so that this text is called the "Hexaplaric text." "None of the various surviving forms of the text has preserved the original form of the version" (pg. 59).

Therefore, we may conclude that the Psalm superscriptions counting days from the Sabbath were added by the Church either unilaterally, or by mistranslation of the Hebrew method of counting days "toward" the Sabbath. In a letter to Ernest L. Martin, author of Secrets of Golgotha, I said the following,


#### Abstract

"The truth is that each generation of Christians has distanced itself from the sabbath more than the previous. They have to start somewhere. After understanding that certain psalms were read on given days of the week according to Jewish tradition, the Alexandrian ... [Christians] used what they thought was the "biblical designation" of the days of the week, but since they had already been mislead as to the day of the resurrection, and the proper enumeration of the days of the week in first century Hebrew \& Greek, they put " $\mu \mathrm{\imath} \alpha \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \sigma 0, "$ for one and " $\delta \varepsilon v \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \circ v$ " for the other.


> But however said titles got there, the Sunday resurrection theory dies on the anvil of biblical chronology: viz., the points I made which show that some version of the above theory is true, and which you overlooked. I would still like you to address them, with all due respect, since these are from the scripture -- a status which Psalm titles do not hold.

Typically, the initial response of the scholarly world to the Sabbath Resurrection is a knee jerk rebuttal, such as are given to ignorant people asking questions. But when they see that they are not dealing with a simpleton, they end up resorting to some extra Biblical tradition like Psalm titles (LXX: Ps. 23:1 [24:1], 37:1 [38:1], 47:1 [48:1], $91: 1$ [92:1], $92: 1$ [93:1], $93: 1$ [94:1]) which are not in the Hebrew text, and of which we have no extant copies prior to the Christian Era.

All through this book, I have been pointing out that traditional

Christianity refuses to take the Scripture literally on the question of history's most important event. They do not heed Yeshua's words, "After three days," nor "three nights," nor "first of the Sabbaths." Nor can they explain Daniel's Prophecy literally from the word to rebuild the city to the coming of Messiah. I will throw in an additional point. Their scholars consistently refuse to translate " $\varepsilon к \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \sigma 1 \alpha$ " as "congregation," prefering "Church" instead, and "baptism," instead of "immersion." It is plainly clear, therefore, that their point of view is based upon tradition and not the actual meaning of the Biblical text.
$\S 372.3$ Also, the phrase $\mu 1 \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omega v$ pops up in the Church Fathers and works such as the Didache in a sense where it is clearly taken to mean "first day of the week." However, these works clearly reject the Jewish Faith of Yeshua, opting for their own priesthood and traditions, which reinterpret the plain meaning of God's words into something else. Right from the beginning, these sources reject the Torah (the Law - God's Instruction). This explains the entire motive for the corruption we find in the Church's documents, so that such documents can teach us nothing about the truth, except to serve as and example of human depravity and inconsistency.

We need to look no further than the Scripture for the right to pass such a judgment on that Religious System which deviates from the God ordained instruction. The first King of Israel (Jeroboam) was also into changing God's holy days. And the apostate priests were also into Sun worship (cf. Ezek. 8) - even in Judea. It is for this reason that Christian practice is truly and simply just a new permutation of the Ba'alism condemned in the Scripture.
§372.4 The Church regularly spins off reactionary groups to its excess and unbiblical tradition, but which are just as ignorant as she is, so that they also are a mixture of truth and error. Such groups are called "cults" but actually they use the same methods of "interpretation" that the Church uses to arrive at different conclusions. And because the cults commit error and are not doctrinally pure, the Church finds the excuse to criticise them. Actually, the Church is the largest cult of them all.


[^0]:    1. Continental Europeans count Monday as the first day of the week, and Sunday as the seventh day of the week. The Burmese have eight days in their week, and the Romans used to commonly count Saturday as the first day. All these nations depart from the God ordained order of creation. The seventh day of the week is the day known as Sabbath everywhere by all Jews. Later we discuss exactly how the Jews numbered the days of the week. Those nations which do not number the days as the Jews do have departed from the norm.
