

**Part Two of PART ONE**  
**Gólgatha to Géhenna**  
**Death to Entombed**

5.1.1.7.

**“First Day of De-Leaven”**

**“Jesus knew that His hour was come ... unto the end!”**

5.1.1.7.1.

**The Last Supper – When?**

5.1.1.7.1.1.

**Synoptists AND John Narrate Last Supper**

John relates a “supper” Jesus and his disciples had, “before the Feast of Passover”.<sup>13:1 of the Manifest of Yahweh’s Disciples</sup>

J.C. Ryle comments: “(John) in his Gospel leaves out the Lord’s Supper altogether, and does not even name it”.<sup>Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, Evangelic Press 1977</sup> Also Bolkestein

5.1.1.7.1.1.1.

**The Last Night of All**

“One thing at any rate is pretty clear. It was not the institution of the Lord’s Supper (John records in chapter 13)... Brentius stands alone in maintaining that it was the Lord’s Supper.”

This is the strangest remark. Was this not “the last evening of His ministry”? John states that it was “before” Passover,<sup>13:1</sup> and “night”.<sup>30</sup> Was this not the same night Judas went out to **betray** Jesus? It could be no other night than the one Jesus was **arrested**, for Jesus declares, “**Now** is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in Him”.<sup>31</sup> With this statement Jesus had his crucifixion in mind. Says Ryle:

“These verses (of John 13) show us what glory the crucifixion brought both to God the Father and to God the Son. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that this was what our Lord had in mind ... An event is about to take place to-morrow, which, however painful ... is in reality most glorifying ...”. (Emphasis CGE)

Refer Appendix p. 263

5.1.1.7.1.1.2.

**Contextual Continuity**

Scholars find it difficult to relate this “night” and “supper” to the next morning and day because of the **long section of discourses** between John thirteen and chapter 18 where the arrest of Jesus is eventually recorded. Jesus however, spoke these things **uninterruptedly** as is implied in 18:1 where John concludes: “**When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron ...**”. Jesus **started** this discourse, 13:31, while still **at table!** The relation between the supper and Jesus’ crucifixion was **immediate**: “**Now** is the Son glorified”.

Judas also wasted no time after he had left: “**Then**, comes there Judas ... having received a band of men and officers ...with **lanterns** and weapons”, as he had arranged with them the day before, “on the Fourth Day”, according to the implications found in the Gospels, as well as, as expressly mentioned in the ‘*Apostolic Constitutions*’. (Book 7 Chapter 23, “on the fourth day (Wednesday) the condemnation went out against the Lord, Judas then promising to betray him for money.”) (This reference came to my knowledge at least a decade after having finished LD.) Using “lanterns”, indicates that “it was night”<sup>Jn.13:30</sup> **still**, when Judas

returned to have Jesus arrested. It was not any other night. Because this is the **night of Jesus’ arrest**, John must have had the **same meal** in mind as the **Synoptists** who also record about the evening of the night Jesus was arrested.

5.1.1.7.1.1.3.

**No Earlier Meal**

The supper related in John 13 had no **double**, as some commentators, just to avoid its **immediate connection** with Jesus’ crucifixion, assert. Conclusions like that reached by Lightfoot, that the supper John mentions had to be the meal at **Simon the leper’s** house, can not be legitimately motivated.

Matthew dates the meal “in **Bethany**” – a **dinner** – “in **Simon the leper’s** house” **just after the priests had “consulted” and just before Judas had “covenanted with them”**, when “**after two days** it would be Passover”. “A woman” anointed Jesus’ “head”. Next “**evening**” of the day before the “**Feast Day**” – the “Preparation of Passover” or “**Day of Removal of Yeast**” just **beginning** – the Lord instituted His Supper “**in the city**” in the “large, furnished and prepared **upper room**”. The meal of John 13:1, was the same meal “in the upper room” recorded by the Synoptists. In other words: Although they all speak of one and the **same Meal** but **not** of the meal in Bethany, they **also do not** speak of the **Passover Meal**.

5.1.1.7.1.2.

**Synoptists Don’t Speak of Passover Meal**

The meal of John 13:1 is taken for the meal at Simon’s house “two days before Passover Feast” and a full day before the Sacrifice would be slaughtered. Scholars try to explain that the “supper” of **John 13:1** could not have been the same meal mentioned by the Synoptists for no reason but that **they, assume**, the Synoptists speak of the Passover Meal! The Last Supper mentioned by the Synoptists occurred **before** the Passover sacrifice was offered – **which could not have been eaten yet**. See Par. 5.1.1.6.3.5.3, 5.1.1.6.3.6.

5.1.1.7.1.2.1.

**Not Eaten Before Sacrificed** on the fourth day (**Wednesday**) the condemnation **went out against the Lord, Judas then promising to betray him for money**

Was the **Passover Meal** eaten on the night of “The Last Supper”? Or was it another meal of **Jewish Tradition**? Scholars disagree. Their **doubt** enveloping the question is noticeable in the **circumscription**, “*Last Supper*” (“*Last Night Meal*” in Afrikaans). It is not a description from Scripture for this occasion. Commentators use it to **avoid the issue** of whether the “Last Supper” was the Passover Feast Meal.

Commentators have a problem with the **date** of the Last Supper: While John places the Last Supper on the **14th** of the month (Nisan), on the “Preparation of Passover”, the Synoptists allegedly place it on the **15<sup>th</sup>**, **translated**: “the first day of the feast of unleavened bread”. They find the same “*contradiction*” within Mark’s single reference (14:12) where, as they explain it, “tei protei hemerai ton adzumon “on the first day of unleavened bread”, naturally indicates the 15th Nisan, and, hote to pascha ethuon, “when they killed the passover”, clearly indicates the 14th Nisan”.<sup>Bacchiocchi</sup> (Emphasis CGE)

With “**Passover**” is meant: The Old Testament **sacrifice** for Passover; the “**Preparation of Passover**”: Jn.19:14, or “**day-for-removal-of-yeast**” – **14 Nisan**. The Passover “**Feast**”-**Day**. The Passover **Meal**: Mk.14:12, Lk.22:7, Mk.14:1, Lk.2:41, Jn.2:23 – **15 Nisan**. The Passover of the “**Sheaf of First Fruits Wave Offering**” – **16 Nisan** (the first day of fifty to Pentecost). The **Seven Days of “Unleavened Bread”** Feast: Lk.22:1. That means, with “**Passover**” is meant **any**

part of, or, the whole of “Passover”, and, any part of, or, the whole of the “Feast of Unleavened Bread”. “Passover” encompasses what is meant when it is said: “Observe the month of Abib and keep the Passover”, Dt.16:1.

Ryle could not have thought of these distinctions when he said: *“The Lamb of God was slain at this feast, in spite of the priests, who said, Not on the feast day.”* (Emphasis CGE)

Although not crucified on the “official” Feast Day, Jesus was in fact crucified during or on the “official” “Passover Season” or Passover period. He was crucified “on the day of Passover meant for slaughter”, which was not the 15th but the 14th of the month Nisan, “the day of removal of yeast”. This confirms Ryle’s remark: *“Let us remember that one of the few dates we know for certain of the events in our Lord’s life, is the time of his crucifixion. Of the time of his birth and baptism we know nothing. But that He died at Passover, we may be quite sure. Let us note that our Lord knew perfectly beforehand when and how He should suffer. This, whatever we may think, is a great addition to suffering. Our ignorance of things before us is a great blessing. Our Lord saw the cross clearly before Him, and walked straight up to it. His death was not a surprise to Him, but a voluntary, foreknowing thing.”* (Emphasis CGE. To understand the nature and purpose of the Last Supper, these comments should be kept in mind.)

As Jesus had taken upon himself our flesh and our human nature and had made it his own so He took upon himself our earthly time and made it his own. (See Part Three of Part Three, Karl Barth.) Jesus “foreknew” the Passover Season. He, determined its dates and He, brought its “times” to “fulness”. The 14th Nisan: “Preparation of Passover” (John), *Hote to pascha ethuon*, “when they killed the passover”, *tehi prohtehi hehmerai tohn adzumohn*, “on the First Day of Removing of Leaven” (Mark, Luke and Matthew). This “First First Day” / “The Very First Day” / “Already the First Day” (Old Testament) is distinguished from the 15th Nisan or “The Passover / Passover Feast / Passover Meal”, and the “Feast Meal / Feast Days of Unleavened Bread”. This distinction is attributable to the primitive date of Passover that prescribed removing of leaven and preparing of unleavened dough, and the preparation for and the slaughter of the sacrifice – before sunset. The baking of unleavened bread and its eating and the roasting and eating of the meat came after sunset. All things both before and after sunset, institutionally, at first happened on the fourteenth Nisan. The day used to be reckoned from sunrise. This reckoning later changed to a sunset observance. Now the “Feast”, or, “Eat”-ceremony fell on the evening of the fifteenth Nisan, that is, during the beginning of the fifteenth of Nisan and no longer during about its middle. (Thus any distinction between the reckoning of ceremonial sabbaths and the weekly Sabbath, disappeared, the weekly Sabbath being reckoned from sunset to sunset from creation.)

“Preparation”, “Feast (Meal / Day)”, as well as the seven days of Unleavened Bread, are all considered “Passover”, which explains Josephus’ statement that the Feast of Unleavened Bread was an **eight** days feast. Antiquities of the Jews 2, 15, 7, in TRC p.75c

The overall concept of an eight day period must have underlain the explanation in Deuteronomy 16:8: “Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread: and on the seventh day (that thou eatest unleavened bread) shall be a solemn assembly”. The day of *A-dzumos* as such when leaven used to be searched out and removed (by hiding it), in every household and throughout the entire land, is intentionally left out of reckoning which, if taken into account, would have made it an eight day period. That is why Mark and Luke define the “First Day of Removing of Leaven” as “the day on which the passover (lamb) had to be sacrificed”. With “First Day of *A-dzumos*” they mean,

“First Day of Passover”. They see **the whole period as one**.

In Mark and Matthew, however, also a contextual association exists between the ordinal, “First Day”, and the “Two days (before Passover)”. Two days before Passover, the Jews conspired to kill Jesus, only, “not on the Feast” Day itself! So this “**First Day of De-leaven**” was the day after the Jews decided to kill Jesus; it was the second in time-sequence of the two days before Passover. Mt.26 and Mk.14 Counting backwards, it will be the first day before Passover Feast, that is, the first day of the entire paschal period (of eight days), the day of “**Preparation of Passover**”.

#### 5.1.1.7.1.2.2.

#### Washing of Feet Before Meal?

The only reason Ryle mentions for his categorical conclusion that the Last Supper is not mentioned by John, is that “*It seems highly improbable that the washing of the disciples’ feet would take place after the Lord’s Supper.*” Washing of feet normally came before meal.

But why associate washing of feet with Passover? Washing of feet (like the use of unfermented wine) was introduced to the Passover meal long after the Feast had been institutionalised during “Mosaic” times. The washing of feet is **no Old Testament institutional element** of the Passover Feast Meal.

And why consider washing of feet improbable to come after the meal on the occasion of the Last Supper? Ryle maintains his own opinion about the meaning of the washing of feet: *“The actions here described (Jesus’, washing the disciples’ feet) would not seem nearly so strange to the disciples as they do to us. They were simply the courteous actions of a host who desired to show the utmost degree of hospitable attention to the guests. Thus Abraham washed the feet of the three angelic messengers.”*

The order of washing after the meal during the Last Supper is **out of the ordinary** – which is in line with everything else with regard to this occasion. From its inception in the mind of the disciples to their finding the room furnished and the table laid, the Last Supper was **inexplicable**. That the **guest** – Jesus – would wash the feet of the **host** – the disciples, is extraordinary. (Jesus was not host as Ryle maintains.) The meal was **prepared for Jesus** – not for the disciples. The owner of the room also had everything ready for his Guest – Jesus. That the “actions” should be so “minutely” recorded (Ryle’s observation) of a “simply” familiar and no “strange” action, implies more than just courtesy. *“The minuteness with which every action of our Lord is related here is very striking. No less than seven distinct things are named, – rising, laying aside garments, taking a towel, girding Himself, pouring water into a bason, washing and wiping. This very particularity stamps the whole transaction with reality, and is the natural language of an astonished and admiring eye-witness.”*

That Jesus elaborated on the deeper meaning of what he did, makes the washing of feet a **most peculiar element** of the Last Supper. Despite it being served after meal, the washing of feet should not be seen as something that could impossibly have occurred at the Last Supper, and that John and the Synoptists who do not mention the washing of feet must speak of different meals.

#### 5.1.1.7.1.3.

#### Purpose of Last Supper

The purpose of the Last Supper of Jesus and his disciples, was to **prepare**: “to be able to”, “to be allowed”, to eat the Passover: “That they might eat the Passover”:

Mt.26:17: “That we prepare for thee to eat the passover”, *hetoimasohmen soi faghein to pascha*. Mk.14:12: “We may prepare that thou mayest eat”, *hetoimasohmen hina fagheis*. Lk.22:9: “That we may prepare”, *hetoimasohmen*;

“that we **may** eat”, *hina faghohmen*. Mt.26:18: “I **prepare** for Passover”, *poi oh to pascha*. Mk.14:14, Lk.22:11: “Where I **may** eat the Passover”, *hopou to pascha faghoh*. Mk.14:15: “**Make ready** for us”, *hetoimasate hehmin*. Lk.22:8, 12: “**Prepare** us the Passover”, *hetoimasate hehmin to pascha*. “There **prepare** ye”, *ekei hetoimasate*. Mk.14:16, Mt.26:19, Lk.22:13: “They **prepared** the Passover”, *hetoimasan to pascha* = “They prepared **for** Passover”. This was an event of the “Preparation of Passover” – John.

Reference to the Passover is not made in the indicative as if the sacrifice had **actually** been eaten, but in the **subjunctive**: that the Passover **might** be eaten, or, with the **infinitive**: with the **resolve to** eat the Passover. To “**prepare**” fulfils the purpose of **intention**. Not the Passover as such will be on the “table made ready”, but **this table will make ready** “**for** Passover”. Jesus and his disciples had their Passover Preparation Meal. **It wasn’t any Jewish traditional meal, but that of the Christ and his disciples. As it at first prepared for the Sacrifice of Passover it forever afterwards will be the Lord’s Supper to also prepare his Church in faith and perseverance to the end.**

The **accusative**, *to pascha* is used adverbially and with the meaning “**for** Passover”. Greek uses the accusative, where, for instance, English, would have used a dative, and it has the verb **transitive** while the sense is **intransitive**: “Prepare the Passover” = “Prepare **for** Passover”. The accusative in this case points to the eventual **purpose** of the action – to **prepare in order to be able to** eat Passover / to **prepare toward** Passover. In Jesus’ case in order to be able **to be** Passover.

The disciples **seemingly** initiate the idea to prepare Passover for Jesus. But **Providence** determines their every action. They act as host for Jesus. Preparation is made **for Jesus’** sake. Even where the text says, “Prepare ye for us”, <sup>Lk.22:8,12</sup> the meaning implied, is, “for Jesus”. Jesus, as **the one of authority**, explains to the disciples, his underlings, how He wants things to be done for **Himself**, using the plural in lieu of the singular. This is a common way to express a **command**. The disciples then were not sent to cook the **meat** of sacrifice, and they eventually did not “sit down” to eat the **Passover** meal that included **unleavened** bread. They went to **prepare** what would **enable Jesus** for the imminent Passover of which He would Himself be the Lamb of Sacrifice – “**for us**”.

Jesus does not **actually** eat the Passover, nor does He eat of **whatever** ceremonial meal. “I have greatly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, but I tell you, **I will by no means eat** thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves ... And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and **gave unto them**, saying, **this is my body** which is **given for you**: Do this in remembrance of me.” <sup>Lk.22:14-20</sup> The reason why Jesus does not eat is obvious: His own body was to be “eaten” as the Passover Sacrifice.

In Mk.14:18, The phrase, “One of you which **eateth with me**”, has no connection with the meal at issue. If applicable to the situation as it was, the plural would have been used: One of **you all who eat** with me. But the singular occurs: “One of you (all) will betray me, **the one who eats**, with me.” The expression is used **figuratively** for: “One in whom I **confide**” / “The one I trusted”.

Luke has a variant: “The **hand** of him that betrayeth me is **on the table with me**”. <sup>22:21</sup> The betrayer and Christ walked and ate together. The betrayer was **trusted** – he was even trusted with the purse.

Similarly the phrase “One that **with me dips** in the (one) bowl”, is not meant literally but figuratively. If used literally, all of the twelve would have been insinuated to be traitors.

But being said metaphorically, it means, “The one in your midst who **respects me not**”. And there was only the one who did not care for Jesus – in a manner of speaking, he would “*poke his hand in the dish*” even while Jesus’ hand went in.

Jesus used figurative speech not only where he refers to the bread and wine as his flesh and blood, but in these indications of the inmost thoughts of his betrayer.

Jesus knows of Judas’ secret disdain, <sup>Jn.13:11</sup> but reacts to it in a most unselfish way: He takes a morsel and offers it to Judas. <sup>Jn.13:26</sup> He still pleads with him without using words. Jesus didn’t split on Judas. Judas’ question – that of every one else – : “Is it I perhaps?” <sup>Mk.14:19</sup> is answered by Jesus with: “**You** said (it – not I)” <sup>Mt.26:25</sup> Even after Judas left, the disciples did not know who the traitor would be. They thought Judas was going to “buy something before the Feast”. <sup>Jn.13:29</sup> They fostered no ill feelings toward Judas, thinking he was going to buy the poor something! If the expressions referred to above were to be interpreted literally the disciples would have interpreted them literally and would have known about Judas. But **they did not know**, and therefore the expressions had **figurative** meaning that kept the disciples wondering. Consequently it cannot be adduced from these expressions that Jesus did eat of the meal, and that it **was the Passover Meal** which He sent the disciples to prepare for Him to eat.

According to Jn.13:26, John asked Jesus who would betray him, and Jesus answered: The one to whom he would hand a morsel. “He gives to Judas”. It seems **no one understood**. That Jesus “*whispered*” his answer “*confidentially*” to John only is unnecessary surmising. Jesus’ answer and actions took on metaphorical significance. **Not even John** knew who the traitor would be. Literally the expression also implies that Jesus actually ate of the meal – which He did not. So it cannot be taken for literal.

The Authorised Version, translating 1Cor.11:25 with: “when he had supped”, is a mistake. *Meta to deipnehsai*, means, “after **the eating** (of the meal / bread)” which Jesus had just given to the disciples to eat: “When he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, **eat ye**, for this is my body which is broken **for you** ...”. Just imagine what went through Jesus’ mind, and one can understand in what way **this was a “preparing” for him for what was to come.**

Ceil and Moishe Rosen, <sup>Christ in the Passover</sup>, chapter, “The ancient Seder and the Last Supper”, p.55 further, do not succeed therein to reconcile “*the ancient order of the Passover service*” with “*the picture of the Last Supper*”: <sup>See also Bolkestein, Mark</sup>

“*Now it was the eve of the Passover celebration. Jesus sent two of his disciples, Peter and John, to prepare for the ritual meal ...*”. It was not for the Passover ritual of Feast Meal “*celebration*” that the disciples went to prepare. They went “to prepare”, for its preparation – “for Jesus”, “that He might eat Passover” – “**eat**”, not literally (He did not eat at all), but symbolically in his own **death**.

“*They found a room as He had instructed them and performed all preliminaries. All was in readiness ...*”. “*Here, on the eve of His death, (Jesus) showed them the full meaning and symbolism of the Passover memorial.*”

Had it been Passover’s “*meaning and symbolism*” Jesus were to show his disciples, He would have taken meat and unleavened bread; not leavened bread and wine. Passover’s “*full meaning and symbolism*” Jesus showed **on the cross**, not in the upper room. He would show the meaning of the symbolism of the Passover “*memorial*” by fulfilling it **in his own body** on the cross. With the Last Supper, Jesus

showed his disciples the meaning of **His** death, with the **New Symbols** of the **Christian sacrament**. The redemption wrought in **Christ** was given the **new** “memorial” of the Last Supper: “Do **this** in remembrance of **Me**”.

Where Jesus says: “That I may eat the Passover”, his intention is **prophetic**. He prospectively offers the sacrifice and empties the cup of suffering in his own body. That Jesus would be the Passover Sacrifice for which the disciples went to prepare, explains **the greater meaning the “eating” of this Passover would have had**.

#### 5.1.1.7.2.

##### **Similarities or Differences?**

#### 5.1.1.7.2.1.

##### **Abstract Assimilation**

“*The Passover Haggadah mentions four traditional questions: Why is this night different from all other nights? On all other nights we can eat bread or matzo (unleavened bread). Why, tonight, only matzo?; On all other nights, we can eat any kind of herbs. Why, tonight, bitter herbs?; On all other nights we don’t dip herbs we eat into anything. Why, tonight, do we dip twice?; On all other nights we can eat either sitting up straight or reclining. Why, tonight, do we all recline?*”<sup>77</sup> From *Christ in the Passover*, C & M Rosen, Moody Press, p.77 (Emphasis CGE)

The Rosens cite various Gospel passages under different headings of “*The Ancient Seder*” “*of the Passover service*”, Lk.22:17-18 is sorted under the heading of “*The Kiddush*”; Jn.13:4-5 under the heading of “*The First Washing of Hands*”; Jn.13:26-27 under the heading of “*Broken Pieces of Bread Dipped in Bitter Herbs and Charoseth and Handed to All*” (“*The Paschal meal eaten; hands washed a third time; third cup poured*”); 1 Cor.11:23-24 is sorted under the heading of “*Blessing After Meals*”; 1 Cor.11:25 under the heading of “*Blessing Over Third Cup*” (“*Third cup taken; second part of Hallel recited; fourth cup poured and taken,*”); Mt.26:30 is sorted under the heading of “*Closing Song*”.

This arrangement is artificial and incoherent, and meaninglessly fragments the narration of the Last Supper. The assortment and combination of the various elements from the Seder and the Supper rather underscore their **un**-relatedness. According to these distinctive practices of the Jewish Passover **Seder**, no particularity of the Last Supper qualifies it as the Passover **Meal**.

Nothing “*necessitates the conclusion that the Markan tradition was mistaken in supposing that the Supper was the Passover Meal*”. “*In 15:1 f., 12-16, it should be noted, it is clear that Mark means the Passover Meal*” ... **by no means!**<sup>V. Taylor Mk.14:16 See Par.5.2.2.</sup>

#### 5.1.1.7.2.2.

##### **The Meal and Food**

The meal is described in John and Paul with the term for a normal, **ordinary meal**: *deipnon* – not “Passover” or “Feast”. Here is the meal that eventually was eaten by the disciples, intended to “**prepare** for Passover” – not the Passover itself. This meal equipped and enabled Jesus to take what was in store for him on the day the Passover was killed. This supplied the reason for Paul to describe the Last Supper with its true designation: “Lord’s Supper”.

No indication exists that **meat**, the flesh of the Passover sacrifice – which was central to the Passover Meal – formed part of the Last Supper. In the Synoptics and 1Cor.10:17 the “**bread**” used with the Lord’s Supper was **ordinary**, daily, leavened bread: *artos*.<sup>Mk.14:22</sup> It was not *adzumos*, **unleavened**, that is, Passover bread. In John no hint is given that the “morsel”, *psohmion*,<sup>Jn.13:27</sup> of the “sop”, also *psohmion* –

“food” – was **unleavened** bread; Definitely it was not dipped **twice** as with Passover meal – or, for that matter, “dipped” at all. The “sop” was the “supper”, just **bread**, served in a bowl, and that **bowl** is indicated with the word “sop”, or, simply, the “food”. The meaning of Jesus, “dipping” into the “sop”, means no more than that He “took”, “bread”. Jesus handed the disciples of what the supper in the bowl consisted of, and that only, was in the bowl into which he stretched out his hand and took of.

“*It was during the ceremony of dipping the second sop into the bitter herbs ...*”. There is not even a suggestion of a **sauce** into which bread was dipped. Nothing indicates or implies the presence of bitter **herbs**, or other herbs, on this table. The traditional impression of the prominence of these substances in the Last Supper is ascribable to paraphrasing translations of the uncomplicated word *psohmion*. The Supper of the Lord of Christianity is extremely **simple**, and the pomp of the Jewish Passover Seder is completely foreign to it.

#### 5.1.1.7.2.3.

##### **Reclined**

“*Jesus reclined with the twelve ...*”. It is stated that Jesus and his disciples “**sat**” down – not, “*reclined*”.<sup>Mk.14:18 Lk.22:27</sup> Where it is said that John “**leant**”, the meaning is that he **leant over** against Jesus. (“*The Greek words here would be more literally rendered, “He having fallen upon”. It is so translated in eleven out of the twelve other places where it occurs in the New Testament. The idea is evidently of one moving and leaning towards another, so as to get closer to him ...*”.<sup>Ryle</sup>) The passage does not say that John reclined on a bench or on the floor at a **table of his own** – which would have been the case had he reclining. The action was that of **sitting** down, and not of reclining or **lying** down on one’s side. Compare *anakeimai*: “Sitting down” at ordinary meals;<sup>Mt.9:10, Jn.6:11</sup> John would not “**incline**” upon Jesus;<sup>Jn.13:23</sup> Sitting “at table”<sup>Lk.22:21 Jn.13:28</sup> like Western custom implies, at **one**, and a **higher**, style of furniture; The preposition *ana* means “(sitting) **up**(wards)”, in such a position that **feet could be washed hanging down over a bowl**; *anakeimai* is an equivalent of *anaklinoh* – compare Mt.8:11, 14:19, Lk.7:36, 13:29, but *anaklinoh* is the word more likely to be translated “to lie down”. “To incline” is derived from *anaklinoh*, and not from *anakeimai*. *Anaklinoh* is notably **not** used in the Last Supper passages. *Anakeimai* constitutes two words, *ana* and *keimai*, “to be situated, placed – besides other meanings. Its meaning of “lying down” is not exclusive or as strong as in the case of *anaklinoh*.”

The fact that John is mentioned as having “leant over” or “reclined” implies that only he so behaved and that the other were sitting upright at the table, not leant over or reclined.

#### 5.1.1.7.2.4.

##### **The Table**

The custom of reclining required **an own table for each person** or small group. Assuming the Last Supper was Passover Meal it is argued that **different** tables were used and not one for all only as implied and stated by the Gospels.<sup>Lk.22:21 Jn.13:28</sup> The argument should reach the opposite conclusion if the Gospels are accepted as first in authenticity and authority, and should state that **because the Gospels indicate only one table**, there could be no possibility of reclining at the Last Supper; it could not have been the Passover meal – or Jewish Seder of the Passover Meal, or an Essener ritual.<sup>Pixner</sup> (The Leonardo da Vinci portrait of the Last Supper is truer to reality than is often accepted. Da Vinci with his passion for physics must have given closer attention to the precise language of the Gospels.)

### 5.1.1.7.2.5.

#### Wine

“*The Gospel accounts of the Last Supper mention only two of the four seder cups – the first and the third ...*”. The Rosens’ mention of the supposed use of wine four times – of which two are allegedly mentioned in the Gospels – is meant to indicate that the Last Supper was indeed the Passover Meal. But wine was used with virtually every meal and was **no peculiarity** of the Passover meal. Its use is of no significance as indication that it was the celebration of the Passover the night before the day of Jesus’ crucifixion. At the Last Supper, **Jesus introduces the wine as the symbol of his own blood to the exclusion and annulment of blood and sacrifice**. No sacrifice could longer represent the blood of the Lamb of God. Wine instead receives a meaning it **never had before**, nor will have, except when used in the Lord’s Supper.

There is a total **absence** of the mention of wine in the Mosaic institution of Passover. Wine was only much **later added** to the ritual of Passover, and then not wine in the ordinary sense of fermented wine, called “**produce of the vine**” on the occasion of the Last Supper and throughout Scripture, but as **unfermented grape juice** – like unleavened bread for Passover. Grape juice with Passover is Jewish kosher, not Christian or Biblical.

### 5.1.1.7.2.6.

#### Sequence and Number

Mark 14:18 and Matthew 26:21 state that Jesus handed “the (one) cup” to the disciples **after** the Meal had started, while the *kiddush* over the first cup of wine, **introduced** the Passover Meal. No suggestion, in any case, exists in any of the Gospel records of the Supper of the Lord, to conclude that the cup was filled more than **once**. The supposition of more than one time’s use of wine at the Last Supper is untenable. The **significance** the wine receives from the **death of Christ once for all** means that it should be taken **only once**. According to Luke 22:17 Jesus first handed the flask over to the disciples for them to **divide** it among themselves. He meanwhile continued with breaking the bread, and after eating of the bread, returned to the wine. Mark and Matthew don’t mention the distribution of the wine, but refer to the drinking of it, **once only, after** the bread.

An **interval** between the **filling** and the **drinking** as with the Jewish Passover Seder is also not to be found in the Last Supper. Paul says that the participants in the Lord’s Supper should wait on each other, meaning they should all drink together and once only. Paul has no interval between filling of the cups and drinking it in mind.

### 5.1.1.7.2.7.

#### Closing Song or Hymn

“*And when they had sung an hymn, they went into the mount of Olives.*” Mt.26:30

**Hymns** were sung at almost every ceremony during the whole paschal period – as with any other religious holy day. See Nehemiah 12. Singing proves not that the Last Supper was the Passover Meal. **When Israel came up out of the Red Sea they sang praises to the Lord. Thus did Jesus make songs of Worship and Praise part of the celebration of his coming up from the depths of death victorious!**

### 5.1.1.7.2.8.

#### The Washing of Feet

“*The first hand washing by the host set him apart from the company.*” No mention is made of any washing of hands **before** the Lord’s Supper. On the contrary, one might expect the minimum of such paraphernalia with Jesus’ institution when thinking of his rebuke of the Pharisees over “washings” of pots and pans and hands.

Mk.4:7,8; 7:3,4 Also Paul’s plea that believers should first do whatever necessary at home before coming to the Lord’s Table suggests that they should wash their hands at home and not at the Table.

“*In washing the disciples’ feet, Jesus used this part of the regular ritual to teach His lesson of humility and love ...*”. This washing of feet had nothing “*regular*” about it. It was not regular in order of **custom** – before meals generally, but here afterwards. It was not regular in order of **status**, because Jesus was not host, but guest. The guest never washed the feet of the host. But Jesus while being guest of honour, did. And Jesus thereby not only taught the hosts, but prepared himself for that “*humiliation to the end*” which he would undergo on the impending day.

Washing of feet formed **no part of the Mosaic institution** of Passover Feast. The washing of feet in the event of the Lord’s Supper, separates it irrevocably from the Passover Meal.

The Passover came **before** the journey, out. Washing of feet came **at the end of the journey** – when Jesus would complete it and **arrive in** the Kingdom. (Israel **entered** the Promised Land through the sea, Ex.15:13,17. At the Lord’s Supper washing of feet was **newly** instituted. The disciples saw the Kingdom of God before they died! Their journey would end in Jesus’ arrival in the Kingdom through resurrection from the dead. “If I wash thee not (thy feet) thou hast no part with Me!” Not only forgiveness of sins – symbolised in washing of the whole body in baptism “with” Jesus in his death, has been attained, but also regeneration. Having entered into the Kingdom and “into the rest” – symbolised in the washing of feet of the Lord’s Supper – “with” Jesus in his resurrection from the dead, the goal had been reached!

### 5.1.1.7.2.9.

#### Time and Date

On the Day of Feast everybody had to have found accommodation and had to have settled in order to partake of the **Passover Meal**. That Jesus and his disciples **came from Bethany** and had the Supper, indicates that it was **not Feast Day yet**.

When the disciples went to “prepare”, they found everything in the room ready. They could “sit down”, “within an hour”. Lk.22:7,12,13 It was “evening”. Mk.14:17 Mt.26:20 This was an **earlier** time than the customary for the Passover Meal **just before midnight**. The **time** the Last Supper was eaten makes it **impossible** to have been the Passover Feast Meal. Not only can no indication be found that the offer was already sacrificed, but the Jews the morning after the Last Supper would not enter Pilate’s house because they **still had to eat** Passover. When Jesus and the disciples sat down the evening for this meal, it was only the **start** of the day on which the Passover **had to be slain**. Only after sunset the **following** day would the paschal offer be served.

Judas, while it was night, after the Supper went out to betray Jesus. He needed **time**. Jesus was arrested and brought before Annas and Caiaphas before he was brought before Pilate and Herod and again Pilate, **before** at daybreak he was “delivered” to be crucified. All this implies that Judas left from Supper at early night, in order to have had enough time. Taking all into account, it indisputably indicates that the Last Supper was not the supper of the Passover Feast. And that implies just as indisputably that the day of Christ’s crucifixion – which began with the evening of the Last Supper – had to be the day “before Passover”, Jn.13:1 – “The Preparation of Passover”. Jn.19:14

The Last Supper, was **not the Old Testament** Passover. It is a **New Testament** institution, novel and uniquely **Christian**. Arguments against such an origin and character of the Lord’s Supper are arbitrary and forced. **Jesus introduced every element** of the Last Supper. In no other way but a purely original way, could the Last

Supper, be “The **Lord’s** Supper” – *kuriakos deipnon*, 1Cor.11:20, the Christian “mystery” or “sacrament”, which is neither the last ordinary meal of Jewish tradition, nor the first of unleavened bread, of the Passover Feast.

**None** of the Rosens’ proposed comparisons between Passover and the Last Supper are tenable. They sterilely reflect the **traditional** comparisons and are Judaistical orientated. They lack a purely evangelical approach to the problem of the time and nature of the Lord’s Supper at its institution **the day before Passover Feast** when Jesus He being the Passover Lamb was crucified on the Preparation of the Passover.

#### 5.1.1.7.2.10.

##### More than One Meal

“...*He took that bread **after** He first gave thanks at the end of the meal; then He broke it and gave it to them ... Jesus **here** instituted the new memorial ...*”<sup>p.58c</sup>

We could not trace **such** a sequence of actions in any of the Gospels. What we could find, was the clause “as they sat and did eat” in Mk.14:18 – when Jesus spoke to his disciples about his betrayal – and, **after** this, verse 22, “took bread, and blessed, and gave to them and said, Take, eat, this is my body ...”. Herein lies **not even a suggestion** that Jesus instituted the Christian Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper on occasion of some ceremonial meal (allegedly the *Haggigah*, “*a holy day peace offering*”,<sup>the Rosens, p.54</sup> *The Bedikat Chametz* – the day for search of leaven in order to put it away – had started sunset. That does not prove that the upper room Supper was Passover Feast Meal or *Haggigah*).

The phrase, “**as they ate**”, *esthiontohn*, in Mark and Matthew, however, being a participle, present tense, means “**at meal**”, “**with supper**”, “**while at table**”. It is the way they used to speak – an “idiomatic expression”. It does not mean that a first meal was finished before the Last Supper began. Such an inference, if applicable, is applicable consistently – which will result in **three** meals on this night: the one supposedly implied in Mk.14:18: “And as they sat and did eat ...”; and **another** (consistently) implied, “as they did eat”, in verse **22. Then**, according to the Rosens, “*He first gave thanks at the end of the meal*” – before “He took the bread” and “then broke and gave it...” – which would be the Last Supper and **third** meal!

The Rosens’ conclusion that, “*Looking to the time when Israel would be left without an altar and without a sacrifice. He used the “aphikome (The “after dish of the Passover Meal – the middle, “hidden, or “buried wafer) for the first time to represent not only the Paschal lamb, but His own body!”*” is reached over avidly and arbitrarily. Least of all the Lord’s Supper was the “after dish” of the Jewish Passover Seder. And their conclusion that “*(Judas) left before eating the Passover (and) had, in effect, excommunicated himself ...*” is purely imaginative, and incidentally wrong, for Jn.13:30 confirms that Judas, “Then having **received the sop** went immediately out”.

#### 5.1.1.7.2.11.

##### Christ the Passover Lamb

The most important reason why the Last Supper could not have been the Meal of Passover Feast, is that **Jesus on this Passover would Himself be the Lamb**. If, supposedly, Jesus wanted to have **Passover** Meal with his disciples, but still were to be sacrificed (at the right time for the Passover lamb to be slain), He had to have had **Passover Meal before** the time the lamb could be killed. The Passover sacrifice could not be eaten before it was even slaughtered. Jesus also could not have eaten **Passover after** the sacrifice was offered – for He was to replace it on this occasion, at the appointed time, **which would be the time of his death** the next day.

The Christian Supper of the Lord is “celebration”, “memorial”, not of Passover, but of “*the death of death in the death of Christ*” (John Owen). Through the providence of God, the Lord’s Supper was instituted **before** that which it was to be a memorial of had actually happened. (Even the Passover had been commanded – “instituted” – before it had actually happened.) The Lord’s Supper **commemorates Jesus’ death** on the cross, and He instituted it before He was crucified.

The Passover of which Christ was to be the Lamb, **by the foreordination of God** happened according to the times and dates set for Passover in **Scripture**. Jesus would die at the **appointed** time. The meal of this night could not have been the meal of the Passover Feast that was only eaten **after** the Passover lamb had been slain.

J.C. Ryle remarks: “*One thing at any rate is very plain and noteworthy. The chief priests and their party made much ado about eating the passover lamb and keeping the feast, at the very time they were about to slay the true Lamb of God of whom this passover was a type!*” (Emphasis CGE)

#### 5.1.1.8.1.

##### Day of De-Leaven – Before Passover On Passover

Professor Bacchiocchi, in his *End-Time Issue No. 73*, claims, “*... were the Gospels’ writers alive today, I have reason to believe that they would appreciate help in correcting some of their inaccuracies. Incidentally, some of the inaccuracies are very glaring. For example, the Synoptic Gospels place Christ’s crucifixion on the day after Passover (Nisan 15), while John on the actual Passover day (Nisan 14). It would be nice if we could ask them to reconcile their differences and give us the exact date of the Crucifixion.*”

Bacchiocchi says John places Christ’s crucifixion “*on the actual Passover day*” (that is, on the actual Feast Day), which is plainly untrue, because John says “it was the **Preparation** of Passover”. This day, says Bacchiocchi, “*the Synoptic Gospels place on the day after Passover*” – while they say it was **the very day** “the passover should be slaughtered”!

The “Meal” at “The Last Supper” then, was not the Passover Sacrifice “Eaten” – i.e., it was not “Passover Feast”. This supper was **for preparation for** Passover’s Sacrifice – the Death of Jesus the Lamb of God. Herein the Providence of God was at work. It can be seen in the use of the phrase: “The disciples did as Jesus **had appointed** them; and they made ready for Passover”, Mt.26:19. Christ’s “appointment” was more than a mere command. His all mighty dispensation overruled the actions of the disciples who first seemingly took the initiative by approaching Him and asking if they would prepare, verse 17. The Greek for “appoint” is *sunektacsen (suntassoh)*: “They gave the thirty pieces of silver for the potter’s field, as the Lord **appointed** me”, Mt.27:9-10. “As many as were **ordained** (*tassoh*) to eternal life believed”; Acts13:48 “There is no power but of God: The powers that be are **ordained** of God”, Ro.13:1.

*Sun plus bainoh* in, “These things happened unto them for ensamples”, means, “these things were **destined** to happen to them”; 1 Cor.10:11, “To the servants of corruption ... it happened according to the proverb”, that is, “It is **determined** that it should happen to them”.<sup>2.Pt.2:19,22</sup> (God in Christ destines, not blind fate.)

Objective reading of John 19:14 in its context, cannot help the perception of Godly foreordination in every aspect of Jesus’ preparation, anguish, betrayal, deliverance and crucifixion in **perfect** fulfilment of Passover, whether or not some detail to us may seem not important. Faith finds evidence in this of Christ’s deity and genuine humanity, though for the unbeliever it may mean nothing. Had God’s

overruling not been present in these events, the symbolic significance of Passover would have been lost.

Jesus then had **himself prepared** for taking the place of the Passover lamb and to be slaughtered in its stead. The meaning of the description of **the day and time** on which Christ would experience the fulfilment of Passover **can but literally indicate “the Preparation of Passover”**. Jesus attended and served **his own Preparation Meal** to be given over to be killed for the sins of his elect – its significance ever since.

Day starts with evening. The night of Last Supper and the day of Crucifixion, in that sequence, are the same day. This day is described as being, “before passover”; Jn.13:1 “not on the Feast (day)”, Mt.26:5 Jesus’ “time”, which was “near” – not present yet. Mt.26:18 “before I suffer”; Lk.22:15 “before it happens”; Jn.13:19 “against / for Passover”, Jn.13:29 “The day of un-leaven on which the Passover had to be slain”; Lk.22:7 “The first day of de-leaven when the Passover was always slaughtered”. Mk.14:12 **No other day** in all of Scripture has ever been so definitely described. Surely one may assume that the intention was to make it easy for the reader to distinguish this day from any other. And the reason for such a distinction was to be able to see how Jesus would fulfil the meaning of Passover “in his own body” through death, and, through resurrection. (Not in eating the Passover Feast meal in any other way.)

#### 5.1.1.8.1.2.

##### “Not On the Feast”

The Jews conspired to kill Jesus, only “not on the Feast (Day of Eating the Passover)”. They had good reason for excluding the 15th Nisan for their purpose. But, like when they decided to let one man die instead of many, Jn.11:50 their wisdom was vain, for they only acted in fulfilment of Scripture. The Gospels would not have mentioned this limit to the Jews’ time, were it not eventually to have come true because it was **divinely ordained** to come true. The reason the Jews gave for not wanting to kill Jesus “on the feast”, **“lest there be an uproar of the people”**, Mk.14:2, is said to be a peculiarity of the Western Text, added by a redactor copyist to elude the supposed problem of date in this passage when compared with verse 12. No necessity remains for such an explanation when the two clauses in verse 12 are seen as complementary. The second phrase defines the first: “The first day of **de-leaven (a-dzumos), when they killed the passover**”.

The phrase “Not on the Feast” doesn’t mean **after** the Feast, because then everybody would have left – and logically Jesus as well. The Jews’ conspiring was in order to get some plan as to how to kill Him before the feast because **his presence at the Feast is what they wanted to prevent**. The whole idea of mentioning, that “after two days was the Feast”, was to show that the Jews had but little time to act before the Feast Day.

The expression *en tehi heortehi* - “on the feast” is explained as meaning “not among the **feasting throng**”, for the obvious reason that these interpreters assume that Jesus was in fact crucified on the Feast as such, 15<sup>th</sup> Nisan. On the Day of feast or not, a crowd assembled soon enough, and Jesus was crucified amongst the feasting **regardless**.

**Refer Appendix p. 268, Last Supper and Day of Month and Week**

#### 5.1.1.8.2.1. Gethsemane

##### “Jesus knew that His hour was come ... unto the end!”, John 13:1-2.

**The Traditional understanding** as the Wednesday crucifixion theory and theories of the same type teaches that Jesus was buried for the **full day** of the Sabbath. As a result of this predicament the Wednesday-theories allege that Jesus **rose “before sunset”**, “**just before sunset**”. “*How many seconds or how many minutes before sunset doesn’t matter*”, as they say. (As long as the seconds or minutes don’t “*count up*” to hours!) But if Jesus **rose “before sunset”**, he could not have been in the grave the full and “*literal*” “third day”, but only for a **portion** of it. So they cannot protest if counted or calendar “days” aren’t full days but **represented** days – the whole represented by **any** portion – as the Traditional view sees things, and also our interpretation of a Thursday Resurrection sees things.

Both the Traditional and the Wednesday views though, maintain that Jesus was **buried “before sunset”**. The **Traditional view ignores and denies** the factor of “three days and three nights” altogether. The **Wednesday** theory goes to the other extreme and takes Jesus’ being **buried** “for three days and three nights” **super-literal** and insists on something **different**, not “three days and three nights”, but **72 hours**. That would mean Jesus was buried for a portion of a **fourth**, or even fifth day. The basic problem with the Wednesday crucifixion theory is its method to unnaturally wrangle so-called “literalness” from every facet of Matthew 12:40, instead of to stay with an unforced, literal interpretation that also recognises the idiomatic and figurative essentials of Matthew 12:40. But the finer difficulty for the Wednesday crucifixion theory or any theory of its kind lies in the phrase, “in the heart of the earth” – which it **only for the sake of literalness**, interpret as being **buried**, and not as being **dead**.

Now if Jesus’ **death** fill the period of 72 hours, the time he was in the **grave** cannot be of that duration because He had been dead some measurable and definitely indicated time before He was buried **and, before day ended**. And if being **buried** fill the period of 72 hours, the state in **death, extends beyond its limits**. Whether being buried or being dead both conditions extend beyond just three days to occupy a **fourth** day, both in terms of hours and “days” as such.

**Arithmetically** as well as **linguistically** there is no possibility that the phrase, “**in the heart of the earth**”, could refer to Jesus’ being **buried**. Jonah, on the other hand, **swallowed** and “**in the belly of the fish**” one might say – figuratively, was thus **buried**. But Jesus does not compare being “**in the belly of the fish**” with **his own** experience. He says, “As **Jonah** was in the fish’s **belly** – three days and three nights, so the **Son of man** shall be” ... **something else!** “... So the **Son of man**, shall be ... **in the heart of the earth!**” – figuratively. That means, “So the Son of man shall be **dead!**” – **literally!** : “three days and three nights”.

From whichever angle one approaches the expression “in the heart of the earth” there’s **no possibility** that it could mean “**buried!**”! The words, “in the heart of the earth”, **aren’t Jesus’ own**. He quotes **Scripture** – Jonah 1:17. Altogether Jesus, “as Jonah”, would experience **death** “according to the(se) Scriptures”: “three days and three nights” – no problems for a crucifixion on Thursday if resurrection on the Saturday!

The **quintessential** though is this, that Jesus, “as Jonah” would **experience live “agony”, “unto death!”** (Lk. 22:44, Mt.26:38) His “sorrow unto death” would not be physical pain merely, but spiritual, conscious, living suffering by the Holy Son

of God **for the sins and failure of the sons of man**. (The disciples slept through it all.) Jesus would, “three nights”, and He would, “three days”, every second thereof **bear** the penalty and wages of the sins, sinfulness and weakness of man. This makes of Gethsemane-night a night as, and grosser than, the two nights entombed. Only a Thursday Crucifixion Day and a Sabbath Resurrection Day can account for these truths of “the prophet Jonah” concerning “three days and three nights”.

“(Thursday crucifixion) *will ever be able to contain only 2 NIGHTS plus your so-called 3 DAYS. (1 FIGURATIVE DAY plus 2 LITERAL DAYS)*”.

“*Thursday crucifixion*” believes: “**Three days**”, “according to the Scriptures”. It believes “three days according to the Scriptures” may be viewed “**three days and three nights (inclusive)**”. “**Three days**” include “three nights”, in two ways, **1**, by reckoning inclusively the part for the whole. Jesus **died** on Thursday, his death **making** of Thursday the first full day, “night” and, “day”, the first of the “three days” **2**, by recognising the “**three nights**” of Mt.12:40 **in Jesus, living through**, “as Jonah”, “**the depth**” of affliction, of despair and of **death** – specifically the **night** of the **Lord’s Supper** wherein He drank the cup that “**except I drink it thy will be done**” would **not pass** but had to be **drunk** – the **night** of Gethsemane, the **night-part** of **Thursday** the (full) **day** of Jesus’ **death**.

“*Thursday crucifixion*” believes: “Three days”, “according to the **Scriptures**”. Those “Scriptures” not only is Jonah 1:17, but especially the **Passover Scriptures** of **14 Nisan, 15 Nisan, and, of 16 Nisan**. “**For Christ is our Passover**”, says Paul, and, He is “the (Passover) **Lamb of God**”, says **John**. And Paul **in the context of the resurrection** writes, “For I most importantly delivered to you what I also received (through insight into the Scriptures) that, **first**, Christ **died** for our sins according to the Scriptures (on the subject, that indicate the **first** day of Passover). And that He was **buried** (according to the Scriptures on the subject that indicate the **second** day of Passover). And that He **rose again the THIRD day according to the Scriptures ...**”. According to the Scriptures it could **not** be the **fourth** day of Passover that was the Sunday when “He was **seen ...**”. “Three days”, **literal**, “according to the Scriptures”! **Scriptural** days they are, days of **Passover-** and **Jonah**-experience they are, days of the Feast and Feast-**calendar** they are, and days of the **week** they are. Real and pertinent, to-the-point-days! Also and especially are these days of the **week** since “according to the Scriptures” the **Sabbath** obtains its meaning and importance, and institution and duty from **God’s finishing** on it and from **God’s people’s** Passover on it. This is what the **Thursday** crucifixion theory believes.

The **sixteenth** of Nisan, the Day of the First Sheaf Wave Offering during Old Testament times was never considered a “sabbath”, like the Feast Day of fifteen Nisan was. Despite its great significance! Despite its being the first day of the Fifty Days to Pentecost! It was “Appointed Day”, that when “all Scriptures” would be “fulfilled” in Christ – as these Scriptures on Gethsemane state – **it would only then, in Jesus Christ, become “Sabbath of the Lord thy God” because “in it He rested from all his works He had done”**. This day’s **floating through the week** of past ages “**stopped**”, coming to rest **permanently** on the Seventh Day according to God’s speaking of it – that in it **He, rested!** This is foreshadowed already in the Passover motive’s introduction into the Fourth Commandment – which is **no ceremonial** Institution but a **Messianic and Prophetic** Institution of **Promise and Grace!** “*The Sabbath in the Covenant of Grace*” – in **God’s** Covenant of Grace!

The Sunday Tradition of First Sheaf Wave Offering in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ on the First Day of the week, **cannot deny** these implications of argument because it **itself** through all the centuries essentially rested on it. It rested on these implications of argument of Jesus’ resurrection from the dead but never dared to **openly confess and claim** it. It could not confess or claim it because the First Sheaf Wave Offering and its Day actually belong to the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Scriptures and of God’s speaking. It really contradicts and prohibits application to the First Day of the week. The First Sheaf Wave Offering and its Day **belong and answer to the essence and nature of the Seventh Day** of God’s speaking and of His completion in Christ Jesus! It isn’t delayed as in the Sunday Tradition, but immediately, when it happened, it had to happen “in Sabbath’s time and Day” **in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead**. (Sunday Tradition skips “Still Saturday” between 15 Nisan Friday and “Resurrection Sunday”, placing “the day after the Sabbath”, 16 Nisan of Passover-institution, after yet another day.) But the Sabbath Day so and then through true fulfilment of Passover and its dating, receives status and significance it formerly only enjoyed in Promise and Proclamation “according to the Scriptures”.

#### 5.1.1.8.2.2.

#### The Third of the “Three Nights” Accounted For

See Par. 5.1.1.6.2.4.6.1, Par. 5.1.1.6.2.4.3.

Jonah describes in literal language **what** happened to him, and in figurative language **how** he experienced what happened to him. Jonah literally or truly was “in the belly of a fish”, figuratively, “**buried**”, for a **real** “three days and three nights”.

The expression, “**in the heart of the earth**” though, **in contrast** with Jonah’s being “buried” “**in the belly of the fish**”, expresses in figurative language **not where**, but **how** he experienced his “burial” “in the belly of the fish”. “*In the heart of the earth*” wasn’t Jonah’s “grave” – it was his **experience!**

“As **Jonah** was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights”, says Jesus, so would **He**, be “**in the heart of the earth**”. **Not** the same **place**, **not** the same **experience**, but the **same way and nature of experience as far as the analogy may indicate the reality – and**, “three days and three nights”! In this respect the Wednesday crucifixion theory reveals its weakness most obviously. Although real, the “three days and three nights” is not the “**sign**”-ificant resemblance between Jesus and Jonah. **How they experienced death** as it were, **how** both had been “**in the heart of the earth**” as it were, constitutes the **real** and **important** corollary. According to the **Wednesday** crucifixion the essence of expression of this resembling facet, of being “**in the heart of the earth**”, is not “*allegory*”, but “*literal*”. According to the **Sunday** Tradition it is neither ... and nothing else.

To be “in the heart of the earth”, “in the middle of the sea”, “under the foundations of the mountains”, while being “in the belly of the fish”, is “literally” **impossible** – “three days and three nights” **or not**. ... Wednesday theory fails! **Here is figurative language if ever there was**. It is prophetically imperative – “three days and three nights” **essential!** ... Sunday tradition fails!

Jesus says that He, “Just like Jonah”, would be “**in the heart of the earth**” – **not**, that He, just like Jonah, would be “**in the belly of the fish**”. Because Jonah’s “grave” was the fish’s belly – and Jesus does not compare their **graves** but their **experiences** – He compares the **experience of both of them**, that of being “**in the heart of the earth**”!

Jonah died not. But he **tasted death as for real while alive**. This is what Jesus means to compare **literally**. He would, “as Jonah”, be “**anguished to death**” till



death, in death and throughout death, “three days and three nights”, until God would “loosen the bonds” of the “pains of death”, “the third day”, in “**resurrection from the dead**” ... “**in the Sabbath!**”

In Gethsemane Jesus **tastes death as for real while alive**. Jonah’s was not perfectly “as” Jesus’ experience. Jonah’s **only** was **but** a “sign” or “type” of what **Jesus’** experience would be. Jesus was the antitype. Both Jonah and Jesus faced death, as it were tasted it in anguish, but **only Jesus**, “**finished**”. Only Jesus could call out, “It is finished”, “fulfilled” – **even before** “He surrendered over the spirit” into His Father’s hands!

This saying from the cross, “**It is finished**”, does not only **proleptically** take hold on the **resurrection**, but it **takes with it** every moment of **giving over** his life since “it was night” (Jn.13:13b) and every moment of **giving over** his life since “now”, that “the Son of man is **glorified** and God is **glorified** in Him”, **by death**, and “Jesus knew that his hour was come ... unto death!”, John 13:1-2 and “the hour has struck” that “the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners”. (Mt.26:45) **Only Jesus** of Him and Jonah, **died**, finally, irrevocably, paying the price and wages of sin to the last drop of anguish, of blood and of sweat. In **Gethsemane**, Jesus **experiences** “the pains of death”, Acts 2:24. “**So** shall the Son of man be **in the heart of the earth**” = “**in the deep**” (“lowest deep”, LXX) = “**in the belly of hell!**” (Jonah 2:3, 5; 2) These “pains / pangs of death” are first “loosened” when “God raised Him from the **dead**” ... and not merely from an “**as if**” death! Cf. Par 5.1.1.6.5.

#### **Compare Jesus’ Gethsemane night and Jonah’ anguish:**

“Where will You have us prepare for You that **You may be ready to eat** the Passover?” – “**Eat**” in the sense of “**die**”! “The disciples did as Jesus appointed they would, and they made **the Passover-preparation**”, Mt.26:17 and 19.

“**The things concerning Me have an end!**” It **ends** here, beginning in **Gethsemane! John 13:1, “unto the end!”** “The things concerning Me have a **reason and purpose!**” “For I say unto you that **this that is written** must be accomplished in **Me**: And He was reckoned amongst the transgressors”. (Luke 22:37) // “**Let us not perish for the sake of this man’s life ... for Thou Lord, hast done as thou wouldest**”. (Jonah 1:14)

Matthew 26:36 further, “A place called **Gethsemane**, Jesus became “**very heavy**”. “Gethsemane” means “Olive Press” – place of “very heavy” oppression, “**affliction**”, for the olive, figuratively speaking, as for Jesus. // “**As Jonah**” “out of the fish’s belly (Jonah’s “**press**”) cried by reason of **affliction**”.

“I go and **pray** yonder”. “He went a little further and fell on his face and **prayed**, O my Father ...”. (Mt.26:39) // “Jonas **prayed**”, “I remembered the Lord”, “I cried to the Lord my God ...”. (Jonah 2: 2, 7, 8)

“If it be possible, **let this cup pass from me**”. // “O Lord my God, **let my ruined life be restored!**”

“My **soul** is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death”. (Mt.26:38) Already at the Table of the Lord’s Supper, Jesus was “troubled in the **spirit**”, John 13:21 // “Water poured around me to the **soul** ... my **soul** was failing me”. (Jonah 2:6, 8)

“**Except I drink it, thy will be done!**” (Mt.26:42) // “**All that I have vowed I will pay to thee**”. ((Jonah 2:8)

“Now the Son of man is glorified, and **God is glorified** in Him”, John 13:30-31. // “I will sacrifice to thee with the voice of **praise and thanksgiving**”, Jonah 2:10. John 13:1, “Jesus knew that **his hour was come** that He should depart **out of** this world ... **unto** the Father ... **having loved** his own which were in the world He loved them ... **unto the end**”. Thus Jesus glorified the Father, in His suffering unto

atonement and resurrection unto glory. **Here is the sign of Jonah**: “Stand still and **see: the salvation of the LORD**... And Israel **saw that gre at work** which the Lord did and **believed** the LORD ... for **He triumphed gloriously** ...”, Psalm 92. See Par. 5.1.1.6.3.1, -3.

“He began to grieve and **to be distressed** (– *adehmonēin* “*haidēs* = “**to be in hell**”) as of death”, Mt.26:37-38. // “Out of the belly of **hell** (*ek koilias haidou*) thou hearest my voice”, Jonah 2:3.

“God raised Him up, having **loosened** the **pangs of death** for it was impossible that He should be **held fast** by it.” (Acts 2:24) // “I went down into the earth whose **bars** are the everlasting **barriers**”. (Jonah 2:7)

“It was **night**.” (John 13:30) “This is your hour and of the **power of darkness**”. (Lk.22:53) // “**Three x night**” – “**hell**” – “**depths of sea**” – “**heart of earth**” – “**clefts of the mountains**” – “I am cast **out of thy presence**, shall I indeed **see** again thy holy temple?” = **darkness!**

“My soul is **exceeding sorrowful**.” (*perilupos* – Mt.26:38) “Being in **excruciating agony** He prayed.” (*en agoniai ektenesteron* – Luke 22:44) “He began to be **sore afraid**” (*ekthambeisthai* – Mk.14:33) // “Jonas was / I am **very deeply grieved**”. (*sfodra lelupehmai* – J.4:1, 9)

When Jesus had died in Golgotha, “Everybody **turned back and left**” (*hupestrefon*). In Gethsemane says Jesus, “All of you **this night** will be **offended** because of Me”. He found all either “asleep”, “betraying”, “denying”, or “fleeing”. But He found no one staying, standing by Him, praying with Him, “this night”. (Mt.26:31) // God “**pushed aside**” Jonah, “**cast him out**”, 2:4.

Judas who worshipped money, **betray, Jesus**. // “They who worship conceitedness (petty gods) and lies **forsake**, their **only mercy**”, 2: 9.

“There appeared an **angel** unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him”. (Lk.22:44) // “**God** commanded a gourd to be a shadow over Jonah’s head to shade him from his calamities”. (Jonah 4:9)

In Gethsemane’s night Jesus “**sweat blood**”. In the day of the cross from His side “came forth **water and blood**”.

Jesus at the Table, “in this night”, (Mt.26:31) commands “**this cup**” as signifying the blood of his sacrifice. Jesus, in this night, prays the Father to have Him empty “**this cup**” to fulfil His will. (Mt.26:39.) “**The cup** which my Father has given Me, shall I not **drink** it?” (Jn.18:11) “*Shall I not die?*” “**Except I drink it, thy will be done!**” (Mt.26:42)

“**It was the Day of Removing Leaven, of Killing the Spirit, of Sapping Life, of Excruciating Agony** – “**The Night**”, the first of “**Passover**”, “**to be solemnly observed!**” “**It was the Day of Removing Leaven when they sacrificed the Passover Lamb of God!**”

“My soul is exceeding sorrowful **even unto death**”. (Mk14:34, Mt.26:38) // “I am very much grieved, **even unto death**. But the Lord answered, You are sorry for the gourd for which **you have not suffered (death)**!” (Jonah 4:9)

Jesus “suffered”, even unto death”; **He gave His all** – **in this night** of agony in **Gethsemane**. The angel had to strengthen Him in order to again go **on** and **through**, even until and into the fulfilment and finishing – **the death of the cross!** **Jonah** was **saved** such an experience of **death** – he “**suffered (it) not**”. But **not Jesus!** **The similitude with Jonah ends in Gethsemane**, this day of his **dying** and of his **death**.

There had been no day like this before. “Pray that you are not **tempted**”, Jesus told his disciples on this night. **Temptation** was Jesus’ **worst agony**. He was tempted

**this night looking death in the eye**, as He had not been tempted before – not even in the wilderness at the hand of the devil! He was tempted to forsake his mission and ministry in its zenith, in its final act, of being sacrificed the Lamb of God for the sins of His people. If He could be lured from this, He would be lured from Victory! He tells his disciples, “Do not fall into temptation” – a prayer for Himself.

“All this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook Him, and fled”, Matthew 26:56.

When Jesus says, “As Jonah ...” He doesn’t restrict the similarities or rather the similitude to the “three days and three nights”, but primarily has in mind the deeper truth of being “in the heart of the earth”. Jesus sees his finished work and in it, the fulfillment of all prophecy – also that of the prophet Jonah – also that of the “three days and three nights”. Jesus sees in His life and death and resurrection fulfillment of the finishing discovered in The Prophet Jonah – (the **Scripture**, “The Prophet Jonah”). The finishing found in the Book of Jonah ended not when the fish “vomited Jonah out”, but **only where his task had been finished**, not only in saving the Ninevites from death, **but his own soul from the “agony unto death”!** If anywhere, one may surely here draw some line of *allegory*, and say, “*This shows Jesus’ resurrection from the dead*”. It is not surprising to find the phrase “**unto death**” nowhere in the “fish”-episode of being “buried”, but only after and outside it, in the end of Jonah’s “**woes**” or “ills” – *kakohn*, **when at last God had the last word and faith triumphed**. Faith triumphs where it holds its peace, where it has found healing from its **inner** “ills”. **These were the “woes” “unto death” of Jonah Jesus compares His with. These are those “woes”, “unto death” of Jesus He in Gethsemane experienced, and that whole “night” of the Day of Crucifixion and Death. Thus, did Jesus experience “three days and three nights”, “as Jonah”, “in the heart of the earth”.**

#### 5.1.1.8.2.3.

##### **Retrospective “Literal” “Days” and “Literal” “Nights”**

Just like the “**three days**” and “**the third day**” of the various Scriptures are “literal” days, the “**three days and three nights**” are “literal” days, and, “literal” nights – three of **each**. Although adding up to “three days”, the “three days and three nights” **are** not “three days”. They are **separate halves** constituting one day, three times. They are not **called** “days” and they cannot **be** what they are **not called**. **Even less** can they be “**hours**”, **72 hours**, **one period of time**, if they **are**, and are **called**, “**three, days, and, three, nights**” – three **dark** halves or nights and three **light** halves or days. These are there within the duration of the “three days” of the Scriptures. Sunday Tradition is unable to accommodate these words of Jesus, which, although spoken but once, cannot be hushed, or whimsically explained away. **Not if the Scriptures means anything!**

“The third day” or last of these **full-day-cycles** falls within the duration of the “three days and three nights”. The “three days and three nights” of Jonah 1:17 and Mt.12:40 should be seen from the standpoint of the “**sign**”, the resurrection from and over death of the “Son of man” – “the **third** day according to the Scriptures”. The literal **sequence** within the phrase, “three days and three nights”, thus considered, are the **reverse** of the **historical** chronology, but corresponds with the realities of God.

“On the third day according to the Scriptures” Jesus is **resurrected!** **From** this day, while speaking to the Jews about the sign they want, Jesus **looks back** upon his suffering of the past three days of **Passover**. At its beginning He sees the night of Gethsemane, the Egypt-night, the Jonah-anguish. Then He says, “... So **shall** the Son of man **have been** in the heart of the earth three days and three nights!” Here is a sign

of the Son of man, He shall be “Lord of the Rest Day”, having risen upon it, having gone out of Egypt and having “entered into His rest”, “**this day**”. With this sequence Jesus emphasises the beginning and the end, the end actually **first**, the origin of all, **Life Standing Tall Over Death**. The last in sequence, the first in significance; the “day” illuminating the “night”; the odour from Golgotha’s Garden of Life swept across Gethsemane’s Garden of gloom. The ultimate “sign” is Jesus’ resurrection **from** the dead – Jesus, in Life, exalted “far above all principalities or powers”, even far above the powers of death and hell! See Par. 5.1.1.6.3.2. 5.1.1.6.5.

It could not have been simpler. It could not have been truer. It could not have been more “according to the Scriptures”. “According to the Scriptures” it was, **1**, the first day of Passover Feast calendar. **2**, the first day to the principle the part represents the whole – day reckoned sunset to sunset. **3**, the first day “as Jonah was in the heart of the earth”, the first of the “three days and three nights” of **death** and “the power of darkness” – **but, 4**, “the **third** day” **to the soteriological order of creation and redemption**, “the **third** day” from the Day of Rest and Worship the Seventh Day of the week, God in raising Christ from the dead, in “the exceeding greatness of his power”, “finishing”. (Eph.1:19-20) “And they shall kill Him, and **after that He is killed** He shall rise the third day”, Mark 9:31. In 8:31 Mark uses the Future, “I will rise again”, with a **Perfect** sense, “I must **be rejected** ... and **be killed**, and the third day **be risen**”! **Retrospectively**, the third of the “**days**” of the “three days and three nights” as constitutive parts of the “three (calendar) days” “according to the Scriptures”, must have been the **light part of the first**.

Klaas Schilder’s *Trilogy* depicts *Christ At the Entrance Into His Agony*, *Christ In Going Through His Agony*, *Christ With the Exit of His Agony*. Schilder of course does not interest himself in the “three days and three nights” of Mt.12:40. Nevertheless his comments are very appropriate.

“*De ééne “ure” soeverein verdeeld tusschen duisternis en licht. ... God geeft hier het terrein voor Satan vrij ... Gods raad laat dit nu over Christus komen ... Alle engelen worden ingetoomd, opdat alle duivelen zouden uitstromen naar Getsemané en Golgotha. Zie hen nu komen; – als een waterstroom loopen zij tegen de Meester aan. Zij worden opgenomen in de branding van het middelpunt van alle tijden.* (Cf. Jonah 2:5. The OAB renders it incomparably beautiful. Remember that Schilder hasn’t got Jonah in mind!) *Zie hen nu komen; het is hun uur ... Getsemané’s uur ... de wereld-klok wijst nu de helft aan van den éénen werelddag ... zij hebben metterdaad den strijd te openen nu tegen den Zoon des menschen, en vinden Hem met zonden beladen ...*” – One should read Schilder oneself – he is without par. Notice “*half of the sole world-day*” – “three days and three nights ... the Son of man”, in the focal point, being the focal point, of all time and history and space and power!

##### **Refer Appendix 2.**

The “three days and three nights” of Jonah 1:17 and Matthew 12:40, are **not figurative language, but literal. But the expression “in the heart of the earth”, is just as obvious, figurative, and not literal language.**

#### 5.1.1.8.3.

##### **Bar-Abbas**

The governor released Bar-Abbas for the Jews in stead of Jesus, “at that feast” (Mk.15:6 and Mt.27:15) on the day Jesus was crucified. Translations of Mk.15:6 and Mt.27:15 render the phrase *kata de heortehn*, “at that feast”, AV “**on** the Feast”, OAT meaning, “**on the day** of the Feast”. Conclusion: Jesus was crucified on the day of Passover Feast, 15th Nisan – not on any “preparation” day for Passover; not on the 14th Nisan. “**On**” this feast of Passover, then, Bar-Abbas was released.

“On the feast” occurs in Mk.14:2 and Mt.26:5 in the dative and with the preposition *en: en tehi heortehti*, “on the feast”. The construction purely indicates time. In Mk.15:7, time “in”, or, time “on”, is expressed precisely as above: Bar-Abbas, “who had committed murder **in** the insurrection”, *en tehi stasehi fonon pepoiehkeisan*. Just the dative, without using the preposition, can indicate time: *tehi prohtehti hehmerai tohn adzumohn*, “(On) the first day of unleavened bread”.<sup>Mk.14:12 Mt.26:17</sup>

Time is also indicated by use of the genitive case, “in the evening” is indicated by “evening’s arrival (time)” – *opsias genomenehs*,<sup>Mk.14:17</sup> or with the nominative, “When it was the third hour” – *ehn de hohra triteh*.<sup>Mk.15:25</sup>

Why then, in Mk.15:6 and Mt.27:15, the phrase “on the feast”, has neither the preposition *de*, nor the dative; it has not the genitive, and not the nominative, but the preposition *kata* and the accusative? Simply because it indicates that the convict was released “**to the custom** of the feast”. It was **customary** to release a prisoner for the Jews on the feast, or, for the feast. It was “*festal practice*”. Literally, it was “**according to the feast**”:

1. “**About the time** of the feast he released a prisoner for them”: “About the time” Herod vexed the church, Acts 12:1; “About” midnight the shipmen...27:27.
2. “**Every** feast” he released ...: “Every” day, Lk.16:9; “Every” year, Lk.2:41; “Every” place, Lk.22:11.
3. “**For** the feast” he released ...: “For every” reason, Mt.19:3.
- 4.a. “**According to** (the custom of) the feast ...”: “According to” the time he inquired, Mt.2:16; “According to” your faith, Mt.9:29; “According to” tradition, Mk.7:5.
- 4.b. “**Customary** for the feast ...”: “According to custom of / the practice on the feast”: Lk.2:42, “According to the demand / command of law”, Lk.2:22 = “According to the use of law”, verse 27. It was not impossible for a prisoner, according to this custom, to be released **on** the day of feast. But Bar-Abbas’ case is exceptional because he is released at the same time another is executed. Custom also forbade execution on the day of Feast. Pilate finds himself in a dilemma. He finds Jesus guiltless and tries every escape route to let him go. He proposes to let Jesus free – no one has **yet** been set free. It is not Feast yet.

The *NAT* accordingly improved on the *OAT*: “**Every** Passover Feast Pilate released one prisoner for the people”;<sup>Mk.15:6</sup> “The governor habitually every Easter [Passover] released one prisoner of the peoples’ choice. This he did this time, “because the people in any case were assembled”,<sup>Mt.26:15-17</sup> The usual thing considering circumstances suited his decision. But it was not Jesus he let go, but Bar-Abbas, **before the feast, according to the festal tradition**. These verses confirm the notion that Jesus was crucified on the day **before** Passover **Feast**, i.e., on “**The Preparation** of Passover”, as John puts it (19:14).

#### 5.1.1.8.4.

##### Not Defile That They Might Eat The Passover

**Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgement: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgement hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. Pilate then went out to them.**

Observes Ryle: “*This sentence contains an undeniable difficulty. How could the Jews eat the passover now, when our Lord and his disciples had eaten it the evening before? That our Lord would eat the passover at the right time we may*

*assume as a matter of course, and that time was Thursday evening. What then can be meant by the chief priests, and elders, and leaders of the Jews, eating the passover on Friday? This is a question that has received various answers.*”

J.C. Ryle remarks though: “*One thing at any rate is very plain and noteworthy. The chief priests and their party made much ado about eating the passover lamb and keeping the feast, at the very time they were about to slay the true Lamb of God of whom this passover was a type!*” (Emphasis CGE)

When “*the very time they were about to slay*” the Passover lamb, means **before the actual slaying**, and it would be impossible to make “*much ado about eating the passover lamb and keeping the feast*”, **then**. Ryle is completely perplexed by the question, as anyone would be that holds to a Friday-crucifixion or to the crucifixion and the burial **on the same day**, whichever day be assumed.

Ryle’s first assumption is that Christ and his disciples ate the **Passover Meal** the evening before. His second assumption is that this meal was eaten the **Thursday evening** Roman time, which, in Jewish reckoning, goes with “Friday”. On these aspects of the question has been treated extensively above, and it has been shown that they indicate just the opposite of the meanings Ryle assumes. It could not be and it was not the Passover **Meal, eaten** by Jesus and his disciples; it could not be and was not the Thursday evening this meal was eaten, but Wednesday night which, reckoned from sunset, was the evening of the Fifth Day (Thursday).

**Before** the crucifixion, the Jews would not enter to see Pilate and he had to come out to see them because of their anxiety over “defilement”, which would prevent them from eating the Passover. They, **after** the crucifixion, gave “defilement” no thought, but went to see Pilate to have the bodies removed before the “Great Day” of “that Sabbath”. He did not come out to them, and they, showed no scruples to meet him in his own quarters. That implies that **they had to have eaten the Passover in the meantime. Another “evening”** must have occurred on which they had eaten the Passover. That “evening” **had occurred after the crucifixion and before the supper**, while nobody at that stage even considered Jesus’ interment. It was only after Joseph as well had eaten the Passover, it must be inferred, that he would have entered Pilates’ house to ask for Jesus’ body. This evening, in fact, is in so many words recorded in Mark and in Matthew.

“*This sentence*”, “*contains an undeniable difficulty*” for the **traditional** view, and not for the passage of Scripture. “*All these* (answers to this question referred to by Ryle), *it must be confessed*”, says he, “*are only conjectures*”. Some answers will receive consideration further on.<sup>See Par. 5.2.2.2.</sup>

#### 5.1.2.

##### “Evening”, Opsia

##### 5.1.2.1.

##### “Late” in the Day

Refer Par. 5.3.2.2. The Greek adverb, *opse* – “late”, as in the phrase, “When it got late”, *hotan opse egeneto*, Mk.11:19 implies the latter time or latter part of any given period. If the period consists of the “day”, *opse* indicates the **afternoon** – *opse tehs hemeras*, “late in the day”. But if the period consists of the morning or forenoon, *opse* indicates the relative time **before midday** – *opse ehn*, “It was late (in the morning)”. If the period consists of the night, *opse*, it must be noticed, shall apply **only** in the case of the **first half** of night and indicate the relative time **before midnight** – *opsikoitos*, “going to bed late”. *Opse* is **never** used for the latter part of the last half of night, that is, it is never used for **dawn**, because *opse* serves as the **opposite of orthros**, “early”, or, “morning”.<sup>(See Par. 5.3.2.1.)</sup>

This adverb, *opse*, supplies the basis for inflected and compounded words like the adjective *opsimos*, used in an expression like “latter rain” in Joel 2:23: *brecsei humin hueeton prohimon kai opsimon*, “He shall rain upon you the first and the latter rains”.

*Opse* [Comparative *opsiaïteron*, and *opsiaïtata*, superlative, indicate the later and latest phase within and before the end of any period.] also underlies the noun, *opsia* – “evening”, which, in turn, is derived from the adjective *opsios* which normally has the masculine inflexion for the feminine, but, because so closely associated with the feminine word *hehmera*, “day”, became the noun with feminine ending, *opsia*, for “evening”, the late period of the day cycle according to secular concept. (Grammatically likewise *prohia* – “morning”, is derived from *prohi* – “early”).

In the Babylonian reckoning of the day as starting from sunrise and ending with sunrise, as well as in the Roman reckoning of day as from midnight to midnight, the “evening” of day, would naturally be the “late” section “of”, or, “in”, the day. *Opsia* thus became the **continuation after sunset**, of “**vespers**” – *hespera*, the last part of daylight **before sunset**.

*Hespera* is derived from the name of the **Hesperides**, “**daughters of afternoon**” who dwelt on a **western** island and guarded a garden with **golden apples** (suns). *Hespera* is used for locality and means occidental or western. (“Countries of the evening” – “*Abendländer*”). When used for time, it means, “towards the setting sun”, Latin, “*occidentalis*”. “Vespers” presupposes the **visibility of the sun** and is in this sense used throughout the Pentateuch, **118 times**. In variants *hespera* is replaced, once with *deileh* (“After the morrow [*meta tehm epaurion*] Moses sat to judge the people, and all the people stood by Moses from morning [*apo prohiïthen*] till **sundown** [*heohs deilehs*].” Ex.18:13); once with *kekliken hehmera* : “Let us go up against her at noon [*mesehmbrias*]. Woe to us! for the day has gone down [*kekliken hehmera*] (Cf. Lk.24:29), for the shadows of the day fail [*ekleipousin hai skiai tehs hehmeras*]. Rise, and let us go up against her by night [*nukiti*]”, Jr.6:4); and once with *peran* (“There were powerful kings in Jerusalem, and they ruled over all the country beyond the river [i.e., west of the Jordan]”, Ezra 4:20). *Hesperinos*, 7 times, and *hesperos*, used twice, also indicate the time of day **before sunset**. In Job 9:9 *hesperos* is used for one of the four constellatory directions: *Pleias* (seven daughters of Atlas on who’s shoulders the earth rested, for the orient (east); *Hesperos* for the West; *Arctouros*, guarding star of the Bear constellation for north; *Tameia Notou*, “Chambers of the South”).

*Opsia*, distinctly implies the **invisibility of the sun** and is in this sense used throughout the New Testament, **15 times**, as will be shown below. When used for the **Hebrew** concept of the day cycle, *opsia* represents the immediate period **after sunset** until it is dark – in other words, the “**getting dark**” interval between sunset and darkness. This period of time in Bible reckoning and according to Jewish thinking, distinguishes the **beginning or first part** of the day. In the New Testament, *opsia*, “evening”, is used for precisely and exclusively this concept. It can be concluded then, that *opse* is used generally as adverb, “late”, whereas *opsia* is applied specifically as noun, “evening”.

*Opsia* is a **Greek word and concept** which, in the New Testament, is applied to accommodate an **Old Testament and Hebrew idea**. Another such incidence is the “Preparation”, *Paraskeueh*. The etymology of these terms should be derived from the relevant sources, the Old and New Testaments. *Opsia* does not occur in the LXX, and this fact suggests the term’s **newly** acquired “Jewish” meaning as applied in the

Gospels. The term is to be found in Judith.<sup>13:1</sup> After a long party the weary waiters were dismissed and they went to bed “When the evening was come”, *Hohs de opsia egeneto*, some time **well after sunset**. In the New Testament, *opsia* indicates the beginning of the day cycle as in Hebrew thinking. Compare 1Sam.19:11, 1Sam.28:18-25, Jd.19:9, Gn.19:34, Nmb.11 x Ex.15 in context and in the LXX to see the sunset reckoning of the day applied.

### 5.1.2.2.

#### **In the Beginning of Day**

The meaning of *opsia* is described by Walter Bauer: <sup>Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,</sup> *Opsia* “*Als es Abend geworden war*”, “*When it became evening*”, with reference to Mt.8:16 and 14; 15:23; 20:8; 26:20; 27:57; Mk.1:32, and, “*Am Abend*”, “*During Evening*”, with reference to Mt.16:2; Mk.4:35; 6:47; 14:17; 15:42; “*In our literature mostly substantive, “Der Abend”, heh opsia, “at evening”, opsias, usually with the verb, opsias de genomenehs, “when it became evening”.*”

Dr. Nik Lee, <sup>Sonntag die Sabbat (Sunday the Sabbath) NGK Boekhandel 1975, p.29, p.32</sup> defines the meaning of the word “evening” elaborately as “*presupposing ... the thereto foregoing fading away of daylight ... as well as the thereon following darkness of night*”; and, as being “*Not earlier than about two hours after sunset*”, in the case of Jn.20:19.

### 5.1.3.

#### **Opsia, “Evening”, in the New Testament**

*Opsia* occurs **fifteen** times in the New Testament:

#### 5.1.3.1.

**1 and 2: Mk. 1:32, Mt.8:16** “And at even, when the sun did (= had) set, they brought to him all that were diseased”. *Opsias de genomenehs hote edusen ho hehlios eferon pros auton pantas tous kakohs echontas*. “When the even was come, they brought unto him many ...” *Opsias de genomenehs prosehnenkan autohi pollous ...*

To have the sick healed on the Sabbath, was for the Jews forbidden. They had to wait for the Sabbath to pass before they could bring their sick to Jesus.

Matthew takes it as a **matter of course** that evening starts with sunset, and does not mention that the sun went down as Mark does. Matthew writes for a **Jewish readership** who would know that evening starts with sunset. To mention it would be unnecessary for him. But Mark has a **heathen readership**, who is not that conversant with the Jewish way of reckoning the day. He **explains** what he means by “evening”, *opsia*: It is (the beginning of night) when the sun has gone down. The context of 1:32 implies that the day after the Sabbath started with the evening after sunset.

Mark is translated, “**When** (*hote*) the sun has set (*edusen*)”. Some translations interpret this as if it were “evening” “**while**” the sun – so to speak – rolled over the horizon, and others as while the sun was declining towards its setting, *Hote*, though, distinctly will mean “**after**”, where the context requires it, for example: “After they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him”, Mt.27:31 “After he had washed their feet and had taken his garment and was set down again”, Jn.13:12 “After that the kindness and love of God appeared ... He saved us by the washing of regeneration” Titus 3:4-5 “I took the little book and ate it, and after I had eaten it, my belly was bitter” Rv.10:10

*Opsia*, “evening”, extends from **after** the sun has set. “Evening” is not those few minutes **while** the sun moves behind the horizon, nor is it any time **before** sunset. Christ healed the sick while it was evening. He carried on with healing till “very early

night he left and went to a solitary place and there prayed”.<sup>1:35</sup> Mark here further describes “early night”, *prohi ennucha*, with “very”, *lian*, perhaps to distinguish between “early night” as being “late evening before midnight”, and “early morning before dawn”.

*Hote* corresponds with the English “while” as an adverb, meaning “because”. Mark 1:32 consequently supplies a **definition of the meaning of *opsia***: “It was evening because ... the sun did set”.

### 5.1.3.2.

**3 and 4. Mk.4:35, Mt.8:23-27** “And on that day (*en ekeinehi tehi hehmerai*) when the even was come (*opstias genomenehs*) He said unto them, Let us pass over unto the other side”.

Does “on that day”, refer to the preceding daylight, or to the new day that started with the “evening”? The AV, with, “And that **same** day”, seems to infer the continuation of the (previous) day when Jesus “expounded all things to his disciples”, verse 34. A sunrise reckoning of day seems to be implied. But when the context of the verses before verse 35 are compared with that of the verses after verse 35, it becomes obvious that verse 35 belongs with the last group. The phrase “And on that day” does not close the foregoing pericope. **Verse 34** is the closing remark on the first part in which Jesus preached “the Kingdom of God” in parables and with other teachings. **Verse 35 is the introductory remark** to the **second** section where it is told how Jesus and his disciples crossed the sea. Verse 35 can be translated: “**But: kai**, (not *de* as in verse 34. *Kai* indicates not simply a **continuation** of 34: “...and that day ...”, but **contrasts** a new experience: “**But** (now) on that day ...”) “But on that day with the evening beginning”, or, “On that day of **evening’s beginning**”: *opstias genomenehs*, genitive. It was not the “same” day of “speaking in parables to them”, but “that evening’s-day” of crossing the sea and experiencing the storm. It was a memorable “day, that”! A sunset day is emphatically implied.

The pericope Mk.4:35-41 need not be in **historical sequence** with its context. Matthew and Luke report different incidents before this experience on sea. Mark also does not connect it historically in time with the preceding day.

Luke refers to the same occasion, but replaces *opsia* with “On one of those days”.<sup>8:22</sup> “It came to pass on a certain day that he went into a ship ...” Luke immediately **connects the day** involved with the experience **on ship during night**. And that is Mark’s intention as well, with his phrase “**On that day at evening’s arrival ...**”. In Luke there is also no connection with the day of Christ’s preaching of the Kingdom. His narration of the story on sea is preceded with a discussion on the family of Jesus. Had there been a necessary connection between “that day” (Mark) and the Kingdom’s teachings, Luke would have preserved Mark’s sequence.

Many commentators deem the occurrence of *opsia* in Mk.4:35 a redactional mistake. We find no reason for such a conclusion. There exists **no contradiction of ideas in the start of day and a late time of day**. It only exists outside the text in the mind of Western man and his assessment of time. This problem constantly threatens investigators and they unconsciously fall prey to it.<sup>See Montgomery Boyce, Par.7.2.</sup>

Jesus and the disciples crossed **the sea during night** “when it was evening on that day”, “that day” implying the new day according to Hebrew understanding, and the following storm, verses 36 to 41, occurs at night. They arrive “in the country of the Gadarenes”<sup>5:1</sup> the following morning. Compare the night at sea and the storm when Jesus walked on the waters in Mk.6:45-54 and early morning arrival on shore, John 21.

### 5.1.3.3.

**5 and 6. Mk.6:47 and Mt.14:23** tell of the occasion when Jesus sent the crowd away and found himself alone in prayer during the night. It seems that Jesus habitually began his days in prayer during night. “And when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land. And He saw them toiling and rowing ... And about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them walking on the sea”.

“Evening”, *opsia*, marks the beginning of the first vigil, that is, “**early night**” till nine o’clock Roman time. The second watch extended through “**late night**” till midnight. The third watch was “**deep, early, morning**” till 3 o’clock, and the fourth watch lasted **from dawn to sunrise**.

### 5.1.3.4.

**7. Mk.11:11.** “And Jesus entered into Jerusalem and into the temple; and when he had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.”<sup>Refer Par. 5.3.2.2.2.</sup>

*Opsia* occurs as a **variant of *opse*** in this verse. Nestle prefers *opse* in the phrase *opse ehdeh ousehs tehs hohras*, “late already being the hour”. The AV, reflecting *opsia* with “eventide”, is not exact. It is presumable that Jesus would have left Jerusalem for Bethany **before** sunset. *Opse*, the time of daylight before sunset, when Jesus left for Bethany, is also the direct opposite of *tehi epaurion*, the time of day after sunrise, “when they were come (returned) from Bethany”, 11:12.

Compare Lk.21:37-38: “And in the day time he was teaching in the temple; and at night he went out, and abode in the mount of Olives. And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple to hear him”. “In the day time”, *tas hehmeras*, means “regularly during day”, Jesus taught in the temple; “but at night”, *tas de nuktas*, Jesus was (or “went”) to the mountain. Luke says the people “in the morning came”, *ohrthridzen*, to hear him. Before sunrise they were there in anticipation, and He would arrive *tehi epaurion*, just “after sunrise”, to teach them.

Mk.11:1-10 tells of Jesus’ entrance into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. It was a day filled with strange enthusiasm, which inexplicably vanished. The crowds disappeared, as did their acclaims of Jesus. When Jesus entered the temple and looked on everything about, there was nobody else. He does not preach, nor does he heal anyone. He simply left, “it being late already”. The incidence of *opse* as a variant is significant in that it should receive **preference to *opsia*** in Mk.11:11 because the indications of a time before sunset are more persuasive than the indications of a time after sunset. This variant, *opse*, to occur where circumstances favour the impression of late daylight, shows that the meaning the term *opsia* has makes it **unsuitable** to indicate such a time of day. *Opsia* will rather fit the time of day after sunset when it would have marked the beginning of day.

### 5.1.3.5.

**8. Mt.14:15.** “And (Herod) sent and beheaded John in the prison ... and his disciples came and took away the body and buried it and went and told Jesus. When Jesus heard, he departed thence by ship into a desert place apart. And the people ... followed him on foot out of the cities. And Jesus went forth and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick. And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a deserted place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals”.

Herod presumably entertained his guests during night and had John beheaded the next morning, John's internment, Herod's heinous act, the carrying of the message, Jesus' withdrawal, the peoples' following and assembling, and the healing of their sick, were **not** events of **one day**. When Jesus taught, the time of day got noticed when "it was past the time" of day, *heh hohra ehdeh parehlthen*, "the hour has already gone through", and "evening had come", *opsias genomenehs*. It was **after the twelfth** hour Jewish time, that is, after sunset. Notice *hohra parehlthen* as against *hohras pollehs*,<sup>Mk.6:35</sup> a "late" hour **within the twelve** hours in a day but not the twelfth or past the twelfth hour yet.

Jesus sends his disciples to buy food. Does this imply that the day was not over? Does it imply that the sun had not gone down and that "evening" therefore indicates a period of time before sunset, in other words, that *opsia* indicates the end of day and not its start? If food could have been bought just before sunset, it could have been bought just after sunset as well, provided it was not a Friday night (= Sabbath's evening). The disciples do not argue that they have no time to buy food, but that they did not have enough money. Buying went on till late and especially at the cool of day, that is, before and after sunset. The three women, after sunset and the Sabbath "had gone through", bought spices to embalm Jesus' body, Mk.16:1-2. The foolish virgins, who slept while they should have taken precaution, had no oil when the bridegroom arrived at midnight. "Go rather to them that sell and buy (oil) for yourselves",<sup>Mt.25:9</sup> the wise virgins admonished. They went to buy and indeed did buy oil at this time of night. They were nevertheless not allowed entrance to the marriage, not because they could not buy oil, but because they bought theirs too late. When Judas left after the Last Supper, "it was night", while the disciples thought he was going to buy something; they did not find it strange.<sup>Jn.13:30</sup>

After they had left the deserted place the disciples were afraid to go to sea on boat because it was night by then. That they were afraid is suggested therein that Jesus had to "constrain" them to board ship.<sup>22</sup>

### Matthew 14:15 Associated with Feeding of the Multitude

The following associations between the Gospels' indications of time may be observed whereby another explanation amounts to the **same conclusion** that the meaning of the word *opsia* is **the time of night after sunset till darkness**.

In Mt.14:15, it is stated, "Now **evening** having started to **approach** (*opsias de genomenehs prosehllthon*), his disciples said to Him, the place is deserted and **the hour about concluded** (*heh hohra ehdeh parehlthen*), therefore let the crowd go ..."

Notice two things about the Greek: The word *prosehllthon* and the preposition *para* in the make-up of the word *parehlthen*. *Prosehllthon* shows that the evening has **not properly** started as yet. It only "**began to approach**". And the hour of day was **not properly** "past" but only was "**about** gone through".

Now compare this with Mk.6:35 and Lk.9:12. "**Being come already** the late hour (*ehdeh hohras pollehs genomenehs*) came his disciples and approaching Jesus said, the place is deserted and the hour already is late (*ehdeh hohra polleh*): Dismiss them ...". "**As day began to decline** (*heh de hehmera ehrcsato klinain*), the twelve approaching Him, said to Him, Send the people away ...".

If these three verses refer to the same event and its time of occurrence there can be no doubt that with *opsia parehlthen* – "**evening approaching**", is indicated the "**late** hour" of day(light)-time = "afternoon" or time of day that is "**late**" = *opse*.

These three verses, compared with Jn.6:4 which says that "the Jewish Passover Feast (15 Nisan) was **near**", show that Jesus multiplied the bread and fishes **quickly** in order to have finished with it before the Feast Day **would start with sunset**. Jesus fed the crowd in a grain field with corn for much bread, and on the shore of the Sea of Galilee with much fish to eat. **But as food** it was **unavailable** – except through **many hours** of toil. **Only God** can work outside time in order to **stay within the rule of time**. It implies that after sunset it would be the Feast Day beginning with "evening".

#### 5.1.3.6.

**9. Mt.20:8**, "When even was come (*opsias genomenehs*) the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the labourers, and give them their hire ... And when they that were hired about the eleventh hour came, they received every man a penny ... these last have wrought but one hour ..."

Those hired last, worked from six o'clock till six o'clock, in now days terminology. The day ended six p.m. Then were the hirelings paid. Agricultural labourers were day-labourers who worked from sunrise to sunset and were afterwards paid without delay. They were paid when the next day has already started **after the twelfth hour** of the previous day of labour. The time they were paid is called *opsia*, "evening".

#### 5.1.3.7.

**10. Mt.16:2-3**, "When it is evening (*opsias genomenehs*), Ye say, It will be fair weather today, for the sky is red; and in the morning,

Today is stormy weather for the sky is red and overcast".

The sky, in the "evening", and, in the "morning", is described as "red". It implies the absence of shadows because the sun is no longer visible. *Opsia* is regarded as the opposite of *prohi*, "morning" when no sun is visible as well.

*Prohi* is here used **without adverbial or adjectival clauses**, and indicates the time coinciding with the fourth watch, from 3 o'clock toward sunrise. Cf. *prohias* when the Jews decided to kill Jesus,<sup>Mt.27:1</sup> and *prohi* when they took Him to the hall of judgement. Jn.18:28 **Whereas prohi ends the night, opsia starts it**.

#### 5.1.3.8.

**11. Jn.6:16-17**, "Because **evening** did come = started = had begun" (*hohs opsia egeneto*), his disciples went down to sea and embarked a boat and went across the sea to Capernaum. **It was now dark** (*skoia ehdeh egegonei*)..."

"It was dark" when "it was evening" – or, "it was dark", at most, shortly **after** "it became evening".

#### 5.1.3.9.

### Opsia – "Evening", in Passages Near in Context to the Crucifixion

**Before Jesus' Crucifixion:**

**12 and 13. Mk.14:17 and Mt.26:20**. The Last Supper. "And in the evening he cometh with the twelve"; "Now **when the even** was come He sat down with the twelve." "When the hour was come / Within one hour (*hote egeneto heh hohra*) he sat down, and the twelve apostles with Him".<sup>Lk.22:14</sup> "... Then Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me **this night**".<sup>Mt.26:31</sup> "And Jesus said unto (Peter) ... **This day** (*sehmeron*) in this night (*tautehi tehi nukti*) before the cock crow twice (the second hour), thou shalt deny me thrice".<sup>Mk.14:27</sup>

How could it possibly be clearer that the day is made up of the evening, as first part of night, and of night, as first part of the day, and of morning, as last part of day's full cycle as in Genesis 1... "And it was evening and it was morning the ... day".

#### 5.1.3.10.

After Jesus' Resurrection:

**14. Jn. 20:19.** "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were for fear of the Jews ...", or, more literally, "Being evening then (*ousehs oun opsias*) on that first day (*tehi hehmerai ekeinehi tehi miai sabbatohn*)..."

**Seen in the light of Lk.24:29-35, where Jesus met two disciples on their way to Emmaus while the day was "far spent", it has to be accepted that when those disciples arrived in Jerusalem, it could very well have been "at least two hours after sunset", as Dr. Nik Lee describes the time when Jesus appeared to the disciples "while it was evening then".**

(It being the "first day of the week" according to Idiom, it should have been "on the second day of the week". See Par. 5.2.1.1: 6.2.1.)

#### 5.1.3.11.

##### Opsia Between Jesus' Death and Resurrection

**15 and 16. Mk.15:42 and Mt.27:57.** These are the two **cardinal instances** of the occurrence of the term *opsia* relevant to the present question whether Jesus was buried on the same day He was crucified or on the following day. There can be no doubt about the application and meaning of the term *opsia* throughout the Gospels and specifically in the context of Jesus' death and resurrection. It indicates only one time of the day, and that is its **beginning** according to the Biblical reckoning, **irrespective of the "lateness"** of this beginning in relation to the earth's rotation. **No reason** exists why this term should not in these accounts of Jesus' crucifixion maintain its invariable meaning.

#### 5.1.3.12.

##### Thanks to Translations

The New Afrikaans Translation "translates" *opsia* in Mk.15:42 and Mt.27:57, with "late noon" (mutually exclusive concepts and a contradiction in terms). This rendering *volens volens* implies that translation with "evening" would have meant that the new day **had already begun** when Joseph went to ask for the body. The translators used "late noon" instead of "evening" **for no other reason than to avoid this impression**. Their rendering supplies no case of an applicable meaning of *opsia* so that it also could indicate the last part of daylight before sunset. **Their paraphrasing is sure indication of their awareness of the implications of an evening's interval between Jesus' crucifixion and interment.** Why is *opsia* from only very recently, in only the latest editions of the New Testament, and only in Mk.15:42 and Mt.27:57, translated with terms that indicate "afternoon" in stead of "evening"? The change in meaning is neither accidental nor insignificant. It can't be ascribed to the discovery of better manuscripts, because, none are relevant. It must be explained by the translators' insistence to create the impression that it was the same day of Jesus' crucifixion, that he was buried as well. Even when they find it impossible to misinterpret the noun *opsia*, they force open another route to escape the conclusion that Jesus died and, only after the interval of the evening, was buried. So they misinterpret the time aspect of the verb, <sup>(See above, NIV.)</sup> Dr. Alfred Marshall <sup>Nestle Interlinear 1974</sup> seems to be perplexed and paraphrases: "evening coming", but gives the literal meaning, "when it was evening" as well.

Older translators are ignorant in regard to the implications of an "evening" between Joseph's actions and Jesus' death. They translate *opsia* straight forward with "evening", thus attesting to the true significance of the term, while they just as unpretentiously render the verb with a past tense: "Even was come"; <sup>AV</sup> "Evening had come" <sup>RS</sup> "Le soir etant venu"; <sup>Segond</sup> Even Luther, "Am Abend", but referring to Ex.34:25.

New translations, **trying to cover up the implications** of a literal and true rendering of *opsia genomenehs* in Mk.15:42 (Mt.27:57), succeeded in just the opposite, and have in their effort **highlighted** aspects of the history of Christ's suffering which **otherwise would have remained unnoticed**. (Translators are not infallible or too holy to be criticised. They are very often nameless, and hide behind this fact to take the liberty of translating either irresponsibly or responsibly to the dictating of the dogmatic stances of the movements they represent. The New Afrikaans Bible's rendering of Mk.15:42 is a case in point, and clearly reflects the conviction of the representation of the churches involved in this translation.)

Several reasons can be given that in Mk.15:42 (Mt.27:57) *opsia* – "evening", indicates the beginning of **another** day following Jesus' crucifixion. In the New Testament *opsia* **always means "evening" after sunset**. Mark does not **only** say that Joseph, "when **evening**", went to ask Pilate, but, that he went, "when **it was evening**"; Mark says that Joseph went, "when **already** it was evening"; and, that he went, "it being **evening's time** (Genitive) already": *kai ehdeh opsias genomenehs*. Mark does not stop here, but immediately continues to define this evening further: "Joseph went ... **because** it had become evening already and the Preparation, **it being the Fore-Sabbath**", *epei ehn paraskeueh ho estin prosabbaton elthohn lohsehlf* ...

#### 5.1.4.

##### Mark 15:42 & Matthew 27:57

##### Genitive Absolute

The **idea implied**, it having become the evening already, needs **specific definition**, and therefore the Genitive is used **with adjectives and adverbs** to make complete sense: "When it was evening already – *ehdeh*. The participle relates itself to the root-idea of the Genitive: "Evening time (it) has / had become – *opsias genomenehs*. This case of the use of the Absolute Genitive is neither grammatically nor to content connected with what **preceded** the sentence in context. <sup>(Dana & Mantey)</sup> And it stands in no relation to the predicate, "Joseph entered". The time of **Joseph's** entering should be deduced from the Absolute **Genitive**, "it was evening's time already" ... when. The time supposed in the Absolute Genitive should **not** be deduced from **Joseph's** entering and thus made any time pinned to Joseph's actions. In other words, the time indicated (of Joseph's actions) is independent and absolute – "It was evening already".

#### 5.1.4.1.

##### Adverbs

##### 5.1.4.1.1.

##### Epei, "Because"

In Mk.15:42 *opsia* is meant to indicate that it was "evening" in the sense of the **beginning** of "Preparation", that is, the beginning of Friday **with evening**, when Joseph "went to Pilate" to ask for Jesus' body. In terms of "English" time: "It was **Thursday evening**". Friday lay **ahead**; It was **not in the end** of Friday. *Epei* is an adverb to both verbs, "evening **came**", *opsias genomenehs*, and *ehn*, "it **being** the Preparation which is the Day Before the Sabbath": "Because the evening's time had

come, and because it was the Preparation”. *Epei*, literally – “on” (*epi*) “being” (*eimi*) – relates and combines the two verbs, explaining the identical nature of the two (or three) Time Concepts: “On being evening’s (time), that is, Preparation, that is, the Day Before Sabbath”. Compare *epei* ... *ehn* = “being”: “So also are ye, **being** zealous of spirit”; <sup>1Cor.14:12</sup> “**Being** children, they are partakers of blood”; <sup>Hb.2:14</sup> “Able to have compassion, **being** himself compassed with infirmity”; “They called Paul, Mercurius, **being** chief speaker”; <sup>Acts 14:12</sup> “The priests took the silver pieces and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, **because it is** the price of blood, *epei timēh himatos estin.*” <sup>Mt.27:6</sup> “It is not lawful ... because ... it is the price of blood”: The ideas are combined and explained by *epei*. *Epei* explains by giving reason: “Because it is the price of blood, it is not lawful to add it to the treasury”. The same thing happens in Mk.15:42: “It became evening, being the Preparation”, or, “Because it was evening, being Preparation already ...”. The reason is found in the words actually used, and not supposed, from outside the context, as in the case of the supposition that Friday’s end is indicated because the crucified had to be buried on the same day of death.

According to the supposition that Jesus was crucified on Friday, the **near end** of Friday is the cause of Joseph’s and the Jews’ actions. But, on the contrary, according to the supposition discerned in Mark, the reason was the fact that Friday, the day for Preparation and of “that High-Day-Sabbath” (John), has **started**. Strictly speaking, the **time** of day, whether it being the end or the start of day, wasn’t the direct cause of their actions. They had **their own motives**. “The Jews”, had in mind the **“that-high-day-Sabbath”** <sup>Jn.19:31</sup> **which awaited them that day**. (The day of the morning following – Friday, would be Passover Feast Sabbath). The Passover was their greatest festival symbolising their deliverance from slavery. **The crucified as symbol of Roman tyranny, would on this Feast Day, be their worst embarrassment.** “*De Joden dan, opdat de lichamen niet aan het kruis zouden blijven op den sabbath, dewijl het de voorbereiding was (want die dag des sabbaths was groot), baden Pilatus, dat hun beenen gebroken, en zij weggenomen worden.*” So they wanted them off the crosses and taken away as long as they could get out of the public eye. The Jews did not care about the crucified being dead or not. Whether they were to get buried wasn’t given a moment’s thought – they weren’t dead yet in any case and **could** not be buried. The Jews also knew perfectly well that crucified **were not given a burial. They cared for nothing but to save face.**

**Joseph’s** motives, humanly speaking, could be nothing but a **mystery**. The possibility of obtaining Jesus’ body for burial, was nil. How he could have given it any thought is inexplicable. How he gathered the courage to do what he did against the obvious intentions of the Jewry, can be ascribed to nothing but God’s **providence**. How he eventually accomplished Jesus’ entombment so privately and peacefully, can be ascribed to nothing but the exaltation by the Father of Christ already in his death.

*Epei* supplies **logical connection** between the time of day and Joseph’s actions “**because it now was evening to the Preparation, Joseph came ...**”. Mark’s use of certain verb clauses to describe the time of day involved, perfectly corresponds with John’s record. With that being the case, added the constant meaning of the word *opsia*, translators have to face the insurmountable problem of interpreting these factors **so as to create the impression which would agree with tradition**, that Jesus was **buried the same afternoon** on which He died. They have to, because they also must save face, also for the sake of tradition, but for not as noble a tradition as the Jews’.

#### 5.1.4.1.2. “Already”, *Ehdeh*

The above conclusion is substantiated again by the translators’ **intended disregard** for the word *ehdeh* in Mk.15:42. *Ehdeh* is a word with strong meaning and is consequently almost never not distinctly translated. In Mk.11:11, Jn.11:17, Mt.17:12 and 5:28, *ehdeh* is translated “already”. See also Mt.17:12, Mk.6:35, Jn.3:8, and many more. But in the translation of Mk.15:42 **its absence is conspicuous**, especially in the latest versions: “When evening had come”, <sup>Modern Language</sup> “Late that afternoon”, <sup>Living Bible</sup> “When the evening came”, <sup>Phillips</sup>

Neglect of this term in translation can not be blamed on variants. Actually, **variants confirm** the reason Mark intended for using the term, because *ehdeh* is in one variant replaced with an equivalent, *palai*, <sup>LTr:WH, G.V. Wigram Greek Concordance</sup> with the meaning, “**long since**”: “It was evening for long already when Joseph went ...” It could never have been “late afternoon” or “late noon”, **end** of day. It was late, yes – thinking like “Western” man – but **late whilst the start** of the new day – thinking the “Bible” way. That means that Jesus still hung **on the cross late in night** when tradition has him buried for about six or nine hours already! See Mk.15:44, “already, *ehdeh*, (dead)” = “any while / [long ago], *palai*, (dead)”. *Ehdeh* is translated “**now**” in the Authorised Version. The meaning is, “by now already”, “by the time Joseph went evening had already come” – it implies what *palai* does. Compare Lk.21:30, “Summer now is near” – **winter is far spent** and summer for quite **some time now** the prospective.

Where the idea of “at long last” or “eventually” – and thus the lapse of a long time – is implied, *ehdeh* is used, “... if by any means now **at length** I might have a prosperous journey”. <sup>Ro.1:10</sup> After long waiting, Paul is granted by the will of God opportunity; “Now at the last your care of me hath flourished again”. <sup>Fl.4:10</sup> After long neglect, the Philipians again revived in caring for Paul.

In Mark, *ehdeh* has the same significance, and is used with the same determination as in Paul’s use. It is not to be ignored in Mk.15:42 where it is stated that it was evening for long already when at long last, Joseph managed to go and ask Pilate for Jesus’ body in order to bury it the way Jews buried their dead. See Par.5.2.2.2.

“Preparation” was **not ending** when Joseph “went to Pilate” – it **began**. “Preparation” ended after Joseph had **buried** Jesus. It was **not the weekly Sabbath** that would start with *opsia* in Mk.15:42. It then was **not** before sunset – “**it was The Preparation**”, **after sunset, beginning**. Jesus that day **would** be buried! It was **not** a matter of **haste** “because it was already late noon” before the Sabbath – it was **a matter of opportunity** provided in the providence of God for Joseph to bury the body of Jesus on that day. *Opsia* – “Evening”, “Preparation” and “Foresabbath”, were that one day’s opportunity for Jesus’ entombment. **Time was not running out on Joseph – time for him arrived**. What happened with Joseph taking the initiative, happened during **late night – not** during “late noon”.

#### 5.1.4.1.3. The Pronoun Article

According to Traditional interpretation of Mk.15:42, only late Friday afternoon constitutes the “Sabbath’s-Eve”. It is supposed that Joseph then acted and finished what he set out to do. However, what Tradition calls “Sabbath’s Eve”, and limits to Friday afternoon, is in Mk.15:42 indicated as the full implied prospective day, signified by its peculiar start, “It was evening now”, and by its defined purpose or character, “being Preparation which is the Before-Sabbath”, *epei ehn parskeueh ho*



*estin prosabbaton*. The foregoing context tells of Jesus' crucifixion. The phenomenon of time is used in Mark and Matthew to mark a new development. This whole time factor is supported by the article pronoun *ho*, "which". What is indicated with this participle, is the solid opportunity for preparation in Jewish Tradition – the whole sixth day of the week; not only its end according to Traditional thinking. This little word is not in the feminine and refers not specifically to the feminine word *heh opsia*, or even only to the (feminine) concept of "day", *hehmera*. The whole of "Preparation" and "Fore-Sabbath" is implied, that is, it includes the "evening" and the "day", but also its expected contents according to the nature and purpose of the day. "It had become evening the Day of Preparation before the Sabbath". "Evening the Day of Preparation", is implied by this pronoun article. <sup>See Par. 5.1.1.5.4.4.</sup>

#### 5.1.4.1.4.

##### Plain Concepts, Plain Words

Presuming Mark and Matthew wanted to tell their readers that Joseph buried Jesus on the day he was crucified, before sunset, before evening, in the "afternoon". Then why do they not say so? Is it too difficult to express the time they had in mind? Why would they use words **regularly and consistently** used to indicate some time period very different from the one they presumably meant? Why would Mark say "already" evening while he meant "before" evening – he uses the concept "the day before the Sabbath" in the immediate context. Why could Mark not say of Joseph, as he does of Mary, that he "came beforehand" – that he "anticipated", *prolambanoh*, <sup>14:8</sup> the evening, to bury Jesus? He "took no thought beforehand", <sup>13:11</sup> *promerimnaoh* one might assume. Why did Mark and Matthew not use the term for "before", *prin*, as they do very nearby, "before the cock crow". <sup>Mk.14:30 Mt.26:34,75</sup> It is an easy concept for "before daybreak" and could as easily have been used for "before evening". Or, for the same reasons, *pro*? <sup>Mt.24:38 Lk.22:15 Jn.13:1</sup> But these Gospels would not use it. If they wanted to state the time as being "noon" or "afternoon", why did they not use *mesos* as when Paul at "midday" saw the light, <sup>Acts 26:13</sup> or, "about noon" – *mehsembria*? <sup>Acts 22:6</sup> If Mark and Matthew had the "eve" of evening proper in mind, why did they not express their mind with *hespera*? <sup>Lk.24:29</sup> If they simply wanted to say "late" on the day of crucifixion, they could – they surely would – have used *opse*. Why not *husteron*, "Later Joseph came ..." like when Jesus "Later appeared unto the eleven"? <sup>Mk.16:14</sup> Why would Mark use the most common word to indicate the start of day after sunset with "evening", *opsia*, if he meant the most common concept of the end of day before sunset not evening yet? Simply because he did not mean the end of day or before sunset, but the beginning of day after sunset, "having had become evening already".

#### 5.1.4.2.

##### Verbs

#### 5.1.4.2.1.

##### Ginomai, "To Occur", "To Arrive" See App. p. 273f

Mark says "Evening's had come, it being the Preparation already, Joseph going...", *kai ehdeh opsias genomenehs epei ehn paraskeueh ehlothohn Iohsehlf*. Then Joseph came on the scene. The occurrence of the factor of **time was accomplished**; the occurrence of the factor of Joseph's **actions was not**. What happened with time, is expressed with the verb *ginomai*, here used as a passive participle, genitive feminine singular, **Aorist**. The feminine "gender" and singular "number", show that this word is connected with the "evening", *heh opsia*, a feminine singular term. The genitive "case", indicates that the phenomenon that had occurred, the time that did arrive, belonged to this distinctive time slot – it was of this kind: "evening's time". The passive "voice" in this instance is of no consequence – it is used as an active – time

was not brought, it occurred itself. The participle "verbal form", shows the relation between the occurrence and the phenomenon: It was "arrived" time, "evening's" time. The **Aorist** "tense" tells that change incurred. **The action indicated by the "Aorist", *Aoristos* – "unlimited (tense)", may be viewed as in its beginning, indicating entrance into a state or object: /--- "It became" evening. This is the "ingressive" **Aorist** aspect. Or it may be viewed as in its entirety: (.) The phenomenon is factual – the "constative" **Aorist** aspect: "It was evening".**

All these factors are contained, "inflected", in the single form of the word. Its meaning is consequently established as distinct from the meaning of the same "basic" word used in any other form or inflection. Translation should make the distinctive meaning of the particular inflection clear. *Genomenehs* could not be replicated, for instance, with a plural. It would be nonsense. But even the term's other attributes should be treated with circumspection, for example, **its Aorist time aspects**. The occurrence of the evening can not be interpreted, as some translations do, as to be prospective. Evening "**was**". "Punctiliar", accomplished change, into "evening" – that is, **Aorist** aspect, not necessarily connected with time, but essentially with the nature or status of an occurrence **as fact** – that is what is found in Mk.15:42. If evening were "approaching", the Imperfect, Present, or even Future would be used. There exists no possibility of an **Aorist** future in this instance. In translation the equivalent of the Imperfect or **Aorist** future may sound correct, but as translation, it is incorrect. The use of the **Aorist** here is **regular**, as in every similar case, which makes it a constative and ingressive – English equivalent, **past perfect**.

According to the collective properties guaranteed in the inflected form of the word, *genomenehs*, in Mk.15:42, means, that "It **had become** evening already ... when Joseph came". It does not mean that "Evening **was coming** ... when Joseph came". It **excludes** that meaning. And it excludes any other way of saying, for example, that it was "noon" when Joseph came. It was **not**, "late afternoon, about 4 p.m.". <sup>Vincent Taylor</sup>

Compare **Mk.6:2**, *genomenou sabbatou ehrcsato didaskein* – "When the sabbath day was come, he began to teach". It is not meant that Jesus taught while the Sabbath approached, or when the Sabbath had started nearing, but when it **already had been** Sabbath. In Mk.15:42 the **identical use** of words are found: *Genomenehs opsias*. The **identical meaning** of the use of words shall be found here as well. And if that is not enough, Mark will define what he means with *genomenehs*, himself, if a look is taken at **1:32**: *Opsias de genomenehs hote edusen ho hehlios*. *Edusen* is the indicative "mood", **Aorist**, of the verb *dunoh* – "the sun goes down", and has the meaning: "**After sunset**". When "evening came" – *opsias genomenehs*, it was "after sunset".

In Mk.15:42, the "evening" – *genomenehs*, then means that "evening **had** already come and it was The Preparation ...". It does not mean Joseph came while it was late afternoon and **not evening yet**. Had it been the **fore-'eve'** of the new day, that is, the afternoon of crucifixion day that was **in the process of running out** when Joseph buried Jesus, Mark would have used the **Imperfect** tense or even the Present. He would have related a **continuing nearing prospective** time and not a **completed, stated and factual event**. He certainly would not have employed the **Aorist** or have employed it **in the way** he did. The idea of a time period of day approaching, can in Greek be indicated **in many ways**, but never in the way Mark describes the **fact** of a time period of day that has already started. <sup>15:42</sup>

Now the **Aorist** of *ginomai* is in fact used in the New Testament to indicate a **future and incomplete** extent of time. But it is **never** used in such an application

**independently.** In such instances, of the clearest examples are found of the Greek language's analytical characteristic. Most commonly such instances will be found in the Vocative. Theatrical **expressions will invariably accompany the Aorist** inflection if used. Where used in the indicative or as a participle or however, the future or duration of time will be indicated through the use of **analytical adverbs or particles or verbs**, for example: "While the day was coming on", *Achri* ("until") *de hou hehmera ehmellen* ("near") *ginesthai*.<sup>Acts 27:33</sup> "When the seven days were almost ended", *Hohs* ("When") *de emellen* ("were about") *hai hepta hehmerai suntelleisthai* ("to be fulfilled"). **Descriptive verbs**, like *erchomai* ("to come"), and *engidzoh* ("to be near") will be used rather than *ginomai*, to indicate future time or a continuously anticipated moment. But *ginomai* is the preferred verb, and preferred in the **Aorist**, to indicate stated and occurred time.

*Ginomai* in Mk.15:42 is used as a participle, *genomenehs*. It relates the verb in the indicative with its subject: "**It being evening** now, **Joseph** went in ...". That implies, had it not been evening by then, Joseph would not have gone in to Pilate then. These ideas should be reflected in translation: "The evening therefore an arrived (phenomenon of time), and because it was Preparation now (the one before the Sabbath), Joseph went into (the palace) to Pilate", or, "After it had become evening, being the Preparation which is Friday, Joseph went...".

*Genomenehs* is a participle of the **Aorist** in the genitive. When this term is used in the New Testament to mention time (It is almost used as a "**technical**" term for this purpose – as English would use "It is ..."), it **without exception** indicates **arrived** time: Mk.1:32 / Mt.8:16; Mk.4:17 / Mt.13:21 / Acts 11:19; Mk.4:35; 6:2, 21; Mk.6:38 / Mt.14:15, 23; Mk.6:47; 14:17; 15:33; Mt.16:2; 20:8; 26:6; 27:1 / Jn.21:4; Mk.15:42 / Mt.27:57; Lk.4:42; 6:48; Acts 2:6; 12:18; 16:35 et al. The ingressive connotation of the **Aorist** – **change** into the time concerned – is **completed** and the time is **factually stated** in accordance with the constative connotation of the **Aorist**.

The **Nominative** participle of *ginomai* has much the same meaning as the **Aorist**, cf. Acts 16:27; Lk.22:40

To indicate continuing, toward an expected point in future, time, the participle of *ginomai* is seldom used – and then, with the **dative**, e.g. Mt.14:6; Mk.16:10. The **Present** tense of the participle would rather be used to indicate the continuing or approaching state of an action or condition: "The king was sorry", *perilupos genomenos*.

For an event that was **future**, for something that should have happened or was to happen at some time, the **accusative** of the **Aorist** participle is applied. For example, "The promise **to be fulfilled** to the fathers we preach", *euangelidzometha tehn pros tous pateras genomenehn*;<sup>Acts 13:32</sup> "That word which **was to be** published", *to genomenon rehma*.<sup>10:37</sup> The same idea is obtained with the participle of the Present tense in the accusative, "When you see these coming things happen", *hotan idehte tauta ginomena*.

In Mk.15:42 the **genitive, Aorist** participle **functions specifically** to mean "**It was evening already**". No justification can be found in this statement to interpret it as to indicate the evening prospectively. The time **was**, and it was the one time of day **after** sunset, which begins the day and does not end it. While the particle *ho* includes the "evening", the "day", and the "Preparation", the same applies to the participle *genomenehs*: "It became evening" = "it had become evening"; "it became The Preparation" = "it had become the Preparation". Translations that **ignore or slight** these factors of Greek grammar, syntax and idiom, do it to **compromise on the**

**implications** they have for the day on which Jesus was resurrected. Why **must** Joseph have Jesus buried on the day of crucifixion? If Mk.15:42 is translated as if the evening was approaching (New International Version), Jesus could be buried the same day before sunset **so that He could be resurrected three days later on Sunday**. It might in return be asked why **must** Joseph bury Jesus the day **after** his crucifixion? The answer has already been given: Because it is **true** – **because the Gospels say so. This sequence** of events in this time chronology is the only which agrees with and answers to the **prophetic significance of the Paschal symbolism**. The date for the slaughter of the Passover Lamb and the date for the Passover Feast are fulfilled. Also the date for the First Sheaf of harvest Wave Offering fits to perfection as **metaphor** for Christ's resurrection on the day after Passover Feast.

#### 5.1.4.2.2.

##### "To be", *Eimi* See App. p. 273f

When "it became evening", the day after Jesus' crucifixion, the "Preparation" or "Fore-Sabbath", **had begun** – "already"! It was now that Joseph started to act. Joseph did not start to act at day's end. He started to act with day's beginning after sunset. When Joseph began his actions, "Preparation **was**" – *ehn paraskeueh*, that is, "Preparation (**has**) **begun**".

*Eimi* (first person declension; *ehn*, the third person), "(time) to be", like *ginomai*, "(time) to occur / arrive", when indicating expected, future time, shall never be applied without **analytic adverbial clauses**. "Passover was **near** (but not yet)", *ehn engus to pascha*;<sup>Jn.11:55</sup> "Passover was **after two days**", *ehn to pascha meta duo hehmeras*;<sup>Mk.14:1</sup> "**After this** was a feast", *meta tauta ehn heorteh*.<sup>Jn.5:1</sup> These adverbial phrases show that Passover has not begun yet. In Mk.15:42 though, *eimi* is used **without such specifics**, and means: "**It was** Preparation (in fact)".

*Eimi*'s Imperfect tense form, *ehn*, serves as its **Aorist**. It must be determined from the context if the application is Imperfect or **Aorist**. In Mk.15:42 the **Aorist** functions because *ehn* is preceded and followed by the **Aorist**: "evening came", *genomenehs*; "Joseph went in", *eisehlthen*. **A fact is stated**: "**It was** Preparation which is the Day before the Sabbath" – **Aorist**. The rest must be inferred: If it now was Preparation, but "evening", then it has to be "Thursday evening" in modern day terms. **The Preparation had only one "evening", the evening called Thursday evening**. That means that *ehn* indicates the **beginning** of Friday – according to Biblical reckoning of the day. If not Thursday evening but Friday evening, it would have been Saturday, and Joseph must have gone in to ask for Jesus' body during Friday night and must have buried Him before sunset the following afternoon which would have been on the Sabbath. The point of departure for determining the days on which every thing else happened, is the established and sure day and time of Jesus' burial, completed by Joseph on Friday afternoon "as the sabbath drew near", Lk.23:54. This is the only time that can be defined *as "late afternoon, about 4 p.m."*. Therefore it had to have been **Thursday** "evening" when Joseph went in to Pilate, when "Preparation had **begun**" (equivalent of the participle "when / with Preparation **begun**"). "It was Preparation **already**" – for the Greek, *ehn*. **Not**, "*Friday which ended at sunset*",<sup>v. Taylor</sup> but Friday which **started after** sunset Thursday evening.

Used with adverbial clauses, *ehn* would indicate that a time unit **would start and is implied in whole**: *ehn to pascha meta duo hehmeras*, "After two days **was** Passover" = "Passover **egan** after two days"; "**It was** late already", *ehn gar hespera ehdeh* = "Late afternoon has **started** and constituted the extent of time",<sup>Acts 4:3</sup> Similarly, used independently, *ehn* would indicate the time of "being", as having "begun": "Early morning **was**", *ehn prohi* = "early morning had begun";<sup>Jn.18:28</sup>

“(They) were the days of unleavened bread”, *ehsan hehmerai tohn adzumohn* = “Days of Unleavened Bread Feast started”; <sup>Acts 12:3</sup> “It was the sixth hour as darkness had begun”, *ehn ehdeh hohsei hohra hekteh kai skotos egeneto* = “With the sixth hour beginning, darkness engulfed the earth”. <sup>Lk.23:44</sup>

Jn.19:14 applies both time aspects of Aorist and Imperfect of *ehn*: “It was (*ehn*) the Preparation of Passover (going on – Imperfect) and the sixth hour (began – Aorist)”. Even in a case like John 13:30, where it is told that when Judas left after supper, “It was night”, *ehn nucs* may indicate the beginning of “night” proper, in distinction of *opsta*, “evening” – Aorist. But, meaning, “While being night, Judas left”, the Imperfect holds good.

In Mk.15:42, it can be concluded, *ehn paraskeueh* means that Preparation not only “was”, but that Preparation “began” – “being evening already”, being after sunset already – and that Joseph at Friday’s beginning on Thursday evening, started out to do what he had to do. **After all that had happened during the day that followed – during the same but anticipated day**, Luke could conclude: “And the day was the Preparation” = “had been the Preparation” – *Kai hehmera ehn paraskeuehs* is the complement of the verb of incomplete predication, “was”: At the end of Preparation as a day, “day ended”. *Hehmera* is the subject. As for the specific hours for the Jews’ preparations – these only started then. It was only by then, after Jesus’ interment, that it was “after noon”, because only then, “because of the Jews’ preparations”, did the Sabbath “draw near”, Jn.19:42, Lk.23:54. Of an imminent approach of the Sabbath with the “afternoon” there could have been no possibility “when evening had come” some eighteen hours before Joseph closed the grave! See Appendixes p. 276f. “Aorist”.

## 5.2.

### **On The Improbability of What Supposedly Happened the Afternoon of Christ’s Death; and The Probability of These Things To Have Happened During the Course of Another Day After Jesus’ Crucifixion and Death**

#### 5.2.1.

##### **Day of Crucifixion**

The day of crucifixion began, as already shown, with the evening when Jesus and his disciples had the Last Supper. Judas was the first to leave the company when “it was night”, and soon returned to have Jesus arrested. Then, after the darkness and forlornness of Gethsemane, Jesus was taken to the one high priest, then to the other and back to the first, who had him brought before Pilate. This time during night, John describes as *prohia*, “the early morning”. Mk.13:35 describes this time of night “when the cock crows”. It was 3 a.m.

Lk.22:66 is translated, <sup>AV</sup> “As soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led him into their council”. “As soon as it was day”, rather coincides with “the sixth hour” Roman time, when, John says, Pilate “delivered him unto them”. That was long after the Jews first heard him and He had gone from chief priest to chief priest and from Pilate to Herod through the whole of the early morning’s night. This time was the end according to John, of Jesus’ trial, when Luke says, it started. But Luke has not the time of morning in mind. His reference recalls the “day” of verses 2 and 6: “Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover. And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him – for they feared the people ... And (Judas) sought opportunity to betray him unto them in the absence of the multitude ... Then came the day of

unleavened bread when the Passover must be killed”. Soon afterwards Jesus and his disciples ate the Last Supper. Then Judas went out to betray Jesus, and returned with a mob to arrest him. Judas brought Jesus first to the Jewish leaders. “Now as their day came” = “Now as their opportunity arrived” – *hohs egeneto hehmera*, according to their conspiring, “they assembled” and “led him into their council” – privately, the “people” whom they “feared”, yet not knowing.

Then the Jews sent Jesus to Pilate, and Pilate sent him to Herod, and Herod sent Jesus back to Pilate, who, when “it was six o’clock”, “delivered” him to the Jews “to be crucified”. “And it was The Preparation of the Passover”, says John in 19:14, the same day Luke mentions, three hours after Jesus was first led into the council of the Jews.

#### 5.2.1.1.

##### **Morning Before Crucifixion**

J.C. Ryle comments on John 19:14, “*And is was ... preparation of the passover*”,

*“This remarkable expression cannot mean that “this was the hour for preparing the passover meal”, for it was not. It means, “this was the day before the great sabbath of the passover week”, a day well known among the Jews as the preparation, or day of preparing for the passover sabbath, which was peculiarly a “high day”. St. Mark expressly says this in his account of the passion. (Mark 15:42.) That all the Jewish feasts had their “eves”, or preparation days, is quite clear from Rabbinical writers.*

*We should observe how accurately and precisely John marks the day of the crucifixion.*

*[And about the sixth hour.] This expression raises a grave difficulty, and one which in every age has perplexed the minds of Bible readers. The difficulty lies in the fact that Mark in his Gospel expressly says, “it was the third hour, and they crucified Him” (Mk.15:25); while John in this place says our Lord was only condemned at the sixth hour! Yet both Evangelists wrote by inspiration, and both were incapable of making a mistake. How then are we to reconcile and harmonize these two conflicting statements? The solutions of the difficulty suggested are many and various.*

- (a) *Some say, as the rationalistic writers, that one of the two Evangelists made a blunder, and that one of the accounts therefor is false. This is a solution which will satisfy no reverent minded Christian. If Bible writers could make blunders like this, there is no such thing as inspiration, and there is an end of all confidence in Scripture as an infallible guide.*
- (b) *Some say, as Theophylact, Beza, Nonnus (in his poetical paraphrase), Tittman, Leigh, Usher (vol. 7. 176), Kuinoel, Bengel, Pearce, Alford, Scott, and Bloomfield, that the discrepancy has probably been caused by an error of the manuscript writers, and that the true reading in St. John should be “third”, and not “sixth hour”. This, however, is a very shortcut road out of the difficulty, and the immense proportion of old manuscripts are flatly against it.*
- (c) *Some say, as Augustine does in one place, and Bullinger, “that at the third hour the Lord was crucified by the tongues of the Jews, and at the sixth by the hands of the soldiers”. This, however, to say the least, is a weak and childish explanation. Moreover, it is open to the grave objection that it would make out our Lord to have been only three hours on the cross, and all that time in the dark, and not seen consequently by any one! At this rate, the inscription over His head on the cross would certainly not have been read by many! “There was darkness over all the land from the sixth to the ninth hour”.*

(d) Some say that Mark reckoned time on the Jewish plan, by which the hours began to count from the morning, and their seven o'clock answered to our one; while John reckoned time on our English plan, which is the same as the Roman one, and John's sixth hour meant literally about six in the morning. According to this theory Jesus was condemned, in John's account of the passion, at six o'clock in the morning, and crucified, in Mark's account, at nine o'clock.

This explanation is very commonly adopted, and is supported by Wordsworth, Lee, and Burgon. But it is open to very serious objections. I see no proof whatever that John reckons time on the Roman and English plan, and not on the Jewish plan. The passage in the story of the Samaritan woman, which is commonly quoted as a proof, is no proof at all, and on reflection will cut directly the other way. If the "sixth hour", when Jesus sat on the well (see John 4:6), meant really our English six o'clock in the evening, it makes it impossible to understand how the conversation with the woman, her return to her native village, the telling to the men to come and see Jesus, the coming of the men, the return of the disciples with meat, could all be brought into the short space of one evening! The thing would have been impossible. Moreover, it is an additional objection, that if Jesus was condemned at six o'clock in the morning, there are left three long hours between the condemnation and the crucifixion unaccounted for and unexplained. I am obliged to say that in my judgement this way of explaining the difficulty completely fails.

(e) Some think, as Calvin, Bucer, Gaultier, Brentius, Musculus, Gerhard, Lampe, Hammond, Poole, Jansenius, Burkiit, Hengstenberg, and Ellicott, that John's sixth hour means any time after our nine o'clock in the morning; any time, in fact, within the space begun by the Jewish third hour. They say that the Jews divided the twelve hours of their day into four great portions: from six to nine, from nine to twelve, from twelve to three, and from three to six. They also say that any part of the time after our six in the morning would be called the third hour. And they conclude that both the condemnation and the crucifixion took place soon after nine o'clock, Mark calling it the third hour, because it was near our nine o'clock; John calling it the sixth hour, because it was some time between our nine and twelve.

Grotius says, in Parkhurst, that the third, sixth, and ninth hours, which were most esteemed for prayer and other services, were marked by the sounding of a trumpet, and that after the trumpet sounding at the third hour, the sixth hour was considered to be at hand. Glass and Lampe support this opinion; and Lampe shows from Maimonides, a famous Jewish writer, that the Jews really divided the day into four quarters. Hengstenberg also remarks that the fourth and the fifth hours are never mentioned in the New Testament.

This theory undoubtedly brings the two Evangelists near to one another, if it does not quite reconcile them.

(f) Some think, as Augustine in a second place suggests, and Harmer, quoted in Parkhurst, following him, that the "sixth hour here does not refer to the time of day, but to the preparation of the passover"; – and that the meaning is, "It was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour after that preparation began". But as that preparation often began very early indeed in the morning, or about our three o'clock, six hours counted from that time would bring us down to Mark's third hour, or our nine o'clock. Lightfoot supports this view, which is certainly very ingenious, and would clear away all difficulty. But it may fairly be objected that plain readers would hardly attach such a meaning as Harmer suggests to "the sixth hour".

The difficulty is one of those which will probably never be solved. God has been pleased to leave it in Scripture for the trial of our faith and patience, and we must wait for its solution. Questions of time and date, like this, are often the most puzzling, from our inability to place ourselves in the position of the writer, and from the widely different manner in which measures and points of time are expressed in the language of different nations and in different ages. This very difficulty before us, perhaps, presented no difficulty whatever to the Apostolic Fathers, such as Polycarp and Clement. Perhaps they possessed some simple clue to its solution of which we know nothing. It is our wisdom to be patient, and to believe it admits of explanation, though we have not eyes to see it.

If I must venture an opinion, I think there is more to be said for the fifth of the six solutions I have given than for any other. But I allow that it is incomplete. In any case we must in fairness remember that St. John does not say, distinctly and expressly, "It was the sixth hour", but "about the sixth hour". This shows that some latitude may be allowed in interpretation, and that the acknowledged discrepancy between John and Mark, must not be far pressed, or made of too much importance. One thing, at all events, appears to me quite inadmissible. We cannot allow ourselves to suppose that Jesus was not crucified till twelve o'clock in the day, when the miraculous darkness began, and that He only hung on the cross three hours." pp.284-287

We quoted Ryle at length because his treatise shows the universal acknowledgement of the issue and how serious Christian thinkers regard a problem of the kind of time in Scripture. Unfortunately, Ryle himself, where he at first denies any possibility of a "blunder", at last "acknowledge(s) discrepancy". To us there is no difference but the manner in which the "blunder" is phrased. Christian "patience" will not supply the answer, but closer investigation and the preparedness not only to "wait for its solution", but to accept it when it comes. We believe its solution did come, long ago already, in the form of the solution under ("d"), and that the extensive debate round this "problem" is much ado about nothing. This "solution" should be given fair consideration and not be discarded out of hand because – it will be shown – there is abundant proof for the "eyes to see it". It is indeed "very commonly adopted" for good reason.

Christ's was not only a suffering under Jewish law and custom, but under the "worldly" and **Roman law and custom**. The Roman factor in his passion, specifically during his crucifixion, was predominant, and to find the hours, these **meaningful** hours, **minutely** recorded in Roman time, is nothing to be surprised by. It is by far the simplest and most satisfying explanation for this "problem" with the least negative implications – if at all.

"The passage in the story of the Samaritan woman," says Ryle, "is no proof at all" that John does not use Jewish time. He is so sure on strength of a single supposition, namely: "If the "sixth hour" when Jesus sat on the well (see John 4:6), meant really our English six o'clock in the evening ...", then, "The thing would have been impossible". We wish he told us why he thinks the evening is involved, because we find nothing to the effect. If the early **morning's "sixth hour"** is supposed, "all could be brought into the space of one ..." normal morning, and the "sixth hour" would be the "Roman plan", "sixth hour".

"Now Jacob's well was there. Jesus, being wearied with journey sat thus upon the well: It was about the sixth hour. There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water: Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink. (For his disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.) ... Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband, and come hither ... Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee, am. And upon this came his disciples

... The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and saith to the men, Come, see a Man ... Then they came out of the city, and came unto him. In the meanwhile his disciples urged him to eat. He said to them: My meat is to do the will of Him who sent me ... So when the Samaritans were come unto him, they besought him that he would tarry with them. And he abode there two days.”<sup>Jn.4</sup>

Ryle and others, for **no** reason, assume that the time John mentions when Jesus stopped at the well, was the “**evening’s**”, “sixth hour”, **Jewish** time, which would have made it **midnight**. That this assumption is ridiculous is apparent, and the whole discussion could be stopped here. But John is not even speaking of the **Roman** “sixth hour” evening’s time, but of the Roman **morning’s** “sixth hour”, which is about **sunrise**. (It was not the Jewish morning’s sixth hour, which is **noon**, for reasons that will be given shortly.)

In the first place there can be no reason why John does not speak of the morning six o’clock. Jesus’ journey took him from Judea to Galilee through Samaria.<sup>5</sup> He made journey, about the **middle of summer**, as can be deduced from verse 35, it being “four months (before) harvest time”. If John speaks of Roman time, by six o’clock in the morning in these geographical regions, Jesus could have travelled for about three hours already and it must have been very exhausting<sup>6</sup> because of the heat and aridity of the country. A journey would rather be undertaken very early morning than before midday, exactly because of the heat of midday or even of the afternoon.

The disciples went to town to buy “meat”.<sup>8</sup> That would be no problem, just as their journey before six in the morning was no problem. His disciples urged Jesus to eat.<sup>31</sup> It means nothing for the notion that it was our “lunchtime”, which corresponds with the Jewish “sixth hour”. They could have asked Jesus to eat the morning at six o’clock because they were on the road long enough and were hungry by then.

The time “to draw water”<sup>7</sup> for cattle, was **before sunset**. The woman came to draw water for **domestic** use because no mention is made of cattle. Before sunset, the herders would have visited the well. But **no one** was present except Jesus, when the woman arrived. Jesus “**sat on the well**”,<sup>6</sup> which means no one needed the space to reach for water. It obviously was not “peak hour” about the Jewish ninth to eleventh hour. Water also was never drawn at the **heat of day**. The **morning**, “six o’clock”, must have been the time – which implies it was “Roman” time.

Verses 40 and 43 state that Jesus stayed with the Samaritans for two days. If the beginning of this stay is taken as from Jesus’ arrival there, at the well, the first day would extend till the next morning, and the second day would extend till again the next morning. Herein is no Jewish understanding of the day-cycle suggested. If the “Jewish plan” were applicable, and Jesus arrived midday, He could not have “departed thence after two days” but should have left on the first day following, because the Jews reckoned any portion of a day as the full day. Jesus would also, if He arrived before sunset and left after two full day cycles, have been obliged to start his journey back, at evening, which is most unlikely.

Ryle indirectly tries to substantiate his claim that John uses the Jewish count of hours, by saying: “*If I must venture an opinion, I think there is more to be said for the fifth of the six solutions I have given than for any other.*” *This “fifth” solution, is based on the dividing of the Jewish day so as to “esteem most for prayer and other services the third, the sixth and ninth hours.”* “*They say,*” from the Jewish first hour beginning with sunrise till the Jewish third hour, will be viewed as and be called, the third hour; from the Jewish fourth hour till the Jewish sixth hour, ending midday, will be treated as, and be called, the sixth hour. (It seems they prayed incessantly.)

Now, **John**, speaks of a **certain stage** in the course of events on that morning of “the Day of Preparation of Passover”. That stage was where Pilate finally surrendered to the Jews and “**delivered**” Jesus “unto them”. The **locality** was in Jerusalem, Pilate’s house, on the pavement just outside. One could almost visualise Pilate’s gesturing – he had nothing more to say – as John records: “Then delivered he Him therefore unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus, and led him away”.<sup>19:16</sup> Verse 14 told us that it was now, “the sixth hour”, and **Ryle tells us, “the sixth hour”** **Jewish time**. According to the above explanation, this “sixth hour” could have extended any time from “the fourth hour” began, till “the sixth hour” elapsed – that is, any time from 10 to 12 am. [*“They also say that any part of the time after our six in the morning (the Jews’ “first”) would be called the third hour, and any time after our nine in the morning (the Jews’ “fourth”) would be called the sixth hour.*” says Ryle.] The assumption that John here speaks of Jesus’ crucifixion, when he said that Pilate “delivered” Jesus to the Jews, underlies Ryle’s argument. That means that Jesus was crucified at the **earliest 10 a.m.** If the hour is to be understood as the most “**esteemed**”, the time would rather have been the sixth hour properly, that is, **12 a.m.** “*One thing, at all events, appears to me quite inadmissible,*” says Ryle: “*We can not allow ourselves to suppose that Jesus was not crucified till twelve o’clock in the day ...*” He argues for this inadmissibility himself.

Then, **Mark**, speaks of a **certain stage** in the course of events of that morning of “the Day of Preparation of Passover”. That stage was “when they crucify him” (Present tense),<sup>15:24</sup> Verse 25 confirms, “It was the third hour and they **crucified** him”. The **locality** was outside Jerusalem at “The place called skull”. We have already shown that the **Aorist** of *ginomai, ehn*, indicates the beginning of the third hour: “**The third hour started “ticking off” when they crucified him**”. If we must stick to what “*They say*”, the time at earliest was “the first hour”. If it is allowed that “the third hour” is simply “*stated with*” factual circumstances (**Aorist** Constativ Aspect), the time at **latest** was by the **end** of “the third hour” Jewish time as “*They say*”. If it is allowed that *ehn* in this instance is Imperfect tense – which it probably could be because the Present tense is used almost as equivalent – then “the third hour” was **in process**, and not lapsed yet, so that it would be **earlier than the third hour’s end**.

Mark, speaks of the first to the third hour “*Jewish*” time as “*They say*”, and John speaks of the fourth to the sixth hour “Jewish” time as “*They say*”. But **Mark**, while speaking of the **earlier time**, speaks of the **later phase** in the course of events, and John, while speaking of the **later time**, speaks of the **earlier stage** in the course of events. If Ryle and “*They*” who say that John uses “*Jewish’ time*”, were correct, it is **John** who should have spoken of “the **third hour**”, and it is **Mark** who should have spoken of “the **sixth hour**”. This must be what might be called a “**blunder**”!

Ryle refers to the fact that the fourth and fifth hours are never mentioned in the Gospels, and to the inference from this, that the first of every three hours represents the following three hours. The fourth and fifth hours accordingly will be indicated with “the third hour”. If this principle were correct, then also the seventh, tenth and eleventh hours should not have been mentioned, but should have been indicated by “the sixth hour” and “the ninth hour” respectively. The nobleman’s of Capernaum child was healed the “seventh hour”;<sup>Jn.4:52</sup> Jesus invites two disciples at “the tenth hour” to visit him.<sup>1:35</sup> John says it was the “morning” – *epaurion* when these disciples stayed with him for the “**day**” – *hehmera*. If Jewish time were used, the disciples would have had to stay over for the **night**.

Hours were strictly counted and accounted for. Labourers were paid per hour.<sup>Mt.20:6,9</sup> John is more specific about the indication of time than the Synoptists

with his question: “Are there not twelve hours in a day?”<sup>11:9</sup> The seventh, tenth and eleventh hours are specifically mentioned. That implies that the day was reckoned **hour by hour**, and not only every three hours by every three hours.

The fact that, when John is understood to use the Roman time count and Mark the Jewish, they perfectly **synchronise**, is in itself proof of their individual frameworks of time reference. The inevitable result of all these proposed calculations, and surmising, is that they “*on reflection will cut directly the other way*” and indicate that John understood the hours according to the “*Roman plan*”. What “*serious*” implication could this have for faith that needs “*serious objections*”? By accepting the solution according to *the “Roman plan*”, no “*trial for our faith*” is lost. To insist on John’s use of a Jewish count of hours, would have serious implications for believing the Gospels, for it would imply discrepancies for which no explanation can be given. To accept John’s use of the Roman count of hours, will at least mean that the trial is won mentally. The only result for faith in accepting these different time nomenclatures in the two Gospels, is that the believer can accept as true a **naturally told** story, and may allow **words to have their own meaning**. Not only is the “sixth hour” not “*anything from our 9 to 12 o’clock*”, “the third hour” not “*anything from our 6 to 9 o’clock*”, etc., but “*Deliver*”, is not “*Crucify*”. John and Mark speak of different things, which happened at different times. John’s subject is the earlier – naturally, and Mark’s the later – actually. And there is no other way to explain why John mentions the later time, and Mark the earlier time, than that John used the Roman designation for hours, and that Mark used the Jewish. This situation is corroborated by other factors in both Gospels which will be treated on shortly.

Ryle’s “*additional objection*” to John’s use of the “*Roman*” hour count is that it would imply “*three long hours between the condemnation and the crucifixion unaccounted for and unexplained*”. Ryle says, “*I am obliged to say that in my judgement this way of explaining the difficulty completely fails*”. The only thing Ryle avails with his protest is to create prejudice so that the reader will without good reason, reject what Ryle rejects and accept what Ryle accepts. Such is the power of negative argument. Meanwhile all logic as well as all facts are disregarded concerning the possibility of another way of understanding the matter.

The Gospels’ reports of the events of the morning of the day of crucifixion contain **many allusions** to what really happened during the three hours between when Pilate “delivered” Jesus and when “they crucified him”. (That is, between “the sixth hour” Roman time and “the third hour” Jewish time, or, between 6 and 9 a.m.) It asks for no great imagination to realise what at length happened within this time. In the very first words following Pilate’s “delivering” of Jesus “to the Jews”, “**and they took Jesus, and led him away**”, much is implied. What the Jews did to Jesus when they “took” him, and how they “led” him away, is not told in detail, yet can be believed without contradiction. That it took **time** to do it follows naturally. John forthwith tells of Jesus, “bearing his cross”.<sup>17</sup> But it is not said whence the cross was obtained. Did the Jews prepare the cross beforehand? The Jewish way to execute would have been to stone Jesus, so they would not have had the cross ready themselves. The cross was a Roman instrument of death, used by Roman authority only, so it must be assumed it first had to be fetched – even assembled, into the form of a “cross”. Nails and rope were part of the equipment – it had to be made available – which are **time** consuming measures.

Word passes through the **whole city**, and from every quarter they approach to partake of the spectacle, devout and insolent, Roman and Jew, men and women. They only heard about Jesus’ doom after “six o’clock”, and could not fly to the scene. It took

**time** for the crowd to gather.

“They laid upon one Simon a Cyrenian, arriving from his land, and on him they laid the cross, that he might bear it after Jesus”.<sup>Lk.23:26</sup> Why did they do this? Christ’s was a path of suffering, of suffering an eternity on every step of the way. There was **no shortcut** to the cross.

“And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him”.<sup>27</sup> Their tears were like salt on the wounds from the whip. This massive parade **slowly made its way** through the city. But just before they passed through the gate, “Jesus, **turning**, said unto them, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. For behold, the days are coming, in which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps that which never gave suck. Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us, and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?”<sup>28-31</sup> The crawling mob now comes to a **standstill**. First listen! You may think you have control, but He, just turning, brings you to a stop so that you shall first hear Him speak – not to you or for your sakes, but for the sake of those who are his. Wait, they must first be comforted, for it is written, “Comfort ye the daughters of Jerusalem”. An important prophesy had now to be fulfilled when it seems He already was brought to silence and submission. **How long** did it take Jesus to “complete” this mission? Will three hours be enough?

Now from the dungeons they brought “two other, malefactors”, and they were “led with him to be put to death”.<sup>32</sup> Here comes more excitement – what a day! With great commotion the crowd goes on toward Gethsemane. No one notices how **time** speeds by.

Again the whole procession is brought to a **standstill**. “Pilate wrote a title, and he wants it put on the cross. And the writing was, Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews. This title then read many of the Jews, for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city”. Shuffling ensued as the Jews made their way through the throng to read the inscription brought all the way to where Jesus would be crucified. They wanted to see for themselves. Much arguing resulted. Go back to Jerusalem and tell Pilate we won’t be intimidated, the chief priests said. They even went back all the way themselves to show him their indignation. “Pilate answered, What I have written, I have written”.<sup>Jn.19:19-22</sup> Back to Golgotha again where the inscription is nailed to the tree. No disciplined march from the pavement to Calvary it is, but **hither and thither and nothing suddenly**.

The three men are offered an intoxicating concoction. Soon they will need some relief from pain. Jesus refuses his. Now they take his garment. As soon as they have finished crucifying Him – no hurry – they will throw the dice for his clothes. “And it was the third hour, and they crucified him”. **Could it be this late already?** Did all this happen in just three hours? They cannot believe it’s over already. Perhaps he should show his power and come down from the cross, they mocked. But it was over. The third hour had struck in the time of God. More is “accounted” for than can be “explained”. No emptiness, **no sudden leap** from the “sixth hour” to the “third hour”, can be traced. It was God’s time from when Jesus was “delivered”, till His cross was planted in the earth. Every thing had to happen according to the foreordination of “the fullness of time”. So the argument, of an unaccounted for period of three hours, why John would not use “the Roman plan”, can itself not be accounted for. What is surprising, is not that it took “three long hours” of nothing between “deliver” and “crucify”, but that so much could fit in, in so short a time so that Jesus could be crucified when, as He said, “My time”,<sup>Mt.26:18</sup> had “**come**”. This

was his hour, for him to “eat the passover”, by being the Passover. This is what the Last Supper was prepared for and did prepare Jesus for.

John uses the **Roman count of hour**. A Roman **day**-reckoning though would have caused the greatest confusion among Christians because John not only uses **Roman** elements of time reckoning, but the **oriental perception of the day**. Because John counts the **hours** of day the Roman way does not mean that his total worldview was anti Jewish. It does not mean that this Gospel **reckons the day for religious purposes** from midnight to midnight. It is not expected of John’s readers to discard with the Jewish estimation of time when it comes to acts of worship.

John, of all the Gospels, most often refer to the day by its **representative start, “the next morning”**, *epaurion*.<sup>6:16,22</sup> *Epaurion* means “in the east”, or, “after-morning”, *epi* plus *aurion*. It comes before midday, *mesos*, when it was “day” proper, *hehmera*. (Nowhere will *epaurion* be found to specifically indicate time of day, after, noon, and nowhere will *aurion* be found to indicate time of day, after, sunrise.) But John uses *epaurion* to **generally** refer to “the following day”. It does not mean John reckoned the day from sunrise to sunrise. For instance, he would not have said that it was “still dark on the first day of the week” when Jesus on Sunday morning appeared to Mary, 20:1, **as tradition explains things**.

This same John argues: “Are there not **twelve hours in the (working) day?**”<sup>11:9</sup> This was a non religious but **existentially** and properly Jewish conception of the day. John asks this question about the “**day**” – *hehmeras*, the word for the “day”, used, specifically, 12 hours, as **light part** of the cycle;<sup>11:9</sup> comprehensively, 24 hours, as **full cycle**.<sup>4:40</sup> and, representatively, midday, as **central** of the cycle.<sup>9:4</sup> (*sehmeron* for “night”.<sup>Mt.27:19</sup>) Because John uses the midnight to midnight count for hours, it does not mean that he viewed the day **practically** the same way.

John still esteems days of worship and religious significance the Jewish way from sunset to sunset. He speaks of, “it is Sabbath”, “on the Sabbath”, “that-high-day-sabbath”, “because he does not observe the Sabbath”;<sup>5:10, 16; 7:23, 19:31, 9:16</sup> “The Preparation”,<sup>19:42</sup> “the Passover, the Jews’ feast, was near”, “before the feast of Passover”, “that they could eat the Passover”, “It was the Preparation of the Passover”;<sup>6:4, 11:50, 13:1, 18:28, 19:14</sup> “on the last day, the high day of the feast”;<sup>7:37</sup> “It was the feast of the dedication of the temple”.<sup>10:22</sup> **He takes the Jewish and Old Testament concept of these institutions for granted**. Scholars of New Testament generally are unanimous in their estimation of John’s Gospel being the most “Jewish” of all the Gospels.

John assumes **the day to begin at sunset** with evening. This can clearly be deduced from, “And as evening had come” – *hohs opsia egeneto*, after the five thousand had been fed and Jesus and his disciples after the day’s experience, left by boat.<sup>6:16f</sup> This passage not only speaks for itself in so far as it relates to the day’s beginning, but corresponds with the Synoptists in this respect – see above, *opsia*, Par.5.1.2.2.1. In 19:42 the beginning of the Sabbath is anticipated with Friday afternoon’s “preparations of the Jews”. John also respects the time for the start of the Passover Feast as distinct from the “Preparation of the Passover”, implicating the sunset reckoning of day which actually brought about the division of the 14th Nisan into the 15th. See also on 20:1 above.

This then gives an idea of the **compactness of events** of the **morning after sunrise** of the day of Christ’s crucifixion. (Remember when this day began with the Last Supper and its night ended with Jesus’ trial in the **early morning** and how Pilate “delivered” him to the Jews, “the sixth hour”, Roman time.) The Gospels create the impression of a division of this day into four time sections. The **late morning** from

sunrise six o’clock Roman time when Jesus was “delivered” by the Roman Pilate till the third hour Jewish time when Jesus was crucified by the Jews. The **early midday** from now till the “sixth hour” Jewish time “when the miraculous darkness began” – 12 a.m. The **early afternoon** from now till “the ninth hour”, when, the darkness ending, Jesus died. “It is finished” – 3 p.m. – the time of the slaughter of the Paschal Lamb. And the **late afternoon** from now till the twelfth hour, sunset, **after which**, “because it was Preparation, the Jews besought Pilate that the bodies should not remain on the cross, that day being an high-day-sabbath”. “And Joseph, when already evening, and the Preparation, went in to ask Pilate for the body of Jesus ...” – **the next day, beginning!** But we anticipate. Let us now review the development of the last section of the day of Christ’s crucifixion.

## **5.2.1.2.** **Afternoon After Christ’s Death –** **The Nature and Consequences of Events** **Which Marked the End of this Day**

### **5.2.1.2.1.1.** **Supernatural Events**

*“The miraculous signs which accompanied our Lord’s death – the darkness from twelve o’clock to three, the earthquake, the rending of the temple veil ... struck myriads with awe and astonishment, and perhaps smoothed the way for our Lord’s burial in Joseph’s tomb, without opposition or objection.”* Ryle’s *Expository Thoughts*, 4, p.326d

Although we differ greatly and in almost every respect with Ryle on how these “**signs**” effected “**our Lord’s burial**”,<sup>p.327a</sup> we would stress our agreement with him that these phenomena eventually contributed to a most important fact, the fact that Jesus was buried “**without opposition or objection**”. **In order to have had this result, these “signs” had had to be of singular nature and of immense effect.** The phenomena which accompanied Jesus’ death, seldom, if ever, receive due consideration in commentaries. No exception of greater significance though, can be found in **Schilder’s Trilogy**. Part Three, *Christ Crucified*,<sup>Chapter 16, translated by Henry Zylstra, Paideia Press</sup> “**In all Lenten literature known to me there is no work comparable to the trilogy of Klaas Schilder.**”

Luke records a darkness that lasted from noon till 3 p.m., that is, for the last three of the six hours Jesus lived in death’s agony on the cross. Three hours, in the Gospels’ record of Jesus’ crucifixion, were exactly of three hours’ duration in modern time reckoning. The Jewish light day always had twelve hours, all year round. That implied a shorter hour in middle winter than in middle summer. But Passover coincided with beginning of springtime, exactly the fourteenth and fifteenth days after the first new moon after equinox – that is, Passover coincided with the first night of full moon after equinox. “It is a night to solemnly observe”. **The hours would be of equal length** day and night, the days being as long as the nights. So **three hours – exactly – were left** of day when of a sudden the strange darkness ended.

An eclipse of the sun could not have caused the darkness, because it was full moon, the learned say. Ryle, on Mark 15:33-38 describes the phenomena as “**miraculous**” – without **explanation**. If without explanation, it also would occur without **warning**. It would not have set in gradually. It was there like lightning strikes – just darkness, not here or there, but “over all the land”. Without explanation and without warning, it had to be without **degree**. It was darkness totally, perfect blackness. There was no reflected or deflected light. There were no lights lit because

it was day at its brightest when the darkness fell like a smothering blanket. The knife in the hand of the priest coming down on the first paschal offering went astray in the fright of sudden darkness. Every priest was dumbfounded, blinded, terrified. (It was of the kind of darkness of the fifth Apocalyptic plague. “Now the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their sores, and repented not of their deeds.”<sup>Rv.16:10-11</sup>) The **after effect** this darkness caused, would not be shrugged off in short time. It **lasted** at least till some life returned into them and the Jews are recorded to have asked Pilate that the crucified be removed.

Then, on the “ninth hour”, just as suddenly as it came, the darkness was **light** again. But this was not light as of the sun. Again it was light like lightning strikes. Not dawn towards light, but blinding, painful, sudden blast of light. (“And the fourth angel poured his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues; and they repented not to give him glory.”<sup>Rv.16:9</sup>) This was the light in which man now, as he gradually moved his hands from his eyes, beheld the result of the darkness and earthquake. **Man was as perplexed and as disconsolate by this light as he was by the darkness.** It was no light given him to go about his business as usual. It was light that infiltrated the remotest corner of the darkness of his heart.

As the priests slowly began to see, they felt the earth and heavens tremble and roar from without and from within. As the **veil**, that hindered light on the **holiest** of all and **seat of mercy**, was rent as by the hand of God, the golden cover shone in full splendour and public eye. Nothing more humiliating could happen to this proud priesthood. “Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose.”<sup>Mt.27:50-52</sup> Wenham notes, “According to The Gospel of the Nazaraeans “the lintel of the temple of wondrous size collapsed” at that time.”<sup>Easter Enigma, p.71-79,6</sup> (“And He gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice **out of the temple** in heaven, **from the throne**, saying, it is done. And there came voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great **earthquake**, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great.”<sup>Rv.16:16-18</sup>)

“The tearing curtain and the exposure of the Holy of Holies at the time of the earthquake which followed Jesus’ death, would have profoundly disturbed (the Jewish authorities) and reawakened their anxieties [of] an uprising by the people.”<sup>Wenham p.71/72</sup>

They sacrificed despite the rent veil and exposed ark of the covenant. And they sacrificed like they would again many years later when the Romans would destroy their temple. They sacrificed till the blood could not be contained while confusion could not be greater. They could find no time to think of the crucified. Under these circumstances it is sure the Jewish leaders would have been “profoundly disturbed.” But exactly their disturbance would have made them forget about an uprising or about Jesus. The people also would have been upset by the calamities, and would not have worried about an uprising for which they in any case would have been too disorganised by reason of the “signs”.

Tents of visitors’ attending Passover reached between white washed graves on the rocky slopes surrounding the city walls. An earthquake that “**rent the rocks**” and **opened the graves** would have caused havoc. Calamity and consternation were boundless. Damage and injury were immense. Survival must have been every one’s sole impulse.

“This gospel [of Peter] says that there was great disquiet among the people at the crucifixion of Jesus and at the “great signs” which accompanied it and that this murmuring of the people made the elders afraid.”<sup>72b</sup>

The Gospel of Peter gives an **absolutely distorted** picture of Christ’s crucifixion which in every respect is unreliable. We cannot approve “that some of its independent features may represent genuine historical reflections.” It is specifically in these “independent feature” where this document loses grip on truth. However, the section Wenham here must have had in mind, <sup>15</sup> has no word that “the elders” were “made afraid” by the peoples’ “disquiet” and “murmuring”. It simply says, “They (the people) were disquieted and in fear that the sun may have gone down while He still lived”. In section 23 this “Gospel” even continues: “Then the Jews rejoiced and gave the body to Joseph to bury because he saw all the good things done by Him”.

#### 5.2.1.2.1.2.

##### At the Cross

Now imagine everybody who attended all this at first hand – who were assembled round the **centre of it all**, the crosses at the place of the skull. Imagine them calmly dispersing and strolling off to attend their usual business?! Could anything be further from reality! Imagine everybody at this scene, during and after these “miraculous signs” of awesome magnitude, still loitering around, still having courage to mock and be boisterously haughty – that would be even further from the truth. Imagine, all calmed down and everything back to normal by sunset as if nothing out of the ordinary had happened just three hours ago – the Son of God neatly buried and everybody at peace with his own conscience? **No impression more false could be entertained.** The truth about the nature of these events is observed and realised **only in their effect.** Were things, immediately or soon afterwards, just the usual again, nothing significant really happened with these “signs”. It would not even be worth their mention in the narratives of Jesus’ crucifixion. These phenomena were not recorded for the dramatic effect of words. They were recorded because they actually occurred and because they occurred with full magnitude and effect. These words were not written to serve as an impressive background picture that could be replaced by another pretty setting immediately after.

#### 5.2.1.2.2.1.

##### “Returned”

From after Jesus’ crucifixion until his ascension, Luke divides his narrative into historically momentous **segments** with the use of the word *hupostrefoh*, “to return”. **After the crucifixion**, at the end, implying all the day’s events as accomplished, the word appears, after everyone’s “beholding”, “all returned”,<sup>23:48</sup> **After the burial**, at day’s end, after everyone’s “beholding”, the word appears: “And they (the women) returned”.<sup>23:56</sup> **After the appearance** on Sunday morning, after everyone’s “beholding”: “They then returned from the grave and told it all”.<sup>24:9</sup> **After Jesus appeared** to the disciples from Emmaus, after everyone’s “beholding”, “they in the same hour returned to Jerusalem”.<sup>24:53</sup> **After the ascension**, after everyone’s “beholding”, “they worshipped him and **returned** to Jerusalem with great joy”.<sup>24:52</sup> In each case, after everyone’s “beholding”, it was a “**return**”: a “return” to



**Jerusalem.** Where Luke states that “all”, after they all “beheld” Jesus **die**, the implication is no different – they “all”, “returned”. They “all”, “returned” to Jerusalem. They “returned” not toward Joseph’s sepulchre, but **away from** it, because it was “in the place where he was crucified”.<sup>Jn.19:41</sup> They **left** the scene and “returned” ... **before Joseph did anything to bury Jesus.** The implications go contrary to every detail of the traditional impression of these events.

#### 5.2.1.2.2.2.

##### The Crowd, “Returned”

It is written those at the crosses “returned, striking their breasts” – Lk.23:48 **they were uncontrollably frightened and blindly fled from the scene.** “**They feared greatly**”.<sup>Mt.27:54</sup> No wonder John described what happened **before** the darkness, as happening “**by the cross**”.<sup>19:25</sup> The earthquake, and the darkness ending in shocking light while Jesus “with a great voice”, gave up the ghost, took events “away from” the cross. The focus of the story moved to where the actors would be. John fills in this after-phase with the measures the Jews took to minimise their embarrassment on the Sabbath to follow.<sup>19:31f</sup> **These actions of the Jews were the direct result of the supernatural phenomena,** which John does not mention but must have assumed.

Luke detailed the “away from the cross” phase more fully. Luke uses the word *hupostrefoh*, “return”, 33 of 36 times in the New Testament! He must have found it a vividly descriptive word and specifically suitable to describe **reaction and opposite motion.** In 23:48 he enlarges to this effect, describing the whole crowd’s “return” from “the sight they came together to”, “**with beating of the chest**” – an indication of **breathless desperation** caused by their flight opposite from where they earlier assembled to. Very soon after the darkness ended and the earthquake, no soul could be found near the cross.

Suppose the crowd stayed after Jesus died. The traditional view is that Joseph buried Jesus while everybody was still there. The scene would be totally chaotic. There would be no suitable moment for Joseph to attend to Jesus. The Jews would have prevented Joseph to bury Jesus – it was not what they had in mind for him, as must be adduced from their request to Pilate to have the crucified “removed”. They would not have been ignorant about Jesus’ burial – what they obviously were, as must be inferred from their meeting with Pilate “the morning after the Preparation”.<sup>Mt.27:62</sup> Many more **impossibilities** would have to be accepted – as will be shown. But presently the important factor of the **after-effect** of the supernatural phenomena must be kept in mind. **The crowd could not have stayed on – just because these events would have made it impossible.**

“Some of them that stood by the cross” (“at the ninth hour”, when Jesus, just before he died, called out, “Eloi, Eloi, Why hast thou forsaken me”), “when they heard it, said, behold, he calleth Elias”. They associated the word “Eloi”, with “Elias”, not simply because of the phonetic similarity. They must have thought of **their own circumstances** as the great and last day of judgement, when, it is written, Elias would be sent to prepare the way of the Lord and, as Jesus just the morning warned, they would pray that the mountains might fall upon them. **What they heard, revealed their fear!** “Some heard” “Elias” for “Eloi”. **Of these, “one while on the run, called, Wait (*legohn* ... *afete* – give a chance / allow) you all!”** “This one gave Jesus to drink while holding a reed with a sponge filled with vinegar put around it.”<sup>Mk.15:36</sup> He held on to this apparatus **from before the darkness** when he actually used it to mock Jesus,<sup>Lk.23:36</sup> and he still held to it after the darkness. He was the ringleader in arrogance, but now was more scared than any. He held fast to this reed

no longer as a tool to annoy, but as his only hope. He gave Jesus to drink not out of compassion but to keep him alive. “Let us see if Elias will come to take him down! But, Jesus with a great voice expired (nonetheless)”. This individual’s behaviour **reflects the reaction of the whole crowd** at the time of the Jesus’ dying – it was a heals over head “return” from the “sight”. The man called to the crowd in general to **stop! – they were all running!**

Matthew has the subjects the other way round, “**The rest said, Man, hold ...**” (*eipan afes*)<sup>Mt.27:48</sup> The man was “**running bewildered**” - (*dramohn*), like the whole crowd must have been, “straightway” (Matthew) “when they heard” that “Jesus cried with a loud voice”,<sup>Mk.15:34</sup> and they experienced the earthquake and sudden end of the darkness. **They all stopped and ran in turmoil**, the thought flashing through their mind: It might indeed be true that Elias will come to set this man free and mean the death of us all! So the one calls to the other, one and all together. Only this morning Jesus, on his way to Calvary, warned of doom to come.

Immediately after this running and hesitating, **the scene changes** to that at the **temple**, verse 38. Not one Gospel has **anything** to tell of what happened at the **cross** after Jesus’ death and the crowd’s **return** during the rest of that afternoon! What happened after, is all **implied in the nature and effect** of the disasters and Jesus’ dying. The three hours remaining of this day, unlike those of the morning before, were impossible for normal human control. Here are three hours, not “*unexplained*”, but **inexplicable**; not “*unaccounted for*”, but **unaccountable.**

#### 5.2.1.2.2.3.

##### The Jews, Returned

It is important to appreciate the true nature and magnitude of the “miraculous signs” which accompanied the death of Christ. They stand up in greatness as might be possible for natural events, to the greatness of the event of Christ’s death – which greatness we would not even attempt to explain. And the greatness of these events is measured most importantly in **after-effect**, which was the **disarray of normality.** It did not take these Jews who were at the crucifixion but a few minutes or a few hours to settle down to their previous business of Jesus’ crucifixion (and then, according to tradition, to suddenly turn about and provide him with a proper burial). They were not preoccupied with Jesus – they were preoccupied with themselves in the most difficult situation.

John records the Jews’ unanimous action that must have followed a previous unanimous **resolution.** The “chief priests” of the Jews were at “the place where Jesus was crucified”.<sup>Jn.19:20-21 Mk.15:31</sup> So were “the rulers” of the Jews.<sup>Lk.23:35</sup> They **fled** from the scene of the cross, each in his own direction. They must have received **opportunity** before they asked Pilate to deliberate and to arrive at a decision with which they, “then” (*oun*), “because it was Preparation”,<sup>Jn.19:31</sup> could confront him. That opportunity also “*paved the way*” for them to “enter” like Joseph after them did, into Pilate’s house without fear of getting defiled. They could no longer be defiled because they had their Passover Feast Meal! At the Meal, they were consoled and could gather themselves again. At the same Meal they conferred upon further action. **This explains the Jews’ absence from after Jesus’ death till after his burial.**<sup>Mt.27:62</sup> They therefore, when the crowd “returned”, returned from the cross as well.

Wenham reckons that the Jews were absent during Joseph’s initiatives because it was “*in the late afternoon at about the time of the waving of the first fruits, an important ceremony in the Passover season at which the chief priests would probably have been present.*” “*This*”, he says, “*could account for the fact that Joseph met with no opposition from them when he made his request ...*”<sup>EE p.63/64</sup>

It was **not** “*in the late afternoon*” that Joseph asked for the body, but “**when it was evening already**”, that is, it was **after sunset**. It must also be observed that the wave offering, according to the institutional records of this feast, was brought, “the next day”, “the day after the (Passover) Sabbath”. It wasn’t brought on the day of Feast which also was the “Sabbath” of Passover (15 Nisan), but “on the day **after** the (Feast) Sabbath the priest shall wave it”, Lv.23:11 *et al.* . “*The waving of the first ... sheaf*” it was, not “*first fruits*” *per se*, and offered on **16** Nisan, not on 15 Nisan. Jesus was crucified on “the Preparation of Passover”, that is, on the 14th of Nisan. Wenham’s dating of the Wave Offering is **out with two days**, and his argument must be of no consequence as reason for the Jews’ absence during Joseph’s undertakings.

#### 5.2.1.2.2.4.

#### **The Guard, “Returned”**

The crowd “returned” in desperation. This crowd was composed of different groups. One group was the guard. And it seems even the guard **fled**: It seems incredible. Nevertheless, “when the centurion (“and those with him”<sup>Mt.27:54</sup> saw what was done (how Jesus “gave up the ghost”,<sup>verse 46</sup>, as well as the earthquake,<sup>Mt.27:54</sup> the graves that opened (there were graves nearby, one of which was the new grave that belonged to Joseph), and the sudden light), he glorified God ... and he, as well as all the people that came together to that sight, **beholding these things (the phenomena), beating their chest, returned**”. When Joseph went to Pilate, the **centurion was with Pilate** and could immediately inform him on Jesus’ death.<sup>Mark15:44-45</sup> The centurion left his post of guard fleeing with the crowd. How else could he not be at the cross still? If he didn’t run away – if he didn’t “return” in the way Luke describes – then he could be with Pilate only because the guard was changed, and that would only have been at six o’clock, sunset – which in any case confirms the time Joseph acted – “evening” after sunset. (Day-time had two watches, sunrise to midday, and midday to sunset.) The soldiers no longer “were there”, but “**came**” – from probably their quarters, or more probably, from Pilate’s house – from where also Joseph “came”. (The barracks and the Palace could have been joined.) The guard of soldiers was not sent a message at the cross, but “came” on instruction. The soldiers now **on errand arriving** at the crosses, **knew not** that Jesus had already died. They could not have been those soldiers who were present with the centurion before and who **saw** Jesus die. Those soldiers had left – had fled – the scene, “seeing these things that were done”. Again, the only other answer to the question of who these soldiers were, is that they were of the vigil (the first of night) that relieved the guard of the centurion. These soldiers acted in a most **unexpected manner**. The guard present at Jesus’ death was overawed and at least the centurion acknowledged Jesus’ divinity and justness. The men who came and splintered the legs of the helpless crucified and coldly pierced the side of Jesus could impossibly have been those who experienced “the things that were done” and who confessed of Jesus.

#### 5.2.1.2.2.5.

#### **“Everybody”, “Returned”**

Luke 23:48 states that “**all**”, “everybody”, *pantes*, “returned”. “All” – that is, “**all they who came and saw**, returned”, *pantes hoi sumparagenomenoi ... theohrehsantos ... hupestrefon*. The **guard and centurion** did “come together”; they did “see”; they are implied in the words “all”, and “they who” – so even they, “returned”. They “returned” on seeing and experiencing “these things what happened” or, “were done”. It adds up to this: The guard, with the **crowd**, “**returned**” to Jerusalem in a manner that can be understood in no other way as that they **fled from the place** – “**chest beating**”, “**running**”, “**calling / screaming**”. What is said of the

crowd and of the guard, must also be said of the **women** who are also mentioned to have “been”, “standing”, “there”. They also, are included in the word “all”. Luke, on this point, says: “When the centurion saw what was done ... **all the people** (*kai pantes*) that came together to that sight, and saw the things that were done, returned. **And all** (*pantes de*) his acquaintance stood far off, **and** the women (*kai gunaikes*) ... while seeing these things.”<sup>23:47-49</sup> *kai pantes, pantes de, in both instances*, means, “and all” – the women **included**. It means, in both instances, “all, **that is**, the women as well”). No one remained. Every group, of which the crowd consisted, “**returned**”.

#### 5.2.1.2.2.6.

#### **The Women, “Returned”**

In Mark 15:40 the women assembled at the cross are only referred to incidentally: “**There were** also women looking on afar off, among whom were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and of Joseph, and Salome”. Mark ends the story of the crucifixion with his reference to the women; it may be accepted that nothing more was to say because nothing further happened at the place – because every one had gone back to Jerusalem. Matthew 27:55 writes much the same as Mark, but also states that these women were “**there**”, *ekei*, beholding afar off”. His reference implies the women’s presence, not after, but **during** the events “there” – **nowhere else**. These events are those around the cross **before and up to** Jesus’ death – the same events Luke says the crowd as well as the women, “saw”. After that, the women’s presence “there”, is no longer supposed. These implications perfectly agree with what John in so many words states, writing on the activities of the “soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus”. He says, “Now there stood around the cross (*para tohi staurōhi*) of Jesus, his mother, and her sister, Clopas’ Mary and Mary Magdalene”. Of any one’s presence at the cross after Jesus died, no mention is made or indication given. The implication is clear, and Luke’s intention with the description of “all”, “returning” when Jesus died, is **immediate and literal**. Jesus’ body was not entombed before Joseph appears in the record, “when it was evening already”.

#### 5.2.1.2.3.1.

#### **The Women “Were There”**

If the women left the scene of the cross after Jesus died, and Jesus had been buried very soon afterwards – quite some time before sunset – then how could they possibly have been present at his grave? Unless they returned to the cross, of which no Gospel gives as much as a hint. (Or, unless they never left, but “*remained standing*” (*NAT*) – see shortly). If the women left, but returned to Calvary, the priests and scoundrels would as well, and no opportunity would have come up for the way Jesus’ entombment is recorded to have been conducted – privately and peacefully, with no interference or even the Jews knowing.

Mark says “And there also **were** women looking on afar off”, *ehsan de kai gunaikes apo makrothen theohrouσαι*.<sup>15:40</sup> Matthew says, “And many women **were there** beholding afar off”, *ehsan de ekei gunaikes pollai apo makrothen theohrouσαι*.<sup>27:55</sup> Luke’s use of the word “**stood**”, **implies** what Mark says with the word “**were**”, *ehsan*, and what Matthew says with the words “**were there**”, *ehsan ekei*. The women “**were there**”, meaning they “**stood there**”, “at the sight”, “looking at these things”, “from a distance”, “as it happened”. The “sight” where the women “were”, when they “saw” how “these things happened”, was the **crucifixion** of Jesus. It is from **this** scene that they “returned home”. It was not from his **interment**. The women, it is said, “**were there**” – but **once** – they did not “return”, then “were there”, **again**. They “returned” but **once** after Jesus died, that is, to Jerusalem.

Luke, however, does mention a **second** time the women “returned” – but that was after Jesus was **buried**.<sup>23:56</sup> A “return”, **twice** on the **same** afternoon from the **identical scenario** where **no interruption** is supposed – as the traditional view describes these events – makes no sense. A **second “return” of the women** is distinctly stated. **After** the clear **break** in events, **after** Jesus’ **crucifixion** and death the afternoon of the **first** day of events, and **after** Jesus’ **burial** as a result of Joseph’s actions which he began only **after sunset** on the **second** day of events – makes perfect sense! **Before** this **second** “return” – their return from the **grave** – the women, **the day before**, “were there”, at the **cross**.<sup>Mk.15:40</sup> They “stood there”, “around the cross”,<sup>Jn.19:25</sup> “seeing the things that happened”, at the cross.<sup>Mt.27:55</sup> From the place and event of the **cross**, they “all” “chest beating” “**returned**” – “to Jerusalem”.<sup>Lk.23:48</sup>

Luke tells **who** those that “returned” from the cross, were:

1. They were “everyone” / “all the people” / “all those” / “all them” / “all” – *pantes hoi*;
2. They were those “that gathered” / “that came together” / “that arrived” – *hoi sumparagenomenoi*;  
They were “every one” / “all”, “gathered” / “assembled”, “crowds” / “groups” – *pantes hoi sumparagenomenoi ochloi* ;
3. They were “everyone”, “together”, and “each group”, “assembled”, “at this sight” – *epi tehn theohrian tautehn* ;
4. They were, “every individual” and “all the crowd”, “on the spot”, “looking at the things happening / the things that had happened” – *theohrehsantes ta genomena* ;
5. They were those who “returned”, “while they smote their breasts” – *tuptontes ta stehtheh hupestrefon*.

Were the women some of “all the people”? They were. Did the women “arrive” at the sight? They did. Were the women a “group”? They were. Was the group of women one of several, constituting the “crowd” as a whole? They were, and we shall look into this matter further just now. Were the women “on the spot”? They were. Were the women “looking at what happened / at things happening”? They were. Now every one and all thus far identified, included the women. As every one and all thus far identified, “returned”, “chest beating”, “frantically” – certainly the women “chest beating returned” too. But some translators call halt just before this conclusion is reached or reflected in translation. No, they say, everybody else on the scene of the cross, “returned”, “**But, the women, and all his acquaintance, remained standing**” – in order to witness what **further** happened: how Joseph buried Jesus! **Then** they “followed after” to the grave, “sat”, “there”, “looking on”, “how his body was laid”, then “went home”, and “rested the Sabbath”.

It is completely **irrational** that Luke would exclude the women from the crowd after he all along had them included. Luke describes the women **acting, as** crowd. The crowd stood around the cross – so did the women. The crowd saw what happened – so did the women. The women, standing “far”, could only have stood far or have looked on from far, **in relation to the crowd’s position** between them and the cross. The women’s “standing”, implies the time they stood, and that was while the crowd was standing there – **before it left**. Luke does not describe the women acting **contrary** to the crowd. He does not separate the women from the crowd, but presupposes their oneness with the crowd. They were “onlookers of these things”, *horohsai tauta* – **as were the crowd, theohrehsantes ta genomena**. They were “bystanders”, *heistehkeisan* – **as were the crowd**.

### 5.2.1.2.3.2. “From Far”

Both Mark and Matthew connect the **position, “afar off”**, with the act of “**beholding**”. The women saw the crucifixion and the natural disasters and how Jesus “yielded up the spirit”. They saw this from their identified position, “afar off” – **relative to the cross** and to the rest of the **crowd** – which determined the position where they, while they “were there”, “**stood**”. They formed a group in the outer circle of the crowd. **Luke had nothing different in mind**. His description of the women’s position, “**standing** afar off”, does exactly what Mark’s and Matthew’s do, “**looking** from afar off”. It has nothing to do with what **later on** happened to Joseph in Pilate’s house. Or, what **even later** happened, when he took Jesus off from the cross. Or, **still later**, when he laid the body in the grave and closed the opening of the sepulchre – as though the women **waited for Jesus’ interment** in contrast with the crowd at large who “all returned home”.

### 5.2.1.2.3.3. Parentheses

The Gospels, who all mention the women’s presence at the cross, have **nothing further to tell** about them after Jesus had died. Mark, Matthew and Luke refer to them **parenthetically** after they have reported Jesus’ death. This **written sequence** has no bearing on the **historical** sequence of the women’s presence at the cross, their seeing of “the things that were done”, “there”, and their leaving from the “sight”. The **NAT** creates a different impression. It represents the women as being **present** at Jesus’ entombment **directly after Jesus died**. This again betrays the translators’ awareness of the implications for the traditional interpretation. For the traditional view, the women could not have left the scene at any stage **before the burial was finally over**. The **NAT** treats of the women as though they were **not** part of the crowd. They “**remained standing**” at the cross while the rest left, **till** Joseph took the body down. Then they “**walked with**” him to the grave, and only **after the burial**, “returned”: “**All the people who thronged together to see the spectacle and who saw what happened there, went home dismayed. But all Jesus’ friends – also the women who followed him from Galilee, remained standing at some distance. They saw all these things.**” The **NAT conjures by parenthesising Joseph’s** actions. It resumes from where the women “saw all these things”: “**The women who came with Jesus from Galilee, walked with and saw the grave and looked on while his body was laid down. Afterwards they went home and prepared incense and ointments.**”<sup>NAT Lk.23:48-56</sup> The **NAT** illustrates what power the parenthesis has. It can change meaning drastically. **The NAT invents its own parenthesis** and consequently is enabled to ignore the parentheses of the texts. (**How could the ignorant believer be judged?**)

John refers to the women in historically chronological context at Christ’s crucifixion, but Mark, Matthew and Luke mention the women’s presence as an **incidental afterthought**. “**The other three evangelists [Synoptists] do not mention the presence of the women till after Jesus has died, though they imply in general terms that they watched what had gone on**”<sup>Wenham p. 60e</sup> ... **during the crucifixion!** Matthew and Luke used Mark as “source” – from there the similarity in the Synoptists. **Being a parenthesis**, Luke’s reference to the women cannot be interpreted as if their actions followed in **historical** sequence on the crowd’s and the centurion’s actions. The women’s actions **in relation to the crowd’s return** were **simultaneous** while in context of the written passage it is mentioned **last**.

That means, it can not be said that, while the crowd “returned home”, the women (or the “acquaintance”) then, afterwards, “**remained behind**” on the scene of

the crucifixion. Such an interpretation results in treating the indicative verb, “stood”, as a participle, and the participle “seeing”, as an indicative: “*All who came together to the sight ... returned home, but the friends and women, while remaining standing, saw the things that followed*” (– not “what **had** happened”). Accept the indicative as well as the participle **as they are**, and notice the difference: “... the friends and women **stood** far off, **watching** these things”. **That**, they did, while they were still part of the crowd – not after there no longer was a crowd.

John confirms this and uses the exact same word, *heistehkeisan*, “stood”. He even supplies the names of the same women named by Mark and Matthew who “were there” – “**Standing by the cross** of Jesus were his mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene”, RSV. “Now there **stood** by the cross of Jesus ...”, AV. They “**stood by the cross**” before the darkness and before Jesus yielded up the spirit. It is to this “*standing*” or “*being there*”, that the parentheses in the Synoptists refer. It infers “the things that were done” **then**, and “**there**” – not later, or at the grave.

The women did not “stay on”, whereupon “to see” (infinitive) what further happened. But they “stood”, they “grouped together”, “while seeing these things” – *horohsai tauta* (present participle), whereupon, they “returned” as everybody else. Mention of the women (and in Luke of “his acquaintance”) in this context, is made **incidentally** in the three Synoptists. Interpolations are **common** in all the Gospels in the narrative of Jesus’ passion. This one (in three Gospels) is not exceptional. Because in a parenthesis, the indicative verb *heistehkeisan* in Lk.23:49 has **no direct relation** to the immediately preceding incident in verse 48 of “all the people” who “returned” from the “sight”. The phrase, “His acquaintance and the women stood far off”, implies their **earlier** and total experience during the crucifixion as integrally “crowd” – just as the finite statement, “There were women (there)”, in Mark and Matthew, does. The relation it thus, **does** have with the immediately preceding occurrence is **consequential**. Because the women and friends **were** “crowd”, they also acted as crowd, and as crowd, “returned”.

If the women “remained standing” after the crucifixion to see the burial and are mentioned during the burial, then surely “his acquaintance” would have been mentioned as well as they were the first subject of the action of “remaining standing” at the crucifixion. But at the grave **no relatives** are mentioned or supposed!

Because in a parenthesis, the act of “standing” of “the acquaintance and also the women” is **recalled** – it is mentioned **retrospectively**. It was not told **during the course** of events, but is deemed necessary of mention. So it is related afterwards. The writer means to say, “**Don’t forget**, there **were** women there **also**, and Jesus’ friends. They **stood** there – they were **there** – looking on from far”. The writer, after the relative point in past time – the crucifixion and Jesus’ death – informs his readers about the women’s presence **and witness**, there, at the crucifixion! **Being a parenthesis**, this reference to the women thus **complements the objective with the use of the Pluperfect**.

#### 5.2.1.2.3.4.

##### **The Pluperfect**

The women “*remained standing*”, translators say. The word for this is *heistehkeisan*. The AV renders it honestly without ulterior aim: The women “**stood**”. The tense is **Pluperfect**. “*The Pluperfect is the perfect indicative of past time ... It represents action as complete and the results of the action in existence at some point in past time, the point of time being indicated by the context ... the only device for construing it in English is the simple past.*” Dana and Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek

N.T.<sup>1957</sup> (Emphasis CGE) Ryle says, “*The Greek word rendered “stood” [in John 19:25] is literally “had stood”. Does not this mean from the beginning of the crucifixion?*” p.311<sup>e</sup> It does mean “from the beginning of the crucifixion”. But it does not mean “**remained standing after** the crucifixion”. The “**point** in time indicated by the **context**”, to which, in Lk.23:49, “some point in **past time**” relates, is **Jesus’ crucifixion and dying**, while the darkness was driven out and the earth quaked and all “**returned**”. The women, **before this point** in context – “**in past time**” – “remained standing”, while Jesus, “**in past time**”, was crucified and hung on the cross from 9 till 3 o’clock. The women “**remained standing**” while they “**in past time**”, “looked on” and experienced the crucifixion, the darkness, the earthquake and the centurion’s confession.

Luke uses the Pluperfect of *histehmi* because he sees the women and Jesus’ “friends” **as crowd**. They were part, one group, within and of the crowd. Literally they were “**bystanders**” forming one section on the perimeter of the crowd, “witnessing from afar off”. “They were there”, they “**stood**”, with the crowd, **and** they **moved** with the crowd. The women (and “friends”) “arrived” and “assembled”, with the crowd; they “saw” and “looked on”, with the crowd, and they “**returned**” **with the crowd**, “smiting their breasts”, with the crowd.

The NAT, using this **continuous** past tense nonetheless – not “the simple past”, creates the impression of a reference point in **future**, relative to the time of the completed action. With “*remained standing*”, it “*represents action as complete and the results of the action in existence at some point ... in future time!*” Translation with “*remained standing*” is not relative to “*the point in time indicated by the context*”. The women, when Jesus died and everybody else “returned”, did **not** “remain standing”, to **afterwards** be able to see how Jesus **would** be buried. That being the obviously possible implication if “remained standing” is used, this phrasing should have been **avoided** in order to avert the wrong impression. Its use, **notwithstanding**, can only mean that the translators **willed** to create just such an impression. The significance of the Pluperfect is misrepresented.

#### 5.2.1.2.3.5.

##### **Conjunctions**

Another distortion that results from the false interpretation of the Pluperfect, is the NAT’s rendering of the conjunctions *de* and *kai*. These are translated as though they signify behaviour on the part of the “acquaintance” and women **contrary** to that of the crowd at large: The crowd “returned”, “*but, the friends, also the women, remained standing*”. They, “*remained standing*” to witness the things that **would** happen **afterwards** (at the interment). But these particles have here, as hundreds of times, a non-antithetic, copulative meaning. *De* and *kai* are used, often and throughout chapter 23 and the whole of Luke, with **little or no meaning**. In the particular case of their use in verse 49, no reason can be found why they should have exceptional significance. Their meaning is to **bind and continue**: “**And** (*kai*) the entire crowd returned ... **And** (*de*) all his acquaintance **and** (*kai*) the women (who accompanied him from Galilee) stood at a distance seeing these things”.<sup>49</sup> The only special function of *de* in this instance, is its **introductory function** to the parenthesis which tells of Jesus’ friends’ presence at the cross. Because it introduces the parenthesis, **de is used, and definitely not kai** – which **might** have meant “*but*”.

The particles *de* and *kai*, used alternatively here, are of the same nature. **Both**, **join** actions and subjects. They don’t separate. The centurion’s confession, and the “return” of “everybody”, are **joined** with *kai*. The “acquaintance”, as one group in the

“crowd”, “stood far off”. They are connected with the crowd’s **whole** experience at the cross (from beginning till their “return”), with *de – de* being the introductory word for the parenthesis contained in verse 49. Then the women are incidentally mentioned – a parenthesis within a parenthesis – as those who “followed him from Galilee”. They are connected, through the use of *kai*, with the “acquaintance”, with those who “stood far off” – **in the crowd**, that is.

If these particles, correctly, **join**, the woman, as did the “acquaintance”, “stood afar off”. If these particles **divide**, then not the women, “stood”, but **only** the “acquaintance”. If one group of those of which the crowd as a whole consisted is exempted from the act of “returning”, it would not be the women, but the “acquaintance”, because *heistehkeisan* has the “acquaintance” as direct subject – not the women. This is the inevitable result if the purpose of these conjunctive particles is interpreted as dividing and contrasting, and not as combining and equalising. If they **distinguish**, the women are **separated** from the “acquaintance” **and reckoned with the crowd**, and consequently also “returned” to Jerusalem after Jesus had died. But if these particles **join**, the “acquaintance”, **and** the women, **and** the crowd generally, “all” – the women **and** the acquaintance, “from afar off”, where they, on the outskirts of the crowd, “stood”, “returned” on “having seen these things”. Whichever way, the *NAB*’s translation is **wrong and false!**

Immediately after Luke described how **everyone** returned from Calvary and left the place desolate – by making use of these **conjunctions** – he continues by **contrasting** Joseph’s actions with what preceded in context – by making use of the **conjunction** *kai*. He is enabled to use this particle with an **opposite of its usual** meaning, by **combining** it with the (vocative) imperative *kai idou*, “Behold!”: “All returned chest beating ... Also his acquaintance stood there far off, and the women ... who looked on. **But, lo!** a man named Joseph ... he, went unto Pilate ...”. Lk. 23: 48 – 49, 50, 52. This **contrast** obviates another series of events of another occasion and another time. Luke omits telling which time is now involved. But his distinguishing application of this conjunction tells it all. Again Mark and Matthew supply confirmation, and specifically state what time – and day – it was: “It was evening already, since Preparation had begun, which is the day before the Sabbath”. John also presumes this time where he recalls what Joseph did, “After these things” (after Jesus’ crucifixion). He presumes the same time because he tells what the Jews did (just before Joseph went to Pilate), “because it was the Preparation”. Jn. 19:38, 31. This illustrates how these conjunctions may be used to combine, or to separate. The way they are used by Luke in verse 49 categorically belongs to the combining usage.

#### 5.2.1.2.3.6.

##### Contextual Sequence

The “acquaintance” and the women could not have “looked on” on how Joseph buried Jesus, immediately after it is said in Luke that “all returned”, **even if** it is supposed that they “*remained standing*”, “*to see*”. Because, what the women **supposedly**, immediately or very soon afterwards, would have witnessed “there” – what Luke tells to actually have happened – **next in contextual sequence**, would have been **practically impossible** for them to have seen: **1.** It happened to **somebody** who is **never mentioned** to have been present at the cross or grave before or at the stage the women supposedly anticipated events. **2.** It happened long **after** the time that the women supposedly saw it. **3.** These were events that took place **remotely** from the cross and grave. **4.** It was Joseph’s **secret** entrance to Pilate. It was not Jesus’ interment which the women, or “friends”, supposedly would have witnessed, because **it is not** what follows in context after the women would have stopped to see these

things. The cunning attempt to improvise the fake picture of the women “remaining / staying behind”, “looking on” as Joseph buried Jesus virtually directly after his death and before the sun has set, miserably fails even before its only grounds of grammatical distortions is taken into account.

#### 5.2.1.2.3.7.

##### “These Things”

The demonstrative pronoun *tauta* “these things”, referring to what the women were supposed to have been “beholding” while they “*remained standing*” when the rest of the crowd had “returned home”, neutralises the possibility of the whole supposition because it refers **exclusively** to what in context **has already been recorded**. This pronoun’s function, following its nature of being a demonstrative pronoun, is to represent that which **has** been “demonstrated” – referring **back** to it. Jesus’ “acquaintance and also the women”, having “witnessed” **what is implied by the word** *tauta*, “these things”, witnessed **only** what the crowd as a whole witnessed. Their subsequent reaction would have been only what the **crowd’s** reaction would have been, and that was, to have “**returned home**” from the “scene” or “sight” of the cross – **not** to have “**remained behind**”.

#### 5.2.1.2.3.8.

##### Contextual Contrast

**No** contrast can be observed between what the **women** did and what the **crowd** did. But **obvious** contrast can be found between what happened during the afternoon of crucifixion, and what happened during the progression of the day of interment. An unmistakable **unity** exists in the contents of Lk.23:49 **and what goes before**. Just as clear a unity binds together what happens in verses **50 and further**. The broad subject of the first section is Jesus’ crucifixion; the broad subject of the second section is Jesus’ burial. The crucifixion has Jesus and a multitude of others as actors. The second has Joseph, at first, as **sole** actor while the women – **only** “those who came with him from Galilee” – joined much later. The narrative of the crucifixion is loaded with intrigue, violence, barbarism, noise, and restlessness. The narrative of Jesus’ interment is one of personal concern, private care and respectful quiescence. In the first story the “powers of darkness” (Luke) seem to have won the day; in the second, Christ’s impending triumph seems to be present already and to override every imaginable obstacle.

The women, and Jesus’ friends, as part of the crowd “returned” from the “sight” at the cross. A strange and mysterious dusk enveloped the silhouetted crosses. The scene was **desolate**. Broken loose boulders lay strewn over the uneven plateau beneath the shadows of the crosses. Fissures of opened graves gaped around. It was no scene to “behold”, but one to flee from. Jesus is not forsaken so much by God as by man. He is a forgotten crucified abject – reckoned not worth a burial even.

“**But lo!**”, says Luke. What is now going to happen is so unbelievable for this narrator that he does not consider to tell **when** it actually happened. The time “this man”, Joseph, acted, was of no consequence to Luke. He didn’t find it strange at all that the sun has set, it being evening already – as Mark and Matthew inform their readers – of whom Luke is one! That it happened at all, what now was going to happen, was so unexpected that it matters not if it were to have happened another six hours later. All that Luke says is: “Beware!” A stronger way of drawing contrast would be difficult to find. **What was to follow, no longer belonged to the nature of things that came before.**

As Mark and Matthew put it, much later than when the crowd “returned”, in fact, “when it was already evening”, this lonely figure, Joseph of Arithmatea, arrived as out of nowhere.

These considerations show how the **factor of time** mentioned or particularly by not being mentioned **separates the two stories** and **two days** of events, the crucifixion’s story and the interment’s story. The crucifixion story was concluded by the parenthesis in the Synoptics of the women who were present during the course of that event. Everybody fled the scene and “returned home”. This “return” can impossibly be the “return” of the women mentioned after Joseph closed the sepulchre. But “there was” another woman “there”, “at the cross”, who also “returned home”.

#### 5.2.1.3.1.1.

##### Mary At The Cross

*“St. John tells us that at this awful moment, Mary, the mother of Jesus, and other women ... stood by the cross on which our Lord hung. “Love is strong as death”; and even amidst the crowd of taunting Jews and rough Roman soldiers, these holy women were determined to stand by our Lord to the last, and to show their unceasing affection to him. ... When all men but one forsook our Lord, more than one woman boldly confessed Him. Women, in short, were the last at the cross and the first at the tomb.”* <sup>Ryle, 309d</sup>

It is obvious that Ryle, with “*at the last at the cross*”, means that these women were **till Joseph took the body down and to the grave**. It is just as obvious that the NAT (in Lk.23:55) means that the burial was the event when these women “*walked with and looked on how his body was laid*”. That is how, allegedly, they got to be “*first at the tomb*” (unless Ryle here has the Sunday morning in mind). Ryle again, says, “*The mother of our Lord would surely stay by the cross to the last, if any woman did.*” <sup>313c</sup> His meaning, anyone would agree, includes not only the crucifixion, but presupposes (as does the NAT) the final **closing of the sepulchre**. According to these traditional interpretations there was **no interval**, no complete break in event and time – **or a very insignificant one at most** – between crucifixion and burial. Both crucifixion and burial were completed **before sunset**, with time enough left for the women to prepare spices and for the Jews to make their preparations for the Sabbath before sunset.

*“All three evangelists (the Synoptics) speak of these men and women as watching from a distance, and might seem to imply that they were there at the end ... it is probable that (Joanna) was one of the “many” others who were there ... and was probably there at the end.”* John Wenham, <sup>Easter Enigma, p. 62b, 63b</sup> Although both these authors in the first place suppose Jesus’ **death**, with, “*the end*”, they definitely also suppose an **uninterrupted transition** to Jesus’ **burial – from the cross to the grave**. **As** these women were present when Jesus died, **so** they were when he was buried. These authors admit no “**return**”, or leaving of the vicinity of the cross, of **any**. That, again, implies that both “*the end*” in the sense of Jesus’ death, and “*the end*” in the sense of the interment, were **finished** during the **single** time span after three o’clock till at latest five o’clock Friday afternoon.

*“Everything had to be done under extreme pressure of time before the sabbath began at dusk. There was no time to wash the body, no time to procure ointments and no garment with which to dress the corpse ... the women [therefor] agreed to return to the tomb at the first possible moment after sabbath was over to anoint the body properly.”* <sup>Wenham, p.67b and 66a See also V. Taylor Mk.15:42</sup>

But, says Wenham, “... *Nicodemus ...bought ... his huge quantity of dry spices ... lavish provision fit for a king*”, with the view to have Jesus “*decently*

*buried.”* <sup>67</sup> (Emphasis CGE) The haphazard way Wenham (with tradition) suggests Jesus’ burial was settled, belies every detail he himself could think of, and every detail the Gospels provide of the procedure. **There is in the contexts of the four Gospels’ narratives, no implication nor fact whatsoever that substantiates the idea of shortage of time, opportunity or care taken with Jesus’ burial**. It is a figment of biased imagination. It all originates from the presupposition of the women’s immediate presence at the **cross and sepulchre** on the same afternoon of Friday before sunset. In other words, **tradition** presupposes that there was no “return”, and that there was no time for a “return”, after Jesus’ death to still had him buried before sunset.

If these writers mean with “*the end*”, Jesus’ **death**, and nothing afterwards, they confirm the **limited** relevancy of the parentheses in the three Synoptists to what went **before** Jesus’ death. That implies the women as **being part of the crowd** and their actions being of the crowd and the same as the crowd’s. When the crowd, after Jesus’ death, “returned home”, the **women** “returned home” also. Then the full afternoon of the day of Christ’s crucifixion went by before the next, and first event recorded, would begin. That event would be when **Joseph** went in to Pilate when it “**was evening already**” (Synoptists), or, in John, when “the Jews asked Pilate”, when “**Preparation had begun**”.

Such are the implications the presupposition of the women’s immediate presence at the cross **and sepulchre** on the same afternoon of Friday before sunset, has. Such is the notion of **Mary’s** presence (the mother of Jesus) under these circumstances. According to this presupposition, the women did not leave the cross, and if the crowd left, they were thus separated from the crowd. Also implied by these writers, as tradition always does, these women stood “*amidst the crowd of taunting Jews*”, right **next** to Jesus’ cross. That would imply that when the women “**stood far off**”, it was **another** occasion, the occasion at the grave. But herein two more mistakes lurk. First, The women were not “far” from the scene when they were at the grave. They were right **in front**, looking on as Joseph “laid the body”. And they did not “stand”, but “**sat**” there, “watching”. (Mk.15:47 is not “*appended*”, and does “*belong to the narrative proper*” despite the “*many textual variants*” which **in no instance** affects its historical and chronological authenticity. cf. V. Taylor) Second, John does not say, as translations usually do, that the women were **at**, or right **next** to the cross. John says they “were standing **in the presence** of Jesus’ cross”, *heistehkeisan para tohi staurohi*, that is, **anywhere around** the cross – **the other Gospels** telling more exactly **where** in relation to the cross and crowd – “**far off**”.

From the women’ position generally, as **tradition** has it, Mary’s position relative to the cross, is usually adduced: These women stood “near” the cross, so Mary also stood near the cross. But this can not be made out from the **text**. From the **context** is is clear that Mary **did** stand near the cross – so near Jesus **could converse** with her. But Jesus spoke to **Mary**, and that implies that the **others** were not near too.

“When Jesus therefore saw his **mother, and the disciple** standing by ...”, *Iehsous oun idohn tehn matera kai ton mathethehn parestohta* ... Here **John and Mary** are said to have “stood” (*histehmi*) “**in the presence**” (*para*), *parestohta*, of **each other**. John says not that they were near the cross. They were **together separately** in relation to the other women as well as in relation to the cross. John mentions Mary, Jesus’ mother, and John, as **near enough to be spoken to**; he mentions three other women **specifically** as also being at, or, “**in the presence**” of the cross of Jesus – “they were there” – as the other Gospels say and as John implies. Then John omits to say anything about the “many women” who were present, and

with whom the three he does mention, “stood” and “watched”, “afar off”. “Among” these “many” women, “were”, Matthew and Mark say, the three others they all mention. The three women John mentions besides Jesus’ mother, were “present at the cross”, “far off”, “among” “many” other women, **also** “present at the cross”.

#### 5.2.1.3.1.2.

##### Mary Absent

Mary is mentioned as being present at Jesus’ **crucifixion**. Her presence is mentioned with more elaboration than with any other individual’s. Her presence at the cross was of great significance, otherwise it would not have been mentioned – certainly not in the exhaustive way it is recorded. That John singled out Mary’s attendance at the crucifixion as well as his own, being the only narrator to do this, must have been for **good reason**. The **same** reason, or, reasons, should **still** have been applied – there is no reason why not – when Jesus was **buried** – according to tradition, immediately after. Mary’s attendance **then**, should **also** have been recorded. **But it is not**. Her presence, **not being mentioned**, must imply her **absence** during Jesus’ interment.

#### 5.2.1.3.1.3.1.

##### John Took Mary “Home”

The silence of Mary’s name being loud enough to guarantee her absence at the burial, it is stated into the bargain that John “took her home” <sup>Jn.19:27</sup> before the darkness started. He took her “to his home”, *eis ta idia*, John writes,

“There is no evidence whatever that John had any home in Jerusalem”, it is protested. <sup>Ryle, 313b</sup> Surely John would have had abode in Jerusalem during his attendance at Passover, whether in his own or someone else’s house? If this possibility were conditional whether *eis ta idia* could be interpreted, John “took Mary home”, then nothing prevents it from being interpreted thus. But it could be true that John had no house of his own in Jerusalem. That might be why *eis ta idia* is used, and not *oikian*. In any case it was the place where John **stayed** and “**into**” which he “**brought**” Mary.

If Mary had been **present** when Jesus was buried, she could not have been “**taken home**”, and the burial **could** have taken place just after Jesus’ death – with her present. Was it to his “home” then that John “took” Mary?

“The Greek words rendered “his own home”, (*eis ta idia*) mean literally, “his own things”. It is a thoroughly indefinite expression. We can only suppose it means, that in future, from that day, wherever John abode the mother of our Lord abode also.” <sup>Ryle, p.313b</sup> What Ryle says, comes down to John “**taking care**” of Mary from then on. But how would John **at the cross**, have started “looking after” Mary? Such a meaning **does not fit the context and the nature of events**. John, for the obvious reason that the horror of the crucifixion of her own son was unbearable for the mother, took Mary away to the calm and shelter of his home. *Eis ta idia* means, “Into his own **house**”. It implies literal locality.

The expression *eis ta idia* does not **duplicate** what is stated independently in so many words, that John now received Mary as mother, and she received John as son, and he, consequently, would look after her. John, now the son of Mary on declaration of his beloved Master and virtually in the place of his Master, would first thing have noticed her immediate need – **to be taken away** from the scene.

#### 5.2.1.3.1.3.2.

##### “Into his Own”

In no instance of the use of the pronoun *idios* in the New Testament is it used in the sense of “**care**” – therefore, it must be expected that *eis ta idia* would not mean “into (someone’s) care”.

*Idios* has a strong connotation of **locality**. As it is used in Jn.19:27 it is no exception. “**Home**”, or, “house” is implied in “his own city” = “the city where his house is”; <sup>Mt.9:1</sup> “his own land” = “the territory where he stays”; <sup>Jn.4:44</sup> “his own land” = “his property (dwelling)”. <sup>Mt.22:5</sup>

“**House**” is indirectly **implied** in “his own employees” = “his house servants” looking after his “goods” at home; <sup>Mt.25:14</sup> “own brother”, “left behind at home”. <sup>Jn.1:41</sup> The meaning is not metaphoric of “care”, but metaphoric of “house” – not to be under someone’s purveyance, but to be under someone’s roof.

The **local** meaning of “privately”, “isolated”, is implicit in “a deserted **place** apart” = “a place for himself”; <sup>Mt.14:13 et al.</sup> “Aside” = “a place away from the crowd”. <sup>Mk.7:33</sup>

*Ta idia*, neuter, plural, differs in meaning and use from the masculine and feminine: *tohn idiohn*, “to provide for **his own**, especially for his own **household**”; <sup>1Tm.5:8</sup> “The world would love his own”; <sup>Jn.15:19</sup> “to establish their own”; <sup>Ro.10:3</sup> “seek their **own interest**”.

Not once is the neuter plural, *ta idia*, used for “**own interest**” or “personal matters”. John would not have taken Mary “into his own things”. (Ryle) He would not have taken her “into his **care**”.

*Ta idia* does **not** even mean “people of a household”, or, “**family**”. This concept is expressed with *ton idion oikon*: “Show respect at home”; <sup>1Tm.5:4</sup> (“To look after his own people / household”, *oikeiohn*, verse 8.) “To rule his own household”, *tis tou idiou oikou*; <sup>1Tm.3:5</sup> “He loved his own (people)”, *tou idious*; <sup>Jn.13:1</sup> “His own received him not”, *hoi idioi*. <sup>Jn.1:11</sup> “To their own company”, *pros tous idious*. <sup>Acts 4:23</sup> Because John didn’t use *tous idious*, he didn’t take Mary “into his household”, or, “company”.

*Ta idia* in 1 Thess.4:11-12 means, “Live quietly, make **your own**, work with your own hands”, over against those “outside”, *pros tous ecsos*. Paul advises how one should govern his **house**. *Ecsos*, “outside”, is literal – see Mt.12:46 – so is *ta idia*, “house”, when used **metaphorically**, literally, “**house**” – not “care”.

“The Word became flesh and dwelt / **tabernacled** among us”. <sup>Jn.1:14</sup> He came to his **place**. “He came unto his own / **house** (*eis ta idia* – “the world was **made** by him” <sup>Jn.1:10</sup>), and his own household / people (*hoi idioi*) received him not”. <sup>Jn.1:11</sup>

Peter remonstrated in Luke 18 verse 28: “We have left all”, variant: “We left *ta idia*”! Jesus answered Peter: “There is no man that hath left *oikian* – house”! *Ta idia* and *oikia* are used **synonymously**. (To have left “house” meant also, that “parents, brethren, wife, children and land” were left, that is, that “care” was left behind.)

The believers at Tirus accompanied Paul to the shore, “And when we had taken our leave one of another, we took ship, and they **returned home** (*hupestrepsan eis ta idia*) again”. <sup>Acts 21:6</sup> (Compare Lk.23:48 – “All returned (home)” after Jesus’ crucifixion.)

In the **LXX** *ta idia* means “house” or “home”. Compare Esther 5:10 and 6:12 where *ta idia* is translated from “bayith” / “bayita”, the Hebrew word for “house” or “home”. In Prov.11:24 *ta idia* is an affixture for “**property**” as one’s house is called

in English. The nearest thing we can think of as an equivalent for the Greek, (*eis*) *ta idia*, is the French, “*chez lui*”.

According to the illustrated cases of the use and meaning of the phrase *ta idia*, John took Mary “home”, “**into his house**”, **before the darkness** started at midday. It does not mean that John took Mary in his care. The important implication of the fact that John took Mary to his house at this stage during the crucifixion is that neither he nor she was present and is heard of again after Jesus died. **If they stayed till Jesus was buried, it would have implied that his burial was on the same day.** But because they were not present, no inference of the sort can be made.

#### 5.2.1.3.1.4.

##### “Taken” Home, *Lambanoh*

Further confirmation that Mary and John “went home” in the **literal** sense, is the verb used for John’s action of “**taking**” Mary home, *lambanoh – elaben autehn*. Jn.19:27 While enduring his own suffering, Jesus, “who can have compassion with infirmity”<sup>Hb.5:2</sup> noticed Mary’s grief where she stood near his cross. Receiving his mandate made John aware of Mary’s distress, and he, without delay, “took” Mary – by the hand, physically assisting her over the rough terrain, and “treating” her like a frail woman should be treated, brought her into his house.

Other instances of *lambanoh* in the context of Jn.19:27 are, “Said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him ... The Jews said, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death”.<sup>18:31</sup> “Take” and “put to death” are understood as the same thing. “Pilate took Jesus and scourged him”.<sup>19:1</sup> “Take” supposes “scourge”. “Take ye him and crucify him”.<sup>19:6</sup> When the Jews “took” Jesus, they “crucified” him. *Lambanoh* is equal to **physical handling** in whatever way the context supports. Compare “They caught (*lambanoh – labontes*) him and beat him”<sup>Mk.12:5</sup> “They caught him and cast him out of the vineyard and slew him”.<sup>Mt.21:39</sup> John, accordingly, “took” Mary in a literal sense, and “brought” her into his house – away from the scene of the cross, not to return again.

John, “**taking**” Mary, *eis ta idia*, does not mean that he “**accepted**” responsibility for taking care” of her. To express that “**care is taken**”, or, “**accepted**” of someone, the term *melei* would be the first choice. “For He careth for you”, *hote autohi melel peri humohn*.<sup>1 Pt.5:7</sup> The object is in the **genitive** case. Thus, “You take care of him”, *epimelethehti autou*. That again means, been taken away from the cross – without any suggestion of a return to the cross.

*Elaben* is the **Aorist** of *lambanoh*, and has a momental, constative connotation: It had happened then – John “took Mary to his house”. It was not a matter that he in future **would** take care of her.

#### 5.2.1.3.1.5.

##### “Immediately”, *Af Hohras*

“And from that hour (*kai ap’ ekeinehs tehs hohras*) that disciple took her unto his own house”.<sup>Jn.19:27b</sup> “And from that moment the disciple took her to his home”.<sup>Mt.</sup>

“*Bengel, Besser, Ellicot, and Alford, from the phrase “hour”, suggest that John took Mary home immediately, so that she did not see our Lord die, and then returned to the cross. This, however, seems to me very improbable. The mother of our Lord would surely stay by the cross to the last, if any woman did. John would not leave the cross, in my opinion, for a minute.*”<sup>Ryle, p.313c</sup>

The only reason Ryle thinks the expression *af hohras* could not mean “**immediately**” (literally, “from that (same) hour”), is his opinion that if any woman

would have stayed at the cross, it would have been Mary. The implications are clear: If this expression means “**without delay**”, and if the phrase, *eis ta idia* means, “into his house”, John and Mary would have left from the scene of the cross there and then. In the absence of any indication that they again returned to the cross, they would not have been present at the burial, and there would be no point of contact from which to deduce that Jesus was buried that same afternoon at all. If *eis ta idia* meant “in his care”, and *ap’ ekeinehs tehs hohras* meant “from then on”, it could be deduced that, because no immediate return is implied, neither Mary nor John left the cross, but “stayed on” and saw “these things” pertaining to Jesus’ interment. Commentators usually settle for the last, and incorrect, option.

Every aspect thus far considered favoured the first assumption. It will be shown that the last premise is irreconcilable with the meaning of *af hohras* as well. **This phrase is an idiomatic expression in every respect for the literal indication of time, “immediately”.**

If John at the cross really started to look after Mary, first thing he would have done would have been to “immediately take her to his home”! To take someone into one’s care is to provide in his needs over a **continuous period**. It need not mean that one is taken into the house of the benevolent at all. If John meant “care” with *ta idia*, it would have been unnecessary for him to have added “from that hour”. He could only have said, nothing, or, *ap’ (arti)*, “henceforth”,<sup>14:7, 13:19</sup> or, *meta (tauta)*, “afterwards”,<sup>19:38</sup> or, *ap’ ekeinehs hehmeras*, “from that **day**”.<sup>11:53</sup> Why would John have written “from that **hour**”, if he did not mean an immediate action? He said “hour” because he meant “without delay”! And because he meant “without delay”, it is implied that he meant that John took Mary to another **place**, which happened to be “into his house”, *eis ta idia* – not that he took her “in his care”. John’s was one specific action of no long duration. He took Mary home, and there they stayed for at least the rest of that day. There would be no sense in returning to the same circumstances from which they virtually escaped. And where they now were in John’s abode, they had no idea that after sunset Jesus’ fate completely would have changed. They actually could then neither have known of the darkness to come or of Jesus’ death, ending the darkness. Of Joseph’s plans they had no inkling, and of Jesus been buried, could not.

*Af hohras* implies an **immediately following** event, like John taking Mary home, away from the scene of the cross. It does not imply an **indefinite circumstantial situation**, like John for the rest of her life providing for Mary. John would have done that, being made Mary’s son by word of Jesus, but not because it is implied in this idiom for “immediate”.

*Af hohras* is used especially by **Matthew**. By comparing Matthew’s application of this phrase in its parallel incidence in Mark, its precise significance is seen. Mt.9:22 – “The woman was made whole from that hour” = Mk.5:29 – “And **straightway** (*euthus*) the fountain of her blood was dried up”; Mt.15:28 – “Her daughter was whole from that hour” = Mk.7:29 – “Go thy way; the devil **is gone** out of thy daughter. And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out”; Mt.17:18 – “The child was cured from that hour” = Mk.9:26 – “And the spirit cried and rent him sore, and came out of him ... Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up and he arose”. Matthew captured all this in one phrase, *Af hohras*, “immediately”. Mt.16:21 – “From that time forth began Jesus to shew (*apo tote ehrcsato deiknuein*) unto his disciples how that he must go” = Mk.8:31 – “And he **began** to teach (*ehrcsato didaskein*) them that the Son of man must suffer”; Jesus explained not gradually over an indefinite future period, but then and there. Mt.27:45 – “Darkness



came after the sixth hour”, *apo hektehs hohras skotos egeneto*, = Mk.15:33 – “Darkness came the sixth hour” – immediately. Mark does not use *apo*. But “immediately” is what Matthew means by using the word “after”. When Matthew wants to say, “From then on”, he never uses *af’ hohras*, but simply *apo*, e.g. 10:12, “After John”.

This **idiomatic and stylistic** use of *apo* is also an attribute of its use in **Jn.19:27**, “That disciple took Mary home immediately”. To indicate a generally future circumstance (like John who started to care for Mary from the day Jesus was crucified onwards), there is no sense in saying that John would look after Mary “from the very same hour”. It makes even less sense if John kept standing about under the most unfavourable conditions for “caring” for Mary and to have kept her there.

It is not only here in Jn.19:27 that *af’ hohras* is used – outside Matthew – with the meaning of “immediately”. In Acts 23:23 the command is given for Paul’s stallions to be brought into preparedness for his flight, “not later than three hours”, *apo tritehs hohras*. It would have had tragic results if after three hours **beginnings** were made with such preparations. “After three hours” Paul had to depart immediately, and all preparations were to be completed by then. *Apo tritehs hohras* does not mean “after” the third hour, but, “within” three hours.

In John, *af’ hohras* would mean, conclusively, **not “ever after”**, but, “within the hour” / “at that point in time”, which is, “immediately”. John took Mary “into his house immediately”, which implies that he **left** the scene of the cross, and returning to it would have had no sense.

#### 5.2.1.3.2.1.

##### John Present at “The End”?

“And from that hour that **disciple** took her unto his own house”, Jn.19:27b

*“Bengel, Besser, Ellicot, and Alford, from the phrase “hour”, suggest that John took Mary home immediately, so that she did not see our Lord die, and then returned to the cross. This, however, seems to me very improbable. The mother of our Lord would surely stay by the cross to the last, if any woman did. John would not leave the cross, in my opinion, for a minute. His narrative of the crucifixion reads like that of an eyewitness from first to last.”* <sup>Ryle, p.313c</sup> (Emphasis CGE)

After John “*has gone*”, Wenham says, “*There follows a gap in (his) narrative of some hours [John doesn’t mention the darkness], which suggests that he stayed with his new mother for a considerable time before returning to witness the end. He then heard the Lord’s “I thirst” and “It is finished” and his final yielding up of his spirit. All this happened on “the day of Preparation”, which, as Mark explains simply means Friday the day before the Sabbath.*” <sup>EE p.62/63</sup> (Emphasis CGE)

These two views are quite exclusive of each other. **Basic assumptions** are used in both though, from which independent conclusions are reached. These views have **in common** that they assume the day of crucifixion to have been **Friday**, and not the day before. They in common “*simply*” take for granted the day of “The Preparation” was the “*Sabbath’s*” and not “**the Passover’s**” – which John, “*simply*”, explains, 19:14, and Mark, quite intricately, distinguishes, as the “Preparation on which the Passover was slaughtered”. Mark implies the beginning of the prospective day on which Jesus, **would** be buried, by telling that “it was evening already”, when Joseph started out on his undertaking of Jesus’ burial. That the day of burial was, **looking towards the past**, in fact Friday, is undoubtedly concluded from **Luke, 23:54 further, and John 19:42.**

#### 5.2.1.3.2.2.

##### The Eyewitness

The **sole** reason for assuming that John was present at the time Jesus died, and after, is that his account sounds like “*that of an eyewitness*”. But notice Wenham’s remark, that there seems to be a **gap** of several hours after John had left. That implies that he was **not** an eyewitness to whatever happened **during these hours**. It then only remains to be explained how John if he had not been present, could like an eyewitness have recorded how Jesus “*at the end*” died.

It does not seem to be a mystery as far as John only is concerned. The question should **apply to the Synoptists** as well. Were **they** present “at the end” to have been able to record it? The probability they were **not** is great. Some scholars say it was **Mark** who **fled** nakedly when Jesus was arrested. <sup>See EE 58d</sup> That he would later on have returned to the scene of the crucifixion is unlikely. Be that as it may, the question remains as **how anybody** could have observed Jesus’ actual death, since it happened in pitch darkness. How would John have been able to return to the cross in such darkness? It was only when, or immediately after Jesus died, that, by virtue of his triumph in death, the darkness was overcome with light. And we have already seen that this light was so sudden and sharp, that no human eye was able to see for considerable time. It is even said that God hid his face from Christ while He died on the cross. The vivid descriptions in Scripture of indescribable and unseeable realities (– we call them “mysteries”) like that of Christ’s dying – make the believer take refuge in the doctrine of inspiration. These things were **revealed** to the authors of the Bible.

*“John saw this dispatching of the two criminals by the soldiers and then witnessed how they came to Jesus and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. But one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear.”* (Emphasis CGE). <sup>EE p.63a</sup>

The only **supposition** on which John’s presence at Jesus’ death and burial is argued – his depiction of the events being as that of an eyewitness – is deprived of any basis. That **John** is associated with the initiative toward the custody of the body and the actual handling of it, from the cross to the interment, is **always, taken for granted**. It is **never** substantiated, but for the very vague and actually wrong **impression** that John was the eyewitness to whom the nature of the narrative, bearing the characteristics of an **eyewitness account**, must be ascribed.

The **assumption** that John helped with the burial is based on the **assumption** of being the eyewitness. Why? “**He** that saw it, bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe. For these things were done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture saith, They shall look upon him whom they pierced?”

On first and objective observation, it appears that John, the writer of the document, records **what he was told**, by **some person who actually observed** the events. John says: “**He that saw** it, bare record.” It is a **personally** communicated account told first hand (to John) – not **written** first hand: “*I, John, who saw, witness (by writing).*”

Why would John not have used the first hand, **first person**, way of telling? If John is personally involved, there exist **no hindrance** why he would not have written in the first person. If he could write, with **no** direct inducement, in the **first person** to say, “**I** suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that could be written (on) the things Jesus did”, <sup>21:25</sup> he could, when telling what he **himself** saw, have written in the first person. But he does not – which can only mean that he was **not** the

eyewitness.

Where John elsewhere records his personal contribution to events, he refers to himself **indirectly** as “**the disciple**”. “The disciple which testified of these things, **and** who wrote these things ... we know that his testimony is true”. 21:24 John was “the disciple whom (Jesus’) mother stood by”.<sup>19:26</sup> **In 19:35, it is not** “the disciple”, but just, “**he**”, that saw. In 19:35, it is just he “that saw” who “**bare record**” (“**witnessed**”). In 21:24 it is he “which testified” “**and** wrote”. The witness who saw the piercing of Jesus’ side **isn’t the one who writes** – the one who saw only **witnessed** to what he saw, while the witness who **wrote**, is the apostle himself – writing of “all the things”, also those things he had not witnessed himself.

John will refer to himself in the third person in passages **where he might receive undue reverence**. In the remark about the world that would not be big enough to contain the books, were all Jesus’ deeds recorded, there is nothing that might glorify the witness. John speaks in the first person, “I suppose”. No glory could be gained by being witness to the piercing of Jesus’ side. John would have spoken in the first person, “I who saw”, had he been the witness. Actually John would have created the impression of being cowardly evasive if he witnessed but recorded not in the first person. John writes in the third person, and must have had reason for doing so, that reason simply being that he wrote what he was told first hand by the first hand observer.

John could have said of his own witness in the third person, that “he saw and he witnessed”. But for him of **his own** witness to have said that “he is indeed a trustworthy witness”, *kai alethineh autou estin heh marturia*, would have been to **overstate** his own credibility. For John, to have said this of someone **else** is acceptable as a **testimonial** of that other person’s testimony and trustworthiness.

John, in writing, does not act as first hand witness. He only acts narrator – and thus acts as apostolic witness. Had he been the witness who saw the piercing of Jesus’ side he would have written, “He, who saw it, **now witnesses**”. He would have used the **present tense**. But John records of the **original source**, of the very eyewitness, and says: “He who **had seen** (the soldier pierce the side of Jesus) and **had witnessed** of it” – **past perfect**, *ho heohrakohs memarturehken*.

If John had been the witness, he should have said, “**We** who saw, witness”, because if **he** was there, **he could not have been the only one** who saw and witnessed – there would have been **many more** observers. And that would have made the reference to the **one** witness superfluous. If John were that witness he could not have been an only witness. If he were present still when Jesus’ side was pierced, everybody else would have been present still. So many would have seen it that John could not have said “**he** who saw”.

Two witnesses were required to accept a testimony for true. There was no other witness, but it matters not. This witness is so trustworthy that his witness only suffices. On the witness of **two** any matter stands fast. But here there was **only this one’s** witness. But the matter stands fast nevertheless because this man’s witness is **reliable**. John’s stressing the trustworthiness of this witness, implies that he is the **only** witness of the event.

“**That one**”, “the eyewitness” – *ho heohrakohs*, “witnessed” – not “This one”, John, the writer and “the disciple”. John realises that this man speaks from his heart. He writes, “That one can be believed – his witness is true”. “**You also** (and not only I), may believe” what “this one” the eye witness, **to both you and I**, witnesses. John wrote what he heard from this original eyewitness, and the reader, through John’s writing, hears from the original eyewitness. From the context **only one**

conclusion as to who this witness was, can be drawn, and that is that it was Joseph of Arimathea. It also implies that he was the only witness who believed. The soldiers witnessed but did not believe. John also at that stage believed not!

Second: The fact that John describes events **before the darkness** like only an eyewitness could have done, gets most obvious if his record is compared with the Synoptists’. That the Synoptists were also eyewitnesses, seems **unlikely** from the way they relate “these things”. Their distinction of those present as those “who assembled” and “who saw”, suggests that they “were” not “there” **themselves**. As a result they speak of “these things” in general terms. But more important for observing the difference between theirs and John’s record, is their **omission of John’s presence**. They also **use the parentheses** to tell of the **women’s** presence at the cross, while John tells of them and himself in **contextual and historical agreement** – he tells it **as it happened**. John actually connects the soldiers’ act of dividing Jesus’ garments and leaving Him naked on the cross, with what the women did **at the same time**. He says, “These things **then**, the soldiers did (*hoi men oun stratiohtai tauta epoiehsan*). **But (de)** in the presence of Jesus’ cross, stood his mother and her sister, Mary of Clopas and Mary Magdalene”. John also tells **first hand** how Jesus – before the darkness set in – was obtruded with having vinegar to drink. This mocking went on **before** the darkness, and is not recorded at the end of the section like the Synoptists who didn’t see, do. John records as if **while** happening – he **saw**. **After** the darkness started – no, after John left – his narrative **loses** the character of personal encounter. John, in fact, **does not mention the darkness** at all. That suggests that he had been in a place – in the comfort of his abode – where he would not have felt the effect of the darkness so acutely. He experienced no stumbling and groping in the dark out at the cross. Therefore he records it not. The difference **in** John’s account of events **before and after the darkness** is the second reason for believing that he was absent during “the end” and after.

The perspicuous differences between John and the Synoptists, underline the significant **concurrence** in **all** the Gospels, of a sudden break and **complete default of further information** about events at the scene of the cross **after Jesus’ death**. This is a third reason for believing that John was absent from before it became dark at the cross. This non-existence of information after Jesus’ death and the earthquake, could only imply that no eyewitnesses were then present. Eyewitness type of account is **only resumed**, from **after** the Jew’s **private**, and Joseph’s **individual and secret** actions – clearly a type of report compiled on later investigation – are related. Eyewitness type of account – **related to the writer** by the witness – is **resumed** from the piercing of Jesus’ side. Eyewitness type of account – again **related to the writer – continues** from the episode of the women’s “walking with” to the grave, “sitting” right “in front of the grave”, and, “seeing” how Joseph “laid the body” in the grave, and “rolled the stone in the opening of the grave”. **In between** these segments of the context, that is, between the crucifixion and the burial, much happened, but not on “that sight” or site. It happened behind the city walls and behind the walls of Pilate’s palace and behind the torn curtain of the Holiest of Holies behind the walls of the temple. It all implies a time when Jesus was **forsaken by man**, from after the darkness when God hid his face, till after the darkness of **night** “when it was evening already”.

What Ryle sees as “*very improbable*”, in fact seems to be the **only** probability – that John left the place of the cross to take Mary to his house, and **did not return** again to “*witness the end*”.

## 5.2.1.3.2.3.

**Factual Consistency**

Had John been present, he would have been mentioned **by name** because **every** person who **was** at the grave and burial, **is** mentioned by name. The fact that John is **not** named or even **implied** to have “*witness(ed) the end*”, means he **was not** there.

The actual circumstances that **would demand** someone like John’s presence, for example, the “preparing” or “handling” of the body, the supply of provisions for the task, and the laying down of the body in the grave, the closing of the stone door, being recorded with **obvious absence** of John’s name or participation while it would be expected, can only mean that he was nowhere near then.

Had Mary and John been present at the crucifixion before the darkness, their presence **afterwards** would only be the **natural** thing to expect. It would have been natural, **had they not** been recorded to be present, **by name**, at the crucifixion, **and**, had been recorded to have left. It would be **just as natural** to expect their presence at the funeral **to have been recorded, by name**. But **it is not**. This fact is more significant in the light of the other fact that those who **were** present **at the funeral, are** recorded to have been present – **by name**. To assume Mary’s and John’s presence at the funeral on strength of their presence at the crucifixion, is most **unnatural**. It is more unlikely, more “*improbable*”, taking into consideration the fact that **they**, are **recorded**, to have **left** the scene, and to have gone home. This fact is even more significant in the light of the fact that they are **not** said to have **returned** whereas they **are** said to have left. If John had gone to the trouble of informing his readers of John and Mary’s leaving of the cross, he even more surely would have gone to the trouble of informing them of their return to the cross – if they did, because that would have been most unexpected.

The circumstances earlier, before Jesus died and just after, of the **supernatural** phenomena, would, naturally, have **precluded** John’s return to the cross “to see the end”. It might naturally be expected that John and Mary, **while being at home**, soon after the earthquake and the end of the darkness, were to **assist at accommodating** and comforting those who fled from the cross, who were so exhausted and dis comforted that they “returned, chest beating”. Thus, the view that takes it for literal that John and Mary left the scene of the cross comes over quite naturally although it is most unnatural and “improbable” in the estimation of tradition’s advocates.

## 5.2.1.3.2.4.

**John at The Interment?**

As the women’s presence is presupposed to have been **uninterrupted** till after the interment, so is John’s. Says Ryle: “*There seems no reason why we should suppose that no one helped Joseph. He could hardly lift the cross, or reverently lift off the body of a full-grown person in the prime of life, without some aid. Why should we hesitate to believe that John and Nicodemus helped him?*”<sup>341c</sup> (Emphasis CGE)

“*We should hesitate to believe*” it for the very reason that John is **not** mentioned. **Why** should we hesitate to believe if **only Joseph** is mentioned? The logical thing to do is to “believe” only what we are informed.

These were the events where John’s assistance would be **expected to be found** – but is not found. Joseph, nevertheless, needed not to have done these strenuous tasks all by himself. He came to take Jesus’ body on **Pilate’s** approval and instruction. The **soldiers** had to **oblige** Pilate’s **authority** and let Joseph have the body. **They** had to take it down for him, or had to have assisted him in the task. **John**

**features at no stage**. It is expressly **stated** that **Nicodemus** assisted Joseph – and even he, from only later on and at another **venue**, “where” they “treated” Jesus’ body. <sup>Jn.19:39-40</sup> If John assisted Joseph as well, it would have been stated as well. When Nicodemus arrived to assist Joseph, the **women** were not part of the company yet. But they **are mentioned** – while John, again, is not – at the stage where they actually joined with Joseph and Nicodemus and “**walked with**”, or, “**followed**” to the grave. **Everyone**, who attended Jesus’ entombment, are **mentioned**, and mentioned **by name** and **by clear indication of their associated action**. The fact that neither Mary nor John is mentioned has only one implication – they were not there.

Mention or assuming of John’s presence at the burial is not only non-existing in John, but in **all** the Gospels before or after Jesus’ death. It is expressly recorded how everybody, as well as the women, “returned” from the cross when Jesus died. It is just as **expressly** recorded how John and Mary, before Jesus died, “went home”. Then, the Jews are mentioned, and Joseph after them, and Nicodemus. And eventually two specific women. And then the Sabbath came and “went by” ... and again the women come to the fore! The Gospels tell, with more than expected clarity, of each particular **individual’s involvement** with Jesus. Of John it is stated that he was the disciple whom Jesus loved. <sup>Jn.19:26</sup> Whom else would Jesus have given his mother to? Of the women it is stated how they served him and followed him. <sup>Mk.15:41</sup> A lot is said about Joseph, and some revealing innuendoes on Nicodemus are given. An interesting aspect of these fragments of information about each character is that they are “*thrown in*” at **specific stages** in the development of events **as they occurred** during Jesus’ interment. The same style of narration is found only in John as far as the **crucifixion** is concerned. In the Synoptists the crucifixion is recorded quite differently from the way the interment is.

Why should **John’s contribution** to events be given? Because he was the **only disciple** of Jesus at the crucifixion. Nothing unrealistic should be attributed to this. “Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, **every** man to his own, and shall leave me **alone**.” <sup>Jn.16:32</sup> John receives special mention because of his exceptional attendance at Jesus’ crucifixion. Peter denied Jesus, and nothing is said of him further. Mark might have been the one who fled naked when Judas came to betray Jesus. And so every disciple just **vanished** when Jesus entered into the critical stages of his affliction. “*The statement that all forsook him and fled refers to the disciples. Afentes is not pleonastic but has its full meaning in forsaking.*” <sup>V.Taylor, Mk.14:50</sup> Only John remained. **He too** would leave – but not in the **disgraceful** way the others did. For John too, “the hour has come”. He would leave **on the command** of his Master and **honoured** with the commission to be the son of Jesus’ mother.

## 5.2.1.4.

**“Before the Sabbath Began at Dusk”**  
**Deuteronomy 21:22-23****Refer Appendix p. 259**

**Almost every commentary** on the passion of Jesus will use the argument that Joseph had to bury Jesus in great haste after the crucifixion because everything had to be finished “**before sunset**”. All commentaries and points of view which hold to the understanding that Jesus was buried on the day he was crucified, mention, or imply, the **appropriateness of the instruction contained in Dt.21:22-23**, e.g. V. Taylor, Mk.15:43: “*Joseph makes his urgent request ... impelled by the law of Deut. xxi. 23 ...*”. “*If a man be put to death, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day.*”

The ironic fact is, however, that **no Gospel** mentions this passage, implies it or even suggests it. Not Matthew or even John, who often associates the Old Testament with its fulfilment in Christ – “**That the Scriptures might be fulfilled**” – refers to or infers from this Scripture. When the Jews asked Pilate to crucify Jesus, they argued: “We have a law, and **by our law** he ought to die”. <sup>Jn.19:7</sup> When they asked Pilate to remove the crucified, they used no argument from the law. They didn’t say, “By our law he ought to be buried before sunset”. No law of theirs was relevant and no law of theirs was valid under the circumstances.

Commentaries make this text the standard measure of procedure with the crucifixion and interment of Christ and the end of any argument not complying with tradition. Ironically, again, they use it without knowing what it really says. Misconception could be attributed to the AV which creates the impression that the “man” is actually **killed by being hung on the tree**: “If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and (if) he is to **be put to death, and thou hang him** on a tree ...”. The OAT is more accurate: “If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and **he is put to death, and you (then) hang him on a tree**”. The OAT allows of death to be caused in **another way** than by being hung on a tree. The **Mosaic** method of execution is by **stoning**. <sup>Cf. K. Schilder *Christ Crucified* p. 295-296</sup> A person **thus** brought to death was **accursed**, and this curse is **publicised** by way of the **corps** being hung on a tree. Not the **living** man is hanged, but “**his body**” – “it shall not remain upon the tree”.

Those who stone to death and any, who might see, should be made aware of the **consequences of sin**. The community is never detached from any of its members’ behaviour. Being hung on the tree, is not so much meant for the condemned as for society. The reason for the Deuteronomy instruction was **warning** against **moral sins**. For crucifixion, the reason was political and social defiance. The Mosaic instruction is **not meant** as way of execution.

The text demands the hanging to last **not longer than the end of the same day of execution**. But it is universally accepted (and we have no reason not to believe) that a crucified (or one “hanged on a tree”) could live for several days. If the condemned had been hung but did not die before sunset, would he be taken off living, and given his leave, or, be buried alive? It makes no sense to hang a living man and not allow him to die by hanging.

One cannot miss to notice from this text, that it presupposes a morning to morning reckoning of the day (as for ceremonial observations): “His body shall not remain **all night** upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him **that day**”. That means, the body must be removed and buried before **sunrise!**\*\*\* (**The reader will notice that I CHANGED my mind in this regard!**) This Scripture cannot be applied to the situation of Christ’s crucifixion where **sunset** is made the time ultimate for Jesus to be removed from the “tree” and to be buried. The “sunset” idea, on which the assimilation is **wholly depending**, is foreign to the Deuteronomy law and the motivation on which Joseph acted. (**See changed view in App. p. 259-262.**)

It is assumed the Dt.21 “law” stipulates that the body should be removed from the tree and buried the **same day before sunset**. Even if this were so, no connection with Jn.19:31 can be seen, because that Scripture stipulates that the Jews wanted the crucified taken off the crosses **because of “that High-Day-Sabbath”** – **not** because of an imminent **sunset**.

On the basis of Dt.21:22-23, it is assumed, the urgency arose to have Jesus **buried** before sunset. But there is **nothing** in the context of the Jews’ request to Pilate suggesting a burial. Not for Jesus, nor for any of the crucified. The Jews had **one wish** only, and they would for no reason have had any other – to have the crucified taken

**out of sight**. Their **motive** for their request was just as singular. Their motive can only be **adduced from circumstances**. The only information John gives of these circumstances is **the particular time** it was – “For it was the Preparation, that day being an **High-Day-Sabbath**” – “For it was the Preparation” of the Passover ... “*which was peculiarly a “high day”*” (Ryle). Only Sabbath-days of **Feasts**, were “high / great” days, e.g. “the high day **of the feast**”, **John** 7:37 (refer p. 67 / 68) – **which is inescapable proof the Sadducees’ reckoning of Passover does not apply in the New Testament**. Jesus, as a crucified victim of the Roman oppressor, had **political and national implications**, which the Jews did not think of when they insisted on Jesus’ condemnation. The crucified had become an **embarrassment and dilemma** for the Jews on the Feast of Passover, it being “a High Day” in Jewish history and religion, the day of their **deliverance from slavery**. Their political, national and religious **pride** was at stake. They requested that the bodies be “**taken down**” and “**removed**” in order to be taken out of the public eye held no implication of a burial. They **never asked** that the crucified should be buried because they never **wanted** them buried. The Jews didn’t even ask that the crucified must be **killed**. They knew well that the crucified **could** not be killed because it was against Roman law which they had no say in. So they thought it well to propose their legs be broken so they could “**be removed**”. In this way they still obeyed the law! What hypocrisy! How could commentators associate the Jews’ anxiousness with the Old Testament instruction of Dt.21:22-23?

All the dead of the Jews, human and animal, was to be buried or burned. The fact that the Jews don’t request either implies that they did not consider any as the answer to their problem. **They had a problem with the presence as such of the crucified** on the “*High-Day-Sabbath having started.*”

The reason for the absence of any reference or inference to the Dt.21:22-23 instruction is that it does not apply in the instance of Jesus’ crucifixion. No Old Testament law was valid because it was **not a Jewish question of law, but a Roman**. It was Roman in method and it was Roman in administration. The civic authority and jurisdiction belonged to the Romans. The Deuteronomy “law” was meant for a sovereign **Jewish** dispensation. While Jesus was already dead on the cross, he could not be treated as dead before the Roman authorities **confirmed** his death and allowed him to be taken from the cross. **The Deuteronomy instruction was of no consequence**. Jesus’ body was to **remain** on the cross for as long as Roman law required – and that without any doubt meant after death. The body of the crucified could not even be taken off the cross just because it has died. It had to stay on the cross till it decomposed. That Joseph was granted permission to take Jesus’ body down must be attributed to nothing less than the **providence of God and not to the benevolence of the Jews or of Pilate!** It no less must be seen as **overruling grace** that Joseph was allowed to **bury** Jesus “to the custom of the Jews”. If any human factor played a role, it was the very real possibility that Pilate also feared. **Sunset** had no part to play in the urgency of things. **The urgency of events lay in their own nature**. Was Jesus to receive the destiny the Jews had in mind for him, or **would God overrule?**

Through the Jews’ deliberation with Pilate, then with Herod, and finally, with Pilate again, they admitted of and submitted to their situation as being under the control of the Roman state and government. They not only willingly, but also on petition, submitted the case “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews”, to Roman disposal. That circumstance was sealed with the emblem of Roman authority nailed on the cross above Jesus’ head. “What I have written, I have written”, Pilate dared the Jews.

**The King of the Jews is crucified – on Roman Authority.** No Law of Moses would be considered. And no law of Moses could, because there was no law on a case like this – not even Dt.21:22-23 would be fitting.

The Jews **eagerly went along** with every decision Pilate made. They actually coerced him into making those decisions. **But when it came to the inscription** that identified this crucified one as the King of the Jews, they vehemently objected. Everything they wanted was at the point of full satisfaction. The whole crowd and leaders of the gang were already on the site where Jesus was to be crucified, when this inscription was brought there from Pilate. <sup>Jn.19:20</sup> The Jews could not accept, and went back to give Pilate their mind, but of no avail. They had to return and do as he commanded. They were **humiliated. Their whole scheme started to turn sour on them.** On “the Preparation of the Passover”, the Jews could still have lived with this insult. But the following day would be “an High Day”, “The Feast-Sabbath” in all its glory. And these crosses, especially this Nazarene with that insinuating inscription on his cross, would be too much for their self-esteem. This finally motivated them to go and ask Pilate to have the crucified removed for the occasion. **The courage for this, they plucked up in company – at their Passover table.** Moses’ instruction was given no thought.

The Jewish leaders, priests, scribes, and “important” members of the Sanhedrin, like Joseph, <sup>Mk.15:43 Lk.23:50-51</sup> in all probability had their Passover meal **together.** In this way Joseph could have learnt of their plans for further action. He could thus have foreseen **how Jesus would have ended up** with the other two crucified where they were to be discarded in the valley of Hinnom, <sup>2 Chr.33:6</sup> or “in a common criminal’s grave” if he acted not in time.

With the macabre methods of Roman crucifixion, the Mosaic instruction of Dt.21:22-23 has nothing in common. The first comes from **man’s** degenerate mind. The second comes from the **godly man Moses.** Sin had to be illustrated as the curse it is to a people who needed such illustration.

**Paul** uses the **metaphor** of the cross for the **curse** Jesus bore. This is **no assimilation** of the “tree” of Dt.21:22-23 and the “cross” of Jesus. It is no assimilation of the law of Dt.21:22-23 and the law of crucifixion. It is not even the assimilation of the curse of Dt.21:22-23 and the curse Paul has in mind, because Paul uses symbolism. Paul uses Dt.21:22-23 as paradigm in **spiritual** sense. The **physical** aspect like the form of the structure and the **duration of application** plays no role in his thinking. **The way in which Jesus died, is not conditional for the efficaciousness of his death.** There exists not the vaguest similarity or connection between the bearing of our sins as the curse Jesus substitutively became, and the literal resemblance the crucifixion of Jesus had with the hanging on a tree of Dt.21:22-23. Whether Jesus died the Jewish way “on a tree”, or the Roman way “on a tree”, makes no difference to the meaning and worth of his dying for our sins. It means He became a curse – for us – that, unto our redemption. That is all Paul sees in the comparison.

To argue with reference to the Dt.21:22-23 “law” that the hanged must be removed from the cross and be buried before sunset, **defeats the object of argument**, which is to show that the crucified had to be buried the same day – which starts with **sunset** – the “evening” **after** sunset, no longer being the same day. Joseph, who started on undertaking to bury Jesus “when it was already evening”, could not have buried Jesus on the same day he was crucified, but must have buried him on the next day following. What we have aimed to show, this counter argument has confirmed.

### 5.2.1.5.

#### Day Concluded

The day Christ was crucified on, ended with the effects of his death and the supernatural disasters lasting through the remainder of the day at least. Considering the circumstances the afternoon must have passed like a moment. Notwithstanding it is assumed that Jesus was also buried and the usual and unusual preparations were made before the sun set. It is obvious that this would have been impossible. The total circumstance of the afternoon and ending of the day of crucifixion makes it nonsensical to even suggest that it could be “**late noon**” when Joseph went to ask Pilate for the body. It was much later. “It was evening already” indeed.

#### 5.2.2.1.

#### Day of Burial Began

##### 5.2.2.1.1.

#### Contextual Transition

Events on the day Jesus was **entombed** came **after** “it was evening the Preparation”. Events on the day of Jesus’ crucifixion and death came **before** “it was evening”. According to John 19:31, it **would be** the Preparation. *Ehn*, in the phrase, *epei paraskeueh ehn*, means, “It was Preparation”, **in the same sense** it is used in the phrase, *ehn megaleh heh hehmera ekeinou tou sabbatou* – “It **would be** a great day of that Sabbath (coming)”. That Sabbath – the Passover Feast Sabbath – would then be the Preparation as well and would already have started by the time the Jews negotiated with Pilate. It **would be** the 15th Nisan. The Great Day Sabbath was **imminent** – it **already had started!** Of **neither** the Sabbath nor the Preparation the **end** is indicated. (Refer to Par. 5.1.4.2.2.)

When this day – on which Jesus **would be buried** – **ended**, John says, “Because of the Jews’ preparation they laid Jesus there”. John does **not** use the verb *ehn* in this case. That it **was**, or **had been**, the Day of Preparation is **implied**. On **no other** day but Friday would the Jews have prepared for the Sabbath. <sup>Lk.23:56</sup> It must be **deduced** that “it was the Preparation” in the sense of, “the **opportunity** for preparation **drew to its close**”. More correct, this phrase (It is no clause.) means: “*the opportunity and time of preparation was imminent* – it **just started!**” Here the **end or ending** of Friday is indicated **without** the use of the verb *ehn* and by way of inference.

Like the other Gospels, John implies the day of **burial that was to be**, from its beginning to its end when he says “The Preparation (of the Sabbath) **was**”. The actual **events of the day** occurred **between** the time indications, “Since it was the Preparation” of 19:31, and, “(Due to) the preparation of the Jews” of 19:42. **Both** designations **cannot** indicate the **end** of events of the day. **In clearest contrast** to “the Preparation (Day)”, 19:31, for “the preparations of the Jews”, 19:42, on which the **Sabbath** and Jesus’ **burial** were to follow, John speaks of the “**Preparation of Passover**” <sup>19:14</sup> on which Christ’s **crucifixion** was to follow. “It was (*ehn*) Preparation of the Passover”, he says, when “the sixth hour” began (*ehn*). The **next day, would be** “The Preparation (of the Sabbath)”. **And when it “came”, John says it “was”** – *ehn*. John has different names for these days. He has different contents for each.

John says “because it was Preparation Day (Friday) (now)”, meaning Friday **beginning** – *epei paraskeueh ehn*. The day **following**, and not **of** Jesus’ death, started. John means **Friday** as being the “great day”, because he does not say “*That Sabbath was a high day*”, but, “**That day** was a high-day-sabbath” – *ehn gar megaleh heh hehmera ekeinou tou sabbatou*. He says, “Because (it now) was **that** high-day-sabbath (beginning)” so that **both** clauses, *epei paraskeueh ehn*, and, *ehn gar megaleh*

heh hehmera ekeinou, concern the same day, **Friday**: “The Jews, therefore, Friday being entered upon – so that the bodies should not remain hanging on the crosses during the Sabbath – for that Sabbath having being entered upon was a high-day-sabbath – asked Pilate ...”. Notice how clearly both clauses almost emphatically indicate that the day John had in mind, was with what the Jews only then perceived, **only beginning**, and that the entering upon it **shocked** them to the realisation that the bodies would remain hanging on the crosses the next day – that is – for the whole duration of **this** high-day-sabbath. Could they not persuade Pilate to “have (them) removed”? Theirs came too late as an after-thought on their deeds of the past day (the day of crucifixion), but nevertheless not too late to try to save face.

The other Gospels do the same from a **perspective of time common to all the Gospels**. Mark distinguishes the “Preparation which is the Day Before the Sabbath” on which Christ was **buried**, from the “The Day the Passover was **slaughtered**”. Matthew points out that Jesus was taken and killed “on the first day of “a-dzumos” -”de-leaven” or, “for removing leaven”. Luke introduces Joseph with the remarkable exclamation, “Behold!”, “That day” which **followed**, “was the Preparation” and the day of Jesus’ entombment.<sup>23:54</sup> “The next morning after their preparations”<sup>Mt.27:62</sup> the Jews had the grave secured on the Sabbath. But despite, before “it was evening” **again**, Jesus was resurrected.

“**Being already evening**”,<sup>Mk.15:42 Mt.27:57</sup> **it was not the end, but the beginning of the chain of events that led to Jesus’ burial and eventually to the closing of the sepulchre when “the Sabbath drew nigh”**. “*The next series of events*” in which “*Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus were to figure prominently*”,<sup>EE p.63b</sup> **starts from here – it ends not here**. See App. “Aorist”, p. 276, ‘Hebrew Original’

#### 5.2.2.1.2.

##### **Passover Meal Implied**

The Jewish leaders must have conferred – at the **Passover Table!** – before they petitioned Pilate. The proposal they came up with was of the nature to invite disagreement. But there was **no dissension** among them. They did not think of all the consequences and implications the crucifixion would have had before it was over and **they had to face new problems**. And then they only **gradually** began to understand. Only “**in council**” at their eating of the paschal offer, could they decide on the three men outside the city gates. The Jews did not want to kill Jesus “on the Feast”. But now he was going to hang on the cross on the Feast! An “uproar” was more likely than ever because the Feast has now irrevocably **arrived**. The Jews never could have casually walked off from the cross and into the city and in on Pilate to negotiate on the fate of the crucified **under the circumstances that prevailed after Jesus had died**. Every detail the Gospels give of the entombment of Christ precludes any knowledge or participation of the Jews in the proceedings. **Their disposition and intentions were contrary to all information given by the Gospels of the burial**. The Jews certainly would have been involved with Jesus’ burial – **had they known about it**. They would have been most anxious to **prevent** the burial, and not, as tradition and the Gospel of Peter state, to assist. That can be concluded from the nature of the request they put to Pilate and their frantic request for the sealing and guarding of the tomb the Sabbath morning.

How wrong an impression can be entertained is illustrated by the following quote from Ryle’s *Expository Thoughts*,<sup>Vol. 4 p. 327</sup>

“...*For anything we can see, the (breaking of the legs of the crucified) would not have been done if the Jews had not asked ... If the Jews had not interfered ... for*

*anything we can see, Pilate would have allowed our Lord’s body to hang upon the cross till Sunday or Monday, and perhaps to see corruption. The Jews procured our Lord’s burial the very day that He died ...”*. “... *As it was, the Jews managed things so that our Lord was laid in the grave before the evening of Friday, and was thus enabled to fulfil the famous type of Jonah, and give the sign He had promised to give of His Messiahship ... All this could not have happened if the Jews had not interfered, and got Him taken from the cross and buried on Friday afternoon! ... The restless, busy meddling of Caiaphas and his companions, was actually one of the causes that Christ rose the third day after death, and His Messiahship was proved ... The burial, therefor, was entirely owing to the request of the Jews. The providence of God ordered things so that they who interceded for his crucifixion **interceded for his burial**. And by doing so they actually paved the way for the crowning miracle of His resurrection.*” (Emphasis CGE.)

One of the obvious misconceptions here entertained by Ryle, is that it was the Jews who “*interceded for Jesus’ burial*”. It was **not they, but Joseph**, who did so on his own and certainly **contrary** to the Jews’ desire. Ryle’s supposition in the first place, that the Jews, whether priests or Joseph, were **so collected**, that their, “*restless, busy meddling*” and calculated “*interference*”, “*procured our Lord’s burial the very day that he died*”, is unreal and wrong. He presents them as being so well in control of circumstances that they even “*managed things so that He was laid in the grave before evening*”. Ryle does not consider the **circumstantial impossibility** of what he takes for granted. Could the Jews be so nonchalant? Had “*things*” not “*managed*” them!? Were they in no wise disturbed and unsettled by what happened – the darkness, the light, the earthquake, the chaos, the destruction and (probable) death all around, “covering the whole land”? Were not these priests and rulers so put out of countenance by the sight of the torn veil so as to be unable to think of anything but the visitation of the angel of death? If not, then these “*signs*” were for nothing and like nothing. If they really were what the Gospels make them out for – terrible, enormous events of **divine intervention through supernatural visitations (See Acts 2:19-20)**, then the Jews would not have been able to recollect themselves for considerable time. In fact, they would **not have been able to think** of the crucified again before “It was Preparation now ...” and **at least three, to even six hours later, and, definitely, after evening**.

After long and frantic attempts at order, the aftermath of the miraculous visitations to some degree under control, the Jews again could think of the special season at which it occurred. They thought of their disadvantaged situation – **the nightmare their Feast had become**. They must have recalled that the first night of 15th Nisan was the day the first born were exterminated and a day of terrible disaster for any Jew who might not have adhered to the blood rites. If they were the morning only afraid of being defiled, they now were afraid also of Godly judgements. With their **Holy of Holies** already **exposed to profane gaze**, they would not be able to endure the further embarrassment of their holiest **days** being profaned by crosses **advertising** their subservience to the oppressor. The Jews never would have approached Pilate for a favour before they **had eaten their Passover meal!** Not after what they had seen and heard and experienced this afternoon of Christ’s crucifixion. They might have been hypocritical enough to be defiled, but they certainly were bigoted and scared enough not to. They **first** ate their Passover so that they no longer **could** be defiled, **and** would be **protected** from further catastrophe when entering the Roman ruler’s house. **They ate their Passover Meal “in the evening”, and then** went to ask for the bodies to be removed.

The argument is raised that it was **already Passover before Jesus was crucified**. It is suggested that **only some of** the Jews would not enter into Pilate's palace when they brought Jesus to be judged by him, and that those who would not enter, would be only those who have not had their Passover meal. Those who did enter would have had their Passover Meal already the previous evening – it is said – when Jesus and the disciples had theirs.

The argument implies that it was **already Passover before Jesus was crucified**. Nothing in John at this point suggests that any Jews went into the Praetorium. No exceptions are implied – **All the Jews would not enter**, which means none of them at that stage had eaten the Passover Meal. Jesus would be “killed” as Passover Lamb on the **right** moment of the slaughter of the Passover sacrifice. His death indicates the **real** time of the Passover's offering. And He had not died yet, therefore the Passover Meal could not have been yet.

It is further suggested that **so many offerings** had to be brought during Passover that all could not be slaughtered during the course of one afternoon, and that the sacrificial aspect of the Feast **lasted over two days**. Some Jews consequently ate their Passover Meal the day **before the official date**. Again it should be considered that **no Jew** would enter Pilate's house. Why should only some have “assembled” to have Jesus condemned? They **all** participated in this crime. If some supposedly already had had their Meal, why did not they represent the Jews? It would be normal and expected for Pilate to be approached by them in his official office. That **he**, “**went out unto them**”, was most extraordinary. He could not be met by anyone inside. There also exists no indication in the Gospels of the circumstance supposed. If so many sacrifices were killed, **mention** would have been made of it as mention was made of it at the occasion of the Passover under Josiah's rule when so many sacrifices were brought that the priests had to slaughter into the night.<sup>2 Chron. 35:14</sup> If this incidence is taken as example, and were a similar situation encountered during the Passover when Jesus was crucified, the slaughter of these sacrifices would have been done beyond the normal time of the afternoon **into the night**, and not over several afternoons. It had to be done “**the same day**”.<sup>2 Chron. 35:14, 16</sup> The sacrifice was killed during daylight of the afternoon, approximately in the middle of afternoon. As the population increased, and the sacrifices increased, the time of killing was made earlier and earlier in order to finish with sacrifice **before sunset**. In the days of Josiah the organisers of the Feast were **not expecting** the quantity of killings to be made, and had to finish it well into night. But this was **exceptional** and by implication proves the **norm of starting earlier** as the sacrifices increased. Sacrifices were to be finished “**before sunset**”.

It is further suggested that **two calendars** were followed for the dating of the Passover. (Billerbeck) Certain Jews of the one school would have already had their Passover Meal when the others would not have had theirs. That would explain, it is claimed, how the Jewry, the morning, would not dare to enter unto Pilate, and he had to come out to them, but the evening, would not hesitate to encounter Pilate in the same locality they the morning would not. Again it may be answered that **no suggestion** exist of such a situation. Indication to the contrary though, is obvious. The **unanimous** action of the Jews belies the idea. It is stated that “they”, the Jews all together, led Jesus to the hall of judgement, but that “they would not defile themselves” by entering. “Themselves” – not “some of them”. “The Jews”, as one, called on “**law**” to give reason for not acting on their own in crucifying Jesus. If dissension existed among them in interpretation of their law as to the dating of Passover, it would have been **impossible to hide**. But Jn.19:35 supplies conclusive

evidence that there were **no differences among the Jews** on any relevant matter of “law”. Pilate exclaims on the combined conduct of the Jews, “Am I (also) a Jew? Thine own **nation and the chief priests** have delivered thee ...” The Jews maintained a **single** front. The chief priests were of the Sadducean party, whereas the Pharisees were the “people's party”. These parties had different views on the dating of Passover. Despite their different opinions the Jews **in practice held to the Pharisaic interpretation**. In any case **the occasion was bigger than their differences**, and they for once would be united in their campaign against Jesus. This truth is transparent throughout the four Gospels. (Even Herod and Pilate became friends through the event of Jesus' crucifixion, “from that day on”.)

The Gospels do not use two dating methods for Passover. The Synoptists, like John, state Jesus' crucifixion to have occurred on “The Preparation of Passover”, that is, “**On the first day of de-leaven** – which is the day **when they killed** the passover (lamb)”. The Synoptists without any hesitation state the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread to have been “**after two days**”. No indication of a possible alternative dating can be found. John without reservation identifies the “**sixth day** before Passover”. If more than one calendar was existent, John could not have been so categorical. Also John's references to “**the day before the Passover**” and “**The Preparation of Passover**”, confirm the non-existence of differing dates.

It is even suggested that the Jews **forfeited their Passover Meal** in order to ensure the removal of the crucified before the Sabbath that would follow. They would rather be defiled than allow the bodies to stay. This argument is based on the assumption that the Jews the morning would not enter into Pilate's house, but the evening **in fact did enter into his house** and were thus defiled and therefore could not eat the Passover – that it was Passover Meal's night indeed.

The Jews, as well as Joseph, leaders of the people, **religious heads** and members of the High Council, would **not** give up their Passover Meal. Joseph especially, “waited for the Kingdom of God”,<sup>Lk.2:35:51</sup> The Passover Meal symbolised **his** keenest expectation. Not only was this the most important Feast in the Jews' religious calendar, but under the circumstances it was most appropriate. This was the one opportunity of their lives the Jews would not let slip away.

When, the morning, their fury drowned all reason and they screamed for Jesus to be crucified, they **could** not deny their bigotry and enter Pilate's house. Now, the evening, with their **desire accomplished** and Jesus securely nailed to the cross, and at the **very eve** of their celebration of feast, **could** they, **now, for no reason**, forfeit what they would not under much severer prompting?

It is an inconsistent idea that the Jews, while protesting for the **one** religious interest – the holy day coming, would discard their **other** religious interest, the Passover Meal. They were anxious not to be embarrassed by the crucified over their festal days – most holy days to them. Would they act contrary to their own interest and objective and forfeit the Meal?

It is argued that the Jews, when they went to “besought Pilate that the bodies might be taken away”, **did not enter** Pilate's house. They again stood outside – with the implication that at that hour they have not eaten the Passover Meal yet, and that consequently it still was before sunset. If the Jews stood outside like they did the morning, John **again** would have recorded it. John would again have recorded the reason, that they might not be defiled. He also again would have mentioned Pilate's coming out to them, like he did the morning.

If it is taken for granted that the Jews stood outside when they “besought Pilate”,<sup>19:31</sup> the same must be assumed in the case of Joseph when he also, “besought

Pilate”,<sup>18:38</sup> because **that is all** John says of Joseph. **John does not** record that Joseph “entered in” to Pilate. Luke says that Joseph “approached” Pilate, *proselthohn*. Joseph “approaching” Pilate, “begged”, *ehiehsato*, for the body. Now Mark says that Joseph “went in unto” Pilate, *eisehlthen pros*, and “begged” – *ehiehsato*, for the body. A discussion obviously inside the building ensued. Joseph “came” – *ehlthen*, and “approaching unto Pilate”, *proselthohn tohi Pilatohi* “begged” – *ehiehsato*, the body. **The other Gospels imply what Mark expressly records.** That Joseph “entered” is further indicated in the way he entered. He entered, “secretly”, “out of fear for the Jews”. He would not have stood outside to be seen. He had a very private meeting with Pilate. John says of Jesus that he, the morning of the day he was crucified, was “led away to Annas”. He does not record that Jesus was led into Annas’ house. However, John records that Peter, in contrast with Jesus, “stood at the door without” which implies that Jesus did go **into** the building.<sup>18:13, 16</sup> It cannot be doubted then that John, by saying that the Jews “approached” Pilate, means that they, like Joseph did, actually **entered** into Pilate’s house. The Jews, the evening, **have already had their Passover Meal and could no longer** by getting defiled **be prevented to enter** Pilate’s house. That again implies that **the new day of Passover Feast had begun** when Joseph went into Pilate’s house to ask for Jesus’ body that was **still on the cross**.

#### 5.2.2.1.3.1.

##### The Jews’ Reason for Asking

The Jews approached Pilate now, “because it was Preparation” – *epei ehn paraskeueh*. It was **Preparation** – of the Sabbath. But this Preparation was **itself**, a Sabbath – The Sabbath of the Passover, 15th Nisan, “when they (ate) the Passover”. It was the symbolic day of their deliverance from oppression. **“It was evening now” on and of this day.** If only the bodies, that emblem of subordination, could be removed from sight for this **impending** day! The shame of these crosses in broad **daylight** would not only be unbearable for themselves, but intolerable for the people.

The Jews approached Pilate with their request because they had come to **realise** that these crucified ones definitely were **going to stay alive over their holy days** of the Passover season, and were going to stay hanging there **for the world to see**. They acted “in order that **the bodies would not stay on the crosses on the Sabbath**” – *hina meh menei epi tou stauruhi ta sohmata en tohi sabbatohi*. The **bodies** would be an embarrassment **on the occasion** of that High-Day-Sabbath. They were not worried about the **Sabbath’s holiness as such**. Commentaries usually present much argument on what type of “High Day” or “High-Day-Sabbath” it was. But in John the important thing is not what these days meant in themselves, but what they meant for the Jews. Because it was an important Sabbath, the **Feast Sabbath of their exodus from slavery**, the bodies on the crosses would be an **irritation and shame**. **The holy hours of the Fourth Commandment Sabbath played no part in their decision.** It was “an high day, that day” – with immense **implications for national and religious consciousness**. That was their only motivation for asking for the removal of the crucified whom Pilate, at **their** earlier insistence, had crucified. They did not remind Pilate of how holy the Sabbath was. They asked him for the removal of the bodies because it was an “important” or, “high” day **for them**. In crucifying Christ they triumphed then, but now **were shamed**. That is the only explanation the Gospel of John implies for the Jews’ otherwise inexplicable action. The traditional explanation – of the Jews’ Pharisaic pietism over the Sabbath’s holy hours **being so near they might not be able to finish betimes** with having Jesus properly buried before sunset – can not be found in the Gospels. The Jews were **not**

worried about a **sun** that was setting. **A sun that had set, worried them!** A time of **day** and a **late** time of day are not suggested. **It never was relevant in any case, the sun having been under for quite some time and it being the start of day and an early hour of night when Pilate interviewed the Jews.**

These Jews went to Pilate with no compassion for the crucified, and with **no consideration for the law** of the fifth book of Moses, that the body of an executed person should not remain hanging longer than the end of the day on which he was killed. The Gospels nowhere tell us anything of the kind. (The Gospel of Peter stresses this law’s validity in this case.<sup>See Par. 5.2.1.2.11.</sup>) **The implication inferred from the information the Gospels give** is that the expectation was that the crucified would **remain on the crosses** “on the sabbath – that day being a great day of a Sabbath”. The Jews went to Pilate for no reason but that **they could not stand the idea!** Not because the sun was going down, not because the Sabbath approached, not because the Sabbath was holy or especially holy, but because of their national and religious pride enhanced in “that day”. Of importance is the **implications of being** an “High Day” for the Jews – that is what mattered to the Jews on the occasion of Jesus’ crucifixion.

#### 5.2.2.1.3.2.

##### Why the Request was Granted

The Roman authorities experienced the **same calamities** as the Jews on the afternoon of crucifixion. As soon as they could gather themselves after having been dispersed by the supernatural calamities, the soldiers were put on alert. They must have thought that the Jews would **grab the opportunity** for an uprising. This was no peaceful scenario where any Jew could calmly mind his own business and, “to the custom of the Jews”, bury the dead. No Jew would be able to make the least suspicious move because Roman soldiers swarmed the city and districts. Pilate would be in no frame of mind for the Jewry again. He had enough of them and their intrigues for one day. Before law and order were restored, the priests could forget to be granted an interview. Three or four hours were a very short time to recover. It had become the Day of the Jews’ Preparation for the Sabbath, **and** time for the Passover Meal’s cooking after sunset, **and** time for the Meal to be eaten, before the Jews, **at last**, could go to acquaint Pilate with their wishes. **Pilate feared** as much as the Jews. He granted them conference. They asked that the bodies be taken off the crosses and removed – with their **legs broken**. It could not even have been Roman law, so savage was the Jews’ proposal.

“*It was part of the crucifixion torture that the crucified man needed the support of his legs if he was continually to keep raising himself sufficiently to keep breathing.*” Says Wenham.<sup>EE p.63a</sup> Ryle’s understanding that, “*In asking Pilate to allow this breaking of the legs, (the Jews) did nothing but was usual*”, is boundlessly off the mark. “*The thing would not have been done if the Jews had not asked*”, he says, and therein he makes no mistake. **They required a complete breach of Roman law** (– not to speak of obedience to Old Testament law. No law of the Old Testament stipulates such measures as the breaking of legs of a condemned on a tree in order to hallow the hours of the Sabbath day. The laws of Dt.21:23 and Ex.20:10 are irrelevant.) **No Roman law** called for the breaking of a crucified person’s legs. This idea was hatched in the **mind of the Jews**. While these men were so bedevilled as to come up with a proposal such as this, **could they have had the burial of Christ in mind?** They intended **not** to attain “*sepulture to the body*” of Jesus. Their actual intentions are recorded in so many words – words to be literally understood: They wanted the bodies – and the crosses, **1.** taken down – “that the bodies should not



remain on the cross”, and, **2**, be “taken away”. To make this possible, these Jews proposed, **3**, the “legs (of the crucified) be broken”.

Pilate would not be able to **free** the crucified, neither did the Jews **want** them freed. The crucified could not be **killed** in any other way. He had to **die by himself while on the cross**. No crucified person could be **taken off** the cross before decomposed. This law bound Pilate. But he just **might** consent to the Jews’ wishes if the crucified were **at least immobilised** and taken to the place of decomposition, Gehenna, Hades! The Jews proposed: have their legs broken so they **may be removed**. Pilate agreed. He confirmed the character he proved the morning. The morning he disregarded his Roman law by **condemning the innocent**. Tonight again he disregards his Roman law on crucifixion, in **allowing the breaking of the legs** of the crucified.

**5.2.2.1.4.**  
**Joseph Asked**  
**5.2.2.1.4.1.**  
**“After This”**

**Luke** introduces Joseph’s unexpected appearance in the Passion narrative with probably the best word for the purpose, *kai idou*, “**Then, Look!**” Not only is Joseph an obscure character who needs introduction. **The turn in events is just as unexpected**. The reader must be prepared for what is now to follow in the history of Christ’s passion. “Now, Notice!” – *kai idou*

**Mark** changes the subject of the narrative by first inserting a finishing parenthesis of the women’s presence **during the crucifixion**, and then to draw a very visible line under the time at which **Joseph, started** acting, “**When it was evening**”.

**Matthew** inserts not less than four parentheses (of the veil that was torn, of the graves that were opened, of the centurion’s confession, and of the women’s attendance at the crucifixion) to **complete** his statements on the day of crucifixion, before he commences with Joseph’s story.

**John** prepares the way for the readers’ acquaintance with Joseph, by a preparatory parenthesis which brings perspective on the possibility of Joseph’s interview with Pilate – **The Jews** saw Pilate first and were granted their request. That Joseph’s wish – a lonely individual’s – was also tolerated and Jesus’ body could be taken off the cross is therefore not too improbable.

In the four of the Gospels, not a word is told of anything happening **at the cross after** Jesus died. All the parentheses **complete the story of crucifixion by adding every possible relevancy to the crucifixion** – to what happened **before and while** Jesus died. In the four of the Gospels, the **turn** of events and **change** in the nature of events and style of narration, is as if cut by knife where the story dealing with Jesus’ **burial** starts.

The words, “**After this**”, in John 19:38, mean, “**After the Jews asked Pilate**”. In John’s Gospel the **main** story is **interrupted** after verse 30 – the Jews asking Pilate that the bodies of the crucified be removed. John tells this **first** in order to give **perspective to Joseph’s actions**. This background, contained in the bigger parenthesis of verses 30 to 37, is further filled in with more “*of John’s parentheses*” (Ryle). There are three bracketed sections in the first sub-parenthesis: a – “because it was the preparation”; b – “that the bodies should not remain on the cross”; c – “for that day was an high day”. The second sub-parenthesis is about the witness to the piercing of Jesus’ side,<sup>35</sup> and a third is about the prophecies.<sup>36-37</sup> Even the remainder of the containing parenthesis is compiled of remarks in brackets: Verse 32 :- “Then came the soldiers and brake the legs of the first (and of the other [which was crucified

with him)”). Verse 33 :- “But when they came to Jesus (and saw that he was dead already) they brake not his legs”. Verse 34 :- “But one of the soldiers (with a spear) pierced his side (and forthwith came there blood and water).”

After this bigger parenthesis about the doings of the “Jews”, **the main story is resumed** with “After this”. Within the bigger parenthesis details are contained which in time came after Joseph’s interview with Pilate. In the context of narration they come before Joseph’s actions, but in time of occurrence they followed. What Joseph does “after this”, happens **while** the soldiers **were sent** to do as the Jews requested.

“... **Joseph realised that the body of Jesus would shortly be hauled down and thrown into the common criminals’ grave along with the corpses of the two thieves.**”<sup>Wenham p.63c</sup> (Not corpses but alive.)

**How** would Joseph have come to realise this? He was one of the Sanhedrin, member of the chamber of rulers. He (and possibly his family if any attended this Passover) had his Passover Meal with these Jews, and **heard them conspiring**. This was the occasion which not only brought the Jews back on their “normal” track after the calamities of the afternoon, but which must have shocked Joseph into focus on what really was happening around him. Straightway after the Meal he went over to Pilate’s palace, but the Jews were quicker. The Jews made their request first. Joseph’s absence from the team would have made them suspicious. So Joseph had to hide and wait his turn. It was nerve wrecking and he had to “pluck up courage”. But “*providence forced his hand – he must act now or not at all*”.<sup>Wenham</sup> Just as the Jews left Pilate’s house, Joseph, “secretly for fear of the Jews”, “took courage” and despite the chance of being **detected and to have his plans thwarted** by them, “entered in, and begged Pilate for the body of Jesus”. “No. He can’t be dead yet!” said Pilate. “I promised the Jews that their legs may be broken so their bodies **and crosses** can be removed. They never told me that Jesus was dead. But I’ll ask the centurion, he should know. He is right here now. Call him here!” And the centurion confirmed, “*I myself saw him die, and what happened as he died. He is dead all right.*” So “Pilate gave the body”. Joseph made haste – he had to forestall the soldiers. “He came therefore”, says John, and, one must understand, he came with all his might therefore. **As Joseph arrived** at Calvary, the soldiers shivered with cruellest blow the legs of those crucified left and right of Jesus. A strange silence prevailed; the suffering must have lost consciousness. “When they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they break not his legs; But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side.” **Joseph, in the nick of time, prevented the soldiers from further action**. “Pilate gave me the body of this one”. And he took Jesus’ body from the cross himself – and away where he could leave him while he went to buy linen.

**5.2.2.1.4.2.**  
**Joseph Entered “Secretly”**

Joseph went to Pilate’s and entered in, and “**secretly besought** that he might take away the body”. John says he entered secretly “for fear of the Jews”. Mark says Joseph “went in boldly”. Matthew and Luke simply say that Joseph “approached Pilate”, Joseph acted, “fearing”, or, “boldly”? It is not a matter of either or, but of how. John defines Joseph’s fear as wariness of the Jews. It was in the face of this wariness or “fear” that Joseph “plucked up courage” and “boldly”, the Jews notwithstanding, entered the palace and asked. The conclusion must be reached that Joseph was not afraid to be Jesus’ disciple. It is argued that Joseph did not enter and ask “in secret”, but “was Jesus’ **disciple** secretly”, “because he feared the Jews”.<sup>Jn.19:38a</sup> Matthew, who also mentions the fact of Joseph’s discipleship, says nothing of secrecy or fear.<sup>27:57</sup> On the contrary, by mentioning the fact of Joseph’s discipleship,

Matthew explains how it could be possible for Joseph to have done such a courageous thing. He implies courage only, and courage on the part of Joseph from before the event took place. Matthew does not imply timorous and secret discipleship – neither does John – “He indeed was a disciple himself!” Luke’s description of this man Joseph’s character is most apt: “A good man, and just. The same **had not consented to the counsel and deed of (the rulers)**”. No, in fact, “He indeed singularly waited for the kingdom of God”. Indeed, “a man”. Joseph asks Pilate because “he was discipled to Jesus” – *ematheteutheh*.<sup>Mt.27:57</sup> “He asked **being a disciple** of Jesus”, *ehrohthehsen ... ohn mathehtehs Iehsou*. “Who himself indeed was a disciple”, *hos kai autos emathehteutheh*. “This man, he went unto Pilate”, verses 50 to 52. What a credential! Seldom is something of the like seen in Scripture. Of no other “disciple of Jesus”, is anything near said. The insinuation that Joseph, because he feared the Jews, was a disciple of Jesus only secretly, can not be reconciled with the testimony given of this man’s undaunted stand for Jesus. The rest of all argument must agree with this finding, and does in fact agree.

Joseph entered “secretly”. It implies Joseph’s **avoidance of the Jews** on entering upon Pilate. He did it stealthily like a preying lion, not like a scared criminal. He used his surroundings to purposeful effect. The dark of the after-evening provided shelter.

“It was evening proper” – Mk.15:42. “Secretly”, *kekrummenos*, **suggests the darkness** of night, not only here in John 19:38, but throughout Scriptures. This word is used where obscurity and light are in contrast and where obscurity and darkness are associated, e.g. Mk.4:22, 1 Cor.4:5. In the context of Jn.19:38 the only subject *kekrummenos* can be associated with, is the implied darkness of the time of day. The secrecy, in which Joseph went to ask, had nothing to do with his discipleship. Mark expressly states that Joseph, “boldly **went in** unto Pilate, and craved the body”, *tolmehsas eiselthehn kai ehitehsato to sohma*. It all had to do with this **bold** step he now for **fear** of the Jews **secretly** takes to thwart their plan with the crucified Jesus. What Joseph “dared” to do (*tolmehsas*), is that which he would “secretly” (*kekrummenos*), but courageously do, to enter and to ask Pilate for Jesus’ body.

Joseph “**asked**” not “because he was a disciple secretly for fear of the Jews”. That makes no sense and simply isn’t true. “Secretly” does not apply to Joseph’s discipleship. Why did Joseph ask? “Because he was a disciple”. The **participle, ohn**, “**because he was**”, supplies reason for the act of the subject: “**being / because** a disciple, Joseph **asked** that he might take away the body”. **The predicate of the sentence is not “being” – ohn**, which cannot be the verb because it is a participle. How did Joseph ask? “Secretly”. “**Being** a disciple of Jesus (*ohn mathehtehs tou Iehsou*) Joseph after these things (*meta de tauta*) **asked** Pilate (*ehrohthehsen ton Pilaton Iohseh*) – but secretly for fear of the Jews (*kekrummenos de dia ton fobon tohn Ioudaiohn*) – that he might take the body of Jesus away (*hina arehi to sohma tou Iehsou*).” *Kekrummenos* is an adverbial participle, telling **how** Joseph asked: He “asked **secretly**”. The verb is “asked”, and the adverb, “secretly”, applies to the verb. *Kekrummenos* combines with “Joseph asked” – not with “being a disciple”. If Joseph did not ask secretly, he might not have been able to take the body of Jesus away. “**Being**” – *ohn* is a participle that explains **reason**. How could Joseph ask? Joseph, “**being a disciple**” of Jesus, could ask.

If Joseph does not fear to be a disciple, **why is he afraid** then? He fears the Jews and their plans – which he obviously **knows**. They had no intention to bury Jesus respectfully. He had to **prevent** their plans to realise. He must see Pilate in

person and in private. No one must discover what he wanted to do. Wait till the Jews are gone. Then quickly enter. Fortunately it was relatively dark, the moon providing just enough light to see where he was going, but not to be conspicuous. The Jews never saw Joseph when he entered Pilate’s house. They knew nothing of his request or of Pilate’s braking contract with them. They had different plans. They did not realise that they lost Jesus. They were ignorant of what the providence of God had in stall for him. **They yet did not regret his burial** as they would before the morning of the Sabbath that followed this day.

#### 5.2.2.1.4.3.

##### **“Already Dead”, *Palai Apethanen***

And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead; and calling to the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. And knowing of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph.<sup>Mk.15:44</sup>

Pilate wondered if Jesus could have been dead **already** (*ehdeh tethnehken*) by the time Joseph asked. That implies that the time that elapsed since Jesus died till Joseph asked was relatively **short**. Arguments to the effect that Joseph buried Jesus **before sunset**, revert to this statement, “already”, for the assumption that after sunset would be too late for the in between period to be “short”. The point in time, in relation to which it is determined whether the period was short or long, is taken as sunset – **which is abstract**. Whether a period is long or short, in this case, should be determined against **the normal period of staying alive** for a person that has been crucified. This period could be several days. Against several days, say, six hours, is **just as justifiably a “short” time** as, say, two hours. The relative insignificant difference in **length of time**, is most significant in **implication though**, two hours implying that it was **day’s end**; six hours implying that it was **day’s beginning** “for quite a while already”.

Pilate asked the centurion if Jesus “had been dead for **long**” (*palai apethanen*), or, if Jesus had died “long ago”. The centurion answered affirmatively. Here the period can not be either short **or** long, because it is not a period of question, but a period of statement. Jesus **had** been dead for “**long**” when Joseph asked. If assumed Jesus were dead a “**short**” while, therefore Joseph must have had finished with the interment **before sunset, then, by the same logic**, if Jesus were dead a “**long**” while, it implies that Joseph asked for the body **after** sunset. The first supposition is based on Pilate’s conjecture. The second supposition is based on the centurion’s sure knowledge.

This argument underscores the finding in Par. 5.1.2 that *ehdeh* means “already” / “long since”. It means the same as *palai*. In the sense of a stated and factual occurrence, as in Mk.15:42, *ehdeh* means, “It was **well** into evening”. Mk.15:44 confirms that the time aspect of the **Aorist** in 15:42 indicates an accomplished ingressive, “punctiliar” transition from the previous afternoon into the current “evening”, “It **had** become evening” – “**already**”!

From Joseph’s action “When it was evening already”, it must be inferred that Jesus still **hung on the cross when it was late and well into the new day** of Preparation for the Sabbath, when Joseph arrived to take the body down and away to attend to it elsewhere. Joseph **finished** what he set out to do then, only by the **following** afternoon shortly before the Sabbath would start.

Joseph’s interview has a further implication – of the centurion’s **whereabouts** when giving the information about the relative time of Jesus’ death. **Where was the centurion** when Pilate “called” him? Was he at the cross, or in Pilate’s house or maybe in the barracks nearby? In Acts 23:17 a very similar situation is found, where

Paul “called unto him one of the centurions”, *proskalesamenos hena tohn hekatontarchohn*. The centurion called by Paul was not sent for. He most probably was inside the fort (*parembolehn*) where Paul was kept in safety. Paul’s nephew, “came and entered into” the fort, *paragenomenos kai eiselhohn eis*.<sup>16</sup> Joseph, like Paul’s nephew, “came”, *elhohn*, and “went in”, *eisehlthen*, (*proselthohn*, Matthew) into Pilate’s “palace”. (Pilate “went into” the praetorium after he judged Jesus, *eisehlthen eis to praetohrion*.) Enough indication is given to accept that **every** individual involved “entered” at some stage and was present inside the building. The centurion was near enough to be **summonsed immediately** to Pilate and be interrogated without waiting for him to be **fetched** from Calvary. Pilate learnt from the centurion in **person**. A **message** was not sent from Calvary. The centurion was not at Golgotha still. He was with Pilate.

Not one of the guard stayed at Calvary. The guard “**returned**”, “**fleeing**” (“chest beating”, “breathless”) from the cross. After the **catastrophes** the whole army had to be re-organised from Pilate’s quarters. It was some time after the **change of watch**. The soldiers, who were sent to brake the legs of the crucified, were a group who **knew not** that Jesus was dead already. Everything indicates that the centurion **could** not have been at Calvary still when Joseph arrived. Joseph entered Pilate’s house, asked permission, the centurion was consulted, and Joseph **could still catch up** with the soldiers sent to break the legs of the crucified, before “they came to Jesus”. The centurion was **available in no time** to answer to Pilate. One may assume Pilate “called the centurion” from easy proximity, which could not have been the site of crucifixion but most probably Pilate’s own house.

#### 5.2.2.1.5.1.

##### The Body “Delivered”

Matthew states that Pilate “commanded” that the body should be “delivered”, *ekeleusen apodohthelnai*. *Apodidohmi* could here imply that Pilate wanted to make amends to Joseph. (Compare Mt.5:26, 6:4 *et al*, where *apodidohmi* means to “repay”.) Did his conscience prick? Pilate wished Joseph to be accommodated as far as possible. It may be inferred that the centurion’s testimony influenced Pilate toward a sympathetic decision. The Authorised Version may be understood literally: Pilate “**delivered**” the body to Joseph. The soldiers were not only obliged by Pilate’s command to assist Joseph to **take down** the body, but also to “**bring**” it to be “delivered”, “where” Joseph, “handled” its preparation. The soldiers “brought” the body, but because Joseph is the responsible person, the verb is singular. Joseph is responsible for “taking away” the body after Pilate “**entrusted**” – *epetrepsen*, him with everything that would ensue [had Jesus been dead by then of course]. Joseph received authority to give directives to the soldiers for the removal of the body.

Pilate allowed Joseph to have Jesus’ body. Joseph could waste no time to get to the crosses because the soldiers were sent there already to break the legs of the crucified. This must not happen to Jesus. If there is one person that could possibly be the witness that related first hand to John when he wrote of the events that occurred at the crosses when Jesus’ side was pierced with a spear, **it was Joseph, and no other**. Least of all he who saw “these things that were done” could have been John. It could not have been John, because he left from the scene of the cross before noon and did not return. When “it was evening already”, John, who is not mentioned again in the story of Jesus’ passion, was nowhere near the cross of Jesus. **Joseph, when he came to take Jesus’ body off the cross, was eyewitness to the piercing of his side**. It is the most logical conclusion, and the most natural. Joseph is mentioned in the Gospels where he undertakes for Jesus’ burial. His discipleship, though unassuming, came a

long way as can be inferred from the references that introduce him to the reader. That he would wish to remain **anonymous** as witness is in keeping with the aptitude of this “*hidden servant of the Lord*”.<sup>Ryle</sup>

Joseph also was witness to a most **significant coincidence**. The legs of the two crucified next to Jesus were broken but not Jesus’. “That the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken”, is quoted from the Passover’s institutional injunctions of Ex.12:46 and Nmb.9:12 verbatim. Its significance for this investigation lies in the fact that this instruction is **not given for the slaughter** of the sacrifice. It is not said that no bone should be broken when the lamb is killed – that of course as well. It is said, **when eaten**, nothing should be left over and **no bone of the remains** should be broken. **But the evening after sunset was the “night to be solemnly observed”**. It was the time exclusively dedicated to the festal ritual of the Meal. **When eaten as solemn observance of this night, no bone of the sacrifice was to be broken**. Thus this reference to the fulfilment of Scripture in the passion of Jesus, suggests, indeed strongly indicates, that this Scripture was fulfilled to even the **relevant time** presupposed thereby. The time of fulfilment was **the night when “it was evening already”**.

Another Scripture, says John, was fulfilled that **night**, the Scripture of Zechariah 12:10. “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall **mourn** for him, as one mourneth for his **only son**, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his **firstborn**.” Who would not think of Ex.11:4-6, “Thus saith the Lord, About **midnight** will I go out into the midst of Egypt: And all the **firstborn** in the land of Egypt shall die ... And there shall be a **great cry** throughout all the land”. “Mourn” – “great cry”; “firstborn” – “firstborn” and “only son”; “midnight” – even like the “lamentation of Josiah” **after his death and day of battle**.<sup>2Chron.35:25</sup>

##### “By night”

**Tonight was not the first time** Nicodemus “came to Jesus by night”.<sup>Jn.19:39b</sup> He once before visited Jesus by night. He, this time, “brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound”.<sup>39c</sup> “Nicodemus who the first time came to Jesus by night” – <sup>Jn.19:39</sup> Herein the suggestion is contained that Nicodemus **this time as well**, came “by night”. Nicodemus is mentioned three times in the Gospel of John, chapter 3, 7:50, 8:2 and **each time**, the context indicates, directly, or by implication, that it was during night. The argument is **consistency**. For what other reason than that this time it **also** was by **night**, would John have mentioned that Nicodemus the first time came to Jesus by night? Then took they (he and Joseph) the body of Jesus and wound it in linen clothes (bought by Joseph) with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury”.<sup>40</sup>

#### 5.2.2.1.5.2.

##### Joseph Took the Body Down

Joseph “took down” the body – *kathelohn* “*kathaireoh*”.<sup>Mk.15:46 Lk.23:53</sup> If Joseph needed help with taking the body down, the soldiers were obliged to assist him – Pilate “commanded” (*ekeleusen*) the body “to be given” (*apodohthelnai*) to Joseph.<sup>Mt.27:58 Mk15:45 Jn.19:38</sup> Only John – on Joseph’s testimony – gives a glimpse of what occurred when the body was taken down. One of the soldiers pierced Jesus’ side when he saw that he was dead already. The others’ legs were broken. These preliminaries were done in order to **remove** the crucified from the crosses and of course to remove the crosses as such – an **extraordinary** exercise to comply with the Jews’ request. Jesus would have received the same fate as the other crucified, **had not Joseph**

“come” and taken the body down. When the body was freed from the cross, Joseph removed it from site. This is indicated in several ways.

### 5.2.2.1.5.3.

#### “Took Away the Body”, *Ehren*

The whole **objective** of the Jews’ request and Pilate’s granting of their request, was to have the **bodies and crosses removed**. Giving the body to Joseph **did not conflict** with this objective although it defeated the **Jews’** plans as it had Jesus in mind.

The word used for the action of removing of Jesus’ body is specific and in contrast with the words which describe the other actions taken by Joseph. He “takes down” (*kathelohn*) the body.<sup>Mk.15:46 Lk.23:53</sup> He subsequently “removes” it – *ehren* “*airoh*.”<sup>Jn.19:38</sup> Then he and Nicodemus “handled”, the body (*elabon* “*lambanoh*) Jn.19:40 Mt.27:59

#### Separate Localities

**Distance** between the different places where the first and preparatory events, and the second and completing event of the burial took place, can be discerned. Pilate “gave the body to Joseph”. Herein lies a sense of belonging and harbouring entrusted to Joseph. His abode would suit the purpose. Then another and **unfamiliar** location is introduced – “a sepulchre hewn out of rock”. Jesus’ body was brought from the cross to the harbour of “**entrustment**”, and brought again from there to the place of last “**deposit**”, the sepulchre.

Joseph, when he had “brought (Jesus) away”, went to a **third location** where he **bought the linen**. He then **returned** to the second one, where he and Nicodemus “treated” the body.

Nicodemus “arrived”, “**came**”, *ehlthen*, at the locality where he and Joseph “prepared” the body, *elabon*, plural. He did not – like Joseph – “arrive” at Calvary, the locality **from** where Jesus was “brought”, or, “taken”. Nicodemus “came”, or, “arrived”, **there**, “**where**” he and Joseph “treated”, or, “prepared” the body. “Nicodemus **also, kai**, arrived”. If Nicodemus arrived “as well”, it implies that Nicodemus arrived, **like** did **Joseph**. Joseph arrived, or, “came” to the place **from the cross** with the body.

“There **came** Nicodemus”. “Then treated they the body and wound it”. “Now **in the place where** he was crucified there was a garden and in the garden a new sepulchre. **There** laid they Jesus”. The adverbs, “where”, *hopou*,<sup>Jn.19:41</sup> “there”, *ekei*,<sup>42b</sup> “near”, *engus*,<sup>42b</sup> and the phrase “in the place”, *en tohi topohi*, all imply **movement between two places**. The first place is described as “where he was crucified”. “There was a garden in the place”. **The very insert that explains which garden** is meant – “the place **where he was crucified**”, is intended to distinguish it, not in itself, but from the place **where he was “handled”** by Joseph and Nicodemus in order to be prepared for burial. The second place is where Joseph “took him away” to. In that place Nicodemus joined Joseph. There they “treated” the body. The tomb in the garden, “**was near**”,<sup>42b</sup> **the place where Joseph and Nicodemus prepared** the body, “according to the ethics of the Jews”.

The tomb is said to have been “in the garden where they crucified Jesus”. **This already says** that the tomb was near to the site of crucifixion – **but secluded**. (Refer Par. 5.2.2.5, p. 167) To **repeat in so many words** that “it was near”, would be unnecessary. In view of the compactness of the narrative, waste of words must be ruled out. The phrase “there laid they Jesus” (referring to the tomb), indicates **relevant** “nearness” – **relative** to the locality **implied by the last mentioned action**, which was the “preparation” of Jesus’ body for interment – “**to be buried**”. Much else

also occurred before the last mentioned action of preparation of the body. The phrase, “Because the tomb was near”, exclusively and as **only possibility**, refers to the grave’s nearness to “**where**” Nicodemus “**arrived**” (at Joseph’s place), and “**where**” “they **prepared** the body”. It was **from here**, “near” to the grave, that the women “**followed after**” to see how Joseph “laid the body”.<sup>Lk.23:55 Jn.19:42c</sup> And it was **from** the grave that the women, on Friday afternoon before preparation of their spices and the “preparations of the Jews”,<sup>Jn.19:42</sup> “**returned home**”.<sup>Lk.23:56</sup>

*Airoh* in Jn.19:38, *ehren*, indicates **Joseph’s** own deed of “taking away” Jesus from the cross. **He** “fetched” the body. Joseph does this before “Nicodemus came there also” – “came” – to where Joseph “brought”, or, “took the body away” to. After Nicodemus “arrived there”, **they**, the two, “took”, or, “handled”, that is, “treated”, or “prepared” the body. Two locations are implied, the first, the place **from** which Joseph took the body away – the cross; the second, the place **to** “where” he and Nicodemus attended to it further. Distance in between these places is implied. **Time** in between is implied.

In Luke, **all this** is taken up in the **single** action of Joseph: “He took it down and wrapped it”. In the Greek the emphasis is in the “wrapping”: “Taking it down – *kathelohn* (participle), he wrapped it”, *enetulicsen* (predicate). The whole procedure is ascribed to Joseph only. Joseph initiated and undertook. The burial was Joseph’s deed. In this, however, it may not be assumed that **any number of persons** could have partaken in the procedure of the burial. The whole of each narrative is not general, but **specific as to whom** the partakers were. Nicodemus’ participation is mentioned. It implies **no more** than **his** participation. In the Synoptists the women are mentioned. Their **names** are given specifically. **No other** women were there. The interment is mentioned to have resulted “*without opposition or objection*”, (Ryle) which implies the **absence of Jews**. The Roman soldiers are not heard of again after Joseph has taken the body down. They were appointed at the grave only the Saturday morning, which implies their absence at the grave **any time earlier**. *Airoh* means that Joseph took Jesus’ body “**away**” from Golgotha to the place where he and Nicodemus “prepared” it for burial “to the custom of the Jews”.

*Airoh* in Jn.19:38 means the same as in 20:13, 15, “(Mary) saith unto them, Because they have taken away – *ehran*, my Lord”. “(Mary), supposing (Jesus) to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have **borne him hence** (*ebastasas*), tell me **where** thou hast laid him, and I will **take him away** – *aroh*. ***Airoh* and *bastadzoh* are used synonymously, meaning, “to take away from one to another place”.**

In Mk.6:29, Mt.14:12, John the Baptist’s “disciples came and took up the body and buried it”, *ehran to ptohma kai ethapsan auton*. John was beheaded while he was in prison. His disciples certainly didn’t “take up” AV his body “and buried it” there, neither in terms of location nor in terms of time, immediately. The meaning is the disciples “transported” the body **elsewhere** where they afterwards buried John. It is all implied in the two verbs used, “to take up”, and “to bury”.

Everything needs not to have happened on Herod’s birthday.<sup>Mt.14:6</sup> Mark says that Herod “made supper”, “when a convenient day was come”,<sup>6:21</sup> implying a party of several days. His daughter requested John’s head “by and by”,<sup>25</sup> meaning “soon”, implying not necessarily the same day. “But”, Mark says,<sup>27</sup> although he could have waited with the decapitation, “the king **immediately** sent an executioner”. The man was worried and wanted the thing behind him as quickly as possible. Mark ends the pericope, “When (John’s) disciples (*mathehtai*) heard of it, they came and took up his corpse and laid it in a tomb”.<sup>29</sup> A new subject is introduced in verse 30 when “The apostles (*apostoloi*) met with Jesus at a “deserted place”. These are Jesus’ disciples,

who “told him all, both what they had done, and what they had taught”. They didn’t tell Jesus about John’s death. It seems very likely that what Jesus, according to Matthew, “listened” to <sup>Mk.4:3, 33 Mt.4:24 Lk.19:48 Jn.8:45, 47</sup> (while “hearing he departed”), was the apostles’ – the “teachers’ ” – report, of “their teaching”. <sup>Jh.12:38 Ro.10:16</sup> Jesus did not “hear of it”, John’s death. “Of it” is supplied. Jesus grieved not John’s death – he showed compassion with the people. Jesus then taught the people. <sup>34</sup> When it “got late” on this day, <sup>35</sup> his disciples wanted Jesus to send the people away. <sup>36</sup> Matthew’s reference in 14:15, after telling of John’s death and burial, “When it was evening”, indicates the beginning of another day that occurred an indefinite period after or before the event that in context precedes it. While in the case of John’s death and burial there is no evidence of his burial to have taken place the same day before sunset, there are indications to the contrary – his body’s “removal” and interment implying distance, time and organisation. Nothing less can be found in the instance of Jesus’ death and interment. Only indications to the effect are more and clearer.

What *airoh* means in the case of John’s burial, it means in the case of Jesus’ burial – “to dispatch”, “transport”, or, “to take away”. Jesus was not “taken” or “handled” in the perimeters of the cross. He would afterwards be **brought back** – to the **vicinity** of the cross – **to the garden** where both the cross **and the tomb** were. Jesus was brought back to this “garden”. “Garden” in the sense of agricultural land, like an olive orchard. It was no garden for esthetical purpose but **rough terrain** not suitable to “handle” (*lambanoh*) a body for funeral. Jesus’ body was brought back to the garden, “near” to the place his body was “made ready” for interment. He was brought back to “where”, incidentally, stood the crosses **the day before**. (They were now removed on Pilate’s orders.) The phrase “where he was crucified” thus **recalls** something that is **past**, over and gone. It is yet “another of John’s parentheses”. The actual occurrence going on **today**, in the same locality, is of quite a different nature than of the occurrence of yesterday.

*Airoh* does not simply mean “to take” in the way *lambanoh* is usually interpreted in this instance. Joseph didn’t “take” the body down, *kathelohn*, to simply “take” it, *ehren*, to again simply “take” it, *lambanoh*, in order to “bury” it. Each word should receive its **contextual meaning**, which, in each case, is **significant**.

#### 5.2.2.1.5.4.

##### **“Treated”, *Lambanoh***

To “take”, *lambanoh*, in its context, means **more** than merely to “take hold of”. For example, “to take” a woman, means to **marry** her. <sup>Lk.20:29</sup> “Taking” oil, the wise maidens **filled** their lamps. <sup>Mt.25:4</sup> To “take” the Holy Spirit is actually to **receive**. <sup>Jn.20:22</sup> To “take” the Holy Spirit. Jesus by “taking” the vinegar he was offered, **“tasting”** it, refused it. <sup>Jn.19:30</sup> cf. Mk.15:36-37 But Jesus “instead”, *ho de*, expired. <sup>Mt.27:34, 48, 50</sup>

*Lambanoh* is used in the context of Joseph’s undertakings, **only** in connection with the **actual treatment** of the body. <sup>Mt.27:59 Jn.19:40</sup> It **involved the wrapping and embalming**, and one could very well imagine that there was more to the care of the body than to unceremoniously wrap it with spices in the sheets. Jesus’ body was inflicted many wounds and bruises during his ordeal. It had to be washed and treated properly before it could be wrapped in sheets. It was an intricate and delicate procedure accompanied with elaborate ritual “**to the prescriptions** -‘ethics’, *kathohs ethos*, of the Jews to bury”. Jn.19:40 Here is a definition of the nature of the “handling” or “taking” of Jesus’ body. These men did it “as the manner of the Jews is to bury”. It was a very careful and ceremonial **homage** paid to the deceased. It was the meaningful and **orderly** ritual of salving and embalming, avowal, mourning,

condolences, prayers and procession. The traditional opinion of a hurry-scurry get over with, allows for no suitable location, no suitable time, no suitable procedure, and no suitable aptitude for the thing the Gospels describe as Jesus’ burial. In his burial God’s glorifying of Jesus begins to show forth openly. He was buried. That in itself was something wonderful. The way He was buried was even more against expectation. He would be buried, not only by the rich and honoured, but **in the way** of the rich and honoured among the Jews. And his grave, eventually, would be among the honoured and rich, and would never have been used before. Prophecy is again come true in the passion and death of Jesus. It was not an occasion where time dictated and the occasion lost against it.

Joseph took much pains to purchase “fine linen”, and Nicodemus brought hundred pounds of precious spices! **The quality of the “treatment” in terms of “handling” was in keeping with the quality and quantity of the materials of both linen and spices and oils. Room – to corresponding quality – is implied for such treatment. Then, time, to quality and quantity, fitted the occasion.** The place and time for doing these preparations certainly was not on the ground virtually under the feet of a barbarous crowd – as it is implied by the traditional view. The implicit place and occasion where Joseph of Arimathea would “handle” the body, was, being a man of means, **where he stayed** in Jerusalem or where he might have camped outside Jerusalem for the Passover. (It probably was not far from the same piece of land where his property of the “new grave” was.) Here he brought Jesus’ body to be “treated” as it should. He has already proved by obtaining the body that he could overcome any obstacle. He disposed of every necessity for a proper burial, and was going to use it. If anything lacked, he would not hesitate to do something about it. He had no linen. O yes, There was linen, but not fine linen, not good enough linen. Not linen never used for anyone else before – like his new grave he was going to give for Jesus, “where never one was laid”. So he set out to find “fine” linen. “But there is no trader available at this time of night”, he might have reminded himself. *‘I’ll wake one from sleep. This is no ordinary matter. If he wants payment later, then I’ll pay him later. But Jesus must be buried today – the law permits burial on the Passover Feast Day and thus demands necessities to be made available. If I keep putting off, the Sabbath might find me with uncompleted duty. Sabbath will also be Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering – then the law permits it not that the dead be buried.’* Joseph returned with the linen. On his way to buy linen, or perhaps even before he went to ask Pilate for the body, he contacted Nicodemus. *‘Meet me at my tent and come help me with Jesus.’* (When Joseph “entered unto Pilate” he acted in faith stronger than even his courage. He **believed** that Pilate would grant his request and that he **certainly** was going to bury Jesus.) “And indeed Nicodemus came there” (*kai de*). Jn.19:39a

#### 5.2.2.1.6.1.

##### **Only Joseph?**

The verb *ehren* is **singular** – only Joseph “brought” Jesus to his place. Again the soldiers could have helped – they were obliged to. The singular verb indicates that Joseph, even with help from the soldiers, was **solely responsible** for bringing Jesus’ body away from the cross and to his abode. This must also have been the guard’s last presence at the cross. The soldiers and the guard are not heard of again till a watch is **newly appointed at the grave** on **Saturday** morning. If the body had been taken down while everybody else was present, they surely would have co-operated and it would not have been recorded that Joseph only did it. “They” would have taken down, and the verb would have been plural.

John says that “they”, plural, “prepared the body” – Joseph and Nicodemus. But in all the Gospels it is said that only Joseph – singular – “took the body down” and “removed” it. If John had been with Joseph, or the women, these verbs would have been in the plural, for they without doubt would have co-operated with Joseph. The fact that the singular occurs has literal implication – **only Joseph was responsible** for taking down and removing the body. And this implication has the further unavoidable implication, that the cross was desolated, from “everybody returned”, till the soldiers and Joseph “arrived” to “remove” the crosses and the bodies. They returned “because it was the Preparation”, and “evening already”.

Joseph asks for the body on his own. Only he as responsible person takes it down and removes it – all singular verbs. Only Joseph is eyewitness to the piercing of Jesus’ side. Later Joseph’s only helper “came (there)”. Then they, he and Nicodemus, “handle” the body, “treating” it to “Jewish ethics”. They “wrap” it – with the view “to bury” the body in Joseph’s new grave. The only explanation for the plural in John is that Joseph and Nicodemus were responsible for the preparation of the body for interment. There is only one explanation for the singular in the Synoptists for the different procedures of preparation for burial of the body where John has the plural. They do not mention Nicodemus’ collaboration. They do mention the women – who had no part in the preparation of the body for entombment.

Neither the women, nor John, could have been present with the taking down and removal of the body. Neither of them could have been present when the body was prepared for interment. In all the Gospels their absence in person and action in the narration of these events is as obvious as the absence of the names. The women’s absence during these procedures, and their presence at the entombment – while still the absence of John or any other is as obvious as before – imply another occasion after passage of the night following the day of crucifixion.

#### 5.2.2.1.6.2.

##### Condensed History

In John, “treatment” of the body is qualified by three factors. It is described as **the wrapping, with spices, in linen sheets**, which procedure was executed “as the manner among the Jews is to bury” – *kathohs ethos estin tois Ioudaiois entafiadzein*. But this verse can be divided in another way by treating the phrase “as the manner among the Jews is to bury”, as a parenthesis – as John is accustomed to do. Then the procedure had this meaning: “They took the body of Jesus and wound it in linen clothes with the spices **to bury (it)** (as the manner among the Jews is).” The “treatment” was **with the view** “to bury” and “according to the custom of the Jews”.

John’s “treatment” (*lambanoh*), is in the other Gospels expressed with the words to “take down”, and “wrap”. Mark sees the final ritual – in view of the interment as such – the **enfolding** of the body in linen, as the main and **encompassing act** of everything that followed from the moment Pilate “gave the body to Joseph”. In **three words**, he **summarises** the **whole** history between Pilate’s granting of the body and readiness for interment of the body. “And (Joseph), **buying** (*agorasas*) a piece of fine linen, **taking him down** (*kathelohn*), **he wrapped** him (*eneilehsen*) in the linen, and deposited him in a tomb hewn out of rock.” Mk.15:46

Mark says, “**buying linen**”, then, “taking the body down”. Mark should not be held to a strict historic sequence. Naturally Joseph would not have taken the body down and left it under the cross and then went to buy linen. He also would not obtain permission to have the body and then leave it on the cross first in order to buy linen. He could not have left the body on the cross in any case because the soldiers would have taken it down and would have removed it, as Pilate guaranteed the Jews. The

actions of buying and taking down are not recorded in the indicative, but as **adjectival participles**. He had to buy linen and remove the body – **in whatever sequence** – before he could enfold it in linen. **Consecutive** actions are distinguished with the body “**treated**” and “**wrapped**”. In **John 19:40** the verbs reflect actual sequence. Both “treated” and “wrapped” are finite verbs in the indicative. They are significant as independent and representative actions. The implication of the fact (in Mark) that Joseph had to take the body down, **and**, had to buy linen first in order to bury Jesus – makes them **simultaneous** actions irrespectively. Joseph had to “bring” / “remove” the body **to safekeeping** before he could leave it to go buy linen. The body was not left on the site of the crosses.

Matthew follows Mark in **comprehensive brevity**. Mark uses three words to sum up the whole. Matthew uses **only two**: Joseph “preparing (*labohn*) the body wrapped (*enetulicsen*) it in a pure linen cloth”. Then it was “placed”, *ethelken*, in his new tomb. Luke **reduces all** – from the procurement of the body to its finished preparation – to the **single** word: “This man (Joseph) taking down the body (*kathelohn*) (from the cross) he **wrapped** it (*enetulicsen*) with linen. And then he placed it in a new tomb”. Lk.23:54

**Every** event in the process of burial is not mentioned in any **one** Gospel – and not every preparatory measure will be found in **all** the Gospels collectively. Only John records the use of spices. Only Luke records the women who “followed after”. Only Mark records the purchase of the linen. Only he and Matthew name the women who were sitting at the grave.

**In all it must be concluded and conceded that an undertaking is presupposed by all the authors of the Gospels which cannot be judged to its length in time from the very economic use of words with which they describe it. It cannot be decided from the brevity of recording that it took almost no time to bury Jesus. Much is indeed implied by every word.**

According to any of the theories that Jesus was buried before sunset, at best one hour is allowed for the burial. The Jews’ preparations were to be finished at least an hour before sunset – that is, five o’clock. Jesus died at three o’clock. The Jews were admitted to Pilate first. Then Joseph entered. Joseph could do nothing before permission was granted. **Could these visits be within one hour only?** In the case of the Jews’ visit, time consuming discussion may be expected. In the case of Joseph’s request the same might be expected. Then perhaps one hour remained for the interment. **No matter how hasty it was undertaken it would have been impossible** to buy linen and to finish the preparation of the body and the interment before five o’clock. Before five the women’s preparations of spices had to be finished as well as their usual preparations for the Sabbath – which was unusual because of the High Day. Any before-sunset interpretation requires two prerequisites. Every bit of information of a proper procedure for burial (and there is more than enough), and every implication contrary to a before-sunset interpretation (and there are a lot) must **summarily be discarded**. Every element indispensable for the statement of the before-sunset interpretation, like great haste and the end of day nearing, must **arbitrarily be assumed**.

#### 5.2.2.1.6.3.

##### “As the Manner of the Jews is to Bury” On the Passover Feast Sabbath?

Would Joseph do **purchases on the Day of Passover Feast?** The answer is not difficult to give. The traditional view that dates the crucifixion and burial on the Passover Feast Day of 15th Nisan, has to answer the same question. The burial could

be undertaken on the Passover Feast Day because it was **an exceptional instance due to the coincidence of feast days**. In any case a burial would **not be classified as “menial labour”**, “servile work”, or work for profit making which was forbidden on the Day of Passover. According to Ex.12:16 “no work” was allowed on the first day of the Eating of unleavened Bread. It was “an holy convocation”. But at the same time the remainder of the offering was instructed to be burned on the day after the meal – the next day of the 15th Nisan, “The First Day of Eating Unleavened Bread”. To remove any doubt, the later prescriptions Lv.23:7 prohibits “labour of profession” – labour at a price and common on ordinary days – thus **allowing exceptional and necessary work**. According to Dt.33:3 Israel actually on the 15th Nisan Feast Sabbath moved out of Egypt with all their might – a very laborious task. The night of the 15th was the specific holy part of the Passover Sabbath to be “observed stringently”. During this night Israel had to wait on the Lord. The following day they had to act on his command.

Would Joseph do purchases in the **night**? The answer again is not difficult. (See Par. 5.1.2.2.) The traditional view is that Joseph bought linen while the body was left at Calvary while the Jews and the crowd were at the site of crucifixion. He then buried Jesus immediately and in their presence. How was Jesus’ body not removed while the soldiers came to do just that and found Jesus dead already? Nothing but Joseph’s mandate could have prevented them. If Joseph left the body on the ground under the cross, the traditional view must explain how that was possible and how that was not recorded in the Gospels. It also has to answer how Joseph managed to bury Jesus without interference from the Jews or even their knowing it.

Any interpretation as would Joseph have buried Jesus after sunset Friday *Afrikaanse Bybelkommentaar: Melito’s Paschal Ode* must explain how Joseph bought linen on the Sabbath and how he buried Jesus on the Sabbath, because that was not permitted under any circumstance. It was not allowed because it was the Sabbath. The women could **not even balm** the body on the Sabbath with the spices they have already had prepared for the purpose on Friday afternoon, but had to wait for the First Day. <sup>Lk.23:54-56 Mk.16:1-2</sup> Burial on this Sabbath was also not allowed because it was the Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering, symbolising the **resurrection of life**. Jesus **had** to be buried the Friday despite the fact that it was Passover Feast Day, because the **Sabbath followed**, and that Sabbath at the same time was the day of First Sheaf Wave Offering, 16th Nisan. Jesus also had to be buried the Friday, not despite the fact, but because of the fact that it was Passover Feast Day. Passover Feast Day followed the night of exodus from Egypt when Israel ate the Passover. Next day what remained of the sacrifice was burned. <sup>Ex.12:10 Nmb.28:25 Dt.16:4</sup> Jesus as the sinless Lamb of God, would not be burned, but would suffer hell – would be “in the HEART of the earth as it were – and be buried, on the day of Passover Feast, 15th Nisan. As the paschal offer’s remains were burned “the next day”, Christ was buried on the next day. It had to be that way. Joseph would not have buried Jesus on any other day.

As the scene at the grave clearly could not have had anything in common with the scene of the crucifixion, it clearly could not have occurred during night. The description of the interment is vividly one of a **daytime event**. It ended before sunset, and could not begin on crucifixion day that extended during night till the following afternoon. The crucifixion and interment with their contributory events and actions, therefore had to have been two occasions of consecutive days. After the interment the women “returned”. Their “return” could impossibly have been the same as the first mentioned return after the crucifixion, because, if so, Joseph had to go to Pilate to ask for the body after he had already buried it.

### 5.2.2.2.

#### “That Day Was the Preparation”

The expression, “**that day**”, is always used as a retrospective or prospective reference to a past or future event or time. In Jn19:31 *ekeinos e.g.* 'ekeinos' refers to the day that has just started and at that moment still lay ahead -- was then prospective. The time and the day on which reference is made to the day or event referenced, **naturally cannot be identical**. It's like that in any language. We shall party after a rugby game won, until after twelve o'clock, and say, What a game have we had ‘today’ while actually the game was on the day before! A year after we shall recall that party and say, What a party we had ‘that day’ while the party actually was on the day after! So will the historic context determine which time or event actually is spoken of or referred to. The grammar does not literally determine the real facts; the style, idiomatically does. The matter is one of Stilistics, not of Grammar or Syntax. Nevertheless 'ekeinos' is a Demonstrative Pronoun, which explains any difficulties; it does not cancel out Grammatical sense.

#### 5.2.2.2.1.

##### The Body “Laid”

Luke concludes the narrative of the burial with an important observation: “The women, (of) the same who arrived with him from Galilee, **following** behind, saw the tomb and how his body was laid.” 23:55 The “following”, in this case, was not the “following” of Jesus while he ministered in Galilee. It also was not the women’s “following” behind as part of the crowd through Jerusalem and towards Golgotha. And, most emphatically, **it was not a “following” of the women behind Joseph when he “came” and “took away” the body of Jesus** (and, as it is claimed, immediately brought it to the tomb and laid it down therein.) **This is traditional fancy. This is one of the most glaring distortions by which the traditional view wants to create the impression of the completion of Jesus’ burial before sunset.** It has already been shown how the women **left the scene** of Jesus’ crucifixion with everybody else who “assembled”, “there”, and “saw”, “these things”. They were no longer at the cross when Joseph arrived there to take down the body. They also did not follow Joseph there. Luke has stated in 23:49 that “the women who followed him from Galilee stood afar off (from the cross), beholding these things (**happening at the cross**)”. Why would Luke again mention the “women which came with him from Galilee” if it had been the same occurrence? He would not have mentioned them a second time had it not been a second event. Why would Luke again, in verse 55, say that the women saw the grave and how the body was laid **if in the first instance** it was the grave they saw and how his body was laid, as allegedly implied by the pronoun *tauta*, “these things”? <sup>23:49</sup> Critics who want to keep a façade of seriousness, explain with “*different traditions*”, “*duplications*” and “*hallucinations of the Gospel writers*”, anything possible and impossible but to reject the idea that it was the same day these two situations occurred on. With the **burial**, “the women” were there – not “his **acquaintance** and the (“many”) women” who were at the crucifixion. At the crucifixion the **crowd** was there. The **crowd** was ‘nt there when Jesus was buried. The women were “**sitting**” – not “standing” – when Jesus was buried. They were “**in front of**” – not “afar off”. It was the **grave** they were at – not the cross, “seeing” the grave and how Joseph **laid** the body – not how he went to ask Pilate, and not how Jesus surrendered the spirit. The women “**followed** behind” to the grave. **Cf. Acts 16:17** They “followed” **in procession** after Joseph and Nicodemus to the grave, any time during Friday. At the grave, it might be assumed on grounds of the “**Jewish custom**”, <sup>Jn.19:40</sup> a service was held. Scriptures were read and prayers and songs were offered in

worship on the occasion. Nothing spectacular. No unlawful assembly of more than two males. Quiet, peaceful. It was a most solemn day. When they “returned”, it was reluctantly. Joseph, “having rolled a great stone in the door of the sepulchre”, “departed” Mt.27:60 for “preparation” for “that High Sabbath’s Day”. Jn.19:31 And the women “returned”, to make “preparations of spices and ointments” and the other “preparations of the Jews”. Lk.23:56 Jn.19:42

**SUMMARY**  
**Old Testament Symbolism**

**Haste** was of the essence of the Exodus **while in, Egypt**. With the remains of the lamb, the People left Egypt – in fact, were “carried” out, by the hand of God. “All that night”, and all the morning following, the People “moved out”! But by midday they at Succot, stopped, pitched tent, made fire, burned the remains of the lamb, and for the first time baked, and **ate** of unleavened bread, and **rested**.

For that reason, this day, 15 Nisan, became known and observed as “The Feast” and a “Sabbath” – the Sabbath “of Passover” – indeed, sometimes indicated as, “The Passover”.

With every aspect of this the typical – as in the Gospels illustrated – the Type, **agreed!** It **had to**, because so **God**, “**ordained**”!

We, are not **allowed**, to expect any different in the story of Jesus’ fulfilling of God’s Passover.

**Par. 5.2.2.2.2.**  
**The Women At The Grave**

Luke 23		Matthew 27		Mark 15		John 19	
Crucifixion	Burial	Crucifixion	Burial	Crucifixion	Burial	Crucifixion	Burial
27							
Followed Him a great company of people and women who bewailed and lamented him		55		40			
		Many women who followed Jesus from Galilee		Also women			
49	55						
His acquaintance and the women (that followed Him from Galilee)	Women who came with Him out of Galilee	(who followed Jesus from Galilee)					
			followed (Joseph)	61	were (there)	47	25
stood far seeing these things	They beheld the sepulchre and how his body was laid	were there from far beholding	Sitting over against the sepulchre	were (there) from far looking on	They saw where he was laid	(There) stood about the cross	(to) the garden sepulchre
		56 among whom was	there were	41 among whom was			42
		Mary Magdalene	Mary Magdalene	Mary Magdalene	Mary Magdalene	Mary Magdalene	
		Mary mother of James and Joses	and the other Mary	Mary mother of James and Joses	and Mary of Joses	Mary, wife of Clopas	
		Mother of Zebedee’s children		and Salome who followed and served Him in Galilee		His mother’s sister	
				and many other who came up with him to Jerusalem			26
						Jesus’ mother standing by disciple	
48	56						because of Jews’ preparation
all returned chest beating	They returned and prepared						

**5.2.2.2.3.**  
**Two Women**

Certain women “who came with him from Galilee”, “beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid”, says **Luke 23:55**. **Mark** mentions the same actions



recorded by Luke, and he supplies the **names** of the women whose actions it was as well, “**Mary Magdalene and Mary of Joses** beheld where he was laid”.<sup>15:47</sup> **Matthew** describes how Joseph “laid” the body “in his new tomb” while “there was **Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary**, sitting over against the sepulchre”.<sup>27:61</sup> **John** possibly implies the **women’s** presence and participation in the proceedings of the Friday afternoon at the grave in the phrase, “There laid **they** Joseph and Nicodemus) Jesus because of the Jews’ preparations”. John may have used the plural with also the women in mind. And the **women’s** preparations of spices and ointments may as well be classed as “preparations of the **Jew’s** (custom to bury)”.<sup>19:42, 40</sup> Thus in all the Gospels the presence of women at the interment can be found or inferred.

Luke mentions women “who **followed** him from Galilee”.<sup>23:27</sup> This “**following**” most probably started when Jesus left Galilee for Bethany<sup>Jn.12:1</sup> **on his last pilgrimage** to the Passover Feast. Just after six o’clock on the Preparation of the Passover, “a great company of people and women who bewailed and lamented him”, assembled behind Jesus and Simon who carried the cross. The women who accompanied Jesus from Galilee “to Jerusalem”<sup>Mk15:41</sup> for Passover, mingled with the crowd. At the cross they “stood far, seeing these”.<sup>Lk23:49</sup> When Jesus had died, “all returned”,<sup>48</sup> “And his acquaintance and the women”<sup>49</sup> returned as everybody else did. Then “**evening came**”.<sup>Mk15:42 Mt.27:57</sup> **Next day only** certain women “followed”<sup>Lk23:55</sup> Joseph to “the garden tomb”.<sup>Jn.19:41</sup> “They beheld the sepulchre and how his body was laid.”<sup>Lk23:55</sup> “They returned home and prepared spices and ointments.”<sup>56</sup>

**Who were these women?** They “followed” Jesus from when he set out on his journey “from Galilee”.<sup>49</sup> But so did “many other”,<sup>Mt.27:55</sup> “a great company”<sup>Lk.23:27</sup> – men and women. Luke, however, supplies information that distinguishes the **women at the grave**. He says, they “followed Him **out of Galilee**”. They weren’t followers of Jesus only from this last trip “to Jerusalem”,<sup>Mk15:41c Lk.23:27, 49 Mt.27:55</sup> but they were followers of Jesus when he **came** to Galilee and **while** he ministered “**in Galilee**”,<sup>Mk.15:41b</sup> and they **stayed** with him when he **left** Galilee for the last time. Refer Part Three, *Pentecost to Paul, 3, Gospels*, on Jesus’ ministry in Galilee. While at the cross, Luke describes them as being “bystanders” (*heistehkeisan*) “**in the outer circle**” (*apo makrothen*)<sup>49</sup> of the crowd. But, “sitting over against the grave”<sup>Mt.27:61</sup> “they beheld”<sup>Lk.23:55</sup> from so **nearby they could see** “how his body was laid” in the sepulchre.

Mark also discerns carefully. These women, who Luke says, came with Jesus **from within and out of** Galilee, not only followed Jesus shortly before his death “from Galilee”. They were not only **while journeying** “**servicing**” – present participle according to Matthew 27:55 – but they were established followers and accepted deaconesses. “They **followed and served** him”, Mark says, “**all the time**”! – Imperfect Indicative. They were “those who served and followed all the while **when He was in Galilee**”, *hai hote ehn en tehi Galilaiai ehkolouthoun autohi kai diehkonoun autohi*.<sup>15:41</sup> “In Galilee” they served, when “out of Galilee” He came “to Jerusalem”. Mark makes his statement for the books: “**These were Mary Magdalene, the mother of James and Joses, and Salome**”. Matthew audits Mark’s part, clarifying a little: “There were **many women** who (*haitimes*) followed him from Galilee looking on from far”,<sup>27:55</sup> but, “**among whom**” (*en hai*) were<sup>27:56 Mk.15:40-41</sup> Mary Magdalene, Mary of James and Joses, **and the mother of Zebedee’s children**”. John makes it more familiar: Mary Magdalene, Mary, wife of Clopas and **Jesus’ mother’s sister** (Salome)”.<sup>27:56</sup>

**Three Gospels** mention these women by name being **present** at Christ’s **crucifixion**. They are **named** at the crucifixion. They are named again in the same section of two of these Gospels. Are they mentioned **again** while they **still** were at the

scene of the **crucifixion**? **Why** would they be named again while, according to tradition, the **time** was just a little later on the **same afternoon**, the “**place** where he was crucified”, virtually the **same**,<sup>Jn.19:41</sup> the people, **all**, the **same**, and circumstances, **unchanged**? **Why** would it be said that they “**followed there**”<sup>Lk.23:27</sup> only to **repeat** that they “followed”<sup>55</sup> there? **Why** would it be noted that they “returned”,<sup>Lk.23:56</sup> again, if, it was **just after**, “all returned”?<sup>48</sup> And – they never came **back**? **Why** would it be noted that the women, when at the crucifixion, that they “**stood**”, “watching **these things**”, “from far”,<sup>Mt.27:55</sup> <sup>49</sup> – things of the crucifixion and Jesus’ death **generally**, but, **at the grave**, that they were “**sitting**”, “**over against**”,<sup>Mt.27:61</sup> and “saw”, **specifically**, first, “the sepulchre”, and, second, “how his body was laid”, if it had been the same event, place, people and time? **Why** would John record **Jesus’ mother’s and John’s** presence at his cross, but fail to notice their presence at the grave? It all makes no sense. But had it been **two occasions of two days**, it makes complete sense.

Different events on consecutive days also explain why the women are **twice named**, and, **differently** named. Why were they named twice if only **one instance in time**? If only one instance in time, Friday afternoon, how could **three** women be named present at the crucifixion while at the interment **only two** are named? There were **no other** women but the two mentioned at the grave. **Two Gospels name these women**, the one, Matthew, dependant on the other, Mark. But Matthew also uses independent sources. If Mark were wrong, Matthew would have supplied the correct information, one might presume. Or, if Matthew were wrong, Mark is the oldest and shortest text, and therefore would have had the correct information, one might also presume. But Mark and Matthew perfectly **agree** on who the women at the grave were when Joseph buried Jesus. There **can** be no doubt. If one accepts the Gospels as witnesses of the truth telling the truth as it is in Jesus, then **these two** women were there and **no** other. There are **two witnesses** to it. So the matter is beyond dispute. And that implies situations **separated** by the history of an actual and real death of Christ, of an actual and real negotiation for his body by Joseph and actual and real passage of time accurately and as trustworthy **recorded**. **If the Gospels proclaim Christ’s death and resurrection for truth**, they proclaim it for **reality** – physically true **facts**. And indications and statements of **time** in this history are of the **same nature and credibility**.

When the women are again referred to immediately after the Sabbath, Mk.6:1 names the **three** women. When Luke mentions them where they returned from the sepulchre, the two **Marys** are mentioned by name. “Other women” are said to have accompanied them. Thus Salome most probably would have been included with “the rest”, *hai loipai*.<sup>24:10</sup> **If the individuals are not the same, the whole occasion is another**. Only the two women are mentioned at the **entombment** of Jesus’ body on Friday afternoon – **with no possibility** to infer another person as in the case of Lk.24:10. Three are mentioned as this special group “among” the others at the **crucifixion, and after the resurrection** – but two at the interment – which implies **different days** on which burial and crucifixion took place.

**Salome** was one of the three “deaconesses”,<sup>Mk.15:41b</sup> who “stood”<sup>Lk.23:49</sup> “about the cross”.<sup>Jn.19:25</sup> But her name is missing among those attending the entombment. The fact that she is not mentioned implies that she was not there. Wenham suggests that she left with Mary and John before Jesus died. That may be possible. But that “*This fits the unexplained disappearance of Salome in Matthew’s and Mark’s accounts of the burial*” and is “*a good example of an undesigned coincidence ... corroborating both the Johannine and the Synoptic accounts*”, is an unwarranted

conclusion. John mentions no womanly participation directly at the burial, and Salome's absence at the burial is meaningless in regard to "corroboration" between John and the Synoptists. However, the fact that John mentions **no** women, and the Synoptists **only** the **Marys**, supplies an "undesigned coincidence corroborating both the Johannine and the Synoptic accounts" in so far as **it implies the absence of any other** women or men but Joseph and Nicodemus at the interment. John, "returning to witness the end", for example, or, Jesus' mother being "there till the very end", is ruled out by the **apparent absence** of their names or phrases allegedly allowing any such corollary. **Salome's** absence is not supposed as the vague possibility that she might have left with John and Mary, but is **literally implied** in that she "**left**" with "everybody" and the whole "crowd" who were at the crucifixion, and didn't return or wasn't involved again and wasn't mentioned again until after the Sabbath, thus to have been absent at the grave because the interment occupied another day.

**Why** is Salome not at Jesus' interment? Is an independent source that overlooked her name used? Then why did Matthew not notice it? Luke also refers to the two **Marys** only in 24:10, but not in the same context – after the resurrection. **He uses an appendage** that allows for **supposing** Salome's attendance. No such room for conjecture appears in Mark and Matthew's account of the women's attendance at the interment. If Mary Magdalene and the other Mary could attend the interment, why not Salome as well? In the answer to this question much is implied. "Undesigned" and "incidental corroboration" can be seen in this with the various statements in the Gospels which imply the women's and anybody else's **ignorance** of Joseph's actions and its eventual result in the burial of Jesus. Quite clearly the **Jewish leaders** were not aware of it. No crowd was there, which means the **people** generally didn't know. And even the fact that the two women who did attend the funeral, arrived **unprepared** and had to do their "customary" "preparations" after the burial, implies that they knew nothing of what Joseph had done. That "**Nicodemus** came there with an hundred pounds of spices", though, just as clearly implies the opposite. **He was aware and came prepared** for a specific task. The question as to how Nicodemus knew, can only be answered hypothetically, namely, that he **had to have been informed** by the only man who could have informed him – Joseph of Arimathea. **The whole scheme of things suggests the acuteness of the peculiar circumstances.** It might reasonably be assumed that Pilate granted Joseph's request **on conditions relative to the prevailing circumstances**, Mutual distrust was the order of the day. Pilate didn't give permission because he was friendly with Joseph, but because he thought it **in his own interest as Roman consul**. He had his conditions. No unlawful assembling. The reason for congregating must not be political or **in any way inciting** – a burial would be in order. The number of people attending is strictly limited – **only a few**, and only relatives and friends **directly responsible**. Not even the mother may attend. The fewer women "bemoaning and lamenting", the better. The burial must be as unobtrusive as possible. **The situation of the morning before should not be repeated.** The undertaking must be quiet and absolutely **orderly**. **On these conditions only, or not at all.** Salome may not have been on Joseph's memorandum. Or Joseph may have been **unable to find her** and tell her betimes to meet at his house from where the procession will proceed to the garden tomb. In any case it seems that Salome was informed of events only on **Saturday afternoon**, and she was enabled then, "**after the Sabbath**", to buy her contribution of "aromatic oils" for use inside the grave. It must be deduced that **Salome did not attend** the entombment.

#### 5.2.2.4.

##### After the Burial and Before the Sabbath

Joseph rolled the stone in the opening of the sepulchre and "departed". He rolled the stone by himself or perhaps with the aid of Nicodemus, **downhill**. There now was no guard or soldiers present to help. Were the women, acting together, so frail they, trying together, could not move the stone back to open the grave? When they went to the tomb to salve the body they wondered how it **was done**, not how it might be done – which implies that they realised that they would not have been able to do it by themselves. When Mary wanted to look or to go "into the sepulchre", she had to "stoop down", *parekupsen* "parakuptoh." <sup>Jn 20:11</sup> Peter also had to "stoop down" to look into the grave. One has to "stoop down" in order to fasten one's shoes, or to write on the ground. The fact also that the women were "sitting" while "they beheld (inside) the sepulchre and how his body was laid", suggests a **lower level** where they sat than the way from which they approached the grave. A purpose made channel "hewn out of stone", **descended toward the opening**. Joseph could easily have loosened some blocking object under the stone and have "rolled" <sup>Mt.27:60</sup> it down "on, to" (*proskulisas*) the opening. Thus the closing could be done almost effortlessly. But opening, which would mean rolling the stone "of considerable size" uphill, would be most difficult, and not possible for even several women. Cf. Par. 5.3.3.2.2.4.

It is significant that it is carefully recorded that the two **Marys** made preparations for treatment of the body, **after the burial**, and that, **also after** the burial, "by reason of the Jews' preparation **being near**" – *dia tehn paraskeuehn tohn Ioudaiohn engus ehn*, "they put Jesus in the grave" (*tohi mnehmeiohi* – <sup>variant GEds – Wigram, Bagster</sup>), "They laid Jesus", "there, therefore" (*ekei oun*), not only because the grave was near – "grave" the subject, nominative, *to mnehmeion*, but because time for preparations drew nigh. "Therefore" is relative to the previous verse: **Because no one has ever used the tomb**, "therefore" it was the tomb for Jesus and laid they Him "there". The **nearness** of the tomb is relative to the place "**where**" Joseph and Nicodemus "treated" the body for interment and brought it from. Its "near"-ness is not directly relative to the **time** of day. It is not true that they could have looked for any other grave that might have been nearer in order to save more time. (As some suggest.) **To save time was not the idea** with using Joseph's own and new grave – especially not while the grave supposedly was so near the crosses that Joseph could immediately transport the body from the cross into the grave.

In the phrase in Luke 23:54, "And that day was the Preparation, and the Sabbath drew near", a task well done is suggested. Now opportunity is available to give the next day some thought and get things *in readiness* for it. "The Preparation Time" had begun for the women, and they consequently "went home and prepared" – both spices for after the Sabbath, and the ordinary and extraordinary "preparation(s) of the Jews'" for the particular occasions. Now if the women could after the funeral have found time for preparations – if there actually still was **allotted** time left for preparations, shortage of time could not have been such an acute problem as tradition makes of it. The fact that the women made their preparations after the burial does not mean that they had no time to do it before the burial. **If Joseph and Nicodemus could** find the time for that, the women could also. That they did not must be ascribed to another reason. And that reason must be that they could not have been **advised** of the preparation of the body Joseph and Nicodemus had finished on their own. Or, they could be **requested** when and how to attend. 'Be calm, and stay home to comfort the mother. Don't worry about a thing. We would expect you about midday.' The two women arrived accordingly, and could but "follow" in the procession to the grave. In

the presence then of these honourable men and women Jesus found his final earthly resting-place. “He was destined to have a death among the criminals, but he received his grave with the rich”, Lk.53:9 Cf. Par. 5.3.3.3 to 5.3.3.3.2.1.

The NAT renders the phrase, “the Sabbath drew nigh”, *epefohskan sabbaton*, Lk.23:54 as though the Sabbath had already started when the women made their preparations. Such a paraphrasing is incorrect and self-contradictory. Verse 56 also states that the women “rested on the Sabbath according to the command”. That implies their observance of the **beginning** of the Sabbath from sunset on. From sunset on cannot be described with the term *epifohskoh* (See Par. 5.3.) but overlaps the **traditional Jewish time** for preparations on Friday afternoon. The two ideas, “Preparations time” and “the Sabbath drawing near”, are **explaining one another**. It **logically** is before sunset. And that is the time **literally** indicated by the verb *epifohskoh*. “Sabbath” is also in the **accusative** in Lk.23:54. Time was extending **toward** the Sabbath. It was not “on” the Sabbath, which would have been the dative use, (*en*) *tohi sabbatohi*. It was not “Sabbath’s time”, which would have been the genitive case, *sabbatohn*. It “was” not “Sabbath”, nominative, *ehn sabbaton*, (as “the day was (the day) of Preparation”, *ehn paraskeuehs*. Lk.23:54) It “was” not Sabbath, nor did it “become” Sabbath. The verb used, is not *ginomai* or *eimi*. Day “starts” not over a lengthy period like over the several hours for preparations. Day starts at a definite point in time, the moment the sun has set. And the tense used – the imperfect, implies that the time of preparation was going on, and was not over yet, before the Sabbath would begin. The Jews were strict in the observance of the beginning and ending of the Sabbath.

When Joseph had closed the grave and the women had left, Preparation Time was at hand and the Sabbath was drawing closer. So was the “light”, *fohs*, approaching its end and the Sabbath its beginning. It was “light” time still for making “preparations”. The Jews strictly ended their preparations for the Sabbath at least an hour before the last hour of day. With these phrases in Luke 23:54 and John 19:42, the end of the story of Jesus’ burial is brought to an end. The implication of the fact that the women this early had finished with preparations **after the interment**, contrasts sharply with the late hour Joseph started with his undertaking of the burial. If in chronological order, the women’s preparations and Joseph’s undertaking, could not have been on the same day, because then Jesus would still have hung on the cross after he was buried, and he would have been buried before he was even confirmed dead by the Roman authorities.

#### 5.2.2.3.1.

##### After the Sabbath Started Till “the Next Morning”

The weekly Sabbath day followed on the day of Jesus’ burial and the “Jews’ preparations”. That has been shown decisively above. “Now on the next morning which followed their preparations, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, Saying, sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye must have your watch: go, make it sure the way you see fit. And going they made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting a watch.”

Why does Matthew not simply say the following “Sabbath”? He wants to draw attention to the reason for **the Jews’ presupposed ignorance of developments with the body of Jesus**. They didn’t know about Joseph and Nicodemus’ undertaking of Jesus’ interment. They thought they had the last say (and sadistic last laugh) when

they got Pilate’s agreement to have the legs of the crucified broken so they could “**be removed**” and the crosses as well. They would not be embarrassed because of the crucified hanging there over their holy days. But now they are bemused to wit’s end. **A burial was the last thing the Jews would have imagined or tolerated.**

The Jews some time between late afternoon Friday **after the burial** and Saturday morning had to have found out about Joseph’s undertaking for the burial of Jesus and that it was an irrevocable feat by the time they received information. They must have found out about it about this time because “On the following morning”, *tehi epaurion*, they met with Pilate to discuss the implications it had for them. They without doubt were caught unawares by Jesus’ burial. The way they reacted tells of **desperation**. “Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. **Command** therefore that the sepulchre be made **sure** until the third day lest his disciples come by night and **steal him away**”. If they knew of Joseph’s actions they in the **first** place would have tried to **prevent** him and avert all these troubles. And if they just after the burial learnt about it, they **without delay** would have asked for the sealing and guard. They would not have waited for the morning or for the beginning of the Sabbath. They would have had enough time after the burial before the Sabbath for that. But they were intensely busy with “preparations” as if it were the most important thing in the world. They, “the chief priests and Pharisees”, “**on the morning after**”, tried to amend for their pre-occupation with “**their preparations**”. See Part 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.5. p. 254 further.

The “next day” of “the morning after their preparations” could only have begun the previous “evening” after sunset. Not the next day in the sense of a new date began “the next morning”, but the **next day’s morning – the light and work-part of the day’s cycle**. *Epaurion* literally has the meaning of “after-morning” – day **after sunrise till midday**. The morning **before** sunrise constitutes the first half of day’s morning, from midnight till sunrise. This first part of morning is called *aurion*. “Dawn” – “the cock’s crow” – makes up the time from about 3 p.m. till sunrise or second half of *aurion*. The latter half of *aurion*, “east”, is distinguished by the added preposition *epi* + *aurion* – “**after**”-morning. *Epaurion* is the equivalent of “in the forenoon” and the opposite of “in afternoon”, *tehi epifohskousehi*. Mt.28:1 “East” and “after-east”, *aurion* and *epaurion*, represent the sun in the first half of earth’s rotation, **midnight till midday**. Translation of *epaurion* with “**the next day**” reflects “the on the night following **day after sunrise**” – **excluding the day before sunset**. The point of relevance of any time indication with this word is **sunrise**, whereas the point of relevance of any time indication with “forenoon”, is midday. Nine a.m., for example, is either the third hour after-morning, or the third hour forenoon. *Epaurion* is used 17 times in the New Testament, and **not once for later than midday**. It can not be taken for any time or simply for the “next day”. In the instance in Mt.27:62, the “morning after their preparations”, *Epaurion* is used **as the antipode of the previous afternoon**, presupposed in Matthew for the period of “**their preparations**” for the Sabbath before sunset. In Luke **this** afternoon is supposed in the “drawing near” of the Sabbath, *epefohskan sabbaton*. In Matthew *tehi epaurion* is also used specifically in **anticipation** of *tehi epifohskousehi* in 28:1.

This phrase, “the day’s morning after their preparations”, is an undeniable, inevitable and inescapable **indication of the taking up of the previous afternoon**. If Christ had to have died on this implied afternoon, he would have died after the time he had been buried.

*Tehi epaurion* in Mt.27:62 is also used with the view to the resurrection of Christ implied in the opening of the grave. The morning the Jews with the help of the

Romans – Church and State – make double sure by sealing the grave and setting a watch, that Jesus would never escape the fate of all sinners and mortals – to die and never to rise from the dead. Not, to rise from “death”, but from the “dead” – proving solidarity with all mankind. **Man’s fate is sealed in death, and thus is Jesus’ in his grave** – this “deceiver” who boasted he would rise again. “We remember, Sir”, the minutes of the meeting of the rulers of the world read. And indeed the world would never forget – “After three days I am raised!” No “command” of the mightiest “living” could prevent this “dead” to “rise again”. He can’t be “sealed” and “ensured” among the dead. He has the key to the grave and death. He has the power to brake where keys might fail. His power is the key. See the stone fly like a pebble from the door of death.

“In the morning”, sealed ... but, “in the afternoon” ... “Lo!” The grave is opened!

#### 5.2.2.3.2.

##### “Till the Third Day”

The Jews held meeting with Pilate because they were **desperate**. “He said, I will rise again after three days”, *meta treis hehmeras egeiromai*. There is no time left. Command therefore! The idea with the sealing of the grave is to have it sealed for this very third day, “while the third day”, *heohs tehs tritehs hehmeras*. *Heohs* in this instance cannot mean “for three days to come” because it would have been the **second day already** according to the traditional interpretation of the three days that Jesus would be dead. If Jesus would not rise on the third day, he would be still sealed in the grave for anyone to see as proof of his “deception”. No further watch would be necessary. “Therefore, command”, to seal and guard the grave **till the third day lasts** and the case would be won for the Jews. *Heohs*, means, “while the third day, as it means “while”, elsewhere. Compare, “While it is day” (*heohs hehmeras estin*), Jn.9:4 “While even now” (*heohs arti*), 1Cor.8:7 “While I shall pray” (*heohs proseucsohmai*), Mk.14:32 Mt.26:36 “While he sent the people away” (*heohs autos apoluei ton ochlon*), Mk.6:45 Mt.14:22 “While all these thing be fulfilled” (*heohs genehtai*), Mt.24:34 “For seven times” = “till the seventh time” (*heohs heptakis*), Mt.18:21 “Including John” = “while John lives” (*heohs Iohannou*); “Even now” (*heohs arti*) Mt.11:13 “Including the very last” (*heohs kai to eschaton*), Lk.12:59 “In the days of David also” (*heohs hehmerohn Daudi*), Acts 7:45

“For the third day”, *heohs tehs tritehs hehmeras* – genitive: “Seal the grave the third day’s duration”. That means, “Seal the grave till the third day lasts”, or, “has gone through”, like Mk.16:1, *heohs tehs tritehs hehmeras diaghenomenou*. Or, *heohs tehs tritehs hehmeras teleiohsantou / teleiohsas*, Lk.2:43 Jn.17:4 “Till the third day is past”, *heohs tehs tritehs hehmeras paragetai*.<sup>1Jn.2:8</sup> An **elliptic** complementary predicate is supposed as in the Gospel of Peter.<sup>V:27</sup> The disciples tell how they, after the crucifixion (on Friday according to this document), fasted “for a night and a day till the Sabbath (had passed)” (*nuktos kai hehmeras heohs tou sabbatou*). The reason for sealing the grave is that this morning is “the third day” already. The Jews do not ask that the grave must be sealed till the third day **begins**, also not that it should be sealed “for three days”, but, “till the third day ... is over” = “while being the third day”.

#### 5.2.2.4.

##### Scheme of Days

(Cf. Part Two Introduction to Par. 5.3.)

#### 5.2.2.4.1.

##### Preparation of Passover

##### First Day Without Leaven

14th Nisan

Thursday

>6th hour >Darkness

##### CRUCIFIED

>3<sup>rd</sup> hour Mk15:25 > 9th hour Mk15:33

>Near city Jn19:20

>Earthquake, dead raised, veil

>Turning, said Lk23:28

> Running, calling Mk15:36

>Delivered Lk23:24

> DIED Mt27:50

>6 o'clock Jn19:14

>All returned Lk23:48

>It was evening Mk15:17

>Pilate, Herod Lk23:1-11

>It was evening

>Prepared Mt26:17

>Caiaphas Jn18:18

Mk15:42

>Last Supper

>Annas, Peter Lk22:57

>Judas Jn13:30

>Betrayed, Council Jn18:3 Lk22:66

>It was night

>Gethsemane Mt26:36

>Mount >Mk14:26

In the **tenth** day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb. Ye shall keep it up until the **fourteenth** day. Ex12:2-6 Jesus **six days before Passover** arrived at Bethany where Lazarus was. Mary anointed the feet of Jesus. Jn.12:1,3 **After two days was the feast** of the passover **and** of unleavened bread. The priests sought how they might take him and put him to death. Being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having a box of ointment. And she break the box and poured it on his head. Mt.14:1-3 **Before the feast** of passover, in the **evening**. He cometh with the twelve, and supper being ended, He began to wash the disciples’ feet. Judas went immediately out. It was **night**. Jn.13:1 Mk14:17 They came to Gethsemane. Judas betrayed Him. They laid their hands on Him and took Him. And they led Jesus away to the high priests. They delivered Him to Pilate. He sent Him to Herod. Herod sent Him again to Pilate Mk.14:32f Lk.23:7-12 It was the **preparation of the passover** (not of the Sabbath), Jn.19:14 the **day before the feast** 13:1 on which the passover was **killed** (not, “eaten”) and **leaven removed** Lk.22:7 Mk.14:12, 2 and about the **sixth hour**. **Then delivered** he Him unto them to be crucified. Jn.19:14-16 As they led Him away there followed women. Jesus, turning unto them, said ... And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary, they crucified Him and the malefactors there. Lk.23:26f It was the **third hour**. (9 o'clock) Mk.15:25 They railed on Him. Lk.23:40 Likewise the priests. Mk.15:31 John took Mary home. Jn.19:27 There was a darkness over all the earth until the **ninth hour** (3 p.m.). Lk.23:44 And Jesus gave up the ghost. Mk.15:26-37 And the **veil** of the temple was **rent**. :38 And the **earth did quake** and the rocks rent and the **graves were opened**. The centurion and they that were with him (**the guard**), Mt.27:54 saw that He yielded the spirit. Mk.15:39 **Many women** were there

beholding afar off. Mt.27:51-55 There were also the three (**Salome** present). Mk.15:41 Mt.27:55-56 **All** the crowd Lk.23:44, 46 Mt.27:46-50 Lk.23:48-49 that came together to that sight Mk.15:14 beholding the **things that happened, returned, also** all his acquaintance **and** the women beholding **these things**. Lk.23:48-49 “The hour cometh that every man shall leave Me **alone**”. Jn.16:32

#### 5.2.2.4.2.

##### Feast of Passover

##### First Day of Unleavened Bread

##### 15th Nisan

##### Friday

>Stone >rolled in door Mk15:46

##### BURIED

>There laid <sup>Jn19:42</sup> >Joseph departed Mt27:60

>Saw where Mk15:47 >Two returned Lk23:56

>Sitting Mt27:61 >Prepared spices, oils

>New tomb in garden >Jews' preparations

>Marys followed Lk23:55 >Toward Sabbath

>It was evening already >Jewish custom Jn19:14 >Rested Lk23:56

>Eat the Passover Jn18:28 >Wound in linen with spices

>Jews, being Preparation >They prepare body Jn19:40

>After this Joseph >brought myrrh, aloes Jn19:39

>He arrived >There came Nicodemus

> Took > body away

The Jews then, **since Preparation (for Sabbath) began**, Jn.19:31 (after Passover Meal no longer afraid of being “**defiled**” by entering the palace 18:28) besought Pilate that the bodies be taken away. 19:31 Joseph, after this, 38 **when even was already come**, Mk.15:42 Mt.27:57 secretly, for fear of the Jews, Jn.19:38 **went in** Mk.15:43 and asked Pilate for Jesus’ body. When Pilate knew of the **centurion** that Jesus had been any while dead, he **entrusted** the body (to Joseph). Mk.15:44, 45 He **took it down**. Lk.23:53 He took the body **away**. Jn.19:38 (31) He bought fine linen. Mk.15:46 Nicodemus (who at the first time came to Jesus by **night**) also came and brought myrrh and aloes about an hundred pounds. Then they **prepared** the body of Jesus. They wound it in linen with spices as **Jewish ethics** for burial (require). Jn.19:39, 40

The women from Galilee (who followed and served Him **in** Galilee Mk.15:41) followed after. Lk.23:55 (to) the place **where** He was crucified. Jn.19:41 There was **Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, sitting over against** the sepulchre. Mt.27:61 They beheld **how his body was laid**. Lk.23:55 They **returned** home **and prepared** spices. 56

Jesus was buried “on the Preparation that is the day before **the Sabbath**”, Mk.15:42 which is Friday. It was **not** the “Preparation” of any **other** ceremonial “sabbath”, but of the Sabbath which was the Sabbath “**according to the commandment**” Lk.23:56 (the 4th of the Ten Commandments) – **the seventh day of the week** (that) “was past (when the women) on the first day, might come and anoint Him”. Mk.16:1.

After the burial, Friday was “**declining towards the Sabbath**” Lk.23:54 (which was to begin with evening after sunset. Mk.1:32 Mt.8:16, 20:8) The “preparation of the Jews” Jn.19:42 for the Sabbath had **yet to be made** and the women **still** had time also to “prepare spices”, before they could “rest” Lk.23:56 from sunset onwards.

#### Conclusion

The first translations of the Bible into English, some later versions and some other translations, all render Mark 15:42 and Matthew 27:57 to the effect that sunset and evening had gone by before Joseph of Arimathea required of Pilate Jesus’ body with the view to its proper Jewish burial. Christianity regardless has tenaciously held to the idea that Jesus had been buried shortly after he had died and before the sun had set and day ended. Christianity entertains this idea because “the third day” of Jesus’ repose in the grave calculated from Sunday morning – which it holds was the time of Jesus’ resurrection – must be Friday. “According to the Scriptures”, however, the prophetic meaning of the Passover of release from death forms the basis for the observance of the Seventh Day Sabbath – the basis for the time of Jesus’ resurrection. Had the Church kept to the plain meaning of its translation of Mark 15:42 and Matthew 27:57, Sunday should never have gained a foothold in Christian worship. It still would have been the idolatry it always had been. Now Sunday observance has become a greater idolatry while the Sabbath has lost its due honour for being the Christian Day of Worship and Rest, “the Lord’s Day”. That is to say, if Mark 15:42 and Matthew 27:57 had been understood at face value, to the effect that, “When it was evening it being the Preparation – the Fore-Sabbath – for quite some time now, Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable counsellor who earnestly awaited the kingdom of God, arrived. He courageously and secretly approached Pilate, and requested Jesus’ body.”

#### 5.2.2.4.3.

##### **Robert Trail, *The Works of Robert Trail, 1810, New Edition, The Banner of Truth Trust, Volume 2, Concerning the Lord’s Prayer, Sermon 7, p. 94f.***

##### **“Admire This Will of Christ”**

(Emphasis that of CGE:)

“... <sup>94</sup> *Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold **my glory which thou hast given me**: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*

<sup>95</sup> *... Christ knows himself **fully and perfectly**; and therefore he knew what a great blessing he **willed** for his people, when he uttered this suit to his Father. It is the wise constitution of God, that the knowledge of Christ, and the enjoyment of Christ, and the knowledge of that enjoyment, are inseparable. ... But **Christ knew himself perfectly**, and what bliss his company would be to his people. This is one thing that **may make us admire this will of Christ**, ...*

*Our Lord Jesus knew best where **he was to be**. I told you **where Christ was** when he made **this his will**, even near the lowest step of his humbled state. He was **just going to the garden of agony, and from that to the death of the cross. But he prays as if in heaven already**. And well did he know **whither he was going, and what a high and happy state himself was going to, unto which he also meant to bring his people**.*

<sup>96</sup>... Christ knew well where his **people** were. ... In love and pity to **them**, therefore he **wills** this blessed lodging for them in heaven. ... Christ's heart, in this prayer, **springs up to that same everlasting life** for them.

<sup>98</sup>... Christ's prayer, and Christ's blood are of the same extent, and both have an everlasting voice and virtue. This prayer of our Lord was put up **in the same night he was taken**; and its force and virtue is still as great as when it was uttered first. So it is with the voice and virtue of his blood. It speaks to this day as precious things as when he shed it ... that virtue is of eternal duration.

... Here we have our Lord praying to have all his people **with him where he is**. His prayers were **always heard**: John 11:41,42, "And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee, that thou **hast heard** me; and **I knew** that thou **heardest me always**." And surely he was heard in his last and main **prayer for his own glory**, and his people's blessedness, in this text, **Christ did all the Father's will, in working out the redemption of the elect; and the Father will do all the Son's will, in giving the blessings bought to be redeemed**.

<sup>99</sup>... The name of Christ's Father, is that name and discovery of God wherein he stands related to the Son, and the Son to the Father, **with the power and virtue of this name**; as in verse 26 of this chapter, "**And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them, and I in them**."

... In verse 6 Christ's '**manifesting the Father's name to them**', respects the clear and glorious discoveries Christ had made to them of the Father's name in and by Christ's incarnation, words, and works. In verse 26, his '**declaring to them the Father's name**', respects the light and knowledge of the Father's name, which Christ had **wrought, and was father to work in them**." (Emphasis CGE)

Throughout the main theme Trail pre-supposes is Christ's resurrection from the dead, as throughout his prayer it was Christ's presupposition himself. Jesus **knew** he would rise from the dead and grave and that would be his everlasting glory. It was the glory of his **resurrection** that was the glory of his **suffering**. Without Christ's resurrection the glory of his suffering and death would not have been glory, but shame – mortal shame. Christ's **resurrection** is the glory he glorified his **Father** with **when he suffered death for us**. Christ's **resurrection** is the glory he glorified his **people** with **when he suffered death for us**. And Christ's **resurrection** is his co-lateral to every *virtue* and *blessing* **already in his death** that of his people. It means their own resurrection from the dead into life eternal already.

Passover is Resurrection Faith. This is Passover, Yahweh's Passover whereby God institutes his Day of Rest. "**Christ did all the Father's will**". Yahweh's Passover is God approaching, leading, and crossing, carrying through the Red Sea, reaching, bringing to the opposite shore, and leaving, closing up the depths behind and treading forth on promised land. "**Christ had wrought**" – "**His people with him where he is**". **The Sabbath is Resurrection Faith.**

Christ "**fully and perfectly**" knowing, "**fully and perfectly**" "**willed for his people**" his "**glory which thou hast given me**". Christ "**made this his will**", "**declaring to them the Father's name**", by "**the power and virtue**" of which "**springs up to that same everlasting life**" as His, also theirs. *This is the one thing that "make us admire this will of Christ."* He is the Passover Lamb of God who for the love "**thou before the foundation of the world didst love me**" with, laid down his life Himself for us.

Two things are clear and do stand fast, First, The Christ knew, and as He knew, He also willed to die : as He knew and as He willed his resurrection-life – His Own, as also of his people; Two, Jesus as God, knew, and, Jesus as God, willed, and

Jesus as God laid down his life to die and being God died indeed – being God to rise and swallow up death and grave in victory of life through Life. That is "Yahweh's Passover", even "our Passover". "And they sang the song of Moses and of the Lamb", and celebrated Sabbath's Day of Rest!

#### 5.2.2.5.

##### **Addendum**

#### **"Friday Crucifixion Sunday Resurrection"**

The abbreviation LD for this discussion refers to *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace*. The titles on the outer cover – in quotation marks – are for convenience sake and does not reflect the full meaning of contents.

Part 1 / 1, "*Passover*", deals with the different interpretations.

Part 1 / 2, "*Crucifixion and Burial*";

Part 2, "*Resurrection*";

Part 3 / 1, 2,3 "*Pentecost*", "*Troas*", "*The Sabbath in the Gospels*";

Part 3 / 4, "*Proclamation*";

Part 4, "*Paul*".

For our discussion I shall follow the order of the web site "*Paper*". Quotations will be in *italics*, underlined, and "*in quotation marks*". In several places I shall argue as were I in discourse with the sender to me of this *Paper's* web site, whom I'll indicate as "SK". Places of reference in *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace* are given directly after a topic has been raised by the *Paper*.

The first and most important difference that may be noticed between *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace* and the *Paper* is that of **approach**. The *Paper's* obviously is from a Roman Catholic point of view and mine as one may infer from the title of my book, is from a Reformed Protestant point of view. It may seem strange, as Roman Catholicism agrees with Reformed Protestantism on the days and times of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection, while I don't. It may further be surprising that I disagree with Tradition on the times and days of the crucifixion and resurrection, yet am the staunchest critic of the Wednesday-crucifixion theory, and of its theology and hermeneutics. (In fact, it will be difficult to find a treatise more thorough against the **several** Wednesday-crucifixion theories, refer Part 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.1.4, from p. 77.) So there will be points whereon I and the *Paper* may agree. But there will also be fundamental differences. I shall not say much on the agreements, but shall concentrate on the differences for the sake of brevity and comprehension.

#### 5.2.2.5.1.

##### **Translations**

(p. 1) "*L. Bible Proof Jesus rose on Sunday ... (p. 2) A. Mark 16:9: Irrefutable Sunday resurrection passage 1: ... 1. These three translations absolutely state that Sunday was resurrection day:*

*NASB: Now after He had risen early on the first day of the week*

*RSV: Now when he rose early on the first day of the week,*

*NIV: When Jesus rose early on the first day of the week"*

Would not this pivotal text be carefully so **translated** as to **irrefutably supply Bible proof Jesus rose on Sunday**? If one controls the dating of *these three translations* and other *translations*, he will discern a development from rather ambiguous to definitive in order to say precisely that *Jesus rose on Sunday*. Would that not evoke suspicion that a certain prejudice influenced the translators – who are just human?

I absolutely agree that this pivotal text would be carefully so translated as to irrefutably **supply** Bible proof Jesus rose on Sunday because a contradictory impression exists in the original!

**Refer LD Par. 6, Part 2, from p. 172.**

(p. 2 cont.) "*L. These two translations also state that Sunday was resurrection day, but because of the wording, some will take issue:*

*\*KJV: Now when Jesus was risen early on the first day of the week*

*\*ASV: Now when he was risen early on the first day of the week"*

Why, "*Because of the wording*", would "*some take issue*"?

I suppose because the *wording* or even the punctuation permits another meaning, and requires an indicative. Just place a comma after "*risen*", and the meaning cancels the verb in the first three *translations*. The clause becomes adjectival as well as adverbial – it describes Jesus and how He appeared – exactly what a **participle** would have done. Without the comma, the verb of predicate is "to rise". With the comma, another verb of predicate is anticipated – Jesus' actual act of the First Day. What could it be? That "He early on the First Day, **appeared**"! Then **how** did He appear? : "*risen(-from-the-dead)*"! In the Greek just two words say it all, the participle *anastas* – "risen", and the finite verb, *efaneh* – "he appeared". In John 21:14 a synonym in the passive *egertheis* – with the same force as in Mk.16:9 – also states that Jesus "the third time appeared ... **risen**".

**Refer Part 2, Par. 6.1.1.4.4, from p. 178.**

(p. 2 bottom) "*Mk 16:9 ... (p. 3, top block) What Sunday resurrection folk say: This verse states that the very action of Jesus' resurrection occurred on Sunday. Read the verse, this is exactly what it says.*"

Correct, but keep in mind *this verse* is quoted from a *translation*, and *translation* is what *Sunday folk* – who translated – say!

*... There is no way around the obvious meaning of this verse. If this verse does not give the day of actual resurrection, THEN THE BIBLE IS*

*TOTALLY SILENT as to what day Jesus actually did rise. Challenge: What verse outright states that Jesus was risen up from the dead?"*

"*What verse outright states that Jesus was risen up from the dead?"* There is a whole New Testament full. But there is **just one** verse that outright states **the day of the week** that Jesus was risen up from the dead, and it **isn't** Mk.16:9.

At this point SK commented: "*Are you sure? Firstly, I am not fluent in any form of Greek, so I would want to get expert opinions from Greek scholars on any statements made about Greek. Intrinsicly, I doubt any claim made about Greek words because I have seen distortions made too often in order to support alternative beliefs.*"

With SK's *doubts* I am sympathetic. He will find in *LD* the opinion of every *expert* on the subject of interest I could find in university libraries in South Africa. SK should keep in mind though that translations of the Bible have virtually become massproduction and themselves should come under scrutiny for *support of alternative beliefs*. While being distinctly aware of the sure possibility that I would myself be accused and be found guilty of *distortions* and *alternative beliefs*, I became the more convinced to investigate the very Translations and Traditions of centuries of veneration.

*"... What Saturday resurrection folk say: The tense of the Greek word "risen" is perfect present tense and that the verse is not saying that Jesus actually rose but was in a state of resurrection on Sunday. This means he rose on Saturday and after this he will be in a state of resurrection forever! For example, they would use the parallel"*

**These** Saturday resurrection folk must be wrong because they mistake the tense of the Greek word "*risen*" for perfect present. It also seems **they** mistake the Greek word for a verb of predication – for an indicative, finite verb – which again, it is not. Not all Saturday resurrection folk say so, though. **Compare Part 2, Par. 6.1.1.4.2, from p. 173**

(p. 2 cont.) "*B. The Road to Emmaus: Irrefutable Sunday resurrection passage #2: ... Lk 24:1,13,21,46 ... Lk 24:1, (Verse and Text) "But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came to the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared." ... Comment ... The entire events of Lk 24 occurred "on the first day of the week."*"

**Refer LD Par. 5.3.3.3.3, Part 2, from p. 139.**

What about the spices – was it *prepared on the first day of the week*? Of course not. Significant events referred to in Luke chapter 24 were events of **another** day and days. I'm sure the reader won't have difficulty with the principle of this reservation. The problems start where this principle is put into practice, and we say the resurrection cannot be subjected to it – when we say the resurrection **must** be an event of this day, the First Day (Sunday).

Here SK comments, "*Well, the simplest answer is usually the right one. The authors of the Gospels were not out to be confusing. Why make an issue out of something if the clearest meaning of the text IS the generally accepted one ... after all, it IS the generally accepted one for two reasons – it is the simplest reading of the text, and it was always believed that way.*"

I deny that, 1, "*the simplest answer is usually the right one*"; that 2, "*the clearest meaning of the text IS the generally accepted one*"; that 3, "*it is the simplest reading of the text*" (that the resurrection must be an event of this day, the First Day, Sunday); 4, "*it was always believed that way*".

*"Lk 24:13 ... (Verse and Text) ... "And behold, two of them were going that very day to a village named Emmaus, which was about seven miles from Jerusalem. ..."*

*Comment ... "That very day" = Sunday and refer..."*

To what event(s) does the relative phrase "*that very day*" refer? **It refers to the apostles and Marv's actions** – the first **visits** to the grave "on the First Day" recorded in **the foregoing verses of the chapter**, "*That very day (of these visits) two of them were going to a village named Emmaus.*" Now does that make of the *passage* an irrefutable Sunday **resurrection** passage?

Here SK comments, "*Nope. You misunderstand the link to the verse. It is to establish a timeline throughout the day.*"

#### **5.2.2.5.2.**

##### **Emmaus**

*"Lk 24:21 ... (Verse and Text) ... "But we were hoping that it was He who was going to redeem Israel. Indeed, besides all this, it is the third day since these things happened." ... Comment ... "it is the third day since Jesus was laid in the tomb. This was the day the two expected Jesus to rise from the dead. This was their expectation."*

This is the first time in my life I hear that Jesus' disciples **believed** He would rise from the dead again – and that (supposedly) at their precise knowledge of time and day! (I think if I were to award a trophy (as the *Paper* does somewhere) for the most novel idea, it would be for this one.) These disciples did **not expect** Jesus would rise from the dead **at all**. In this Scripture Luke describes the **disappointment** of their *expectations*. They expected Jesus would *redeem the Israel to the flesh*. But when Jesus was “delivered over to the Jews”, the disciples’ Jewish *expectations* perished. Only after about forty days after Jesus’ resurrection, their mistaken, profane and unconverted desires revived. Even then *their expectation* was not the **heavenly** kingdom of the **risen** Christ. **Refer LD Par. 7.4, Part 3 / 4, from p. 1.**

Here SK comments, “*Jesus DID tell them, and the thought was there, and on the Sunday (the third day, as the text states, since his death) they began to realise this ... Their expectations do not define the fact that they refer to Sunday as being the third day since Jesus died. The third day since “this” happened ... this being the death of Jesus and the redemption of mankind. That is clear enough. Sunday is the third day since that particular event. They were in the process of realising this, and besides, it is irrelevant whether they put two and two together and got the third day, or if they were just counting the days and Luke brought out the significance of that. The fact remains that the term “the third day” had deep significance, and therefore its connection to Sunday as the third day after Jesus’ death in such an explicit way is proof that Sunday IS the third day after Jesus’ death. This whole run-around seems to me to be an elaborate plot to explain away (to go to great extremes to deny) the basic meaning of the text (that the text explicitly mentions “the third day”.)*”

I do not “*deny*” nor do I try “*to explain away*” “*that Sunday IS the third day after Jesus’ death*”. **I agree**. But I **do** deny and I **do** try to explain away the assumption that the phrase “the third day” is used in Luke **24:21** with “*deep significance*” or so as to indicate **Sunday** for being **the** “third day” of “*deep*” – **prophetic** – “*significance*” – so as to indicate **Sunday** for being “the third day” **as used by Jesus and the Gospel writers**. I also try to explain “*the third day since “this” happened*” refers to “*this being the death of Jesus*” full stop to the Emmaus disciples! The Emmaus disciples in no way also thought that this was the third day since “*the redemption of mankind. ... That is clear enough. Sunday is the third day since that particular event*” – the event of “*the death of Jesus*”. The Emmaus disciples did not have in mind the **deep prophetic** significance the phrase has in Scripture and for those who believe. *They were NOT in the process of realising this*. Only as Jesus later on explained the Scriptures to them did they begin to form an idea about the significance of past **events**. If the **phrase** had been the thing they then started to see in prophetic light, it would have been made mention of here – here in the chapter – here where Jesus had expounded the Scriptures to them and not there where Jesus at first crossed their road.

(p. 3 bottom) “*Avoiding the truth about the Road to Emmaus passage:*”

(p. 4 par. 1. a) “*Armstrong’s view of Luke 24:1-46 ... Armstrong said that the expression “it is the third day” has no special theological significance and does not refer back to the prophecy of Jesus that he would rise the third day ...*”

One does not need to agree with Armstrong in anything but this. If ever he said something right, it is this. That Armstrong is acknowledged by nobody for being a theologian or exegete, makes no difference. With this statement he makes no mistake – even though almost everything else he ever said was wrong. Reference to Armstrong’s helpless plodder is irrelevant. (Omitted here.)

(p. 4 par. 1. b) “*The men on the road to Emmaus were referring to all of the events of the crucifixion including the setting of the seal of the tomb and from Mt 23:65 to Sunday, that was three days, “it is the third day since these things happened”.*”

I agree that Armstrong’s view is nonsensical and factually incorrect.

“*There is no evidence that any of the disciples knew about the setting of the tomb seal and the guards standing there*”.

This observation of the *Paper*’s, is true and of the utmost importance, and is confirmed in **LD**. But how is it possible since according to Tradition the disciples or at least some of them were present at the crucifixion, its aftermath, and the burial?

**Refer Par. 6.1.1.4.3.2, Part 2, from p. 177. Also Par. 6.1.3, from p. 187 and Part 1 / 1, Par.5.3.4, from p.160.**

(p. 4, par. 2 b) Says Armstrong, “*... The phrase “it is the third day since these things happened” (is) completely unconnected with what Jesus said about Him raising the third day*”. But denies this *Paper*, “*... In fact, there is absolutely no question about the fact that they (the disciples) specifically had Jesus’ prophecy about himself raising the third day in their minds when they said, “it is the third day since these things happened ... Why would Luke confuse us by recording this KEY expression of prophecy (the third day) on the very day AFTER the real third day”?*”

Why would Luke ... record this **KEY** expression of prophecy (the third day) on the very day **AFTER** the real third day? (One should remember that Jesus and his disciples spoke Arabic, and the “prophetic” expression of the words “the third day” might have sounded quite different from the usual chronological use. I am not able to tell. Nevertheless, if Luke mentioned these **everyday** words for being used **ON the real third day**, perhaps one could have seen something “*prophetic*” in them – some “**KEY**”-meaning. (As perhaps the Jews did when they asked Pilate for the seal **ON** the very (prophetic) “third day”!) But why should these most common words for counting days not be used for counting the most natural sequence of days **AFTER** an event?

These three words as a phrase do not intrinsically possess *prophetic* significance. And *per se* they are no “idiomatic expression”! Jesus had to explain the events from the prophecies to the two disciples – how could they explain the prophecies from the events to Him? *Prophetic* significance would depend on the **contextual relevancy** of the phrase’s use. In this instance of its use – by two ignorant and unbelieving, perplexed men – the phrase’s meaning is without prophetic or even just idiomatic meaning. The men are **surprised**: “*How is it possible, Stranger, you do not know about what happened? And today is already the third day since it happened! Where have you been?*” They don’t ask Jesus, **Don’t you understand the prophecies? They ask Him, Don’t you know about events – and that after three days!** ? The disciples ask Jesus how he could be so – as they thought – uninformed. They don’t instruct him to their own *expectation* and *prophetic* insights – which is completely against the tenure of the anecdote. As far as I know, nobody has ever understood this text thus. But even had the view been widely accepted, it could never pass the test of sound exegesis or of sound hermeneutics.

At this point, SK comments, “*Good point. And I agree with you ... To be honest, I never picked up on this one, but now that you have highlighted it, I would agree with you.*” And I admire SK and am grateful to him for his honesty and braveness to make such a concession. I can testify here that I through the course of the composition of my thesis had to admit mistakes and had to make adjustments of



smaller and greater importance. As late as during this very discussion (27 June 2001) I was forced to adapt an important aspect of my views to the more exact facts of Scripture.

(p. 4) “2.° ... No other passage of scripture even mentions the seal or the guards in connection with Christ’s crucifixion”, referring to Luke 24:1-46 and Mt.23:65 on the same page.

Luke 24:1-46 mentions nothing about the *seal or the guards* while Mt.23:65 does not exist. I therefore assume chapter 27 of Matthew is meant. Both passages though mention “the third day”, not prophetically, but purely chronologically. In **Matthew 27**, the Jews vent their **fear** of superstitious *expectations* that the third day of Jesus’ being dead would, according to His prediction (to them a prediction purely), see His warning come true and them embarrassed. **They** – the Jewish religious leaders – “the chief priests (Sadducees) and Pharisees” – **might** have thought of “the third day” with the *prophecies* in mind – it was the third day of the Passover Feast when they conferred with Pilate the third time! And that certainly may explain their fear and anxiety. But in **Luke 24**, the two disciples vent their ignorance and disappointment pointing out to Jesus it already was the third day **after their Expectation died!** **Theirs**- these disciples’ – is a purely **chronological, non-expectational** use of the phrase “**the third day**” and of the clause, “**This is** the third day since (it happened)!” This uncomplicated connotation is confirmed by Luke’s use of the preposition, “after”, or, “since” – *apo*, where he refers to the days that **passed** “since” the **crucifixion** – “cut off” from it. **Refer LD Part 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.1.4, from p. 77, Appendix p. 341, “Idiomatic Expression”**

(p. 4 bottom, to 5 top) “c. Four powerful, but inconclusive passages that indicate Jesus rose on Sunday: ... Passage ... Mt 28:1 ... Mk.16:1 ... Lk 24:1 ... Jn 20:1 ... Comment: “These Passages do not explicitly state that Jesus actually rose on Sunday, rather they specifically tell us when the empty tomb was discovered. However, in the absence of any Bible verse that tells us he rose on Saturday, it is quit obvious that these verses do in fact tell us that Jesus had risen only a short time before.””

First inconclusive evidence is admitted, then evidence is asserted from the inconclusive evidence, “these verses do in fact tell us ...”. But, as pertains the assumption of “absence of any Bible verse that tells us he rose on Saturday”, read *The King James Version* in Matthew 28:1, where it *specifically tells us* of every supernatural and natural phenomenon that accompanied the very moment of Jesus’ resurrection from the dead, “**in the end of the Sabbath**”, or, more accurately, “**Late on the Sabbath in its fulness!**”

At this point SK answers me, “*Nope. Sorry. It says AFTER the Sabbath. It talks about sunrise ... dawn. Yes, by performing certain biblical abstractions one can try to manoeuvre around that, but since the translation “dawn” is well accepted by scholars and rejected only by those with an agenda, I suspect we can keep the Bible as it reads on this one.*”

SK did not have the opportunity yet to read LD, so I suspect we can wait until such time as he has read LD on this one.

**Refer LD Part 2, Par. 5.3, from p. 3.**

### 5.2.2.5.3.

#### **Not Discovered**

(p. 5, II) “Other details of death and resurrection ... A. Was Jesus discovered risen before or after sunrise Sunday? ... Wednesday 72 hour literalists maintain that Jesus died 3 PM Wednesday and rose 3 PM Saturday, but was not discovered until early Sunday morning. This means that the tomb stone was rolled away in broad daylight YET NO ONE DISCOVERED IT until Sunday morning ... Not even the guards! Such is quite unbelievable!”

The *Paper* set out to answer both the Wednesday crucifixion theory and the viewpoint of a Thursday crucifixion, yet it nowhere answers the last. So I must qualify here that what it argues applies to the Wednesday theory, but cannot apply to the Thursday view. Thursday *literalists* (like me, who do not mind being branded *literalist* as soon as the opposing debater finds *literalistic* approach not suitable to his own motion) *maintain that Jesus died 3 PM Thursday and rose approximately 3 PM Saturday* (it could be even earlier, considering the words “in the afternoon” – *tehi epi-fohs-k-ous-ehi*), but He did not appear before *early Sunday morning*. This means that the tomb stone was rolled away in broad daylight YET NO ONE DISCOVERED IT until **Marv** – **before anyone else** the first time saw the opened grave “on the First Day early darkness”. The fact that nobody saw Jesus’ resurrection happen, is *irrefutable*. And the fact that the grave was only **DISCOVERED already** open, is *undeniably proof of a period of time that elapsed* between resurrection and first sight of the grave, and of **another period of time that elapsed** between first sight of the grave and Jesus’ first appearance.

At this point, SK objects, “*No. Whether we believe in a Wednesday or Thursday crucifixion, the problem lies with the Saturday resurrection. And the argument is then the same – if the tomb was open at 3pm Saturday, it would have been noticed. And that IS unbelievable. And it DOES apply to the Thursday view simply because the day of the crucifixion has nothing to do with the matter. It is the day of the resurrection that matters, and there the Wednesday group and the Thursday group agree.*”

Just for the sake of bare facts, let me put some straight: Most *Wednesday folk* say resurrection on the second in between Saturday’s end and Sunday’s beginning (whenever that might be). Other *Wednesday folk* insist on Sunday at dawn. Many *Wednesday folk* really have no clue when. But **Thursday** resurrection claims just what is read in Mt.28:1 with one correction. It claims, “Late, being Sabbath’s-time in the afternoon against the First Day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out to have a look at the grave ...”. The correction pertains what in translations usually is rendered as the “**dawn**”. It should be only what **the same** Greek word indicates in **Luke 23:54**, namely “**in-the-declining-of-day-light-time-being-towards-the-day-(following)**”. In the case of Luke 23:54 the “oncoming following” day was the Sabbath; in the case of Mt.28:1 the “oncoming following” day was the First Day of the week. Nothing spectacular! No (hidden) *agenda!* Just the plain meaning of a plain word that very literally had been used for the “**afternoon**” **through centuries of its Greek use.**

“*If the tomb was open at 3pm Saturday, it would have been noticed.*” **It was not noticed.** “*And that IS unbelievable*” to SK. What makes this fact unbelievable to SK, is the **time of day** the tomb was opened, “**3pm Saturday**” **broad daylight!** SK’s reservations seem quite logical. They merit consideration. One should read John especially, because he gives more detail than the Synoptists. On reading John one

notices that he describes **a secluded place** ... 1, – “the place where the grave was”, “where there was a garden” – most probably an olive orchard of rough and rocky terrain. And in the rock was hewn the grave that belonged to Joseph. And therein they laid Jesus’ body, and “returned home”, says Luke. **The grave was left alone!** ... 2. **It wasn’t an inhabited place** ... 3. It was “near” the place where they crucified Jesus – which was outside the city and past the camping strip around the city. **The grave was some distance** ... 4, – although not very far – from where the disciples John and Peter were able to run to it. The grave was **out of sight**, we are justified to accept! (See Par. 5.2.2.1.5.3, p. 130.)

Then Pilate granted a **guard to prevent visitors** ... 5, to the grave. And this guard was smitten like dead by the appearance of the descending angel. They didn’t see a thing – not even the angel. They only saw his brightness and his brightness hit them unconscious. But remember the **Jews asked for this guard** ... 6, and they themselves surely would have used every means to scare the people away from the grave. Then came the “**great earthquake**” ... 7, and from its moment of occurrence nobody would have been able or interested to worry about the grave or its Occupant. **For a few hours to have passed while the grave was left in its forlornness surprises not at all.** Even the fact that Mary reported she saw the stone door flung away from the grave without saying a word about people who might have been supposed to be there or not to be there, confirms the idea of the forsaken and forgotten grave. Matthew says the two Marys just about the time of the occurrence of the earthquake left home for a look at the grave. But they must have been frustrated in their plan, obviously, because of the earthquake and because of the guard – because they did not see the things that happened there at that moment. They might only at this stage have heard about the guard, and they only at the time of the guard’s relieve – a Roman guard and at the end of the Roman day at midnight – would “come unto the sepulchre thick morning” – Luke.

Luke *tells us* the women came with their spices prepared to anoint the body “deep early morning”. Then Mark *tells us* that the women “came upon the grave just as daylight broke through”.

At this point SK replies, “*In other words, at dawn, at sunrise, as Mt 28:1 says.*” All right: At dawn, and even as **you** may read in Mt.28:1, at sunrise. But this is not what is contended! In Luke and Mark “*at dawn, at sunrise*”, concerns the **women’s visit** to the grave – not Jesus’ appearance let alone His resurrection! And in Matthew where Jesus’ resurrection is in fact supposed, the traditional colouring of the time-clauses of verse 1 to indicate the **dawn** and its traditional connection with the **Appearance**, are the things contended.

Then John again *tells us* that “Mary stood by the grave”. **Here**, as Mark also says, Jesus “appeared to Mary first, **early** on the First Day”. John further *tells us* that Mary mistook Jesus for the **gardener**, who would have started work with **sunrise**. This had happened before Jesus appeared to any other person. Matthew’s recording of Jesus’ appearance to the **several women** on approaching Jerusalem, had to have **happened after some period of time had elapsed after sunrise when Jesus first appeared to Mary**. But **NOWHERE AND NO HOW** do I see *factual* information that could just vaguely implicate a **Sunday resurrection!** And clear as daylight do I see that Jesus rose from the grave **not near** the time of night of any **visit** to the grave, so that there is nothing *quite unbelievable* about the fact that the *tombstone was rolled away in broad daylight YET NO ONE discovered it until SATURDAY NIGHT*.

Here SK interrupts, “*You mean Sunday morning – Matt 28:1. Dawn. Sunrise.*” He he should have noticed that Mary paid the grave two visits on her own, and four

counting those accompanied by other women. John relates the first and last of Mary’s visits to the grave, the first “while still being early darkness on the First Day” – *tehi miai tohn sabbatohn prohi skotias eti ousehs*. **Refer Part 2, Par. 5.3.3, from p. 106.**

#### 5.2.2.5.4.

##### **Resurrection, Visits, Appearance**

(p. 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> block) “*Mt.28:1 Now after the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to look at the grave. (ASV mistranslates Mt.28:1 “Now late on the sabbath day”.)*”

**Refer Part 2, Par. 5.3, from p. 3 to 59.** Also refer **Part Two, Par. 5.3.2.6, p. 60** on, for questions put to Prof. Bacchiocchi on this text.

In the blocks opposite wherein Matthew is quoted (p. 5 bottom block), the other Gospels are quoted, and also there the usual translations are used – which are biased. They all are flavoured with the Sunday resurrection idea.

SK here observes, “*But not because they are translated that way because they are trying to prove it. They are translated that way because it is the obvious translation, the easiest reading of the text. Ockham’s razor, I think it is called. Not that I believe that rule to be infallible, but that’s what it’s called. But if everyone for 2000 years has found the historical view passed on to them by the Church to be in union with the simplest translation / interpretation of the Bible, then that translation must be the right one.*”

Then why New Versions? Only to update the language to modern usage? The **Nida**-principle in the later years of the previous century was to conform the Bible to cultural and contemporary thought patterns and was expressly formulated so as to steer away from literalness – in my opinion that is, to steer away from accuracy. (Refer *Bible Students Association Journal*, December I think of 2000.) “*If everyone for 2000 years has found the historical view passed on to them by the Church to be in union with the simplest translation / interpretation of the Bible, then that translation must be the right one.*” So why change them? And why change them obviously to blur the meanings and implications the old Translations allowed? One is forced to acknowledge: New Translations / Versions primarily aim at “*trying to prove*” “*the historical view passed on to them by the Church*”, **not** “*because it is the obvious translation*”, **nor** because it is “*the simplest translation / interpretation of the Bible*”.

The reader may consider my alternatives for the Modern Translations in this connection. **Refer LD Part 2, Par. 5.3.3.2.2.3. to 5.3.3.2.2.7, from p. 117.** My translations may (no, certainly will) answer the question asked underneath the blocks:

(p. 5 bottom of block) “*Was it after sunrise as per Mt, Mk and Lk OR before sunrise as per John??*”

And they may (no, certainly will) contradict the assertion: “... *All are correct! John simply records that Mary left the house while it was still dark ...*”; “*by time they got to the tomb, Mt, Mk and Lk record the sun was up.*”

Anyway the thrust of the *Paper* is clear – and clearly confused with all the contradictions and enigmas accompanying the **traditional** view of the Sunday **resurrection allegedly at the time of the women’s ONLY visit** to the tomb. Simple fact though, *all* these possibilities are **wrong!** *John simply records that Mary actually “saw the stone rolled away”, “while yet being early darkness / night” – prohi skotias eti ousehs.* And neither *Mt*, nor *Mk* or *Lk* record(s) the sun was up by the time they got to the tomb! The conclusion forces itself, that nothing of the “*details*” here

referred to, throw any light on the days and times of “*the death and resurrection*”. They exclusively are – **incorrect** – details concerning the **visits** to the grave, as emphasised in the block of the *Paper* where “*In 20:1*” is quoted, “*Now on the first day ... Mary ... saw the stone already*” removed. There is every guarantee in all these Scriptures – taking account of both the nature of events and of the Greek text – that the period between these visits to the grave and Jesus’ resurrection, is relative, and cannot be limited to “*only a short time before*”. The *short time before* reached from the previous day **of** the “*Sabbath’s*”-events (the Genitive *sabbatohn!*) that accompanied the moment of Jesus’ resurrection, to Mary’s first glimpse of the rolled away stone door, “*while early darkness / night on the First Day*” (the Dative *miai*).

(p. 6) “*B. Day and year Jesus died: Friday Nisan 14, 30 or 33 AD: ... 1. Variables we can determine with certainty from scripture: ... Wed/Thurs/Friday crucifixion? (Friday is clearly the day) Crucifixion on Nisan 14 or Nisan 15? (Nisan 14 is clearly the date) Do Passover, wave / sheaf offering and Pentecost etc. fall on the same weekday every year or are they like birthdays that fall on different weekdays depending on the year.*”

*B. 1. 4<sup>th</sup> o ... Which chronology shall we follow: Mt + Mk = Lk or John? (ie which one uses the term “Passover” for the seder/lamb meal and which one uses “Passover” for the entire 8 day festival? We have determined that the synoptics Mt + Mk + Lk, use Passover for the whole 8 day feast and therefore judge that John’s chronology is to be followed.)*”

Unopposed, the *Paper* just follows preconceived assumptions, like “*B. ... Day and year Jesus died: Friday Nisan 14, 30 or 33 AD*”, and,

“*B. 1. 3<sup>rd</sup> o ... Do Passover, wave / sheaf offering and Pentecost etc. fall on the same weekday every year or are they like birthdays that fall on different weekdays depending on the year*”.

It is concluded in favour of “*the same weekday every year*” – as further on, p. 15, “*IV. A. ... 1. ... New Bible dictionary, Passover: ...*”. *New Bible Dictionary* argues in defence of the Sadducean reckoning, yet the *Paper* on p. 9, fourth and third line from the bottom, “*block*” “*Friday the 14th Nisan*”, states, “*The week day of passover changed from year to year as do our ...*”.

I shall rather follow the Pharisees with whom Jesus at least held some conversation; and the populace, who “*followed Jesus*” and with whom “*He went up to the Feast*”. They at least in the matter of Passover’s calculation, were in agreement with the Scriptures. The Sadducees’ reckoning of Passover – in any case – was not the official or accepted and implemented despite the fact that they during the period “*till 70 AD*” held the high priestly office. Besides every historical indication against such a thesis, the whole tenure of the Gospels contradict employment of the Sadducees’ reckoning. Especially John’s indication of specifically Friday as “*that day being a High-Day-Sabbath*” categorically proves the assumption that the Sadducees’ Passover reckoning applied, false.

One should keep in mind that the source referred to for confirmation of the *Paper*’s thesis of a Sadducean reckoning of Passover is itself unconfirmed by fact or argument. Its source, *New Bible Dictionary*, is itself the explainer of the Sadducean Passover calculation. Its validity is simply accepted. Not the faintest suggestion though of the Sadducean reckoning exists in the New Testament. And besides, total uncertainty rules as to what the Sadducean reckoning really was. The only sure thing about it is that the Sadducees’ differed from the Pharisees’ reckoning. Not even the Jews ever for sure or exactly knew or could explain the Sadducees’ calendar

calculations. An example of the confusion surrounding the Sadducees’ reckoning is the dating of the Day of Atonement. The Sadducees (as “*sources*” say – we nowhere find the Sadducees themselves saying or being quoted as themselves saying) insisted the month should always begin on the First Day of the week so that every seventh day would be a weekly Sabbath. But how could the ninth or the tenth day of the month Tishri then be called a “*Sabbath*”? Or, supposing such a reckoning, why is the fifteenth of Nisan, and not the fourteenth, called a Sabbath? I accordingly have tried to indicate in *LD* – and I believe with persuasive and convincing argument, fact and implication – that *we can from Scripture determine both a Thursday Nisan 14 crucifixion and a Sabbath resurrection*. **Refer LD Part 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.5.3.4, p. 49; Par. 5.1.1.6.1.4.3.1, from p. 83 and many more, in fact the whole of Part 1.**

(p. 6) “*B. ... 1. ... 2<sup>nd</sup> o ... Crucifixion on Nisan 14 or Nisan 15? (Nisan 14 is clearly the date)*”.

**Refer the whole of LD Part 1, but especially Tables (find Paragraphs in Index), 5.1.1.6.2 et al.**

**But why** do we have to choose which chronology to follow? *Mt, Mk, Lk or John*? They all **agree perfectly** on the whole 8 day feast and therefore their **common** chronology is to be followed.

(p. 6) “*B. ... 2. Variables almost impossible to determine with certainty none of which come from scripture*”.

We agree to a remarkable and encouraging degree:

“*Dates indicated by Daniel’s prophecy and Nehemiah’s decree*”

(I don’t know what the *Paper* means by “*Nehemiah’s decree*”. It might have Cyrus king of Persia in mind. **Refer 5.1.1.6.1.5.2. See Appendix to Part 1 / 1 on Daniel’s prophecy.**

“*When was Jesus born?*” **Refer 5.1.1.6.1.4.1.2.**

“*Jesus ministry 1-3 years?*” **The reader may find a very positive Paragraph on this question in LD, Part 3 / 3 from p. 191, especially Illustration on p. 192.**

(p. 6) “*B. ... 2. ... Solar calculation ... Lunar calculation Visual calculation ... Mean conjunction ... true conjunction ... rules ... change ... The mathematics of the day was not sophisticated enough to calculate the true conjunction ... Qumran calendar ... leap months ...*”

**Refer Part 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.4.1 to 5, from p. 77.**

(This topic is irrelevant. I have nevertheless given it a lot of attention in *LD*.)

(p. 6) “*B. ... 2. ... Translation of date into Julian and Gregorian dates*”  
It never occurred to me to apply. Quite a few centuries after the meal.

“*Choosing between the years 30 and 33 AD for a Friday crucifixion ...*”

(p. 6) “*B. ... 3. ... “I see no possibility (or necessity) of coming to a decision choosing one of the two years.”*”

I agree with Raymond Brown quoted, but because of a **Thursday** Crucifixion, the year **29/30** AD seems to be the year according to historic, Biblical and astrometric indications. Especially the **harmony between all relevant factors** makes 29/30 AD the year to choose. But admitted, “*We will never be certain about the year. This is*

*IMPOSSIBLE to calculate without making huge assumptions.*” I have notwithstanding decided in favour of 29/30 AD in view of the striking harmony found between many factors, as may be seen by a reading of LD.

(p. 6) “B. ... 3. Perspective on determining the calendar date of Jesus’ death: We can from scripture determine both a Friday Nisan 14 crucifixion and a Sunday resurrection.”

This is presumptuous. Prove assumption with assumption! And base assumption on biased, carefully prepared translations.

Here SK objects, “... I doubt that they prepared their translations to twist the text to support Sunday resurrection. More likely, they took the Bible at face value, with their mind on known facts passed down by Tradition ... and yes, even Luther was a supporter of that.”

I have quite a few surprises for this honest man. And the strange thing about them is that they all pertain Sabbath and Sunday (First Day) Scriptures. Who would not ask, But why are all these, passages that have to do with the Sabbath and the First Day? Are there ANY Sabbath or First Day Scriptures that are rendered without prejudice? SK of course will have to read LD to see each and every case scrutinised. Sad thing is, the ordinary man – who knows nothing of Greek – won’t be able to pick up discrepancies in every case. In some instances the discrepancies are glaring spectacles; but in others sublimely reverent.

(p. 7 top) “The Holy Spirit CHOSE to be silent on the specifics of the date of ... crucifixion.”

Then why did He through the Scriptures, and through the Gospels, give so many “specifics”? On the slaughter of God’s **Lamb of Passover**? On the **ordering of its “remains”** from dust to dust but not to see corruption? On the **First Sheaf** Wave Offering? On Pentecost and the **Holy Spirit**? On the “Sabbatismos” remaining for the **People** of God” on entering His *katapausis*? Did Paul speak on own authority in 1 Corinthians 5? Was the Holy Spirit silent on these things? God Tri-Une in his omnipotence and predetermination Himself was meticulously predisposed to the precise execution of the *specifics of the date of crucifixion*. It not at all is “fruitless, irrelevant and a waste of time” to search for the truth about the “calendars and dates” of these things – especially since it got buried under ages and the combined effort of **men’s contortions**.

(p. 7) “...<sup>o</sup> Most churches that teach a Wednesday crucifixion share these two things: 1. Sabbath keepers (Saturday) and 2. Bind all the Jewish feast days upon Christians.”

Is it not significant that Tyndale (killed for his faith by the Church) who translated Mt.28:1 so as to state that Jesus’ resurrection occurred “in the Sabbath”, said that if he were to start a sect his part in Christ should be removed? He said it on the same occasion when he pleaded that his part in Christ should be removed had he but once translated against his conscience! And I converse with quite a few persons in LD who are members of no sect, nor believe in the Wednesday crucifixion, yet believe that Jesus was not crucified on the Friday or resurrected on the Sunday. And I recall that the Pope gave orders that the Waldensians should be extinguished from the face of the earth because they kept the Sabbath “with the Jews” – yet they did not “teach a Wednesday crucifixion”. And that the Pope wrote to Augustine of Canterbury that those Celts who refused to keep Sunday in stead of the Sabbath, were

something like a plague. Yet these Celts neither *taught a Wednesday crucifixion* nor went along with the Pope in the reckoning of the Passover (Easter).

The same may be confirmed regarding many Christians’ keeping of the Sabbath who do not “bind all the Jewish feast days upon Christians”. Now I want to say that in Jesus Christ every and all Old Testament “feasts” and “feast days” are as relevant and binding as ever – no, more, and for the first time! Because they are all taken up in the ONE – Jesus Christ the *katapausis* of God. Christians who celebrate Jesus, celebrate each and every Old Testament “feast” and “feast day” “in Him” (Colossians). And therefore – for no other reason – Christians who celebrate Jesus **also** keep the “sabbatismos” remaining for the People of God” that always accompanies God’s *katapausis*. They also keep it because **while** these Old Testament “feasts” and “feast days” were fulfilled **in Jesus Christ**, they also were fulfilled ... “in the Sabbath” – not per accident, but per the predetermination and will and eternal council of God.

**See schematic illustration on p. 197, Par. 5.1.1.6.4.0.1, Part 1 / 1.**

Regrettably I must admit another, and most unfortunate co-incidence, and that is that modern Sabbath keeping Churches seem to invariably join to their keeping of the Sabbath the *arch-error of free will* and a righteousness of works. I find it most strange, seeing the truth of the sovereignty of God and Grace in every aspect of doctrine concerning the Sabbath in Scripture. I find it inexplicable that while the Scriptures combines the essence of Passover and Sabbath, not a single contemporary or post-apostolic Sabbath-believing Church has ever entered into the understanding thereof earnestly. In contrast the Apostolic Church applied this truth so naturally and spontaneously it almost seems they were doing it unawares.

(p. 7) “o (cont.) Sabbath keepers (Saturday) ... bind all the Jewish feast days upon Christians”. The Paper connects this remark to “Gal 4:10 ... and Col 2:16”.

**Refer Part Four, Par. 8.2.3, from p. 125.**

(p. 7, C. 101 scholars on the day Jesus died ...)

**I ignored this section – Sola Scriptura!**

**5.2.2.5.5.**

**Last Week and Palm Sunday**

(p. 8) “D. Chronology of Jesus’ Last week ... This chronology is based upon: ... 1. Friday crucifixion on Nisan 1 ... 2. Year of crucifixion 30 or 33 AD ... 3. Sunday resurrection ... 4. Last supper not seder / Passover meal ... 5. Christ crucified at same time as Passover lambs”.

The Paper’s approach is completely biased and preconceived. Only points 4 and 5 are admissible **beforehand**. The first three points are those argued about and should still be proven – either right, or, wrong. In any case, compare “block”-illustration with **Par. 5.1.1.6.1.1 and 2, in Part 1 / 1, from p. 71. Also Par. 5.1.1.6.3, from p. 167.**

“Friday ... Nisan 7 ... John 12:1 Six days before the Passover Jesus came to Bethany”

**Refer Table in Part 1 / 1 on p. 72, Par. 5.1.1.6.2**

We (the Paper and I) start by differing with one day to the days of the week, and with two days to the days of the month (Nisan). The Paper places Jesus’ arrival in

Bethany on Friday, Nisan 7. I place Jesus' journey from Jericho to Bethany 7 or 8 days before He "visited Lazarus six days before Passover". Jn.12:1 reads. "Six days before Passover (Feast-Sabbath of 15 Nisan) Jesus went in where Lazarus stayed in Bethany". **The Church General believes the Friday of Jesus' crucifixion was this Passover's 15 Nisan.** Now John expressly states that Jesus visited Lazarus on a weekly Sabbath. "**The next day**" (John 12:12) – the day after Saturday "six days before" Friday 15 Nisan – confirms the general Church Tradition of "**Palm SUNDAY**". So the Paper's taking 14 Nisan for Friday clashes with Church Tradition as well as with the arithmetic of counting back from 1 day before to six days before. But Church Tradition again, cannot have the crucifixion on Friday because Friday was 15 Nisan on which date the Passover was eaten and not slaughtered!

(p. 8) "*Friday ... Nisan 7 ... Chief priests and Pharisees plotting to arrest Jesus*". The Paper places this on Friday with reference to "*John 12:1*"! However, the "*chief priests* (then) *consulted to kill Lazarus*" – not Jesus. **Refer Part 1 / 2, Par. 5.1.1.8.2, p. 19.**

"*Nisan 8 ... Saturday ... supper with Mary*"

I also place the supper "*at Lazarus*" on "*Saturday*", but on Nisan 9 – "Jesus came / entered where Lazarus was / staved" – in colloquial English, "Jesus paid Lazarus visit six days before Passover (Feast)". He "came (there)" after his journey and arrival in Bethany the day before. **Refer 5.1.1.6, from p. 68.** I can't see what is the relevance of reference to "*Luke 7:36-38*" though. I also cannot find any reference there to the priests' consulting.

(p. 9) "*Sunday ... Entry into Jerusalem and Palm Sunday*"

We agree on Sunday and event, but again differ with the day of the month. The Paper places it on Nisan 9, I place it on the 10th. The Paper places the "*chief priests*" "*plotting to kill Jesus*" on this Sunday, referring to Lk.19:35-38. But they did so on a later day, taking account of verses 46-47 – the history of another pericope and of another day. In fact, according to Matthew's relating in chapter 21, the "*chief priests and scribes*" on this day "were sore displeased", but nothing is said of their meeting to consult to kill Jesus as in the 26th chapter! In Mark 11 there is a clear line drawn between the histories of Palm Sunday and another day in verse 15, where it is said they again, "came to Jerusalem". It was on this other day, that Mark says "the scribes and chief priests sought how they might destroy him". And this is the day the Gospels place "two days before Passover (Feast Day of 15 Nisan)"! (p. 9 cont.) We agree on placing "*Monday ...*", according to "*Mark 11:12 Next day when they came from Bethany*", after Palm Sunday, but not on the date. On "*Tuesday*" we compare well, except for the date. (p. 9 cont.) At "*Wednesday*", other differences start to emerge, despite remarkable similarities: The Paper confirms agreement with the fact that the Bible day begins after sunset (more than once): "*Sunset, 6 PM Tues – Sunset, 6 PM Wed, Roman (our) time ...*". It also confirms, "*This was two days before Passover*".

(p. 9) "*Wednesday ... Two days before Passover*", *chief priests plot to kill Jesus ... Mark 14:12-16, Luke 22:7-13 ... Judas bargains with leaders ... Jesus retires to Mount of Olives*".

I agree exactly, see **Part 1 / 1, p. 72.** Here though, at Matthew 26 verses 17 and 20, Mark 14 verses 12 and 17, and Luke 22 verses 7 and 14, people loose track of

the days' succession when tracing the week of Jesus' passion. These texts, Mark.14:1-2 and Luke 22:1-2 apply to "two days before the Feast"! They won't even refer to the first day before the Feast Day that would be the Preparation of Passover. Luke in fact says, "The Feast (Sabbath) of Unleavened Bread drew nigh which is called the Passover (Feast Sabbath)". Then, after Judas "communed with the chief priests how he might betray Him" ... "then came / began the day of de-leaven (*adzumos*)".

Mt.26:17 and 20, Mk.14:12 and 17, and Lk.22:7 and 14 which the Paper refers to under "Thursday", therefore record the beginning of the actual day Jesus would be crucified on! **But it fails to see this day's unity.** The Paper implies the Last Supper's was one day before the crucifixion's! But Luke says, "**When the hour arrived**" on that same day "**when the Passover must be killed ... they sat down at table**". It was some time later that night than when Jesus first "appointed" the disciples. Jesus "appointed the disciples "as it (now) was", or, "as it (now) became *The-Day-they-Killed-the-Passover-the-Day-For-Doing-Away-With-Leaven*" – which implies a time of day of just after sunset – the "First Day" (before the Feast-Day) that just began. We Westerners forget to think "Jewish" when it comes to understanding the day's progression. **Refer Part 1 / 2, Par. 5.1.4.2, from p. 50.**

Where everybody seems to be oblivious to it, where one day is taken for granted there are two days in fact. **Refer Part 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.2.1, from p.109; p. 50, Par. 5.1.2 / 3.**

(p. 9 bottom) Under "*Friday*", the Paper says, "*Friday the 14th of Nisan is the Passover, it started at sundown ... Thursday ...*".

But we found under the heading, "*Wednesday*", that "two days before Passover" supposed the Passover's (Sabbath)day of Feast Meal. Now (except in Ex.12) the Feast (or Meal) is nowhere in the Scriptures dated on 14 Nisan; and nowhere in the entire Scriptures is the slaughter of the lamb dated on 15 Nisan.

Here SK qualifies his position: "*Which is why I prefer a 14 Nisan Lamb killing and crucifixion. ... What is not debatable is that Jesus died on Preparation day = Friday. That was passed down from the very people who were present. That is how we know what the Bible means. I refuse to acknowledge a possibility that Jesus died on any other day ...*". **Refer Part 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.3.6, from p. 183.**

(p. 9 bottom, first remark) "*Friday the 14th of Nisan is the Passover. It started at sundown with sunset Thursday and ended at sundown Friday 6 PM our Roman time.*"

Just remember though the day that started at sundown with sunset, the 14th of Nisan the Passover for being the day of the lamb's killing, was the day that started according to the Paper's allocation of it, on "*Thursday*"! And Thursday – as the Paper itself notices – started "*with sunset Wednesday and ended at sundown Thursday 6 PM our Roman time*".

Therefore Thursday, and not Friday, "also is Preparation day for the Feast of unleavened bread". Therefore (with "Therefore" I mean according to the Paper's reckoning of day as above) also, was "*Judas identified as the betrayer*" (only by actual betrayal though. Refer 1 / 2, Par. 5.1.1.7.1.3, from p. 6) on Thursday (= Wednesday-night), and was the "Passover meal" on Thursday evening (*our time*) (= Friday), "and The Lord's Supper" on Wednesday evening (*our time*) = Thursday = Fifth day of the week. And therefore, "Around 12 PM Roman time, Jesus retire(d) to Gethsemane ... and 12 AM – 6 AM Roman time, but still Nisan 14, the trials took place" and so forth exactly as the Paper says it happened on Friday while it in truth

was Thursday, until and including what the Paper observes, “Between 3 – 5 PM thousands of lambs are being slain ...”.

On which day of Passover-Season was Jesus crucified? is the big question. He was crucified on the day the synoptists call **“The Day They Slaughtered the Passover (Lamb) ... The Day of Leaven’s Removal”** which John calls **“The Preparation of the Passover (Feast Day)”** in 19:14! This first day of Passover **“Season”** or **“Feast”**-period was thus called to **distinguish** it from the day on which the Passover Meal was **eaten** – that is, **“The Passover”**, as in the phrase “two days before **Passover**”, or, **“The Feast”**, as in the phrase “not on the **Feast (Day)**”, or, **“High-Day-Sabbath”** as John defines it. **Refer 1 / 2, Par. 5.1.1.8.1.2, p. 19.**

(p. 10) *“Friday ... Crucifixion ... “between the evenings” ...”*

Jesus was crucified *“on the first day of Passover – the day of de-leaven”*. That day began *“as Jesus had appointed”* the disciples, *“and when evening came, He with the twelve sat down”*, Mt.26:17-20. **The day(light) to follow** *“between the pair of nights”* – old and new, of fourteenth Nisan: *behn ha arbayim* – would witness God’s Passover Lamb *“slaughtered”* as well as *“leaven removed”* (the Synoptists), *“because it was the Preparation of the Passover”* (John). **Refer Part 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.5.4, from p. 53; Par. 5.1.1.6.4.10, from p. 215.**

I agree with everything the *Paper* says concerning the burial, p. 10 in “block” for *“Friday”* – except for its assumption that the day of Jesus’ burial was still the day of his crucifixion. In fact it was the day after, **Refer LD Part 1 / 2, Par. 5.1.2, p. 35f.**

Here SK objects, *“Nope. Mt 27:50 has Jesus die. Verse 57 has him buried a few hours later. Evening does not imply the next day, it implies evening. Verse 62 implies the next day ... or states it directly. It states that the next day is the day after the day of Preparation. Since the day before the day after the day of Preparation is, in fact, the day of Preparation, this is day the day Jesus died. So, if Jesus died on Preparation day (Jon 19:14, 31), and the day after Preparation day is the day after he was buried (Matt 28:62), he must have been buried on the same day he died. John 19:42 even states that he was buried on the same day as his death – calling both Preparation day.”*

SK goes through the whole chronology of events and in the process puts together what were different days and divides into two days what was the same day. He does exactly what Tradition has been doing for 2000 years. I do not make light of anything he says. I seriously point out the true facts as recorded in Scripture: *“Mt 27:50 has Jesus die.”* ... No problem.

*“Verse 57 has him buried”*. ... The verse reads: *“When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus’ disciple: He went to Pilate (verse 58 goes on to say), and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body delivered.” Still no interment!* Verse 59 continues, *“And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth”*. **Still no interment!** First *“there came Nicodemus”* with hundred pounds of Nard ointment. Then Joseph and he *“prepared the body as the custom of the Jews is.”* Then Mary and the other Mary *“followed behind”* as these two men carried the body to the place of the tomb. **Only now** applies Matthew’s continuing words of verse 60: *“And laid it in his own new tomb”!* **Remember that we read in verse 57 of Matthew 27 of an evening that intervened.**

*“Evening does not imply the next day, it implies evening”* *“Evening”* says *“evening”*, and that, *implies the next day, come what may!*

*“Verse 62 implies the next day ... or states it directly.”*

Sure. But the next day after this day that began with the “evening” of which verse 57 spoke, ended (with day’s last part of “afternoon”, see Luke 23:54). So *verse 62 implies the next. Verse 62 does not state the third day directly, but verse 63 does!*

*“Verse 62 implies ... that the next day is the day after the day of Preparation.”*

True of the second day – that it was Friday and that on Friday followed the Sabbath – naturally. But it is not true of another “Preparation” which John spoke of in 19:14 and there clearly defined as “being The Preparation Day of Passover”. It is NOT true of THIS other “Preparation” which Matthew speaks of in 26:17 and which he there clearly defines as being “On The First Day Without Leaven”. One cannot simply talk this days’ duration and events away as did they not end with Jesus dying and everybody returning to Jerusalem and leaving the scene of the crosses desolate ... Till Joseph as from nowhere appeared on the scene *“when evening had come”*. Only confusion results if one does forget that “evening had come”. Forgetting or purely misreading this factual event of the night before Jesus’ removal from the cross causes the confusion in everything that was *passed down from the very people who were present. That is how we misunderstand what the Bible means.*

*“John 19:42 even states that he was buried on the same day as his death – calling both Preparation day.”*

Nope! John does not call both the day he was buried on and the day of his death, *“Preparation day”*. **One.** John calls the day Jesus was crucified on, *“the Preparation (Day) of Passover”*. **Two.** John identifies Friday-“Preparation” with the day Jesus was buried, and states that *“The Jews therefore, being the Preparation, so that the bodies would not remain on the cross on the Sabbath – it was the High Sabbath Day that – asked Pilate ...”*. **Three.** In 19:42 John mentions the *“Jews’ preparations”* for the weekly Sabbath as the reason why *“they put Jesus ... there”*. Nowhere in the context of verse 42 does John say this was *“the same day he died”*. John 19:30 records Jesus’ death. Then in verse 31 began the day Mt.27:57 and Mk.15:42 also mention as having begun. They only begin their story where John in verse 38, says, *“after this ... Joseph ...”*.

Only where the Paper says, (p. 10) *“John 19:31 Thieves legs broken because it was the preparation day of Passover’s “high day””* does Friday start. And only *“2 Mary’s watch Joseph and Nicodemus bury Jesus”*, happened on *“Friday”*, about 18 hours later. **Refer LD Part 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.2.1.3.1, from p. 117.**

(p. 10) *“Saturday ... Observing the Sabbath day rest ... in the grave”*. *“The Messiah(’s) rest in the tomb, observing the Sabbath day rest the second day in the grave”*.

**Refer LD 3 / 4, Par. 7.7, from p. 193.**

(p. 10) *“Chief priests and Pharisees ask Pilate to put a guard on tomb about (the time) Jesus died and one hour into the Sabbath but our Friday night) ...”*

The request came *“during the after-morning”*, that is, morning after sunrise – *epaurion*, and *“after their (the Jews’ and or women’s) preparations”*. The ground word, *aurion*, means, “East”, and never can indicate “Abendländische” / Western-time. That means, the Jews requested a guard on the morning of the day after the day

of burial, i.e., after the Preparation-day-for-the-Sabbath – which means, the Jews on the Sabbath, morning, requested a guard. **Refer LD 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.2.3.1, from p. 149.**

Here SK remarks, “*So he was buried the night before. Jesus was buried on Preparation day (John 19:42), and the Jews requested a guard the NEXT day.*”

Jesus “*buried the night*”? If so, He was buried on the second of the “three days”, the day after His crucifixion. But Jesus wasn't buried during the night or after sunset. He was buried before sunset, “while the Sabbath approached”, according to Lk.23:54. He was finished buried the time of day being the “Jews preparations” (for the weekly Sabbath) – John 19:42. But Jesus’ “Jewish burial” started from the moment Joseph “took the body down” – after sunset – and continued during night and till the afternoon of Friday.

“*No Bible verse outright states that Jesus was risen on Saturday.*”

**Refer LD Part 2.**

The Passover Scriptures accordingly clearly instruct three consecutive days of observance as “Passover-Redemption” as such in distinction as well as in conjunction with the Feast of Unleavened Bread:

**Removal of Leaven** annexed with the penalty of death for non-observance and **Slaughter of Passover** annexed with the grace of postponement for non-observance, **ON THE FIRST DAY, 14** Nisan.

**Eating of Passover** consisting of the Lamb and Unleavened Bread after sunset and the Burning of Remains and burying of unbroken Bones after sunrise, called the “Sabbath-day” of Passover Feast, counted the first of seven days of Unleavened **Bread Eaten, ON THE SECOND DAY, 15** Nisan.

**First Sheaf Wave Offering**, “*the day after the Sabbath*” of Passover Feast, the second day of Unleavened **Bread, eaten**, to be counted the first day of seven times seven and a fiftieth day, **ON THE THIRD DAY** of Passover, 16 Nisan. For our purposes the important aspect lies in the second day’s observance which included the commands pertaining the lamb’s bones and remains. Tradition overlooks the fact that these are the events of the second day and places them on the first day of Passover Season. The day between Jesus’ slaughter and resurrection cannot thus be absorbed into the first and be reduced to the meaninglessness of Tradition’s “Still Saturday”.

p. 10 “*... Sunday ... resurrection takes place just at day break about 6 AM*”

**Refer LD Part 2, Par. 5.3.3, from p. 106; Par. 5.3.3.3.5, from p. 144.**

(p. 10) “*Sunday ... Nisan 16 ... The day of first fruits/ wave/ sheaf offering*”. “*Jesus is strongly typified as THE PASSOVER LAMB and the first fruits!*”

It is true the “*first fruits*” typify Jesus – but in the Passover-context He is typified as being the “First Sheaf” – First Sheaf of the winter-harvest of corn – also symbolic of the saved (through the sacrifice of Him). Of the corn came the dough for Unleavened **Bread**, offered as the First (two) Loaves Wave Offering of First Fruits after harvest – typical of the Holy Spirit’s creative activity in the manifestation of the Body which is Christ’s, the Church on Pentecost. (Two loaves! The Church manifests as the Communion of believers.) The “*first fruits*” offering though – in the context of the Day of Atonement half a year later – is of the summer-harvest of (especially) grapes – also symbolic of the damned (among whom are saved the elect through the sacrifice of Him). The *Paper* confuses two Passover Feast Days and their offerings. **Three annual** “First Fruits Offerings are distinguished in the Old Testament, “First fruits of sheaf wave offering” of winter harvest, Nisan 16 – Lev. 23:10; “First fruits of loaves wave offering”, “Pentecost” – Lev. 23:17, and First Fruits of summer

harvest – grapes – at the time of the Day of Atonement. Offerings of Firstlings was another but continual “First Fruits Offering”. **Refer 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.1.4.3.2, from p. 85; 5.1.1.6.4.7, from p. 207; 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.1.2.2.4, from p. 76.**

(p. 10 below) “*III. The “Last Supper” was NOT a Passover meal*”.

**Refer LD 1 / 2, Par. 5.1.1.7, from p. 1.** Note some discrepancies:

(p. 10) “*III ... A ... Spectrum of views ... The flesh from the lambs could not be left over after that night, but any remaining had to be consumed (Deut 16:4; Ex 12:10). If the last supper was indeed the actual Passover (seder) lamb meal then Jesus was killed as the “Lamb of God” after all the other Passover lambs were burned with fire the morning of His death.*”

If Jesus had been buried on the day of his death, He as the “Lamb of God” would have been buried before the flesh from all the other Passover lambs were burned with fire and their ashes with their unbroken bones were buried on the day after His death. (“Burial” is absolutely implied yet not stated in as many words in Moses’ books. Burning also ends up in the return of “ashes to ashes”; of “dust to dust”. In fact, had “burial” – return to the earth – not incurred, the purpose and meaning of God’s instruction would have been defeated.) Would what the *Paper* says concerning the time of the killing of the lamb, not also be true concerning the time of its “consuming”, that “*Christ literally fulfilled the Passover lamb symbolism to the exact time of the day*” ... and the day as such? “*He was slain when the Passover lambs were being slain! ...*” as well as buried when the Passover lambs were being “buried”! (1 Cor 5:7-8) Is it not also true that if not also buried at the time and on the day of the Passover lambs, “*... then Jesus fails to fulfill the anti-type of the Passover lamb, since he ...*” was buried one day before all the other Passover lambs on Nisan 15? (p. 11, “*C. I.*”; p. 10, “*A. I.*”) **Par. 5.1.1.6.4.0.1, p. 196, Par. 5.1.1.6.4.7, from p. 207.**

I entertain about every of the *Paper’s* arguments on the fact that the Last Supper was not the Passover Meal. But I think its arguments 3 and 4 on p. 13 are exceptionally pertinent: “*The Passover (seder) meal was to be a family meal with close relatives. It violates the intent of the meal for 12 men to abandon their wives and children on Passover night. Ex 12:3 “Take a lamb for themselves, according to their fathers’ households, a lamb for each household.” The evening they ate the seder/lamb meal, they must remain in their houses till daylight – “none of you shall go out of the door of his house until the morning.” Ex 12:22. Yet Jesus did go out to the garden of Gethsemane after the meal.*”

Although what the *Paper* observes is most certainly true, it also is true the Passover Festival got officiated and centralised with the introduction of its Temple-service. Jerusalem seems to have provided the greater-“home” and the collective offerings to have replaced the family-offerings.

I might again ask, If the particulars of the Feast and its times were to be respected so precisely, what about the time of the symbolic demand of earth and death by reason of the sins Jesus vicariously bore for us, on even the remains of our Passover Lamb?

(p. 14) “*5. ... The entire 8 day Passover festival*”.

I entertain a completely different explanation. First it should be remembered that the description of Passover of being an eight-days Feast Season, although correct, is extra-Biblical. But the characteristic derives not from “*the last supper on the eve of*

Nisan 14. The Last Supper was not “considered the FIRST meal for the entire 8 day Passover festival”, or, as the *Paper* says, “considered a very special meal by the Jews, for it was the first one of many”. It is easy to see why not. Leaven had to be removed during the night and day of 14 Nisan. At its beginning – evening of night – the meal consisted still of leavened food. Only during the further course of night and day leaven had to be removed. Only the next day (light half of day), had unleavened dough for the entire number of days of Unleavened Bread been prepared. The first one of seven and no more meals of Unleavened Bread was eaten on 15 Nisan, during its beginning – during its night-half before midnight. Although “considered a very special meal by the Jews”, the meal of 14 Nisan evening (beginning), was not one of the seven Passover, Unleavened, Bread, meals. Jesus’ use of ordinary bread was an introduction of it to a new symbolism of representing the Lord’s broken body.

The eight-days idea (Refer Par. 5.1.1.6.4.13.2, Part 1 / 1, from p. 232) comes from the fact that the original day of 14 Nisan’s reckoning from sunrise to sunrise was changed to a reckoning from sunset to sunset. Its original first part – its day-part – became its last part, and before it, got prefixed the previous night to make up the first part of 14 Nisan. Its original last part – its night part – became the first part of the following calendar day, of 15 Nisan. From this change originated two “first” days of Passover, its First Day of Preparation, 14 Nisan, and its First Day of Feast, 15 Nisan, the first of seven days of Unleavened Bread Feast. (Refer Part 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.5.3.5.1, p. 49, 5.1.1.6.3.4.3, p. 179) The last of the seven meals of Unleavened Bread Feast is accordingly dated as being that of “the twenty first day of the month” Nisan – during its first or evening-night part.

(p. 14) “6. ... (Jesus) knew He would miss the Passover meal (seder), since He would be in the tomb Friday night, at the very time the Jewish nation were eating the lamb”.

Jesus so to speak ate the Passover Meal being its sacrifice and in being sacrificed the Passover Lamb of God. For this the Last Supper was Jesus’ “Preparation for the Passover”. We are speaking symbolically of course, but of true reality, that Jesus really died for our redemption or Passover. So we must respect the reality and truth and exactness of the Gospel stories. The *Paper* should reconsider its words, “... (Jesus) knew He would miss the Passover meal (seder), since He would be in the tomb Friday night, at the very time the Jewish nation were eating the lamb ...”. Jesus would not be in the tomb the evening after his crucifixion and death – His body would still hang on the cross!

Refer Part 1 *in toto*, especially 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.1.4, from p. 104.

(p. 14, “block”) “Jesus our Passover ... Lord’s Supper ... Frequency ... Every Sunday: Acts 20:7”.

**Refer Part 3 / 2, Par. 7.2, from p. 92.**

(p. 14) “D. Interpreting “Passover” in the Gospel accounts: ... 1. Mt 26:17-19 “Now on the first day of unleavened bread [we know this was Nisan 14, yet it is called the first day of the feast of unleavened bread]”.

This was Nisan 14 all right but not “the first day of unleavened bread” being feasted or eaten. Nisan 14 is never called “Feast” although it was counted the first day of Passover Feast Season as well as of the Feast (Days) of Unleavened Bread – being “the day they removed leaven” just as being “the day they killed the Passover (lamb)”. Refer above, p. 175.

(p. 15) “IV. Types and anti-types of crucifixion fulfilled only with a Sunday resurrection! ... A. Day of first fruits and Pentecost always fell on a Sunday: ... 1. New Bible Dictionary, Passover ...”.

Being the Traditional viewpoint, the *Paper*’s shall always fall back on reliance upon the Sadducees’ calendar reckoning. Each time reappearing does not increase its strength though – only its imposing pretending. Refer above, Sadducees, p. 169 et al.

(p. 15) “IV. ... A. ... 2. Still fell on Sunday in 33AD! ... Those who say Jesus was crucified on a Thursday or Wednesday cannot absolutely guarantee that first fruits and Pentecost always fell on a Sunday because they must use a different year (ie. 30 AD) in which Nisan 14 would not fall on a Friday.”

“They must use a different year” ... but, ... “ie. 30 AD”? What is the logic of this or what advantage for the Traditional Friday crucifixion idea? Why would “those who say Jesus was crucified on a Thursday or Wednesday” try to “absolutely guarantee that first fruits and Pentecost always fell on a Sunday”? What caused it being recognised that Jesus’ crucifixion occurred on a Thursday, was not a determination from any supposed year’s incidence of the “first fruits”, but independent, unbiased observation of the Gospels’ large and many indications.

The *Paper* also noticed here, “Even if the Sabbath of Lev 23:11&15 is not the weekly Sabbath, but a reference to the first day of unleavened bread, being the Sabbath, the Wave/ sheaf/ First fruits offering AND Pentecost still fell on Sunday in 33 AD, the year Jesus was crucified!!!” If the *Paper*’s argument is that because the Sabbath of Lev 23:11&15 is the weekly Sabbath, therefore the Wave/ sheaf/ First fruits offering AND Pentecost fell on Sunday, how on earth could “the Wave/ sheaf/ First fruits offering AND Pentecost still (fall) on Sunday” if “the Sabbath of Lev 23:11&15 is not the weekly Sabbath”??

(p. 16) “B. Passover the type of Christ’s crucifixion ... 1. Friday: Exodus = Passover meal = Christ crucified type of the crucifixion day Nisan 14”.

(I take it the *Paper* means “Christ crucified” was the anti-type.) Important though, is that it repeatedly elsewhere says that the “meal” belongs with 15 Nisan, yet here it identifies “Passover meal”, “= 14 Nisan”! Most important, however, is that the *Paper* simply asserts for fact and settled – that “Friday: ... = 14 Nisan”!

The *Paper* repeats its tactics under “C. Wave/ sheaf/ first fruits the type of Christ’s resurrection ... 2. Sunday: First fruits = Christ raised (the Omer, or day of firstfruits, a clear type of the resurrection day, but not a Sabbath day!) Lev. 23:10-12”. Simply claim assertion, then present it for fact and proof! Most impressive! Although Tradition boasts ages’ success with this method, everybody cannot be fooled all the time.

It is correct that the day “after the Sabbath” Israel had to start counting fifty days on, was not called a Sabbath. But it does not prove the day “after the (Passover) Sabbath” was the First Day of the week. It proves nothing of anything the *Paper* claims for fact. It proves just one thing, that neither the days of the week nor natural chronology of astrometric “powers” are determinative when it comes to the events of the Passover. For faith it proves that God predisposed the dating of Passover and in the case of Jesus’ last Passover according to divine predestination and Covenant fidelity First Sheaf Wave Offering of First Fruits in truth occurred on the weekly Sabbath ... in order in exactly this coincidence to fulfil its prophetic typology.



(p. 16) "C. ... 3. The Israelites were instructed to be ready to leave Egypt at daybreak on the 15th (morning of the 15th)."

They were instructed to leave "midnight" as soon as the death angel passed through the homes of the Egyptians. It is important to notice the date of fifteen Nisan! But remember this was just the beginning of what happened on fifteen Nisan.

"Then they travelled day and night for the next few days first to Etham and then to Pi Hahiroth where they encamped by the sea. (Ex 13:20-14:2)".

Where does the *Paper* find "the next few days" in "Ex 13:20-14:2"? And where does it read that "they travelled day and night"? They travelled "that night", after midnight that is, first. They then travelled the next day daylight hours to Etham and then to Pi Hahiroth where they encamped by the sea. This was the first sunset on their journey and "this night" – "night" again – would witness their journey through the Red Sea. If for exactly this chronological Passover procedures of God with Israel Deuteronomy 5:15 reads, "Remember ... that the Lord thy God brought thee out ... therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day", would not the Sabbath be the very day of true Passover, that is, the day of First Sheaf Wave Offering? Refer Par. 5.1.1.6.1.3.1, p. 73.

"... The Israelites emerged on the other side (of the Red Sea) as the day was dawning and at which time the sea covered the Egyptians. (Ex 14:27) This event is a shadow of the fulfillment of the day of First Fruits. Therefor the people of Israel "saved" by coming through the Red Sea on the same day of the year and same time of day that Jesus rose from the dead as the "savior" of all who will turn to him – Nisan 17, before dawn."

"This event is a shadow of the fulfillment of the day of First Fruits. Therefor the people of Israel were "saved" by coming through the Red Sea on the same day of the year ...". But to also claim "that Jesus rose from the dead" the "same time of day", "before dawn", is not only unwarranted, but unnecessary. It was the same day – the only aspect of coincidence concerning that day that the Scriptures considers of importance. The words "that day" and "that night" are interchangeably applied in Exodus to events of that day. God never says, "Watch the hour how I am going to redeem you", but, "Watch this night = this day how I am going to redeem you". We are not bound to give to the hours or time of day the importance God intended for the day simply. The command doesn't say remember the hour or keep holy the dawn, but remember the Sabbath Day – the whole of it – because of what God did "on it / in it / by it". The day was instrumental – not the hour of day – in God's doings. And besides, what God did in Christ for being dead in the grave, is for what it was no less of redemptive value and necessity than what his entering upon death and his emerging from it is for what it was. Man has no right to belittle any aspect of Jesus' redemptive work. Any facet thereof without the other would leave it imperfect.

Of course Jesus' resurrection is the ultimate, the great, the true moment of the ultimate, of the great, of the true Day of the Yom Yahweh. Ephesians 1:19f is my favourite Scripture in this regard. Now the naked factualness of this event in the anti-type Himself (not in the people or in any symbolic representation) is in naked factualness stated in Matthew 28:1 to have occurred "in Sabbath's-time"!

So the *Paper's* dating of the day Israel "emerged on the other side", "Nisan 17", is wrong, and is applied to the wrong day of the week. It should be Nisan 16, and be applied to the Sabbath. God Himself through Israel's history and through the Law He gave them, applies this event to the "Sabbath Day of the Lord thy God"! The

Seventh Day became "The Sabbath Day of the Lord thy God" for no reason but this His Work of Salvation in Jesus Christ! The First Day of the week nowhere fits into this picture.

### **5.2.2.5.6. Pentecost**

(p. 16) "E. Pentecost the type of the giving of God's law".

The resemblance is not only the number of days from accomplished Passover to the giving of the Stone-Law. The prophetic symbolism is much grander. The giving of the Law on Sinai is the type of the giving of God's Christ for a Law to the New Testament People of God for it is the giving of birth and life to the People of God. Pentecost is not a spirit that witnesses to itself, but it is The Spirit – God's Holy Spirit – in its true and sole manifestation: as The Witness to the Christ of God in Resurrection from the dead! Pentecost is this event of Christ Jesus through the Holy Spirit ... and He in his freedom thus living and working becomes for His people their Law. And while Christ Himself thus becomes unto His people their Law ... behold: It is the Sabbath Day, the Sabbath of the Lord thy God! **Refer Part 3 / 1, "Pentecost".**

(p. 19) "CI. From the mouth of Jesus! ... Luke 13:32 "Behold I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I reach my goal." ... 1. What this proves is that the expression "the third day" represents a literal duration of Friday – Sunday!!! Jesus spoke Lk 12:32 ON A FRIDAY and he entered Jerusalem on a Sunday exactly one week before he died!"

Inaccuracies abound and misconceptions flourish in an instant soil-base for fantastical mutations. Soil-base: "Jesus spoke Lk 12:32 ON A FRIDAY and he entered Jerusalem on a Sunday exactly one week before he died!" Lk.13:31 says, "The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying to Him, Get thee out and depart hence; for Herod will kill thee. And He said to them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils ...". Jesus said this "the same day" while "journeyng to Jerusalem" and "as He went through the cities and villages", according to verse 22 – naturally preaching on the Sabbath Days! The Greek actually says "In that hour / at that time = during His journey approached Him ...". There is no contextual or textual indication that "Jesus spoke Lk 12:32 ON A FRIDAY". On the contrary, if verse 31 should be connected with what contextually follows, Jesus might have spoken these words on a Sabbath – see 14:1. Also keep in mind the overall impression this section creates, and the probability is good that Jesus might have spoken these words on a Sabbath Day. **Refer 3 / 3, Par. 7.3.2.1.5, p. 198; 3 / 4, 7.4.3.2.6, p. 79; 7.5.6, p. 116; 7.6.3.1.2, p. 153.**

But what is it the *Paper* actually wants us as it were to hear "from the mouth of Jesus"? This, what it with three exclamation marks emphasises: "... What this proves is that the expression "the third day" represents a literal duration of Friday – Sunday!!!

"He entered Jerusalem on a Sunday exactly one week before he died!" That would mean Jesus died on Sunday (or Saturday). The more "exactly" a lost person watches his tracks, the less chance he will realise he is crawling around in circles: "What this proves is that the expression "the third day" represents a literal duration of Friday – Sunday!!! ... This is an irrefutable argument. ... Lk.13:32 is so powerful ... only those driven with an agenda to maintain Sabbath keeping would not be convinced!"

With reference to Lk.13:32 the *Paper* wants to disprove the claim that the “third day” means after 72 hours – quite right! But then it should keep an eye on this aim and mustn’t try to prove a Sunday resurrection from it. It represents no literal duration of Friday – Sunday.

(p. 23) “E. “Preparation”, the first century word for Friday!”

Bacchiocchi’s every argument is refuted in Part One of *LD*. **Refer 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.5.4, from p. 53.**

(p. 24) “F. Scholars and commentaries on 3 days and 3 nights”

No matter how respected the Christian scholars and how formal the Jewish commentators referred to are, when it comes to Bible-matters, the Bible is its first and more often than not its only expositor. These sincere scholars simply have no more to work with than what the Bible supplies them with. Nevertheless I on this particular point agree with them and their explanation. But they should not be too moderate. The usual meaning of the usual expression “three days” / “the third day” etc., is not the more complicated meaning of the more complicated and exceptional expression, “three days and three nights”. Jesus used it with specific meaning in differentiation from the usual. He used the definitive expression “three days and three nights” for the reason of its definitive meaning. Jesus thereby meant more than simply the representative concept or method for reckoning and counting days. Jesus with “three days and three nights” meant just what He said. It not in the least clashes with the principle of a part as representing the whole as in the expression “the third day”. Now the Friday crucifixion Tradition cannot meaningfully tolerate the reality of three days and three nights, while the Thursday crucifixion idea, can. The Thursday crucifixion idea does require the principle of the part for the whole while it also requires three days and three nights.

Refer 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.2.4.6.2, p. 125; Part 2, Par. 5.3.3.2.2.2.2.1.

#### 5.2.2.5.7.

(p. 25) “Two Sabbaths theory: (a false view)”

We nevertheless cannot reach consensus on the larger issue of a Sunday-resurrection or a Sabbath resurrection because the *Paper* argues against a Wednesday-crucifixion. In the first place I may say that the Wednesday argument is not going to be refuted with reference to “either 30 AD or 33 AD”.

(p. 25) “A. Plural “sabbaton” in Mt.28:1 refers to weekly Sabbath ALONE!”

Amen! Yet the Friday Tradition and the Thursday crucifixion in principle remain worlds apart. Why? Because the Friday Tradition without question takes for granted “the obvious fact that Jesus was crucified on Friday”. To acknowledge agreement in principle on the issue of the plural “sabbaths” for the single, is not to admit the word “sabbath” without exception refers to the weekly Sabbath! The *Paper* refers to Col.2:16 where the word “sabbath” has the meaning of Old Testament (Jewish) festival-Sabbaths primarily. In Col.2:16 the weekly Sabbath may be implied as well, but only as the Sabbath of Christian freedom! Refer Part 4, Par. 8.2.2.

(p. 26) “B. “High Day” of Jn 19:31 refers to weekly Sabbath, not 1st day of unleavened bread: ... John 19:31 “The Jews therefore, because it was the day of preparation, so that the bodies should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath (for

that Sabbath was a high day), asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.” ... 1. It was a special Sabbath, the one that fell within the feast of unleavened bread. More importantly, the Sabbath within “Passover week” was the one they used determine (sic.) the Wave/ sheaf/ First fruits offering on the day after the Sabbath- always Sunday (Leviticus 23:11); AND tot start counting down for the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) Leviticus 23:15. Pentecost always fell on a Sunday. (see notes within this document: Passover always fell on Sunday and “New Bible dictionary, Passover”). Even if the Sabbath of Lev. 23:11&15 are not the weekly Sabbath, but a reference to the first day of unleavened bread, being the Sabbath, the Wave/sheaf offering AND Pentecost still fell on Sunday in 33 AD, the year Jesus was crucified!!!”

Now again the *Paper* uses the “proof” of intimidating repetition. It refers to references about Sadducees and things – anything except the Bible – even astrometric findings! (By the bye, *Her Majesty’s Nautical Almanac Office* (they are on Internet) – with regard to the years 29 and 30 AD indicate a Thursday 14 Nisan – refer p. 78 of 1 / 1, Par. 5.1.1.6.1.4.1.2.) The *Paper* this time more elaborately reiterates its initial assertions and assumptions, that First Sheaf Wave Offering and First Loaves Wave Offering always fell on Sunday – because the Sadducees say so. And then even if what the Sadducees say may be wrong and “the Sabbath(s) of Lev 23:11&15 are not the weekly Sabbath, but ... being the Sabbath ...”, First Sheaf Wave Offering and Pentecost “still” must be Sunday!

(p. 26) “2. ... We deny that John’s phrase “that Sabbath was a high day” could possibly refer to the first day of unleavened bread. ...° Nowhere in the Bible are the annual Jewish feast days like Passover or the days of unleavened bread called “HIGH SABBATHS” or “high days”! so the Bible itself, by its silence, refutes the concept completely.”

The *Paper* ignores John’s, own and unique use of the expression, “high / great day” – *megaleh hehmera*. We have above referred to Jn.7:37, “In the last day, the great (high) day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink”. John in no wise associates this indication, “high day”, with the weekly Sabbath; but being “the last day of the Feast”, it was that Feast’s Sabbath Day. If I correctly observe verses 2 and 23, this might have been Wednesday. If the Jews in this matter say a “high day” “is one of the annual holy days” – nobody may say “it is completely wrong”.

(p. 27 under first dot) “John tells us “that Sabbath was a high day”, not “that day was a high Sabbath”! A huge difference”. (Under the second dot) “For that Sabbath was a high day. Notice the word “day” is not in the original Greek.”

What would the “huge difference” mean? It would mean that if “John tells us “that day was a high Sabbath””, then he would have said “Sabbath” for the Feast Sabbath that fell on Friday. Now John in 19:31 does not say “that Sabbath was a high day” – Sabbath the subject or the complement of incomplete predication. John 19:31 reads, “The day was great that very Sabbath’s-day” (*ehn megaleh heh hehmera ekeinou tou sabbatou*) – “that day” (nominative), another day than the weekly Sabbath-day is the subject or the complement of incomplete predication. “That, day, was, a high-Sabbath’s-day” in clearest contradistinction to the ordinary weekly Sabbath. John, in the simplest possible Greek, explicitly defines this “high-day-of-a-Sabbath” for “being The Preparation” – *epei paraskeueh ehn* – the weekly Sabbath’s Preparation Day! Let the Septuaginta translate the Hebrew of *Lev 23:32 16:31*

shabbath shabbathon “by the compound Greek expression “sabbata sabbaton”, it matters not. John does not use “the simple “sabbaton” used in the Gospels”. He uses his own and Jewish expression of “high-day-of-a-Sabbath”. John had no problem to simply say Sabbath when he intended to indicate simply the (weekly) Sabbath. He says it like everybody else and he says it like he himself says it several times. But John also had no problem to indicate Friday-“Preparation Day” for “being an High-Day-Sabbath” when it in fact was the case.

John in 19:31 records the events after Jesus’ crucifixion the past day. In 19:14 he identifies crucifixion day as being “The Preparation Day of Passover”. The day to follow The Preparation day of Passover is the Passover’s Sabbath. John in 19:31 records or rather starts recording the Passover’s Sabbath’s events – events of the day after Jesus’ crucifixion – of the past “Preparation Day of Passover” (Thursday).

The Synoptists don’t describe the Feast Sabbaths as “Sabbaths / Sabbath”. But John in 19:31 does. And John in 7:37 describes a Feast Sabbath as a “high /great day”. John proves that annual feast days like Passover are in fact designated “High-Day-Sabbaths”. It exceeds no normal man’s intelligence to see. And it falls within any ordinary Jew’s scope of religious experience. To say “When the Jews used the word Sabbath, it always referred to the weekly Sabbath” is to say too much. “NEVER” say never and never go beyond what the Bible says, like in the *Paper’s* block on p. 27, bottom, “Sabbaths ...: all nailed to the cross.” I assure you, “Christians” – good as any – do “keep them” whether they were nailed to the cross or not. In fact, “Christians” keep the Sabbath for the very reason it was nailed to the cross with Jesus Christ. The Sabbath, like all Law, was nailed to the cross by virtue of Jesus Christ. Like all law receive validity by virtue of Jesus Christ, also the Sabbath by virtue of Jesus Christ receives validity. Jesus Christ, “is the Word” – God’s Word, and He, “is the Word” also in the sense of God’s Law. And Paul warns “anyone” (*tis*): “Don’t judge (the Church) pertaining festivities of Sabbath Days!”

(p. 27 under first dot, second sentence) “It is obvious that the day was a Sabbath already, but that it was a special Sabbath ...”.

The *Paper* could not have said better what John meant to say. It is the power of Tradition. Despite its obviousness, despite the fact that the day was a Sabbath already, the *Paper* doesn’t recognise the fact! “That day already was, it having been entered upon (some while ago)”: “as it became evening” – John 19:31, Mt.27:57 and Mk.15:42! And it was a Sabbath already, its holy hours being the Jew’s waking up call – Attention! ... the bodies on the crosses! But that it was a special Sabbath they would not have given the crucified another thought!

(Under second dot cont.): “It was an ordinary weekly Sabbath made HIGH by the fact it fell within Passover week.”

The *Paper* no more than claims. A million times asserting won’t change the Passover Sabbath into the weekly.

(p. 27 third dot. I have copied exactly as is.) “It is redundant and makes no sense to say, “that Sabbath was a high day” should be paraphrased “the first day of unleavened bread was a high Sabbath because it is like saying “your wedding day is special to you”. All wedding days are inherently always special. Every first day of unleavened bread was always a SPECIAL day. If this is what John meant, all he

would have to say is “the legs were broken because it was the first day of the feast”. Every Jew would know that this was a High day ... Even if we grant that the first day of unleavened bread universally viewed as a “high sabbath” by the Jews, why would John say “the first day of unleavened bread is a high sabbath”. That is as silly as John saying, “the seventh day of the week was a sabbath”. So it is obvious that the weekly Sabbath was made special (or as John said a “that Sabbath was high”) by the fact that it fell within Passover week.”

We could turn the argument around and say, If we grant it was the weekly Sabbath made special by the fact that it fell within Passover week, such Sabbaths were universally viewed as a “high sabbath” by the Jews. So why would John say “the Sabbath was a high day”?

Exactly because this Preparation Friday was the Passover’s Sabbath that has just been entered upon, it caused the Jews great anxiety. It supposes it could have been different – it could have been a normal Preparation (Friday). But now being coincidental with this High Day Sabbath, the Jews were afraid the crucified might remain on the crosses over it. The Jews the previous day were not so attentive when they crucified Jesus. They were so preoccupied with the unholy design to kill Him they never gave it thought that the Passover’s High Day would see them shamed. Now after sunset when calamities subsided and they had had their Passover Meal, the result of the Jews’ madness started to dawn upon them. John records the forgotten co-incidence of that Friday’s Preparation being the Passover’s High Day Sabbath and thus unintentionally proves what for no Jew ever was an issue, that the annual Feast Days were called Sabbaths.

(p. 27 bottom) “C. Mary bought spices on Sunday (after Saturday)”.

Correct and important observation!

The *Paper’s* refutation on p. 28 under point “2.” of the claim that the women bought spices after a supposed annual sabbath that fell on Thursday, accepted. **Refer 5.3.3.2.2.1, Part 2**

(p. 28) “3. Here is the Bible truth that Jesus was crucified on Friday: ... (under second dot) Lk 23:49 tell us that the women were at the foot of the cross: “And all his acquaintances and the women who had followed him from Galilee stood at a distance and saw these things. Then notice that Mary “followed after [Joseph of Arimathea when he buried Jesus], and saw the tomb and how his body was laid. And they returned and prepared spices and perfumes.” Lk. 23:50-56. This proves that Mary prepared the spices in Lk 23 ON THE SAME DAY JESUS WAS BURIED. ... Lk 23:55 also plainly states that the “preparation day” was the same day they bought the spices. Hence: Christ’s burial, the day of preparation and the day they bought the spices were all THE SAME DAY.”

How perfectly we agree on the impossibility of a Wednesday crucifixion. Yet how perfectly we disagree on the possibility of a Friday crucifixion. The *Paper* makes of two days’ histories, one: “Lk 23:49 tell us that the women were at the foot of the cross: “And all his acquaintances and the women who had followed him from Galilee stood at a distance and saw these things.” Then notice that Mary followed Joseph of Arimathea when he buried Jesus”. What were “these things” “the women saw”?

Where were they when they “saw”? When did they “see”? Refer 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.1.2.3.1. to 8 pp. 78 to 87.

“Lk 23:55 also plainly states that the “preparation day” was the same day they bought the spices”.

Caution! ... The women “prepared”. They didn’t buy. The women only “bought ... after the Sabbath”. The implications are far reaching.  
Refer 1 / 2, Par. 5.2.

(p. 29 second dot) “The truth is that they began mixing spices on the same day Jesus was crucified but ran out of time”.

The issue of the same day – answered many times over.  
The issue of time: Refer Part 2 of 1, Par. 5.2.2.2; Part 2, Par. 5.3.3.3.1.

(p. 29 second dot cont.) “... all day Saturday ... after the Sabbath ... Saturday night ... early Sunday morning ... to the tomb”.  
Refer Part 2, Par. 5.3.3.2.2.3, and further.

(p. 32) “VIII. Problems with ... Thursday crucifixion and Saturday Resurrection: ... A. Saturday Resurrection totally unbiblical”.

The *Paper* at this point retraces all the previous arguments rather verbatim – no different approach, no further argument, no new facts.

I have found in this argumentation for a Friday crucifixion and a Sunday resurrection three characteristic aspects. First that of the Emmaus road story – that the disciples expected Jesus would rise on that day, “the third since it all happened”. The second is its insistence on the hypothesis that the word “Sabbath” is in the New Testament used for exclusively the weekly Sabbath – whereby the Old Testament “Feast”-Sabbath referred to in John 19:31 has to be the weekly Sabbath and could not have been the Friday. The third is this treatise’s dependence on the (supposed) Sadducean reckoning of Passover.

A further – and fundamental – characteristic of the whole of this *Paper* is its total dependence on accepted translation, with the exception of those old translations that favour the concept of a Sabbath (Saturday) resurrection.

One might assume the *Paper*’s is the way ordinary people would think on the issue of the traditional alternative for the days of crucifixion and resurrection.

I appended this *Paper* to serve as a summarising reference to Part Two of Part One, *Crucifixion*, as well as an introductory reference to Part Two, *Resurrection*.  
Appendix 2, Refer p. 30.

#### 5.2.2.6.

##### ‘Descended to hell’

The Protestant explanation of the Apostolic Confession of Faith, Article, “descended to hell”, implies the Paschal symbolism of Jesus’ Suffering and Resurrection “the third day according to the Scriptures”. Klaas Schilder’s exposition allows the Paschal sequence – and precisely – although he did not concentrate on sequence or chronology. Jürgen Moltmann has the following to say in his *Das Kommen Gottes – Christliche Eschatologie*, under Chapter 3, 11, 6, *Reich Gottes – Geschichtliche Eschatologie*, p. 279-280. Note the meaning of the words of these headings – besides the eschatological. To suppose actual historic chronology in them is simply to take words to mean what they say. But again, Moltmann certainly didn’t have the Passover or its chronology in mind.

“Die Höllenfahrt Christi ... Die christliche Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge ... geht davon aus, dass Christus in seinem Leiden und Sterben die wirkliche und ganze Hölle der Gottverlassenheit für die Versöhnung der Welt erlitten und die wirkliche und ganze Verdammnis der Sünde für uns erfahren hat. Genau darin liegt der göttliche Grund für die Versöhnung .... Weil Christus nach Luther in seiner Verlassenheit am Kreuz alle Qualen der Hölle, der Verwerfung von Gott und des ewigen Todes stellvertretend für uns erlitten hat, an unsere Statt und zu unsere Gunzen ... (Darum: ... “Sieh auf die Wunden Christi, dort ist dir deine Erwählung gewiss gemacht.” ... Der am Kreuz sterbende Christus war der am meisten Angefochtene und der am tiefsten Verworfenen unter allen Menschen. Weil er unsere Verwerfung an seinem Leibe erlitten hat, erkennen wir unsere Gnadenwahl aus seinen Wunden.

Wann hatt Christus die Hölle für uns erlitten und welche Hölle ist es? Luther spricht von der Höllenfahrt Christi VOR dem physischen Tod am Kreuz, nicht danach. Das ist der Tradition gegenüber neu. Calvin ist ihm darin gefolgt (Inst. 2, 16, 10.) Die Verlassenheit Christi zwischen Gethsemane und Golgotha ist die Verrlassenheit eines in alle Ewigkeit Verdammten. Das nicht erhörte Gebet in Gethsemane bereitete Christus Höllenqualen. Darum fallen Schweiss und Blut von ihm auf die Erde (Referred here to Luther in his Genesisvorlesung! See Par. 7.7.) Er geriet ‘in gehenna et in inferno’. Sterbend am Kreuz hat er nicht nur Gottes Gegenwärtigen Zorn über die gottlose Welt erfahren, sondern auch ‘futuram iram, künftig Hölle’.”

The paschal lamb was put to pen on the tenth day of the month Nisan for to be “prepared”. It seems the animal wasn’t given anything to eat or drink until at length it was sacrificed! The lamb suffered unwillingly and unconsciously. But not the Lamb of God’s Passover – He suffered willing to suffer, knowingly and consciously.

Christ entered the pen and his last seven days of separation and suffering on the tenth of Nisan (on Palm Sunday). But his final experience of Paschal suffering only began when his “hour was come” in the evening of the Last Supper which ‘prepared the Passover’ of the Christ Himself and began the first of the three last days “according to the Scriptures”. This phrase, “according to the Scriptures the third day” fastens Christ’s suffering, death, AND BURIAL AND RESURRECTION to the Passover, “by ordinance (of God) for ever”! Christ from that night on, lived his dying and death for us – to be raised “the third day” in triumph over the anguish of death, over death itself and the realm of the dead, over the grave, and hell, and sin.

Now if the Passover lamb had been separated 10 Nisan – day one – it “suffered” its “preparation” till 14 Nisan – on which day it after five days of living “hell”, was at last sacrificed. It had to be sacrificed the last part of the day – daylight time – and afternoon. Then on the sixth day the lamb’s bones and remains were burned and buried. Being but a mortal creature it couldn’t in itself symbolise the overcoming of death by resurrection. But on the seventh day therefore, the First Sheaf of Harvest was brought before God to show the Resurrection – “ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES THE THIRD DAY (OF PASSOVER FEAST)”. The New Testament words, “the third day” are contractual or clausal, and must originate from the Institution of the Passover, Lv.23:5-6 x Ex.12:10 – according to which Institution the remains of the sacrifice had to be burned on the second day of the Feast. (In contrast to the Peace offering of which the remains could be burned on the third day (Lv.7:17, 19:6)). Hosea (6:2) should have the Passover and its day of Life “after two days” in mind. “Celebrate the Passover” (“Keep it a Feast” Ex.12:14 *et al*) is the command. The command, “Observe the month of Abib” (Dt.16:1) widens the

Passover Feast to also incorporate the month of Nisan at least from its tenth day onwards. Passover is metaphor of Christ in His suffering, and **when it is Christ the true Lamb of God**, also the seventh day in the chronology of the Paschal-Event – 16 Nisan – is **God's true "Seventh Day"**, his Sabbath Day of the completion of all His works in Resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ, "our", and God's, "Passover Lamb". God determined the time so as in Jesus Christ to have reached fullness.

The Living Christ, died: the death of Passover – for the forgiveness of sins of the many who are His. His 'Work of Redemption' – Jesus' **dying** by descent into hell – God by the resurrection from the dead of Him, "**finished**". The Passover of Yahweh not only foreshadowed Christ's work of redemption. The Passover of Yahweh's last, true and fulfilling eventuality – the exaltation of Jesus Christ by the raising of Him from the dead – also finished, exemplified, exhibited and exonerated '*The-Day-Concerning-Which-God-Thus-Spoke*': "**The Seventh Day**".

### Letters

12 Desember 2000

Geagte mev. Erasmus,

Eerstens, verskoning dat ek nog nie u geld ingebank het nie. Nou gaan ek maar iets waag en sommer kontant tussen hierdie velletjies insit.

En dan baie dankie vir die geskriffie. Wat my veral geïnteresseer het was u sieninge rondom Jesus se kruisiging. Vir my was dit ook van betekenis dat meer en meer geleerdes hulle met die tydsberekening en datering daarvan bemoei.

"*As die Here Jesus drie nagte en drie dae in die graf was soos Hy gesê het ...*". (42/1) U sit Mt.12:40 in hakies. Nou lees ek dit nie daar dat Jesus dit gesê het nie. Hy praat van "**in die hart van die aarde wees soos Jona**". Dit beteken nie om "**in die graf te wees**" te wees nie, maar om **dood** te wees want "soos Jona" s'n was Jesus se ervaring 'n **doodservaring**. Die analogie met Jona is nie volkome nie – Jona is immers nie Christus nie. Waar Jona in die **vis**, "tot die **dood** toe benoud" was, het Jesus aan die **kruis, gesterf**. Jesus het gesterf en **só** was Hy "in die hart van die aarde". "In die hart van die aarde" vertel **hóé**, en nie **wáár** nie. Jesus het "in die hart van die aarde" ingegaan – **figuurlike** taal as daar ooit was. "Soos Jona", was Jesus "drie dae en drie nagte" in die **dood** – **letterlike** taal as daar ooit was. Die probleem vir die tradisionele verstaan lê nie by "**in die hart van die aarde wees**" nie, maar eenvoudig by "**drie dae en drie nagte** soos Jona". Die probleem vir ú verstaan eger lê by **sowel** "in die hart van die aarde wees" as by "drie dae en drie nagte soos Jona". Die probleem vir ú verstaan lê ook by "drie dae en drie nagte" want u maak daarvan "**72 uur**" (42/27). En dan draai u die volgorde sommer ook om en maak daarvan "**drie nagte en drie dae**".

U kom verward voor waar u die tye van begrawe en opstaan parallel trek. Onthou ons praat **argumentshalwe** van die tyd wat Jesus begrawe sou wees, en nie van die tyd wat Hy gesterf het nie. "*Die Bybel verklaar dat die Here Jesus begrawe is net voor die sabbat begin het.*" (40/17) U sê verder dat Jesus "*drie uur namiddag ... sy laaste asem uitgeblaas het.*" En "*omdat dit die voorbereiding van die Jode was*", "*moes hulle gou maak*". (40/14) Die implikasie is die Joodse vrou moes ná die begrafnis nog hulle voorbereidings gaan doen voordat die Sabbat sou aanbreek. "*Gou*" na "**drie uur**" is daarom nog **duidelik** "*voor die sabbat begin het*". "**Net voor die sabbat begin het**" is dus 'n netjiese "**net**". Ons verwag daarom 'n netjiese "**voor**" of "**teen sonder**" (42/7) wanneer dit by die opstanding kom om "**72 uur**" later te kry! Maar nee, "**teen die aanvang van die vierde dag**" word "**met die aanvang van die**

**18de Abib**". "**Teen die aanvang van die vierde dag**" is **duidelik, vóór** sonder. "**Met die aanvang van die 18de Abib**" is **duidelik, ná** sonder.

En "**teen die aanvang van die vierde dag**" word "**met die aanvang van die**" ... **vierde** dag! U konstateer dan ook "*Die Jode het dit reg verstaan om te beteken 'na drie dae', want hulle sê hulle onthou dat Hy gesê het: 'Oor drie dae staan Ek op'*". (42/12-13) Maar u vergeet dat die getuienis agterna was dat "God Hom **op die derde dag** opgewek het"! Jesus het self ook gesê dat Hy "**op die derde dag** klaarmaak" – verwysende na sy opstanding uit die dood, en dat "Ek **dit in drie dae** weer sal opbou" – verwysende na sy opgestane liggaam uit die dood! Ens. Neewat, u moet die **idiomatiese** betekenis van hierdie voorsetsels nie so verontagsaam nie. Hoe verklaar u bv. Markus 9:31 waar Jesus sy dissipels leer dat "Die Seun van die mens oorgelewer (= gedood) word in die hande van die mense en hulle sal Hom doodmaak, en nadat Hy gedood is, sal Hy **die derde dag** opstaan" – *meta* **treis** *heemeras* – presies dieselfde frase van Mt.27:63! Soos u die frase inkleur het Jesus hier vier dae in die **dood** nodig en moes Hy daarom op die vyfde dag uit die **graf** gegaan het.

Maar u het verder gelyk – 42/15b-16, "*Hulle wou die graf verseël hê ... hulle het dit nie verstaan as 'tot die derde dag begin nie', maar 'tot die derde dag verby was'*". Laat my kwalifiseer, Die Jode wou nie "*die graf verseël hê tot op die derde dag*" nie (42/15a). Hulle wou die graf "**vir** die derde dag" verseël hê.

A! U sien nou die oneindige komplikasies en implikasies. Die saak is veel eenvoudiger en die eenvoud daarvan is juis die oplossing vir al die probleme wat enige foutiewe interpretasie oplewer. Nogtans bewonder ek u eerlikheid en moed om die tradisie te bevraagteken. Ek is net bevrees of u dieselfde moed en eerlikheid sal bly handhaaf om die volle konsekwensies te aanvaar? Ek vertrou u sal. Daar is net een soort geloof, en dit is die opregte en moedige volhardende en lydende geloof in Jesus – Op.14:12!

Die "drie dae en drie nagte" **as 'n eenheid gesien**, is gelyk aan **die** "drie dae, **volgens die Skrifte**". En deurgaans het **hierdie dae** te doen met die **sterwe en opstanding** van die Versoener en Verlosser. Sy begrawe-wees is **slegs een** faset van hierdie groter geheel van Sy Sending! "Drie dae en drie nagte" is **daarom** nie "**72 uur**" nie, maar verteenwoordigde en verteenwoordigende dae onafwykend "volgens die Skrifte"! Wat hierdie drie dae maak wat hulle is, is die oomblik in God se tyd. Daardie oomblik maak die dag. As dit die sterwe van Christus is, is daardie dag die Dag-van-sy-Sterwe. En as dit die dag van sy opstanding is, is daardie dag die Dag-van-sy-Opstanding! **Hierdie twee oomblikke verteenwoordig twee van die drie dae op die kalender van God – dag- gedeelte sowel as nag-gedeelte – volgens die Skrifte**. Nou waar is die derde van die drie dae dan?

Mev. Erasmus, as hierdie twee dae van die drie dae "volgens die Skrifte", die Kruisigingsdag en die Opstandingsdag is, is hulle dit volgens die Skrifte van die **Pasga!** Jesus die Lam van God, ons Pasgalam (ek gee u nie die Skrifte nie, u is self daarmee volkome vertrou) is geslag "op die **dag** wat die pasga geslag moet word" – én op die **tyd** wat die pasga geslag moet word, naamlik "tussen die paar nagte van die veertiende van die eerste maand". Geslag is die Pasgalam van God tussen daardie "**paar nagte**" (*Been-ha-arbajim*) geslag! Ses uur die oggend is Hy oorgegee om gekruisig te word. En drie uur namiddag van hierdie eerste dag "volgens die Skrifte" (soos u ook uit Korintiërs aanhaal, 43/12-20) sterf Hy. Die eerste dag **loop uit**. Hy kom nie **aan** nie! Net so verteenwoordig die Goddelike **oomblik** van die opstanding van Jesus Christus uit die dood **die hele derde** van die drie dae "volgens die Skrifte" (soos u ook aangehaal het). En tussenin lê daardie ander (derde) dag van hierdie "drie dae volgens die Skrifte". Lees u nou weer daardie aanhaling uit Paulus, en watter dag

sou u sê is dit? Hoe lees “die Skrifte”? U verwys na die instellingsskrifure van die Pasga. Wat moet Israel doen met “die bewaarde dele” of “oorblyfsels” van die offerlam? Hulle moet dit verbrand! “Stof tot stof, as tot as” – hulle moet dit “*ter aarde bestel*”! En wanneer? “Die volgende dag”! Die dag ná die lam geslag was moes die bewaarde oorblyfsels teruggaan aarde toe. Dit was net so ’n deel van die Pasga-eskatologie as die slag van die lam!

Nou, watter “Skrifte” word vervul in die sterwe, begrafnis en opstanding van die Here Jesus Christus? **Alle** Skrifte maar tog onteenseglik in besonder die **Pasga**-“Skrifte”. Lees mens Handeling sien mens hoe juis hierdie Skrifte tot vervulling gekom het. So ook wanneer mens Skrifure soos Korintiërs lees. Hoe dikwels nie sê veral Matteus en Johannes “sodat vervul sou word ...”! Tog lees ons nêrens maar nêrens iets soos dit van die nimlike Deuteronomium 21:23 nie! Nee, volgens die Pasga-profesie (profesie is dit verseker) moet die lam vir die sondes eers die volgende dag begrawe word. Jesus is die antipiese Pasgalam – die ware en Eerste Een. Hy leer ons die tye (42 par. 4) en die eerstydse of Ou Testamentiese Pasga kom maar net van **Sy tye**. Hy sterf by voorbeeld “tussen die paar nagte”, dit wil sê **in die dag**. Hy word sonop oorlewer en die oggend gekruisig om uiteidelik die namiddag “die gees te gee”. Sal Hy die volgende dag begrawe word – is dit in sy mag om eers die volgende dag begrawe te word – of wag die misdadigers se lot ook op die Gunsteling om “die verderf te sien” nog dieselfde dag van sy sterwe? Die beskikking van God waak oor elke oomblik en oor elke ontwikkeling. Kyk wie kom daar aan as die son al onder gegaan het en die volgende dag al aangebreek het! Josef! “Want toe dit al aand was, toe kom Josef en hy waag dit om in te gaan na Pilatus”. Toe skrik die vertalers so ’n kwart eeu gelede wakker en hulle sê, Hokaai! Kom ons sê, “Laat die middag” sodat daar nog tyd sal oorbly om Jesus begrawe te kry voordat die son ondergaan!

Daar het u nou die “drie dae”, “volgens die Skrifte”. Maar waar is die drie **nagte** daarvan? Die eerste dag **loop uit**. Hy kom nie **aan** nie, het ons hierbo vasgestel. Waar begin hierdie eerste dag eintlik? Die oggend toe Pilatus vir Jesus oorgee het? Nee. Hy begin toe Jesus besef het “dat sy uur aangebreek het” die “uur” wat Hom by die “einde” sou laat uitkom – Jh.13:1. Hier begin Jesus se Jona-nag van “tot die dood toe benoud”. Hier en in Getsemane deurleef Jesus die smarte van die dood. Daarom verwys Jesus in Mt.12:40 na Jona se ervaring en sien Hy, soos Jona, sy ervaring as’t ware voor die oë afspeel: Hy sien hoedat die Seun van die mens “drie dae en drie nagte in die hart van die aarde sal gewees het”. Jesus sien hierdie beeld van sy eie smarte vanuit die oogpunt van die uiteinde daarvan – vanuit die oogpunt van sy triomf oor die dood en sy benoudheid en van die “ontbinding van die pyne van die dood”. Vele oomblikke van hierdie eerste dag verteenwoordig die geheel daarvan, inderdaad van die geheel van beide die nag en die dag daarvan. Sy laaste maaltyd saam met sy dissipels tot “voorbereiding” van sy eie “eet” van die offer deur eie sterwe, is een so ’n oomblik. Getsemane is nog een. Om “oorgee” te word, is nog een. Om die kruispad te loop, nog een, om geslaan, gespoeg, gehoon te word, nog een. Om opgehef te word en staan gemaak te word, om te hang en te dors, om te verlang na sy Vader, om die gees te gee. Om verlaat te word.

Om amper gebreek te word in die gebeente, om feitlik met die misdadigers gereken te word selfs in sy dood – maar daarvan verhoed en behoed te word, om volgens die gebruik van die Jode versorg en toegedraai te word en met eerbetoning tot graf geneem te word – dit is die verteenwoordigende kenmerke van ’n ander dag – van die volgende dag in die Kalender van God volgens die “Verbygaan”-genade-Verbond!

### **The Death of Death in the Death of Christ** (John Owen)

#### **Where Did Death Die?**

To ask, Where did death die?, is quite another thing than to ask, When did death die? To ask, When did death die?, the answer will be one of time only. To ask, Where did death die?, the answer will supply the time, but also the place and the event. The question, Where?, goes deeper, is comprehensive, reaches other dimensions than time. Nonetheless, time is always one dimension, one factor of the formulation. The question, Where did death die?, seeks the answer in history.

Because the question and the answer concern but one Person in history and time, because it concerns Jesus the Christ of God, the answer must be found in the history of this one Man, and in but one place in the history of this one Man. That place is the Eternal Council of God Tri-Une. Death died in and with the decision in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit to create human beings. Man was the life in which and through which death was to die once for all ... in truth had died once for all. This the Council of God explains the creation as well as the incarnation of the Son of God. It was the Covenant of Grace since its inception in the will of God – its beginning which is without beginning; which saw its realisation in the incarnate Jesus – Saviour of His People.

Where did death die? It died in the death of Christ. But that ostensibly is a contradiction, for Christ the Creator and Saviour of life to die must mean the extinction of life! And that it certainly was when Jesus died, for He to us-ward, died. And death triumphed. And the grave triumphed. For death is the wages for sin, which Christ took upon Himself in man’s stead. So Paul asks: “Death, where is your sting? Grave, where is your victory?” And they reply: Take a look at Calvary! See who is buried in Joseph’s tomb!

We, humanity, humans, “We have borne the image of the earthly”. For this reason what Paul says next, is only the “image of the heavenly”. What Paul in First Corinthians 15 says of man, is by analogy of the Anti-Type, is but a metaphor of the True Human Being, Jesus Christ. We not only safely may, but should, in order to really understand this Scripture, apply it to Jesus Christ, firstly. Then read that Paul here speaks of Christ, saying, “Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption”. This Jesus who died by all reason cannot see life again. But: “Behold! I shew you a mystery: We shall all sleep.” There’s no mystery in this – we all die! Ah!, “But we shall all be changed!” This Jesus who there dies and there did die – whose life on that cross is being extinguished and exterminated eternally, who is the emblem of corruption, HE, “shall be changed” and for sooth was “changed” being raised by God into life eternal. For this His “change” and “new creation”, “we all, shall be changed” and newly created. This now, goes against reason, against nature, against reality. This is the “Mystery of the Ages”.

Paul says of Jesus Christ firstly: “In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be RAISED INCORRUPTIBLE”. It is this Jesus of Nazareth whom you have beheld dying death that shouted “Victory!” but now is still, the trumpet sounds so loud! The very trumpet that sounds incorruption, life – THE LAST TRUMP – sounds the death of death in the death of Christ! Where did death die? It died in the Man from Galilee; death died by His death in resurrection from the dead of Him.

Paul here firstly speaks of Christ. Be sure! “So when this corruptible (in suffering, in dying and in death) shall have put on incorruption (in resurrection and life), and this mortal (by nature of Jesus of Nazareth) shall have put on immortality” (by the title Lord Christ), THEN (and in, by, through and at this eschatological

“MOMENT”) shall be brought to pass that is written, DEATH IS SWALLOWED UP IN VICTORY”! HERE, death died. “O death, where is (now) thy sting? O grave, where is (now) thy victory? ... Thanks be to God, which giveth us (THIS victory –) **the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.**” Paul here speaks of **Christ firstly!**

“This is the first resurrection” (John) – “THIS”, the one, ours, in Christ Jesus.

**Application** to the Sabbath Rest of God: It is folly to protest that Jesus “ended” his mission to bring rest to his people by his death, and that then – as these protests go – it “behoved Christ” to “according to the commandment”, “rest” in the grave “on the Sabbath”, and that therefore his resurrection cannot have meaning for the Sabbath day. As the protests go, for two reasons: First, that Jesus did not rise from the dead on the Sabbath Day but on the First Day anyway. Two: That Jesus’ death is unto us an example that we on the Sabbath should not work (To rise to life is a work.), but rest (To lie dead in the grave is to rest.). As one correspondent wrote: “The attempt to attach the day of the resurrection (rising, moving, activity) to the Sabbath actually creates an antithesis in the meaning of the Sabbath as the day of complete rest (repose, stillness, inactivity).” (I think I recognise the sound of Bacchiocchi.)

The following discussions virtually from the start took on this turn – which I never thought the subject would have provoked. It threatened to derail and instead of to be a discussion on the relation between the Sabbath Day and Jesus’ resurrection from the dead, it threatened to be an argument on

“the state of the dead”; then on

“the nature of Christ” –

whether He had the foreknowledge; and,

whether He was God when He died, for,

can God die?;

then again on the present work of Christ “in the heavenly sanctuary”

or on his future “finishing” at his Second Advent.

– all proposed as objection to the supposition of a relation between Jesus’ resurrection and the meaning of the Sabbath for the Christian Faith. I therefore can do no better but to present these discussions more or less as they came.

#### **SDANet – SDaily Discussions**

To: sdanet@sdanet.org

**The Church believes the Lord’s Day for to be its Day of Worship Rest because on this Day – the Lord’s Day and Sabbath of the LORD your God – God in fact finished all his works in raising Jesus Christ from the dead. According to the Prophetic Word of God, that is how it should have been accomplished, once for all in Jesus Christ Himself as the eternal Word of God. “It is the LORD’s doing, let us rejoice in it!” God speaks of no other day than the Day He “THUS spoke, And God rested the Seventh Day”. God’s speaking “concerning the Seventh Day THUS”, is God’s Word Jesus Christ, and He, in resurrection from the dead to “finish all the works of God” “in the exceeding greatness of his power” and to “reign for ever and ever” through Jesus Christ!**

**Sidney L. Davis, Jr.**

God did not finish the work of salvation by the resurrection of Christ, but rather by his death. It is Jesus’ death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection. Thus it behoved Christ to rest on the Sabbath according to the commandment because he said, “it is finished” on the cross”.

I didn’t send Sidney this my answer:

“Jesus’ death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection”?

Then death came by the death of Christ, for sooth, as were the saved the damned!

“It behoved Christ to rest on the Sabbath according to the commandment”?

“Know ye not, brethren – for I speak to them that know the law – how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?” (Ro.7:1) But Christ when He no longer lived yet was still under the dominion of the law? The commandment rules over every man for as long as he lives, and takes its toll in death. The Law after death no longer sways dominion but with every man at death, dies with him. Man no longer can obey nor transgress when dead.

**T.C. and Elaine Nelson**

In reply to Gerhard Ebersohn, Sidney Davis wrote:

“God did not finish the work of salvation by the resurrection of Christ, but rather by his death. It is Jesus’ death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection. Thus it behoved Christ to rest on the Sabbath according to the commandment because he said, “it is finished” on the cross. “ If there had been no resurrection, and Christ remained in the grave, or you saving that it was His death, solely, that secured the believer’s eternal life? How so? Is the resurrection of no significance for us, then? Elaine Nelson ”

To: Sidney L. Davis, Jr.

My answer of 26 June was in haste, so if you would, I shall continue.

Said you, “God did not finish the work of salvation by the resurrection of Christ, but rather by his death. It is Jesus’ death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection. Thus it behoved Christ to rest on the Sabbath according to the commandment because he said, “it is finished” on the cross.”

I have shown last time that the Apostles knew only one Crucified Christ – the Risen Crucified Christ. The New Testament refers to this Christ many times as the One Who was “raised according to the Scriptures”. If Jesus of Nazareth did not rise from the dead he would have been one of them still and the whole universe would have been hell. I doubt no moment you realise that if Christ did not rise from the dead “according to the Scriptures” then “God did not finish the work of salvation” AT ALL! It is God’s work of salvation – His Work and Word through Jesus Christ – that completes, “ends”, “all God’s works He had made”. No, Jesus’ word from the cross “It is finished” is Faith taking hold on Victory. It is a “proleptic” claim of the dying Christ on the “recompense for labour”.

It is impossible to “either or” and to say “It is Jesus’ death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection”. But it won’t be equally wrong to say ‘It is Jesus’ resurrection that secures for the believer eternal life, not his death’, because His resurrection presupposes his death. Jesus’ death – humanly speaking – naturally would NOT presuppose his resurrection. Thus when Jesus utters the word, “It is

finished”, that word as sure as the Word of God is sure presupposes his resurrection. As Abraham “afar off saw (Christ’s) day”, so Jesus from this side of the grave, “afar off saw (His own) day” the other side of the grave – His “day” of triumphant victory in resurrection from the dead. (Read Klaas Schilder “Christ in his Suffering” on this phrase – it is most rewarding!)

To close with, Please tell me, Sydney, what, or which death, did Jesus die for the salvation of sinners?

I have good news for Sabbath-keepers, that “THE SEVENTH DAY CONCERNING (WHICH) GOD THUS (THROUGH THE SON ... IN THESE LAST DAYS) SPAKE”, IS RESURRECTION FAITH, AND THEREFORE CHRISTIAN FAITH! Encourage one another with these words!

**Steve Timm.**

I hope that in discussing this topic which has quite a bit of interesting material, that we will as a net not get into a flame war over which is more important, cross or resurrection. I would like to explore a term that Gerhard used below.

What do you mean by the term "resurrection faith" which you have used in a couple of posts? It is not clear to me how the resurrection, either of Christ or ourselves, has anything to do with faith.

Dear Steve,

Thank you for responding. I cannot, I am unable ... whatever, I stammer as I write. I am confounded, and cannot understand your question. As I opened SDAnet I was sitting reading Acts 2 and further. A few lines from it, verses 23-24, and 26: “Therefore did my heart rejoice”. Why? “For I foresaw the Lord always before my face”, verse 25. David believed, and he believed the risen Christ according to this context. That is Resurrection Faith! Faith is Resurrection Faith – the faith in Jesus Christ crucified and “raised for our justification”. It even is true of Christ Himself, looking at verses 33 further. Jesus was not left in death or hell because of His own Faith in the “God (who) had sworn to Him an oath” (verse 30). “He” (David, yes, but also God – the immediate subject of the verbs here) “He, God, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ”. Now here’s a good definition of what Resurrection Faith is: “Therefore, let all the house of Israel (the Believers in Christ) KNOW ASSUREDLY, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye (the Church – we men) have crucified, both Lord and Christ”.

I could go on and write volumes about what Resurrection Faith means. But this should be enough. It is the Christian’s everything. Just remember in this instance – not per accident – all this Church-Life, all this Conversation in Congregation by the Holy Spirit, happened to have occurred on God’s Holy Day the Seventh Day Sabbath – not on Sunday!

**Sidney L. Davis, Jr.**

“My point was not to minimize the resurrection as it was to put the death of Christ in its proper perspective in the gospel and the plan of salvation as it relates to the Sabbath. Jesus was the Lamb that was “slain from the foundation of the world.” This “gospel” and the Sabbath have a common origin. The majority of Christians base the sanctity of Sunday because of the Lord’s resurrection on the first day of the week. Some Sabbatarians who seek to diffuse or undermine the strength of this have imagined to transpose the resurrection of Jesus from the first day to the Sabbath by inventive and speculative interpretations of Scripture as a way to pre-empt the “first

day” or Sunday resurrection rationale. Buying into such only strengthen’s the position of Sunday sanctity while occluding the believer of the true significance of the gospel of the cross of Christ or his death. Such would not be necessary if we would put the same emphasis on the meaning of the death of Christ as the writings of the NT does.

The observance of Passover was meant to commemorate not the resurrection, but rather the death of Christ “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come.” (1 Corinthians 11:26) It is interesting that the festival of Easter that supplanted the Passover commemorates the resurrection. The Sabbath was to be remembered and observed as “a little passover” (see Deuteronomy 6:12-15) just as Sunday which supplanted the Sabbath was to be commemorated as “a little Easter”. Why would the evil one intend that the Christian focus be on the resurrection as opposed to the death (the Cross) of Christ? The Cross is the greatest revelation of God’s love to the world, “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:14-16 “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?” Romans 6:3

We hear much about the power of the resurrection (as we should), but how much do we hear about the power of his death? 1 Corinthians 1:18 For THE PREACHING OF THE CROSS is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved IT IS THE POWER OF GOD. --Sidney Davis

“... to put the death of Christ in its proper perspective in the gospel and the plan of salvation as it relates to the Sabbath.” This is the “proper perspective”: “Jesus was the Lamb that was “slain from the foundation of the world””; in fact, “This “gospel” and the Sabbath have a common origin”. “The gospel” is the realization of “the plan of salvation”. This Gospel already is perceived in the creation. That’s my whole point. When God “founded” “the plan of salvation” and through the creation of the world started the Good News of Redemption, we at the end of the creation-story in Genesis read how God “ended” or “finished” “all his works”. God “rested”, He “sanctified” and He “blessed”. None of these concepts could possibly be derived from God’s “works” of creating the material “world”. He had the “world” created fully already on the Sixth Day, and “very good” indeed. But these works of God of the Seventh Day – they are the works of His “rest” – contained deeper significance in that they pointed to Grace and Mercy. In Christian concept and language, these Divine Acts of the Seventh Day meant Jesus Christ in Whom and through Whom, God had finished “all His works He had made” – “from before the foundation of the world”. If God rested on the Seventh Day He rested in Jesus Christ or not at all. If God “finished” or “ended” on the Seventh day, He in Jesus Christ “finished” and “ended”. If He “sanctified” the Seventh Day on the Seventh Day of creation, it was because of His Holy One Jesus Christ. If any blessing from or on the Seventh Day falls – it is because of the value of God’s Beloved Son. Hebrews 3 the first verses do not speak of Israel in the first place; it speaks of the creation in the beginning in the first place. The Gospel was preached to “them”: all human beings from the first – “This “gospel” and the Sabbath have a common origin”, are your own words.

The majority of Christians may erroneously base the sanctity of Sunday on the First Day of the week because of the Lord’s resurrection. And “some Sabbatarians who seek to diffuse or undermine the strength of this” may without solid ground deny



the Lord's resurrection on the First Day of the week. The majority of Sabbatarians would *seek to diffuse or undermine the strength* of the Lord's resurrection for reason of the Day's Rest and Worship value and validity. But I am a Calvinist, and from these thoughts on the creation-Sabbath, had come to the conclusion that the Sunday is a stranger and an intruder in "*the plan of salvation*". It has no part therein like the Seventh Day has. This was my honest and independent finding. If finding Jesus Christ – and the sanctity of the Seventh Day because of Jesus Christ – in the Genesis story of the creation is "*inventive and speculative interpretation of Scripture*", then it must be. But if to find Jesus Christ in the Genesis story of the creation is the proper "*interpretation of Scripture*", then I cannot see how it could "*diffuse or undermine the strength*" of the sanctity of the Sabbath Day. I am able to see though how finding Jesus Christ in the creation-story strengthens the sanctity of the Sabbath Day – and especially since it is the Risen Lord Jesus Christ that is to be found in that Scripture.

Is it true that "*We hear much about the power of the resurrection (as we should)*"? If we did, the Sabbath day must receive its due from it – which it for centuries had NOT. I think we have heard far too little about Jesus' resurrection and little of its full scope and impact. "*But how much do we hear about the power of his death?*" The power of Jesus' death is but heard of and is but revealed in that POWER WHICH IS GOD'S SPIRIT THAT RAISED CHRIST FROM THE DEAD. Of course Christ EARNED life through dying and death – but where is Christ's labour "ended", "finished", "sanctified", "blessed"? ONLY IN THE RECOMPENSE FOR LABOUR ... ONLY IN RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD. "unto us which are saved (TO LIVE) THE PREACHING (THE WORD of LIFE) OF THE CROSS IS THE POWER OF GOD" – THE LIVING CHRIST.

There's no "*imagination*" at work here or needed. What is needed is the eye of faith, the eye of "the Faith of Jesus" – the Christian "*perspective*". There's no need why one would *intend the evil that the Christian focus should be on the resurrection AS OPPOSED to the death (the Cross) of Christ*. It is an absolutely irrelevant and self-destructive notion.

And what is least possible here, is "*to transpose the resurrection of Jesus from the first day to the Sabbath*" because all Scripture – including the Sabbath-Scriptures – speaks of Jesus, and it speaks of the Jesus-Risen-From-The-Dead. "From the dead" ... it cannot be disregarded and never be forgotten. But also "Risen from the dead" and out of death – death overcome and LIFE and REST having being achieved, obtained and entered upon.

All the while contemplating we talk about the Sabbath Day; it all is Sabbath-"*rationale*". One cannot talk like this about the First Day, can one? There's no "*resurrection rationale*" in the Bible's First Day (of the week)! "According to the Scriptures" makes perfect sense while speaking about God's Sabbath Rest and Jesus' resurrection from the dead. But where shall one find such correspondence, "according to the Scriptures", between the First Day and Jesus' resurrection? There is none.

No one is able to "*transpose the resurrection of Jesus from the first day to the Sabbath*". But the Church (my Church the Christian and Protestant, "Reformed" Church), has for centuries succeeded to ostensibly have "*transposed*" the resurrection of Jesus from the Sabbath to the First Day. It robbed the Sabbath Day of its Christian basis, essence and strength, and transferred it to the Sunday. It is to weep for, and I do weep.

The Sabbath does have a "Theological basis": this, its Christological basis. The Sabbath also does have a "chronological" basis. And the two are mutually

contributing in spiritual, worshipful, meaning. Law and Mercy do embrace more so here in the Seventh Day than anywhere else in the creation of God.

Which death did Jesus die for the justification of sinners? That death which He overcame and vanquished in resurrection of LIFE and GLORY! Hence the Sabbath Day's "end" and Sabbath Day's "it is finished" – already heralded the day of Jesus' dying and suffering of hell for the justification of sinners. God had this confidence in Jesus His Christ He with an oath confirmed that His Holy would not see corruption in death. Also God's Holy the Sabbath Day, therefore, did not see corruption in the death of Christ, but its vindication in the Raising of Him who is Lord of the Sabbath Day.

"Lord of the Sabbath Day" – just think of it! It is Christ's Name! He introduces Himself to man in his most dire need of redemption and salvation by this Name: "Therefore (that is), for man's benefit was the Sabbath made and is the Son of Man, Lord of the Sabbath, for man". – Not your usual translation, but nothing wrong with nonetheless.

The Scriptures *supply a way to pre-empt a SABBATH'S resurrection rationale. Buying into such only strengthens the position of the SABBATH'S sanctity while leading the believer into a truer significance of the Gospel of the cross of Christ and his death* – it leads him into a grasping of a truer significance of Christ's RESURRECTION. *Such is necessary if we would put the same emphasis on the meaning of the death AND RESURRECTION of Christ as the writings of the NT do.*

This might not be easy to understand – until it loses its unfamiliarity. Then it becomes the only way to understand the Sabbath in the light of the Scriptures and the revelation of God's Love through Jesus Christ.

### John Howard

*Responding to Sidney Davis, who wrote:*

*"God did not finish the work of salvation by the resurrection of Christ, but rather by his death. It is Jesus' death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection. Thus it behoved Christ to rest on the Sabbath according to the commandment because he said, "it is finished" on the cross.*

*I would submit that God did not finish the work of salvation either at Christ's death or at His resurrection. The finishing of that work is yet future. The cross and the resurrection are certainly monumental landmarks in the history of salvation, but neither one is the be-all and end-all. Christ's high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is equally important. That's why Paul told the Corinthians, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." 1 Corinthians 15:17. If Christ hadn't risen from the dead, He couldn't have ascended into heaven where He is "a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Hebrews 8:2. Jesus' earthly ministry, His death on the cross, resurrection, and His heavenly ministry are all vital components of the plan of salvation. Each individual part is every bit as necessary as any other. Christ indeed did say, "It is finished" on the cross; but that was in reference to the completion of His earthly ministry, which was but one part of God's plan. Jesus at that time still had a work yet to accomplish -- namely almost 2000 years of priestly ministrations and advocacy in the heavenly temple. When that phase of the plan of salvation is completed, God will again say, "It is done." Revelation 16:17. The work of salvation will not be finished until the close of human probation, at which time Jesus will say, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is*

righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Revelation 22:11,12.  
In His service.

Says John Howard,

"I would submit that God did not finish the work of salvation either at Christ's death or at His resurrection."

And he gives his place of God's finishing of the work of our salvation:

"Christ's high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary".

Where is "heaven"? Heaven is where God is and where God is God over all. The earth is as much "heaven" and "heavenly" as any other place in the cosmos. In fact, no place wherever is "heaven" like the earth is "heaven", for this earth is the focus point of God's affection: "For God so loved the world (– this earth –) that He gave his only begotten Son (– to this planet –) that whosoever (– of this world's inhabitants –) believeth in Him, should not perish (– so that this world should not perish –) but have everlasting life (– and this earth should be saved incorruptibly)".

God's throne and the right hand of his throne is Calvary's Hill, Golgotha, where in the heart of Joseph's tomb on Judgement Day Christ was crowned the King of Life. Ephesians the first chapter will confirm all this.

By the Power of His earthly resurrection, "THIS JESUS", whom NO ONE BUT GOD AND ANGELS SAW RISE FROM THE DEAD, who NOW, is Lord, crowned King and proclaimed Surety of every and all the saved from among men: HE, even NOW, in glorified body the Man Jesus of Nazareth, "THIS JESUS WHOM YOU NOW SEE", is "taken up into heaven" – the Christ! Were He not raised from the dead into heavenly realms He would not have ascended and from heaven would not have returned. Were He not "LIFTED UP" from the dead into heavenly realms, Jesus would not have interceded for us before the Father. His intercession now is what it perfectly had been the very moment of his resurrection from the dead – NOTHING ELSE AND NO MORE OR GREATER!

Yes, what you say, dear Dennis, is true, yet qualified – very surely qualified by what Jesus' resurrection from the dead upon this earth already means for believers. "Each individual part" of God's "work of salvation is every bit as necessary as any other" ... YES AND NO, for without Jesus' resurrection his dying could still have occurred, and without Jesus' resurrection his intercession could never have occurred. The whole work of God's redemption must be seen as a whole and as seen as a whole in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. It is like seeing God's work of redemption as that of the Tri-Une God. Each individual Person is every bit as necessary as the Other, yet, without Jesus Christ, would be impossible. The whole work of God's redemption must be seen as the work of God-Tri-Une, while it is seen as the work of the Second Person. It is like seeing God's work of salvation three dimensionally, past, present and future, where the present lies in the present of the Christ-event. What went before stretched out to it; and what came after, flowed from it.

#### Dennis Murphy

I'd like to respond to the specific question asked by Gerhard Ebersöhn: what, or which death, did Jesus die for the salvation of sinners? The short answer is the 'second death'. We all recognize that Jesus, in paying for our salvation, experienced death for us. Since the punishment for sin is permanent, everlasting death, for Jesus

to suffer what we deserved means He had to have experienced the despair and loneliness of the 'second death'. To me that means that He could not have known with assurance that He would ever come out of the grave. "The wages of sin is [eternal] death," and Jesus "became sin" for us. So the horror of the approaching death may have been much more ominous to Jesus than we can imagine if He experienced it as the death that is final. When one realizes that this must have been Jesus' experience on the cross, it makes the depth and resolve of God's love even more wonderful. Jesus not only willingly gave His life for us, He gave it with the possibility that He would never live again.

Jesus came to earth to do His Father's will, to reveal His Father's character to us, and to lay down His own life on our behalf at an appointed time. When that time came, after His hours of suffering on the cross for the unappreciative people He came to save, He announced that "It is finished." He committed Himself to the will of His heavenly Father, then He "laid down His life". He laid it down, willing to \*never\* take it up again, if that is what our redemption would cost. The thought is awesome to me when I contemplate it, that Jesus loved us so much to die permanently, if necessary, to save us.

I haven't replied on this letter yet. But what purpose could it have served for Jesus "to die permanently, to save us" meaning to die but not to rise again? If He would, "THAT" IS WHAT He would have done, and I would have written the pronouns with small letters or rather I would not have been able to write them seeing I would have been dead and so the whole argument. The notion, "if necessary to die permanently", or, "the possibility that He would never live again", or, Jesus or God "willing to \*never\* take it (Jesus' life) up again" ... "if that is what our redemption would cost" it won't be the "Gospel". "THAT" in all eternity would NOT pay the "cost" of "our redemption". It would have been a worthless 'redemption' and could not for an instant have been contemplated by God. So to consider its possibility is vain and nonetheless "awesome". It does not "make the depth and resolve of God's love ... wonderful", but ridiculous. Then the Sabbath indeed "would have been" "Still Saturday" – "Day of the God of Doom" – for then God would have been DEAD!

#### Colin Heesom

"Gerhard Ebersöhn wrote: "No, Jesus' word from the cross "it is finished" is Faith taking hold on Victory. It is a "proleptic" claim of the dying Christ on the "recompense for labour". It is impossible to "either or" and to say "It is Jesus' death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection". But it won't be equally wrong to say 'It is Jesus' resurrection that secures for the believer eternal life, not his death', because His resurrection presupposes his death. Jesus' death – humanly speaking – naturally would NOT presuppose his resurrection.

I'll jump in here: because human death does not presuppose resurrection until Jesus was resurrected the "It is finished" can only refer to the sacrificial life: Desire of Ages is clear on Jesus not being certain of the resurrection due to his separation (by our guilt on him) from the Father's insight by faith which Jesus had access to. Jesus did not divinely know of the resurrection when he died, as he always lived by faith in the Father's love: he could believe the promises and assurances he'd had through his life, but that's the closest he was to knowing about Sunday morning on Friday afternoon. The resurrection is the triumph over death, but Jesus did not foreknow it on Friday."

I answer by asking, "... the "It is finished" can only refer to the sacrificial life"? Then DEATH "FINISHES" God's death in Jesus. Then DEATH "FINISHES" God's creation as God's salvation. Then the earth and man's future is not only bleak but blank! What "Desire of Ages" is this that "is clear on Jesus not being certain of the resurrection"?

What faith is this that "did not divinely know of the resurrection"?

Could this be "the Faith of Jesus" that, "when he died", could "not foreknow His Own resurrection"?

Had Jesus not "always lived by faith in the Father's love" – a love that could not hold to Him the sure Word of "the promises and assurances" of resurrection from the dead?

Where did "the closest" "faith" of his resurrection from the dead "which Jesus had access to" "through his life", "on (the) afternoon" of his suffering and dying vanish to?

Is not "faith", "faith" exactly in "the Father's insights" and had not "the Father's insights" been exactly the resurrection of the Son from the dead?

Jesus in "the closest" hour of his "separation ... from the Father", "could believe the promises and assurances he'd had through his life" – **from Him!** Jesus' very "knowing about" the moment of Life's Overcoming MADE HIM ENTER the gates of eternal death, FOR HE MOST ASSUREDLY KNEW OF THE FATHER THAT "the resurrection is the triumph over death." That was the whole idea of Jesus' accepting to die and of his actually going through with the deal: "God's eternal purpose".

Refers Colin Heesom to my writing:

"Thus when Jesus utters the word, "It is finished", that word as sure as the Word of God is sure presupposes his resurrection. As Abraham "afar off saw (Christ's) day", so Jesus from this side of the grave, "afar off saw (His own) day" the other side of the grave – His "day" of triumphant victory in resurrection from the dead. (Read Klaas Schilder "Christ in his Suffering" on this phrase – it is most rewarding!)

"To close with, Please tell me, Sydney, what, or which death, did Jesus die for the salvation of sinners?

Says he,

Before suggesting an answer for Sydney, the purposes of Jesus' death and resurrection in salvation history are given in Rom 4:25: he was put to death because of our trespasses and was raised because of our justification. (That's a legitimate meaning of the Greek preposition normally rendered "for") The source of eternal life for the redeemed is his divinity, for it cannot die - is not subject to death, and he had earned eternal life for his humanity - but only representatively our humanity and eternal life, not gifted to us as our eternal life: that gift came from his divinity.

As to the death he died: eternal death: separated from the Father in judgement and propitiation (i.e. bearing the wrath of God as us for our sins), undergoing the condemnation of the curse which the law bestows on our human nature - and which we confirm with our past unbelief and moments of unbelief today. "He tasted death for everyman" (Heb 1:9), "...because we are convinced that one died for all, therefore all have died" (2 Cor 5:14) He died everyman's second death, and because he lived and died as us, representing us in his corporate humanity, all have died in his death - which we confess in baptism. Colin Heesom "

### Tony Zbaraschuk

The Word of Sidney Davis came to the Net, saying:

God did not finish the work of salvation by the resurrection of Christ, but rather by his death. It is Jesus' death that secures for the believer eternal life, not his resurrection.

I think certain notable Christian writers, like Paul of Tarsus, would disagree with you on this one: "if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins" (1 Corinthians 15:17, but see also the whole of the chapter). Anyone can die. Anyone can stay dead -- but Christ has come, not for that purpose, "but so that they might have life, and have it more abundantly", as John said.

Thus it behoved Christ to rest on the Sabbath according to the commandment because he said, "it is finished" on the cross. One part of the job was finished: God had taken upon Himself all the sins of the human race, all the weight of the separation that lay between Him and His fallen creation. God had shown fully what sin was like, and what it did: it killed. Even God Almighty, it killed. But that wasn't enough -- after all, if that were all, what would the point be? Why bother trying to overcome something that killed even God himself?

No, it wasn't the crucifixion that made the disciples go out and preach; it was not the death of God that sent martyrs through the ages to their own. It was not the ending on Calvary that made the Church go forth. It was the Resurrection, the new creation, the sign that God had taken everything that could be done, every evil that had ever been accomplished, every pain ever inflicted -- and destroyed them. Remake what had been broken, heal what had been harmed, restore what had been corrupted.

It is obvious Tony every time says "it was not" as a way to emphasise and not to deny, of course. Went my thoughts on God's wondrous deeds: It was the death of God that sent martyrs through the ages to their own. It was the ending on Calvary that made the Church go forth. BECAUSE the Resurrection, the new creation, was the sign that God had done – had accomplished – everything for the salvation of his own. God in Jesus' resurrection had remade what had been broken, had healed what had been harmed, had restored what had been corrupted. The Passover actually reaches its zenith in God's creating of the New Israel, The Christian Church, "when had fully come the Day of Pentecost". (Acts 2) Here, where in the history of Yahweh's Passover the Trinitarian God reveals Himself through the Holy Spirit in the making of the Church the Body that is Christ's, God had accomplished. It is God's ending on Calvary that makes the Church go forth; it is the sign that God had done everything that could be done. Then, by the Resurrection of the Son is shown, God had accomplished! He had healed, He had restored, He had created anew: Behold! the New Creation even of Christ resurrected from the dead!

The New Creation is God, for ever in Christ with us; and the New Humanity – the Body that is Christ's, for ever in Christ with God!

THIS IS THE PROCLAMATION OF PENTECOST! Here we see the Tri-une God revealed and the sign of His Self-revelation as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, **even his Church**. And silently but surely present, **facilitating** and **servicing** God the Father Son and Holy Spirit and his Church, IS THE DAY! "Remember the Sabbath Day!" "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy" unto God, because HE, did not forget his Sabbath Day – not in this, His New Creation and the End of His first creation. The Sabbath is eschatological.

Which is fundamental? Which is central? Which is essential? Which is significant? WHICH IS INDISPENSIBLE? Is it not that God accomplished in the Son in resurrection from the dead? If not the Son in resurrection from the dead is fundamental, is central, is essential, is sign-aficant, IS INDESPENSIBLE, THEN WHAT IS? Therefore, "It was the Resurrection, the New Creation, the sign that God had ... accomplished!" "God in Jesus Christ through and by resurrection from the dead "secures for the believer eternal life" (Sidney Davis), "secures", or guarantees, "that they might have life, and have it more abundantly".

And "the Seventh Day concerning (which) God thus spoke" (Heb.4:4), was and IS SIGN TO THE SIGN of Jesus' resurrection, his Church! That, the believer in Jesus Christ may and must be sure of with a certainty as strong as the Faith of Jesus that took Him to the tree, that nailed Him there and that killed Him there, and that carried Him through – through His dying, death and grave – into resurrection of Life and Glory! Rest Day of the LORD your God is sign to it: The Body that is Christ's ON THIS DAY! "Therefore there remains in force for God's People their keeping of God's Sabbath Day". (I am convinced this is a true to "spirit and truth" rendering.)

**Sidney L. Davis,**

"It is not my intent to downplay the meaning of the resurrection in comparison to the cross of Christ, but rather to put the cross of Christ in the perspective that the Scriptures give it in the plan of salvation. When properly understood, the theological need to make a doctrinal invention of the Sabbath to be the day of the resurrection as a device to pre-empt the implied sacredness the event supposedly gives to Sunday is not necessary nor theologically justified. So the text or statements I supply to support this position is not an attempt to pit the meaning of the cross in the death of Christ vs. the meaning of the resurrection.

"The scenes of the past and the future were presented to the mind of Jesus. He beheld Lucifer as he was first cast out from the heavenly places. He looked forward to the scenes of His own agony, when before all the worlds the character of the deceiver should be unveiled. He heard the cry, "It is finished" (John 19:30), announcing that the redemption of the lost race was forever made certain, that heaven was made eternally secure against the accusations, the deceptions, the pretensions, that Satan would instigate." DA 490.2

Sidney L. Davis, Jr. deals with the most important aspect of my founding the Sabbath on the Scriptures' Gospel-meaning. I am living an isolated life – here in South Africa and being a Sabbatarian among Sunday-keeping Calvinists. I only have the Bible and my almost exclusive 'reformed' library. Now it may not be of theological importance, but fact is I arrived at my conclusions solo, and not with any objective "to make a doctrinal invention of the Sabbath to be the day of the resurrection as a device to pre-empt the implied sacredness the event supposedly gives to Sunday". Whether you might believe it or not, I have from my sources – the Bible and those 'reformed' books – made the discovery – in your words, that IT IS NECESSARY AND THEOLOGICALLY JUSTIFIED to understand the Sabbath in the light of the Christ-event. In fact, that is the ONLY way to get the Sabbath Day have any relevance for or in Christian Faith.

Second, It is not a matter of "(playing down) the meaning of the resurrection in comparison to the cross of Christ, but rather to put the cross (AND THE WHOLE CHRIST-EVENT) ... in the perspective that the Scriptures give it in the plan of salvation".

Thirdly, it is necessary to "theologically" answer for REJECTING the Sunday's claim on the meaning the resurrection has in the perspective that the Scriptures give it in the plan of salvation.

Then I might add that I could not find a single accountable (or even slap-dash) assertion of the Sabbath's validity because of the Gospel among those Sabbatarian arguments that place the resurrection on the Sabbath Day. One finds this mere "dating" of Christ's resurrection on the Sabbath Day among the so-called "Unitarian" Sabbath-keepers like the Church of God as they call themselves while they don't even believe the deity of Christ! How could they possibly take advantage of the coincidence if they don't even believe Jesus was God incarnate? In any case, these Unitarian Sabbatarians don't time Jesus' resurrection on the Sabbath. They may claim it is Sabbath's-time but immediately with or shortly after sunset on Saturday is on Sunday because both days are being reckoned the Jewish way. Quite confused they are.

So I had no instigators to the idea that Christ rose from the dead but the very nature of the Sabbath-histories of the Old and New Testament. Just think of all Jesus' "Sabbath ministries" – If these preliminary life-giving works of His have meaning for the Sabbath Day – call it "theological" meaning if you like – how would his supreme work of restoring and creating new and everlasting life not have meaning for the Sabbath Day? Sunday as it were saw it coming and was quick to snatch the advantage to itself. The origin of Sunday-observance in the Christian Church was theological – falsely so.

Lastly, Re-read the passages you quote from Mrs White (new to me) and just ask yourself, Does not Mrs White all the while PRESUPPOSE Jesus' resurrection from the dead? I'm sure you will agree she does!

Says Sydney, "My point is only made to demonstrate that the meaning of the resurrection does not eclipse the meaning of the cross ..."; it is not an "attempt to pit the meaning of the cross in the death of Christ vs. the meaning of the resurrection."

I appreciate. I have through my studies tried to pay due attention to the other "side" of the Sabbath Day, namely its Gospel-symbolism of judgement. God's Rest is not only the final moment of entering upon His Rest in Jesus Christ through resurrection from the dead, but it also is his working towards the obtaining of it through the suffering, dying and death of Jesus. The Sabbath first has a night half before it has its day part – first its darkness, only then its light. So Jesus' being in the state of sinners' death for the redemption of sinners, is as part of God's glory in the Sabbath Day as is Jesus' breaking the bonds of death and grave to emerge Life Eternal "in Sabbath's-time". Jesus acknowledged this God's glory in His suffering the judgements of God on the Sabbath Day when he prepared to meet the final assault in the night of Gethsemane. Refer John 13.

Then may I say I am unable to grasp how a "theological need" or "device", namely, a "doctrinal invention of the Sabbath to be the day of the resurrection", or, "a Sabbath resurrection scenario", could "pre-empt the implied sacredness the event (of the resurrection) supposedly gives to Sunday", or, could "make Sunday holy"? **How would "the logic that justifies it (a Sabbath resurrection scenario)", "empower" "the actual detriment of the event"?**

However, I think I get your point, that by arguing FOR the Sabbath for being the day of Jesus' resurrection, I in fact argue against it and in the process advance Sunday; and why? Because Sunday really is the day of Jesus' resurrection? Which is to argue in a circle. No, first of all ask: Which day, "according to (the tenure of the whole) Scriptures", HOLDS THE PROMISE OF AND SHOULD BE EXPECTED to

have been the day of Jesus' resurrection? There's absolutely nothing in Scriptures that suggests the First Day or any day but God's Day of ending, blessing, sanctification and rest, the Seventh Day "concerning (which) God spake", should be that day – "Day of Worship-Rest" (as Sunday is spoken of in South Africa among "Gereformeerde mense", "Reformed believers").

*"The attempt to attach the day of the resurrection (rising, moving, activity) to the Sabbath actually creates an antithesis in the meaning of the Sabbath as the day of complete rest (repose, stillness, inactivity)."* Of whose Sabbath-activity of rest do we speak? Not of man's, but of God's. Think about God's Being – could He be "inactive"? You know the Roman Catholics (and to a lesser degree Protestants generally) religiously observe "Still Saturday"? It implies God's "repose" of the Seventh Day is one of death's "stillness"! Abominable idea! God isn't God but as the God Who Acts and Who in Jesus Christ Acts; Whose Rest is solely His Act of WORK in and through and by Jesus Christ the WORD of God. The WORK of His WORD is God's REST. His WORD by virtue of His WORK is God's REST. Law to the effect of stopping work "was added" (says Paul) and is applicable to man as a sinner. Nowhere in the creation-account of the Sabbath Day is prohibition of vigorous activity either of man or of God suggested or implied. God's deed of rest of the Seventh Day was such it was invigorating, as it says God was "refreshed". Sinless man was supposed to do his sinless work on the Sabbath Day had the Sabbath Day been intended for sinless man.

Two diverse ideas – Colin Heesom and Tony Zbaraschuk respectively representing them – seem to emerge from the discussion on my writing on the significance Jesus' death and resurrection have for the Sabbath Day. From the nature of Colin's it obviously holds no promise for the Sabbath. Tony's however, is full of potential for a fuller appreciation of the Sabbath. Colin's denies many and important aspects positive for the Sabbath which Tony's requires. These differences do not originate with the Sabbath, but with the basics of Christian Faith which one holds. I recognise in Tony's views a more Calvinistic approach – more similar to my own. And Colin obviously heavily relies on Mrs. White's ideas. That is strange: one would expect that the Seventh Day Adventist viewpoint (Mrs. White's, Colin's) would favour the Sabbath better than the Calvinistic (orientated) view would.

As I have said, the differences begin at one's overall Christian persuasion. Most prominent is one's understanding of God. Colin cannot think that God could die, but nevertheless gives greater value to the dying of the human Jesus than he could give to the resurrected and glorified divine Christ. Tony, on the other hand, cannot but think of God who dies on the cross for the salvation of man, and consequently will put greater emphasis to that end on Jesus' resurrection than on his death.

May I invite Colin to a study of Reformed theology on the topic? I cannot think of any source better than the Schilder I referred to in prior mail. But also Oscar Cullmann's *The Christology of the New Testament* is of supreme quality. Of course Karl Barth, and Karl Barth again! Dietrich Bonhoeffer: *The Cost of Discipleship*. I could summarise his ultimate aim as The Exalted Servant : The Obedient God. Then even a book *God in Creation* by a Tübingen Professor Jürgen Moltmann with whom I am at loggerheads on the subject of the Christian Sabbath. But he wrote an earlier book of immense depth and worth, *The Crucified God*. He may be better known for authoring of the famous book *Theology of Hope*, from which I discovered my dictum for my own sort of faith: "*Christian Faith that isn't Resurrection Faith is neither Christian nor Faith*". My critique against Moltmann is that he doesn't practice what he preaches: He keeps the Sabbath (which he professes is valid for Christians) at the

level of "creation" and would not see it elevated into the realm of Resurrection Faith – the position he reserves for the First Day of the week.

Another aspect of Colin Heesom's protest against the Resurrection-value for the Sabbath Day is Jesus' foreknowledge or rather supposed lack of foreknowledge of His resurrection from the dead. (Also Dennis Murphy 30 Jun 2002)

Says Colin, "*I'll jump in here: because human death does not presuppose resurrection until Jesus was resurrected the "It is finished" can only refer to the sacrificial life: Desire of Ages is clear on Jesus NOT BEING CERTAIN of the resurrection due to his separation (by our guilt on him) from the Father's insight by faith which Jesus had access to. Jesus DID NOT DIVINELY KNOW of the resurrection when he died, as he always lived by faith in the Father's love: he could believe the promises and assurances he'd had through his life, but that's the closest he was to knowing about Sunday morning on Friday afternoon. The resurrection is the triumph over death, but Jesus DID NOT FOREKNOW it on Friday.*" (Emphasis GE)

Refer my writing to Steve, "Therefore did my heart rejoice". Why? "For I foresaw the Lord always before my face", verse 25. David (speaking for Christ) believed, and he believed the risen Christ according to this context. That is Resurrection Faith! Faith is Resurrection Faith – the faith in Jesus Christ crucified and "raised for our justification". It even is true of Christ Himself, looking at verses 33 further. Jesus was not left in death or hell because of His own Faith in the "God (who) had sworn to Him an oath" (verse 30). "He" (David, yes, but also God – the immediate subject of the verbs here) "He, God, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ". Now here's a good definition of what Resurrection Faith is: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel (the Believers in Christ) KNOW ASSUREDLY, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye (the Church – we men) have crucified, both Lord and Christ". Did Jesus not know the purpose of his mission and incarnation and suffering? To suggest He didn't it must be assumed He wasn't tempted as we are; it must be assumed He suffered like an ascetic – suffering for the sake of suffering. (Klaas Schilder shows how Jesus' biggest temptation was to lose sight of his Victory – to suffer for the sake of suffering not having the overcoming through suffering and resurrection in sight.) What carried the Lamb of God to the cross and through dying the death of sinners for sinners was the obedience to "the Law of the faith of Jesus". Jesus foresaw God's faithfulness and confidence in the resurrection of Him – and obeyed. Jesus' obedience to the Law of God and Faith in God cannot be separated in His crisis-hour (Rv.14:12) He being God incarnate knew His own future as He knew its outcome in victory – in which He also saw the overcoming and life of man.

Speaking of the faith of the saints through the ages the Preacher of the Sermon to the Hebrews concludes, "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the Promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect". What we – Christians – have received is the PERFECT fulfilment of the Promise: "Jesus the Author and Finisher of our faith, who, for **the joy that was set before Him** endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God".

Jesus resurrected and exalted is God's finished works from which also His **future** works derive their possibility, actualisation and completion. (In answer to John Howard 29 Jun 2002) That has been Protestant faith all along, and the whole New Testament is Witness to it. Christ's Second Advent fully rests on his First Advent. God's Rest whence derives God's Day of Rest solidly rests on "(Jesus) having entered upon His Own Rest as did God from His". (I wonder if Luther disliked Hebrews so much because he disliked the Sabbath Day?)

But my point at present is that this constitutes the whole meaning of God's Sabbath Day as it is the whole meaning of God's Sabbath Rest – His satisfaction in Jesus the Victor Lord of hosts. The Sabbath Day after the finishing of all God's works no longer is the creation-Sabbath or Jewish Sabbath of anticipation and waiting; it is the Sabbath of the Promise Realised from whose soil spring all New and future Life. Christ knew it – that is His glory as it is the Sabbath's glory! Jesus conquered looking the enemy straight in the eye, fully understanding every possibility and option.

**Dennis Murphy,**

*There doesn't have to be any problem or contradiction. The stress, anguish, and pain of Jesus on the cross does not extend into the grave. In his \*death\* could be the rest of the Sabbath day, but perhaps we should add that his \*dying\* was a separate thing. In dying on the cross, Jesus indeed "experienced" dying the Second Death. It was part of his "work" in saving us-- to go thru with his plan regardless of opposition and obstacles, even at the cost of eternal death. But having done that successfully, he died (laid down his life), and he experienced rest during the Sabbath hours from his work of salvation. Even though it was preceded by pain and anxiety and suffering, Jesus still had rest during the Sabbath.*

*I have spoken the same way of relatives who died after a long fight with pain. They then are at rest, beyond the reach of their pain. That's a very helpful way of saying it, BTW, when consoling someone who believes the deceased is in heaven. It's true to both of us that they are at rest and without pain, and you avoid having to say something that argues with the other person's beliefs at a difficult time.*

*(My comments above only relate to Jesus' death and his rest in the grave during the Sabbath, and are not a statement about the "Saturday resurrection" argument that I think has also been a part of this discussion.) Have a good day, and may God be with you.*

*I have spoken the same way of relatives who died after a long fight with pain. They then are at rest, beyond the reach of their pain. That's a very helpful way of saying it, BTW, when consoling someone who believes the deceased is in heaven. It's true to both of us that they are at rest and without pain, and you avoid having to say something that argues with the other person's beliefs at a difficult time".*

Our lives are hidden with Jesus Christ in God whether we are alive or dead. Blessed peace we enjoy in Christ. We enjoy that peace and rest in Jesus for the sake of His dying and death in our stead. When Jesus surrendered the ghost according to His last volition on the cross. He had not "taken up" his life again yet. The opposite of his "laying down" his life, was the "taking up" of it again, the moment of His Rising in Life Eternal. That eternal life is the attribute of Jesus' resurrected life, not of his state of being dead, which it must have been, were He not dead in his death for sinners, but resting. (And that deed of His of resting supposed to be GOD'S act of rest. No, the ideas are irreconcilable.)

Now besides, often Jesus says that He would be raised "the third day" – meaning He would be dead the death of sinners for sinners the full duration of it, intensely described in Mt.12:40, that He would be "in the heart of the earth". This condition of Jesus having lasted the full "three days and three nights", is spoken of by analogy of Jonah's experience in the belly of the whale, described as being an experience of hellish anguish. The anguish did not end before the days ended – it did not end when Jesus died. How to explain it I don't know nor care to know. I only

know the Bibles says so and I also know that that was what our redemption required and cost – and what Jesus paid for it. I don't pretend to know what death is. I think it is something one must go through before one would understand it. But this every one of us do know, and that is that it isn't something any of us would envy another or would wish for, like taking a nice nap. Then we talk of our temporary death – not the death Jesus died, namely the death of sinners for sinners – the anguish and "horror" of hell. Jesus through the whole development of conquering death through his dying, death and Resurrection, confirmed the Gospel in the words of John Owen, "*the death of death in the death of Christ*"! Death – not "rest"! Look at the Passover similitude, how Israel suffered and kept on suffering the fears of death virtually with their feet on the opposite shores of the Red Sea, before they saw the waters close behind them and swallow up the enemy at last. Do you know what says Jonathan Edwards that renowned American evangelical? He says it was the very day of the Sabbath that moment! (Third Sermon on The Lord's Day) Of course it was – which is first possible to establish – no, which is first necessarily established by reason of the fact this same experience of Passover was incorporated the very reason to keep God's holy Sabbath Day! This is exciting! God's Word is "living" as Hebrews says exactly within the context of speaking about God's rest and the "Sabbatismos still in force for God's People"! I speak to my Gereformeerde brethren and they don't understand or believe one word, can you believe! (I have received some promising response from Prof. Flip Theron though.) In any case, under no circumstances could Jesus' condition or experience or state in and of death – call it what you will – be seen as the enjoyment of the Sabbath-Rest BUT AS THE EARNING OF IT. This earning of the Sabbath-Rest of God would be – one hesitates to speak like a mortal has to speak – void and a farce like Resurrected Life would be void, nihilism and a burlesque had Jesus not actually raised from the dead and had he not actually "entered into His Own Rest Like God = being God"! Hb.4:10 Verse 10 supplies the grounds for the conclusion reached in verse 9 that the Sabbath is still in force.

I am able to once more agree with you, that "*There doesn't have to be any problem or contradiction. The stress, anguish, and pain of Jesus on the cross does not extend into the grave*", although I would add, "*in the exact same way*". In fact says Peter Acts 2:24, "Whom God hath raised up having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that He should be holden of it" ... any longer after having been raised. The moment of loosening the pains of death was the moment of resurrection from the dead – not the moment of entering into it. I would further add that "*In his \*death\* could be the rest of the Sabbath day*" EARNED AND PAYED FOR. Then surely and freely may we both confirm "*that his \*dying\* was a separate thing*" than his death associated with the state of the grave. Like Martin Luther explained the article of faith, "Descended into hell" – that it truly was Jesus' experience during Gethsémané and his suffering upon the cross. Jesus entered into that place of total separation from the Father when He gave up the ghost – He did not fall asleep. Klaas Schilder writes all three volumes of his Trilogy – *Jesus' Entering Into His Suffering; Jesus' Going Through His Suffering; and Jesus' Exit of His Suffering* – as being the meaning of this article through Jesus' experience from the Last Supper until his (seven) last "Words from the cross". Soteriology at its best! There, again, I fully consent: "*In dying on the cross, Jesus indeed "experienced" dying the Second Death. It was part of his "work" in saving us-- to go thru with his plan regardless of opposition and obstacles, even at the cost of eternal death*". May I suggest a few changes of emphasis, and say, *In dying on the cross, Jesus indeed "experienced" dying the Second Death. It was part of his "work" in saving us—in*

obtaining God's Rest of which the Sabbath is sign and celebration—to go through with his plan—THE *opposition* absolutely fastened in prospect—and *obstacles*, even the *cost of eternal death*—the fixed objective availed.

God's Sabbath Rest and man's keeping of it in the light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is no "*invention*" – it is the only "valid" "therefore" (explanation) for it – Hb.4:9 : "Therefore (*ara* – "because Jesus gave them rest", verse 8) a keeping of the Sabbath (*sabbatimos*) is valid and in force still (*apoleipetai*) for God's People (the Christian Church – *tohi laohi tou theou*)". Man, the New Testament knows of speaking on the subject of the Sabbath Day! The Old Testament had not received that much revelation about God's Day of Worship-Rest. We should understand the Old Testament in the light of the New Testament, and not *vice versa*. The same for the Sabbath Day.

I have on my shelves a booklet from the Powell Bible School of the University of South Africa, entitled, "*Opgewek oor die Opstanding*". The Afrikaans has the nice word-play and alliteration. The English would translate, literally, *Raised because of the Resurrection*; but the real Afrikaans meaning is, *Exited about the Resurrection*. These Sunday-folk of mine, they find joy in Sunday because they believe – without any reason – that Jesus rose from the dead on that day. But the Sabbath-folk – who have everything to believe the Sabbath for to be the Day of God's Rest through Jesus' finishing of His Own Works – they cannot get exited about the fact?! Ah! Let people think it is an "*invention*", I take great delight in this truth that Jesus' Day of Resurrection is God's Day of Finishing Rest. You know what says Karl Barth after his exhaustive treatise on the Sabbath Day in one place? He asks, "*Was it not innovation?*", or, "*an invention?*", when the Church against all expectation and the drift of the whole of his own argumentation decided for the First Day of the week instead of for the Sabbath Day? The basis of Sunday observance in the Body that is Christ's is the worship of strange gods, and the Church's placing of Jesus' resurrection on the Sun's Day is an *invention* – not the contingency it so had to happen and the fact it actually did happen that Jesus rose from the dead on God's Rest-Day.

#### Dennis Murphy.

*I'd like to respond to the specific question asked by Gerhard Ebersöhn: what, or which death, did Jesus die for the salvation of sinners? I think the short answer is the 'second death'. We all recognize that Jesus, in paying for our salvation, experienced death for us. Since the punishment for sin is permanent, everlasting death, for Jesus to suffer what we deserved means He had to have experienced the despair and loneliness of the 'second death'. To me that means that He could not have known with assurance that He would ever come out of the grave. "The wages of sin is [eternal] death," and Jesus "became sin" for us. So the horror of the approaching death may have been much more ominous to Jesus than we can imagine if He experienced it as the death that is final. When one realizes that this must have been Jesus' experience on the cross, it makes the depth and resolve of God's love even more wonderful. Jesus not only willingly gave His life for us, He gave it with the possibility that He would never live again.*

*Jesus came to earth to do His Father's will, to reveal His Father's character to us, and to lay down His own life on our behalf at an appointed time. When that time came, after His hours of suffering on the cross for the unappreciative people He came to save, He announced that "It is finished." He committed Himself to the will of His heavenly Father, then He "laid down His life". He laid it down, willing to \*never\**

*take it up again, if that is what our redemption would cost. The thought is awesome to me when I contemplate it, that Jesus loved us so much to die permanently, if necessary, to save us.*

Are you not too sure that "*that to me means ...*"? Are you sure you are not parroting? "*He laid down (his life), willing to \*never\* take it up again, if that is what our redemption would cost.*" That was not the deal – not "the plan of salvation", not God's determinate will or "Council". God's will never rests on "*woulds*"; He doesn't act on "*ifs*". From eternity to eternity there are no uncertainties with Him. He foreknows the future as He disposed of the future from his own eternal being. Jesus *laid down His life*, for *THAT IS what our redemption cost*, *willing to take it up again*, for *THAT IS what our redemption* bought. *Jesus loved us so much* He did die, unconditionally, *permanently to save us*.

That outcome, "*It is finished!*",

the Son – so sure was He – *announced*  
on scaling the last hurdle in his course of *suffering*,  
*committing Himself to the will of His heavenly Father*,  
holding fast to His Word of Oath  
not to let the Beloved see corruption in the grave.

Can you imagine Jesus having been incarnated, anointed by the Holy Spirit and attested by the Father, just having come of Priestly age, not understanding for what it all was about? What could Jesus have had in sight when He told the Church in Nazareth, "Today this word is being fulfilled in your ears"? It is an exact similar word than that word of His from the cross, "It is finished"! Did Jesus not know His coming was the inauguration of the Jubilee – Time of setting free and rejoicing – and not HOW it was to come about – Jesus not foreseeing His resurrection from the dead? That means Jesus understood sheer nothing of his redemptive mission. But He came to conquer and knew He would, and that was His strength of faith throughout. That to Jesus was God's Law – "the Law of the Faith of Jesus" (kai = "indeed!"). The Sabbath in the context of such faith of Jesus meant it to be His Day of Glory – "the Commandment of God" its guaranty. Jesus' faith not only carried Him into and through His suffering, death and overcoming through resurrection, but it prepared Him thereto.

I would rather stick to the old faith here that Jesus' reason for accepting to lay down His life and the strength to go through with it was His clear perception of it itself. He knew He had to do with everlasting death – that is what He came for – to overcome and destroy it. That inspired Jesus and gave Him faith in his own success. So the Father swore to Him, and so all believers believed in Him. He would not disappoint any, not – by the power of his very own conviction!

This has been an unaccustomed subject for me to deal with, being a Calvinist who took for granted the position I here try to make clear – even to myself. So thank you for bringing to the table this aspect of the subject. I think the conclusion reached endorses the principle that the Sabbath as the Day of God's Finishing and Rest belongs to Christ by feat – by victory over death, destruction and nihil. "It is finished" – that word is Creative Word, Redemptive Word, as well as Clarion Call of the consummation of all things. That consummation is the Centre of the universe and of time, the immeasurable and unfathomable Source of Life Eternal. He – The Author and Finisher – comes forth from the heart of the earth in Calvary's hill, Hero of the saints and hosts of heaven – His Name: Lamb of God, God with us, The Coming God.

**Yet another aspect of Sidney L. Davis, Jr.**

It took me some thinking to start realise that you write as a Sunday-keeper. For about two years now I have been confronted with your kind of arguments levelled against my resurrection views about the Sabbath by Sabbatharians – not by Sunday-believers. I have got so accustomed to these sort of objections coming from people who believe the Sabbath that I thought you were another of them! (This in itself says much about the main idea under discussion.) As a result of my mistaking your orientation towards the question, I struggled with the meaning you must have intended for the word “*pre-empt*”. Be that as it may, I shall now have to re-adjust my answer.

Say you, “*The majority of Christians base the sanctity of Sunday because of the Lord’s resurrection on the first day of the week.*” There cannot be any denying the fact. But like in the days of the Reformation Christianity was unanimous in all its doctrine and the Reformers’ came out isolated and few. It says nothing good for either Christianity or the day they believe.

Nevertheless, it says nothing bad for *the majority of Christians* that the **principle** they adhere to, that they “*base the sanctity*” as such on or “*because of*”, “*the Lord’s resurrection*”. Why? Because in principle, basically and in essence, it is the selfsame principle, basis and essence of God’s doing of the Seventh Day, namely every “work” of His of the Sabbath Day – “God’s works” of “ending” of “finishing”, “perfecting”, “completing” – the functioning of His very Being – namely His “rest”, His “sanctification” and his “blessing”. Now you, a Christian, will agree that if I wrote each and every of those “works of God” with a capital letter, we as Christians correctly could identify those “works of God” with “The Word of God” even with Jesus Christ Himself! To explain what I mean in theological terms, we understand God’s creation-acts of the Seventh Day eschatologically. In simple Christian language, we read John 1 into Genesis 2-3. Whether that may be acknowledged for sound hermeneutics doesn’t worry me, because “all Scripture is given” for no other purpose than the revelation to human heart and mind the Will of God Who is Jesus Christ. It doesn’t worry me at all, because I am in the best of company, for example, Karl Barth’s, who said that any Christianity that isn’t eschatology, hasn’t got a thing to do with Christ! “*ganz und gar und restlos NICHTS!*”

Then of course the Sabbatharians who would not accept this principle, basis and essence of Jesus’ resurrection as the finishing of all God’s works, will “*seek to diffuse or undermine the strength of this*”, and a few might even “*imagine to transpose the resurrection of Jesus from the first day to the Sabbath*”.

Right here our roads no longer run parallel, but cross. Roads are a bad metaphor, for right here we actually crash into each other. But before we start to pick up the pieces, please tell me where have you found these Christians? I sincerely would like to meet them, because we might be sharing very exiting beliefs!

A few Christians might have better reason than to “*imagine*” the resurrection of Jesus happened “in Sabbath’s-time”. (See, inverted comma’s for indicating a quotation – Mt.28:1!) And they might have made the discovery that in fact it was the Sunday-folks who did the “*transposing*” from the Sabbath to the First Day. I’m talking of the transposing in the first place of this motivation or basis or reason for the day’s special meaning – the meaning of it “*because of the Lord’s resurrection*” – hence “Lord’s Day”. That – the transferring of the Christian reason from the Sabbath to the First Day – was the first step in the *transposition*-process. I know the traditional explanation all agree in not giving this factor any role to play in the process. But it

temporarily did surface in very early Christianity – one may infer it from Galatians 4 in fact. By the time of Justin Martyr it literally had won the day – in just one hundred years! So venerated were both the day and its lord. (An inscription reads “Lord Sun’s Day”. Read Moltmann’s excellent dissertation on the “cross” of Constantine’s battle-emblems in his *The Coming of God*.)

Talk about “*inventive and speculative interpretations*”, and you’ll find them with the Sundaydarians “*the majority of Christians*” – my own people and my own Church. And where will you find them with these my brethren in the Faith of Jesus? Where least expected! Where most effective! Where best protected. Where no-one seems to bear responsibility or to give account! Where is that? Daniel tells us (I see so much discussion on Daniel presently in SDANet.) Daniel tells us. He says the little horn who is anti-Christ is all I know will think himself higher than God and mightier so that he will change God’s Word the Holy Scriptures – God’s “*Times and Law*” as called by Daniel. (“Times” – “News (Letter)”; “Law” – “(Written) Word”)

I put on the agenda and for the record: Not a single Sabbath and Sunday text with regard to the resurrection of Jesus, had not through translation been subjected to change and manipulation and falsification. That is how the Sabbath lost its virtues to the First Day and how the First Day – as Augustus Hesse phrases it – “*was invested with an interest not before attached to it, and became worthy of the new title which it afterwards obtained from ... Christ’s resurrection*”. No, it stole it from the Sabbath Day! “*The position of Sunday sanctity*” in truth had been annexed through “*occluding the believer of the true significance of the gospel of the cross of Christ*” because it is that very Gospel – the Gospel of the Crucified Jesus Resurrected – that *invests* the Sabbath Day of the Scriptures and of God’s speaking in, by and through Jesus Christ, *with an interest not before attached to it, and worthy of the new title which it afterwards obtained from Christ’s resurrection* even “the Lord’s Day”.

**Dennis Murphy,**

Quoting GE.

“That eternal life is the attribute of Jesus’ resurrected life, not of his state of being dead, which it must have been, were He not dead in his death for sinners, but resting. (And that deed of His of resting supposed to be GOD’S act of rest. No, the ideas are irreconcilable.)”

“*I am not sure I understand what you wrote. What are the irreconcilable ideas? Is it the comparison of Jesus dead in the tomb with resting on the Sabbath? I think that is usually intended to be just a metaphor that fits the timing and events of Jesus’ death, burial and resurrection. No one that I know thinks that Jesus was happily “resting” in the tomb, as we might relax on Sabbath after a hard week of work. He was dead, as best as the word applies to Jesus who had the power to both “lay down” his life and “take it up” again (John 10:18).*”

“Besides, often Jesus says that He would be raised “the third day” – meaning He would be dead the death of sinners for sinners the full duration of it, intensely described in Mt.12:40, that He would be “in the heart of the earth”. This condition of Jesus having lasted the full “three days and three nights”, is spoken of by analogy of Jonah’s experience in the belly of the whale, described as being an experience of hellish anguish.”

“*It is helpful to me to try to limit my comments to what the verses actually say. Matt 12:40 says that “as Jonah was three days and three nights” in the fish (not a whale, actually), so Jesus would be in “the heart of the earth” for the same time. I know that some people are concerned to reconcile the literal amount of time stated in*



that verse with what we usually understand to be a Friday evening thru early Sunday morning, or only one full day and two partial days. Whether the "full duration" is necessary or inclusive reckoning of the partial days is correct, is not important to me. I think it's even possible that Jonah was not in the fish for the full, literal time. Jonah would have been in shock, passing in and out of consciousness in the darkness of the fish's stomach, and who would there have been to accurately measure his time, anyway? By Jonah's dim awareness, he was in the fish for what seemed like three days and nights. It's only his testimony that would have given the time to anyone to record."

"I don't pretend to know what death is. I think it is something one must go through before one would understand it. But this every one of us do know, and that is that it isn't something any of us would envy another or would wish for, like taking a nice nap."

"The state of death itself is not mysterious, as far as what we experience. According to the Bible it is a state of dreamless unconsciousness. No sense of time; no awareness of events. It is certainly a mystery as to what constitutes our "spirit" that returns to God when we die, how it defines us, and how that is kept and later returned if and when we are resurrected. But we don't have to understand that. Understanding what we experience is what takes away a lot of the fear of death, and I know people who have genuinely wished for it (but not suicidal), because it meant release from the burdens and aches and pains they were patiently enduring while they lived."

"We talk of our temporary death – not the death Jesus died, namely the death of sinners for sinners – the anguish and "horror" of hell."

I don't believe there is any difference in the state of death, whether it's temporary or the final 'second death', except that God says there is no return from the latter. The real difference between the "temporary" death we experience and the final 'second death' is in one's experience in approaching it. The first can be approached peacefully, even if in pain, because we have hope in Christ for resurrection and life again. The second is dreadful and horrible because one knows, while dying, that one is cut off from God and there is no hope, ever, of coming back. It is an experience of dying in despair and loneliness. That's the "horror" I meant when I first wrote about it. Did you mean to refer to the "horror" of hell as the fear of torture and flames of the popular concept of an eternally burning hellfire? I don't think you did, but I ask only to help clarify our dialogue and avoid any misunderstanding. I don't believe in that idea and I did not intend that meaning in my first message.

I'm not familiar with Jonathan Edwards' writings, or some of those other references you mentioned, so I'll leave it to others to respond there. Thanks much for your response, and your kind compliment. I hope my words here have been helpful.

#### **Sidney L. Davis, Jr.**

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." Mark 16:9 Church history is very clear that the sacredness attached to Sunday by Christians is founded on the historical and Biblical testimony of Jesus' resurrection being on the first day of the week (see Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2; Mark 16:9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1). That this is affirmed by the Scripture and the testimony of the Church Fathers is so clear and evident that it is useless and futile to debate or discuss this with anyone who refuses to acknowledge such evidences in the face of the universal Christian witness. The

typology of the resurrection is affirmed also in the NT testimony of Jesus being resurrected as the "first fruits" (1Cor.15:20).

According to Leviticus 23:11, the day of the "first fruits" was on the "morrow after the Sabbath" (i.e. Sunday). Christ resurrection on the first day of the week is a fact that was never a point of controversy in the Christian church until the late 18th century. The doctrinal innovation that attempts to transfer the day of the resurrection from the first day to the Sabbath was later given great impetus and emphasis as a cardinal teaching of Herbert Armstrong and the [former] World Wide Church of God. You might find the following article by Samuele Bacchiocchi helpful. "The Time of the Crucifixion and Resurrection".

#### **From : SDA Net.**

7 Jul 2002

"Gerhard,

1) It's very difficult to tell what you're quoting, and what's your own writing. Could you please clear this up before reposting?

2) A less important point, but one that you may want to look at it -- on my screen, your mail program is not generating exactly the characters that I think you mean (e.g., I'm seeing question marks (?) in place of quote marks ("")), which makes reading your prose rather difficult. Could you please check and see what encoding it's using, and make sure that it's sending in plain text?

3) Sidney Davis (note spelling, Sidney not Sydney) is not a Sunday-keeper by any stretch of the imagination, and this is well-known to many of us on SDA.net, so you may want to reconsider this point (if, in fact, you're not quoting someone else -- see point 1 above)."

#### **Dennis Murphy**

Quoting G. Ebersöhn:

"Are you not too sure that "that to me means ..."? Are you sure you are not parroting?

"Parroting" usually means to thoughtlessly repeat someone's comments. I don't think I was doing that. I did use the phrase, "To me that means", so I could more clearly distinguish my opinion from what I think is explicit Bible teaching.

It's clear in the Bible that Jesus offered his own life to redeem ours, and that he took the punishment that we deserved. The punishment for sin is death; not the temporary death we experience because our bodies fail, but the permanent, 'second death' in which one is eternally lost. Therefore, in some way, Jesus must have experienced the second death if he really did suffer for sin in my place. But my description of when that experience started and stopped, and what Jesus' thoughts were, represents my own opinion. I welcome differing opinions from others. I also expect that others' opinions will also reflect the Bible teaching that Jesus experienced the penalty of sin for us, even as they may differ in details.

Responding to my comment, Gerhard wrote:

"He laid down (his life), willing to \*never\* take it up again, if that is what our redemption would cost." That was not the deal - not "the plan of salvation", not God's determinate will or "Council". God's will never rests on "woulds"; He doesn't act on "ifs".

I feel like you're overreacting. I meant only that as Jesus was enduring the cross, as he approached the time when he would lay down his life and as he was tempted to avoid making that sacrifice, he did make the choice that he would die for us even if God did not ever call him back. That he gave his life voluntarily, at the appointed time, was exactly what was intended in God's plan of salvation, God's "determinate will" or "Council". I don't mean to deny the scriptural promises and prophecies of Jesus' resurrection. I'm saying only that Jesus had to take those statements on faith, just as you and I have to trust God's word in our own choices and crises. He had no supernatural vision or assurance of the future resurrection being guaranteed. Not at that time, anyway.

“ From eternity to eternity there are no uncertainties with Him. He foreknows the future as He disposed of the future from his own eternal being. Jesus laid down His life, for THAT IS what our redemption cost, willing to take it up again, for THAT IS what our redemption bought. “

I don't know what you mean by "disposed of the future from his own eternal being". But it seems that you don't like the idea of Jesus wrestling with whether or not to give his life because you think all the details of his future were already known to him. I don't think he had that insight. I'll try to submit some more detailed comments about this later under the "openness of God" subject thread that's still continuing on SDAnet.

“ Jesus loved us so much He did die, unconditionally, permanently to save us.”

I agree with you about the "unconditionally" part. He offered his life without any conditions or reservations. But did you really mean to say "permanently"?? He was dead for no more than three literal days and nights, according to the Bible. Saying that Jesus died "permanently" isn't consistent with what you've written before about his resurrection. I wrote that he was \*willing\* to die permanently if that's what would be required to save us, but not that he actually did that.

“ That outcome, "It is finished!", the Son - so sure was He - announced on scaling the last hurdle in his course of suffering, committing Himself to the will of His heavenly Father, holding fast to His Word of Oath not to let the Beloved see corruption in the grave.”

Perhaps I'm just not understanding what seems to be objections. I think I agree with what you wrote. I do believe that Jesus held fast to the promises in the scriptures and basically committed his life to his heavenly Father even as he could not see for certain how it would work out. His choice was to trust, and obey, the will of his heavenly Father no matter what would happen.

“ Can you imagine Jesus having been incarnated, anointed by the Holy Spirit and attested by the Father, just having come of Priestly age, not understanding for what it all was about?”

That's not what we've been discussing. Our topic has been Jesus' experience on the cross in the hours just before his death. That's different from Jesus beginning his mission on earth and knowing or not knowing what he came here to do. I'm sure he knew "what it was all about".

“ He came to conquer and knew He would, and that was His strength of faith throughout. That to Jesus was God's Law - "the Law of the Faith of Jesus" (kai = "indeed!"). ...

I would rather stick to the old faith here that Jesus' reason for accepting to lay down His life and the strength to go through with it was His clear perception of it itself.”

Where does Jesus demonstrate faith, if he already saw clearly, with the kind of "foreknowledge" that you seem to imply, that he would win and be resurrected and that everything would work out OK? Faith is the trust and belief you have in something that you \*don't\* yet see (Hebrews 11:1). I know that Jesus believed in and even told others about his resurrection. But I believe that was his determination and his faith talking, and it's different from foreknowledge. (What does "kai = "indeed"" mean?)

“ I think the conclusion reached endorses the principle that the Sabbath as the Day of God's Finishing and Rest belongs to Christ by feat - by victory over death, destruction and nihil.”

One might say that the Sabbath, as the day of the Creator's rest from his work of creation, belongs to Him by feat - by virtue of his successful and perfect work of creation. If you mean something similar, that the Sabbath also belongs to Christ by virtue of his "work" of saving us which he performed during his life here on earth, then I can agree with you. I'd qualify my statement a little, depending on what emphasis and definition you might give to his \*finished\* work. But Jesus certainly made the one, sufficient offering for sin by his death, and the Sabbath day has become as much a memorial of his salvation as it is already of his creation.”

“Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. Mark 16:9” An alternative will show your quoted 'translation' is no translation but a manipulation: “As The Risen One He (Jesus) early on the First Day of the week appeared first to Mary Magdalene.”

You say,

“Church history is very clear that the sacredness attached to Sunday by Christians is founded on the historical and Biblical testimony of Jesus' resurrection being on the first day of the week (see Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2; Mark 16:9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1). That this is affirmed by the Scripture and the testimony of the Church Fathers is so clear and evident that it is useless and futile to debate or discuss this with anyone who refuses to acknowledge such evidences in the face of the universal Christian witness.”

I answer: First, The sacredness UNDULY attached to Sunday by Christians is NOT founded on Jesus' resurrection BEING ON THE FIRST DAY of the week. Two: The historical and Biblical testimony of Jesus' resurrection AS FAR AS IT IS SCRIPTURAL, FIRST CENTURY testimony and history, 'affirms',

1, retrospectively factually and literally that Jesus rose from the dead “In Sabbath's-time”. Mk. 16:9 also affirms this matter of fact because it STATES the Risen Christ APPEARS on Sunday morning.

2, prospectively, prophetically and symbolically (eschatologically) Jesus would rise from the dead “In Sabbath's-time” for both Old and New Testament “appoint” the Sabbath for the finishing of ALL God's works in the “exceeding greatness of His Power” - its “end”, completion, perfection, “rest” and “sanctification” in and through the Word of God Jesus Christ.

In my discussions with Sdaily I try to show point 2.

To a priori decide the way you do, Sidney, “that it is useless and futile to debate or discuss this with anyone who refuses to acknowledge such evidences in the face of the universal Christian witness”, is most unhappy. Dear friend and brother in

Jesus Christ, kindly first take out the word “*evidences*” so that we could go on unprejudiced. Then kindly consider “*the universal Christian witness*”. As I understand you are a believer of God’s Seventh Day Sabbath. Do you believe it in consent to “*the universal Christian witness*”? Then also take out the clause “*refuse to acknowledge*”, because it isn’t true, I tell you honestly. Actually, precisely by seriously considering each and every of these “*evidences*”, I for one, independently, prejudiced, and from the stance of “*the universal Christian witness*” of the Protestant and Calvinist Faith was compelled to come to the conclusion these “*evidences*” are a big scam and fraud – “*so clear and evident*” God’s Holy Day the Sabbath holds the privilege and heirloom to the “*typology of the resurrection*”.

I present this the Sabbath’s rightful claim to you without ulterior motive. Hold the faith you hold, love it and cherish it, praise and thank God for it. Yet still the SABBATH is cosmic eschatological sign of the Body that is Christ’s the whole Church and of its Lord the Resurrected Crucified. So help me God, here I stand, I cannot do or say otherwise, not even in the face of universal Christian accusation of “*useless and futile debate*”.

Say you, Sidney,

“*Typology of the resurrection is affirmed also in the NT testimony of Jesus being resurrected as the ‘first fruits’ (1Cor.15:20).*”

No doubt!

Say you,

“*According to Leviticus 23:11, the day of the ‘first fruits’ was on the ‘morrow after the Sabbath’ (i.e. Sunday). ... ‘Christ’s resurrection on the first day of the week is a fact that was never a point of controversy in the Christian church until the late 18th century.’*”

I answer, Have you read what Apollinaris in about 170 AD wrote, that it’s no shame to be ignorant, only the ignorant need further instruction? You know what he wrote about? He wrote of the Christians of his own time, as well as of Christians before him. He wrote of “*SOME*” who were “*ignorant*” about the dating of the Passover-events. And what he refuted the Church has ever since accepted. What he held for “the Scriptures” meant that ‘Sabbath’ of Passover could be any day of the week. I have many times read HOW the Sadducees explain, but never the Sadducees themselves explain that “day after the Sabbath” always meant “the First Day of the week”, which till today, no other Jew has discovered true. Why, it’s plain “the morrow after the Sabbath” of Passover’s Feast and “such Great Day”, that flesh BURIED yesterday should not corruption see today! First Day OF THE WEEK? Go, ask, the Jews may speak.

Then Sidney, do you say,

“*The doctrinal innovation that attempts to transfer the day of the resurrection from the first day to the Sabbath was later given great impetus and emphasis as a cardinal teaching of Herbert Armstrong and the [former] World Wide Church of God.*”

Sidney, I ask that you will believe me, I speak the truth: NO Church or person ever influenced me in my discovery over a quarter of a century, except MY OWN CHURCH (“Die Hervormde Kerk”) – PURELY THROUGH ITS OWN AND NEW TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE THAT DIFFERED FROM THE OLDER. LATER ON the Greek New Testament, and, Calvinistic or ‘Reformed’ Theology, gave “*cardinal impetus and emphasis*” to my findings – NO Herbert Armstrong or

any Church than mine! Today I know the ‘*teachings*’ of the WWC better than anyone else – and am the staunchest of its repudiators. (See Part One of *The Lord’s Day in the Covenant of Grace*.) As for Prof. Bacchiocchi and his *The Time of the Crucifixion and Resurrection* – see Part Three and many other places.

I wrote: “That eternal life is the attribute of Jesus’ resurrected life, not of his state of being dead, which it must have been, were He not dead in his death for sinners, but resting. (And that deed of His of resting supposed to be GOD’S act of rest. No, the ideas are irreconcilable.)”

You commented: “*I am not sure I understand what you wrote. What are the irreconcilable ideas?*”

They are, that Jesus had not really been dead, but was ‘resting’ or ‘sleeping’ – which are actions of a living organism only; That the state of being dead – being dead in the death for sinners – supposes GOD’S act of rest - which is the basis to and essence of the Sabbath’s rest. I say: “Life” in no sense can be ascribed or attributed as a quality or property of the condition or state that overcame Jesus the moment when He died. “The pains of death” were “loosened” the moment when Jesus rose from the dead – that’s Scripture. Jesus DID NOT “REST” in the grave; The grave and Jesus’ STATE AND TIME of being in the grave and in death WAS AS PART OF HIS SUFFERING and AS PART OF his through suffering paying man’s debts and receiving man’s punishment, AS WAS any of his suffering before his moment of actual death.

Now let me acknowledge an ENIGMA - which I would insist on rather than try explain! That Jesus’ NOT-RESTING OF the Sabbath Day was Jesus’ EARNING of God’s Sabbath REST! Jesus earned God’s-Own-Rest as well as the People’s Sabbath-rest, through SUFFERING AND THROUGH DEATH. DEATH IS THE WAGES FOR SIN: BUT, for Christ was victory - victory over death; the attainment of LIFE. 1Corinthians 15, Romans 6, 8, Philippians 3, Ephesians 1 .... The whole and every word of Scriptures say it, proclaim it, herald it, trumpet it. And it shall be the sound of the last trump. Yes, the New Testament isn’t quiet on Jesus’ resurrection. Just so, is the Old Testament not quiet on the Sabbath’s Eschatological meaning. It SHOUTS it! The Sabbath proclaims God’s Rest - Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead! And Jesus did not disappoint the Clarion Call. He heralded that very sound ... “In the Law is it written of Me!” I’ll repeat, That eternal life and REST are the attribute of Jesus’ resurrected LIFE – not of the grave THOUGH it is its GIFT ... BECAUSE JESUS’ GRAVE IT IS!

I accept your saying it, “*No one that I know thinks that Jesus was happily ‘resting’ in the tomb, as we might relax on Sabbath after a hard week of work. He was dead, as best as the word applies to Jesus who had the power to both ‘lay down’ his life and ‘take it up’ again (John 10:18).*”

You say,

“*I know that some people are concerned to reconcile the literal amount of time stated in that verse with what we usually understand to be a Friday evening through early Sunday morning, or only one full day and two partial days. Whether the ‘full duration’ is necessary or inclusive reckoning of the partial days is correct, is not important to me. I think it’s even possible that Jonah was not in the fish for the full, literal time. Jonah would have been in shock, passing in and out of consciousness in the darkness of the fish’s stomach, and who would there have been to accurately measure his time, anyway? By Jonah’s dim awareness, he was in the fish for what*”

seemed like three days and nights. It's only his testimony that would have given the time to anyone to record."

And I have no purpose to indulge in an answer on time-aspects. The important thing was "CONDITION" to quote myself - the intensity and unfathomable depths of Christ's anguish (Jonah's only by analogy). Paul: "Nor height, nor depth ... shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." "HE STAGGERED NOT AT THE PROMISE OF GOD THROUGH UNBELIEF; BUT WAS STRONG IN FAITH, GIVING GLORY TO GOD". (This is said of "the father of faith", but I meant it of our Lord, the AUTHOR AND FINISHER of faith.) My friend, God's promise to Jesus was suffering, dying, death and the grave. Those are "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord". Can you not see our Lord's resurrection as well, and "more so" - because by the resurrection the Promise holds good. ONLY by the resurrection. This the Sabbath-Rest of God rests on and lives by. Take it, or not, I told myself. What would you have chosen?

You say: "The state of death ... we don't have to understand that."

Then thank you for saying it: "... The real difference between the "temporary" death we experience and the final 'second death' is in one's experience in approaching it. The first can be approached peacefully, even if in pain, because we have hope in Christ for resurrection and life again. The second is dreadful and horrible because one knows, while dying, that one is cut off from God and there is no hope, ever, of coming back. It is an experience of dying in despair and loneliness. That's the "horror" I meant when I first wrote about it."

Never could I not agree; never not be grateful for your words. But THAT NO FRACTION LESS was Christ's agreement to and appointment for the SABBATH Day. Here's the zenith of God's love to us no moment the prospect of Christ's victory lost! Faith and Hope, and the greatest, Love!

Say you: "... According to the Bible it (death) is a state of dreamless unconsciousness." I'm sure you mean "a state", of death - not of life, like "sleep", like "no sense of time"; like "no awareness of events" regardless, FOR THESE ONLY THOSE ALIVE ARE ABLE TO! (Even when supposed negatively.)

To us, yes, as you say, "...Understanding what we experience ... takes away a lot of the fear of death ...". But I think - fearful idea - that Jesus experienced FEAR! "Blood and water sweat"?! Because to HIM it meant NO release from the burdens and aches and pains HE patiently endured while He lived. No, I won't attempt to solve the paradox the pains of DEATH loosened AFTER death when to Victor Lord of Hosts opened wide the portals to God's innermost and BY THE ALTAR of the temple they the SON brought forth and put the CROWN ON HIM and GIVING TESTIMONY MADE HIM KING and ANOINTED HIM; and clapping hands they sang: GOD SAVE THE KING!" This Scripture virtually forgotten? It was Sabbath's Day!

You may say: "I don't believe there is any difference in the state of death."

That's not my point. To me it's of small concern. What I'm driving at, is, See! It's Sabbath's-time! For IN went all the anguish of Gethsemane's heart of earth, of Calvary's pause of gall to drink, of Golgotha's hill where lifted high He into Father's hands surrendered ghost. From there, in Joseph's tomb was laid; from where, "God says, there's no return"! BUT RETURN HE DID FOR GOD ALSO THUS SPOKE : THAT INTO HIS OWN REST HE WOULD ENTER. Therefore, WE, "(death) can approach peacefully, even if in pain, because we have hope in Christ "FOR RESURRECTION AND LIFE AGAIN"! "REMEMBER THE SABBATH DAY"! No dying in despair or loneliness. No horror of death. Come o Day when gathered

from the corners of the earth the dead shall be raised incorruptible and "from week to week" enter into keeping Sabbath - "Yahweh for ever and ever reign"!

The twin doctrines of the Christian Faith are the Resurrection and the Sabbath! Write you, "I'm not familiar with Jonathan Edwards' writings, or some of those other references you mentioned, so I'll leave it to others to respond there."

Next time I'll post a bit of Edwards' sermon I referred to. It will illustrate how "Evangelical" ("Reformed") theology argues against the First Day and FOR the Sabbath. I cannot help to quickly quote this from Edwards: "The death of death in the death of Christ". This is the best definition of both the earning, obtaining and availing of eternal life and its prize, acceptance and celebration I have come across. What do spectators as well as players enjoy most, the playing of the gruelling game (I'm a great rugby fan) or the victory? If no victory all enjoyment of the pain and the fight are GONE! "It's all about winning", they say. What would it have been for God?

Wrote Dennis,

"... as he was tempted to avoid making that sacrifice . . ."

Ah, brother, you see it! Please do yourself the favour to read Klaas Schilder as I previously recommended! You won't regret. It will be the experience of your life! If it's not available to SDANet's contributors and if allowed, I could send SDAILY a few extracts. It's the Gospel as never before contemplated. Schilder is a child of the war times of the previous century. What great theologians did those difficult times produce! Gone the detached unconcerned philosophical deism of the century of prosperity, ease and grandiloquence.

You said, "He (Jesus) had no supernatural vision or assurance of the future resurrection being guaranteed. Not at that time, anyway."

I can only try to comment if the metaphysical term "supernatural" is left out. Exactly "at that time" - when Jesus stood before the eternal portals of death and the heart of the earth gaped wide at his feet, beckoning Him, "Come down here", Jesus held to his Father's Oath not to let his Beloved see corruption. I shall never be able to understand it another way.

But I also should not allow it to distract me from the aim of my contemplation on Jesus' suffering. For just like it was for Jesus, the end of his suffering should be kept in sight! Human thinking always goes wrong somewhere. But the Gospel kept before the eye of faith in its completeness, won't fool any believer. He must understand it truly for it is meant as the revelation of GLAD TIDINGS - VICTORY. "Victory": the New Testament word for the Old Testament word "END" or "finished". "Gospel" means "God's Rest" in its fullness, even Jesus Christ and HE resurrected from the dead and exalted to the right hand of God Almighty.

Only in the whole can the one point I want to hit be observed. I may not dissect Jesus' one and only errand and the obtainment of it. Jesus' suffering and exaltation, his earnings and his wages, are one. When Christ enters upon his SUFFERING, He says, NOW IS GOD GLORIFIED. But NEVER could it be imagined He meant God's glory without TRIUMPHANT VICTORY through RESURRECTION from the dead! For Christ the ALL and WHOLE meant Glory, meant to conquer, meant LIFE and LORDSHIP. Unimaginable, but just think without Jesus' resurrection, and one would imagine the impossible where God would not have had his Sabbath Day. Neither would the creation or human beings have had it.

The Sabbath lives by the finishing of "all the works of God" in and through Jesus Christ by the exceeding power of his might - it could only be by virtue of Christ's resurrection from the dead.

If I now repeat my writing of before,  
 “From eternity to eternity there are no uncertainties with Him.

He foreknows the future as He disposed of the future from his own eternal being. Jesus laid down His life, for THAT IS what our redemption cost, willing to take it up again, for THAT IS what our redemption bought “,

I hope you’ll find explained what I meant. God from his own being brings forth all future by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead – especially the Life and Future of all his Elect – which are hid in Christ in God. It means yes, what you think I err in, to think “*all the details of his (Jesus’) future were already known to him*”. I think He had that insight. Jesus not only “*was willing*” to **endure**, but WILLED to endure as to **overcome!**

But again, What has it got to do with God’s Sabbath Day? I think it means for the Sabbath Day that it itself is eschatological – sign of the Coming God and sign of His-Having-Reached-The-Opposite-Shore of the Promised Land in Jesus Christ even from before the day He had made the Sabbath Day!

What I mean, you ask, by “*Jesus loved us so much He did die, unconditionally, permanently to save us*”?

It is not what you explain, “*Saying that Jesus died “permanently”* “. Just notice the comma, and you’ll see I “consistently” mean quite the contrary. I say that he was NOT willing to die permanently, but through FAITH WILLED to die in order to vanquish dying and death all together in order to permanently save us. THAT – without an “if” is what WAS required to save us, and THAT, Jesus actually did accomplish. THAT was God’s REST and his entering into his own rest. THAT is creation’s rest and its entering into its own rest – just like God entered into his. Whence Hebrews 4 the chapter’s Sabbath-talk.

Say you, “*Perhaps I’m just not understanding what seems to be objections. I think I agree with what you wrote.*”

And I with what you write.

We have cause to celebrate! “I believe the communion of the saints”, says the Confession. It is a communion in and of faith – faith in the common object of Christian Faith: Jesus Resurrected Crucified Lamb of God, Iehsous Xristos, Sotehr, Uios Theou – Jesus Christ, Saviour, Son of God. WE HAVE CAUSE TO KEEP GOD’S SABBATH DAY!

We have solid and basic reason to believe “*that Jesus held fast to the promises in the scriptures*”, and WHOLLY “*committed his life to his heavenly Father*”, EVEN AS HE SAW FOR CERTAIN “*how it would work out*”. “*His choice was to trust, and obey, the will of his heavenly Father no matter what would happen.*” What would happen from eternity had been prepared for Him. Everything that happened was the dispensation-of-God-in-realisation. That is Calvinism. That’s why I am a Calvinist, and that is why I’m a Sabbath-believer and NOT a Sunday believer – Sunday that NOWHERE shall be found in the dispensations of God’s Eternal Purpose. Could I persuade you of the Sabbath’s CHRISTIAN reason for being and the ecstasy of its jubilation!

I wrote: “Can you imagine Jesus having been incarnated, anointed by the Holy Spirit and attested by the Father, just having come of Priestly age, not understanding for what it all was about?”

You commented, “*That’s not what we’ve been discussing. Our topic has been Jesus’ experience on the cross in the hours just before his death. That’s different from*

*Jesus beginning his mission on earth and knowing or not knowing what he came here to do. I’m sure he knew “what it was all about”.*”

A few minutes, a few days, a few years, or many ages “*before his death*” – what’s the difference? The principle is in Jesus’ incarnation already starts his victory through suffering and dying for the sins of many; and in God’s determinate will from before the foundation of the world. But in this word from the WORD of God comes the hour of God’s glory, “TODAY”, “THIS HOUR”, “NOW” . . . “TO THE GLORY OF GOD!” (Christ upon entering Gethsemane.) As Hebrews says, “TODAY! If ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts.” The Sabbath always addresses the IMMEDIATE PRESENCE of the completion of all God’s works in the turn of the YOM YAHWEH, as Klaas Schilder more or less puts it.

I’m glad you’re “*sure he (Jesus) knew what it was all about*”. What would make “*Jesus’ experience on the cross in the hours just before his death*”, any “*different from (His) beginning his mission on earth?*” And why?

Ask you, “*Where does Jesus demonstrate faith, if he already saw clearly, with the kind of “foreknowledge” . . . implied, that he would win and be resurrected and that everything would work out OK?*”

You don’t recognise the answer contained in your question? Then don’t you see it in your own answer, “*Faith is the trust and belief you have in something that you \*don’t\* yet see (Hebrews 11:1)?*” “You \*don’t\* yet see “*that something*” yet, yet trust and believe it! Jesus did!

“*I know that Jesus believed in and even told others about his resurrection. But I believe that was his determination and his faith talking, and it’s different from foreknowledge.*”

No objection! Here is something that may explain why I say so:

You ask: “*What does “kai = “indeed” mean?*” I quote from previous correspondence between myself and Edwin de Kock whom I think you’ll know better than I do: (I hope I spelled his name correctly.)

“The Sabbath I believe answers to the three main criteria of any conviction, practice or doctrine to be “*Christian Faith*” (Moltmann); or “*Christentum*” “*Christianity*” (Barth). The first criterion is **Eschatology** (I like the simpler word, “Prophetic Word”, or, as the New Testament phrases it, “(Faith) according to the Scriptures” – the whole of Scriptures is “Prophecy”, is “Law”. The second criterion is **Resurrection-Faith**. And the third, the signet, “Here is the elect’s (saints’) (long)-**suffering** that holds to the Law of the Faith of Jesus”. (Not, “. . . ALSO the Faith of Jesus” as if the Law and the Faith here supposed have man as its subject, and are the works of man; as if the Faith is not everything and only secondary. No, the copulative *kai* acts much stronger, and should be rendered, “indeed!” or not be mentioned, thus making both the Commandment and the Faith, that of Jesus – that upholds the elect.

It was “Jesus’ Faith”: in Him, was “God’s Commandment”. That Faith led Him to the cross. **That Faith as God’s Law took Jesus to the tree** and He in and with Himself let it be nailed to the tree. (Read Klaas Schilder – the most inspired human word outside the Bible on the suffering of Christ!) God raised up from the dead again this One for the many, for whom “the Faith of Jesus indeed is the keeping of God’s Commandment”. In this Scripture I hear Jesus’ word from the cross, “It is finished!” – God’s predestination which includes Prophecy and history in Jesus Christ, is realised. In and with Himself, yea, as Himself, **Jesus’ Faith obeyed Prophecy even in coming up from the dead**. “The suffering of Jesus”, in fact leads to, and protrudes from, Law and Faith, because it was the FAITH THAT IS THE

LAW OF THE SUFFERING OF OBEDIENCE that brought Christ to the Scriptures, Prophecy and Law. In that it was eschatology, His suffering in dying and hell carried him through death and the grave into resurrection and jubilation. The suffering of Jesus flows right through and forth from the cross and death and resurrection of the Suffering Servant to the “suffering of the elect (‘saints’)”. Out from the truth and fountain of this Scripture Rv.14:12, **flows** John’s conclusion, “Blessed are the dead who from now die in the Lord”. (It is the “first resurrection”, we Calvinists believe.) Yea, “Blessed are the dead who from now die in the Lord **that they might rest** from their labours” – that is, that they might be raised from the dead in and with Jesus Christ – before the second and eternal death strikes! The gist of Rv.14:12 is, **Jesus’ Faith** – unto Himself being God’s Commandment – **brings Him to and carries Him through suffering** in order to CONQUER AND MAKE THE LORD’S DAY. The Day the Psalm says is “of the Lord’s making”, is none but the Sabbath Day – none but the Day of Jesus’ resurrection from the dead. The day of God’s creation-Rest is the Day of the exceeding greatness of His Power when He raised Christ from the dead! It cannot be different days, never, in all eternity NOT. It is too great for that, being the Lord’s Day that can be but one, the “Day concerning which God ... in these last days ... spoke ... to us in the Son ... **in this wise**: **In resurrection from the dead** “God the Seventh Day rested”! (Hb.1:2 and 4:4) In the language of Rv.14:12 it means that a Sabbath which **simply** is “Law” and only the letter of a Commandment – Law that is not “the-Law-of-the-Faith-of-Jesus” – “*ganz und gar und restlos*” has nothing to do with Christ! It is not, “the Everlasting Gospel”!

Say you, “*One might say that the Sabbath, as the day of the Creator’s rest from his work of creation, belongs to Him by feat - by virtue of his successful and perfect work of creation. If you mean something similar, that the Sabbath also belongs to Christ by virtue of his “work” of saving us which he performed during his life here on earth, then I can agree with you. I’d qualify my statement a little, depending on what emphasis and definition you might give to his \*finished\* work. But Jesus certainly made the one, sufficient offering for sin by his death, and the Sabbath day has become as much a memorial of his salvation as it is already of his creation.*”

I ask, Why would you allot inferior merit to the resurrection? The Sabbath’s worth, virtue and merit – all – are totally derived; totally granted: by mercy. It has NO HONOUR of its own or it would be in opposition with Christ’s. What the Sabbath has received it received on merit in virtue and by worth of Jesus Christ. These culminate in the culmination of Jesus’ meritoriousness, virtuousness, and worth obtained, vindicated and established once for all by his resurrection, even as the meritoriousness, virtuousness and worth of the suffering and death of Jesus once for all are obtained, vindicated and established by his resurrection from the dead.

This is Paul speaking: “For if, when we were enemies, were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, MUCH MORE, being reconciled (by His death – it is CONDITIONAL) we shall be saved by his life.” Paul pictures an ABSOLUTE INTER- OR MUTUAL DEPENDENCE of the suffering death and resurrection of Jesus Christ for our “atonement”. He also sees an “atonement” in the works of God. And this “coming together” – this “finishing” of all God’s works He had (ever) done, finds its zenith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. So that not even is the creation a finished creation without the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

**Sidney L. Davis, Jr.**

*Dear Gerhard,*

*The post to which you respond below was not written by me. You have a unique way or style or writing which makes it very difficult for me to follow your flow of rhetoric and your line of reasoning. Sometime I cannot tell where your words or the words of the respondent begin or end. Then your punctuation is very difficult to understand. Your parenthetical interludes, inserts and adlibs within your sentences and paragraphs are very distracting and make reading your posts quite laborious. This also applies to your use of certain unusual terms not in popular usage. I think it may be because of your disposition to be more philosophical and esoteric than factual or literal in your answers and explanations, or maybe perhaps your unfamiliarity with English. Would I be assuming that you are more German or Dutch?*

*Aside from this, your Sabbath resurrection belief is one that was heavily championed by Herbert W. Armstrong and the World Wide Church of God, Church of God 7th Day and their affiliates. I have never seen this theory advanced by any mainline Christian sect or Orthodox sect, and certainly not in Christian antiquity. You appear to indicate that this Sabbath resurrection scenario is one advanced by Evangelical or Reformed theology. If this is what you contend this is new to me and must be of recent development. I do not think there can be any meaningful dialog between us on this matter since we both are confirmed in our positions regarding the day of the resurrection. But I would be most interested in your references and sources which you appeal to for this belief.*

Thank you for answering all the deficiencies of my mail to you despite. The subject matter of my discourse being of such importance to me, I would be most grateful if you would further tolerate my attempt to bring over to you what I mean. I shall try to do everything point by point as you wrote to me in order to talk plainly and understandably.

First, I apologise for mistaking the writing to which I refer, for yours. Then, Yes, you’re right, I am not English, but ‘Dutch’ – in fact Afrikaans – and my reading of a life-time had been mostly German and “Puritan” English. So, I’m afraid it will be impossible for me to improve on my use of the English language. But my ability or rather inability in the proper use of the English tongue I cannot allow to prevent me from telling about the most wonderful light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I often feel like those Pharisees the Lord spoke of when He said they cross the globe just to make one disciple. So far I haven’t made one disciple. But that’s not my ideal – not at all! I only am unable to keep silent and unable not to share the joy of my discoveries.

It would be most disappointing to me if your words “*I do not think there can be any meaningful dialogue between us*” were to mean you’re not interested to lend me an ear any further. I shall oblige your wishes nevertheless. Please then just let me speak this once while I’m at it.

Allow me first categorically to state once more that the Sabbath, its chronological derivation, its doctrine, its theology, its reason, its meaning, its why and wherefore of Armstrong and the rest I don’t care for save to reject in a way answerable to myself, to theological discipline, and before my Lord and Judge. I know Armstrong’s and their doctrines in and out. I learnt of them only at a very late stage in my own development and AFTER my own convictions had been established firmly. There is NO agreement between the views a la Armstrong and mine. I believe

the same day as the Jews, for example, but certainly not the same Sabbath! So with the Armstrong-people. Theirs is not 'my' Sabbath if I may call it 'mine'.

You are right again where you say, "*I have never seen this theory advanced by any mainline Christian sect or Orthodox sect*". But, when you say, "*... and certainly not in Christian antiquity*", I invite you to read my book *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace*. IF WE DEFINE "*Christian antiquity*" the first century Christianity and the Christianity of the New Testament – THEN, it's another matter. THEN, both you and I are in possession of "*Christian antiquity's*" whole and sole authoritative history, doctrine, theology and ethics for we both have the New and Old Testament Scriptures. Then neither of us is better informed than the other, and nobody in this world could be better equipped with every necessary source from which to reach conclusion on this particular matter. THEN, to fall back on "*mainline*" Christianity or on "*any mainline Christian sect or Orthodox sect*" would be as good as it would have been for me to fall back on Armstrong for my own "*theory*". Which would have been disastrous. Especially Part Three of *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace* treats on how the early – Apostolic – Church built its Sabbath, its Sabbath-keeping, its Sabbath-doctrine, and its Sabbath-theology and Sabbath-ethics, on nothing but Jesus Christ and especially his resurrection from the dead.

You protest that it appears to you that I attempt "*to indicate that this Sabbath resurrection scenario is one advanced by Evangelical or Reformed theology. If this is what you contend this is new to me and must be of recent development.*"

I draw from both the recent and the not so recent "*Evangelical or Reformed theology*". I draw from the very acceptance of Sunday-sanctity per se. There's a whole story that is accepted without question behind the MAKE BELIEF of Sunday-sanctity, namely the story of Jesus' resurrection! But as with the fact that the Church holds to Sunday for the evangelical reason of the resurrection per se is never questioned makes of it no fact, so with "*Evangelical or Reformed theology*" – it makes of it no fact the fact it holds to the evangelical reason of the resurrection per se for reason of Sunday's sanctity. But enough of such 'philosophical' analysis of the issue. Plainly, theologians like Karl Barth, Schilder and Edwards treated on the SABBATH – not on Sunday – extensively, only to arrive at the conclusion: Jesus' resurrection from the dead ultimately confirms this SABBATH DAY. But what do they do? They switch their tune. They literally or shall I say literally bewitch the serpent. They belie their OWN findings concerning the SABBATH DAY, and bestow the worth of it on the Sunday. I am sure – seeing you are acquainted with "*Evangelical or Reformed theology*" – you will agree. I chose these mentioned three theologians as examples of this practice because I hold them so dear. I also refer to others, like Luther. And find in their writings on the Sabbath consequences that confirm the Sabbath's rightful claim on the resurrection's blessings that throughout Christian history the first century excepted has been heaped on the Sunday. You will find my theologians considered extensively in the Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace. (In Par. 7.7 you'll find Jürgen Moltmann – unfinished on present reading.)

An important but not the less unknown truth: "*Mainline Christianity*" is the ONLY party responsible for the advancement of the *Sunday "resurrection scenario"*, AS also and further advanced by Evangelical or Reformed theology. Why? Because "*Mainline Christianity*" are the TRANSLATORS of the Scriptures, that's all! (And no one can deny the leading role the Roman Catholic Church has had to play during the previous two centuries.)

Lastly, I used to be "*confirmed*" in my "*positions regarding the day of the resurrection*" AS YOU ARE that it was the Sunday. Then came, not Armstrong or

anybody else, but "*Mainline Christianity*" (my own Church under the spell of Roman Catholicism) with her new Revisions and New Translations and New Bibles by the score. And I who didn't know a thing, who didn't suspect any obscure agendas, who simply followed after the fathers, peacefully sat in the rear pew reading my Bible. There it all started, and the texts I read concerned the suffering of our Lord, and his resurrection – the place where in God's Word the very Gospel is concentrated. My eye caught what previously had been overseen by reason of the traditions of our Christian worship, suddenly highlighted, as were it written in capital letters both what used to be discrepancies and what now the first time had become contradictions.

It is men – only human beings – who give the Bible in men's hands, and say: This is the Word of God, read it, and you will find the truth in there. Meanwhile the Word of God is there, but also their own doing. And in some places their own doing is not God's Word, but the lie of anti-Christ.

Now, dear Sidney, nowhere will you find those lies heaped up like in the New Testament Scriptures that have to do with the Sabbath Day and the First Day of the week. But even if it were possible to convince somebody of the manipulation of these texts, it still is a technical thing as I always say. One must be convinced of the soul of the issue – its theological vindication: That by nature and by rights the Sabbath and the resurrection belong together – rather, the resurrection and the Sabbath – and not the resurrection and the First Day of the week.

#### **Lottie Walker.**

*"Following the discussions on reckoning Jesus' statement at Matthew 12:40 "so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" with other Bible passages that "appear" to contradict this, let me first say I've always believed Jesus' statement whether or not it could be reconciled. But I heard an exhortation provided by Doug Bachelor and studied and searched and sought and I believe he has it right.*

*In essence, most have concluded "heart of the earth" means the grave. Even the sepulcher was not "in the heart of the earth" as we might envision that phrase. And, when David says at Psalm 139:15 that he was "curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth", our minds don't go to "the grave" as might be envisioned by the phrase "lowest parts of the earth".*

*So I've come to agree with Bachelor that the phrase really means for threedays and three nights "The Son of man (was) delivered into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and the third day rise again. (Luke 24:7) and the "precise reckoning of actual time" started when "they laid their hands on him, and took him." Mark14:46 because they "couldst have no power at all against (Him), except it were given (them) from above (John 19:11) and He said "... this is you hour, and the power of darkness." ((Luke 22:53) Thus, power was given to the prince of darkness (through his agents) over Jesus for three days and three nights. He was "in the heart of the earth".*

*After much study, again I believe Bachelor "reconciles" Matthew 12:40 by letting scripture interpret scripture."*

I know about the "*Friday (?) morning delivered, Sunday morning raised*" – Theory. There are a million factors which this Theory does not take into consideration. I repeat my offer of a free CD read only medium copy of my book *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace* – I only must have your postal address, of course, to be able to send it off to you. You will find the Theory considered in Book

1, Par. 5.1.1.6.5, "*Thursday morning delivered, Sunday morning resurrected*", page 254 or 256 thereabouts. (My writings is that of just the weakest of mortals. I rectify, adjust and add to my books constantly, so the page numbers change with time. The Paragraph numbering is better to search by.)

I believe you have been following the correspondence through SDAnet on what you refer to as "*Subject: Sabbath Resurrection?*" If so, then you will appreciate that Jesus entered into his final atoning suffering already at the Table and through Gethsémané. John 13:1 states that Jesus "knew that his hour was come", "before the feast (day) of the passover". "The day that they always sacrificed the passover on" – as the Synoptists say – in fact started with its evening of after sunset. Jesus "within an hour" after evening had begun, says Luke, joined the disciples at table for the Last Supper. As soon as Judas had left, Jesus pronounced, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him" – which is a reference to the glorifying of God of and through Jesus' suffering. The expression "in the heart of the earth" is figurative language of this suffering of Jesus the second death for sinners. The first of the three days of Jesus' being "in the heart of the earth", starts here. It was the day of his crucifixion and death already: its first and night-part literally as well as symbolically. The event makes the day – not the day the event! Remember what Luke says, that Jesus would be delivered into the hands of evil men, yes, but also that He would be given over to the powers of darkness! That most intensely started in this evening-beginning of the day of Jesus' final suffering, crucifixion and death.

You are right, the expression "in the heart of the earth" does not refer to being buried, but to the anguish of Jesus' suffering the death of sinners for sinners. But there's a great deal more to tell about this night for Jesus Christ of into-hell-descending.

Schreibt Stephan: "stephan.isenberg@wtal.de"

"Das Gesetz wurde durch Mose gegeben; die Gnade und die Wahrheit ist durch Jesum Christum geworden" (Joh 1. 17). Diese Worte sind ... zeigen uns den Unterschied zwischen der alten und der neuen Ordnung. Das Gesetz fordert, ohne etwas zu geben, Jesum Christus offenbart Gnade und Wahrheit, wodurch Er den Menschen in den Stand setzt, Gott verherrlichen zu können. Das Gesetz verheißt Leben mit der Bedingung des Gehorsams, Jesus gibt das Leben ohne Bedingung, ein Leben, das sich durch Gehorsam offenbart. Das Gesetz verurteilt, verdammt, verflucht, Jesus befreit von Fluch und Verdammnis.

Dies alles läßt uns die Unmöglichkeit erkennen, das Gesetz zu erfüllen. Wie kann ein Toter Früchte des Lebens, wie kann ein fleischlicher, unter die Sünde verkaufter Mensch Früchte des Geistes hervorbringen? Und zu einem solchen sagt das Gesetz: "Tue dies, und du wirst leben!" – ein Beweis, daß der Mensch tot ist. Nicht um den Menschen in das Leben einzuführen, sondern um ihm die Erkenntni"; seines toten Zustandes zu verschaffen, wurde das Gesetz von Gott gegeben.

Zugleich aber diente es auch als Mittel zur Absonderung Israels. Diese Absonderung Israels meint auch Israels Einschliessung unter allen Völkern und Menschen: „Aber die Schrift hat alles beschlossen unter die Sünde, auf daß die Verheissung käme durch den Glauben an Jesum Christum“. Es gibt nur eine Erlösung für den Juden wie als für den Heiden. Und des Menschen Erlösung bekommt sein Gesetz. Indem Christus Erlöser der Juden wie der Christen ist, gelte dasselbe und einzige Gebot ihnen allen, indem ...

Gott wählte Sich, um die Heiligkeit Seines Namens zu wahren, Israel aus und trennte es durch das Gesetz von anderen Völkern.

Dies zeigt uns, daß ... nur die Gläubigen aus den Juden wie aus den Heiden, Israel Gottes sind. Und dieser Wahrheit widerspricht die Idee daß das Gesetz eigentlich nur Israel nach dem Fleisch, gegeben war. Dass Gesetz war gegeben einem für Gott abgesonderten Volk. Das bedeutet ein geistlicher Volk – ein Volk der Gläubigen aus allen Nationen.

Die Heiden waren nicht unter dem Gesetz in dem Sinn des Gesetzes als das "gegebene" oder geschriebene Gesetz.

Es bedeutet die Heiden waren unter dem Gesetz in dem Sinn des Gesetzes als das ungeschriebene und geistliche Gesetz Gottes eigenes Wesens. Es gibt kein Mensch der nict unter das Gesetz und unter den Fluche des Gesetzes verkehrt weil sie ALLEN, VOR GOTT, Sünder sind.

Ich weiss daß du nicht den Reformierten Standpunkt des geistlichen Israels behauptest, und es tut mir Leide fürs.



Sagst du selbst denn,

... Aber in Israel finden wir das Gepräge der Geschichte der Menschheit; seine Übertretungen liefern den Beweis, daß niemand fähig ist, das Gesetz zu halten. Israel stand unter dem Fluch des Gesetzes; aber Paulus ruft den Christen aus dem Judentum zu: "Christus hat uns losgekauft vom Fluche des Gesetzes, indem er ein Fluch für uns geworden ist" (Gal 3, 15).

Paulus ruft auch den Christen aus dem Heidentum zu.

Bitte achte das Wort, "ER". "Er" ist Christus. Wäre Christus der Fluch des Gesetzes für uns, wäre er es für allen denen er stierb, und das ist für allen, allen denen seinen Auserwählten aus allen Menschen oder Nationen.

Der Ding am meisten unglücklich dieser Sache ist, daß du solch eine künstliche Rede triffst für Unterscheidung zwischen der Volk Israel nach den Fleisch und Israel nach den Geist als wäre nur der erstere den Sabbat zu unterhalten, aber nicht der letztere. Schlimm!

"Also ist das Gesetz unser ... [„unser“ daß ist, der Juden und auch der Heiden] ... Zuchtmeister gewesen auf Christum hin, auf daß wir aus Glauben gerechtfertigt würden. Da aber der Glaube gekommen ist, sind wir nicht mehr unter einem Zuchtmeister" (V. 24, 25). Also sind wir [alle Gläubigen] nicht nur von dem Fluch des Gesetzes freigemacht, sondern auch von dem Gesetz selbst. Auch beweist der Apostel dies deutlich in Röm 7, wo er sagt, daß man entweder Christum oder das Gesetz zum Manne habe, und daß man, an Christum glaubend, durch den Leib Christi dem Gesetz gestorben sei. Christus ist für jeden Glaubenden des Gesetzes Ende (Röm 10, 4) wie er, Jesus, auch für jeden Glaubenden des Gesetzes Ziel ist, und mittertat der Gesetz selbst ist. Jesus hat als Ziel daß den Menschen zu lernen gehat mit der Bergpredigt, daß er, der Gesetz Gottes ist - unbereicherbar des Menschen reichen. Gesetz Gottes ist viel mehr als die Zehn Geboten, viel grösser und viel tiefer und höher. Und Christus hat zum Ziel den Mensch das zu lernen, daß er IMMER UNTER DIESEN DEN NEU-TESTAMENTISCHE GEBOT UMGEHT UND STEHT - darum NIE durch den Gesetz gerechtfertigt wird sein. Dieses des Christus Gesetz ist zu schwer und zu streng man könnte es nachfolgen außer seines Nachfolgen in Christum zuteil zu sein.

Da nun der gläubig gewordene Jude vom Gesetz befreit ist, so ist selbstverständlich der Gläubige aus den Heiden, der nie unter dem [GESCHRIEBENEN] Gesetz gestanden hat, durch den Glauben kein Sklave des Gesetzes geworden aber hat er Sklave Christi geworden wie der Jude die immer unter den geschriebenen Gesetz lebten.

Die so allgemeine Ansicht, daß man zwar von dem Fluch des Gesetzes, nicht aber von dem Gesetz selbst befreit sei, zeigt sich daher im Lichte der Heiligen

Schrift als völlig irrtümlich. Es ist eine erwiesene Tatsache, daß niemand das Gesetz erfüllen kann; und deshalb macht sich jeder einer Übertretung schuldig und stellt sich unter den Fluch, sobald er das Gesetz erfüllen will. Ja, und auch sobald er das Gesetz ungehorsam ist!

Wie man es auch betrachten mag, stets folgt der Fluch auf die Übertretung. Sogar auf die Einhaltung folgt der Fluch stets, wegen des Menschen natürliche Ungerechtigkeit und Verdorbenheit!

Wenn man sich also in bezug auf die Heiligung des Sabbaths auf das Gesetz beruft, so stellt man sich auf einen jüdischen und durchaus nicht evangelischen Standpunkt. Man wendet sich nach Sinai zurück, während Christus uns durch Offenbarung der Gnade und Wahrheit vollkommen erlöst hat. Vergeblich wird man im Neuen Testament einen Grund für eine solche Anschauungsweise suchen; ...

Nicht eine Stelle im ALTEN Testament setzt oder beruft die Heiligung des Sabbaths auf das Gesetz! Auch der Alten Testament atmet diese Gesinnung gegen das Gebot ... vielmehr sagt hier der Apostel im entgegengesetzten Sinn ganz ausdrücklich: "So richte euch nun niemand in Bezug auf das Essen und Trinken oder, in Bezug auf das Essen und Trinken ihren Festen, oder ihren Neumondes, oder ihren Sabbathen, die ein Schatten ist (gewirft) von den zukünftigen Dinge - der Körper welche ist Christi" (Kol 2, 16. 17). [griechisch]

Hier ist die Christengemeinde festlich sich gütlich tun ihren Sabbathe genossend. Was lehst du hier weder die Freiheit der Kirche? Paulus sagt, auf Grunde Gottes Erlösung die Er vollbrachtet durch Jesu Auferweckung vom Tot (12-15) und in der Anschauung seines vollbrachte Schöpfung durch die Kirche (17-18), daß niemand die Kirche verurteilen kann. In Anerkennung was, willst du die Kirche richten? Ganz eine andere Sache ist das, daß "Ihr nehmet wahr Tage und Monate und Zeiten und Jahre und berechnet sie. Ich fürchte um euch, ob ich nicht etwa vergeblich an euch gearbeitet habe" (Gal 4, 10. 11).

Warum nehmt das Christentum den Tag der Sonne wahr? Während Christus uns durch Offenbarung der Gnade und Wahrheit Gottes vollkommen erlöst hat? Warum nehmt das Christentum den Tag der Sonne wahr wie in alten Zeiten und heidnischen Kulturen? „Wie wendet ihr euch denn wiederum zu den schwachen und dürftigen Satzungen, welchen ihr von neuem an dienen wollt?“

Und ganz wieder is diese eine andere Sache, daß "Der eine hält einen Tag vor dem anderen; der andere aber hält jeden Tag gleich" (Röm 14, 4).

Jeden Tag des Festzeitens waren diesen Tagen. „Du aber, was richtest du deinen Bruder? Oder du anderer, was

verachtetest du deinen Bruder? Wir werden alle vor den Richterstuhl Christi dargestellt werden ... denn das Reich Gottes ist nicht Essen und Trinken, sondern Gerechtigkeit und Friede und Freude in dem Heiligen Geist (der schafft die Gemeinde der Gläubigen). Gott wirdt uns nicht richten in Bezug auf ob wir gegessen oder nicht gegessen hatten (14:3), aber ob wir unseren Brüder liebten und nicht verurteilten. Und die letzteren nennt Paulus die Starken, jene ersteren die Schwachen.

Lehset Verse 6 ohne die zweite Phrase „ ... welcher nichts darauf (auf die Tage) hält, der tut's auch dem Herrn (nicht)“, weil sie nicht Echt, aber eingeschoben ist. Welchen sind dann „die Starken“, und welchen „die Schwachen“? „Die Starken“ sind dann die Juden wie Paulus - 15:1, „welcher auf die Tage hält“!

Er beweist also, wie hieraus hervorgeht, tatsächlich, daß er vom Gesetz frei ist und benutzt diese Freiheit gegenüber denen, die unter dem Gesetz waren, wiewohl er sie in ihrer Schwachheit tragen will.

Diejenigen welche den Tagen nicht beobachteten aber Wein tranken, diejenigen waren die Schwachen, die weil die Juden den Tagen beobachteten und auch nicht Wein tranken - wie bei Pascha die starken waren!

Im allgemeinen richten sich solche, welche auf einer strengen Sabbathfeier bestehen, meistens unwillkürlich nach ihrer persönlichen Anschauung. Im allgemeinen richten sich allen einander, und niemand achtete den ander. Nach ihrer persönlichen Anschauung die welchen waren gerechtich laut ihren eigenen Richterstuhl.

Je nach den Umständen erlaubt sich der eine dieses, der andere jenes. Keiner hält sich in allem an die Vorschriften des Gesetzes.

Ganz das Gegenteil. Je nach den Umständen erlaubt sich die eine der andere nichts; keiner hält sich an die Vorschrift des Gesetzes Christi einander zu lieben. Aber Macht man darauf aufmerksam, so wird das Evangelium als Deckmantel gebraucht, ohne zu bedenken, daß dadurch das ganze System umgestürzt wird. Wer an der sogenannten Entheiligung des Sabbaths Anstoß nimmt, war dem, der sich einer solchen Entheiligung schuldig macht, gleich das Gesetz vorhält, muß sich natürlich selber dem Gesetz in allen Teilen unterwerfen und darf sich weder die geringste Abweichung erlauben, noch bei einer etwaigen Übertretung sich auf das Gesetz berufen.

Dies würde ganz willkürlich und eigenwillig sein und weder vor Gott noch vor den Menschen einigen Wert haben. Will man in dieser Beziehung sich auf das Gesetz berufen, so stellt man sich bei Übertretung desselben unter den Fluch und die augenscheinliche Abweichung besteht doch wohl darin, daß man den Samstag, den siebenten Tag der Woche, in den Sonntag, den ersten Tag der Woche, zu

verwandeln für gut befunden [und bei solche Übertretung sich selbst unter den Fluch stellt.]

Die Heilige Schrift gibt nicht die geringste Anleitung dazu (den Samstag, den siebenten Tag der Woche, in den Sonntag, den ersten Tag der Woche, zu verwandeln), sondern bezeichnet vielmehr den Unterschied ganz deutlich mit den Worten: "Aber spät am Ende des Sabbaths, in der Dämmerung des ersten Wochentages usw." (Mt 28, 1).

Ich habe irgenwo anders geantwort auf diese Stellung der Einheit oder Scheidung Versen 1 und 2. Ich bestätige mit denselben Wörter keineswegs ist hier der siebente Wochentag in den ersten verwandelt. Tatsächlich der Sabbath dauert, der erste Tag der Woche nähert. Diese Sabbatszeit bezeichnet eine ganz neue Ordnung; es ist der Tag eines neuen nämlich des der Auferstehung.

Auch finden wir in der Apostelgeschichte, daß der Sabbath fortbestand und die Apostel an diesem Tage in der Synagoge lehrten, während sie sich am ersten Wochentage zum Brotbrechen versammelten.

Auch hierauf hatte ich schon geantwort. Und es war befunden daß wir auch genau die griechisch in der Apostelgeschichte 20:7 finden, daß der Sabbath fortbestand und die Apostel - so sollen wir herleiten - an diesem SABBAT in der Obernhalle „zum Brotbrechen versammelt hatten“, und daß sie am Abend danach, des ersten Wochentages STETS versammelt waren, und daß Paulus weil er des andern Morgens weiter reisen wollte, mit ihr Gespräch hülte.

... Will man den im Gesetz gebotenen Sabbath feiern, so muß dieses selbstverständlich am Samstag geschehen, keinesfalls aber am ersten Wochentage, dem herrlichen Tage der Auferstehung.

Verdrehung! Und ‚Observation‘ des Sonntags ist das! Nein, Will man feiern den im Gesetz gebotenen und in und durch Jesus Christus zu Tag des Herrn gemachten Sabbat, so muß dieses selbstverständlich am Siebenten Tage, am herrlichen Tage der Auferstehung und Vollbrachtung allen Gottes Werken geschehen, keinesfalls am Tage der Sonne!

... Geschieht dies, so erniedrigt man diesen Tag zu einem Tag der ersten Schöpfung und knüpft ihn an die Erde. Man richte sich doch in allem nach der Schrift, und man verwirre nicht den schönen Zusammenhang ihrer herrlichen Grundsätze.

Geschieht dies, daß dieser Sabbattag der ersten Schöpfung an die Erde geknüpft wird, wird er nicht erniedrigt, aber wird den in Jesu Christo an die Erde geknüpften Tage, erhöht, und ‚ver-Herr-licht‘ - wird er „gemacht“ oder „erschafft“: den Herrntag! Das ist seines herrlichen Grundsätze. Geschieht dies, daß man den, in der Schöpfung versprechenden, im Gesetz gebotenen, und in und durch Jesus Christus den zu Tag des Herrn gemachten

Sabbat des Siebenten Tage der Woche, in den Sonntag den Ersten Tage der Woche verwandeln, so muß, selbstverständlich, den herrlichen Tage des Sabbats so erniedrigt wird, man verwirrt den schönen Zusammenhang des Siebenten Tag der Schöpfung und der Auferstehung Christi mit dem unmöglichen Zusammenhang der Auferstehung Christi und des Sonntags der heidnischen schwachen und dürftigen Satzungen und Abgötterei.

Das ist nieregends deutlicher als in dem Folgende: Viele andere, welche die oben angeführten Widersprüche einigermaßen begreifen, rechtfertigen ihre Anschauung betreffs der Sabbathfeier durch die Behauptung, daß das Gebot einer solchen Feier im Gesetz nur eine Wiederholung des bei der Schöpfung gegebenen Gebotes sei und daß jener Ruhetag, den Gott lange vor der Gesetzgebung einsetzte, ohne Widerrede beobachtet werden müsse.

Viele andere möchten so rechtfertigen ihre Anschauung betreffs der Sabbathfeier. Aber diesen sind nicht allen. Lesen Sie meine Verhandlung auf Jürgen Moltmann betreffs in der Schöpfung gegebenen Sabbattage (Englisch nur) [www.biblestudents.co.za](http://www.biblestudents.co.za). Der in der Schöpfung gegebenen Sabbattage war eschatologisch - er sieht auf Christum hin. Er enthält nicht ein Gebot auf die Arbeit. Der Mensch ist nicht gegenwärtig weil er den Gärten hinausgeworfen war infolge seiner Sünde. Er ist am ersten Sabbattag durch Christus repräsentiert - der Sabbat und Gnade sind Partner im Dienst Gottes.

... Laßt uns diese Behauptung etwas näher beleuchten. Wir lesen in 1. Mo 2: "So wurden vollendet der Himmel und die Erde und all ihr Heer; und Gott hatte am siebenten Tage sein Werk vollendet, das er gemacht hatte, und er ruhte am siebenten Tage von all seinem Werk, das er gemacht hatte; und Gott segnete den siebenten Tage und heiligte ihn, denn an demselben ruhte er von all seinem Werk, das Gott geschaffen hatte, indem er es machte."

Hiernach allen Menschen sei still, Gott ist's dort Ruhe kraft seines Wort

... Hier findet sich nicht die mindeste Andeutung, daß der Mensch den Sabbath heiligen soll.

„So sehet nun darauf, wie ihr zuhöret“; „Wer Ohren hat zu hören, der höre!“ Hier findet sich nicht die mindeste GESCHRIEBEN daß der Mensch den Sabbath heiligen soll. „Aber“, sagte Karl Barth, „Aber hoch über dieser Entscheidung des menschlichen Gehorsams oder Ungehorsams steht die Kraft dieser Einsetzung, der (gehaltene oder gebrochene) Sabbattag selber als das unbewegliche, in und mit der Erschaffung der Zeit selbst aufgerichtete Zeichen der besonderen Gotteszeit, der alle Zeiten entgegengehen.“ ... [Barth meinte den Tag des Herrn entgegengehen. Er auch meinte den Sonntag - aber

widerspricht ihn selbst wie deutlich hier. Der Sabbat Gottes des Siebenten Tages „nach der Schrift“ ist was Barth spricht von! Nirgendswo kommt der Ersten Tag darauf an.]

... Ein solches Gebot wäre auch, da Adam und Eva nichts zu tun hatten, als sich in Gott zu freuen, ganz und gar zwecklos gewesen.

Das zu sagen ist das zu spekulieren. Mann brauchte nicht Gebot auf Gebot weil er Sünder ist, aber Gnade und Gott. Beobachte Gott segnet, und er heiligt am Siebenten Tage sein Werk - er „vollendet das er gemacht hatte, und er ruhte von all seinem Werk“. Das kann nichts anders sein denn eschatologisch Gottes Werk der Erlösung in und durch Jesum Christo vollendet! (Ach, ich bin so dumm mit der Deutsch!) Jederfall, ganz und gar zwecklos hat Gott den Mensch erschafft, aber der Tag war noch nicht um, und er sündigte und ohne weiteres benötigte die Gnade Gottes - benötigte dem Lamm Gottes. Darauf folgte der Sabbattag.

Es wird uns hier nur gesagt, daß Gott ruhte, weil Sein Werk vollbracht war. Weil es nichts mehr zu tun gab, so ruhte Er.

Einen Ding unmöglich für Gott zu tun, ist nichts zu tun. Während er ruht, da ist Gott aktiv im höchsten, vollsten Sinn; Während er segnet, da ist Gott aktiv im herrlichsten, freisten Sinn; Während er heiligt, da ist Gott aktiv im präzisesten, meist auserwählenden Sinn; Während er vollendet, da ist Gott aktiv im äußersten und letzten Sinn. Wo doch kann es sein? Wo Gott in Jesu Christo vollendet allen seinen Werken. Wann ist's? Am Gottes Tag seiner Ruhe - am Sabbat Gottes, am letzten und Siebenten Tag seiner Arbeit den Mensch zu erretten von dem Tot, in Auferstehung von dem Tot Jesu Christi.

... der in sechs Tagen alles geschaffen hatte, am siebenten Tage ruhte.

Alles war vollendet und vollkommen, alles war sehr gut, alles war gerade so, wie Er es gemacht hatte; und von diesem Werk ruhte Er. Das Schöpfungswerk war vollbracht; Gott hielt einen Ruhetag.

Das ist der wahre Charakter des Sabbaths. So viel uns die Heilige Schrift darüber sagt, ist dies der einzige Sabbath, den Gott gefeiert hat.

Amen da nicht einen Wort du hier schriebst ist wahr ohne Christus der Werkende und ohne Christus der Ruhende, ohne Christus beide der Grund und das Ziel allen Gottes Werken. **Das Schöpfungswerk war vollbracht in dem Erlösungswerk.** Alles war wieder vollendet und vollkommen, alles war wieder sehr gut, alles war wieder gerade so, wie Er es gemacht hatte; und von diesem Werk ruhte Er. Das Schöpfungswerk war vollbracht es war

erlöst. Gott hielt seinen Ruhetag - in und durch Jesu Christi.

... Wohl lesen wir, daß das Gebot Gottes, den Sabbath zu halten, an den Menschen gerichtet wurde und der Mensch dieses Gebot übertrat; aber die Worte: "Gott ruhte", finden wir nur bei der Schöpfung. Im Gegenteil sagt der Herr Jesus ausdrücklich: "Mein Vater wirkt bis jetzt und ich wirke."

Das bestätigt die Ruhe Gottes an dem Sabbattag der Schöpfung war eschatologisch. Ohne Christus wäre sie leer. Im eigentlichen Sinn des Wortes kann der Sabbath erst dann gefeiert werden, wenn alle Arbeit vollendet ist. Er konnte nur gefeiert werden inmitten einer unbefleckten Schöpfung, einer Schöpfung, wo nichts von Sünde zu entdecken war. Gott kann nicht ruhen, wo die Sünde wohnt.

Erst auf Christurn hin und erst in Jesu Christo her, empfangt der Sabbat Gottes Segnen, Heiligung, Vollendung und Ruhe. Diesen Begriffen sind völlig Unsinn betreffen sie nur schöpferische Werk und Vollbrachtung.

Man schaue um sich, und man wird begreifen, daß Gott in der gegenwärtigen Schöpfung nicht ruhen kann. Die Dornen und Disteln, verbunden mit den Tausenden jener niederbeugenden, demütigenden Früchte verkünden es mit lauter Stimme: "Gott muß wirken; Er kann nicht ruhen."

Kann Er einen Ruheplatz haben inmitten der Seufzer und Tränen, der Beschwerden und Leiden, der Krankheiten und des Todes, der Untreue und der Schuld einer verderbten Welt? Kann Er unter solchen Umständen Sabbath halten? Unmöglich.

Unmöglich! Jesu Christu ist Gottes Ruhe, und seines Vollendung. In ihn allein hält Gott Sabbat - ruhet Er. Aber mitten allen diesen Dingen hieroben bezeichnet ruhte Gott. (Sehe den 47. Paragraph KD 3/2, p. 684-6 - nur ein von viele.)

Die Heilige Schrift sagt es uns unzweideutig, daß Er von der Schöpfung an bis jetzt unaufhörlich und ohne zu ruhen wirkt. Von dem Fall Adams an bis zur Menschwerdung Christi wirkte Gott, von der Menschwerdung bis zum Kreuze wirkte der Sohn Gottes...

Am Sabbat sagt Jesus das Wort, "Mein Vater wirkt bis jetzt und ich wirke." Am meisten wirkten der Vater und der Sohn im Moment Auferweckung Jesu Christi - da ruhet Gott erstenmahls. Gott volendetet seine Arbeit „als spät der Sabbats(uhr), lichtscheinend hervor gegen den Ersten Tage" - griechisch wortwörtlich. Es war der Schöpfungssabbat zum Herrntag „gemacht" indem es war der Jesus zum Christurn und Herrn „gemacht".

Und vom Pfingstfeste an bis jetzt wirkt der Heilige Geist. Und in der Tat, während der Herr Jesus auf Erden war, gab es für Ihn keinen Sabbath. Allerdings vollendete

Er Sein Werk vollkommen; aber wo brachte Er Seinen Sabbath zu? Im Grabe.

Aber wo brachte Er Seinen Sabbath hin? Zum Grabe. Und wo brachte Er Seinen Sabbat durch und von? Hin, zu, durch, aus und von dem Grabe ging Gott durch den Sohn ... hin, zu, durch, aus und von der Auferstehung des Amen und Anfang Schöpfung Gottes. (Ofb.3:14)

Der Herr Jesus, Gott, geoffenbart im Fleische, ausstehend vom Tote der Herr des Sabbaths, der Schöpfer und Erhalter des Himmels und der Erde, Er brachte den Sabbath in dem finsternen und schweigenden Grabe zu. Hat das keine Bedeutung? Haben wir nichts daran zu lernen? Kann dieser Tag, an dem der Sohn Gottes im Grabe lag, in Ruhe und Frieden und in dem Bewußtsein, daß es nichts mehr zu tun gebe, gefeiert werden? ... Unmöglich? „Bei den Menschen ist's unmöglich, aber bei Gott ... möglich". Diesen Tag an dem der Sohn Gottes im Grabe lag, in Ruhe und Frieden und in dem Bewußtsein daß es UNS nichts mehr zu tun gebe, wird gefeiert! Fürchte und scheue Gott, „denn Er ist der lebendige Gott, der ewiglich bleibt, und sein Königreich ist unvergänglich, un seine Herrschaft hat keine Ende."

Wir haben weiter keinen Beweis für die Unzulässigkeit der Sabbathfeier nötig. Es gibt keine! Es nur gibt diese Beweis für die Sabbathfeier. Es mag unser Erstaunen erregen, daß Er, der Heilige Gottes, gerade am Sabbath im Grabe lag; aber ach! die Ursache ist offenbar: Der Mensch ist ein gefallenes, verdorbenes, schuldiges Geschöpf. Sein schrecklicher Gang auf dem Wege der Sünde hat in der Kreuzigung des Herrn der Herrlichkeit sein Ende gefunden. Der Stein vor dem Grabe des Herrn bildet den Schlußstein in der Geschichte des Menschen.

„Da trieb Adam aus und lagerte vor den garten Eden die Cherubim mit dem blossen hauenden Schwerz zu bewahren den Weg zu dem Baum des Lebens."

Was aber tat der Mensch, während Jesus im Grabe lag? Er feierte den Sabbath. Sonderbare Widersprüche! Christus liegt im Grabe, um Genugtuung für einen entheiligten Sabbath zu leisten; und der Mensch feiert den Sabbath, als ob der Sabbath nie gebrochen wäre. Ach! es war der Sabbath des Menschen, nicht der Sabbath Gottes; ein Sabbath ohne Christum, eine leere, kraftlose, wertlose Form.

„Und siehe, es geschah ein grosses Erdbeben. Denn der Engel des Herrn kam vom Himmel herab, trat hinzu und wälzte den Stein von der Tür ... als der Sabbat war langsam nach Mittag vor den Ersten Tag der Woche ..." Tag des Herrn, Sabbat des Herrn deines Gottes ... des Volkommenheit, des überschwingliche Größe seiner Kraft an uns die wir glauben nach der Wirkung seiner mächtigen Stärke welch Er gewirkt hat in Christo, da Er Ihn von dem

Toten auferweckt hat und gesetzt zu seiner Rechten im Himmel." Dass war der Sabbath Gottes am diesem „Siebenten Tage der Woche dem Gott spricht also: Und Gott am Siebenten Tage RUHTE!“.

Die Tatsache, daß Christus am siebenten Tage im Grabe lag, liefert uns den unwiderlegbaren Beweis, daß der Sabbath der ersten Schöpfung angehört, jener Schöpfung, deren Ende Christus durch Seinen Tod geworden ist. Der erste Mensch war verloren; und Christus machte diesem Zustand durch Seinen Tod ein Ende.

„Der Sabbath ist um den Menschen willen gemacht...“

Mit Seiner Auferstehung begann eine neue Schöpfung. Er ist das Haupt dieser neuen Schöpfung, und die Gläubigen sind die Glieder. "Das Alte ist vergangen; siehe, alles ist neu geworden."

So war es auch gewesen am Anfang während Gott schuf Himmel und Erde und den Mensch der sobald er geschäft war, Sünder geworden ist. Was hast du geschrieben, mein Bruder in Christo? Nie habe ich etwas gelesen was den Sabbath des Siebenten Tage so bestätigt. Der siebente Wochentag wurde zugleich der erste Tag der neuen Schöpfung. Der Siebente Tag war's. Wie am Anfang der Siebente Tag der Schöpfung und Sabbath Gottes der erste Tag für den Mensch gewesen war - der Tag auf jenem Gott dem Mensch Versöhnung veranlassete.

... Am Sabbath blieb der Herr im Grabe, ein sprechendes Zeugnis, daß noch nicht an Ruhe zu denken sei: aber sobald ...

... sobald der Auferstehung, sobald wir mit Glaubensaugen Ihn am Sabbatszeit aus dem Grabe steigen sehen, „Tot, wo ist dein Stachel? Hölle, wo ist dein Sieg? Der Stachel des Todes ist die Sünde; die Kraft aber der Sünde ist das Gesetz. Gott aber sei Dank, der uns (nicht das Gesetz, aber) den Sieg (und die Kraft deines Sieges) gegeben hat durch unsern Herrn Jesus Christus. ... Der Tod ist verschlungen in den Sieg!“ 1.Kor.15:55-57 Das ist die Ruhe Gottes Sabbattage.

Eine Lüge ist's darum - die Lüge welche das ganze Versprechen Gottes im Bezug auf dem Sabbath Lügen straft - daß Jesu am Ersten Tage der Woche vom Tot auferstanden war. Am Sabbath blieb der Herr im Grabe, ein sprechendes Zeugnis, daß noch nicht an Ruhe zu denken sei: aber sobald AM SABBAT es war die bestimmte Zeit sehen wir Ihn aus dem Grabe steigen - GOTT VOLENDETET ALLEN SEINEN WERKEN.

- ein lebendiges Zeugnis, daß Gott das vollbrachte Werk Christi als gut anerkannte. Gott „ist zur seine Ruhe gekommen“. Hb.4:10 Ein lebendiges Zeugnis war's, daß Gott das vollbrachte Werk Christi, als das vollbrachte Gotteswerk des Siebenten Tage, gut anerkannte. Das ist jetzt der Tag des Lebens, der Freude, der Ruhe; denn

alles ist vollbracht, und nichts ist mehr dem Mensch zu tun übriggeblieben Gottes Sabbatruhe mithineinzugehen. Denn am Siebenten Tage „erquicken sich Gott“, sagt der Schrift in 2M.31:17. Alles ist vollbracht, und nichts ist mehr zu tun übriggeblieben weil das Werk Christi ist vollbracht. Dieser Tag der Ruhe Gottes in und durch die Auferstehung Christi führt uns in den Himmel und in die himmlischen Reiche ein.

Welch ein treffendes Bild der Gnade! ...

Es heißt jetzt EBENSO: "Sechs Tage sollst du arbeiten und am siebenten Tage sollst du ruhen!" (J)etzt heißt es: "Ruhe, und dann gehe an deine Arbeit!" oder: "Lebe, und dann bringe die Früchte des Lebens hervor!" Herrliches Evangelium! Das läßt uns aus freier Brust Atem holen. Nicht länger brauchen wir zu seufzen unter der unerträglichen Bürde eines unerfüllbaren Gesetzes, sondern wir können, da wir des Lebens Gottes teilhaftig sind und Seine Kraft besitzen, in Freiheit Gott verherrlichen, der uns von der Sünde erlöst und von den Fesseln Satans befreit hat.

Das also ist die wahre Bedeutung ...

NICHT:... des ersten Wochentages ,

ABER des Siebenten Tage dessen Gottesziel vollendete ist in Jesu Auferstehung vom Grab, vom Tot und von den Toten.

... Welch ein weites Feld herzerhebender Betrachtungen eröffnet uns dieser Tag! Er ruft uns gleichsam zu: "Alles ist vollbracht; Gott hat das Werk Seines Sohnes angenommen, und darin möget ihr ruhen."

Dieser Tag verkündigt uns, daß Sünde, Tod und Verdammnis im Grabe geblieben sind und daß Leben und Unvergänglichkeit ans Licht gebracht worden sind. Es ist das Licht jener herrlichen, himmlischen Ruhe ...

Dieser Tag „ist der Schatten von dem das zukünftig ist, wahrlich des Körpers der gehört Christi“.

... die wir bald mit Jesu genießen werden [und schon mit Jesu genießen sind.] Wir sind mit Christo gestorben und haben aufgehört, Kinder des ersten Adam zu sein. Wie könnten wir nun noch den Tag der ersten Schöpfung feiern?

Wir feiern den Tag der am ersten gehört der ersten Schöpfung aber der Christi nun gehört weil Er geworden ist das Haupt des Leibes nämlich der Gemeinde. Durch den Sabbath in den Ersten Tage der Woche zu verwandeln würden wir nur unseren herrlichen Standpunkt in der neuen Schöpfung verleugnen. Aber welches ein herrliches Vorrecht ist es andererseits, sich am des Herrn Ruhetage des Neu Testamentischen Sabbath mit den Brüdern versammeln zu dürfen, um als Glieder Seines Leibes über die vollbrachte Erlösung zu frohlocken! Wie herrlich ist es, nach dem Vorbilde der ersten Christen gerade an diesem Siebenten Tage Gottes Sabbattage zusammenzukommen, um den Tod des

Herrn zu verkündigen! Wie geziemt es sich, an diesem Tage Seiner Auferstehung an Seinem Tische versammelt zu sein, zum Gedächtnis Seines Todes und Seines vollbrachten Werkes! Der Herr ist gestorben, gestorben für uns; das ist es, was uns das Brot und der Kelch zurufen. Aber der Herr ist auferstanden; Er lebt für uns! Das ist die laute Verkündigung des Sabbattages Gottes ewige Gnadenbund die Er ewig Neu geschaffen hat durch Christi Tod und Auferstehung. Welch ein reicher Trost, während wir „monatlich“ (Kolosser 2:16) an Seinem Tisch versammelt sind am Tag des Herrn – Sabbat des Einziges Gottes – Gott des Abrahams, Isaak und Jakob und Gott und Vater unserer Herr und Retter Jesus Christus! Ja wahrlich, der Gottessabbat Herrntag kann nicht hoch genug geschätzt werden. So haben Sie nicht gedacht, Bruder Stephan, obgleich diese Wörter etwa deinen sind.

... in der Offenbarung wird dieser Tag [der Ersten Tag der Woche] der "Tag des Herrn" genannt (Offb 1. 10)...

[Wir haben jetzt gesehen die Unmöglichkeit dieser Stellung. Der Tag des Herrn ist Sabbat des Herrn eures Gottes, und daraus geht deutlich hervor, daß es in der Absicht des Herrn liegt, daß wir an diesem Tage ruhen und unser Zusammenkommen nicht versäumen. Er hat uns nicht NUR ein Gebot, sondern das herrliche Vorrecht gegeben, uns an diesem Tage vorzugsweise mit Seinem Wort zu beschäftigen und, von allem abgedrängt, uns in unsere himmlischen Segnungen zu vertiefen. Dieser Grundsatz ist von großem Gewicht. Es ist ein Vorrecht, eine Gnade Gottes, daß wir am Gottestag des Herrn Ruhe, ruhen dürfen. Er hat uns durch die allgemeine Einrichtung der Verhältnisse, in denen wir leben, in den Stand gesetzt, dies tun zu können, ohne äußere Verluste zu leiden. Es ist durchaus keine Sünde, wenn wir am Tage des Herrn die Gute arbeiten; denn wo das Gebot ist, da ist auch der Geber des Gesetzes, unser gnädige Gott und Vater und unser Erlöser und Herr, Jesus Christus. An der Sabbatsruhe Gott dienen ist ebensowenig Sünde wie am Ersten Tag arbeiten, weil für den, der die Freiheit versteht, der Ruhetag auch Anbetungstag ist.

Jemanden, weil er am Sabbat arbeiten muss, von der Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen auszuschließen, würde eine verkehrte Handlung sein. Paulus sagte, „So aber jemand die Seinen, sonderlich seine Hausgenossen, nicht versorgt, der hat den Glauben verleugnet und ist ärger denn ein Heide“. (1.Tim.5:8). Wir können aus Liebe für den Herrn uns freiwillig alles Arbeitens an Seinem Tage enthalten (Js.58:13); aber wir dürfen nie vergessen, daß es der Tag der Auferstehung ist, der Tag des Lebens, der Tag, auf den Gott Selbst nicht nur durch seinem Gesetz Anspruch macht, aber bedeutendste durch seine Gnade. Möge

daher niemand einen Christen mit dem eisernen Joch der Menschengeboten und Traditionen und falschen Herrntagen binden, während es sein herrliches Vorrecht ist, den Sabbat des einzigen Erlöser und Herr zu feiern! Kolosser 2:16! Möge niemand aus dem Himmel oder auf der Erde, ihn eine dem Fluch unterworfenen Abgötterei bringen, wo keine Ruhe zu finden ist und wo die Lüge herrscht und ermordet.

### Buried Before Sunset, or, After Sunrise?

#### Appendix to Par. 5.2.1.4. P.106

##### **An unknown author quotes**

“ Deut.16:6 – “But at the place which Yahweh thy Elohim shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even ["ba ereb"], at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt.”

He asks,

“ What does the phrase "going down of the sun" mean?

And answers,

“ The same Hebrew construction is found in Josh.8:29 – ... "And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree until eventide [ereb]: as soon as the sun was down , Joshua commanded that they should take his carcase down from the tree, and cast it at the entering of the gate of the city, and raise thereon a great heap of stones...”

The author also quotes,

“ Josh.10:26,27 , "... and they were hanging upon the trees until the evening [ereb]. And it came to pass at the time of the going down of the sun, that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees, and cast them into the cave wherein they had been hid, and laid great stones in the cave's mouth...”

He then claims,

“ The underlined words in both verses are the equivalent Hebrew of "at the going down" in Deut.16:6. Notice one verse says the sun was already down and the other verse says it was going down. To understand what the status of the sun really was, we must look at the commandment that led Joshua to order the king's body taken down. It is found in Deut.21:22,23...

“ Deut.21:22,23 - "And if a man committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day ; (for he that is hanged is accursed of Elohim;)...”

The author then asserts,

“... Joshua was obeying Yahweh's commandment ... -

““ The body had to be buried the same day it was hung on the tree.

““ That means it had to be buried before sunset.

We wish to differ on several aspects.

First we must stress the fact we agree with the unknown author on the Nisan 14 (end of day) slaughter of the Passover lamb, and its eating in the night of Nisan 15. But this very Passover-arrangement is in contradiction with his ideas on the meaning of the Deuteronomy instruction as well as with both the Joshua passages.

Deut.21:22,23 - "... if a man be put to death ... and thou hang him on a tree, His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day" - meaning he must be buried the current day that had begun with "night" - during which the body had been hanging on the tree. It implies the body had to be removed from the tree before sunrise with the view to its interment during the following daylight!

Thus Joseph of Arimathea removed Jesus' body from the tree far into night and very probably only before sunrise. "Thou shalt in any wise bury him that day" - which exactly Joseph did: during daylight of "that day", after the day on which Jesus had been crucified.

"Shemesh" in Josh.8:29 is translated "sun" in the KJV, and *per se* means the rising of the sun - Gn.19:23, Josh.12:1 and many other places. (It is also used for other times of sunlight, e.g. Josh.10:12.)

The words supplied in Josh.8:29, "and as soon as ... was down" - because the opposite of "ereb" - should be: "and as soon as the sun began to rise" "shemesh". And the words supplied in 10:27, "going down", should be, "at the time of the dawning / rising of the sun" "shemesh".

See the close nexus between "east" - *mizrach*, and "morning" - *shemesh*, in the combination "early dawning" - *mizrach shemesh*. Compare the *s-h-a-* in *shachar*, "morning" / "dawn", and in *shakam*, "to awake" / "rise", with the *s-h-e-* in *shemesh*, "sunrise". Then also compare the *m-i-s-h-* in *mishchar*, "morning", and in *mishap* - "dawning of day", with the *-m-e-s-h* in *shemesh*, "sunrise". Now put the two together, and it becomes *s-h-a + m-e-s-h*, then becomes *she-mesh*. Then just to confirm this type of combination, see Dn.6:19, *shepharpara*, "very early in the morning". *Eth eber* and *shemesh* it is clear, are the opposites of day-time and night-time, respectively "afternoon" / "towards sunset", and, 'afternight' / "towards sunrise"!

Therefore in the case of Joshua 10:26,27, instead of to translate, "... and they were hanging upon the trees until the evening [ereb]", rather translate, "... and they hanged them upon the trees while the sun was setting [ereb]. And it came

to pass that at the time of the rising of the sun "shemesh", Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees." "Eth ereb" indicates the time of day of the hanging; "shemesh" the time of night of Joshua's commanding.

We are compelled to conclude, that the phrases in the two texts, namely, "as soon as the sun was rising" "shemesh", and, "at the time of the rising of the sun" "shemesh", are **NO equivalent** Hebrew of "at the going down" "eth ereb / ereb" in Deut.16:6, where it is the rendering of the word *bo*, and, meaningfully, is used in conjunction with the statement, "at the sea" - which is to the west of the land and just the opposite of *shemesh*, "sunrise" in the east!

Joshua was obeying Yahweh's commandment. The body / bodies had to be buried the day after they were put to the tree - after the night during which they "remained on the tree". There is absolutely no possibility or implication the bodies could have been removed from the tree "before sunset" before "all (this) night". And that means the dead had to be buried in the daylight following the night = "that same day".

There would have been no sense in having the bodies hung just before sunset only to remove them, again just before sunset. Therefore, instead of translating like the KJV, "And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree until eventide [ereb]", rather translate, "And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree before sunset [ereb]: and as soon as the sun dawned, "shemesh" Joshua commanded they should take his carcass down."

In both events stone-mounts of such hugeness were built over the graves they "remained unto this day" - an immense task scheduled certainly for daylight and impossibly for night-time.

Indeed, just so, Joseph was obeying Yahweh's commandment. Jesus' body had to be buried the day after they hanged Him - in fact after the night in which the body "remained on the tree". There is absolutely no possibility or implication the body of Jesus could have been removed from the tree "before sunset" of the day before - not before "all night" of the day that afterwards did begin - He "shall not remain all night", but "before the sun had risen" shall be taken "down off the tree", and "that (same) day" be buried.

That would bring the exact and full fulfillment "according to the Scriptures the third day" of the typology of the Passover as prophesied: Deut.16:6 - "But at the place which Yahweh thy Elohim shall choose to place his name in (*i.e.*, in Jerusalem, in Jesus Christ!), there thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even ["ba ereb"], at the going down of the sun, at the season that

thou camest forth out of Egypt."

That was the sacrifice of Him. Then, o sinner, they lifted Him upon the tree "before the sun did set" and before "it was evening", "so that the Scriptures might be fulfilled": "**His body shall not remain all night** (Mk.15:42, Mt.27:57) **upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury Him** that day" . "And after this Joseph of Arimathea came" ... "he took the body down ... and the women beheld how his body was laid ... and the sun declined towards the Sabbath Day."

#### **Appendix to Par. 5.1.1.7, p. 1 further**

##### **By an unknown author**

What does the New Testament tell us about Passover? First let's look at some clear scriptures beginning with Jn.18:28 . "Then led they Yahshua from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover." This verse has led many people to believe that these Jews were about to eat the Passover at the wrong time since Yahshua supposedly ate it the night before. This has led to the belief that the Pharisees kept Passover on Abib 15 and the Sadducees (whom Yahshua supposedly followed) on Abib 14. If you will check verses 3, 12, & 28 of that same chapter, as well as Jn.19:6, you will note that the Jews of verse 28 included "chief priests" and "captains". The chief priests were, beyond a shadow of a doubt, Sadducees. Luke 22:52 reveals the "captains" to be "captains of the temple", again Sadducees. Therefore, these Sadducees had not eaten the Passover yet.

Jn.13:1,2 - "Now before the feast of the passover, when Yahshua knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. And supper being ended . . ." This verse tells us that the supper of Abib 14 took place before the Passover. It was not the Passover.

John 13:2-30 - It is believed by many that this supper took place on the night of Abib 14 which they consider to be the time when the Passover Lamb was eaten. After the foot washing, they sat back down to the supper table. Yahshua then dipped a sop and gave it to Judas Iscariot at which time Satan entered him. Yahshua then said, "That thou doest, do quickly" (vs.27). The disciples did not know why Judas was leaving, but they suspected he was going to buy things they needed for the feast (vs.29). What?! How could the disciples think so nonchalantly of this sudden departure from the Passover supper unless, of course, it was only a common supper the night before the true Passover supper. Had Judas been sent from the true Passover supper the disciples would have been shocked. And what merchants would have their shops open to allow such a purchase on the night of Passover? Obviously the disciples thought shops would be open because it was the night before the lamb was eaten.

The supper in John 13 is the same supper of Mt.26:20,21; Mk.14:18; and Lu.22:22,23. John 13:1 says that supper was "before the feast of the Passover." The reaction of the disciples to Judas' departure confirms the fact that this supper was before the Passover supper.

Jn.19:14 - "And it was the preparation of the passover , and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King!" If Yahshua had just finished eating the Passover the previous night, how can it be the "preparation of the passover" at about noon the next day? The "preparation of the Sabbath" ends as the weekly

Sabbath day begins. The "preparation of the Passover" must also end as the Passover begins. Since this verse refers to Abib 14 at noon, [ sunrise - John uses Roman count of hours. CGE ] then the Passover could not have begun yet. It will have begun at least three hours later at the normal time of sacrificing the lambs. If one believes the lambs were sacrificed at the beginning of Abib 14, then all of Abib 13 would be the "preparation of the passover."

Lu.22:1 - "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover." As in Eze.45:21, Passover in this verse would refer to the entire festival and not the victim.

This brings us to the most difficult part of this study; understanding what took place at the last supper. Lu.22:7-18 - "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare? And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in. And ye shall say unto the goodman of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. And they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of Yahweh. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of Yahweh shall come."

Verse 7 means that Abib 14 had begun. Why would they begin preparing for Passover after the sun had set? To prepare the Passover, if that were the Passover meal, would mean to bring the lamb to the priests, have it killed, bleed it, clean it, carry it back to the room that they still needed to get, cook it for hours after they kindled a fire and carve it up. Not to mention the lines of people waiting to have their lambs killed after sunset (thousands of lambs)!

Verse 16 adds the words "any more" which are not found in the oldest Greek manuscripts (Vatican, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus). The added words imply that Yahshua had just finished eating the Passover. Omitting the words implies that Yahshua did not eat the Passover. Although he desired to eat the Passover with his disciples the following night, he knew he couldn't because he would be dead.

In the Evangel accounts of the last supper, Yahshua and his disciples were having a common meal. They did not eat the Passover since the priests did not begin killing them until the following afternoon. That is why John 18:28 says the Jews hadn't eaten the Passover even after Yahshua's trial began.

The Passover meal was a family gathering in which the women and children also participated. When Yahshua attended the Passover as a boy of twelve he accompanied his family (Lu.2:41,42). Yet, in Yahshua's last supper the women and children are conspicuously absent. All that were present were Yahshua's male disciples who were linked to him socially rather than through kinship. Where were the women who followed Yahshua throughout his ministry? Where is Peter's wife or the wives of the other married disciples? They were not in attendance because that was not the Passover meal.



Mk.15:21, Lu.23:26 - Simon was forced to carry Yahshua's torture stake. It is said that he was coming out of the "country" (Gr. agros meaning - country, farm, farmland, fields, etc.). The argument is put forth that if Passover was a high sabbath (Abib 15), Simon would have been at the Temple or synagogue and not in the fields. That is true. The opposite holds true as well. If the night of Abib 14 began Passover, Simon would have come out of the fields to observe it the night before carrying Yahshua's stake. The most likely scenario is that Simon came out of the fields the morning of Abib 14 for the purpose of observing Passover that afternoon.

1 Cor.5:7 reads, "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Messiah our passover is sacrificed for us:" Paul tells us that OUR passover lamb has been sacrificed "for us" or on our behalf. Who sacrificed it for us? Is.53 tells us that Yahweh bruised His Son and smote him. Did Yahweh have our Passover Lamb sacrificed at the wrong time? No. That being true, then Yahshua and his disciples could not have eaten the lamb the night before. If Yahshua did eat it the night before, and if he did it correctly, then Yahweh sacrificed Yahshua at the wrong time. The only way to reconcile this dilemma is to acknowledge the fact that what Yahshua did in the evangel accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke is being misunderstood. When translating from Hebrew to Greek and from one culture to another, it can easily lead to error as it has concerning the Holy Names. John's evangel was written in such a way as to leave us no doubt as to when Passover took place.

There are more scriptures to support an end of Abib 14 Passover offering as opposed to a beginning of the fourteenth offering. The content of this study should suffice to enlighten the seeker of truth.

#### Additional Thoughts Concerning Passover

##### **1 Cor.11:18-34**

1. There is no mention of either Passover or of a New Passover in any of these verses. The gathering being discussed is simply called "The Master's Supper". To say it replaces the Passover supper is an assumption. If Paul believed the Master's Supper took place on Passover, he could have easily said so. Since it was only a common supper eaten before Passover (as John 13:1 states), and since that day did not have a name, Paul needed to clarify which day by saying, "the same night in which he was betrayed."

2. It is believed by many that the unleavened bread of verse 24 symbolizes the Passover Lamb. However, the Lamb was not to have even one bone broken (Ex.12:46; Num.9:12). Could the breaking of the bread symbolize the breaking of the Lamb? No.

[ Neither "arton" "bread" nor "potehrion" "cup" indicates unleavened bread as for Passover, or unfermented wine. The words mean ordinary bread and wine as were used for the Last Supper, which confirms the Last Supper was not the Passover meal. CGE]

3. Verses 24 and 25 say, "...this do in remembrance of me." They do not say, "in remembrance of Passover."

4. It is believed by many that the contents of the cup symbolizes the blood of the Passover Lamb. However, the Israelites were not to drink the Lamb's blood. Could the drinking of the "cup" symbolize the drinking of the Passover Lamb's blood? No.

5. Verse 26 tells us that by eating the bread and drinking the cup we show the Master's death. It aids us in declaring and remembering his death, not the totality of

the Passover. There are aspects of Passover that are yet to be fulfilled. Although we have eternal life at this time, "by faith", we will literally have it fulfilled at our resurrection. The Exodus will literally be fulfilled at that time as well.

6. Verse 25 says, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." The New Testament (or Covenant) is the counterpart of the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant was not established in the blood of the Passover Lamb, but in the blood of calves and goats (Heb.9:19,20). This suggests that the blood that was shed to establish the New Covenant differs in function from the blood that was shed for Divine protection from the Angel of Death (judgment from Yahweh) or, the antitype, Yahweh's judgment against the wicked. Yahshua's shed blood on Abib 14 fulfills at least three different sacrificial aspects; Atonement, Divine protection, and Covenant ratification. The cup, then, symbolizes; the remission of sins (Atonement) (Mt.26:28); the New Covenant (Mt.26:28); Divine protection (in that, "I will be to them an Elohim, and they shall be to me a people" (Heb.8:10) implies protection); and it is a means of remembering Yahshua's death. Therefore, to say the cup is a symbol that replaces the Passover Lamb limits the importance of this symbol. When Yahshua gave his disciples these symbols he did not intend for them to be a replacement for the Passover Lamb, especially since he gave them a day before the Lamb was eaten.

7. "The night in which he was betrayed" (vs.23) began the fulfillment of Is.53:7; "...he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter." Yahshua was brought as the [Passover] lamb to the slaughter which took place the afternoon of Abib 14. That is further proof that his death at 3:00 pm fulfilled the phrase "between the evenings." He could not have eaten a fictitious lamb that was slain at the beginning of Abib 14.

#### Jn.6:31-35, 48-58

These verses compare eating Yahshua's flesh to eating manna (the bread of life from heaven), not to eating the Passover Lamb or the supposed unleavened bread of Passover. As Yahweh is Yahshua's source of life (vs.57), Yahshua is to be our source of life by spiritually partaking of this manna from heaven. We symbolically do that at the Master's Supper.

The supper in John 13 is the same supper of Mt.26:20,21; Mk.14:18; and Lu.22:22,23. John 13:1 says that supper was "before the feast of the Passover." The reaction of the disciples to Judas' departure confirms the fact that this supper was before the Passover supper.

## Appendix, p. 20:

Last Supper and Day of Month and Week

A common reason given why "*We know the Last Supper, the meal Jesus had on the evening before his crucifixion, was the Passover meal*", (P.B. Brown) is, that "*The daylight preceding the Last Supper is described as the "first day of Unleavened Bread ... that is, the beginning of Passover."*" (K.F. Doig) And the Scriptures invariably referred to for 'proof', are: "*Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7*", "**came the day**" (and sometimes "*John 13:1*").

People like Lori Elridge (*What Day of the Week was Christ Crucified?, Crucifixion Timetable*) insist the day starting in Mt.26:17, Mk.14:12 and Lk. 22:7, is another day than the supposedly following day starting in Mt.26:20, Mk.14:17 and Lk.22:14, "**when the even was come**". The events of the texts in between accordingly must have occurred, in Doig's words, during "*the daylight preceding the Last Supper*".

"*The daylight preceding the Last Supper*", "*daylight preceding*":

These words or their idea won't be found in the text or context – it is presumed. Brown takes for granted a current day, and for granted events occurring during its ending, i.e., during afternoon before sunset. He calls this "*the beginning of Passover*".

Coleridge differs with Doig, because Doig reckons the day from sunrise to sunrise and Coleridge reckons it from sunset to sunset. The way Coleridge reckons the day is correct, and Doig's method, is wrong.

Whichever, what is always here presumed, is that it is the day's end. Some even presume when Jesus told the disciples to go prepare for the supper it was the time of Passover sacrifice – about 3 afternoon and that that evening, He and the disciples ate the Passover meal. People like Doig and M.P. Germano, introduce "*two Passover celebrations occurring*", the Last Supper being the first – even before yeast or leaven had been removed!

All the confusion must be attributed to the phrase found in about every 'translation', "the first day of the feast of unleavened bread".

In the KJV the supplied words, "day" and "feast", are indicated by italics that they are supplied. Unfortunately the third supplied word, "bread", is not so indicated.

Of course there cannot be a problem with the word "day" being supplied. But the word "feast" is not so simple; and the word "bread" is the real troublemaker.

Nevertheless the word "day" should be qualified.

The word "day" or "first day" in Matthew comes from the ordinal, "on the first" "tehi de prohtehi". In Mark the word "day" is mentioned: "tehi prohtehi hehmerai". In Luke the situation is reversed, and the word "first" does not appear – he simply says, "the day" "hehmera".

"Hehmera" can be any part or whole of the day, not just its light-part. I cannot think that it is ever used for specifically the last part of daylight, i.e., specifically for from 3pm. till sunset (about 6 pm.). In the instance of our texts "the day" per se "had begun" / "had come", therefore, one must deduce, it was after sunset, and evening. It was that day having begun, proceeding, not ending! Therefore not "*daylight*" or "*daylight preceding*", but dusk – evening dusk. It is meant the first full day of the Passover as the Season of Passover, has begun. That day, says Luke, "came" "ehlthen", Aorist ingressive – it had begun.

That day is carefully distinguished:

Mark 14:1, 3, 10, "Two days to the Passover (Feast) ... while in Bethany ... Judas (on day two before) went to the priests to betray Jesus .... Then "kai" on the first day of de-leaven (Nisan 14, on "Preparation of the Passover") when always was sacrificed ("ethuon", Imperfect) the passover ..." so it could be eaten the evening after of the Feast Day.

Matthew 26:2...14 "You know that after two days occurs (the Feast of) the Passover; and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified (within these two days). "Then ..." on the second day before the Feast Day, 13 Nisan, "assembled the chief priests and the scribes ... and consulted that they might take Jesus and kill Him – but not on the Feast (Day proper, 15 Nisan, they said – therefore on the day before the Feast Day, 14 Nisan) ... Then went ... Judas (on day two before) ... to the chief priests ... and they made a deal with him ... .. And on the first day (before the Day of Feast 15 Nisan) on the day of de-leaven ...". The first day before the Feast Day, 14 Nisan, "came".

Luke 22:1, "Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew nigh which is called the Passover"! On this day "the chief priests" and "Judas", connived. Now Judas waited for "opportunity to betray him ... where there won't be a crowd". He had to do it during this interim before the Feast.

"Then came the day" – it had to have been the very day before the Feast Day that here has started. Luke says it was "the day of de-leaven when the Passover (lamb) had to – must – be killed "edei thuesthai".

So there's nothing indefinite about the dating given by the Gospels.

"Bread" is a supplied word just like "day" and "feast".

"Bread" won't be found in the text or context, because it was not the day of the Feast yet, and the Feast Day was the first day during Passover and of Passover, when baked bread was eaten the first time – together with the eating of the lamb.

All the Synoptists have the words, "tohn adzýmohn" "of de-leaven", from "a" "de-", and "heh dzýméh" "leaven". It hasn't got a thing to do with bread until it is mixed in dough and had been baked. Then it won't be yeast any more, but bread, ordinary bread, "ánton" Mt.26:26, Mk.14:22, Lk.22:19 (like in "our daily bread", Mt.6:11, Lk.11:3); "supper" – déipnon, Jn.13:2, "morsel" – psohmíon, Jn.13:26 – still eaten on this night, "the Day of De-Leaven" having just begun and leaven still having to be removed during that night of "the Day of De-Leaven" – in the Old Testament an ordinance the disobeying of, was punishable with death! Therefore: literally, "first" / "first day" / "day ... of de-leaven".

The concept of "bread" is totally unwanted at this time of day on this day, 14 Nisan. It was not yet the day of eating Unleavened Bread, 15 Nisan, 'Feast-Day' = 'Eat-Day'.

But this Supper, "on the first day", "before the Feast", "on the first day, (day) of de-leaven, when the Passover had to be killed", was the new and Christian thing inaugurated by the Lord, on the very day He would die.

Luke differentiates between "the day of un-leaven" – heh hehméra tohn adzýmohn (22:7), and "the (eating)feast without leaven / of un-leaven(ed bread) that which is called (the) Pascha" – heh legoméneh páscha (22:1). Also in Acts 12:3 Luke specifies: "It was (éhsan de) [the several] "days without leaven / of no-leaven" or "days of un-leaven(ed bread) / no leaven" – hehmérai tohn adzýmohn, and that these "days" were "the Passover" – to páscha – verse 4. It was important there was "no leaven (to be found) in the land"; the bread automatically would then have been unleavened bread.

In 1Cor.5:8 Paul's idea is "malice and evil" make the leaven "old", wherefore we should rather "feast with leaven purged of malice and evil", that is, with 'new' leaven, or "the purged leaven of sincerity and truth" – *en adzýmois elikrinéias kai alehthéias*. Bread – specifically bread that is unleavened, is not the idea. For Luke – and the other Evangelists – "the Day of De-Leaven" *per se*, was quite different from the seven "days" of "feast" or "eating" of unleavened bread, called "the Passover". Also part of the Passover, "The Day of the Removal of Leaven", was "the first day" of the Passover Feast period as a whole. It had nothing particularly to do with the bread eaten afterwards during the Passover Feast..

This day began as soon as the sun had set. There is no single instance in the New Testament – John's Gospel included – of another way the day cycle is measured. (John only indicates the hour on the clock so to speak according to Roman colloquial use. He still reckons the day like the Jew he was would have, sunset-wise.) Unquestionably the Gospels all four of them reckon the day from sunset to sunset. Therefore the time here supposed by all three Synoptists is the time period that in Jewish thinking and in the New Testament, covers the beginning-hours of the day, which make up the evening – the hour or so – after sunset till dark. All those funny divisions of the evening into smaller evenings are to be disregarded – they are not traceable in the New Testament or Old, and are devised by sects who are Christian in no way. Christianity has nothing in common with extremists who invariably accompany their sophisms with bombastic parade of their denial of Jesus' divinity.

It was not "davlight preceding", but "dusk" – evening *light* succeeding sunset and introducing the coming duration of the day. Remember the Ingressive Aorist is used – not the Imperfect that would have contained the idea of continuous "davlight preceding" the current day's end and the following's start. The 'day' concerned was a day on the calendar – one rotation of the earth, "hehmera" – that day "having come", and "on" it – for which reason the Dative is used – Jesus instructed his disciples to prepare for Passover.

It took the disciples not long. In fact, they walked into the town, found the house, entered, and found it "furnished" and made "ready". "There make ready!" Lukes states: "When the hour had come", that is, after just one hour, they "sat down". This was the "evening"-hour since sunset. Says Mark, "When evening came" (Marshall), "He arrived with the twelve". Remember Jesus sent / "appointed" only two disciples before to go prepare – verse 13. Matthew says, "Now when even was come, He sat down with the twelve".

In all three Synoptists no events are recorded other than this short conversation between Jesus and his disciples and their separate journeys to the upper room. The disciples laid the table with the simplest of food, bread and wine. Nothing of the excessive Jewish Seder! It could not have taken long. Soon the Lord Jesus introduced this new and Christian Feast of as by faith partaking of the flesh and blood and life of the Lamb of God. Here the first of the "three days" "according to the Scriptures" begins, here the first night of the "three nights" of Jesus' last suffering the agonies of death for us, is Jesus' "eating the Passover", and the meal was "to prepare" Him for that which He so "earnestly desired". This for Jesus meant His eating the Passover! Here Nisan 14 began. And comes the morrow and 6 o'clock on Roman watch, "the Preparation of Passover" (John 19:14) witnesses Christ our Passover being "delivered over" according to God's eternal purpose.

I have found this to be one of the most common mistakes, not to find the unity of the Scriptures that introduce Nisan 14 the "day" having "come", and continued "when (having) come evening".

**By creating two days where there is given but one**, the chronological sequence of the last Passover-week is upset. To follow along this sequence to the eventual day of Jesus' resurrection brings confusion and not certainty.

The confusing of this one day for two, will be found consistently accompanied by the confusing of another sure two days, for one.

The two days that are taken for one, **border the "evening"** between the day of Jesus' crucifixion and the day of His interment. That "evening" is obtrusively mentioned by word twice and indicated elaborately in Mark 14:42f, Matthew 27:57f, and Luke 22:50f .

The first of these two days is this very day we have dealt with so far – the day that had begun with the "day having come" and had continued with the subsequent "evening" of the Last Supper, and that then proceeded on through Jesus' Gethsémane anguish, betrayal, trial, being delivered over, crucifixion and death – 14 Nisan.

Then, precisely in the manner the beginning of this day is indicated (by the mention of the "evening" and the ingressive Aorist) ...

... "came" (by the mention of the "evening" and the ingressive Aorist) the day and "evening" of the second of this pair of days. It is thus marked at its proceeding to have been Nisan 15 "Great Sabbath that day" of Passover Feast, "that was"! Despite, tradition has us understand, all that was to **follow after** the dividing sunset and "evening", had happened **before!**

Just like the day of the Lord's Supper and crucifixion (the day before the Feast Day and "the first day of de-leaven when the Passover had to be sacrificed") began and ended, just so the day of the Lord's burial ("a Great Sabbath that day" of Passover Feast "that was"), began and ended. Nisan 14 ended with afternoon before sunset and Nisan 15 began with "evening" after sunset. Two days – different and separated were they – were "according to the Scriptures", the Passover-Scriptures! For the day on which the Passover lamb had been slaughtered, "came" (with sunset) and the "evening" that followed it. Then the following day that "came" (with sunset) and "in the evening" that followed, it was eaten, and "the very day" its remains was returned to the earth, "... that his flesh (should) not see corruption". "... You shall not leave Him on the pole all that night, but before sunrise shall take Him down, and bury Him that same day (still)." (Dt.21:23)

**Appendix to pp. 51, 55, 113, Aorist and 'Tense'**  
**Dr Ernest L. Martin, 'The World Needs the Original Bible',**  
 August 1994,

"There was another major factor in the Greek about which the eminent Greek scholars of the Protestant world took him to task. This was Mr. Knoch's explanation of what the Greek aorist (often called a tense) in its verbal form actually meant. In simple terms, Mr. Knoch expressed his belief that the Greek aorist (which verbs are found in abundance in the New Testament) was to be rendered by the simple English present tense. This brought on the wrath of the Greek scholars of the Protestant world who reckoned his opinion to be absurd. While the word aorist means "without horizon" (that is, "without limits" as to space), the Christian scholars were more often than not assigning the meaning of the Greek aorist in its New Testament texts to a past tense rendering. In no way could they concede to Mr. Knoch's opinion that the simple present tense in English could explain the aorist in many cases. The past tense made sense to them.

I personally believe, though, that Mr. Knoch was right in a basic sense. But he could well have avoided the ire of many of his critics in the academic world if the word "tense" (which means "time" - or, to express a "time relationship" would not have been used by him in his explanation of the Greek aorist. What he should have done, in my view (and looking at the situation in hindsight) is to explain that even the English language itself has the aorist as a grammatical use in a profound way but that English grammarians are prone not to mention the use of the aorist in English. If the grammarians would do so, they would notice that almost invariably the English aorist is what we in English call the "present tense." Actually, though, the English aorist (or the Greek aorist) is not a present tense. After all, the present tense can easily be rendered in the Greek of the New Testament. The aorist in English or Greek is not the present tense.

Still, the first thing that must be understood is the fact that our modern English (and all major European languages) have the aorist embedded within their languages though it is usually disguised or camouflaged as a "present tense." But a problem emerges when grammarians try to identify it. This is because the word "tense" is used to describe the aorist. The aorist is not a tense! The word "tense" relates to "time," but the aorist is not in any way related to "time." It rather indicates an aspect of space, a state or a condition. And whereas "time" (a tense) refers to the past, present or future in its various forms, the aorist refers to space such as behind, where the speaker is, or in front of the speaker, yet even here (and this is most important to realize) the limits or the boundaries of this aspect of space are always undefined. The aorist is simply an indefinite aspect in relationship to space, to a state or to a condition which is being described.

This aorist aspect is found abundantly in English, but it is shown by utilizing words that sound and look like the "present tense," but in actual fact are NOT the "present tense" at all. The English aorist (unlike the Greek aorist which uses extra letters to show an aoristic aspect) uses words that appear to the eye to be the "present tense." But the words are not showing the "present tense." They are simple homonyms that are presenting the aorist state or condition (not tense, or time). In fact, the aorist (both in English and Greek) does not express any time relationships whatever and it is an anachronism to

call the aorist a "tense." The aorist is simply without limits in regard to space, state or conditions. The aspect of time, let me repeat, is not associated with the aorist of itself either in the English or the Greek. Let me give some examples.

If a person says: "Tap water is liquid," it may appear that the English present tense (with the verb is) is being used in this sentence. But this is not the case at all. The verb "is" is a homonym usage for the aorist state (not tense, or time). It describes an aorist condition. Let's face it, as it is normally understood, all tap water is indeed liquid whether the phrase relates to the past, the present or the future. The aorist (even in its English usage) is giving a state or a condition, and has no relationship of itself to time (either past, present or future). And, using the word "is" in the statement that "tap water is a liquid," is NOT using the present tense in English. The present tense would be "tap water is being a liquid," which is not only awkward in its wording but it is also silly to say it that way. But the verb "is" in the above illustration is not in the present tense (though it outwardly appears to be). It is actually a usage of the English aorist (which is an aspect of space or a state without limits or boundaries)."

The Doctor discerns poorly. Who has ever said the present tense in his example is used? What is used in the Doctor's example is the attributive or verbal use of the adjectival use of the noun "liquid", "either past, present or future". It is the 'constative' affirmation of something that "is", and in that sense only, may be understood as being an Aorist. Whether present, past or future, the 'constative' affirmation shall always be of 'static', or, of 'ingressional' "state or condition" – in other words, "a state or a condition" **with** and within certain "limits or boundaries" (of time), or, **having gone into** that "limits or boundaries" (of time).

The context may show whether this "state or condition" **with** and **within** certain "limits or boundaries" or "state or condition" **having gone into** and within certain "limits or boundaries" (of time), "is" **with** and **within** past, present or future, or, **had gone into** past, present or future "limits or boundaries" (of time).

Surely "is" in the above illustration is not in the present tense", nor "is" it the Aorist! It is a contradiction in terms to say, "The aorist is giving a state or a condition, and has no relationship of itself to time", and the fact, is the very reason why the Perfect more often than not the Past Perfect, or the Present Perfect, gives expression to the 'relative' "state or condition" of the Aorist "aspect".

To illustrate: "tap water is liquid", is always true; "It being evening now" / "now when the even was come", is not always true, but within its time- relationship / state / condition / limits / boundaries, is as always true as "tap water is liquid", is always true. The Aorist is never used without at least an implied time-relationship of con-state-ive or in-gression-al "aspect" – it never is used "indefinitely" or "without limits". Therefore one should rather

understand "is" in the above illustration" is a Present or, is an Imperfect – an "aspect" which indicates something perpetual, limitless, depending on whether ongoing in the past or in the present (or in the future). Or, if one insists "is" in the above illustration ("tap water is liquid") is an Aorist, then one should insist "tap water is liquid" as long as it is not frozen. 'The tap water **froze / got frozen**' – there now, is an Indicative (**finite**) Aorist proper! 'The tap water is frozen' will be Aorist if a **Participle**. So 'the tap water is liquid', if 'is liquid' is a Participle; it probably would be a Present Participle.

The most important "aspect" of the Aorist is that it "states" an **event** that now (whenever presently) is 'stated' as fact: 'Henry is King' / 'Henry was King'; or, that has occurred or had occurred, so that Henry at some indefinite point in time in the past, 'became King', or 'had become King' – 'ingressed' into kingship'. "Tap water is liquid" indicates no such event, and therefore is NOT an Indicative, finite, Aorist, like in, 'The tap water **froze / got frozen**!

The whole significance of the Aorist (infinite) cannot be contained in its name only; it must be deduced from its actual application: "It has / had become evening" = "it was evening (now)" = "evening (now)" = "it is evening already" by fact of the event of becoming evening, having had occurred.

**Appendix, p. 113, 'Hebrew Original'** See *Introduction to the New Testament*, Everett Harrison, Eerdmans, 1971

**"When Were the True Dates of the Crucifixion and Resurrection?"**

Chris L. Lingle of *The Society for the Advancement of Nazarene Judaism* (1997) asks,

"... This precise understanding is supported by the **Hebrew of Shem Tob. The Hebrew Manuscripts of Matthew are now becoming well known as authoritative over the Greek in many areas of the New Testament. Even like its 10th-14th century counterpart - the Old Testament or Tenach, as it is called in Hebrew, the 10th-14th century Hebrew manuscripts of Matthew are believed by many of the world's leading Bible and Semitic Language scholars to be authoritative (see The Semitic Origin of the New Testament - by James Trimm).**

The manuscripts in Matthew 28:1 of Shem Tob perfectly and unmistakably render: "And on the first day (be-yovm ha-roshon Strong's #3117 and #7223) from the week (ma-ha-shabua Strong's #7620) in the early morning (be-ha-shakamah Strong's #7926-7929) came Miriam Magdalene and the other Miriam to see the sepulchre." This is very clearly in support of a Sunday morning resurrection. It is also quite clearly a very fluent mixture of BH and MH (Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew).

Interestingly, the **Aramaic Peshitta of Matthew 28:1 (Fifth century!)** supports the false idea that Yahushua rose **late on the sabbath**. Apparently, this was due to the awkward Greek rendering of "opse" in the passage as it became translated into Aram. "ramsa" - the Aramaic equivalent to the Hebrew "erev".

Another area of confusion with regard to the Gr. root "opse" in Matthew is found in **Mt 27:57**. Here it says that Joseph of Arimathea came to procure Yahushua's body at "evening" (opsios). However, in **Shem Tob**, it renders "toward evening time" (la-et erev) in the Hebrew. (This is pointed out in more depth later in the article). Suffice it to say here that the Gr. root "opse" was used by the earliest N.T. translators, **translating from the Hebrew**, to connote "late, afternoon, and evening". The essential problem with the usage for "erev" as "late" is that in the Hebrew Tenach "evening" (erev) always occurs at the beginning or **early** part of the day and **never** at the end or late part of the day. And even **today, it remains** incorrectly understood as "**late**" in Hebrew because of the pagan and borrowed Greco-Roman element. The word "evening" still carries an ancient pagan notion of being toward sunset in the afternoon or after sunset either way (even as it is in the West today). But, not so in ancient biblical Hebrew. For, it is unique among ancient Hebrew, as opposed to Greek or English understanding, to begin a day at evening or sundown. Therefore, "evening" in biblical Hebrew is always at the beginning of one day and "after" the preceding day. "Opse" in its usage at Mt 28:1 connotes "after" rather than "late" because Greek is a pagan language deriving its original base text from **Hebrew**. This is a classic example of where opposing cultural terminology can cause inaccurate translations. Furthermore, if that language becomes influential enough (and Greek eventually did) it can even change the way a people actually look at a term. In this case, it has directly affected most late second temple and modern Jews.

Therefore, the Aramaic rendering at Mt. 28:1 is likewise without any real support based on the **fact** that Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew renders the passage clearly and concisely as referring to Sunday morning, unencumbered by awkward

*translation. Another obvious reason for the confidence that we place in Shem Tob is made clear in the **parallel passages** in Mark, Luke, and John. It is **universally held** in all manuscript languages of these books that the resurrection indeed occurred on Sunday morning! Read on, below are the Greek renderings:*

*Lk. 24:1 "But the first of the week (sabbaton) at (orthrou batheos) just before day-break they came to the tomb bringing aromatics which they had prepared, and some others with them."*

*orthrou - "dawn (as sunrise; rising of light, by extens. morning – early in the morning" Strong's #3722. "day-break, dawn, cock-crow." Liddell-Scott p. 568.*

*batheos - "profound (as going down, lit. or fig.) - deep, very early" Strong's #901.*

*Mk. 16:2 "And very early, the first of the week (sabbaton), they came to the tomb as was coming the light (anateilantos) of the sun."*

*anateilantos - "to arise" Strong's #393; "to make to rise or grow up...to give birth to, bring to light...(of the sun and moon)" Liddell-Scott's p. 63.*

*Jn. 20:1 "But on the first of the week (sabbaton), Mariam the Magdalene came early, it still being dim (skotias), to the tomb."*

*skotias - "dimness, obscurity" Strong's #4653; "darkness, gloom" Liddell - Scott p. 735. This word is a reference to the dimness just before dawn.*

*Thus, we can readily see that a cursory analysis of these passages reveals that the time of the **visit** to the tomb took place just before sunrise on the first day of the week and not at the end of the sabbath when the first day was just beginning at evening - as proponents of the Saturday resurrection argue.*

*The majority and proper rendering of the scriptures themselves do not contend that the visit took place right after the sabbath at evening. A day beginning somewhere around evening is not the timing being spoken of here. These verses do, however, plainly state that the visit of the women took place in the early morning of the first day of the week. Thus, the argument that these passages prove that the Messiah's body was already risen and gone by the very end of the sabbath is not demonstratable at all and is in error. ...*

*... (L)et's look at a **mistranslated** verse **in the Greek** which some may point to at Mt. 27:57. Most translations from the Greek render "And evening having come"...he came to Pilate and asked for the body of Messiah and then placed it in the tomb. However, we should know that the torah forbids that a body remain unburied after sunset (Deut. 21:23). **The Shem Tob (Hebrew Matthew)** correctly states that it was (la-et erev) "toward evening time" when Joseph inquired about the body. Therefore, we do know that the Messiah was captured, tortured, crucified, AND buried BEFORE evening time. ..." (**Emphasis CGE**)*

So we know by the superior knowledge of our friends of *The Society for the Advancement of Nazarene Judaism* that our Christian heritage of Greek Manuscripts are second hand and inferior, and in the specific instances of concern here, Mt.27:57 and Mk.15:42, false and corrupted – as judged against the "precise understanding" of the "**Hebrew Manuscripts ... of Shem Tob**".

This has been the ONLY contra-position to the KJV and the OAT of these texts I have encountered to date, May, 2003, except of course for new 'Versions' and 'Translations' (that e.g. say "late noon" in stead of "evening", or "evening approaching" in stead of "evening having come"). It ostentatiously contradicts and argues against itself.

STARTING MOMENTS						
Days away	from Nisan	14/15	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
7 Fr.	Travelled	8				
6 Sa.	six days before	9				12:1, 12
5 Su	Palm Sunday	10	21:1 – 17a	11:1 -- 11	19:29	12:12-36
4 M.	money changers	11	21:17b, 18	11:12 -- 19	19: 45 -- 49	12:35-36
3 Tu	over two days Crucified	12	22:23 – 26:1,6,14	11:20 – 13:3	20:1-8 – 22:1	12:37-39
2 W	over two days PO-FEAST	13		14:1 -- 3		12:40-43
1 Th	Prep. of PO. CRUCIFIED	14	26:17-20, 36, 27:1	14:12-17, 32, 15:1	22:7-14, 66	13:1, 30, 19:14
1 Fr.	Fore-sab. Prep. PF 'GD'-Sab.	15	27:57	15:42	23:50-54-56a	19:42
2 Sa.	On the third day RES 'In S'	16	27:62, 28:1-4	(16:6, 9)	23:56b, (24:46)	
3 Su	third day since these things	17	28:13; 28:9	16:1; 16:2; 16:9	24:1, 13, 29	20:1; 15;
4 M.				16:14	24:33	20:19

Was Jesus crucified on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday?

What follows is a chronology of the events surrounding the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ presented in a plausible and logical way in an effort to resolve that question.

To begin, at what time of day does the Bible say that Jesus died on the cross? ...

Mat 27:46 And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Mat 27:50 Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost.

Mark 15:34 And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Mark 15:37 And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.

The scriptures tell us that the Messiah died sometime around the 9th hour of the day (9 hours after the sun had risen). The ninth hour would be about our 3pm in the afternoon and He was put in the sepulchre before sunset. Bear in mind that the reason they were in a hurry to bury Jesus was because the Sabbath would begin at sundown...

Dear Mike, Have you started with the question, "at what time of day does the Bible say that Jesus died on the cross?", to give us the answer: that Jesus "was put in the sepulchre" "before sunset"? And from where do you obtain the idea or "the reason", that "they were in a hurry to bury Jesus"? Where do you get the information it "was because the Sabbath would begin at sundown"? I assume you meant the 'weekly' Sabbath?

Luke 23:54 And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on.

I assume this quote "Luke 23:54 And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on", is meant to confirm your conclusions above it, that: "The ... Messiah died ... about our 3pm in the afternoon and (that) He was put in the sepulchre before sunset. ... they were in a hurry to bury Jesus ...". Just show me please where this quote with its time-reference refer to "The (day) ... the Messiah died"? And how the time of day could be "before sunset" yet - especially since they were "in a hurry" - allow the Marys and the Jews time enough to "retire", and to make special preparations with their fragrances as well as "the (customary) preparation of the Jews (for the Sabbath)"? And Joseph - how could he first have done

everything he had done by the time he put the body in the sepulchre (and afterwards only obtain permission from Pilate to do so)? By being "in a hurry" or by the dispensations of Yahweh's Passover that the Sacrifice should be puried "that same day" it had been eaten? The dispensations of Yahweh's Passover do NOT determine that the Passover's remains should be buried "that same day" it had been slaughtered!

... this is because the Hebrew day begins and ends at sunset, as the Bible makes plain, and Jews practice even today-

"... this is", referring to the interment, accepted; not while referring to the crucifixion! This is because, as the Bible makes plain, the Jews practiced in this instance, their "custom to bury", "according to the Scriptures" - the Passover "Scriptures" - on Nisan 15. Not on Nisan 14!

Gen 1:5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the \*evening and the morning\* were the first day.

Lev 23:32 ... from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath.

Anchor point #1: Jesus died at 3pm and was buried on the preparation day (the day before the Sabbath) before sunset, which would begin the Sabbath day.

"Anchor point #1: Jesus died at 3pm ... on the preparation day ..." "of Passover" (Jn.19:14); on "the day they duly slaughtered the Passover" (Lk.22:7); "the day leaven should be removed" (Mt. 26:17); "the day they always slaughtered the Passover" (Mk.14:12). All four witnesses agree 100%! Jesus' body ("the remains" of the Passover Lamb) though, was NOT "buried" then, but on that "Preparation of the Passover", was "deserted by everyone", who "all returned" and "chest beating", "fled" the scene of Jesus' crucifixion, that day!

Therefore: "Jesus died at 3pm", yes, and that day would at sunset end in "the preparation day" "which is the day before the (weekly) Sabbath", beginning! (Mk.15:42) "Next day / daylight ... that which remaineth of it" (Ex.12:10, 31) - having already burned in hellish fires of dying the death for sin and of sinners - the ashes so to speak of Jesus our Passover and Lamb of God, was carried from Rameses in Egypt to Succoth out of Egypt's city (Ex.12:37, 39), and 'returned to earth' - 'interred' in the "tomb hewn out of the rock".

Jesus was (finished) buried at 3pm. before sunset one may safely assume (Lk.23:54-56, Jn.19:42), on the preparation day of that Sabbath\_of God's finishing of all his works in Christ. The Great Sabbath even of the Passover, had been but the Preparation of "the Sabbath of the LORD your God". That is how and what it ought to have been "according to the Scriptures" and "according to the Promise"!

If one understood this, he understands everything of the time-dispensations of God's Covenant of Grace pronounced and confirmed in the Christ-event.

I pray I could win over your enthusiasm for the truth as it is in The Truth.

Now exactly which Sabbath day, the first day of Unleavened Bread, or the Seventh day (Saturday) Sabbath?

Luke 23:52 This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.

Luke 23:53 And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid.

Luke 23:54 And that day was the preparation [Friday], and the sabbath drew on.

Mike, you forgot Luke 23 verses 48 to 50! Yes, "that day was the preparation [Friday], and the sabbath drew on", but what happened on THIS day "[Friday]"? This: "And behold (as from nowhere without connection with what happened before in verses 48-49) a man named Joseph, a councillor (appears) ... he was from Arimathea ... this (strange) man went to Pilate, and asked if he may have Jesus' body. He then (from "Luke 23:52" "took it down" and what followed. Crucifixion day had ended before Joseph's arrival, and day of burial, had begun "already", with Joseph's arrival - in fact Joseph's arrival was quite a while later than the Jew's at Pilate when this day had begun, as is obvious from Jn.19:31.

Luke 23:55 And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. Luke 23:56 And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment. [seventh day Saturday sabbath]

Fine! But you were occupied with the crucifixion, weren't you? So where is anything said about the crucifixion here?

Luke 24:1 Now upon the first day of the week [Sunday], very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.

Why do you quote this verse at this stage?

Mark 16:1 And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.

And why do you revert to the Sabbath's end, after sunset the beginning of the First Day?

Mark 16:2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

Then again suddenly jump to the Sunday morning? Because it is the sequence of the text in Mark? Did it not strike you - the time-distance between "when the Sabbath had gone through" (16:1) and "very early (before) sunrise / very early sunrising = 'early dawn'" (16:2)? Two events, one day, two times of day!

The women viewed the sepulchre and the body of Jesus on the preparation day (Friday evening before sunset) and then rested according to the 4th Commandment, on the Saturday Sabbath. When the Saturday Sabbath had past, the women returned to the tomb at sunrise,

"The women viewed the sepulchre and the body of Jesus on the preparation day (Friday evening before sunset)" - day of interment; "and then rested according to the 4th Commandment, on the Saturday Sabbath" - day after interment.

And after this day, Mark tells us, "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him". There's a problem with "had bought", of course because it would imply they "bought" on the Sabbath, while they in fact "bought", "when the sabbath was past". One should rather read, "After the Sabbath had passed, they bought ...".

Ehgorasan - the Aorist simply "states" the fact; there's no need for the Past Perfect. Mark thus and herewith - 16:1 - ends the pericope on the interment. 16:1 belongs with 15:47, the parenthesis that retrospectively mentions the women's presence at the burial. The Sabbath's duration afterwards, is then supposed and implied in the words, "when the Sabbath had run out, the women bought ...". They "bought" on Saturday evening. Translators with a Past Perfect force verse 1 in line with verse 2 so that it must indicate the morning of the First Day. They don't care it is God's Word they so corrupt!

... and that day was the first day of the week (Sunday). Clearly then, Jesus was crucified on Friday afternoon, the preparation day for the Saturday Sabbath.

Clearly then, Jesus was buried on Friday afternoon, the preparation day for the Saturday Sabbath.

This Friday preparation day (paraskeue:G3904) is mentioned in Mat 27:62 ...

Absolutely! I won't bother about "G3904" though - the Gospel is self-explanatory.



... Mat 27:62, Mk 15:42, Lk 23:54, Jn 19:14, 19:31 and 19:42 ...

Objection! Here's a big mix-up. "Mat 27:62, Mk 15:42" - these are not the parallel texts. The parallel texts are: Mt.27:57 and Mk.15:42; and not Mt.27:57, Mk.15:42 and "Lk 23:54", but Mt.27:57, Mk.15:42 and Lk.23:50; and not one of these and "Jn 19:14", but these and "Jn.19:31". The texts that indicate the current day (day of interment) has / had started, are: Mt.27:57, Mk.15:42, Lk.23:50 and Jn.19:31. And the texts that indicate day of crucifixion has declined and was ending, are the verses preceding these. And the texts that indicate the day of interment (Friday) has declined and was ending, are, "Lk 23:54" and "Jn.19:42". Then the texts that indicate the middle of day-cycle, "6 o'clock and he delivered Jesus" - day of crucifixion - are, "Jn 19:14" and Lk.22:66. "Mat 27:62" mentions "the morning that was after their preparations" - after Friday and in the middle of the weekly Sabbath. Lk.23:56 implies the weekly Sabbath has started. Then Finally Mk.16:1 says after the Sabbath has ended, implying the First Day had started.

It is worth noting that paraskeue is apparently always used to define the day before the seventh-day Sabbath, but not a day preceding a non-seventh-day festival sabbath. The term always means what we call Friday, in both scriptural and non-scriptural usage.

Which "apparently" is worth nothing and is plainly proven unfounded by John who in so many words and directly applies "paraskeue" to "the Preparation of the Passover" - which "apparently" is further confirmed by the necessary circumscription of "the Preparation" in cases it is "the before-Sabbath" (Mk.15:42) or when it is "the Preparation of the Jews (for the Sabbath Day)" (Jn.19:42).

Anchor point #2: The seventh-day Sabbath was the day after the crucifixion, because the women rested that Sabbath day (Saturday) according to the fourth commandment of God. Therefore, the crucifixion had to have occurred on a Friday.

"... because the women rested that Sabbath day (Saturday) according to the fourth commandment of God ..." - how should that mean, "The seventh-day Sabbath was the day after the crucifixion"? How should the fact "the women rested that Sabbath day (Saturday) according to the fourth commandment" indicate "the crucifixion had to have occurred on a Friday"? I cannot see any connection or implication. If you said because the women rested that Sabbath day (Saturday) according to the fourth commandment of God, the seventh-day Sabbath was the day after the BURIAL, it would have been another matter!

Now here is the logic some people will give for a Wednesday crucifixion -

Nobody is able to come up with genuine logic for a Wednesday crucifixion.

One cannot get three days and three nights (Matt 12:40) from "Good Friday" to "Easter Sunday."  
Except the wilful or ignorant.

Friday and Saturday nights are two nights, and Saturday is one day. This is only one day and two nights, what about the other two days and one night? Friday can't possibly be the day Jesus died.  
Legitimate question; legitimate conclusion!

This is the result of trying to use literal western thinking and applying it to the text ...

To use literal western thinking and applying it are legitimate opus operandi!

... implying that there should be a full 72 hours between the crucifixion and the resurrection.

Which no longer is "literal western thinking and applying it to the text". It is "not the intent of the passage", but some people's "thinking and applying" having turned mistaken deliberation.

For proof let's look at what the Gospels and other books have to say about the matter -  
Mat 16:21 From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again \*the third day\*.  
Mat 17:23 And they shall kill him, and \*the third day\* he shall be raised again. And they were exceeding sorry.  
Mat 20:19 And shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him: and \*the third day\* he shall rise again.  
Mark 9:31 For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise \*the third\* day.  
Mark 10:34 And they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him: and \*the third day\* he shall rise again.  
Luke 9:22 Saying, The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief

priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised \*the third day\*.

Luke 18:33 And they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and \*the third day\* he shall rise again.

Acts 10:38 How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.

Acts 10:39 And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews, and in

Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree:

Acts 10:40 Him God raised up \*the third day\*, and showed him openly;

1 Cor 15:3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

1 Cor 15:4 And that he was buried, and that he rose again \*the third day\* according to the scriptures:

Anchor point #3: Jesus was resurrected ON the third day after His death and burial, not after three literal days. If He rose after 72 hours, then all the above verses would read on the FOURTH day.

Undeniably! "(T)hen all the above verses" - "to use literal western thinking and applying it", ... "would read", "on the FIFTH day" indeed: Wed, Thur, Fri, Sat, Sunday "after the Sabbath"! Nevertheless though: "what the Gospels and other books have to say about the matter" - of 72 hours - isn't quite the same as saying "\*the third day\*". As Jesus does not say "hours", so does He - here - not say "\*the third day\*". And while using other terminology than "\*the third day\*", He meant to say what the other terminology, "three days and three nights", means. For "three days" and for "three nights" we are obliged to go look, besides looking for "the third day". We will find those six elements, within the "three days". Nothing contradictory or exclusive will be discovered, only another aspect and perhaps even another deeper meaning, than what the simple "in three days", portrays.

So now, just WHICH day was the third day? Notice the following verses from the 24th chapter of Luke: Luke 24:1 Now \*upon the first day of the week\*, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.

Do we find "just WHICH day was the third day?"? Not at all, unless we take proper notice of the fact that of all activities on this the First Day of the week, the major event of the previous day, the Sabbath Day, was NOT the cause! That event would on this day only, be discovered by surprise. So we find exactly WHICH day was AFTER "the third day" and so can and must deduce "just WHICH day was the third day" - it had to have been the Sabbath.

Luke 24:7 Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and \*the third day\* rise again.

Do we find "just WHICH day was the third day?"? If the angel here (in Luke 24:7) converses with the disciples live, it understandably had to have been after Jesus' resurrection, and naturally after the day of His resurrection. Jesus' resurrection purely theoretically from the point in time of the angel's conversation with His disciples on this the "First day of the week" could have been any time before on this the "First Day of the week". But it in every sense would have been against all logic and against all "the Scriptures". Contextually - taking into account the natural succession of days, the logical progression of events, the angel's incidental reference in verse 7 to "\*the third day\*", and its prophetic significance, that "\*third day\*", would have been the past and previous day. The angel does not say "today" like one in live conversation would have said, had "the First Day of the week" 'today' been "\*the third day\*". One (Luke) does not (three times?) in one passage (chapter 24) record the words "the third day" if that "third day" had been "today", and not once say or emphasise it, if it were true. The disciples and the angel spoke of unrelated, consecutive and "according to the Scriptures" by no means both, "\*the third day\*".

Luke 24:21 But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, \*to day is the third day\* since these things were done.

Do we find "just WHICH day was the third day?"? We are able to do some subtraction to find "just WHICH day was the third day" if we start with Sunday being "the third day SINCE "apo" these things were done". (We know to start with Sunday from putting together information derived from verses 13 and 1: "That same day ... the First Day of the week".) The second day "since" would be Saturday, the first day "since" would be Friday, and the day OF those "things" - specified in verse 20 - would be Thursday. "These thing" were: "how the chief priests and our rulers delivered Him to be condemned to death, and have crucified Him". "Since" the event and day of "these things", Sunday was the third day in succession - retrospectively as well as progressively, by 'inclusive' as well as by 'exclusive' counting, because it is counted and determined retrospectively. The text in no manner states or implies: "This day had been \*the third day\*" - the day of Jesus' resurrection.

Luke 24:46 And (Jesus) said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead \*the third day\*:

Do we here find "just WHICH day was the third day?"? Jesus "said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all the things must be fulfilled which were written ... concerning Me. ... And he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer (the first day as it is written of Passover) and to

rise from the dead the third day (as it is written of Passover)." Then one may deduce "just WHICH day was the third day" the MESSIAH SPOKE OF IN HOLY WRIT: It certainly was NOT 'the third day since' of which the disciples spoke, but "God thus concerning the Seventh Day spoke: And God on the Seventh Day rested from all His works".

This passage makes plain that on Sunday the \*first day of the week\* (v. 1), the two angels at the tomb said He would rise \*the third day\* (v. 7) ...

The duplicity or ambiguousness of the assertion is misleading.

"(T)he two angels at the tomb" did not say "... that on Sunday the \*first day of the week\* ... He would rise \*the third day\*". Actually, the "...\*" removes any doubt what your intention is, Mike, and identifies "Sunday the \*first day of the week\*", with "\*the third day\*". Thereby this whole paragraph becomes a corruption of true facts.

... and on the same day on the road to Emmaus the two disciples stated it was \*the third day\* (v. 21)

Again "the same day" (Sunday) is "stated it was \*the third day\*" - subtly yet eye-hurting obvious! Had it in this passage and on this occasion and under these circumstances (Luke 24) been repeated a thousand times "it is the third day since", it a thousand times would have confirmed "the third day since", was NOT "THE third day" of Passover Prophecy that had been fulfilled in and through Jesus Christ and which this passage, this occasion and this circumstance, all place in the mouth of the angel or angels, and not in the mouth or mind of the two disciples - and, is it not strange - not once in the mouth of Jesus. Were "today" "THE third day", undoubtedly

Jesus of all men, would have marked the co-incidence!

... and Jesus says he would rise \*the third day\* (v. 46). So clearly Sunday was the third day the angels and Jesus were speaking of ...

So clearly, dear Mike, you are misled yourself, or you attempt to mislead. "Jesus says he would rise \*the third day\* (v. 46)." So "the two angels at the tomb said He would rise \*the third day\* (v. 7)." So clearly Sunday was NOT the third day the angels - or Jesus - were speaking of. "Sunday was the third day" the disciples said "today was the third day since these things were done", that is, past the crucifixion! "Besides all this" it was NOT ...

... the day on which Jesus rose from the grave. If you need even more proof of a Sunday resurrection ...  
(... it will have to be a lot more and a lot better evidence!)

... note this verse: Mark 16:9 Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.

It's no improvement, but worse! Just move the comma from after "week," to after "risen,", and note this verse: Mark 16:9, "Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." The verb of the sentence is "appeared" - not "risen". "He the Risen (Jesus), early on the First Day of the week first appeared to Mary ...".

Those who advocate a Wednesday crucifixion must adhere to a Saturday afternoon resurrection, ...

It is true the Scriptures does not advocate a Wednesday crucifixion. It irrespective though, keeps true the Scriptures adheres to a Sabbath (Saturday) afternoon resurrection, while it, in the case of Jesus "our Passover", advocates a crucifixion on "the Preparation of Passover", Nisan 14. That, in the case of Jesus "our Passover", had been on the Fifth Day of the week, "Thursday".

but the above verses, and in particular Mark 16:9, refutes that very nicely.

I believe you now will acknowledge "Mark 16:9, refutes" not but rather requires "a Saturday afternoon resurrection".

Yet, some will still point to Matthew 28:1 to show that the women first came to the tomb late on the sabbath (Saturday) near sunset:

Some might, but I won't even though! "will still point to Matthew 28:1 to show that": The women never "first came to the tomb late on the sabbath (Saturday) near sunset", but, That the women late on the sabbath (Saturday) afternoon before sunset, "set off to go have a look at the grave" - because that's what the text says. The women "came" not "to the tomb" - that is, they did not execute their intended visit - because that's not what the text says.

Mat 28:1 In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. This point is quickly clarified by looking at ...

... Mat 28:1 again: "In the end of the sabbath, in the very being of light turning / leaning toward the first day of the week, set off / departed Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to (go) see the sepulchre".

... Mark's account ...

Mark has no 'account' of this!

Mark 16:1 And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.

Rather translate as explained above: "... bought sweet spices" in stead of "... had bought sweet spices". Mark simply makes a statement - he doesn't try 'to make a statement'.

Mark 16:2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

"And very early "lian prohi", sun's rising "anateilantos tou hehliou" (= early dawn) they 'deliberately came to' "*erchontai epi to Acc.*" the sepulchre" with clear purpose of ascertaining their (implied) earlier findings. It was not their first visit to the grave! Mary Magdalene - for one - had already discovered the cast aside door stone.

Mark 16:3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?

"Who (on earth) shall roll away the stone from the door of the sepulchre for us?" is more than a question; it is an exclamation of wonderment - the 'Deliberative Future' - which reveals elements of doubt at the size of the stone and of the feat of "casting" the stone "out of" the grave-door "uphill" ("apokulisei" and "anablepsasai") ... "for us?!" It could be translated with "Who would cast ...". It shows the women already knew of the "cast away door stone" which they now inspect more closely.

Clearly the women came to the tomb at sunrise, finding the tomb empty.

This was not "at sunrise", but at "very early sun's rising" before actual 'sunrise'.

So what about the strange wording of Matthew 28:1?

There's nothing "strange about" the "wording of Matthew 28:1" - only many special features characterising the section verses 1 to 4 as being undividable and obtained from an independent source. See treated on in LD, Part 2.

The explanation can be found in the division of the text into verses. The original Greek texts contain no punctuation, or chapter or verse markings. These were later added as a convenience to the reader. By merely reorganizing Matthew 27:66 and 28:1 as follows, the apparent ambiguity completely disappears:

Which in every sense and aspect is unfounded, speculative and faulty. See reference above. The text should be read and is readable only

as in the KJV, and is correct in every respect except for the word "dawn" for "epifohskousehi".

Mat 27:62 Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, Mat 27:63 Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.

Mat 27:64 Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Mat 27:65 Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can. Note that in verse 62, the request for a guard on the tomb was made on a Sabbath (the day after the preparation) and that the request was for a guard until the third day.

The request for a guard on the tomb was made on the "weekly" Sabbath, the Pharisees and scribes' hypocritical "preparations" for it regardless! Which shows they did not bury Jesus on the day He was crucified or even knew that Joseph had buried Him the day before - otherwise they would have guarded and sealed the tomb on the day they crucified Him and presumably would have entombed Him.

Now, here is how the following verses should be printed: Mat 27:66 So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch in the end of the sabbath.

See objections referred to above. The guard and the seal were not set "in the end of the sabbath", but "the next day that comes after the Day of Preparation (after Friday) in the morning" "tehi epaurion". That is, the guard and the seal were set on the Sabbath's morning, which is in the middle of the Sabbath! And it was set "until the third day" would be over. It was set "for the third day" of the prophetic "three days" - "for the third day" about which Jesus prophesied - "lest his disciples come by night!"! It wasn't set "until the third day" from this, day one of its setting - which would have been pointless - but with the view to that very approaching night the watch would also have expired!

Mat 28:1 As it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.

Nothing of which one shall find in the Greek! This quote is the making of predisposed 'translators'.

Note that the wording is not changed, ...

Not in the English (at first sight perhaps), but in the Greek definitely, and perversely.

... merely the dividing point of the verses is changed by moving the period ending verse sixty-six. It was the watch guarding the tomb that began at the end of the sabbath! This shows that Matthew and Mark agree completely as to when the women came to the tomb: just before the rising of the sun at dawn, the first day of the week, Sunday.

About "the watch guarding the tomb that began" we have spoken above. Matthew and Mark agree completely as to when the women came to the tomb, because Matthew mentions no word about either the specific women or the specific visit. Matthew does not agree with Mark that "the women came to the tomb: just before the rising of the sun at dawn, the first day of the week, Sunday", neither in the coming of the women, nor in the women of the coming, nor in the time of their coming. Not even Mark agrees completely as to the time here given, "just before the rising of the sun at dawn". Mark has it "very early sun's rising" which is very early and the dark beginning of dawn.) Matthew's time IMPLIED is AFTER sunrise, because he would mention Jesus' SECOND appearance after His FIRST appearance "to Mary" on her own (Mk.16:9), "early on the First Day", when one would expect a gardener to start work - with sunrise, Jn.20:11f. Then to "agree completely as to when the women came to the tomb", does not in any way mean to agree as to when Jesus rose from the dead! And by an eternity in between does "In Sabbath's slowness daylight having swayed towards the First Day of the week", agree with " : just before the rising of the sun at dawn, the first day of the week, Sunday". This is not "merely the dividing point" - this is the dividing point!

Since Jesus was to rise the third day, the Roman guards were put in place immediately at the end of the Sabbath, because they anticipated the body being stolen by the Jews sometime on Sunday, the third (and next) day ...

Which is surmising, speculation - nothing of "it is written". So much for "the wording is not changed, ... merely the dividing point".

Had they anticipated the theft on Saturday, then the guard would have been in place by Friday evening, (the preparation day).

Keen observation, the fact the guard had NOT been in place by Friday evening (the preparation day) - seeing tradition would have us believe the Jews were present all the time after Jesus had been crucified and until He had been buried. It proves they never knew Joseph had obtained permission to bury Jesus and eventually had Him laid down in the tomb - only two women observing - a solid day after He had been crucified and died!

Anchor point #4: Jesus rose from the dead on Sunday, the first day of the week, which was the third day since His trial, death and burial (Luke 24:21).

"Anchor point #4" has no hold on solid ground! The assertion "the third day since His trial, death and burial (Luke 24:21)" plainly is false, while nothing whatsoever indicates or just suggests, "Sunday ... was the third day since His ... burial". As little as the Jews knew, and as little as all the women but the two Marys knew, did these disciples know Jesus had been taken from the cross and had been buried. Otherwise they would have made mention of it.

Sunday, as we have seen, actually began at sunset on Saturday evening and by Jewish reckoning any part of day is counted as a day ...

Why mention it? By Sunday Jesus appeared, having been raised from the dead already "in Sabbath's time".

So working backwards- Sunday, was the third day, the day of the resurrection.

No, the "Sabbath" was "\*the third day\*" prophetically, the day of the resurrection, and Sunday was the fourth day historically, and naturally the day of the first appearances.

Saturday (Sabbath) was the second day that Christ rested in the tomb.

Before we can possibly proceed: Christ DID NOT rest in the tomb - He "in the tomb" paid the penalty for and reward of sin, which is eternal death and hell due every sinner who ever lived but by this labour of suffering of Christ was saved. Never my ears hear these words "Christ rested in the tomb" but I suffer for the sake of Christ! Jesus "rested" by rising from the dead and by being exalted by the exceeding greatness of God's power.

Saturday (Sabbath) was the second day...

No, Christ rested in victory over sin and grave, over death and hell - in heaven on Mount Olive (Zech.14:4) "in that day" in exaltation at the right hand of the power of God, "in the end" and "in the purpose of the Sabbath's fullness", the third day: "And God on the Seventh Day rested from all his works": "In Him" - who is Christ The Risen.

Friday (Preparation day) was the first day, the day of the crucifixion.

"Friday (Preparation day)", was the first day, the day AFTER, not "the day of the crucifixion". Friday (Preparation day), was a "Sabbath Day, a great day that day it was" of the Passover Feast, Jn.19:31. It was the second day of Passover Feast and Feast Day of Passover Season - "the next day" or "morning" after the

day in which the lambs were slaughtered and after the night in which its flesh had been eaten – the day on which “that which remaineth of it (the Passover lamb), ye shall burn with fire”. “It was the day that”, says John, “the day of” Jesus’ interment. “The selfsame day” (Ex.12:17) “it was”, of and following its night – “that night of the Lord to be observed mightily” (Ex.12:42). “The selfsame day the LORD brought the children of Israel out” (Ex.12:51). The selfsame (second) day, Jesus saved His saved by token of His death and grave.

The selfsame second day of Passover – by the disciples’ recounting – was the first day “since (those) things (that) had occurred” on the first day of Passover Feast Season.

Jesus was crucified on Friday and died at 3 p.m.

Repetition of mistakes won’t make them right; repetition entrenches mistakes yet deeper. Jesus was NOT crucified on Friday nor on Friday at 3 p.m. died – which is no empty repetition of denial. One should come to terms with the bare facts.

He rose from the dead somewhere between Saturday after sunset and sunrise on Sunday morning.

Saturday after sunset, “when scarcely dark yet”, or, “while early darkness (of the night) still” (Jn.20:1), Mary Magdalene had seen the stone flung away from the grave door. Jesus then had been resurrected for some time, NOWHERE NEAR “sunrise on Sunday morning”. “In thick night”, says Luke, the women after midnight went to the grave – and found it empty. “Very early sun’s rising”, says Mark, the women visited the grave – again, and confirmed their earlier finding. “Early on the First Day of the week”, says Mark (16:9), “Jesus first appeared to Mary Magdalene ... Risen”. That must have been “early on the First Day” about sunrise, for John records the gardener (supposed) by then had been on duty already. Virtually the whole Saturday night has been accounted for – and no resurrection! So when was it? “And the angel answered the women, telling them ...”. One is forced to conclude he told them what had happened “In the end of the Sabbath ... when suddenly there was a great earthquake” – and Jesus in fact rose from the dead!

There is absolutely no way to push the crucifixion back to Wednesday and fit scripture. A Wednesday crucifixion is clearly impossible.

There is absolutely no way to push the crucifixion forward to Friday and the resurrection forward to Sunday to “fit” tradition and Roman Catholic worship of the lord Sun and his day. A Friday crucifixion is clearly as impossible as a Sunday resurrection, and for that matter clearly is as impossible as a Wednesday crucifixion.

### Three days and Three nights .

Oh, but then what of these apparently troublesome verses, don't they preclude a Friday crucifixion? - Mat 12:40 For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Mat 27:63 Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, \*After three days\* I will rise again. Mark 8:31 And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and \*after three days\* rise again.

These verses are appealed to in order to propose a full 72 hours in the grave.

These verses are appealed to in order to propose a full 72 hours in the grave by those who propagate a Wednesday crucifixion. But those who propagate a Thursday crucifixion won’t rely on Mat 27:63, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, \*After three days\* I will rise again, because they don’t try to defend the impossible full 72 hours in the grave idea. They also fully understand the idiomatic force of the word “after” for meaning the same as saying “in three days”. Nevertheless while Jesus how many times referred to “the third day” or the like, He could just as well in Mt.12:40 have used any of these expressions. Yet He obviously purposely chose to use the specific description of “three days and three nights”. Why? For its peculiar meaning that makes of it the same yet not the same as “in three days”. See above discussed.) They do seem to say a full 3 days and 3 nights don’t they? How can this possibly be reconciled with the traditional chronology? If you believe the Bible cannot contradict itself, then these verses MUST be harmonized with the rest of scripture on the subject.

Well... please note the following story in 1 Kings- The third day (inclusive reckoning)

1 Ki 12:5 And he said unto them, Depart yet \*for three days\*, then come again to me. And the people departed.

1 Ki 12:12 So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam \*the third day\*, as the king had appointed, saying, Come to me again \*the third day\*.

The king tells the people to depart for three days, but they return ON the third day, not on the fourth!! Why? Because the king did not mean to be gone for a full 72 hours. The counting of days was inclusive in nature. The same day that the king told them to leave was the first day. The second

day they stayed away, and then they returned the third day, as the king had intended. This is the exactly the same manner of counting used for the resurrection. It is inclusive in nature, with whatever portion of the first and last days being counted as full days.

Just for good measure, this same story is told in 2 Chronicles-

2 Chr 10:5 And he said unto them, Come again unto me \*after three days\*. And the people departed.

2 Chr 10:12 So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam \*on the third day\*, as the king bade, saying, Come again to me \*on the third day\*.

Note the way this is worded compared to 1 Kings. Come again unto me after three days, depart yet for three days, and Come again to me on the third day, these all mean exactly the same thing, which is NOT a full three days or a full 72 hours.

Luke 13:31 The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee.

Luke 13:32 And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected.

Luke 13:33 Nevertheless I must walk to day, and to morrow, and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.

Note that here in Luke 13, the third day clearly means the day after tomorrow, not after 3 full days. So, in light of all the evidence, Matt 12:40, 27:63 and Mark 8:31 do not really mean a full literal three days and nights or 72 hours, since Jesus clearly rose ON the third day. By Jewish understanding, referred to as inclusive reckoning, three days and three nights, and after three days, simply meant the same thing as ON the third day.

**Anchor Point #5: Jesus was resurrected ON the third day, not after 72 literal hours.**

All very well; but what does it explain about "three days and three nights" apart from the logical inference "three days" could or could not include "three days and three nights"? So when one says "three days and three nights" that is what he means and nothing short for the very reason of his saying "three days and three nights"! He doesn't say "72 hours" and therefore doesn't mean "72 hours". Just so, he doesn't say "three days", but "three days and three nights", and means just what he says. Now, since Jesus particularly, used BOTH expressions, He - at last, 'in the end' - meant the meaning of both expressions. Jesus thus finally excluded a possibility of the fulfilment of the "three days" or of "the third day" like the

Sunday resurrection tradition offers - as finally as He thus excluded a possibility of the fulfilment of the "three days" or of "the third day" like the Wednesday crucifixion theory offers. ... The kettle cannot blame the pot!

Only a Thursday crucifixion - the 'Fifth Day of the week' having started (Wednesday night with and after sunset) when Jesus' "hour was come" - the 'hour' of his 'live' suffering of the death of death at the table, in Gethsemane, during his trial, in his being delivered over to the Jews, on his way to be crucified, and in being crucified and mocked, to die dying, and the next day be buried and sealed and guarded in death and grave - to account for each of every "three days and three nights" from the standpoint of victory over death, hell, sin and grave.

### The Lord's Passover

Next, lets look at when the Passover really begins. Sometimes in the Bible, the phrases "Feast of Unleavened Bread" or "Passover" are used to describe the combination of 14 Nisan (The Lord's Passover) with the subsequent week long Feast of Unleavened Bread. So the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (in this general sense), would then be 14 Nisan. This habit can cause some confusion if you are not careful, as follows: Mat 26:17 Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?

Mark 14:12 And the first day of unleavened bread, \*when they killed the passover\*, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?

Luke 22:1 Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover.

Luke 22:7 Then came the day of unleavened bread, \*when the passover must be killed\*.

Luke 22:8 And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat.

The above verses seem to say that the Passover lamb was to be slain on the first day of unleavened bread, or 15 Nisan (but actually refer to 14 Nisan, as will be shown) Now, the following verse refers to the Passover meal as occurring on 15 Nisan, the evening after the crucifixion, also 15 Nisan:

John 18:28 Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover.

This confusion can be cleared up by looking in Exodus, Leviticus and 2 Chronicles -

Exo 12:5 Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats:

Exo 12:6 And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening [afternoon of the 14th].

Exo 12:7 And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.

Exo 12:8 And they shall eat the flesh in that night [early hours of the 15th], roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it.

Exo 12:9 Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire; his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof.

Exo 12:10 And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire.

Exo 12:18 In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even.

Lev 23:5 In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover.

Lev 23:6 And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.

2 Chr 35:1 Moreover Josiah kept a passover unto the LORD in Jerusalem: and they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the first month.

Clearly the Passover lamb was to be slain on the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan and eaten in the night of the 15th of Nisan. Yet, according to Exodus 12:18, unleavened bread was also to be eaten beginning on the 14th of Nisan, known as the Lord's passover, which is the day before the Festival of Unleavened Bread (this is the reason for some confusion).

This whole section of yours on "The Lord's Passover", from, "Next, lets look at when the Passover really begins", up to here, I am in full sympathy with. But in your next paragraph where you start to have a closer look at the problematics of the subject, I unfortunately must again begin with interjections.

So this was the time the Lord's supper took place - on what we would call Thursday night, which was the 14th of Nisan ...

This cannot be if one reckons the day as the Gospels and the Jews do, i.e., sunset to sunset. If "what we would call Thursday night ... was the 14th of Nisan", then Friday is Nisan 14. In this way you - true to tradition - must ignore Mt.27:57, Mk.15:42, Lk.23:50 and Jn.19:31, and must place them in and on Friday Nisan 14 (despite the fact tradition sees Friday for Nisan 15), in order that you may be able to make of Mt.26:17, Mk.14:12, Lk.22:7 and Jn.13:1 the (previous) after sunset beginning of Nisan 14! What confusion, to be frank! Only because plain "it is written" is overruled by tradition. Nevertheless: To avoid this confusion, one should start back in the OT texts you quoted, and observe ONE factor: Exodus only knows one date for Passover whether sacrifice or meal of, Nisan 14. The rest of OT knows two dates consistently: Nisan 14 for sacrifice, and Nisan 15 for meal. Two invariables are thus concluded: Sacrifice never on Nisan 15; Sacrifice always on Nisan 14. There is only one way to reconcile this SEEMING enigma, and that is to start the Nisan calendar days in Exodus, half a day-cycle later. That is, instead of to reckon them from sunrise, to reckon them from sunset. It is important in connection with this though, to notice the distinct impressions that already exist in the Exodus Passover histories, namely of TWO, "first" days, e.g. in 12:15. First there is the day "ye shall put away leaven", 15b: next there is the first day ye shall eat unleavened bread, 15c. It was on the separation between these two aspects of Passover - sacrifice and meal - in terms of days and dates, that all OT and "Jewish custom" had been based as till today.

... which consisted of bread and grape juice, but no roast lamb. Later that very same day the Passover lamb was to be slain in the evening. Evening means the closing hours of the day or late afternoon, just before sunset, but not after sunset. This is clear because the killing of the Passover lamb was symbolic for the death of Jesus on the cross, which as we have seen, happened at 3pm in the afternoon of 14 Nisan.

(All right for now ...)

That the Passover lamb was to be slain in the afternoon of the 14th can be confirmed elsewhere in Exodus. Note when the daily sacrifice of lambs was to take place:

Exo 29:39 The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even:

Here it is plain that the daily sacrifices included two lambs, the first in the morning, and the second in the "evening", meaning the afternoon before sunset. So when Exodus 12:6 says the Passover lamb



was to be slain in the evening, it means the afternoon of the 14th.  
(All right for now ...)

The Jewish historian Josephus confirms that the Passover lambs were slain from the ninth hour to the eleventh hour, that being from 3pm to 5pm. (Wars of the Jews, Book VI, Chapter IX, Section 3.) Therefore, the two events, the time for the killing of the Passover lamb and the death of Jesus, coincided precisely on that Friday afternoon the 14th of Nisan, the Lord's Passover, at 3pm.

From where, "the Passover lamb and the death of Jesus, coincided precisely on that Friday afternoon the 14th of Nisan, the Lord's Passover, at 3pm." We have discussed this.

This is further confirmed by the timing of the original Passover in Egypt:

"This" - "on that Friday ... the 14th of Nisan",  
"confirmed by the timing of the original Passover in Egypt:?" I would like to see "this" ...

Exo 12:29 And it came to pass, that at midnight the LORD smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, Num 33:3 And they departed from Rameses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month; on the morrow after the passover the children of Israel went out with an high hand in the sight of all the Egyptians.

Israel Freed From Bondage			
14 Nisan The Lord's Passover		15 Nisan 1st Day of Festival of Unleavened Bread A Sabbath day	
NIGHT	DAY	NIGHT	DAY
Unleaven Bread first eaten	Passover lamb slain about 3pm, blood put on the door posts and lintel	Passover lamb eaten Death Angel slays the firstborn of Egypt at midnight	Israel set free in the morning

Clearly the Passover slaying of Egypt's firstborn occurred at midnight on the 15th of Nisan.....

Agreed! BUT: 1, It is not to say Nisan 14 was a Friday. You have assumed above, and still must prove your assumption right; 2, "slaying of Egypt's firstborn occurred at midnight on the 15th of Nisan" is an inference from later Scriptures than Exodus, because Exodus uses one date only for this event as well as for the slaughter of the

Passover lamb, and that is 14 Nisan! Which means Exodus used a sunrise reckoning of the day for all Passover ceremonies specifically, whereas all the rest of later Scriptures use the sunset reckoning for all days irrespective whether they are ceremonial or just ordinary, like the days of the week for example.

... So the reference in John 18:28 to the Passover meal being observed on the day after the crucifixion is speaking of the meal in which the Passover lamb would be eaten,...  
Quite correct!

... which would occur at the early hours of 15 Nisan,...

Quite correct, "the early hours of 15 Nisan" meaning during night before midnight. This is only possible if one uses a sunset-reckoning of day.

... the Paschal lamb symbolic of Jesus having been slain a few hours earlier on the afternoon of the 14th.....

100% provided one date according to the later Scriptures and sunset day reckoning - not according to Exodus and a sunrise day reckoning. Also, "the reference in John 18:28" should be "the inference in John 18:28". This your own and legitimate conclusion contradicts what you have illustrated in your schematic illustration, which indicates "Unleavened Bread first eaten" in the "NIGHT" of "14 Nisan". You - wrongly - called the meal,

"Unleavened Bread first eaten", "The Lord's Passover".

This meal of 14 Nisan night (and first part), cannot be indicated in the OT. It was not Yahweh's Passover eaten, whether in the New or in the Old Testament, whether seen according to Exodus or according to the other Passover Scriptures.

This was the NEW thing, The Lord Jesus' Supper, as Paul and the Church came to call it. It was not eaten at midnight or just before midnight as the Exodus Passover was, but an hour after sunset - Lk.22:14.

It could not have been the Passover Feast meal because the lamb had not been slaughtered yet. But this meal, Jesus instituted originally, on this night, the beginning-part of day of 14 Nisan, and for Him and for the Christian Church, it in all respects had been the Preparation Meal for Christ's suffering death for those who believe in Him. "Prepare, that we may eat the Passover!" is its clarion call. It is the Feast of Faith - of The Faith of Jesus Christ.

Then have a look again at your scheme and notice that in the Passover history absolutely nothing is recorded of any happenings during the fore- or night-part (as according to the later dating sunset to sunset) of Nisan 14 - on which the sacrifice had to be made during its day or latter part. Only in the End (Jesus Christ) is the beginning (Prophecy and Promise)

filled with meaning. Only with Christ came an occasion that also filled this part of Nisan 14 with meaning – hence the Lord’s Supper.

You should therefore erase your mention of a meal during “NIGHT” of “14 Nisan”. There was no feast then in that night seeing that night then still represented Egypt and its slavery, and Exodus still in effect, then dated that night, NIGHT of 13 Nisan – the Passover was not yet. “Yahweh’s Passover” happened the NEXT night, which Exodus actually stipulates was “14 Nisan”. “THIS night” – as Exodus describes it – Yahweh would “bring” the “host’s of Israel”, “OUT”.

Later on in Israel’s history she introduced her own feast on 14 Nisan’s night (following 13 Nisan Day), and called it the Bedikat Chamets (“Search for Leaven”). It occupied the time-slot on Nisan 14 during which our Lord Jesus instituted His own Supper for His New People.

But even on that first NIGHT of actual Passover – after the Passover dated Nisan 15 but which Exodus still dated “the fourteenth of the month” and end-part of it – nothing but the flesh of the sacrifice was eaten. It was eaten “without” anything. The word “without” later received the connotation of “bitter”, and still later of “bitter herbs”. But in that first night of Passover’s first eating and of Passover’s actual exodus, there was not even unleavened bread eaten with it. The first time unleavened dough was baked to bread and was eaten, was at Succoth on the first day of the JOURNEY, and which Exodus, in effect, would date Nisan 15 (Ex.12:37, 39). All later Passover Scriptures consequently and consistently date the JOURNEY – its commencement as well as its first day’s duration – 15 Nisan!

So it’s no inconsistency or discrepancy or contradiction or flaw the Exodus dating differs from the rest of all Scriptures with regard to the dating of the Passover. In the very manifestation of this difference is revealed the workings of God in the saving of his People through and in and by our Lord, Jesus Christ, our Passover and Lamb of God!

Unleavened bread was later institutionalised “an ordinance” to be eaten WITH the sacrifice in the night of Nisan 15 – its first part, FOR THIS VERY REASON.

You should correct your scheme by replacing “The Lord’s Passover” with “The Lord’s Supper”. The Lord Jesus’ ‘Passover’ would be His “eating” it in, through and by dying, Himself being the Passover Lamb of Yahweh.

As soon as you have amended your scheme table in this way, your dates will automatically move one calendar day backwards (earlier). The day which you have dated 14 Nisan, will afterwards be dated 15 Nisan. You have wrongly supposed 15 Nisan was Saturday. And you have wrongly supposed Friday was 14 Nisan. After amendment Friday will fall on 15 Nisan.

Then as concerns “15 Nisan” everything in your schematic illustration is delightfully in place although the New “Israel” had been “set free” pre-emptively in the death of “our Passover” on Nisan 14 already. The “out of Egypt” in the death of Christ during 14 and 15 Nisan is His “going through”; the “out of Egypt” awaits the “into” – “the rest of God”

(Hb.3-4), his holy Sabbath Day – by resurrection of our Lord from the dead, Nisan 16, First Sheaf Wave Offering, “waved before the LORD”!

As a result, Matthew 26:17, Mark 14:12, and Luke 22:1, 7-8 all are actually referring to the 14th of Nisan (in a general sense) calling it the first day of unleavened bread.

Wonderful observation! I could only find a little irregularity in it, and it is your mention in this context of “Luke 22:1”. The event mentioned in Luke 22:1 occurred “while the Feast Day of Unleavened Bread drew nigh”, the very day of Mt.26:1f and Mk.14:1f, “two days before the Feast Day of Passover”.

Then – and it is not your fault – “calling it (the 14th of Nisan) the first day of unleavened bread”, even “in a general sense” is incorrect and the cause of much confusion. “Bread” is not the issue here, but “leaven” and to be “without” it – “a-dzumos”. The reference of the Gospel writers is to “the ordinance” that on Nisan 14 leaven should be “removed” from the house and land of the Israelites; and its disregard was punishable with death. 14 Nisan, after the Passover, did not see the eating of unleavened bread again – it only saw the removal of leaven. Unleavened bread was first eaten – also “by ordinance” – with the flesh of the sacrifice on the day after, “by ordinance”, on Nisan 15 during its night and first part.

Again you should correct your schematic illustration accordingly – you should remove “Unleavened Bread first eaten” from your “14 Nisan” and “night” block, and bring it over to your “15 Nisan” and “night” block where you said, “Passover lamb eaten”, because Unleavened Bread was first eaten – “by ordinance” – WITH the Passover lamb, Nmb.28:16-18 et al.

Anchor Point #6: Jesus was crucified late on 14 Nisan, the Lord’s Passover.

Quite correct! “14 Nisan, the Lord’s Passover” – the relevant Scriptures describe Nisan 14 with “the Passover” and with “the Passover observed”. The “Feast” (of Passover) always and without exception in the OT, indicates Nisan 15. In the NT though, the Passover in more “general sense”, could refer to “the Feast” (Nisan 15), “the Preparation of the Passover” (Nisan 14), or to the whole period or festive season of Passover. To be specific with regard to your reference to “14 Nisan, the Lord’s Passover”, it was undoubtedly not the Lord’s intention that the Lord’s Supper should be observed strictly on Nisan 14, nor as some sort of Christian ‘Passover’.)

What follows now is a chronological listing of the events of the crucifixion and resurrection, that puts all the pieces of the puzzle together in a way that satisfies all the accounts.

7 Nisan/Abib (Jesus arrives in Bethany at the close of the day)Friday

John 12:1 Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead.

How is that possible? Because "the passover" in "John 12:1" means Passover Feast Day, Nisan 15, as referred to above, Nmb.28:16-18 et al.

"John 12:1" states, "Six days before Passover (Feast Day)".

Anchor points of argument:

1, The sixth day before Passover Feast - Nisan 15 - was the weekly Sabbath Day.

2, "(T)he passover" "Feast", when our Lord was crucified, traditionally, confessed, arithmetically / chronologically and Scripturally, was Friday, Nisan 15 - not Nisan 14.

Therefore:

Day one "before Passover": Nisan 14 - Thursday;

Therefore: Friday: Nisan 8, Jesus arrives in Bethany. See MANY confirming arguments and facts in LD.

But you have "7 Nisan/Abib ... Friday".

8 Nisan/Abib (Mary, the sister of Lazarus, anoints Jesus.)

Saturday (Sabbath)

John 12:2 There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him.

John 12:3 Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.

John 12:4 Then saith one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him,

John 12:5 Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?

See Mat 26:6-13, Mark 14:3-9, Luke 7:36-38, John 12:2-11.

"Mat 26:6-13, Mark 14:3-9": these, the Gospels state, played off "Two days before Passover". You place them six days before Passover! "Luke 7:36-38" in no manner can fit into chronological order here.)

9 Nisan/Abib (The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem)

**Sunday (Palm Sunday)**

John 12:12 On the next day much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, John 12:13 Took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord. See also Matt 21:7-9, Mark 11:8-10, Luke 19:35-38, John 12:12-16.

Mark 11:11 And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple: and when he had looked round about

upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.

Note that according to Mark, Jesus cast out the moneychangers from the temple on day after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem.

(CGE: See my schematic illustration agreeing, p. 74 of Part 1 / 1 - only I date it Nisan 10.)

10 Nisan/Abib Passover lamb selected - (Priests plot to kill Jesus)

**Monday**

On the tenth day, the Passover lamb was selected for slaughter:

Indeed! But which event would you deem was it? I reckoned Jesus' "Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem" perfectly meets all requirements - and so has the Church. "Priests plot to kill Jesus" - Mt.26:2-3, leave no doubt the Priests (finally) plotted to kill Jesus two days before Passover Preparation, but avoided to do it "on the "Feast", Mt.14:1-3 and Lk.21:37-38

Exo 12:3 Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house:

Mark 11:12 And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry:

Mark 11:13 And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not yet.

14 And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard it.

15 And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves;

16 And would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple.

17 And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves.

18 And the scribes and chief priests heard it, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, because all the people was astonished at his doctrine.

And when even was come, he went out of the city. See also - Matt 21:13, Luke 19:46

This episode you quote from Mark, happened on the fourth day before the Feast Day, on Nisan 11. Jesus left Jerusalem and went to Bethany the afternoon, "late" "opse" the day before, Nisan 10. Then "early / morning" "epaurion" Monday - Nisan 11 with sunset having begun - Jesus and his disciples "returned from Bethany (Mk.11:12). That same day still, "they came to Jerusalem", verse 15, and "when it got late" - verse 19, the same day still - they "went out of the city".

11 Nisan/Abib (Fig Tree is dead, Jesus teaches in the Temple)

### Tuesday

Mark 11:20 And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots.

... Mark 11:27 And they come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple, there came to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders,

Mark 11:28 And say unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority to do these things?

Jesus teaches in the Temple: See Mat 21:23-23:39, Mark 11:27-13:37, Luke 20:1-21:4.

Here yet another return from Bethany to Jerusalem is involved. It seems we agree! Compare Mt. 22:23 with 21:18; Mk.11:20f with verse 15f, Lk.20:1-8 with 19:45-48. This was the day just before it is said "two days before the Feast". The third day before 15 Nisan, is Nisan 12

12 Nisan/Abib (The Priests conspire to put Jesus to death.)

### Wednesday

Mark 14:1 After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death.

Mark 14:2 But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people.

The Priests conspire against Jesus - Mat 26:2-5, Mark 14:1-2, Luke 22:1-2.

"After two days was the feast of the passover": Only the one day before the Feast, "Preparation of Passover", "on which they slaughtered the Passover" lay between this day second before the Feast, and the Feast Day. So how can you make it "12 Nisan"? This should be Nisan 13.

Then how do you manage to revert to Mat 24:1? ...

... Mat 24:1 And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to show him the buildings of the temple. 2 And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. 3 And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us,

when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? Jesus retires to the Mount of Olives- Mat 24:1-51, Mark 13:1-37, Luke 21:5-38.

When Jesus "went out, and departed from the temple", and "sat upon the mount of Olives", He did not "retire" for the day. He continued his teaching. Mt.24:1f belongs with Nisan 12, the third day before the feast day - Tuesday - on which He "preached the Kingdom of heaven", all day long!

13 Nisan/Abib

### Thursday

Very obviously this day should not be left BLANK! This only is the day you have referred to way back, and that must be the second day before the Feast Day: "After two days the Passover"! This was the day of the conspiracy, spent by Jesus in Simon's house, when Mary anointed His head.

14 Nisan/Abib (The Lord's Passover, not a Sabbath) Friday (Beginning our Thursday night)

Luke 22:7 Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. Luke 22:8 And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat.

Preparation for the Passover - Mat 26:17-19, Mark 14:12-16, Luke 22:7-13.

Lev 23:5 In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover.

Correct, except for "The Lord's Passover", as pointed out above, and, for "unleavened bread", also as pointed out above. These should be: day of "the Lord's Supper", and, day of "de-leaven"....

The 14th of Nisan is to be the Lord's Passover, and it was just after sunset (the beginning of that day) that the Passover meal of unleavened bread was celebrated by Jesus with His disciples.....

... that the Lord's Supper of bread and wine was celebrated by Jesus with His disciples. Refer the later OT Passover passages: "Passover observed / kept ... fourteenth" = lamb being slaughtered on fourteenth, distinct from the day of its eating on "the fifteenth".

That would correspond to our present day Thursday evening (when using Midnight to Midnight).

That would correspond to our present Wednesday evening when using sunset to sunset. "Midnight to Midnight" in the entire Scriptures lacks.

Judas identified as the betrayer- Mat 26:21-25, Mark 14:18-21, Luke 22:21-23, John 13:21-30.

The Lord's Supper- Mat 26:26-29, Mark 14:22-25, Luke 22:14-16. Jesus retires to Gethsemane and is arrested- Mat 26:30-56, Mark 14:26-52, Luke 22:39-53, John 18:1-12.

In the morning of **Friday** (but still 14 Nisan) the trials took place, and the crucifixion began at about 9am (the third hour- Mark 15:25).

In the morning of Thursday (but still 14 Nisan).

Jesus died at the very moment the Passover lamb was to be slain at the Temple, the ninth hour (our 3pm) on the 14th of Nisan (our Friday).

"our" Thursday day.

From the moment Jesus was laid in the tomb, until sunset, the Jews reckoned to be the first day in the grave, even though it was only a few hours. ....

Which in this context is a totally meaningless remark, because we have not yet given account of the day of interment's beginning! Don't forget Mk.15:42, Mt.27:57, Lk.23:50 and Jn.19:31. Here is where the day of Jesus' 'funeral' so to speak, had begun. Jesus was NOT laid in the tomb, before sunset on Nisan 14 the day He was crucified and died, neither according to Gospel chronology, nor according to OT Passover chronology. He was buried "according to the Scriptures": "the next day", on Nisan 15 to BOTH the dating of Exodus and the dating of the later Passover Scriptures!

So, whatever "the Jews reckoned to be the first day in the grave even though it was only a few hours.", is of no concern here, but what Jesus and the Scriptures reckoned, to experience "the heart of the earth".

It is the day introduced by these texts that is absent in your analysis of the last week before Jesus' crucifixion, and the overlooking of it, and your not accounting for the second day before Passover Feast, and your again confusing Nisan 9 and 10 ... I really can't keep track of everything, that cause your count-down on the Nisan calendar to begin Friday Nisan 7 and end Friday Nisan 14!

All of this took place on what was the preparation day ....

"All of this", from "Jesus died at the very moment the Passover lamb was to be slain at the Temple, the ninth hour (our 3pm) on the 14th of Nisan (our Friday)", until "From the moment Jesus was laid in the tomb, until sunset, the Jews reckoned to be the first day in the grave, even though it was only a few hours ...." - "All of this took place on what was the preparation day ....", "the preparation day ...."

.... the preparation day not only for the 7th day Sabbath, but also for the upcoming Feast of Unleavened Bread. Note - that particular seventh day Sabbath was a "high" day ... ..

"on what was the preparation day": As I have explained above from various angles of approach, "all of this", by no means, "all" "took place on what was the preparation day", whether "the preparation day ... for the 7th day Sabbath", or "for the upcoming Feast of Unleavened Bread". Here's the reasons why not: Jesus on 14 Nisan was crucified, and died. 14 Nisan passed, and 15 Nisan began with sunset. Then Joseph went to Pilate and asked him for Jesus' body. Joseph afterwards went back to Golgotha and took the body down .... and after all the "custom of the Jews to bury" the Passover's "remains", "he laid Him in the tomb", "when day declined" - "day", the day after Nisan 14! And THIS day's "declining", Nisan 15, was "towards the Sabbath" - "the 7th day Sabbath".

It - from the Synoptists - implies this Nisan 15 Friday, was the Passover Feast Sabbath as well! John confirms the fact in so many words: "Because now "epei" the Preparation "paraskeueh" it was "ehn", (and so that "hina" the bodies should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath "en tohi sabbatohi" - because the day of that Sabbath was a Great Day (of holy Feast) "ehn gar megaleh heh hemera ekeinou tou sabbatou".

John 19:31 The Jews therefore,

Emphasis CGE: "oun" plus "epei"

because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, ...

Having just begun and prospective!

... (for \*that sabbath day was an high day\*,)

"... (for \*that sabbath day was an high day\*)" - is a parenthesis from a retrospective standpoint.

besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. ....

"... besought Pilate ...": while all still hung on the cross! THIS, was "15th of Nisan/Abib", not "A double "high" Sabbath" though, but just an ordinary, 'festal', "High Sabbath" or "Great Day" - in OT terminology, just a "Sabbath", in this case, the Passover Sabbath of Nisan 15. And this day now incurred and "was", prospective still, or, has 'ingressed' and "was", progressing now - Ingressive Aorist: "ehn" ... "ehn". Everything that happens from this moment on till the sun about twenty four hours future would set, happened on Nisan 15, the Passover Sabbath, which, in the year of our Lord's deceasing, fell on the Sixth Day of the Jewish week, our Friday. And Everything that had happened up till this

moment from the sun about twenty four hours past had set, happened on Nisan 14, on "the preparation of the Passover", which, in the year of our Lord's deceasing, fell on the Fifth Day of the Jewish week, our Thursday. Very simple, actually.

15th of Nisan/Abib (A double "high" Sabbath day) **Saturday**, which began at sunset on our Friday night. First day of the week long Festival of Unleavened Bread. ... it was a "high" Seventh day (Saturday) Sabbath because it was ALSO the 15th of Nisan/Abib, a feast day Sabbath ...

It was NOT "a "high" Seventh day (Saturday) Sabbath because it was ALSO the 15th of Nisan/Abib, a feast day Sabbath ...". I shall admit though that in such a case as where the Seventh day (Saturday) Sabbath ALSO fell on the 15th of Nisan/Abib, a feast day Sabbath, that Sabbath could also have been considered a "Great Day" or "High Sabbath". But the possibility is inconsequential as to the peculiar meaning the Friday of our Lord's interment obtained, having incurred on the very Nisan 15 Sabbath that the Passover Lamb's bodily "remains" had to be buried by Passover "ordinance".

Lev 23:6 And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.

Lev 23:7 In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein.

The Messiah rests in the tomb, ...

Here's that horrible remark again!

... observing the Sabbath day rest the entire day. ...

And augmented infinitely with pious pretensions!

This is the second day in the grave.

This is the second day in death; this is the first day in the grave of Jesus' suffering the anguish of hell.

16th of Nisan/Abib (The day of first fruits, Resurrection day) **Sunday**, which began at sunset - our Saturday night.

Not a Sabbath day in type or antitype of Jesus' resurrection from the dead, "the third day according to the Scriptures.

The resurrection takes place at some time after the beginning of the day (at sunset) but before the morning sunrise. Just exactly when after sunset the resurrection took place is uncertain, but that it happened on what we today call Sunday is really quite clear as Luke 24 showed ...

Luke 24 showed nothing of just exactly when Jesus' resurrection took place. The resurrection takes place exactly at the moment Matthew gives: "Then suddenly" "kai idou" "in the twinkling of an eye" (Paul) "according to the Scriptures", quote: "In the end of the Sabbath's, midday's turning towards the First Day of the week". It is really quite clear it happened on what we today call the 'Jewish' Sabbath, or the heathen, Saturn's Day, or the Scriptural, "Sabbath of the LORD your God", "the Seventh Day concerning (which) God spoke - in the Son ... in these last days - And God the Seventh day rested from all his works", "by the exceeding greatness of his power, when He raised Christ from the dead".

... but here is more evidence-

1 Cor 15:20 But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the Firstfruits of them that slept. So just how does this verse relate?- Lev 23:10 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the Firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest: Lev 23:11 And he shall wave the sheaf before the LORD, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. The wave sheaf represented the first fruits of the resurrection, the Messiah (1 Cor 15:20), and the day it was presented was the day AFTER the Sabbath as Lev 23:11 just proved. (The Sabbath meant here is 15 Nisan/Abib, the first day of Unleavened Bread [Lev 23:6-7]). ...

In all God-fearing humbleness I am convinced to say, Amen!

Clearly then, since the first day of Unleavened Bread coincided with the Seventh day Sabbath that year

Nisan 15, Friday, was first day of Unleavened Bread Feast.

... the resurrection of Jesus (the first fruits), happened on 16 Nisan/Abib the day AFTER the double or high Sabbath, ...

So this time I'll simply admit, Yes, just don't say "double or"!

... on the first day of the week, Sunday.

Only to emphasize: Never! It already is pagan vainglory just to call the First Day of God's creation, "The Day of the Sun" - "Sunday"; but to so force it by hook or by crook to indicate the day of Jesus' resurrection ...! Fear God, and give Him glory in the face of Jesus, for it is our only reason for being. Bring God His glory in his Truth, and let us forsake our lies and ways of lies, lies lies!

(Because it represents the resurrection, the day of Firstfruits must clearly occur on the third day after the crucifixion [14 Nisan], to fulfill scripture.)

For even more evidence that the commonly accepted chronology is correct, one must really understand the principle of type and antitype. The sequence of days to be observed for Passover was set down in scripture as the "type". This sequence was symbolic of what was to come when the crucifixion of the Lamb of God actually took place, which is the "antitype". So the type and antitype must match precisely:

14 Nisan, the Lord's Passover is the type of the **crucifixion** day. 15 Nisan, 1st day of Unleavened Bread, is the second day. (and is the type of Jesus' Interment.) 16 Nisan, Firstfruits, is a type of the **resurrection**, and the third day.

An example of Israel keeping this precise scenario is found in the book of Joshua:Josh 5:10 And the children of Israel encamped in Gilgal, and kept the passover on the fourteenth day of the month at even in the plains of Jericho. 11 And they did eat of the old corn of the land on the morrow after the passover, unleavened cakes, and parched corn in the selfsame day. 12 And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land; neither had the children of Israel manna any more; but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year.

<u>14 Nisan</u>	<u>15 Nisan</u>	<u>16 Nisan</u>
<u>Passover</u>	<u>OldCorn and Unleavened Bread Eaten</u>	<u>Manna Ceased First Fruits of Canaan Eaten</u>

Sunday and Sunday observance do not derive from the resurrection of our Lord, but from pagan and Roman catholic idolatry and is the doctrine of the False Prophet and Anti-Christ. God's Sabbath Day today is sign of the eschatological Unity and Peace of the Body that is Christ's, her Sabbaths celebrating, because by his resurrection in Him she is perfected, free and sovereign. Do not be persuaded otherwise - it will be to your loss in your rich inheritance in Christ. Peace to you, and Christ's Sabbath rest, today!

Compare with the above as we consider the following scenarios.

PROPOSED THURSDAY CRUCIFIXION - TYPE DOES NOT MATCH ANTOTYPE

<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Sunday</u>	
<u>14 Nisan</u>		<u>15 Nisan</u>		<u>16 Nisan</u>		<u>17 Nisan</u>	
<u>NIGHT</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>NIGHT</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>NIGHT</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>NIGHT</u>	<u>DAY</u>
<u>Lord's Passover</u>		<u>1st Day of Festival of Unleavened Bread A Sabbath day</u>		<u>7th day Sabbath</u>		<u>Firstfruits</u>	
<u>The Preparation Day Crucifixion and Burial before sundown</u>		<u>Rested in the tomb Roman guard set</u>		<u>Rested in the tomb Roman guard continues</u>		<u>Resurrection before sunrise Tomb discovered emptyat dawn The Third Day?? (Luke 24:21)</u>	

I don't know the above "PROPOSED THURSDAY CRUCIFIXION". I derived my 'proposition' from the Bible only.

Those who advocate a Thursday crucifixion propose that there were back-to-back Sabbaths the year of the crucifixion. This is based on an interpretation of the word "Sabbath" in the crucifixion narratives in its plural sense, which it is proposed, indicates that there were two separate and consecutive Sabbath days observed, rather than a single "high" Sabbath day. ....

I do not base 'my' proposition "on an interpretation of the word "Sabbath" in the crucifixion narratives in its plural sense". However 'my' proposition does "indicate that there were two separate and consecutive Sabbath days observed" - but not "rather than a single "high" Sabbath day". Both "back-to-back Sabbaths" were observed their normal way - "according to the Scriptures".

This proposed chronology has several problems: It says,

Firstfruits does not occur on 16 Nisan.

First Sheaf Wave Offering did occur on Nisan 16, Sabbath.

The day following the crucifixion is not a seventh-day Sabbath, but it must be, as established in Anchor Point #2 above.

"Anchor Point #2 above" has been shown in error. Why, "according to the (Passover) Scriptures", or "by ordinance", would it be a "must" the day following the crucifixion is a seventh-day Sabbath? There also is no prohibition in the Bible to an incidence of "back-to-back Sabbaths" in Passover Season - only in modern-day Judaism.

Scripture makes no direct mention of two consecutive Sabbath days in any of the Gospel narratives.

O yes, it does, if the Gospels are put alongside each other, and their several information compared, they all show it, because they all show that it happened with Jesus' crucifixion. Then in John, 19:31, it is not impossible – although also not imperative – to understand the “Sabbath” there to imply both the feast Sabbath 15 Nisan Friday and the weekly Sabbath to have been a “Great Day” Sabbath. Even Matthew's use of the plural in 28:1 the first phrase does not absolutely exclude the conclusion of two consecutive Sabbaths. It should only not be held too strictly dogmatic. In any case there is not a single of the very many factors that contradict the incidence in the year of Jesus' crucifixion of the two consecutive Sabbaths. And many and strong factors directly or / and indirectly confirm the incidence.

By Jewish reckoning (any part of a day is counted as a full day), the Thursday crucifixion theory places the resurrection on the fourth day, not on the third day.

The one of your sketch yes, and it errs. But take the Bible at its word (unashamedly) and it won't disappoint your expectancy, to find Jesus' resurrection “in Sabbath's time”, and not “after the Sabbath”.

The Jewish priesthood, at the beginning of the month, would deliberately delay the declaration of the new moon by one day in order to prevent the inconvenience of back-to-back sabbaths. They still do this to this day.

Truth is, they only in the Christian era, began to do this ... Hillel and blokes like him. Just show me one verse, one word in the Bible that indicates this practice?

#### FRIDAY CRUCIFIXION - TYPE MATCHES ANTITYPE

14 Nisan Friday - The Preparation Day		15 Nisan Saturday - 7th day Sabbath		16 Nisan Sunday	
Lord's Passover		1st Day of Festival of Unleavened Bread		The Omer - Day of Firstfruits	
NIGHT	DAY	NIGHT	DAY	NIGHT	DAY
<u>1st day unleavened bread is eaten</u>	<u>Passover Lamb slain in the evening (afternoon)</u>	<u>A High double Sabbath day</u>		<u>The Third Day! (Luke 24:21)</u>	
<u>Lord's Supper</u>	<u>Crucifixion and Burial before sundown</u>	<u>Rested in the tomb Roman guard set by end of the day</u>		<u>Resurrection before sunrise</u>	

There are innumerable flaws in this scheme; a few have been pointed out already. E.g., “1st day unleavened bread is eaten” in the night of 14 Nisan; the Lord's Supper is the Lord's “Passover”; 14 Nisan was a Friday in the relevant year, “Crucifixion and Burial before sundown”, “A High double Sabbath day”, “Rested in the tomb”, “Roman guard set by end of the day”, “16 Nisan Sunday ... The Omer - Day of Firstfruits”, Friday is “The Third Day! (Luke 24:21)”, “Resurrection before sunrise” ... In fact one will have to search for any point that is not in error!

The true points: “Passover Lamb slain in the evening (afternoon)” of Nisan 14; “14 Nisan - The Preparation Day”, but perverted to: “14 Nisan Friday - The Preparation Day”; “1st Day of Festival of Unleavened Bread” – but perverted to “Saturday - 7th day Sabbath, 1st Day of Festival of Unleavened Bread”, “16 Nisan The Omer - Day of Firstfruits”, but perverted to “16 Nisan Sunday”.

Passover - 14 Nisan, is the type of the crucifixion day and occurs before a seventh day Sabbath.

A mixture of true and false creates the worst untruth. True: “14 Nisan, is the type of the crucifixion day”; Flaw: “14 Nisan ... occurs before a seventh day Sabbath”.

The day following the crucifixion is not only a seventh day Sabbath, but also the beginning of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, 15 Nisan, making that Sabbath a “high” double Sabbath.

*I have responded to this.*

16 Nisan, the day of Firstfruits, a clear type of the resurrection day, occurs after a sabbath day, but is not itself a Sabbath day!

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
<u>14 Nisan - Friday</u>	<u>26:20 - 27:61</u>	<u>14:17 - 15:47</u>	<u>22:14 - 23:56</u>	<u>13:1 - 19:42</u>
<u>15 Nisan - Saturday</u>	<u>27:62 - 27:66</u>	<u>16:1</u>	<u>23:56</u>	-
<u>16 Nisan - Sunday</u>	<u>28:1 - 28:15</u>	<u>16:1 - 16:13</u>	<u>24:1 - 24:53</u>	<u>20:1 - 20:23</u>

“16 Nisan ... occurs after a sabbath day” – This may be the case, but not necessarily or always or of any importance!

“14 Nisan” is not “Friday”.

First notice 14 Nisan actually had started earlier – Mt.26:17; Mk.14:12, Lk.22:7 = Jn.13:1!

Now to proof 14 Nisan was not Friday:

Before Mt.27:61, Mk.15:47, Lk.23:56 and Jn.19:42 came:  
Mt.27:57, Mk.15:42, Lk.23:50 and Jn.19:31

Other flaws and discrepancies:



15 Nisan was not Saturday, but Friday;  
 Mark 16:1 was not Saturday, but Sunday;  
 Lk.23:56a still was the Friday, not Saturday.  
 16 Nisan was not Sunday, but the Sabbath;  
 Mt.28:1 and to verse 4, was not Sunday, **but** the Sabbath;  
 Lk.23:53 was not Sunday – Sunday is a blatant lie;  
 Jn.20:1 to 18 was Sunday; any further has nothing to do with

Sunday except the stepping off remark in verse 19, “Then being evening, and the doors where the disciples for fear of the Jews were locked, with that day the First Day of the week (still fresh in mind), came Jesus...”. I present you these words; imprint them in your mind, for this is what the Word of God says, and not its corruptors. My CONCLUSION will be John 20:19 ... but with my apologies, this adaptation of yours:

The only chronology reconcilable with The Scriptures on all points is the Thursday crucifixion and Sabbath resurrection. It is the only scenario in which the typical festival days and their fulfilment match exactly, without a single discrepancy!

I came across an ‘open letter to Samuele Bacchiocchi’ on internet, **‘When Christ Died, and Rose, A Simple, Biblical, Proof by R.F., Bob Cronin’, wherein Cronin “add(ed) some comments ... concerning your (Prof. Bacchiocchi’s) book, ‘The Time of the Crucifixion & the Resurrection’,**

This was his conclusion:

*“Of your books that I have read thus far I have to say bluntly, this was the worst. It has the weakest, most incomplete and overall shortsighted arguments. The multitude of poor arguments made me angry throughout the book ...”.*

**A note before:** (This is how the ‘Jewish’ Sabbath and all Sabbath Days became the only ‘Christian’ Sabbath – “The Lord’s Day”!)

**One,** That seven days, inclusively the **tenth** day to the **sixteenth** day, are lifted out from “the month of Abib”, which, it is written, “you should observe”. These days are divided into two groups of days, of which the second group constitutes “the three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – namely, 14, 15 and 16 Abib / Nisan. The days in and of **this, last** Passover-“**seven days**” (last Passover of those that were **unfixed** and that before the Fulfiller and Fulfilment of the Passover our Lord Himself had come, **floated** through the weekly cycle of days), these **“seven days”, fixed** upon the corresponding days of **this, first** of all Christian ‘weeks’ of “**Sabbaths**”, so that the seventh “**day**” of **all** Passover Seasons –**The-Day-of-the-First-Sheaf’s-Wave-Offering**–, come to rest on the Seventh Day of the creation-week –“**The Seventh** Day concerning which God thus had spoken, And God the Seventh Day rested from all His works”. **Thereby** the Passover-“Great-Day-Sabbath” and “Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath”, in handing in and in giving over to **The-Day-of-the-First-Sheaf’s-Wave-Offering** (“the day after the (Passover)-Sabbath”), this instance, hands in and gives over to “**The-Sabbath-of-the-LORD-Your-God**”.

Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering and Creation-Sabbath, become one, and Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead “in Sabbath’s-time”, **is**, Lord indeed of the Sabbath”.

**Two,** That the three concluding and determinative days of this last week of the old dispensation and first of the new dispensation, are carefully marked and identified unmistakably at the start, at the end, as well as at the middle of each. (At the heart, that is.)

### **Buried On Same Day Before Sunset?**

#### **Women Prepared Spices at the End, while Men at Days' Beginning.**

Why would nobody have had preparations ready before Jesus would be buried? Because nobody, not even Joseph, knew He would be buried. Yet Joseph, just after he had taken the body down and away to prepare, bought linen, and Nicodemus later on brought spices to prepare the body, all before the actual interment. Then after the body had been laid and the tomb had been closed, the two Marys without interruption, went to prepare spices and ointments on the very same day still and before it would be over. If for burial the women 'prepared' or 'bought' spices, Joseph and Nicodemus had to have done their part, after the women, and the women their business, before the men. But we find it the other way round. It will not help to prolong the duration of the concept, 'evening' – the only explanation is, Jesus was buried on the day after the day He was crucified and died on.

#### **Cronin:**

**Note:** The buying and preparing of the spices and oils by the women occurred ***between two Sabbaths***. Therefore, these two Sabbaths could not have been concurrent, as is popularly believed. And, as John 19:31 explains, the first Sabbath, the one immediately after Jesus' death, was a High Day, that is, an annual Holy Day, the First Day of Unleavened Bread, not the weekly Sabbath.

"The buying and preparing..." – Wrong! "The buying and preparing occurred *between two Sabbaths*..." – Wrong! The **preparing** occurred immediately after the interment **on** the **first** of the two consecutive 'sabbaths', **on** the Passover's 'Great Day'-sabbath, in its closing hours before sunset **before the weekly Sabbath**. And 'the **buying** occurred', **after the second** 'sabbath', **after** "*the Sabbath according to the commandment*", **after** it "*had gone through*" – so that the women "**bought**" spices, on the First Day of the week in fact— **not to be confused** with their 'preparations' on Friday afternoon. "Therefore, these two Sabbaths could not have been concurrent, as is popularly believed", **nor** could they have been **separated** by another 'ordinary' day between them, as you would have liked it popularly believed. Yet it was on precisely this 'intermediate' day of your imagining which in actual fact **was** the Passover's sabbath-day, that Joseph and Nicodemus did their undertaking— according to your reasoning then, **after the women**— while in fact the women did their preparations **after the men!**

**Only** the '**preparing**' of the spices and oils by the **two** Marys 'occurred', well **on** "*(Friday) afternoon / while* the (weekly) sabbath drew on" well on Passover-sabbath of that Friday. And **only** the '**buying**' (for Salome's sake) – "occurred", "**after the Sabbath**". The "*buying*" of the spices by **three** women, was "*after the Sabbath*" or "**when the Sabbath was past**"— nothing of the sort "occurred" on any day in "**between two Sabbaths**"! The "*two Sabbaths*" were: Friday '*Passover-sabbath*'; and Saturday '*weekly Sabbath*', Nisan 15 and Nisan 16. Crucifixion was on "*The Preparation of the Passover*", Nisan 14, Thursday.

#### **Cronin:**

Then "***they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment***" (Luke 23:56).

**No** women or men **after the crucifixion and before sunset** prepared or bought spices or ointments. **No women before or for the burial**, prepared or bought spices or ointments. **Nobody ever expected a burial!** The two Marys on Friday afternoon **after the burial** "*prepared*"; and they and Salome on Saturday evening **after the burial**, "*went to buy*" spices and ointments, so that they "*on the Sabbath day according to the commandment*", the Fourth Commandment, first "*rested*". The way you emphasised, the women both '*returned and prepared spices and ointments and rested, on the Sabbath day according to the commandment*', as if '*the commandment*', were a 'ceremonial commandment'. But they rather '*returned and prepared spices and ointments*' after they had seen the tomb closed; then, "*rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment*".

All and any preparations or buying of spices or ointments **before or for the burial**, were made by **men, before** "*the Sabbath according to the Commandment*" but **after** "*it had become evening*" — therefore, were made during **Thursday night** on "*the Day of Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath*"-Friday. Any and all preparations or buying of spices or ointments for the burial were made during about six hours or longer **after the crucifixion** and **only after Joseph** had begun with the customary preparations for burial, about fifteen to twenty hours **before** he **closed** the grave "*And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on*"!

The women on Friday afternoon **after the burial** "*went home*" – to Jerusalem like in every time Luke uses the word "*to return*" –

*hupostréphoh*, Lk23:54-56. The women's was a returning to prepare. Theirs then was no returning after a **purchase** of ointments and spices, because this was "*(Friday) afternoon*", not Saturday evening "**when the Sabbath was past**", Mk16:2, and the women "*went and bought spices*". This was their second 'returning' – their first was after the crucifixion the day before. (Lk23:56 cf. 48c) "***They prepared spices and ointments***" directly **after** the two Marys had "*looked on how the body was laid*". Then, "*the Sabbath approached*", and they after they had done to prepare, "*began to rest the Sabbath*", the 'Sabbath' in both 54 and 56. The "*preparation*" of spices by the **two** Marys therefore was on Friday afternoon **after** the burial and "***before the Sabbath***" '*epéfohsken sabbaton*'. The "***buying***" of the spices by **three** women, was "***after the Sabbath***" (Mk16:1a) – **more** than 24 hours later. **Both** the after the burial "*preparation*" and after the burial "*buying*", were meant for application at the first possible opportunity **after the Sabbath**, which the women must have realised because of the **Roman guard**, would present itself after midnight of Saturday night when the Roman day and watch would have ended. Therefore, "*deepest morning ('orthrou bathoohs') came the women bringing their spices ...*", Lk24:1.

#### Cronin:

"When evening<sup>2</sup> had come..." Joseph of Arimathea walked ... to Pilate ... to ask of him the body of Jesus" ... "Note the use and application of the term "evening." Clearly, evening was before sunset and must have been considerably longer than just an hour and twenty minutes before sunset. (Underlining CGE) Joseph had time enough to do all these things and still finish **before** sunset. Since the Passover could not be sacrificed until "***between the two evenings***," and according to some, that must be between 3:00 in the afternoon and sunset, but others consider it to be between sunset and dark, this scripture is evidence that it is the former definition that is the Biblically accepted meaning of the term.

Since the Passover had to be sacrificed "*between the PAIR OF NIGHTS*" – that of the 14<sup>th</sup> Nisan ending and that of the 15<sup>th</sup> Nisan beginning – Jesus was crucified 9 am and died 3:00 in the afternoon. Then after sunset, between sunset and dark, this Scripture (Mk.15:42 / Mt.27:57) is evidence that after sunset is the definition that is the Biblically accepted meaning of the term. Mk.15:42 / Mt.27:57 has no relevancy to the time of the sacrifice of

the Passover – it simply gives the time when Joseph began undertaking.

Evening was **after** sunset and Joseph must have had time considerably longer than just an hour and twenty minutes. He had enough time to do all these things; in fact, he had until the following day about 3 p.m., well 'before sunset'. Mk15:42 and Mt27:57 have no 'between', nor "***two evenings***", but '*opsia*', singular. So does any day have one undividable evening, always from sunset until dark, which when Joseph appeared on the scene, had already begun. 'Evening', even 'considered to be between sunset and dark', is still 'evening' **after sunset**, not "before sunset". To make Joseph and the women start after 3 pm, "do all these things", "*go home and prepare spices*", "and still finish **before** sunset" or forty minutes later, is not even comical. The Greek word here used, *opsia*, without exception means the early part of night after sunset before deep night (6 to 7.30 maybe 8 pm)— fifteen times without exception in the NT! Mark and Matthew say "*evening already had begun*" and that "*it was the Preparation*". Mark says "*the Preparation which is the Fore-sabbath*", that is to say, Friday. John says Joseph did so "*after these things*", 19:38, referring to "*The Jews (who) therefore because it was the Preparation (now), that the bodies should not on the sabbath day remain upon the cross because that sabbath would be a great day— asked Pilate to have the legs of the crucified broken.*" Jn19:31. The Sixth Day was beginning; it was after sunset at night now, and the "*great day*" of **Passover-**" *sabbath*", **prospective**. Cronin's theory of a day in between the burial and resurrection of Jesus, ignoring about every mentioned fact of the Gospels, presumes Jesus was crucified as well as buried before this 'sabbath', and was resurrected on the day after it. We maintain in contrast, Jesus was crucified **before** the 'Great Day'-sabbath **of Passover**, was interred, **on** it, and rose from the dead, **after** it, "***On the (weekly) Sabbath Day***".

*'It was a Great Day the day of that sabbath', 'ehn megáleh heh hehméra ekéinou tou sabbátou*. 'The Great Day-sabbath' was so called because **it was the Passover-sabbath of Nisan 15**, not because it concurred with the weekly Sabbath. It without a day in between, preceded the weekly Sabbath. In other words, Friday was Nisan 15 in the year of the crucifixion, not Nisan 14, because on Nisan **14** the Passover-sacrifice was **slaughtered**, and the next day of Nisan **15**, was **eaten and its remains returned** to the earth. Now Jesus on this '***Great Day-sabbath***' was **buried**— on the very "*Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath*"; "*There laid they Jesus because*

of the Jews' Preparation"— 'The Preparation Day' of and for the weekly Sabbath.

**Cronin:**

"When evening had come..." Joseph of Arimathea walked from Golgotha to Pilate (presumably at the Praetorium) to ask of him the body of Jesus (Matt 27:57-58, Mark 15:42-43, Luke 23:50-52, John 19:38).

Incorrect! "walked from Golgotha"— Nobody remained at Golgotha; "everybody returned", says Luke. We don't know from where "Joseph came".

**Cronin:**

Pilate investigated the death of Jesus, to find "if he had been dead for some time" (Mark 15:44), and granted Joseph his request (Matt 27:58, Mark 15:45, John 19:38. Joseph went to buy "fine linen" — presumably in Jerusalem (Mark 15:46).

For the exact order of Joseph's actions – he first took the body down, and then removed it from the place of the crucifixion to the place he could "treat the body", and then only, must have gone out to buy the linen. The implication is, Joseph did **not immediately** and at the cross, prepare or bury the body of Jesus.

**Cronin:**

He then walked back to Golgotha to retrieve the body.

Joseph then walked back to the place he had taken the body to for safekeeping and preparation – probably where he stayed for the Passover; it isn't recorded; we correctly may assume it.

**Cronin:**

He and Nicodemus (John 19:39) "Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen cloths with the spices..." (John 19:40, Matt 27:59), "and laid it in his [Joseph's] own new tomb" (Matt 27:60, Mark 15:46, Luke 23:53, John 19:39-42).

Here you put together two events that in fact had been **separated** by quite a few hours and the going under of the sun! Although the text in Mark and Matthew mentions different things in one breath, it does not mean they happened simultaneously. John *e.g.*, mentions Nicodemus' arrival at the scene of Joseph's preparation of the body some good part of the night **after** Joseph's initial request for and removal of the body. The preparation was properly done "according to the Jewish usage", and must have taken Joseph – and later on also

Nicodemus – the whole night! This brings us to the two things I say you should have separated instead of have put together: They are: "... (they) wound it in linen cloths with the spices...", and "... laid it in his [Joseph's] tomb". Most part of night, and good deal of day, separated Joseph's first **initiatives** and the **finishing** of his undertaking.

**Cronin:**

"And that day was the preparation, and **the sabbath drew on**" (Luke 23:54, John 19:42).

Here we have the last word on Jesus' **burial**, "as the sun ("light" – *fohs*) was sinking towards (the west), **the Sabbath approaching** – *epéfohsken sábbaton*— not of his **death**. The **weekly** Sabbath approached. **You in the wrong place make it the 'Great Day'-sabbath of Passover that was prospective**; you confuse Mk15:42 and Mt27:57 for this place, Lk23:53-56. But see Lk23:48-49 which you have **overlooked!** In Lk23:53-56 it is the immediate day before "the Sabbath according to the Commandment" – the weekly Sabbath, that was **running out**. You seem to have forgotten that you yourself have shown how **on the day before, after** the crucifixion and **after** "the evening had come", Joseph only had **begun** his undertaking, so that, by the time he – **the next day** – had **finished**, "it was the preparation, and / while the sabbath drew on"— "that day", **had** been, the **burial**; which implies, **crucifixion** had had happened the day **before**, and was, the **Thursday**.

**Cronin:**

"And the women also, which came with Him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre and how his body was laid" (Luke 23:55, Matt 27:61, Mark 15:47).

This happened just before your point "And that day was the preparation, and **the sabbath drew on**" (Luke 23:54, John 19:42)." The women followed in the procession to the grave. They must have joined with Joseph and Nicodemus during the course of Friday morning. Four people only – the Scriptures **mention** them only – "beheld how his body was laid". **Only** these knew of the interment – nobody else – no disciple besides these, and no Jew or Roman.

**Cronin:**

"And that day was the preparation, and **the sabbath drew on**".

... referring to the **burial**, not the crucifixion. The women after the burial and after sundown, "**began to rest the Sabbath**" the whole

Sabbath's rest (Ingressive Aorist). On Sabbath morning, the Jews came to know of Jesus' burial— all their plans thwarted, and asked Pilate to have the grave sealed and guarded "for the third day", Mt27:62-66.

**Cronin:**

*"And **when the Sabbath was past**, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Solome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him"* (Mark 16:1).

*"(H)ad bought"* is old English for the ordinary past tense. The Greek simply states the fact: "When the Sabbath was past, the three women "bought *sweet spices*". This time there are three women – Salome who was absent from the burial has now joined the two Marys. The buying of spices most probably was for the sake of her who did not know about the burial.

*"(T)hat they might come and anoint him"* has a future, tentative connotation. They "bought when the Sabbath had passed" – that is, they bought during the evening of after-sunset, 'Saturday'-night. But they could not immediately go and anoint Him. Why not? Because according to the **Roman** reckoning of time the **guard's watch** would last till midnight. Only after midnight would any disciples of Jesus again be allowed to approach the grave. Mk16:2 gives a time of a **later actualised visit** of the women to the grave when it was "very early sunrise" – *lían prohí anatéilantos tou hehlíou* – **by far not** the time of their **buying** the spices just after sunset.

**Cronin:**

*As John 19:31 explains, the first Sabbath, the one immediately after Jesus' death, was a High Day, that is, an annual Holy Day, the First Day of Unleavened Bread, not the weekly Sabbath.*

Rather, as John 19:31 explains, the first of the two Sabbaths was the one on which Joseph **would bury** Jesus, and was a High Day, that is, an annual Holy Day, the First Day of Unleavened Bread, not the weekly Sabbath. It was **pending** because it had just **begun**. The Passover Institution had the "remains" of the Passover lambs returned to dust and earth on the Feast Sabbath that **followed** "the day when they always slaughtered the Passover". Ex12:10. When Jesus was crucified our Passover and Lamb of God, His body was sealed in the earth on the Passover Feast's Sabbath Day – "a Great Day that day was", John says. "That day" was what we call, Friday, and "the Sabbath approaching" was "the Sabbath according to the (Ten) Command-ment(s)"— the **second** and consecutive Sabbath during

that Passover Feast. "They could not have been concurrent", but also were not separated by a day in between them.

**Cronin:**

*"Now late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre."* (Matt 28:1<sup>3</sup>, Luke 24:1, Mark 16:2, John 20:1)

There are two crucial mistakes in this 'translation' of the text. "Dawn" from 'epífohskóusehí' should be "afternoon" – **like in Lk.23:56** where "the Sabbath approached"-'epéfohskén sábbaton' on Friday afternoon; and 'came' should be "went to look", "éhlthen theohréhsai". Because of the guard the women's **intention** "to go have a look at the grave" was frustrated; and the occurrence of the **earthquake** made impossible the occurrence of their intended visit. Also from the reports of the women's **realised** visits to the grave on Sunday morning is it clear they had not actually visited the grave before **then**.

**Cronin:**

*The women could not have bought the spices after the sun set on "Saturday" because:*

- *If there had been any businesses open on the Sabbath (unlikely, because the Jews were strict in not allowing such at that time) they would have closed for the day before dark; and,*
- *It is highly unlikely that any businesses would have opened after sunset.*

'Businesses ... unlikely', but for any who "have need against Passover"— see Jn13:29. Here it was Joseph and Nicodemus "after it had become evening ...", even "night", "in need against Passover" for the interment of the Lamb of God's Passover. And the women before sunset on this very 'Great Day' "the Sabbath approaching", "in need against Passover" indeed 'preparing' for the embalment of the Lamb of God's Passover "after the Sabbath had gone through"! These were no 'foolish virgins' who before midnight bought their oil, but faithful followers "in need against Passover" "nothing left remaining ... with loins girded, shoes on, and staff in hand ... this night ... the LORD's Passover" **observing**.

### Summary

1. "The ninth hour..." (3 p.m.) Jesus died. Matt 27:46-50, Mark 15:34-37, Luke 23:44-46, John 19:28-30).
2. "When evening had come..." (6 p.m.) Joseph of Arimathea walked to Pilate to ask of him the body of Jesus (Matt 27:57-58, Mark 15:42-43, Luke 23:50-52, John 19:38).
3. Pilate investigated the death of Jesus, to find "if he had been dead for some time" (Mark 15:44), and granted Joseph his request (Matt 27:58, Mark 15:45, John 19:38).
4. Joseph then walked back to Golgotha and took the body down and away.
5. He then went to buy "fine linen" (Mark 15:46).
6. He and Nicodemus (John 19:39) "Then treated the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen cloths with the spices..." (John 19:40, Matt 27:59),
7. "And the women also, who came with Him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre and how his body was laid" (Luke 23:55, Matt 27:61, Mark 15:47). "and (they) laid it in his [Joseph's] own new tomb" (Matt 27:60, Mark 15:46, Luke 23:53, John 19:39-42).
8. Then "they returned, and prepared spices and ointments..." (Luke 23:56).
8. "And (retrospectively) that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath (now) drew on" (Luke 23:54, John 19:42).
9. "They (the women) started to rest the Sabbath Day according to the commandment."
10. "Late on the Sabbath Day, after the noon, before the First Day of the week, (when) went Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to look at the grave, and suddenly there was an earthquake ..." Mt.28:1
11. "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Solome, bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him (Mark 16:1)."

Christ entered hell and tasted death, from "the table", through Gethsémané and onward, and died and was dead while on the cross for the last three hours of the Preparation day "of the Passover", and for the entirety of the first High Day Sabbath 'the intervening day' Friday, the second day of the Passover Season, was dead and buried all but the last three hours of the last weekly Sabbath, Saturday, "the third day according to the Scriptures" — exactly three days and three nights, just as scripture declares (Mt 16:21, 17:23, 20:19, 27:64, Mr 9:31, 10:34, Lu 9:22, 18:33, 24:7, 21, 46, Ac 10:40, I Cor 15:4). There is no finagling needed (redefining what a day and night is) to get Scripture to agree with some preconceived and errant doctrine.

### Cronin:

It is also noteworthy that A. T. Robertson, in *A Harmony of the Gospels*, declares that the women visited the tomb at dusk\* at the end of the Sabbath (sunset on Saturday)\*, not at dawn on the first day of the week (Sunday) as is popularly believed. ... (meaningless omitted.)

\*\*\* 'at' – before or after sunset? Robertson does not say these things! Cronin obviously means to say 'ascended' – not, 'risen'. Jesus was the First Sheaf through resurrection from the dead waved before the Lord and "exalted to the right hand of the power of God in heavenly places" right there on the soil of Calvary's hill "in (earthly) Sabbath's time" (Mt.28:1)! (Ro.1:4, 14:9, Eph.1:19f, Col.2:12, 15, Phil.2:8-9, 3:10a)

### Cronin:

After having risen from the dead (GE: on the "afternoon of the Sabbath" - *opse sabbátohn epifohskóuseh*), what was he doing all night long while waiting for the disciples to discover him alive at the tomb? However, if it had only been a few minutes since his resurrection to when the women discovered the empty tomb (as is suggested by Matt 28:1-15 and Mark 16:1-4), there is no interval to question.

There is NO "interval to question" in Matt 28:1-15 or Mark 16:1-4, and it had NOT been "only a few minutes since his resurrection to when the women discovered the empty tomb". Since his resurrection to when the women discovered the empty tomb was as many hours as between 3 pm to after 12 pm on Saturday night when "on the First Day of the week" in "deep darkness" (Lk.24:1) the women "came, bringing the spices" to anoint the body. Only Mary had an earlier glimpse of the rolled away stone "when it was still early darkness" (Jn.20:1) of that same night.

Jesus Christ, our Passover lamb, was **sacrificed** and died at the time of the **Passover** sacrifice of the lambs in the **afternoon** at the end of the **14th** of Abib (Nisan) — which occurred on a **Thursday** (in 30 AD), the year of his crucifixion. He was finally "laid" in the sepulchre in the **afternoon before** sunset the **next** day, and he

experienced death and was in "the heart of the earth" for ... **three days and three nights**, as he had said He would, until he rose from the dead and his grave in the **afternoon** long before sunset on that week's Sabbath — NOT on Sunday morning, as some teach.

**Cronin:**

**Footnotes:**

Translation from **A.T. Robertson's** *A Harmony of the Gospels*, **Harper San Francisco**, p. 239 — He footnotes this verse (Matt 28:1) with: "This phrase once gave much trouble, but the usage of the vernacular *Koine* Greek amply justifies the translation. *The visit of the women to inspect the tomb was thus made before the Sabbath was over* ... (before 6 p.m. on Saturday). But the same Greek idiom was occasionally (GE: two centuries later!) used in the sense of after.' Robertson goes on to say that the women likely bought the spices after sunset. But this is contradictory. (GE: It is no contradiction) Robertson orders Matt 28:1 the time the women visited the sepulchre (GE: They did not 'visit' — they "*set off to go have a look*", but obviously they did not execute what they intended to do.) at the end of the Sabbath, **before** Mark 16:1 (the buying of the spices and oils, after the Sabbath), in effect, saying that the women went to the sepulchre **with the spices and oils** --- **Cronin saying, not Robertson**. This also is not what Matthew or Mark says; Luke says it — one of those "certain details included in one account that are not in another"! So they "*the earliest morning*" — Luke, went to the sepulchre WITH the spices which the Marys the Friday afternoon already had prepared, as well as WITH those they had "*bought ... when the Sabbath was over / through*".

**Cronin:**

*This ... shows that there is (GE: all the) evidence that Jesus did not die on a Friday night and rise on a Sunday morning ... and that translators are subject to bending scripture toward their preconceived beliefs over the truth.*

Cronin not only perverts the Scriptures; he also perverts Robertson's words and thoughts.

**To Cronin, Re: Prof. Samuele Bacchiocchi, cc Bacchiocchi,**

Dear Mr. Cronin,  
I have read your open letter to Prof. S. Bacchiocchi. I would like to know how he reacted to it - if at all! My experience is that the

professor has one answer only to critique - rudeness!

I wrote a lot in response to his writings in 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace'. You can offload the nine books - free of charge from <http://www.biblestudents.co.za>, [www.biblestudents.co.za](http://www.biblestudents.co.za).

I agree on a few points with you. I believe though a Thursday crucifixion - Sabbath resurrection. And I do hold to the "three days and three nights" for real. I shall send you an overview of your letter DV soon. Now just one thing: It is not true "Jesus declared the "three days and three nights" so OFTEN ...". The expression appears only once in Mt12:40 as you know. "The importance of it could not be ignored" exactly for its exceptional use!

In any case, bravo for your confronting the stubborn idiocy of the traditional interpretation of the Passover of our Lord and of the translations of the relevant Scriptures. Here's the real trouble with Bacchiocchi - he is committed to the traditional TRANSLATIONS and owes it to the Pope to be the defender of his perversions. I'm sending a copy of this letter to the professor.

**Prof Bacchiocchi replied (surprisingly polite!):**

*Dear Gerhard:*

*Rest assured that I am defending the Pope. [Sic.] The truth is that my research show how the Pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday. Note that the Vatican has tried to remove FROM SABBATH TO SUNDAY from circulation, but I bought the copyright before the trouble developed.*

*Please read the chapter below and note the various uses of the phrase "three days and three nights."*

*Is the "Good Friday, Easter Sunday" tradition a fact or a fable? Few Christian churches believe that this tradition is truly a fable devoid of Biblical support. This belief rests first of all on the interpretation of the so-called "sign of Jonah." In response to a request for a sign by some doubting scribes and Pharisees, Christ made a startling statement: "An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign; but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt 12:39-40).*

**I. THE DURATION OF THE ENTOMBMENT**

*What is the sign of Jonah that Christ gave to His unbelieving generation as a proof of His Messiahship? Wednesday Crucifixionists firmly believe that the sign consisted not simply of the resurrection which Christ, like Jonah, would experience after a temporary burial, but primarily of the exact period of 72-hour entombment in the heart of the earth.*

*An Exact Length of Time. This conviction is emphatically expressed, for example, in the booklet The Resurrection Was Not on Sunday, published by the Department of Theology of Ambassador College: "Jesus offered but one evidence [of His*

Messiahship]. That evidence was not the fact of the resurrection itself. It was the length of time He would repose in His grave, before being resurrected."<sup>1</sup> The implication of this contention is clearly stated in the next paragraph which reads: "Jesus staked His claim to being your Savior and mine upon remaining exactly three days and three nights in the tomb. If He remained just three days and three nights inside the earth, He would prove Himself the Savior-if He failed in this sign, He must be rejected as an impostor."<sup>2</sup>

**72-Hour Entombment.** Statements such as the ones just quoted clearly reveal the fundamental importance attached to a 72-hour duration of Christ's entombment. This conviction rests on the assumption that when "days and nights" are explicitly mentioned in the Bible, they represent literal 24 hour days. Appeal is made to the creation week where each day consists of "evening and morning" that is, of a day and a night. The designation of each creation day as "evening and morning" is seen as "the only Bible definition which explains and counts up the amount of time involved in the expression 'the third day.' It includes three dark periods called 'night' and three light periods called 'day'-three days and three nights, and Jesus said they contained twelve hours for each period [John 11:9-10]-a total of 72 hours."<sup>3</sup>

## II. THE SIGN OF THE RESURRECTION

The interpretation which views the sign of Jonah as being primarily an exact 72-hour period of Christ's entombment is discredited by three major reasons. These, as we shall now show, indicate that the sign of Jonah consisted not in a 72-hour entombment but in the miracle of the Resurrection.

**Absence of Time Reference.** The first significant reason is the absence of any time reference in the other two passages mentioning the sign of Jonah (Matt 16:4; Luke 11:29-32). In Luke 11:29-30 Jesus says: "This generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of man be to this generation." Note should be taken of the fact that in Luke there is no reference to the length of time Jonah survived in the whale's belly. If the sign of Jonah consisted of the time factor, Luke could hardly have ignored it. The comparison in Luke between Jonah and Christ is not in terms of identical duration of entombment, but of similar miraculous Resurrections: "as Jonah . . . so will the Son of man be."

The book of **Jonah** suggests that Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites through the miraculous way in which God raised Jonah out of the whale's belly and cast him alive on shore. This experience gave Jonah the compulsion to preach, and the Ninevites the conviction to repent. In the same way as God's rescue of Jonah revealed Jonah's prophetic mandate which led many Ninevites to repent, so Christ's Resurrection would reveal His Messiahship which would lead many to believe.

The vast majority of **commentaries** consulted agree in viewing the sign of Jonah as being primarily the sign of Christ's Resurrection. Norval Geldenhuis, for example, writes in *The New International Commentary on The Gospel of Luke*: "Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, because he appeared there as one sent by God after having been miraculously saved from the great fish (as it were raised from the dead) as a proof that he was really sent by God. So also Jesus will by His resurrection prove conclusively that He has been sent by God as the Christ, the promised Redeemer."<sup>4</sup>

**A Parallel Example.** A second significant reason is found in the similar passage of John 2:19 where in response to the same request by the Jews for a sign Jesus replied:

"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." In this statement Christ makes His Resurrection the unmistakable sign of His Messiahship. By virtue of the parallelism between this text and Matthew 12:40 (in both places a sign is asked for and given), it seems legitimate to conclude that the sign of Jonah is essentially the same in both places, namely, the sign of the Resurrection, which is implicit in the first text and explicit in the second.

**The Testimony of the Catacombs.** A third reason is provided by the early Christians' pictorial representation of the sign of Jonah. In numerous frescos of the catacombs, Christ's Resurrection is symbolically represented as Jonah being spewed out by the whale. In fact, the scene of Jonah (known as "Jonah's cycle" because it consists of different scenes) is perhaps the most common symbolic representation of Christ's Resurrection.

The **catacombs** indicate, then, that the early Christians identified the sign of Jonah with the event of the Resurrection and view when he writes that Christ was "designated Son of God in power . . . by his resurrection from the dead" (Rom 1:4). In the light of the above considerations we conclude that the sign of Jonah given by Christ as a proof of His Messiahship consists primarily in His future Resurrection and not in an exact 72-hour entombment. Christ's Resurrection was the unmistakable vindication of His Messiahship, of which the emergence of Jonah from what was a temporary living burial was in some sense a foreshadowing.

## III. INCLUSIVE RECKONING

The literal interpretation of the phrase "three days and three nights" as representing an exact period of 72 hours ignores the abundant Biblical and Rabbinical evidence on the idiomatic use of the phrase "a day and a night," to refer not to an exact number of hours or of minutes, but simply to a calendrical day, whether complete or incomplete. Matthew, for example, writes that Jesus "fasted forty days and forty nights" in the wilderness (Matt 4:2). The same period is given in Mark 1:13 and Luke 4:2 as "forty days," which does not necessarily require forty complete 24 hour days.<sup>5</sup> It is important to note that in Biblical times a fraction of a day or of a night was reckoned inclusively as representing the whole day or night. This method of reckoning is known as "inclusive reckoning." A few examples from the Bible and from Rabbinic literature will suffice to demonstrate its usage.

**An Abandoned Egyptian.** 1 Samuel 30:12 speaks of an abandoned Egyptian servant who "had not eaten bread or drunk water for three days and three nights." The idiomatic usage of this expression is shown by the following verse, where the servant states that his master had left him behind "three days ago" (v. 13). If the "three days and three nights" were meant to be taken literally, then the servant should have said that he had been left behind four days before.

**Esther's Visit to the King.** Another explicit example of inclusive day reckoning is found in the story of Esther's visit to the king. When Queen Esther was informed by Mordecai about the plan to exterminate the Jews, she sent this message to him: "Go, gather all the Jews to be found in Susa, and hold a fast on my behalf, and neither eat nor drink for three days, night or day. I and my maids will also fast as you do. Then I will go to the King" (Esther 4:16). If Esther intended the three days and three nights to be taken literally as a 72-hour period of fasting, then she should have presented



herself before the King on the fourth day. However, we are told a few verses later that Esther went before the king "on the third day" (Esther 5:1). Examples such as these clearly show that the expression "three days and three nights" is used in the Scriptures idiomatically to indicate not three complete 24-hour days, but three calendric days of which the first and the third could have consisted of only a fraction of a day.<sup>6</sup>

**Rabbinical Literature.** Explicit examples for inclusive day reckoning are also found in Rabbinic literature. Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah, who lived about A.D. 100, stated: "A day and a night are an Onah [a portion of time] and the portion of an Onah is as the whole of it."<sup>7</sup> There are other instances in Rabbinic literature where the "three days and three nights" of Jonah 1:17 are combined with Old Testament passages which mention events that took place "on the third day."<sup>8</sup> "It is in this light," writes Gerhard Dilling in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, "that we are to understand Matthew 12:40."<sup>9</sup>

**Jewish Practice.** The practice of inclusive day reckoning, according to The Jewish Encyclopedia, a standard Jewish reference work, is still in vogue among the Jews today. "In Jewish communal life part of a day is at times reckoned as one day; e.g., the day of the funeral, even when the latter takes place late in the afternoon, is counted as the first of the seven days of mourning; a short time in the morning of the seventh day is counted as the seventh day; circumcision takes place on the eighth day, even though on the first day only a few minutes remained after the birth of the child, these being counted as one day."<sup>10</sup>

The examples cited above clearly indicate that in Biblical times the expression "a day and a night" simply meant a day, whether complete or incomplete. Thus, in the light of the prevailing usage, the expression "three days and three nights" of Matthew 12:40 does not require that Jesus be entombed for 72 hours, but for a full day and two partial days.

#### IV. ON THE THIRD DAY

A conclusive confirmation of the Biblical method of inclusive day reckoning is provided by the two most common Greek phrases used in the Gospels to describe the time between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, namely, *te trite hemera* and *meta treis hemeras*, which can be literally translated as on the third day and after three days, respectively. The latter phrase, which is used four times in the Gospels (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34; Matt 27:63), if taken in isolation would confirm the literal interpretation of "three days and three nights" (Matt 12:40), since the latter requires the Resurrection to take place after three whole days from the time of the Crucifixion.

**A Parallel Usage.** This interpretation, however, is discredited by the fact that the very same statement of Christ which contains the phrase "after three days" in one Gospel, is reported in another Gospel with the phrase "on the third day." To clarify this point, in the following table we shall set out the occurrences of these two phrases in the parallel passages of the Synoptic Gospels:

Mark 8:31 Matthew 16:31 Luke 9:22 "after three "on the third "on the third days rise again" day be raised" day be raised'

Mark 9:31 Matthew 17:23 "after three days "he will be raised he will rise" on the third day"

Mark 10:34 Matthew 20:19 Luke 18:33 "after three days "he will be raised "on the third he will rise" on the third day" day he will rise"

**Identical Meaning.** This comparison clearly indicates that Matthew and Luke understood Mark's "after three days" as meaning "on the third day." Further evidence for the basic identity of the two phrases is provided by Matthew 27:63-64. In verse 63 the Jewish leaders tell Pilate that Christ had said, "After three days I will rise again." In actual fact, up to this point only the expression "on the third day" occurs in Matthew (16:21; 17:23; 20:19), which suggests the identical meaning of the two phrases. Verse 64 provides additional confirmation when the Jewish leaders request Pilate to have the tomb guarded "until the third day." David Clark keenly observes in his article "After Three Days," published in *The Bible Translator*, that "Unless this expression [until the third day] referred to a space of time identical with, or at least as great as, that referred to by 'after three days' in the previous verse, then the guard would not extend over the whole of the critical period, and the entire paragraph would thus lose its point."<sup>11</sup> The same author expresses astonishment at the fact that translators of all major English versions have entirely overlooked "the awkward fact that after three days/three days later does not mean the same thing in English as on the third day."<sup>12</sup> Thus, for the sake of accuracy, Clark proposes to use the phrase "on the third day" consistently in all the passages mentioned above.

#### V. FIRST DAY APPEARANCES

The literal interpretation of the "three days and three nights" is also discredited by Luke's account of Christ's appearance on Sunday evening to the two disciples who were going to the village of Emmaus. Christ, whom they had not recognized caught up with them and asked them, "What is this conversation which you are holding with each other as you walk?" (Luke 24:17). The two men, surprised at Jesus' unawareness of what had happened in Jerusalem, recounted to Him "how our chief priests and rulers delivered him [Christ] to be condemned to death, and crucified him. But we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel. Yes, and besides all this, it is not the third day since this happened" (Luke 24:21).<sup>13</sup>

**Third Day on Sunday Evening.** To appreciate the significance of the last statement, notice must be taken of two facts. First, the statement was made on the "evening" of the first day when the day was "far spent" (Luke 24:29). Second, "the third day" refers specifically to the events mentioned in the immediate context, namely, Christ's condemnation and Crucifixion. It is obvious, then, that if Christ had been crucified on a Wednesday afternoon, those two disciples could not have referred to that event on a Sunday night, saying: "It is now the third day since this happened." According to the Jewish inclusive day-reckoning, it would have been the fifth day and not the third.

#### VI. CHRONOLOGY OF PASSION WEEKEND

The chronology of the Passion weekend provides further evidence of the idiomatic usage of the phrase "three days and three nights." The days of the Crucifixion, entombment, and Resurrection are given in clear sequence and with considerable

clarity in the Gospels as Preparation day, Sabbath, first day. Mark, who writes for a Gentile readership less familiar with Jewish terminology, explains with utmost clarity that Christ was crucified on "the day of Preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath" (Mark 15:42). In the following chapter it will be shown that both the term "preparation" (paraskeue) and "Sabbath-eve" (pro-sabbaton) are two technical terms used unmistakably to designate what we call "Friday."

Mark, then, is most precise in explaining that the Crucifixion took place on what today we call "Friday." The next day is designated by Mark as "sabbath" (Mark 16:1) which in turn is followed by the "first day of the week" (Mark 16:2). Mark's chronological sequence leaves absolutely no room for a two-day interval between the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

Similarly Luke makes it clear that the day of Christ's Crucifixion was followed, not by a Thursday or a Friday, but by a weekly Sabbath. He writes: "It was the day of Preparation, and the sabbath was beginning" (Luke 23:54). By linking the beginning of the Sabbath to the end of the day of Preparation, and the beginning of the "first day of the week" (Luke 24:1) to the termination of the Sabbath (Luke 23:56), Luke leaves absolutely no room for two full days to intervene between the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

**No Two Sabbaths.** Some wish to make room for intervening days by arguing that between the Wednesday Crucifixion and Saturday afternoon resurrection there were two Sabbaths: the first, a Passover Sabbath which fell on a Thursday; the second, a weekly Sabbath which fell on the regular Saturday. Such an argument is based on pure speculation because nowhere do the Gospels suggest that two Sabbaths intervened between the day of the Crucifixion and that of the Resurrection.

Support for the two-Sabbath view is sought in the plural form the Sabbath in Matthew 28:1 takes, which literally reads "at the end of the Sabbaths." This text is viewed as "a vital text" which "proves that there were TWO Sabbaths that week with a day in between." The first Sabbath, Thursday, allegedly was "the annual high-day Sabbath, the feast day of the days of Unleavened Bread," while the second was "the weekly Sabbath.

Saturday."<sup>14</sup>

This conclusion is untenable, because, as Harold W. Hoehner points out, "The term Sabbath is frequently (one-third of all its New Testament occurrences) in the plural form in the New Testament when only one day is in view. For example, in Matthew 12:1-12 both the singular and plural forms are used (cf. esp. v. 5)." <sup>15</sup> There is then no Biblical basis for a Passover Sabbath which occurred two days before the regular weekly Sabbath. The clear and uninterrupted chronological sequence of days given in the Gospels is: Preparation day, Sabbath day, and first day. This sequence leaves absolutely no room for a literal interpretation of the phrase "three days and three nights" as representing an exact period of 72 hours.

**Conclusion.** The foregoing considerations have shown, first, that the sign of Jonah given by Christ to prove His Messiahship consisted not in an exact 72-hour entombment, but in His Resurrection on the third day after His death. Second, the phrase "three days and three nights" (Matt 12:40) is an idiomatic expression which in Bible times meant not necessarily three complete 24-hour days (72 hours), but rather three calendric days, of which the first and the third could have consisted of only a few hours.

The latter conclusion is supported by the prevailing inclusive method of day-reckoning, by the parallel usage of the phrases "after three days" and "on the third day," and by the uninterrupted chronological sequence of days which does not allow for three complete 24-hour days. A recognition of these facts adequately explains how Jesus fulfilled His prediction of a "three days and three nights" entombment by being buried on Friday afternoon and rising early on Sunday morning.

## NOTES ON CHAPTER II

1. Herbert W. Armstrong, *The Resurrection Was Not on Sunday* (Pasadena, California: Ambassador College, 1972), p. 4; emphasis supplied.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

4. Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1983), p. 334. Similarly Leon Morris comments: "For the Ninevites the sign was the reappearance of a man who had apparently been dead for three days. For the men of Jesus' day the sign would be the reappearance of the Son of Man on the third day after His death" (*The Gospel According to St. Luke, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* [Grand Rapids, 1982], p. 201.

5. Similar examples are found in Gen 7:4, 12; Ex 24:18; 34:28; 1 Kings 19:8; Job 2:13.

6. For more examples and a discussion of the inclusive reckoning, see *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, vol. II, pp. 136-137; vol. V, pp. 248-251.

7. Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbath 9, 3; cf. also Babylonian Talmud, Pesahim 4a.

8. See Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 56,1 (on Gen 22:4); Genesis 91,7 (on Gen 42:17-18); Esther 9,2 (on Esther 5:1).

9. Gerhard Dilling, "hemera," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1974), vol. II, p. 950.

10. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Day," vol. IV, p. 475.

11. David Clark, "After Three Days," *The Bible Translator* 30 (July 1979): 341.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 342, 343.

13. Emphasis supplied.

14. Herbert W. Armstrong (n. 1), p. 13.

15. Harold W. Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ* (Grand Rapids, 1977), pp. 69-70.

Christian Regards,

Samuele Bacchiocchi, Ph. D.,

Which is all besides the point I would have liked to see stressed, namely the meaning of the word "Sabbath's (time)" in Matthew 28:1.

## **My reply:**

Dear Profesor Bacciocchi,

I am grateful for your patient reply to my last correspondence re Cronin. You cannot know how much your reply affected me - both in having made me conscious of my own impatience and unchristian behaviour, and in having brought about a sweet hope that the Bible-truth

about the day of Jesus' resurrection may gain some ground among sincere Christians. Once again I beg forgiveness for my rudeness and lack of love and sympathy. One cannot commit greater sin but all being of God's infinite grace in Jesus Christ, we may continue on our quest.

As to point '1' of your letter of Sabbath 27 September 2003, 'The duration of the entombment':

This of course is one of the many and great flaws in the 'Armstrong'-view, that it insists on an ENTOMBMENT for 72 hours, while Jesus' DYING AND DEATH actually were for "three days and three nights". There is no way the Friday crucifixion Sunday resurrection tradition can account for this word of Jesus about his being "in the heart of the earth" - that is, being in the state of dying and death - let us be honest.

I believe Jesus entered his proceeding through the agony of the wages for sin (i.e., started to taste death and to undergo hell) at the table of the Last Supper (the evening of the 'first day' of Passover Season) and Gethsemane (the night of the 'first day' of Passover Season), and that He was crucified and died THAT SAME DAY "between the pair of nights" (dual: behn ha arbayim). So we have one of the three nights and one of the three days comprising the 'first day' - both in the sense of the night and day making up the 'first day', and of the moment (part) representing the whole: Jesus' dying 'marking' / 'signing' the 'first day'. 1Cor.15:3, "How that Christ DIED for our sins ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES".

As concerns the second day of Passover Season, I quote you, point 'VI. Chronology of passion weekend':

"... The days of the Crucifixion, entombment, and Resurrection are given in clear sequence and with considerable clarity in the Gospels ....". For the time being, forget about which days of the week these were, and just pay attention to these concepts: "The days ... are given ... in clear sequence ...". Tell this a heathen who has never heard the story of Jesus' passion - will he not understand that crucifixion, entombment and resurrection EACH took up one day? How else? Then how else could one understand 1Cor.15:4 that continues, "... AND that He was BURIED (the 'second day of Passover Season "according to the Scriptures"), AND that He ROSE AGAIN THE THIRD DAY (of Passover Season) according to the Scriptures"?

The Passover history in Exodus 12-16 "clearly" differentiates that the "remains" of the passover lambs was to be returned to earth and dust (by burning) the day AFTER it had been slain - the event and the day had its own sign-ificance - the event or moment 'marked' / 'signed' the day - the part for the whole SECOND DAY! That clarifies Mk.15:42 and Mt.27:57: Joseph "when it had been evening (after sunset) already" only started his undertaking to obtain the body of Jesus for burial (the next and 'second day'). Here the 'second day' of Passover Season BEGAN - it ended not! This was the moment that corresponds with John 19:31, 38 and Luke 23:50. This 'second day' began to END when Joseph closed the tomb and the women "returned home and prepared their spices" - Friday, "the day before the Sabbath", or "The Preparation (of the Sabbath)" ... in the Greek, for those Jewish readers of Mark! The text in John that corresponds with this moment in time is 19:42, and Luke's is 23:56.

Note how you wrote the Crucifixion and Resurrection with capital letters, but the entombment with a small letter. It is only natural and reflects tradition - but not the true Passover significance attached to the

'second day' of the Passover Feast. The Scriptures in contrast, makes of the 'second day' the Passover Sabbath Day. John says a "Great Day that day was"! This day is worthy the whole of its own duration. Night and day comprised the 'second day' of Passover Season - day of burial ... "according to the Scriptures"! Like his DEATH AND DYING Jesus' burial was part of his 'Erniedrigung' - of his suffering or passion - his "going down" into "the heart of the earth" - symbolic words for literal event. But the event consists not in interment as such only, but in all of Jesus' FINAL SUFFERING.

Jesus could say "It is finished" for He had fulfilled every prophetic, and last word of God - the last proleptically included in that uttering from the cross. The "last enemy" conquered in the death of Christ was death. But in the dispensations of God Almighty it required "the third day according to the Scriptures", Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering! Through the ages "the day after the Sabbath" of Passover Season, floated through the week. But in the very day of God's ultimate finishing of all His works it came to rest on the day of His raising Christ from the dead, upon solid foundation once for all on the Seventh Day "concerning which God thus spoke" - Hb.4:4.

Unfortunately my time is up now, so I'll send this off quickly.  
Christian greetings

Dear Profesor Bacciocchi,  
To continue,

(In my last post there were a few spelling mistakes and one of word order. Here is the one of word order corrected: This 'second day' began to END when Joseph closed the tomb and the women "returned home and prepared their spices" - Friday, "The Preparation - paraskeueh - (of the Sabbath)", or, "the day before the Sabbath - prosabbaton" - for those Jewish readers of Mark who might not have known what "Paraskeueh" means!)

We stopped last time, saying, "But in the very day of God's ultimate finishing of all His works it - "the day AFTER the (Passover) Sabbath" and Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering - came to rest on the day of His raising Christ from the dead, upon solid foundation once for all on "the Seventh Day concerning (which) God thus spoke" - Hb.4:4.

Matthew records the event, "In the late Sabbath's afternoon ...". (NOT: 'After the Sabbath, (morning at) dawn of the First Day of the week!') From this moment on and forever more, Christians observe Christ's Passover weekly on the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD our Saviour God. It is no new thing, for the same thing applied for Israel from the moment they set foot on the other side of the Red Sea on the Sabbath "when it was noon".

For justification of my phrasing "when it was noon", I send you the Appendix from book 2, 'Resurrection', Appendix to p. 76-78,

### "Out of the Deep In Afternoon"

In Part Four, 'Paul', I quoted Jonathan Edwards, p. 197f, "The resurrection of Christ from the dead, is in Scripture represented by his coming up out of deep waters. So it is in Christ's resurrection, as represented by Jonah's coming out of the sea; Matt. xii. 40. It is also compared to a deliverance out of deep waters, Psalm lxi, 1, 2, 3, and verse 14, 15. These things are spoken of Christ, as is evident from this, that many things in this Psalm are in the New Testament expressly applied to Christ, (Compare verse 4 with John xv. 25. and ver. 9. with John ii. 17. and ver. 2 with Matt xxvii. 34, 48. and Mark xv. 23. and John xix. 29. and ver. 2 with Rom.xi.9, 10, and ver.25 with Acts 1:20.) - Therefore, as the Jewish Sabbath was appointed on the day on which the pillar of cloud and fire rose out of the Red sea, and on which Moses and the church, the mystical body of Christ, came up out of the same sea, which is a type of the resurrection of Christ; it is a great confirmation that the Christian Sabbath should be kept on the day of the rising of the real body of Christ from the grave, which is the anti-type. For surely the Scriptures have taught us, that the type should give way to the anti-type, and that the shadow should give way to the substance."

Christ was that Substance, and the Sabbath pointed to Him that Substance and awaited Him for the fulfilment of its substance - not the First Day of the week or of its substance. On p. 300f there, I have said, "Seeing it cannot be denied the day of the entering into God's Rest is the Day of the Sabbath, one further objection must be considered. It is the problem of the time of Jesus' entering into Rest through Resurrection from the dead. As says Edwards, "... that the shadow should give way to the substance."

First, let it be observed the moment creates the Day, not the day the moment. We talk of "Resurrection Day", not of "Resurrection Morning" or whatever portion of the day. The Event - Resurrection - makes of it the Day-of-Resurrection. Thus Edwards also sees things. Says he, "But the day that the children of Israel were delivered from their task-masters and had rest from them, was the day when the children of Israel came up out of the Red sea. They had no rest from them till then. For though they were before come forth on their journey to go out of the land of Egypt; yet they were pursued by the Egyptians, and were exceedingly perplexed and distressed." Edwards immediately goes on, speaking of this "day", as the "morning": "But on the morning that they came up out of the Red sea, they had complete and final deliverance; then they had full rest from their task-masters." Again he immediately continues, "Then God said to them, "The Egyptians which ye have seen this day, ye shall see no more for ever ;" Exod. xiv, 13. Then they enjoyed a joyful day of rest, a day of refreshment. Then they sang the song of Moses ; and on that day was their Sabbath of rest." "They enjoyed a joyful day of rest", says Edwards, but half of it they spent in crossing the deep!

"This coming up of the children of Israel out of the Red sea, was only a type of the resurrection of Christ. ... On that morning Christ, in this pillar of cloud and fire, rose out of the Red sea, as out of great waters; which was a type of Christ's rising from a state of death, and from that great humiliation which he suffered in death." But Edwards in the next paragraph describes this "morning" as follows, "Therefore, as the Jewish

Sabbath was appointed on the day on which the pillar of cloud and fire rose out of the Red sea, and on which Moses and the church, the mystical body of Christ, came up out of the same sea, which is a type of the resurrection of Christ".

"It is a great confirmation that the Christian Sabbath should be kept on the day of the rising of the real body of Christ from the grave, which is the antitype. For surely the Scriptures have taught us, that the type should give way to the antitype, and that the shadow should give way to the substance."

I then asked:

Is there any necessity in the morning or the afternoon in this scheme of things? And I answered at that point in time:

Of course not; it necessitates the whole day! The event is much greater than the moment or even the whole day belonging to the moment. We may fairly conclude from this that Edwards makes no clear distinction between the morning and the day of the Israelites' crossing of the Red Sea. But we do sense he reckons the morning of particular importance in Jesus' resurrection: As he supposes this was the day of both the Israelites' entering into the promised land and Jesus' resurrection from the dead, it also must be the morning of both the Israelites' entering into the promised land and Jesus' resurrection from the dead. Now if Jesus rose the morning, it must have been the First Day He rose on; if He rose the afternoon, it, according to the Gospels' account of events, must have been the Sabbath He rose on. And mortal reason might say, because it was the morning in the type, it also had to be the morning in the anti-type. But just the opposite is necessarily so. Because in the type, it had been the morning, it, in the anti-type, had to be in the afternoon. The type, in early times, fore-shadowed; the anti-type, "in the last days", fulfilled. Christ came "in the fullness of time", in its ripeness as being the Fruit of God's labours, the First Sheaf of late-year harvest. The precise word for such a time-slot of day is epi-fohs-k-ousehi - in-full / after-light / time-being = "afternoon" = "Sabbath's-time late" - opse sabbatohn!

After several years I have had a closer look at these texts, and now must answer differently on the question of what the word "morning" in these texts mean. I don't know Hebrew at all, but with the help of Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible, was able to make the following analysis of some relevant words.

"13, And Moses said to the people, Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of the LORD, which He will show you today ... 21, And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and the LORD caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and dried up the sea, and the waters were divided. 22, And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea ...

19, And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel,, removed and went behind them. And the pillar of the cloud went from in front of them, and stood behind them. 20, And it came between the camp (or armies) of the Egyptians and the camp (or hosts) of Israel. And it was a cloud and darkness to the Egyptians; but it gave light by night to the Israelites: so that the one came not near the other all that night.

23, and the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them ... 24, And it happened that in the morning watch the LORD looked unto the host of the Egyptians ... and troubled the host of the Egyptians - 25, they lost the

wheels of their chariots, and they moved with difficulty, so that the Egyptians said, Let us run away of Israel, out of sight! For the LORD fought for Israel against the Egyptians.

26, Then the LORD told Moses, Stretch out your hand over the sea that the waters may close in over the Egyptians, over their chariots and over their horsemen. 27, And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fought against the waters; and the LORD overthrew the Egyptians in the middle of the sea ... 28 ... There remained not so much as one of them, 29, but the children of Israel walked on dry ground right through the middle of the sea - to them the waters formed a wall on both sides.

30, Thus the LORD saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians (lying) dead on the seashore (that day).

"That night" / "all that night" the storm raged! "That night" / "all that night", the LORD was fighting for Israel. It wasn't done before sunrise. Dawn could not have been when Israel actually stood on the other side, free, and the enemy at last vanquished. It had to have been after "all that night".

I therefore have a problem with the KJV that says "when the morning appeared" (27), "Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength" and everything was over, because "when the morning appeared", is "dawn" before "all that night" had passed.

"When the morning appeared" is from boqer pahnah. When the "morning" - boqer, "appears" or 'rises', it 'faces' west. But 'noon', it has "turned", pahnah, and now 'faces', east! Ezekiel 43:17, "The stairs of the sanctuary "faced", or were "turned", east" - pahnah.

In Ex.14:27, boqer pahnah doesn't mean "morning appeared" or that it 'dawned', but that "the sun turned (and looked east)" - "noon after".

In Jeremia 2:27 the Lord reprimands his people, blaming them that "they have turned their back on Me" - "turned", pahnah. The morning having turned its 'back' to its rising, is declining!

Jeremia 6:4 says it all: "Prepare ye war against her; arise, and let us go up at noon (tsohar). Woe unto us! For the day (yom) goeth away, for the shadows of the evening (ereb) are stretched out." Which word here is from pahnah? - "goeth away"!

In Exodus 14:27 "morning appeared" not; it 'went away'!

What about Exodus 14:24 though? There it says "It came to pass that in the morning watch", the LORD saw the Egyptians ... struggled to get their chariots rolling. If this had been "dawn", then it simply says by dawn all was not over yet - the battle still raged; the "rest" had not been "entered" yet.

"In the morning watch" is from boqer ashmurah.

Lamentations 2:18-19, "Let tears run down like a river day and night: give yourself no rest ... cry out in the night: In the beginning / first - rosh, of watches - ashmurah (first watch after sunset), pour out thine heart...".

Judges 7:19, "Gideon came ... outside the camp in the beginning of the middle (tikon) watch - ashmurah, and they had but newly changed guard." This is the second and deep night watch.

Psalms 90:4, "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past; and as a watch - ashmurah, in the night (layelah) (when it is past)". The last or third watch of night - of dawn - is supposed.

The Hebrew night watches were three; the Roman night watches were four. The Hebrews' watches of daytime, like the Romans', were two:

1 Samuel 11:11, "And it was so in the morning (boqer) that Saul put the people in three companies. And they came into the midst of the host in the morning (boqer) watch (ashmurah), and slew the Ammonites until the heat (chom) of the day (yom) (= noon)" - the exact words of Ex.14:24!

The second or afternoon watch, after this, then lasted till sunset.

So in Ex.14:27 we have boqer pahnah, and in verse 24, boqer ashmurah. If the time were the same they would have been called the same; but they are called differently and in fact were of different events.

God had told the Israelites to be quiet and wait for Him while "all night" the wind would blow the seabed dry. Boqer ashmurah in verse 24 started after the wind had blown "all night" and lasted "during the morning watch" or first watch of daytime. Now the children of Israel moved in and through and out of the sea canyon. Boqer ashmurah was while the LORD fought His battle with the hosts of the Egyptians on the seabed.

Now, after the LORD's battle, He ordered Moses so that the sea should close in again. Boqer pahnah in verse 27 was when the LORD triumphed. Boqer pahnah says "morning has turned" - it ended. All history has turned about. This was the moment! Victory, and the song of Moses! The People in broad daylight "saw that great work which the LORD did upon the Egyptians" - verse 31. The People "have entered the rest" (in the words of Hebrews); they stood on the soil of the Promised Land.

The Exodus story gives the precise and same time of day for the moment of "Victory" that the Gospels give, epifohskousehi!

To remove a last obstacle to the better understanding of the events of the Exodus and their times of day, return to chapter 14 and read the text in its actual order, and not with verses 19 and 20 moved in between verses 22 and 23 as I did. With verses 19 and 20 between verses 22 and 23, I made the time of day when the pillar of cloud and fire changed position from in front of Israel to behind Israel, the "morning watch", that is, after sunrise. In its actual sequence, this event took place after the Sabbath had started - after sunset and as soon as the night and the wind-storm had begun. And thus it remained "all that night" - "the pillar of cloud and fire" "came between the (stationary) camp" - not the chasing army - "of the Egyptians, and the (stationary) camp" - not the moving hosts - "of Israel". "All that night" the wind blew and dried up the seabed - verse 21. Then only, "The children of Israel went into the midst of the sea ... and the Egyptians pursued - verses 22 and 23. Here is where the "morning watch" - boqer ashmurah, started. It ended with verse 27, "morning turned (towards the east)" - with the ending of the morning. It was noon or soon after noon. It was "late Sabbath's" - about three quarters through its cycle.

Is there any necessity in the morning or the afternoon in this scheme of things? I at this point in time must answer:

Of course THERE IS; it necessitates the whole day - "THE Sabbath of the LORD your God", so that "In the end of the Sabbath, being light turned towards the First Day of the week ... there suddenly was a great earthquake ...!"

I think one may confidently view boqer pahnah as the nearest Hebrew equivalent of the Greek tehi epifohskousehi - "in the after noon"; and boqer ashmura as the nearest Hebrew equivalent of the Greek (tehi) epaurion "(during) daylight morning".

### Prof Bacchiocchi's reply (shouting!):

THANK YOU FOR THE INFORMATION. IT IS EVIDENT THAT YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN. PARASKETE refers only to FRIDAY. I have explained it to you before.

--

After about half an hour:

Dear Gerhard:

Thank you for your comments. It is evident that you have difficulty to understand what I wrote. Jesus was crucified on a PARASKENE, which is the technical term for FRIDAY. It is as simple as that.

Christian Regards

**My only objective with this animadversion is to establish the truth of Jesus' Sabbath's—resurrection, and the SEVENTH DAY Sabbath's endorsement thereby as the Christian Day of Worship Rest – the Christian Sabbath and The Lord's Day. It is to show the Sabbath is not man's dead works of the Law, but the living and Congregational experience of Grace – that the Sabbath is living Christian Faith for being Resurrection Faith!**

Dear Professor Bacchiocchi,

You wrote to me (extract from letter 22 September),

"... Mark, then, is most precise in explaining that the Crucifixion took place on what today we call "Friday." The next day is designated by Mark as "sabbath" (Mark 16:1) which in turn is followed by the "first day of the week" (Mark 16:2). Mark's chronological sequence leaves absolutely no room for a two-day interval between Crucifixion and Resurrection ...".

I would in the first place like to stress my agreement with your last observation: "Mark's chronological sequence leaves absolutely no room for a two-day interval between Crucifixion and Resurrection". It is impossible because it would have meant that the Crucifixion was on the Passover Sabbath – the proponents of this view with reference to Mk. 16:1 say the women bought the spices after this supposed 'sabbath' – clearly nonsense. But I would like to more emphatically stress my disagreement with your observation, "Mark, then, is most precise in explaining that the Crucifixion took place on what today we call "Friday.""

I dare you show me how Mark does that – the Greek text please, not the Pope's translators' falsification of it! Mark, like the other three Gospels, is most

precise in explaining that the Crucifixion took place "on the first day of unleavening – *adzumos*, when always they killed – Imperfect – the passover" – 14:12. John calls **this** day "the Preparation of the Passover" – 19:14.

You cunningly hide this fact in your second paragraph on page 38 of TCR. I quote:

"Additional and conclusive evidence that "paraskeue-Preparation" is used in the Gospels to designate "Friday" and not "Wednesday" is provided by the sequence in which the days of the Passion weekend are given: "Preparation, Sabbath, first day" (Matt 27:62; 28:1; Mark 15:42; 16:1; Luke 24:54-55; 24:1). Both Mark and Matthew explicitly place the beginning of the first day at the end of the Sabbath (Mark 16:1; Matt 28:1). The latter could hardly have been Thursday Passover Sabbath, because Thursday is not followed by the first day of the week."

"Matt 28:1" does not "place the beginning of the first day at the end of the Sabbath". It places the Sabbath's end before the First Day of the week! You in every way distort facts. In the first place, The First Day cannot be deemed one of "the days of the Passion" had Jesus been resurrected on it. Second, The First Day of the week begins it, and cannot be the "weekend". The Sabbath ends the week. Three: you sweepingly include different views into one rubbish bin saying, "paraskeue-Preparation" is used in the Gospels to designate "Friday" and not "Wednesday"". I don't hold to the 'Wednesday' view as certainly as I don't hold to yours the traditional 'Friday' view.

These are instances of inconsequential error. Serious manipulation of the Scriptures gets involved where you list your three days of Jesus' suffering. You carefully **don't** mention Mark 14 verses 12 and 17 where the day of Crucifixion begins, "The first day of un-leaven on which they always killed the passover ... the evening having come ...". You make of two consecutive days, Thursday and Friday, one – "only Friday".

Via post, while having in mind Jn. 19:14, you asserted: "John simply adds that it was the FRIDAY BEFORE PASSOVER." You deny John *adds* this as a later point in time **of the day that had started** in Mark 14 verses 12 and 17 – **there the prospective** day of Jesus' **Crucifixion** – and instead you ascribe it to the point in time of day which Mark mentions in 15:42 – **there prospectively** the day of Jesus' **Interment**. John in 19:14 *explicitly* states, "It was the Preparation of the Passover" **when at six o'clock in the morning of that day** – that had started in **Mark 15:12, 17, and, in John 13:1** – Pilate "delivered (Jesus) to be crucified". **After** this day, Mark 15:42 follows from where the day of Jesus' burial – no longer of his crucifixion – starts / "was come".

The four Gospel writers must have thought of the Passover prescription that the Lamb must be slain "between the pair of nights" – *behn ha arbayim*. (It is a "dual" according to Young.) This – John 19:14 – was that daylight "between the pair of nights" beginning – no one can deny! Luke says "as soon as it was day(light)" – *hehméra*. On this day the Lamb of God would be hung to the tree (9am), and before the end of it and before the sun would set, would die (3pm), and on the night after, would remain hanging on the tree – but "**not all (that) night**", Dt. 21:23. He surely was to be **removed from the tree before sunrise and be buried** "that (same) day" – the day that had started in Mark 15:42, not in 14:12. So God in his eternal council had predetermined, in the Scriptures had commanded, and in fact, had predisposed. It all happened "according to the Scriptures" – "the Scriptures" of "the ordinance of the Passover" Ex. 12:43, "for a memorial in your minds, that the Lord's Law may be in your mouths, for ..." not by your own hands, but, "by the strong hand (of) the LORD

hath He brought thee out". (14:9) God's "Strong Hand" was shown in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead – Eph. 1:19f. Salvation brings the heart, mind and mouth into action while it brings the hands and anxiety to a halt! The Day of Salvation becomes the Day of Worship. Jesus' works and His finishing of the works of God by them, is our rest – "therefore the Church should still keep the Sabbath holy" – Yes, I quote Hb.4:9 in its very essence!

See how Law and Grace kiss in loving embrace!

What "unmistakably" happened during the course of this day "they always slaughtered the Passover on"? This:

"In the evening He (Jesus) came with the twelve" to eat the Last Supper – 14:17; He was "offended this night" – 14:27; He "this day, even this night," before the cock crow twice", was "denied" – 14:31; "the hour is come, behold, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners" – 14:41; "and they (the disciples) all forsook Him" – 14:50; "and they (the mob) led Jesus away to the high priest" – 14:53; "and straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation ... and they delivered Him to Pilate" – 15:1; "and Pilate, eager to content the people, delivered Jesus ... to be crucified" – 15:15; "and when they had crucified Him ... it was the third hour (9am)" – 15:24–25; "AND THE SCRIPTURES WAS FULFILLED" – 15:28 ("between the pair of nights" – *behn ha arbayim* the Lamb had to be slain!); "And when the sixth hour (noon) was come, there was darkness until the ninth hour (3 pm) – 15:33; "and on the ninth hour ... Jesus cried with a loud voice and gave up the spirit" – 15:34, 37. Mark says nothing of what further happened THAT DAY. Luke says "everybody left / returned (home)". Matthew tells of the earthquake, and the after-effect of both the darkness and the earthquake caused everybody to be pre-occupied with their own affairs for the rest of that day while Jesus hung on the cross forlorn, dead.

Now starts the new and immediately following day: "And now when the even was come and because this day was the Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath (Friday), Joseph of Arimathea came ...". This was after sunset and dusk, the day beginning – 15 times the meaning of 'opsia' in the Gospels! The last opportunity presented itself to Joseph to have Jesus buried "according to the Scriptures".

I again then, Professor Bacchiocchi, dare you to show how "Mark is most precise in explaining that the Crucifixion took place on what today we call "Friday". And you insist you are "not committed to traditional interpretation"? – Whether you realise it or not, you are the slave of it!

#### To summarise:

First, I have never denied *paraskeueh* in Mk.15:42 means Friday. Second, Bacchiocchi's mistake is, **One**. That he says day **ends** in Mk.15:42 (He calls it "the preceding day" in TCR.) while it in fact **starts** here. Two, That he insists Jesus was **crucified** on this Paraskeueh–Friday, while in fact by the time one has read Mark up to here, Jesus had been crucified and had died at least nine and three hours ago respectively! At this point in Mark's telling of the story of Jesus' suffering, his **burial** has become the subject of telling.

Notice the repeat of the precise words in the Greek that indicate the beginning hours of the days of crucifixion and interment in 14:17 and 15:42: *kai opsias genomenehs ... erchetai (ho Iehsous)...*; *Kai ehdeh opsias genomenehs ... eisehlthen Iohsehph*. Unfortunately the KJV do not show the similarity that clearly. It has, "In the evening He cometh ..."; "And now when evening was come ...". If the translation translated in 14:17 as in 15:42, it would have obviated the sequence of days. I think

the KJV translates as it does in 14:17 because it had in mind the fact the day had already been introduced in verse 12, "And the first day of unleaven (having come) when they (always) killed the Passover (lamb) ...", so that "now ... even was come" for some time. Luke (22:14) suggests an hour had gone by before they "sat down".

See also the correspondence in the gravity of the "**hour**" –

"The first day of removing leaven"	Mark 14:12, 17	<b>15:1</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> day: 15:42
"On the first (day) of adzumos"	Matthew 26:17, 20	<b>27:1</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> day: 27:57
"Came the day of adzumos ... hour"	Luke 22:7, 14	<b>22:66</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> day: 23:50
"His hour was come"	John 13:1	<b>19:14</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> day: 19:31, 38

The duration of the daytime of this day is stressed: "As soon as it became / had become day", says Luke (22:66) the Jews really went to work. All day "between the pair of nights" – *behn ha arbayim*, it took to slaughter the Lamb of God's Passover. In the morning its third hour they crucified Him and until its ninth hour it took the forces of hell to extinguish his life. Not till then was it "FINISHED"! This whole day is day of slaughter, day of dying and day of death. Tomorrow shall return for attendance to the "remains" and spoils of this day's dying and death – not before.

Therefore, let's do a re-evaluation of Samuele Bacchiocchi's treatise on what the term *paraskeueh* means, which according to his view is, that it stands for

#### "FRIDAY ONLY".

Refer *The Times of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection*, 1986, pp. 34 to 45.

Bacchiocchi never gives it a thought there may be another than the traditional–'Friday' or Armstrong–'Wednesday' explanations.

The 'Wednesday' theory is wrong in maintaining "... the day before the weekly sabbath was never called a "preparation" in the Bible". (This is what Bacchiocchi says it teaches.) The 'Wednesday' theory is also wrong in that it "interprets ... all the references to the "Preparation day" of Christ's Crucifixion ... in the light of John 19:14". 34b (Bacchiocchi interprets all the references to the "Preparation day" of Christ's Crucifixion in the light of **Mark 15:42!**)

But the traditional theory which Bacchiocchi adheres to, is also wrong in maintaining "Five times is the term "Preparation–paraskeue" used in the Gospels as a technical designation for "Friday" (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:31; 42), besides the occurrence of John 19:14."

The only instances which could indicate "the Day of the Preparation", not in a generic sense, but "*technically*" as name for Friday, are Mark 15:42 and John 19:31. None of the other instances could possibly be limited to either the restricted or 'technical' meaning of a (or of any) day's name, or of Friday specifically as the Sixth Day or "the Preparation Day" or "the Fore-Sabbath" – *Prosabbaton*.

Writes Bacchiocchi,

""A brief analysis will now be made ... in an attempt to determine what is meant by the "Preparation" day mentioned in all the four Gospels as a time reference of the day of Christ's Crucifixion". 35b

This is typical of Bacchiocchi. He is going to "attempt to determine what is meant by the "Preparation" day", but has already decided it is "mentioned in all the four Gospels as a time reference of the day of Christ's Crucifixion". He won't even

consider the possibility that the “Preparation” day could be mentioned as a time reference to the day of Christ’s **Interment “ONLY”!**

“Biblical and historical usage of the term “Preparation–paraskeue” as a technical designation for Friday”, asserts Bacchiocchi, is “irrefutable”. This may be so, but not without qualification – not without saying here, in this case, and in that. My reason for saying so is illustrated by Bacchiocchi’s immediately following words,

“Mark’s Definition. Mark 15:42 provides what is perhaps the clearest definition of the expression “day of Preparation” by the statement: “It was the day of Preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath.”” 35/36

Are all the cases of the use of *paraskeueh* defined in the same way and just as clearly? No! Then why not? Precisely for the reason they – or most of them at least – are cases of *generic* usage – they don’t need such *clear definition* in order to be understood because they are not very defined or limited to the day upon which preparations are being done.

Bacchiocchi’s observation and deductive reasoning are *irrefutable*. Nobody could point to another instance in the Gospels except perhaps John **19:31**, as a case of equally *clear definition of the day* upon which preparations were done, “*day of Preparation*”, being **Friday**. But John in **verse 14** does not have the *statement of* Mark, “*the day before the Sabbath*”, nor the clause, “*that is*”. Something very near to this appears in **verse 31** though.

John’s Day of Preparations in **verse 14**, should be understood by the reference **he** – and not Mark – gives to describe it nearer, “and it was six o’clock in the morning”! With this reference of his, John *irrefutably* connects ‘his’ “Day of Preparation” to the “Great Day” of the Passover Sabbath (Friday in that year in history) as **its** Day of Preparation. In other words, John speaks of Thursday. John’s Day of Preparations for the Passover–Sabbath had progressed **half way through**, when he states it was 6 am. But Jesus’ “hour had come” in 13:1 half a day earlier. At 6am in 19:14 the Passover–Preparation was **current**, and, was half way through and half way towards the Passover Great Day Sabbath. In **verse 13:1** the Passover–Preparation Day had been just beginning and virtually fully prospective towards the Passover Great Day Sabbath.

John’s in **verse 14**, therefore was **not** the Passover’s Great Day **Sabbath** that still **had to** start in 14:31 / 38, but was to be or had to be its “**Preparation Day**” – “(the) Preparation **of the Passover**” (‘Passover’ in the sense of its “Great Day Sabbath” or holy ‘Feast’-Day.)

Says “the booklet *The Time Element in the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ*, published by the Church of God (Seventh Day):  
... Thus, after John states this “was the preparation of the Passover” (in verse 14), we must understand . . . that “the Sabbath day” in verse 31 corresponds to “the Passover” in verse 14.” 34/35

No saner conclusion could be reached and I must fully endorse it as here quoted by Bacchiocchi. No more insane invention to spoil the conclusion though could be made than to push another day in between this Passover Sabbath and the weekly Sabbath, and another day in between this Preparation Day and its related Passover Sabbath – and so push in two days between this Passover’s Preparation Day and the weekly Sabbath Day. (Which the COGSD does.) But I am not busied by this error now.

Mark, as Bacchiocchi observes, “provides the definition of the “day of Preparation” by the statement: “It was the day of Preparation, **that is**, the day before

the Sabbath”. (Emphasis CGE) John has the exact defining phrase, *epéi ehn* – “**that is**”, or, “because it was”, or, “because it now was”, or, “because by now it had become”. This single phrase already indicates which Scriptures are related – they are Jn.19:31 and Mk.15:42, not Jn.19:14 and Mk.15:42.

These words, “... because by now it had become the Preparation (Friday)”, should be read in conjunction with the preceding phrase, “The Jews therefore ...”, “The Jews therefore **since** Preparation it was ...” (Marshall). Three factors must be remembered: One, We are talking of Mark 15:42 paralleled in John 19:31 – not in **verse 14!** Two, **Reason for**, is of the essence of the passage, “*the-reason-being-it-now-had-become-the-Fore-Sabbath-Preparation*” (Friday). Three, The day involved **had begun here** – it is not ending here. Now only, have the Jews regained their wits after having been completely unsettled by the events of the **past** day – day of Crucifixion. Now they (suddenly) **foresee** their embarrassment of having the bodies on the crosses silhouetted against this their most High Day! Their further actions are to prevent, not to make good – which they would have been unable to do, and it would have been too late for, had they found themselves at day’s end. Were they at day’s end they would have been at wit’s end as well, and would not have asked anything of Pilate their hated ruler.

Continues Bacchiocchi,

“Note that in Greek the two phrases “the day” of Preparation” and “the day before the Sabbath” are each given with a single technical term: “paraskeue-Preparation,” and “prosabbaton-Sabbath-eve.” Translated literally the text read: “It was Preparation, that is, Sabbath-eve.” For the sake of clarity Mark uses here two technical terms, both of which unmistakably designated what we call “Friday.”” 35/36

Again we see Bacchiocchi at his best, postulating the unproven by the very unproven. Insists he that, the “*two terms*” are “*technical*”, and therefore are technical.

It remains a mystery besides, why *two technical terms* should be required “(f)or the sake of clarity”, and if, “*both ...* (already) *unmistakably designated what we call “Friday.”*”

That brings us to the question of what it means for a ‘term’ to be used ‘technically’.

It actually should be an unnecessary task, for it from the foregoing has already become clear enough for a ‘term’ to be used ‘technically’ means to be used with ‘automatic’ meaning. (Like a technical instrument usually is an automatically operating instrument.) ‘Technical’ as referred to by Bacchiocchi, means, ‘it follows without saying’; ‘it is self-explanatory’; ‘it does not need explanation’! Bacchiocchi means to say with ‘technical’, that the term *paraskeueh* in Mk.15:42 on its own and without help to explain it, means “Friday”.

This postulate however, is false, unless Mark superfluously and unnecessarily, had *added* the second and explanatory clause, “... that is, the Fore-Sabbath” – *ho estin prosabbaton*. The fact Mark uses two clauses, “Since it was the Preparation” – *epéi ehn paraskeueh*, and, “... that is / being the Fore-Sabbath (“*Sabbath-eve*”)” – *ho estin Prosabbaton*, implies that at least one of the *two terms* is not ‘technical’ or is not used ‘technically’, but “(f)or the sake of clarity” **requires** another and more apt and descriptive, and more specific “*term*”, that “*here ... unmistakably designated what we call “Friday.”*” The required “*term*” is not the explained, *paraskeueh*, but the explaining, *Prosabbaton*. The explaining “*term*”, *Prosabbaton*, therefore, is the ‘technical’; and the other – the explained “*term*”, *paraskeueh* – therefore, **cannot** be the ‘technical’ one. (Look which one have I written with a capital letter.)



This leaves it open for the word *paraskeuēh* to be used in and with other contexts and options than the ‘technical’, in order to mean anything and any day in the line of “preparation”. It also means the word *paraskeuēh* could have been used for any day of the week, for instance for the day of, or for, the Passover’s preparations, no matter on which day of the week it fell. And for that reason the word *paraskeuēh* in John 19:14 could, and in fact does mean, “The Day of the Passover’s Preparations” – ‘technically’! (“For that reason”, I say, the reason being the way *paraskeuēh* has been used in Mark 15:42, and in defiance of Bacchiocchi’s assertions.)

We shall later on meet up with another of Bacchiocchi’s strong points, that of repetition. We consequently shall have to return to the subject of the technical usage of the term *paraskeuēh*.

*“The term “prosabbaton-Sabbath-eve” was used by Hellenistic Jews to designate explicitly and exclusively “the day before the Sabbath, i.e. Friday” (Judith 8:6; 2Macc.8:26).<sup>2</sup> Thus Mark, by defining “paraskeue-Preparation” as being the “prosabbaton-Sabbath-eve,” gives the clearest possible definition to his Gentile readers of what he meant by “paraskeue,” namely, the day before the weekly Sabbath. Clarifications of time-references by a qualifying clause are common in Mark, evidently because the author knew that his Gentile readers were generally unfamiliar with Jewish terms and customs.”* 36b

The reader may refer to *The Lord’s Day in the Covenant of Grace* for a lengthy exposition of some problems faced in this paragraph of Bacchiocchi’s. See e.g. Paragraphs 5.1.1.5.4. to 5.1.1.5.5.2. See also this paragraph from TCR above considered.

We here already catch up with some of Bacchiocchi’s repetitious attempts to convince of what cannot be evinced. In these lines he just re-phrases his previous arguments. ‘Technical’ now is “to designate explicitly and exclusively”. But it nevertheless needs “defining”, “qualifying clause(s)”, “clarifications” and “the clearest possible definition” of Mark’s “time-references”. “(E)vidently because the author knew that his Gentile readers were generally unfamiliar with Jewish terms and customs.”

“... Gentile readers were generally unfamiliar with Jewish terms and customs.” Then one would not expect to find an explanation of the Greek word, but of the “Jewish terms and customs”! Then Mark would have written: “Evening having come it now being the Fore-Sabbath – *Prosabbaton*, that is, the Preparation – *ho estin Paraskeuēh* ...”. If it were like this, then the word “Preparation” more likely would have been used ‘technically’. But no, it is as it is – the Greek is explained with the Jewish word – the generic with the technical-specific.

That brings us to the question of the familiarity, which the word *paraskeuēh* in Mark’s day enjoyed. Bacchiocchi underscores everything Tertullian has to say about it – that is certain, and more, reading his conclusion from Tertullian’s suppositions,

*“By the time of Tertullian (c. A.D. 160-225) paraskeue had already become such a fixed name for Friday that he even argues that this had been the name for Friday since creation.<sup>5</sup> These, and similar examples, clearly indicate that Christians adopted the Jewish practice of numbering the first five days of the week and of naming the sixth and the seventh as paraskeue and sabbaton—Preparation and Sabbath.”*

Who says “that Christians” did so? Bacchiocchi – not Tertullian.

Who says Tertullian wrote of “the Jewish practice of numbering the ... days of the week”? Bacchiocchi – not Tertullian.

Who says Tertullian did not refer to the Roman names for the weekdays by their ‘*planetary nomenclature*’ – he wrote in Latin? Did he not rather say, *paraskeuēh* was the Greek terminology that *had already become such a fixed name for Friday* – *Dies Veneris* – even among the Romans, other ‘heathen’ nations and among Christians, *that he even argues that Paraskeuēh had been the name for Dies Veneris since creation?* That to me seems is what Bacchiocchi himself has written? If so, then Tertullian compares the Roman and the Greek nomenclatures for the week-days – not “the Jewish practice of numbering the ... days of the week”, and is Bacchiocchi’s whole argument artificial!

Early Christians knew the Sixth Day by the name of “the Fore-Sabbath”. We have the Martyrdom of Polycarp who was brought to the stake on the “Fore-Sabbath” as proof. Mark likewise did not know the Sixth Day by the name of “the Preparation”, but had to remind himself as well as his readers that this time, “the Preparation” had been “the Fore-Sabbath”.

“*Early Christian usage*” in the case of “Preparation” for Friday, differs no bit from “*early Christian usage*” of First Day worship for Sunday worship. It is a hoax all along, and Bacchiocchi and his church all go along. Its only and highest aim is to divest the Seventh Day Sabbath of the meaning which Sunday by fraudulent and underhanded force has wrested from the Sabbath for itself – the honour for being the Day on which Christ conquered death and hell and grave and the excelling greatness of God’s power and works were revealed.

On page 35c Bacchiocchi calls on “*irrefutable Biblical and historical usage of the term “Preparation-paraskeue” as a technical designation for “Friday”*”, but fails to present a single example. Bacchiocchi quotes Norval Geldenhuys, “*that at the time when John wrote, the Greek term paraskeue (‘preparation’) was already for a long time the technical term used to indicate ‘Friday,’ the equivalent of the Hebrew erebh shabbath.*” (39a) If something can boast “*historical usage*” “*for a long time*”, it will have been “*commonly used*” (36c) and “*familiar*” (36b), and would have abounded in examples that never needed distinction. Professor Bacchiocchi the historian, will you please put your cases of such “*historical usage*” on the table?

Comes his answer,

*“The recognition of this fact is evident in the right translation which is found in the A.V., R.S.V., and N.I.V., namely “the day of Preparation of the Passover”!* (Hundreds of years too late!)

I have no further comment; but Bacchiocchi has ( a third distinction of Bacchiocchi’s, his insistent groundless ‘conclusions’ as ‘evidence’),

*“This means, as Geldenhuys explains, “that the day of the Lord’s crucifixion was the Friday of the Passover, the Friday that falls during Passover week, that is, Passover Friday (Good Friday). It is a grammatically correct rendering and all the evidence is in favour of it.”*

The only new thing in this *explanation* of Geldenhuys / Bacchiocchi, is that it is a tellingly anxious repetition and insistence upon every acquainted and presumptuous “evidence” that converts fancy into fact for free. Its only strength might be the reader’s bad memory or weak discernment.

Such “evidence” or “considerations” (39c), says Bacchiocchi, “*make it abundantly clear that in the Gospels ... “paraskeue is a technical designation for Friday”* – referring to “*Moulton and Milligan, noted authorities on the Greek language.*” In the total absence of “*historical*”, “*common*” “evidence” or “*usage*” of a “*long time*”, Bacchiocchi reverts to “*noted authorities on the Greek language*” and

“abundantly clear” “evidence” “in the Gospels” .... forgetting its absence throughout the Gospels is what forced his hand to agitate the support of scholars.

One must admit therefore, that “The term “*prosabbaton-Sabbath-eve*” was used by Hellenistic Jews to designate explicitly and exclusively “the day before the Sabbath, i.e. Friday” (Judith 8:6; 2Macc.8:26).<sup>2</sup> Thus Mark, by defining “*paraskeue-Preparation*” as being the “*prosabbaton-Sabbath-eve*,” gives the clearest possible definition to his Gentile readers of what he meant by “*paraskeue*,” namely, the day before the weekly Sabbath.”

Professor Bacchiocchi, you have said it yourself – not I. Please don’t shout at me then! You also at several occasions have ordered me to go read this book of yours, and that is what I did!

What I believe is what you have said in your own words, but what you try to disprove with your own and other confused men’s ideas. What you really believe is just the opposite of your own words here. What you believe is that *the term “paraskeue-Preparation”, was used by Mark to designate explicitly and exclusively “prosabbaton-Sabbath-eve” – “the day before the Sabbath, i.e. Friday”*. What you believe is that John also *thus* – that is, in your delirious way – gives the most confused definition possible to his readers of what he meant by “*paraskeue-Preparation*” namely, *the day before the weekly Sabbath* – which is a skewed and distorted misrepresentation of the Scriptures.

Had Mark used the term “*paraskeue-Preparation*” “*technically*” to designate “*explicitly and exclusively*” to “*Hellenistic Jews*” “*the day before the Sabbath, i.e. Friday*”, he all for nothing would have done so, because *his Gentile readers by the clearest possible term* – assuming *paraskeueh* had been a “*technical term*” – already would have known what he meant. This eliminating deduction implies that Mark explained the term *paraskeueh* to his readers for the very real possibility it could have been used for another day and for another preparation than those of the weekly Sabbath, like “the Passover’s Preparation” (John 19:14), and the Passover’s “Great Day Sabbath” (John 19:31).

It amounts to saying (“*as simple*” and “*as easy as that*”) I do not accept that Mark used *paraskeueh* – not even here in Mark 15:42 – absolutely ‘*technically ... for Friday*’, or, in other words of yours, “*for ONLY Friday*”, and that I do accept that *paraskeueh* may be and in fact is used in John 19:14 for another “Preparation” as well as for “the Preparation” of another “Sabbath”, namely, for “the Passover’s Preparation”, and for the Feast Day or “Great-Day-Sabbath” of the Passover. In the specific year of our Lord, neither “*unmistakably*” the “Preparation”, had been the weekly Sabbath’s Preparation / Fore-Sabbath, nor “*unmistakably*” the “Sabbath”, had been the weekly Sabbath. By divine predetermination though, “The Preparation” in the year of our Lord’s crucifixion, “*unmistakably*”, had been one of the Passover’s, and one of the weekly Sabbath’s – that’s a fact regarded as completely correct and true, because, *as we have shown*, your denial of *paraskeueh*’s generic meaning and use, is simply false.

As far as the Aramaic is concerned on page 36 further, I am unable to comment because I have no knowledge of Aramaic. But I see no difficulty in the logic of the presumable fact “*paraskeue*” was the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic word “*arubta-eve*”, or in the presumable fact “*both of which were commonly used to designate “Friday”*”. 36/37 These assumptions mean nothing to prove an “*explicit and exclusive*” “*designation*” “*for ONLY Friday*” – in other words, they mean nothing

for a “*technical usage of the term “paraskeue”*” as interpreted by Bacchiocchi or whomsoever, “*for Friday*”.

The Professor entwines himself tighter and tighter the longer he persists in his endeavour to impose his viewpoint on the reader,

“*The need for a Clarification. Christians coming from a gentile background had to learn this Judeo-Christian nomenclature of the week-days, because in the pagan world the week-days were not numbered but named after the seven planetary deities (dies solis, dies lunae, . . .). This may explain why Mark, in writing to a Gentile-Christian readership, who had only recently learned the Judeo-Christian nomenclature of the week-days, deemed it necessary to clarify what he meant by “paraskeue-preparation,” by adding the qualifying phrase, “that is, the day before the Sabbath” (Mark 15:42).*” (37/38)

If *paraskeueh* “*already for a long time*” had been an “*explicit and exclusive*”, “*unmistakable*”, “*familiar*”, “*common*”, “*universal*”, “*Semitic Greek*” “*technical term for ... ONLY Friday*”, dear Professor, then why would Mark have bothered to explain it to his readers whoever they were, regardless of your reason here given that they were recently evangelised? The only logical reason I can make out why he should have was the possibility of different Sabbath- and Preparation-Days that could fall on any of the week-days and actually did fall on different days of the week in the year of our Lord’s crucifixion.

If Mark thought it necessary to explain *paraskeueh* because it was “*neecessitated by the fact that the seven-day planetary week itself had been recently introduced in the Roman world ...*”, it remains inexplicable that he did not make use of the planetary or Roman names for the days of the week. Your argument is totally irrelevant, and the fact that you use it, betrays your uncertainty about your explanation for Mark’s elucidation of his use of *paraskeueh*.

Mark defines the day to its Gospel-significance – its Passover-significance. It being the day starting on which the Lamb should be buried, this is what happened ... It is the day after *Adzumos*, Day of Removing Leaven. Disregard of either day is punishable with death. Joseph will fill the part of Israel, and bury the remains of our Passover “according to Jewish usage”. God bless his devotedness. This was the day before that of the Waving of the First Sheaf! And it was the Fore-Sabbath – the next day would be the first of fifty counted to Shavuot. “Prepare ye the way of the Lord”! “Who shall enter through the portals? The Righteous One”! Every reason for Mark to explain to his readers the “Preparation” was the “Day before the Sabbath”! Just as for John who had every reason – every Passover / Gospel reason – to explain to his readers why he said “Preparation of the Passover”!

I shall not discuss the ethical implications of these facts viz a viz Christian Sunday observance instead of Sabbath observance, but rather quote Helmut Thielicke, “*Das in der Theologiegeschichte so oft werksame Prinzip hat sich auch hier als richtig erwiesen: daß bei der Verbindung einer biblischen Wahrheit ... mit einer profanen Ideologie ... diese letztere durchschlägt, daß sie sich emanzipiert und damit den ursprünglichen Lehrsatz bis zur Unerkennlichkeit entstellt.*”

## **Philip B. Brown**

"The Jewish day begins at sunset and is today called "twilight." Sunset is about 6:00 P.M. After 6:00 P.M., a new calendar day begins."

"Agreed"

"The term "twilight" in Exodus 12:6, however, was understood by the Pharisees and rabbis to be from 3:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M., when the sun begins its setting."

"Agreed. The sun in fact begins to set from noon. For the Jews though, the sun no longer sets after sunset – it virtually stops to exist. For the Romans it keeps on setting till midnight when, for them, it starts to rise again. The Athens or Greeks reckoned their days also as from sunset to sunset, we must not forget."

"During the crucifixion, from noon to 3:00 P.M., darkness, or "twilight," came over the land. (From the sixth to the ninth hour in Matthew 27:45 corresponds to from noon to 3:00 P.M. on our clock.)"

"Agreed, although I would rather leave out the idea of "twilight" in this context."

"Christ died at about 3:00 P.M."

"Undeniable! God be the glory and the power!"

"His body was placed in the tomb before 6:00 P.M."

"Agreed. Only question is: Before 6.00 P.M. on which Day of the week? Clearly it was Friday – agreed: "since the Sabbath officially began at 6.00 P.M" as you say. But NOT:..."

"... that night , since the Sabbath officially began at 6:00 P.M."

""that night" you with reference to Luke 23:54 refer to, and which belonged to the Sabbath, came after the burial – it did not precede it."

"Traditionally, the crucifixion is believed to be on Friday."

"Admittedly, no one can deny, "traditionally!"

"We know the resurrection was very early Sunday morning."

"Here is where confusion starts! Here is the a priori indisputable! And I understand why: This is how we read the NT translated for us poor souls. God will forgive us – but not those in places of absolute power who so wrangle his Word."

"John says: (NIV John 20:1) Early on the first day of the week, while it was still dark, Mary Magdalene went to the tomb and saw that the stone had been removed from the entrance."

"Agreed! Just be careful to read what we read – don't add a thing! This is what John says – no more. Is this Jesus, rising from the dead? 'Prohi skotias eti / skotias eti ousehs' – which is, precisely and literally: "Early darkness being", and this, "was / being", "on the First Day of the week". Now, according to your own definition of the reckoning of the day above, it was the First Day \_starting\_. Now read the verse again. Do we read anything about Jesus' resurrection? Not a word! Not an insinuation!"

"Mark says, "just after sunrise, they were on their way to the tomb" (Mark 16:2 NIV)."

"The time of day was \_before\_ sunrise, 'anateilanto tou hehliou' – for the Jew, again, the "new"- 'ana', "coming"- 'teilantos' of the sun, but, "very early" – 'lian prohi'. Compare Mark with John and it leaves the resurrection at least one full night behind!"

"Luke says, "very early in the morning" (Luke 24:1)."

"'Orthrou batheohs' – "thick darkness", only possible during after-midnight darkness of solid night, "on the First Day of the week". Luke's time fits in neatly between that of John 20:1 and Mk.16:2. Therefore: Three different visits to the tomb – no resurrection!"

"Matthew says, "at dawn" (Matthew 28:1)."

"Matthew says nothing of the kind. Do you know what Matthew really says? He says 'tehi epifohskousehi'. What does 'tehi epifohskousehi' mean? Read Luke 23:54. It means exactly the same time of the day spoken of there – literally, "afternoon", in fact \_stressed\_: "in the very being of light" – "actually noon" is what it says! Did Jesus rise from the dead Sunday afternoon? No! Then when? "On noon / early afternoon", the day before – "In Sabbath's-time late" – 'opse Sabbatohn'. That is what Matthew 28:1 says, and may God destroy my soul in everlasting hell if I lie."

"Since John says it was still dark and Mark says it was just after sunrise, the light of the new day probably started to appear during the walk."

"Yes, this is what we are made to believe, "it was ..." the resurrection. But there is no ounce of truth in it."

"All four tell us that the women went to the tomb early on the first day of the week, which is Sunday."

"Only three Gospels give different times of different visits to the tomb. Matthew gives no time of the visit to the tomb he speaks of. Matthew only gives, and only Matthew gives the time of Jesus' resurrection, and that time he says, "belonged to the Sabbath" – Genitive, 'sabbatohn'. He also says it was \_before\_ 'eis' plus Accusative, the First Day of the week", \_not\_ "on the First Day", Dative, as 28:1 is translated \_falsely\_.

"Backing up a bit, it seems as if the crucifixion was on Friday from verses like the following: (NIV Luke 23:52-56) Going to Pilate, he asked for Jesus' body. Then he took it down, wrapped it in linen cloth and placed it in a tomb cut in the rock, one in which no one had yet been laid. It was Preparation Day, and the Sabbath was about to begin."

Which is the action or act intended here, and which are the time-supplying words? "Going to Pilate", "Joseph asked". No problem. "Going to Pilate", "Joseph took the body down", is untrue though, also, "going to Pilate", "Joseph wrapped the body". Therefore it also is untrue that Joseph "placed the body in the tomb" at the time-approximate that he "went to Pilate". Then it is totally wrong and totally untrue to say, \_suggesting the event of the resurrection, "It was Preparation Day, and the Sabbath was about to begin". A variant

reading says “It was the Day Before the Sabbath”, (Friday). It would be as far fetched to place the event of the resurrection within the time-bounds of this day as would be to place the event of the “tomb cut in the rock” within the time-bounds of this day. The adverbial time-phrase, “It was Preparation Day, and the Sabbath was about to begin” only has bearing on the action of Joseph at that time, which was to “place (the body) in the tomb”, and to “close” it, and to “leave”. It also had bearing on the women’s actions at that time of that day, that they “left”, “went home”, and “prepared spices and ointments”. Joseph did not do those other thing at this time on this day. He did those things during the previous night, which is crystal clear from a reading of the Gospels. The implication is just as clear, that the crucifixion took place on the day before the previous night – on Thursday!

“The women who had come with Jesus from Galilee followed Joseph and saw the tomb and how his body was laid in it. Then they went home and prepared spices and perfumes. But they rested on the Sabbath in obedience to the commandment.”

No problem.

“The very next verse is about the women, very early on Sunday morning, going to the tomb. The Sabbath begins at 6:00 PM on Friday and goes through 6:00 PM on Saturday.”

““The very next verse is about the women”, and nothing at all about the resurrection. The Sabbath does not “go through 6:00 PM on Saturday” because that is \_past\_ the (Jewish) Sabbath, which \_stops\_ at “6:00 PM on Saturday”.”

“Jesus was buried just before the Sabbath began. There is a problem, however, with this view.”

“I cannot see why? Only with the shortness of the time allowed, perhaps because the women had quite a few things done before they “began to rest the Sabbath” – Ingressive Aorist.”

“(NIV Matthew 12:40) For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”

“Friday night and Saturday night are only two nights. If Jesus was “in the heart of the earth” for three nights, he had to have been crucified on Thursday.”

“Quite logical, isn’t it? And matter of fact and very, very simple! But most important, it is “according to the Scriptures” and according to the gist of the prophetic Word (Passover-Word) of God! Why tradition had to come and spoil the purity can be attributed to the design of the devil himself only.”

“We know the Last Supper, the meal Jesus had on the evening before his crucifixion, was the Passover meal (Matthew 26:17, Mark 14:12, Luke 22:7, and John 13:1).”

““We know”? Not so! The Passover eaten before the Passover? Plainly impossible. Throughout each and every reference to the Last Supper the Subjunctive or Infinitive is used to indicate the “preparatory” nature of the occasion “\_for\_ the Passover”. It was \_not\_ “\_the\_ Passover”, “eaten”.”

“The very next day after Passover is the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.”

“Wrong. The Feast Day of Passover is the Day of the \_eating\_ of the sacrifice which was accompanied by and which was the day of the first eating of Unleavened Bread. But the “first day” of the Feast Period or Feast Days, was its “Preparation of the Passover” (John), defined as “the Day on which they always slaughtered the Passover”; “the Day on which leaven was removed / the Day of de-leaven” – ‘adzumos’ (Synoptists).”

“This first day, Nisan 15, is a Sabbath.”

“The first day, \_14\_ Nisan, was no Sabbath. The \_second\_ day, “Nisan 15, is a Sabbath” – “the Sabbath”, or, “the Feast” (‘eaten’) proper – its ‘High Day’.”

“The word Sabbath does not mean the seventh day of the week.”

“What nonsense!”

“The word Sabbath simply means to cease work or to rest.”

“It means a great deal more.”

“We get our word ‘sabbatical’ from this Greek word. The word in Hebrew is ‘Sabbath.’ The seventh day of the week is declared to be a Sabbath. Likewise, other specific days of the feasts are declared to be a Sabbath.” “When Passover is on a Thursday, Friday is a Sabbath. Saturday is also a Sabbath. When Passover is on a Thursday, two days of rest follow Passover.”

Agreed, provided “Passover” means 14 Nisan, day of slaughter. Provided further “rest” is qualified as different rests for the different kinds of ‘Sabbaths’. Certain things were allowed as well as prescribed for the Passover Sabbath which did not apply to the weekly Sabbath. That’s a fact not disputable.”

“If we were to rest for two days, how many ‘rests’ would there be? If we rest for two days, we do not rest for one day, stop resting, and then immediately rest for another day. It is one rest for two days. When Passover is on Thursday, Friday and Saturday are one large Sabbath.”

“Which both historically and logically is nonsense. The fact we rest for two days do not do away with the two days. The fact we rest is not the day we rest on. When Passover Preparation Day or 14 Nisan is on Thursday, Friday and Saturday are two Sabbath Days, Friday being the Passover Sabbath Nisan 15, and Saturday being the weekly Sabbath Day.”

“(KJV John 19:31) The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high [megas] day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.”

“The Greek word used in John to describe this particular Sabbath is 'megas.' Today, we use the prefix 'mega' to mean large. The Greek word 'megas' means big, exceedingly, great, high, or large. A large, two day, Sabbath fits the meaning.”

“One might imagine it that way, but it doesn’t change the Scriptural practicality of the event. An ordinary Passover Feast Sabbath per se fits the meaning perfectly in its own right.”

“Also, the word 'day,' appears three times in the above King James verse, but it is not in the Greek. The King James translators were interpreting when they added 'day.' They were incorrectly assuming an individual day.”

“You are alleging incorrectly. John in 19:31 refers to “the Sabbath (day)” that “was the Preparation (day)”, and says that “it was a great \_day\_ (‘hehmera’) that specific (‘ekeinou’) Sabbath (day)”.

“Jesus was “in the heart of the earth” for three nights: Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights.”

“You only assert; you don’t indicate. Therefore I am allowed to say you assert wrongly, and counter: Jesus was “in the heart of the earth” figuratively for three literal nights: Wednesday night, Thursday night, and Friday night, and three literal days, Thursday day, Friday day, and Saturday day, while TRULY “tasting death”, experiencing the woes of hell. It means not that He was \_buried\_ during those three nights and three days. Jesus compares Himself with Jonah who lived through his anguish of death, while He, living, conscious and willing, would TRULY enter death, for us. He would be “released from the pangs of death”, only “on the third day”.”

“He was buried for three days: Friday, Saturday, and the beginning of Sunday.”

“No, He was raised “In Sabbath’s-time”, and, “according to the Scriptures” concerning the Passover Lamb of God, “on the third day” both according to inclusive reckoning, ‘part for the whole’, and literal reckoning, “day” for “day(light)”.

“The resurrection was at the “dawn” of Sunday, the third day.”

“I believe which I have shown completely refutable through the Scriptures.”

### **Philip Brown,**

“Thank you for taking the time to write your long response to my thesis about the “Crucifixion on Thursday.” This was my thesis, but I am having some trouble understanding how it apparently got sent to Val Borum. I do not recall sending such an email. And I cannot find it in my sent folder. Anyway, this thesis of mine came from my web site at [www.newwine.org](http://www.newwine.org).

You said a lot of things. But the primary issue is the “three days and three nights” verse. Without that verse, I believe most people, including me, would place the crucifixion on Friday. You said about this verse (emphasis mine):”

Consult ‘The Lord’s Day in the Covenant of Grace’, Part One, ‘Goshen to Golgotha’, e.g., Par. 5.1.1.6.2.4, 5.1.1.6.2.7.3, 5.1.1.6.3.6 on the meaning of the ‘sign’; Part 1/2, Appendixes from p. 209 on the meaning of Jesus’ suffering of death for us; see especially p.246, letter to Lottie, which I herewith post:

“Jesus entered into his final atoning suffering already at the Table and through Gethsémané. John 13:1 states that Jesus “knew that his hour was come”, “before the feast (day) of the passover”. “The day that they always sacrificed the passover on” – as the Synoptists say – in fact started with its evening of after sunset. Jesus “within an hour” after evening had begun, says Luke, joined the disciples at table for the Last Supper. As soon as Judas had left, Jesus pronounced, “Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him” – which is a reference to the glorifying of God of and through Jesus’ suffering. The expression “in the heart of the earth” is figurative language of this suffering of Jesus the second death for sinners. The first of the three days of Jesus’ being “in the heart of the earth”, starts here. It was the day of his crucifixion and death already: its first and night-part literally as well as symbolically. The event makes the day – not the day the event! Remember what Luke says, that Jesus would be delivered into the hands of evil men, yes, but also that He would be given over to the powers of darkness! That most intensely started in this evening-beginning of the day of Jesus’ final suffering, crucifixion and death. You are right, the expression “in the heart of the earth” does not refer to being buried, but to the anguish of Jesus’ suffering the death of sinners for sinners. But there’s a great deal more to tell about this night for Jesus Christ of into-hell-descending.”

Jesus was “in the heart of the earth” figuratively for three literal nights: Wednesday night, Thursday night, and Friday night, and three literal days, Thursday day, Friday day, and Saturday day, while TRULY “tasting death”, experiencing the woes of hell. It means not that He was buried during those three nights and three days. Jesus compares Himself with Jonah who lived through his anguish of death, while He, living, conscious and willing, would TRULY enter death, for us. He would be “released from the pangs of death”, only “on the third day”

I should rather say, Jesus figuratively was “in the heart of the earth”, for literally “three days and three nights”. That does not say that He ‘was \_buried\_ for 72 hours’ as some people assert. No! He \_experienced\_ the reward for our sins during the “three days and three nights of the Prophetic Word, ‘live’. He \_experienced\_ death and hell \_before\_ he actually “gave the spirit”, \_as\_ He “gave the spirit” actually dying, and \_after\_ He had died and while He was dead truly \_until\_ He rose from the dead really and triumphantly – so that He in fact \_died\_ triumphantly! Jesus on the \_cross\_ could say: “It is finished!”

“It seems to me that you are spiritualizing the verse.” I believe you will now agree I do not “spiritualize” the verse”.

“If I understand what you are saying correctly, you believe that some of these three days and three nights Christ was literally buried, and others he was not yet literally dead.”

I believe, \_first\_, That for three of these three days and for three of these three nights Christ physically and spiritually suffered everlasting death of sinners for sinners; \_two\_, That He was literally ‘dead’ from the afternoon 3 o’clock of the first of these three days, Nisan 14; \_three\_, That He was buried, “according to the

(Passover) Scriptures” “the day after” (Lv.23:5-6, Mk.15:42, Mt.27:57, 1Cor.15:3-4) and four. That with breaking the bonds of death He also broke the hold of the grave, “the third day”, Day of the finishing / perfecting, sanctification, blessing and rest of “all the works of God”, the Sabbath of the LORD your God, “the Seventh Day” of God’s creating as well as of His New Creation – Eph.1:19-22.

“But Christ gave this verse as a sign. How could it be a sign if he was not literally dead for a full three days and three nights? People would simply say the sign was wrong. Figurative death is not a sign.”

I appreciate your concern! The only thing wherein we differ is a nuance of interpretation wherein Jesus “was dead” not only in the sense of the unknown: ‘death’ (which we know nothing about), but that He also “was dead” in the sense of ‘living’ death: actually dying it ... for us (which we also know nothing about), suffering it, experiencing it, from His “hour had come” and from His word: “Now”, until his word of triumph: “It is done” – the prophetic sounding of His resurrection from the dead “on the third day”.

Maybe another aspect we might differ about is the nature of the “sign” Jesus gave. See Par. 5.1.1.6.2.5.1 (in Part One).

“The comparison to Jonah as not being literally dead, implying that Christ was not literally dead during part of the days, does not hold because Jonah was not literally dead for any of the three days and three nights.”

The comparison with Jonah and the fact he wasn’t really dead with the experience of Christ wasn’t meant to ‘prove’ “that Christ was not literally dead” – it shows both the similarity and the dissimilarity. Remember it is a similitude – not the identical – of Jesus’ death. It cannot be denied the part of the significance of the “sign” was the fact that as Jonah figuratively experienced death while alive, Jesus experienced death absolutely realistically while alive. That is what made Christ’s death His anguish. That great Calvinist theologian Klaas Schilder’s three books on Christ’s atoning and justifying suffering treat on ‘Christ entering into His suffering’, ‘Christ in His suffering’, and ‘Christ going through His suffering’ – all ending where He gives over His spirit to the Father! This is the meaning of the Confession: “descended into hell”. Getsémáne night is the beginning of Christ’s suffering of the death of sinners for sinners.

“Jonah was figuratively dead for the full three days and three nights. Jonah’s figurative death is representative of Christ’s literal death. So Jonah’s full three days and three nights of figurative death must be representative of a full three days and three nights of Christ’s literal death.”

So it is! Just realize what Jesus’ “literal death” literally was! It was His Death, but more: It was His DYING of death, literally nevertheless divinely – unfathomable for us. And Jesus’ actually giving up the spirit, ‘marked’ or ‘signed’ the first day of Jesus’ actual death, the second day ‘marked’ or ‘signed’ the second day of His actual death, and “the third day” ‘marked’ or ‘signed’ “the third day of His death: “according to the Scriptures”. Not even with Jonah is the idea to tell that he had been swallowed exactly as the first day began and got spit out exactly as the third day ended. In the case of Jesus such an explanation is far more impossible. But one may freely express it the way in which John 13:1 does: “Now before the Feast Day of the Passover Season, when Jesus realised ...”; or Luke 22:1 and 14: “Then, having come the Day of de-leaven (‘a-dzumos’) ... and when the hour came” ... (“when the right, and prophetic, moment arrived ...”). This leaves an undefined period of time between the start of day (sunset) and the first events of Jesus’ living anguish of death of His

final and finalising suffering. So with His resurrection – it left an unknown space of time before the ending of the day when the sun would set. A “sign” “marks” the road – it is not the road; a “sign” marks the gold coin – it is not the coin. With the coin the identity is much closer than with the road sign. It shows the relative nature of a “sign”. So to insist like you do that “Jonah’s full three days and three nights of figurative death must be representative of a full three days and three nights of Christ’s literal death” – is to require too much of the ‘sign’. After all Jonah was not Jesus.

“I thought of one more point about your view of “three days and three nights”... The night before the crucifixion was the night of the Lord’s Supper. Jesus broke bread with his disciples, including Judas. If the crucifixion was on Friday, then the Lord’s Supper was Thursday night. Yet you say Jesus was figuratively “in the heart of the earth on Wednesday and Thursday nights. Was Jesus figuratively “in the heart of the earth” before Judas betrayed him?”

Let us take it from your words, “If the crucifixion was on Friday...”.

My point is there is no doubt Jesus was crucified the day before Friday, 14 Nisan, called “Preparation of the Passover” (Jn.19:14), while Friday itself was the Feast Day of the Passover, 15 Nisan – the day on which, during its night-hours, the Passover lamb had to be eaten and during its daylight hours “the remains” had to be returned to the dust of the earth (by burning).

Now take your words, “Yet you say Jesus was figuratively “in the heart of the earth on Wednesday and Thursday nights”. If you consider what I have said above, you won’t find it strange. “In the heart of the earth” is figurative language: “for three days and three nights” is literal language. Therefore Jesus since the Fifth Day of the week had begun (on Wednesday evening) had been entering upon the final episode of His whole life’s ‘Erniedrigung’ – debasement, that eventually ended in His being “lifted up” on the cross of shame – His suffering of death ... for us! That should answer your question, “Was Jesus figuratively “in the heart of the earth” before Judas betrayed him?” Luke says it so austere in 22 from verse 19 further. The breaking of the Last Supper’s bread for Jesus already had been the breaking of his body – it for Him was the experiencing of his dying for us the death we should have died. Just look at verse 22! Judas’ betraying Jesus was like a dagger through his heart. Judas even the day before had sold Him out to the Jews. Of course Jesus knew. Now intimately together at table He must have felt the pain more acutely; and when Judas with a kiss betrayed his Master – what unthinkable disappointment must it have been. Yet – and here is even greater mystery – Judas was instrumental in God’s design – and Jesus willingly accepted God’s way for him. What gave greater pain than even Judas caused, was Peter’s actions that would prevent Jesus from obeying God’s will for Him. The temptation not to fulfil the Law was the sting from Satan. Jesus suffered more at the hand of the Tempter than He suffered at the hand of Death itself. This was Jesus’ hour, yet He says it is the hour of the betrayer. “This day, even this night”, Mark 14:30, and Jesus said, “My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death”. My mother showed me this, but I for the best part of my life refused to accept. What great loss had it been to my soul!

“... the primary issue is the “three days and three nights” verse. Without that verse, I believe most people, including me, would place the crucifixion on Friday.”

This text is but one of many, and by far not the most important why the Friday-crucifixion tradition must be suspected of gross inconsistency. In fact, the fickleness of tradition is the basic reason behind each and every manipulation of the

Scriptures that pertains the dating of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection. This is a serious matter; it is of such importance to tradition that it defies the fear of God and sees fit to twist His Word in order to protect its own fallacies. I have become convinced that anti-christ is the guru behind the false readings of the Scriptures, especially of the NT Scriptures that have to do with the issue. I have said this to many, and now tell you the same – and invite you to show me wrong, please – that there is no Scripture-text regarding the dating of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection not falsified so that it would indicate His resurrection to have occurred on Sunday, and His crucifixion to have occurred on Friday. It is meant to distract the believer's attention from the fact that Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection was the divine fulfilling – true and real fulfilling – of the eschatology of OT prophecy, symbolism and Law.

Dt.21:22-23 (Par. 5.2.1.4, from p. 106 of Part Two. You will notice there how I argued on this text that it was irrelevant to the situation of Jesus' crucifixion. Now these arguments or at least some of them may still stand, but have become rather pointless when I after almost three decades only, discovered the true meaning of the text – which is exactly the opposite of what you will read in translations. I never could apply any prophetic significance to this text – until I saw that it is exactly its prophetic merit misapplied to justify a Friday-crucifixion. So please refer from this Paragraph to the Appendix to it on p. 259 of the same book.

Tradition (Roman Catholic Tradition) has always used Dt.21:22-23 to 'prove' Jesus was buried the same day on which He was crucified. He allegedly had to be buried before sunset because this text would have said anyone killed on the pole should be taken off before sunset and be buried before sunset. This has been the text, which the Roman Church has used to align the (Jewish) Passover to the heathen Easter – to fasten the day of Jesus' crucifixion and death to the heathen Friday Easter Feast. But you will notice in the Appendix that this text says the opposite of what RC tradition says. It says namely that any dead person – any already killed person – should after his killing, be hung on a pole (or 'tree') "before night" or "before sunset". He then, afterwards, should not be allowed to stay on the tree any longer than that night, but should, before night ends with "sun" or "sunrise", or "light", be taken off, in order to be buried the same, "following day" (like in the Greek 'epaurion'). See it explained in the Appendix there. Now this text obtains its rightful prophetic meaning! Now it gets eschatological meaning – pertaining to Christ. God be the honour and the majesty of such richness of His Word! And woe and shame on any who without fear of Him go their own way with His Word! If such person be me, then woe unto me, or God be merciful upon a sinner such as me!

Gerhard Ebersöhn  
Suite 324  
Private Bag X43  
Sunninghill 2157  
Johannesburg  
[biblestudents@imagnet.co.za](mailto:biblestudents@imagnet.co.za)  
<http://www.biblestudents.co.za>