

Christiaan Gerhardus Ebersöhn

Resurrection on Sabbath or Sunday?

Part Two

In discussion with

Dr. Walter, 'week', 'Bone-Day', 'Luke 24:21'

August 2011

**‘Week’ – “set of days” Dr Walter Exposed
To try to reason against unreasonableness about the
‘week’, mostly**

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1685640&posted=1#post1685640>

The Sabbath was instituted by God in Genesis 2:2-3 BEFORE there was a Jew on the face of the earth. It was “made for [the] man” and it was “made” by Christ as the Creator of man (Mark 2:27-28).

It was “sanctified” by God or SEPARATED from the rest of the previous six days by God and it was “blessed” by God in contradistinction from the previous six days. Therefore, it was not “made” for man “just as the other six days were made” for man. No, it was “made” distinct from the other six days.

The original Sabbath commemorated a SINLESS creation where God could say “very good” and this SINLESS creation was based upon CONTINUANCE IN GOOD WORKS by Adam and Eve. Grace and mercy have nothing to do with this first creation and when sin entered in, the whole creation was no longer “very good” but corrupted and defiled by sin and reserved for destruction by fire at the end of the SEVENTH millennium.

GE:

The “*original Sabbath*”, “*commemorated*”, nothing; God INSTITUTED it first time ever; how could it be ‘*commemorative*’?

DW:

Not according to the wording of the fourth commandment. The Sabbath commemorates, and remembers God's creation in six days, a creation that God concludes with the words “very good.”

GE:

The “*original Sabbath commemorated*” NO “*sinless creation*” A “*sinless creation*” after Adam sinned, is the figment of your imagination.

“*Where God could say “very good”*”, was ON, the Sixth Day of God’s creating after He had finished to create man and his wife, and BEFORE, this, sinless created creature, debased itself before the devil and disobeyed God before nightfall.

DW:

Absolutely false! The words “very good” conclude the sixth day and all of God's creative work. Satan did not fall on the sixth day and there is not one shred of Biblical evidence to support such an idea.

The fourth commandment in Exodus calls upon Israel to “REMEMBER” the creational Sabbath while the fourth commandment in Deuteronomy calls upon Israel to “REMEMBER” redemption out of Exodus. The former calls to mind the SINLESS state of creation before the fall while the latter calls to mind the RESTORATION of creation to a sinless state by the blood of the passover Lamb of God. The former calls to mind SINLESSNESS by works and finds its application UNDER THE OLD COVENANT in the seventh day “of the week” while the latter finds its application UNDER THE NEW COVENANT in the “first day of the week. Both of these applications are vividly portrayed in Leviticus 23,25.

The Creation Sabbath and the Fourth commandment do not contain the words “of the week”. However, the application of the Sabbath law is consistent with the Seventh day “of the week” but yet cannot be restricted to the Seventh day “of the week” as God applies the Sabbath law to a variety of other days “of the week” as well as to other periods of time than the 24 hour day but to the seventh “month” and to the seventh “year” as well as to the first day, 50th year etc. Thus you

cannot restrict the Sabbath law to the Seventh day “of the week” when God applies it far wider, although, it includes such an application.

Under the Old Covenant the application of the fourth commandment finds its most prominent application to be the seventh day “of the week” as seen in Leviticus 23. However, also in Leviticus 23 is the foreshadowing of the NEW covenant and in connection with this NEW covenant types the most prominent application is always without exception the first day “of the week.” Thus the Exodus application has reference to a SINLESS CREATION maintained by WORKS whereas the Deuteronomy application has reference to REDEMPTION in Christ by a NEW covenant that ushers in a NEW and SINLESS creation that commemorates GRACE without works.

The Old Covenant application by the Jews not only points to a SINLESS CREATION in connection with WORKS but is inseparable from the Levitical regulations that demand that such a goal and set forth the WORKS necessary to obtain (sinless perfection) that goal in the life of the Jew (if he or any man could actually keep that law).

The New Covenant application of the fourth command not only points to a SINLESS creation yet to come in connection with REDEMPTIVE GRACE but celebrates that grace in sanctifying that day in rejoicing and gladness (Psa. 118:24) and in private and public worship “in spirit and in truth” in doing the work of God (Isa. 58:13). It is a BETTER Sabbath observance for the people of God (Heb. 4:9) because it is based upon a GREATER work of God in Christ (redemptive work) that brings in a BETTER creation where again God can look upon all that he has created and say it is “very good.”

Hence, the relationship between the first Sabbath in Genesis and the Sabbath observance in Hebrews 4:9 is a SINLESS creation. That is the “rest” that the people of God

must enter into in order to be free from the PRESENCE of sin. Faith in the gospel frees us from the “penalty” of sin (Heb. 4:2-3). Sanctification by the Spirit of God frees us at times from the “power” of sin but our salvation from sin will not be complete until we enter into that “rest” which is yet future -the rest of God from all sin - the rest found in the first creation but spoiled by sin but restored in the new creation.

The New Covenant Sabbath application is the first day of the week, the “Lord's day” and is set apart and blessed by God to remember the redemptive work of Christ that provides great anticipation and expectation of a New Sinless creation. It is separated from the other six days of the week as “the Lord's day” and is observed by rejoicing and gladness (Psa. 118:24) as a day set apart for public worship of God's people and for doing the WORKS of God (Isa. 58:13).

Hebrews 4:1-11 sets forth the theological ground work for the above interpretation of the Sabbath. All believers before Calvary entered into SPIRITUAL rest when they believed the gospel (Heb. 4:2) just as we do. Spiritual rest is the rest from the presence and power of sin in our spirit due to the new birth. The new birth obtains a sinless sanctified sanctuary within the elect for God to dwell - what is born of Spirit is spirit. However, our soul and body have not entered into a sinless state. The creational Sabbath commemorates a “rest” wherein God and all creation dwelt in a sinless state (Heb. 4:4-5). We have not entered into that kind of rest yet. Joshua did not lead Israel into that kind of rest but only led them into a type of that rest - Palestine. David did not obtain that rest for the people of God by merely subduing all enemies of God's people but only obtained a type of that rest.

Jesus by his work of redemption (Heb. 4:10) provided the basis to obtain entrance into that kind of rest NOW in spirit and in the FUTURE for both spirit soul and body (Heb. 4:11). Just as God commemorated the first work of creation by a Sabbath observance so also Christ commemorated the second

work of creation by a sabbath observance - “the Lord's day” the “first day of the week” the resurrection day and therefore there remaineth a Sabbath day observance for the people of God - a better Sabbath - a sabbath characterized by rejoicing and gladness, and hope, (Psa. 118:24). A Sabbath observance without Levitical Old Covenant regulations. A Sabbath observance characterized by public worship and doing the works of God.

HD:

Good to see and hear from you again Dr Walter. Yes Christ gives rest to those who are heavy laden and weary as He promised. He is our Sabbath rest.

Dr Walters do you see a significance to “Deuteronomy” as a second giving of the law?

What do you think sets it apart from Leviticus?

DW:

Yes, Hank! I see the law given twice in keeping with the law under the Old Covenant versus the Law under the New Covenant. The Sabbath law is really the summation of all other nine in principle and practice. In the second giving of the law the Sabbath is to be kept in connection with remembering redemption. The law is written on the heart under the new covenant (Ezek. 36:26-27 with 2 Cor. 3:3).

The day that commemorates the work of redemption - “the Lord's day” is the external application of the fourth commandment under the new covenant. This new covenant Sabbath is free from all the levitical regulations that characterize the fourth commandment application under the Old covenant.

We enter spiritual rest “in Christ” when we believe in the gospel just as all saints previous to the cross entered into spiritual rest “in Christ” when they believed the gospel (heb. 4:2; Acts 10:43). However, the significance of the Sabbath in

Genesis 2 cannot be fulfilled in the fourth commandment application under the Old Covenant, it was not fulfilled by Joshua leading Israel into the promised rest of Palestine and it was not fulfilled by David subduing all the enemies of God in the promised land (Heb. 4:7-8). However, all these things were TYPES of the final and full application of the fourth commandment found in the NEW CREATION yet to come where once again all creation will be free from the presence of sin. Hence, there remains the external token or actual external sabbath day observance for the people of God (Heb. 4:9) that commemorates the greater work of redemption (Heb. 4:10) by Christ until the people of God enter into that NEW CREATION forever free from the PRESENCE of sin.

This better Sabbath day observance is without legalism, without levitical regulations characterized under the OLD covenant. It is a day set apart for rejoicing and gladness and public worship in pursuit of the works of God. It looks back at Calvary and forward to the New Creation. It is better than the first creational sabbath in that the first commemorated a creation without the presence of sin whereupon God could say “very good” but dependent upon the WORKS of man for that state to continue. In contrast the New Covenant Sabbath - “The Lord's Day” commemorates the work of redemption that secures a NEW creation from the presence of sin based purely upon the GRACE of God without works.

BTW my interpretation of the Sabbath law is not based upon unBiblical logic or allegorization without biblical precedent.

Acts 2:1-41; 1 Cor. 5:6-8; 10:1-11; and Acts 3:15-19 all give Biblical precedence to understand the feasts in Leviticus 23 as TYPES of New Covenant truths under the Old Covenant law. My interpretation and application is in keeping with the Biblical precedent to understand such feasts as types of New covenant truths.

Neither the Creation Sabbath or the fourth

commandment ever use the words “of the week.” Neither was based upon the Babylonian Calendar or any modern calendar. The fourth commandment was incorporated into the Biblical monthly calendar given in Leviticus 23 which is a DATE calendar instead of a DAY calendar. This calendar was Lunar and that is precisely why the pre-babylonian books of the Bible speak of the “new moon.” The lunar calendar was 30 days and this can be clearly seen by the dating given by Moses concerning the length of the flood and the account of Noah and thus a 360 day year. In Biblical lunar Calendar of 360 days there is 30 days in a month which is not divisional by seven. Hence, if the Sabbath was the seventh day of the week in a Lunar Calendar month, then the 29th would start the beginning of the week that would carry into the next month and thus the Sabbath would fall on the fifth of the next month instead of the seventh and then proceed to fall on the 12th, 19th, 23rd and 30th and then begin all over again the next month on the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th.

Now if you put the Babylonian DAY names to each of these dates that would mean every other month the Sabbath would fall on Friday instead of Saturday and most likely that is why the Egyptians Sabbath was observed on Friday.

Hence, the principle is six days work followed and preceded by one day Sabbath regardless of the calendar being used and regardless of the day the Sabbath fell upon.

The permanent establishment of the Sabbath on Saturday by the Jews was due to the Babylonian calendar day names and tradition rather than to any positive Biblical statute or command. The principle of the fourth commandment permitted such an application as the principle only demanded a set of seven days where six days preceded a Sabbath and six days followed a Sabbath.

However, in the Biblical calendar given in Leviticus 23 the Sabbath was established upon the 1st, 8th, 15th, and 22nd day of the month in regard to all the feasts and if you then

followed the Babylonian Calendar day names that would mean the Sabbath fell upon Sunday during these months with their feasts. This is also consistent with the Biblical principle of the fourth commandment of a set of seven days whereby six days of work precede and follow a day of rest.

The significance of the Biblical calendar given in Leviticus 23 is that this is God's calendar and in God's calendar he changed the Calendar year where the first month of the previous civil year that had been observed by Israel in Egypt now became the seventh month in the religious Calendar which began with a first day Sabbath in the seventh month instead of a seventh day of the month sabbath. Furthermore, in the religious calendar year established by God all the feasts, which were types of the New Covenant made the first day "of the week" Sabbath preeminent over the Seventh day "of the week" sabbath in a lunar month. The reason is because the New Covenant would be commemorated by the first day of the week Sabbath rather than the Seventh day of the week. Significantly every feast in the religious calendar established by God made the first day of the week more prominent than the seventh day of the week. Just look at Leviticus 23 and you can clearly see this. Likewise, in the Biblical week of years calendar given by God the 50th Sabbatical year held more prominence than the Seventh Sabbatical year. The 50th year would be equivalent to Sunday in the daily week calendar.

SDA and other Saturn-day worshippers repudiate the Biblical calendar with its emphasis upon the first day, first year and follow after the Jewish tradition based upon the Babylonian Calendar names for the days of the month.

The Sabbath law or fourth commandment was based upon a principle of six preceding a seventh and following a seventh. God applied the Sabbath law to the first day of the week in all of the monthly feasts that characterize and typify the New Covenant. However, he applied the principle to more

than 24 hour days but to “years” that were not only the “seventh” year but also the 50th or what would be regarded as the “first year” of the week of years.

GE:

Just how on earth can it be true, “.....*the first, eighth, fifteenth and twenty second Sabbath days equal the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th Sabbaths in the Jewish calendar Feast months*”?

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71977>

Your logic is not logical. We are told it [the Seventh Day] is the “seventh day” but we are not told it was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK.” Nowhere is the Sabbath command limited to the seventh day “OF THE WEEK.” It can include it but it is not restricted to it and that is obvious by the fact that the SABBATH command is applied to 1st, 8th, 15th and 21st days of the month. It is applied to “years” especially the 50th year and it is applied to “months.” The very fact that the sabbath command is applied to other periods of time than the seventh day and to periods of time longer than a “day” demonstrates it is not to be understood as a restricted to the seventh day “of the week.” Therefore, the Sabbath is not restricted to Saturday but may be applied to Saturday.

GE:

DW: “*We are told it [the Seventh Day] is the “seventh day” but we are not told it was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK.”*” Why should it? It was “*the “seventh day” ...*” *OF THE WEEK*”” for the very reason it was the seventh day... of creation... naturally. And “*we are not told it was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK*”” exactly for it having been “*the seventh day “OF THE WEEK*”” of God’s creation-works before there ever were a calendar or a month or a year. Contextually in both the creation saga and the Fourth

Commandment the origin of things is the presupposed and contextually the origin of things determined the grouping of the first ever seven days of creation which but only in modern and Western society became known as the week. But the ‘week’ it has ever been since the creation... in any case according to the Bible and Bible-chronology.

Re: *“Nowhere is the Sabbath command limited to the seventh day “OF THE WEEK.” It can include it but it is not restricted to it”....”*

“Nowhere is the Sabbath command limited to the seventh day “OF THE WEEK”” is your, UNTRUE, generalisation. Wherever it is said “The Seventh Day” WITH REFERENCE to the creation – as in Genesis 2, Exodus 20 and 31, and Hebrews 4 and Mark 2 –, the number and sequence of days AS THAT single UNIT-of-seven-days and single EVENT-of-seven-days, formed the determinative ORIGIN, of :- ‘the week’!

Then wherever “The Seventh Day” within and ‘OF’ THIS original and fundamental unit-of- seven-days and ITS presupposed UNBROKEN recurrence through all time is the mentioned, the referred-to, or the supposed, “The-Seventh-Day- _OF-THE-WEEK_ ”, is the logical and natural NAME, for / of “The-Seventh-Day”.

There is absolutely nothing – for the BIBLE-believer in any case – unprecedented or illogical or unhistorical or mysterious to be understood about ‘The Seventh Day’ as the “Seventh-Day-of-the-week”. Your problematic interpretation “the Sabbath command (is nowhere) limited to the seventh day “OF THE WEEK””, and “can include it but it is not restricted to it”, clearly is designed to impress in order to confuse.

PS

Like is clear you succeed to do very well, per posts in reply to yours.

DW:

I have already answered this logic plus tradition type of reasoning. You have not been able to answer the problems I placed before you. All you do is simply repeat your logic plus tradition response.

You have not been able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the sabbath law to other days than the “seventh day.” The Sabbath law is the only grounds/basis for the idea of a “sabbath.”

GE:

No; the creation or ‘making-of the Sabbath’ and giving-of-the-Law are “*the only grounds/basis for the idea of a “sabbath”*” — “THE-Sabbath-of-the-LORD-GOD”. Get that!

DW:

You have not been able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the Sabbath law to other periods of time than merely a 24 hour period (month, year).

You have not been able to answer why the Biblical calendar month and year is not divisible by seven but has a “twenty and ninth” day in it. If the “week” is God's basic and essential time measurement then why did He not create the moon, earth and sun orbits and rotations according to that essential time measurement?????? It is obvious from the account of Noah that the first calculations of months and years was strictly lunar with 30 days in the month and 360 days in the year. Just read the account of Noah. This is how God counted months and the year. 30 days is not evenly divisible by seven. 360 days is not evenly disivable by seven.

Man has changed the calander month and years even more in many different calendars.

My position is not dependent upon human calendar calculations at any time in human history. My position isolates seven days as a unit thus permitting the unit to continue

consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise.

GE:

For what are you saying this?! If your “*position isolates seven days as a unit thus permitting the unit to continue consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise*”, your “*position*” simply “*isolates*” the ‘week’ as “*seven days as a unit*” that “*continue(s) consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise*”!

How absurd can you get?

In any case It’s not YOUR “*position*” and it is not YOU who “*isolate*”, “*seven days as a unit thus permitting the unit to continue consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise.*” It is God’s ‘*position*’ as Creator Almighty. It is God, who ‘*isolates seven days as a unit thus permitting the unit to continue consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise*’. It is God’s; it is the story of the creation’s; it is the Law of the Fourth Commandment’s; it is the Scriptures’ ‘*position*’ and ‘*permission*’; not yours! Don’t be so preposterous!

It is God, who ‘*isolates seven days as a unit*’ called by non-Hebrew or Greek speaking people, (the) **WEEK!**

DW:

My position allows the Sabbath law to be applied to any period of time (day, month, year, millennium) that God may choose. My position fits the obvious typology of both the Old and New Covenants.

GE:

That will be the day!

NOW you are talking about really YOUR own

presumptions! It in fact is YOUR “*position*” that “*allows the Sabbath law to be applied to any period of time (day, month, year, millennium) that*” YOU “*may choose*”— TRUE! Which “*position*”, “*fits*” NEITHER “*the typology of the Old*” or, “*New Covenants*”! Because “*the Sabbath law*” in “*both the Old and New Covenants*” can and may be “*allowed*” and or “*applied*” by One Only— God! “One is the Law Giver— He who has the Power to save!” Have you got the power to save? Are you, God? Are you in the “*position*” of God? If you think you are, then ‘*allow the Sabbath law to be applied to any period of time (day, month, year, millennium) that YOU may choose*’, but God, has chosen to allow the Sabbath law to be applied to ONE period of time that HE had “chosen” at and before the foundation of the world, “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

Now how can He be “YOUR God” if you have taken in His “*position*” and usurped His authority to “*choose ... any period of time – day, month, year, millennium*”— anything but “the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”, and “*allow*” and “*apply*”, “*the Sabbath law*” to it?! Blaspheming, so audacious!

DW:

Your position and interpretation is Jewish, and errs greatly in that it restricts the sabbath law application to the seventh day “of the week” as devised by the Jewish calendar “week.”

GE:

“*The seventh day “of the week”*” has not been “*devised by the Jewish calendar “week”*” but God in Jesus Christ, “made the Sabbath” and “gave the Sabbath”, its “*sabbath law*” as well as its “*application*”, “*to the seventh day “of the week”*” — so that it “*fits the obvious typology of both the Old and New Covenants*”.

You are only ‘*devising*’ evil plans against “the Sabbath of the LORD GOD” to create a vacuum into which you could shove your idolatrous Sunday-worshipping ... and that, in the Name of Jesus Christ!

Do you think “*the Jewish calendar “week”*” existed BEFORE the creation? Or do you think “*the Jewish calendar “week”*” existed before the story of the creation was “*devised*”?

If this, the “*position and interpretation ... that restricts the sabbath law application to the seventh day “of the week”*” were ‘mine’, then ‘MY *position and interpretation*’ are the GODLY and SCRIPTURAL, and YOUR *position or interpretation errs greatly in that it is devised* according to your own erroneous fallacies AGAINST THE LAW AND THE SCRIPTURES AND INDEED AGAINST GOD.

DW:

Although the (sabbath law) application to the Jewish calander week is not wrong, it is wrong to demand it is restricted to such an application as that very demand condemns God's own application of the Sabbath law.

GE:

What abominable arrogance you have! The Sabbath Law applies to the CREATION and SALVATION-week, and is never ‘wrong’, because it DEMANDS AND COMMANDS THE “SABBATH DAY” be “restricted” and “applied” TO: “THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH OF THE LORD GOD”. But Dr Walter “*demands*”, “*God's own application of the Sabbath law*” be “*condemned*”! “*The Sabbath law*” has one “*application*” to which it is “*restricted*”, namely, to the Sabbath Day – “the Day the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”. But the arrogance of men in ‘*disallowing*’ “*the Sabbath law*” be “*restricted to the seventh day “of the week”*”, “make the Law of no effect” and in their disallowing and

scheming against God's Law, their "*very demand*" that "*condemns God's own application of the Sabbath law*", condemns God.

And why do you always speak of the "*sabbath law*" and "*application of the Sabbath law*"? Can't you speak of things specifically? **Can't you say 'sabbath' simply when you mean 'sabbath'; or 'law' simply when you mean the 'law'?** **The Sabbath is not the** "*sabbath law*" or, the "*application of the Sabbath law*"?

It is not once written "*application*" in either story of the creation and the giving of the Fourth Commandment!

You are set on confusing; nothing else, I can see.

DW:

Take note that you are basing your position upon TRADITION and not the Scriptures. The Scriptures NOWHERE use the term "week" in connection with the institution of the creation Sabbath or the fourth commandment.

GE:

Yes; and NOWHERE is the term "*application*" used in connection with the institution of the creation Sabbath or the Fourth Commandment.

And take note how you manipulate your way around being confronted by the truth of "*the term 'week' in connection with the institution of the creation Sabbath or the fourth commandment*". Just above you spoke about your "*position*" that "*isolates seven days as a unit thus permitting the unit to continue consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise.*" There's NO DIFFERENCE between "*the term 'week' in connection with the institution of the creation Sabbath or the fourth commandment*" and "*the term 'unit'*" or "*seven days as a unit*" or "*the use*" or the "*application*" or whatever of "*the*

term “unit”” or “seven days as a unit”, “in connection with the institution of the creation Sabbath or the fourth commandment”.

NO, difference.

You purely headstrong refuse to admit the terminology of the COMMON wording, “of-the-week”, preferring YOUR own terminology, “*unit / seven days as a unit / the term “unit” / set of days*”. What is so superior about your terminology that it is right but the usual terminology of, “the week”, is wrong?

DW:

In God's Biblical calendar found in the first five books of the Bible where you cannot find Him using any NAMES but only NUMBERS in counting time (years, months, days) the Biblical calendar is not divisible by SEVEN or by the traditional WEEK but is LUNAR and God speaks of the “twenty-ninth” day of the month.

GE:

Yes, “*numbers*”, are the “*names*”; as of the months, so of the days : “First Day-”OF-THE-WEEK / of-the-Month, “Seventh Day-”OF-THE-WEEK / of-the-Month whichever!

And yes; “*In God's Biblical calendar found in the first five books of the Bible where you cannot find Him using any NAMES but only NUMBERS in counting time (years, months, days) the Biblical calendar is not divisible (Sic.) by SEVEN or by the traditional WEEK but is LUNAR...*”, is speaking of the year’s calendar, or the ‘seasonal’, or the ‘natural’ calendar calculated by HUMANS— of which you, yourself had to say, “*the Biblical calendar provided in Genesis through Deuteronomy is based upon a Lunar year of 360 days and 30 day months not equally divisible by seven. If God intended or designed the set of seven days to be the basis for calendar calculations we would read of 28 day months and years divisible by seven.*” And ... “*My position is not dependent*

upon human calendar calculations at any time in human history. My position isolates seven days as a unit thus permitting the unit to continue consistently regardless of the length of the month or year by any calendar man can devise.”

But here, obviously, you ‘*devised*’ to CONFUSE as usual and according to PLAN!

DW:

If your “week” position were the Biblical position then the Biblical calendar would necessarily be divided by seven BUT IT IS NOT! God would have created the rotation of the moon to be divisible by the WEEK or by SEVEN but he did not.

GE:

“*Would ... would*” but never did....

You cannot even see how you contradict yourself! The ““week” position” is “*the Biblical position*” AS PERTAINING TO THE CREATION-‘week’, confirmed in the New Testament through Christ his whole ministry and especially in the REDEMPTION-week of his Last Passover, and – as you yourself many times have admitted and argued – has NOTHING TO DO with calendar-‘months’ or ‘seasons’ or ‘years’.

DW:

The tradition of the “week” is not wrong but it becomes wrong when you limit and restrict the Sabbath law to it....

GE:

The ‘week’ comes from no “*tradition*”. It comes from God’s original creating of the world and from Christ “The Beginning of the creation of God ... The Amen, The Faithful and True Witness” by the Last Passover of Yahweh. Revelation 3:14.

And what, is “it”? How can “*the Sabbath law*” be “restricted” to “*the “week”*”— “*the “week”*” which comprises the whole “*set / unit of seven days*”? If “*the Sabbath law*” were “restricted” to “*the “week”*”, its “*application*” would have been to all seven days or “*set / unit of seven days*” or to any of the seven days of the creation- “*set / unit of seven days*”— a completely senseless law!

“*The Sabbath law*”, “applies to” – that is – it is “restricted” to “the Seventh Day Sabbath”, or it is no ‘law’ at all.

DW:

The Sabbath law can include it but cannot be limited to it. Your position demands the Sabbath law be restricted to it and God Himself does not restrict the Sabbath law to it.

I am not saying that TRADITION is wrong in regard to defining a seven day period of time as “the week”....

GE:

What is “it”?!

*‘The Sabbath law can include the **week** but cannot be limited to the **week**. Your position demands the Sabbath law be restricted to the **week** and God Himself does not restrict the Sabbath law to the **week**’?*

Or,

*‘The Sabbath law can include the **Sabbath** but cannot be limited to the **Sabbath**. Your position demands the Sabbath law be restricted to the **Sabbath** and God Himself does not restrict the Sabbath law to the **Sabbath**’?!*

*“... God Himself does not restrict the Sabbath law to the **Sabbath**’?! Then what after all is God’s Sabbath Law about? You must be insane....*

You ARE “wrong”, “saying that TRADITION is wrong in regard to defining a seven day period of time as “the week”” because “tradition” is dead right in regard to defining

“*the week*” in the beginning and the creation of the world and in the first institution of the Sabbath Commandment, “*a seven day period of time...*” the specific / “*restricted*” / “*applied*” “*period of time*” “the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”. “God sanctified / set apart / hallowed the Seventh Day” and “blessed the Seventh Day” specifically / particularly **above and apart** from any other day of the week or “*unit of seven*” creation-days.

What English is it you’re talking?

DW:

I am not saying that TRADITION is wrong in regard to defining a seven day period of time as “the week” but I am saying that the BIBLICAL CALENDAR of determining the length of a month and year is not divisible by seven but is rather based upon the LUNAR month of 29th days. Hence, God does not use a WEEK measurement in His yearly and monthly calendar found in Scriptures.

GE:

So?! Besides contradicting yourself in this single non-sense-statement of yours, you flat contradict yourself to just above, quote, “*If your “week” position were the Biblical position then the Biblical calendar would necessarily be divided by seven BUT IT IS NOT! God would have created the rotation of the moon to be divisible by the WEEK or by SEVEN but he did not.*”

All your ‘if’s’ and ‘would’s’ are stupid and nonsensical. “If not ... but not ...”, “If were ... then would not ...”. Can’t you speak SUBSTANCE? No, you can’t.

DW:

It is wrong in regard to the creation Sabbath and fourth commandment when TRADITION confines the Sabbath application within the “week”.

GE:

It is NOT “TRADITION”! And not even “*tradition*” could ‘*confine the Sabbath application within the “week”.*’ Again, what English is it you’re speaking? God – through creating as well as through Law-giving – confined / applied / commanded the Sabbath Day TO the originally created and afterwards commanded “Seventh Day” OF the ‘week’ or “Seventh Day” OF the “*set of days*” the first ever, and out of nothing, created, ‘days’.

It is God; it is the Scriptures! It is the Law! Right here in the history of the creation and of the first Law-giving where God, ‘*confines the Sabbath*’ and its ‘*application*’, “*within the “week”*” TO, “The Day-the-Seventh-Day-Sabbath- : OF-THE-LORD-GOD”! THIS, is The Scriptures; NOT, “*tradition*” and NOT Dr Walter!

DW:

Your position is based upon TRADITION and LOGIC whereas my position is based precisely upon what the Scripture says and how the scripture uses the Sabbath law. Your position of TRADITION plus LOGIC is inconsistent with the Biblical application of the Sabbath law and therefore must be rejected and must be wrong as the only other alternative is to either accuse God of improperly applying the Sabbath law to other days and periods of time or perverting his applications.

GE:

“*The Sabbath law*”, is not “*the Sabbath*”; and “*the Sabbath*” is not the WORD and linguistic “*TERM*”, ‘sabbath’.

And none of the “*other days*” are days ‘*applied*’ or implied in “*the Sabbath law*” except in contradistinction to “The Day-the-Seventh-Day-Sabbath- : OF-THE-LORD-GOD”.

And as far as “*Your position is based upon*

TRADITION....” is concerned....

I said, “Wherever it is said “The Seventh Day” with reference to the creation – as in Genesis 2, Exodus 20 and 31, and Hebrews 4 and Mark 2 –, the number and sequence of days AS THAT single UNIT-of-seven-days and single EVENT-of-seven-days, formed the determinative ORIGIN, of :- ‘the week’!

Then wherever “The Seventh Day” within and ‘OF’ THIS presupposed unit-of- seven-days and ITS presupposed UNBROKEN recurrence through all time is the mentioned, the referred-to, or the supposed, “The-Seventh-Day- _OF-THE-WEEK_ ”, is the logical and natural NAME, for and of “The-Seventh-Day”.

That means the “Seventh-Day-of-the-week” is totally, Biblically-unique. The worldwide acceptance and use of the concept and very words, “of the week”, still, 2000 years after Christ, has not changed the fact of the fact, one bit, but has confirmed it, every day of its use.

Civilised and barbarians alike have their worldview and framework of thought DETERMINED BY AND THROUGH AND ACCORDING TO CHRISTIANITY, whether they know it or not and whether they like it or not. And Christianity of all nations and languages, has its worldview and framework of thought determined VIA THE ENGLISH Bible Old and New Testaments, whether we know it or not and whether we like it or not. And the same applies to the association between Christianity and the history and nation of the Jews— Christianity VIA ENGLISH Christianity, has its roots in ‘Judaism’, not ‘Judaism’ in Christianity. : Now here is where it may be rightfully claimed: “*Tradition*” (as you, Dr Walter, presume), “*has NOTHING to do with*”, the fact, the truth, or the reality “The Seventh-Day” OF THE _BIBLE_, is what is worldwide through TRADITION, known and understood for and as “The Seventh-Day- _OF-THE-WEEK_ ”; which again, is WORLDWIDE known and understood – after the manner of

‘Western’, English, Christian, TRADITION – as and for ‘Saturday’!

I picked this up from somewhere the other day by an unknown to me author, ‘Obadiah’ (emphasis, GE):

“It is entirely incorrect that the Plural for the Greek word for sabbath indicates two sabbath days. It does not mean ‘more than one sabbath’. In fact, the Singular form, sabbaton, IN AND OF ITSELF can mean ‘WEEK’, as in *dis tou sabbatou*, ‘twice a week’ (Luke 18:12); *kata mian sabbatou*, ‘on the first day of the week’ in Acts 20:7; there are not two sabbaths in that context. Didache 8:1 uses the phrase *deutera sabbatwn kai pempe*, ‘the second and fifth days of the week.’ Already in LXX the phrase *he hemera twn sabbatwn* is used many times to mean ‘the sabbath day’ (THE UNDERLYING HEBREW IS SINGULAR). The extension of the plural form *sabbatwn* to mean an entire WEEK is solidly established. This business about Matthew’s use of the plural form implying “two sabbaths” just isn’t true.”

Just as UNTRUE is the biased business about the Seventh Day in the creation story and giving of the Law does not mean “the Seventh-Day-OF-THE-WEEK”!

And God did not “say “*very good*””, on the Seventh Day! God did NOT “say “*very good*””, quote: “.... *UPON CONTINUANCE IN GOOD WORKS by Adam and Eve*”! (Your capital letters!) which is your blatant lie upon which you “based” your patched-up “*Position on the Fourth Commandment*”.

And it is your odious mongrelised Pelagian Arminian Freewillism. Which despicable doctrine you further embroider with asserting, “*Grace and mercy have nothing to do with this first creation*”! While God created originally out of and for nothing than Grace, Mercy and Love!

Away with your hollow, empty, noisy, presumptuousness! You refer to the Seventh-day Adventists—they can take a few lessons from you, Dr Walter!

DW:

I never said the words “very good” were spoken on the seventh day. I said the sabbath commemorated a finished work upon which God concluded with “very good” and that is exactly what Genesis 1:31 states and I quote:

And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

The Sabbath commemorates EVERY THING God made and this statement concludes the sixth day proving Satan could not have possibly fallen on the sixth day because if Satan had fallen before the conclusion of the sixth day, God could never have said at the closure of that day “very good.”...

GE:

You did say “*the words “very good” were spoken on the seventh day*”— indirectly!

So it MUST have been pronounced “very good” on the day AFTER the Sixth – according to you – and while Adam and Eve still CONTINUED in righteousness of works.

But watch how you avoid the issue. It is I, who ‘*never said*’ and you, who without saying, said, “*Satan had fallen ... on the sixth day ... before the conclusion of the sixth day*”. Quote me as I quoted you, Dr Walter, saying it?! Noticed your own words, “*before the conclusion of the sixth day*”?

I say subterfuge, because you thus with SPINNING try to avoid the reality which we are supposed, Dr Walter, to speak about— the historical fact Adam and Eve had fallen in sin, question mark, ‘On which Day-of-the-week the creation-week’? On the Day-of-the creation-week “BEFORE” (– YOUR word, Dr Walter, my capital letters –) “BEFORE the conclusion of” it – it, “*the sixth day*” – WITHOUT “CONTINUANCE IN GOOD WORKS by Adam and Eve” after it, or, “*based upon CONTINUANCE IN GOOD WORKS by*

Adam and Eve” AFTER it?

That then brings us to the second ‘point’ of your subterfuge. That ‘point’ is, your silent deceit to without ado assert that “*God ... said AT THE CLOSURE of that day “very good.”*”; “*this statement (Genesis 1:31) CONCLUDES the sixth day*”. (Emphasis GE)

Your silent deceit is to allege, “*God ... said ... “very good”*”, to “*conclude*”, “*the sixth day*”. Meanwhile you have JUST QUOTED “*exactly what Genesis 1:31 states...: ... And God saw every thing that He had MADE (emphasis GE), and, behold, _it_, was very good. And the evening and the morning were, the Sixth day.*”

GOD’S work that began with the Sixth Day, did not end with the Sixth Day’s end. EVERYTHING RECORDED DONE BY ADAM AND EVE through Genesis 1 and 2, is what the Sixth Day-of-the creation-week was ended with.

And then as the sun as God had appointed it to do “ruled” the Sixth Day-of-the creation-week ended and over with — sunset—,

Genesis 3:8 continues with GOD’S works through Jesus Christ Saviour, of and on the Seventh Day WHEREWITH “God blessed” “The Seventh” and “Sabbath Day”, and WHEREFORE God “sanctified and set it apart”, and WHEREIN God “finished”, and in finishing, “RESTED”... 2:2,3 ... IN CHRIST and THROUGH CHRIST : FULFILLED according to the history of Salvation contained in Genesis chapter 3!

These were the WORKS OF REST of Grace and Mercy of God on the first of all subsequent Sabbaths and Seventh-Days-of-the-week.

I, GE, said:

<There exists no break or gap in chronological sequence between the DAYS, as there exists no break or gap between the EVENTS of the couple’s SIN on the Sixth Day of their creation and God’s GRACE on the Seventh Day after.>

Doctor Walter said:

“What complete nonsense!”

Alright, Dr Walter, Q-U-O-T-E the gap; Q-U-O-T-E what filled it in!

DW:

...You pervert my words as much as you pervert God's Word. You misquote Genesis 1:31 by leaving out the words “everything” and you deny the sixth day CONCLUDES with the words “very good” and you fail to see the direct connection between Genesis 1:31 and Genesis 2:1 which in turn is the basis for the sanctification and blessing of the creation sabbath.

You quote my exact words and in my exact words there is no mention of God saying “very good” on the seventh day. I simply state that the seventh day institution of the Sabbath is the consequence of those words spoken at the end of the sixth day in verse 31 and taken over into Genesis 2:1 which introduces the sabbath observance. Can't you read what you wrote and repeated me saying???????

Here read what you wrote and what I said:

QUOTE=GE *“The original Sabbath commemorated a SINLESS creation where God could say “very good””?! “Where”, was that? “Where” – according to YOU, QUOTE – “The original Sabbath commemorated a SINLESS creation”.* Come on now

Where was that? It is in Genesis 1:31-2:1 which forms the closure of the sixth day and EVERYTHING GOD CREATED and introduces the seventh day which also commemorates ALL THE WORKS GOD CEASED FROM.

I never said the words “very good” were spoken on the seventh day. I said the sabbath commemorated a finished work upon which God concluded with “very good” and that is exactly what Genesis 1:31 states and I quote:

And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold,

it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

The Sabbath commemorates EVERY THING God made and this statement concludes the sixth day proving Satan could not have possibly fallen on the sixth day because if Satan had fallen before the conclusion of the sixth day, God could never have said at the closure of that day “very good.”

GE:

Subterfuge! “...*words spoken at the end of the sixth day ...*” are words spoken ON the SEVENTH Day, especially if they – according to you – were words spoken on or upon or of or about “*a finished work upon which God concluded with “very good”*”, and they – according to YOU –, not having been words spoken “*before the conclusion of the sixth day*”!

DW:

God did not rest “in” his work but “from” his work - all his creation work contained WITHIN THAT SIX DAY PERIOD.'

He rested “FROM” his works and that is the Biblical analogy the writer of Hebrews uses in Hebrews 4:3-4 to demonstrate that the only way we can enter into “his rest” is to rest FROM all our works (see. Rom. 4:5-6; Tit. 2:3; Eph. 2:8-10).

This is precisely why the same writer of hebrews tells us that the intial aspect of gospel conversion is “repentance FROM dead WORKS” - Heb. 6:1

This is precisely why the giving of the fourth commandment is to “remember” both creation (Exodus 20:8,11) and redemption (Deut. 5:15) as they are both works of God that completely deny any works of man (Eph. 2:10a; Tit. 3:5).

This is precisely how we enter into “his rest” by faith in the gospel (Heb. 4:2-3) by ceasing from our own works and

RESTING in his FINISHED - COMPREHENSIVE - SINLESS works that characterize both creation and redemption - both in the types (passover lamb vs actual lamb of God).

You simply do not understand the fundamentals of the Sabbath meaning that is conveyed by God in Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy or in Hebrews. We enter into “his rest” by ceasing from all our works because the Sabbath typifies a rest FROM ALL WORKS and yet at the same time rest based UPON HIS FINISHED work of redemption. And what crass ignorance on public display. Don't you even understand the meaning of the terms “grace” or “mercy” in regard to redemption? There is no such thing as “mercy” prior to sin as there is no need for mercy prior to sin. Mercy is not receiving just compensation for sin - there was no sin by Adam or Eve before the Fall - hence no mercy prior to the fall. Mercy demands a condemned state deserving of punishment. Grace in regard to redemption is getting what you don't deserve. Adam and Eve were not objects of God's grace prior to the fall as they did not need redemptive grace.

GE:

The heart of the issue!

The meaning of the terms “grace” or “mercy” in regard to redemption is the reason why God created at all a new and sinless world “wherein (would) dwell Righteousness” even “THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS”. Exactly because “*there is no such thing as “mercy” prior to sin as there is no need for mercy prior to sin.*” Therefore, because there was sin in God’s creation – because sin had crept in through the devil and his angels – “God in the beginning created the heavens and the earth” Genesis 1:1, and the STORY OF REDEMPTION OF GOD’S CREATION THROUGH JESUS CHRIST FROM SIN, STARTED.

It is the story of the “*original Sabbath*” as well.

This is what Dr Walter has not discovered yet, and I pray he may also see ... in God's own time. Meanwhile I'll fight him with sinner's hands nevertheless.

Therefore yes, of course, "*there was no sin by Adam or Eve before the Fall - hence no mercy prior to the fall*"!!! Hence Mercy and Grace began with Adam and Eve and their creation. Don't you see?! "*Mercy demands a condemned state deserving of punishment. Grace in regard to redemption is getting what you don't deserve.*"

AMEN!

Mercy is receiving just compensation for your sins IN JESUS CHRIST; that is what Grace is.

Adam and Eve were the object of God's grace PRIOR to the fall as they STOOD IN NEED OF "redemptive grace" IN VIEW OF THEIR STATUS QUO THE VERY DAY OF THEIR CREATION.

God's first token of Mercy and Grace He gave Adam and Eve came right after the tragedy of their disobedience and fall when "In the cool of dusk God walking in the Garden Adam and his wife HEARD THE VOICE OF THE LORD GOD"!

There exists no break or gap in chronological sequence between the DAYS, as there exists no break or gap between the EVENTS of the couple's SIN on the Sixth Day of their creation, as there exists no break or gap between creation and God's GRACE on the Seventh Day after.

"*When sin entered in, the whole creation was no longer "very good" but corrupted and defiled by sin and reserved for destruction by fire.*" Period! And "*when sin entered in*" was BEFORE "in the cool of dusk" 3:8 on the FIRST Sabbath Day in Eden and Paradise. What utter NONSENSE then is this "... *at the end of the SEVENTH millennium*"? It is the "*continuance*" of your utter NONSENSE of before it.

DW:

The utter nonsense is what you have written. There is a seventh millinnium and the seven year sabbath, 49th year Sabbath or seven seventh are all types of it. It belongs to Israel and it is completed by the total destruction of this present creation which the seventh day sabbath commemorates. The seventh day sabbath is fulfilled by that seventh JEWISH millenium and the total destruction of the heaven and earth it commemorated.

You are wrong, your position is wrong, your interpretation is ludricous and you accusations are nothing but hot air.

GE:

And Dr Walter never insults nobody.....

I welcome insults.

They are ALWAYS elicited by objections that cannot be answered.

However,

I say it again – and for the last time as I have finished with this aspect or ‘subject’ of the conversation if for its confusion it can be called a ‘subject’ (What a ridiculous supposition creation began with a rest-day....),

The Genesis-recording of or “*in*” the “*creation*”, “*provides*” and “*applies*” and “*proves*”, _the_ “*six working days*” that God first created and then created on, “*that*”, without EVER having been “*preceded*” “*by a Sabbath*”, are “*only*”, “*CONCLUDED*”, by “The Day-The-Seventh-Day” in Genesis 2, and by “The Day-The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD” in the Fourth Commandment, and afterwards, after it thus “IS BEGUN”, for believers (only), CONTINUES ad infinitum.

DW:

Again, you are good at insulting but bankrupt in

responding to the evidence I have presented you. You ignored the direct questions and qualifications demonstrating your position is error or else you could provide reasonable and clear answers.

Your response above does not in the least disprove my position as my position does not deny the Sabbath is the seventh day following six preceding working days. Sunday is the seventh day that follows six preceding working days and is “the Lord's day” the resurrection day which occurred on the first day of the week as Luke proves in Luke 24:1 compared with the words “same day” in verse 13 compared with verses 21-22 proving “third day” since the crucifixion is THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK and therefore necessarily the day of his resurrection. Case closed!

GE:

Now I said,

The “*original Sabbath*”, “*commemorated*”, nothing; God “MADE”, and in making it, INSTITUTED the Seventh Day first time ever, a Sabbath Day; how could it be ‘*commemorative*’? (It was ‘redemptive’, instead, yes!)

Dr Walter answered:

“*Not according to the wording of the fourth commandment. The Sabbath commemorates, and remembers God's creation in six days, a creation that God concludes with the words “very good.”*”

I answer DW:

Dr Walter, you, and I, talked about the – quoting you –, “*original Sabbath*”. That is the Sabbath talked of in Genesis 2, the creation story; that is not “*the wording of the fourth commandment*” in Exodus 20 or wherever.

Next, I have before pointed to the REAL thing with reference to which “*the fourth commandment*” in Exodus et al, speaks, that must be ‘*commemorated, and remembered*’, which (in the first place) is NOT the “six days THOU shalt

labour”, but which is “The Sabbath Day” : “Remember the Sabbath Day” verse 8 = “The Rest Day” per se. Mark the “rest-idea” contained by the “Sabbath DAY”.

Because God’s “REST”, is what the Fourth Commandment actually and really commands should be ‘commemorated, and remembered’. Verse 11, “Remember the Sabbath Day [[For]] the LORD made heaven and-earth and-everything in them in six days, and THE SEVENTH DAY : RESTED HE : WHEREFORE the LORD blessed the Sabbath Day and SET IT APART” : to be ‘commemorated, and remembered’ as, and for being : “THE SEVENTH DAY The Sabbath Day” “the day in”, which, “God RESTED”.

Note that the Adverb of Reason – ‘for’ – starting verse 11 in the English, does not exist in the Hebrew; it is ‘supplied’. Man and both his duties of work and rest, are no more than an incidental parenthesis; it is not the thing of main importance; nor is God’s past and finished with-works of the Sixth and previous days, the real subject of ‘commemoration, and remembrance’.

The REST OF GOD is the essence and form-determining single major factor about, for, and of “the Seventh Day : Sabbath (REST!) OF ...” NOT man or Israeli, BUT : “... OF THE LORD, YOUR GOD”!

In contrast to the supplied Adverb of Reason, ‘for’ used in 11b, the word “WHEREFORE” used in 11b to connect GOD’S REST as reason for WHY the Sabbath must be “remembered”, literally is a HUGE word of conspicuous and direct significance for and bearing on the essence of the passage and the Commandment WHICH IS THE REST OF THE LORD.

The word “wherefore”, comes from in fact a combination of two words in the Hebrew, “ON”, ‘el’, and “PLACE / BASIS / FOOTING”, ‘kehn’ : “ON THIS BASIS THAT GOD ON THE SEVENTH DAY RESTED ... THOU SHALT REMEMBER the Seventh Day”.

DW:

What complete nonsense! You confuse God's plan/purpose of redemption for Adam and Eve with their actual condition and state before the fall. True they were objects of mercy and grace within God's eternal purpose of redemption but that begs the issue. They were not subject to mercy and grace before the fall. It was a sinless creation at THE END of day six. Day six concludes with those words "very good." Day seven commemorates the conclusion from ALL HIS WORKS and there was no sin.

Anyone reading the creation account can easily see the terms and conditions prior to the fall was based upon WORKS - do this and thou shalt die dont do this and thou shalt live. Grace does not come into this picture until after their fall (Gen. 3:15).

GE:

Again your abominable doctrine ...

DW:

Anyone reading the fourth commandment can see the complete nonsense of your denial that the Sabbath commemorates the "very good" work of creation. All you have to ask is one thing to expose your fallacy! That one question is "from WHAT did God rest"? It commemorates God's "rest" from all His works in six days - all of which is summarized at the close of the sixth day which works were "very good." The fourth commandment is all about the creation in six days, its goodness, its completeness -God rested because His works were finished.

GE:

"From" what did God rest? **Rather ask, What IS God's 'Rest'!** ... "From", meaning firstly, apart from / besides / away

from, or, meaning firstly, on the grounds of, from the premise that..., from the a priori ..., on the basis of? Quite a difference!

So, God indeed “rested”, “**from**” his six days of creating, **apart** from it, **besides** it. No problem!

And for the very fact of it, God did NOT **on the basis** or **grounds** of those six days or **on the basis** or **grounds** of his works on them, “**rest**”.

Because it is written:

“BECAUSE GOD ON THE GROUNDS OF HE THE SEVENTH DAY **_RESTED_**, blessed the Seventh Day and sanctified it because that on it God – set apart from all his work which He had made – had **RESTED.**”

Should one **now** say, “THUS, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them”? Thus, like Dr Walter avers?

No! because “THUS, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them” is 2:1 closely connected with 1:31, “Then God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, very good that which He had made! And the morning and the evening were the Sixth Day”-of-the creation-week.

Yes, “*Genesis 1:31 ... forms the closure of the sixth day*”. But NOT “*Genesis 1:31-2:1*”!

And Genesis 1:31 does NOT “*form the closure of ... EVERYTHING GOD CREATED*”. But chapter 2:1, “THUS, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.”

And chapter 2:1, “THUS, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them”, “*forms the closure*” ... NOT “*...of the sixth day*”, but “of ... EVERYTHING GOD CREATED”.

God created orderly; don’t confuse the orderliness of his creation or of his Word about his creation. Confusion is the right hand of deceit; but it is a lame right hand against the order in God’s design and execution.

I may take the opportunity to say, that while I also believe chapter 2:1, “THUS, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them”, “*forms the closure...of ... EVERYTHING GOD CREATED*”, it primarily may be understood for the INTRODUCTION to the summary of chapter 1 found in chapter 2. Put a colon after the text, “THUS, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them : On the Seventh Day God ended.” Not that that makes any difference to any argument between us. But this, no doubt makes all the difference to the arguments used to and fro between us ...

1) “BECAUSE / ON THE GROUNDS THAT GOD IN THE DAY THE SEVENTH DAY RESTED, **THEREFORE REMEMBER** ye, the Sabbath Day to keep it holy” Exodus 20:11,8;

2) “BECAUSE / ON THE GROUNDS THAT GOD IN THE DAY THE SEVENTH DAY RESTED, **THEREFORE** He **BLESSED** the Seventh Day and **SANCTIFIED** it” Exodus 20:11b Genesis 2:3b;

3) “BECAUSE / ON THE GROUNDS / THEREFORE THAT GOD ON THE DAY THE SEVENTH DAY RESTED” is the reason, the basis, the grounds, the a priori, the ‘THEREFORE’, of “He (God) had rested from / besides his **WORKS** which God **CREATED** and **MADE**”. Genesis 2:2 Hebrews 4:4.

4) “BECAUSE / ON THE GROUNDS / THEREFORE THAT GOD ON THE DAY THE SEVENTH DAY RESTED” is “the reason”, “the basis”, “the grounds”, “the a priori”, the ‘THEREFORE’, of ALL, THAT IS “the **SEVENTH DAY SABBATH**, of the Lord your God.” Exodus 20:10a.

“ALTHOUGH (‘kai toi’)—

Hebrews 4:3b,4—

his works / creation / from the foundation of the world

('tohn ergohn apo katabolehs kosmou')
 having had come into being,
 ('genehthentohn' Aorist Participle)
 God THUS having said in the Scriptures
 ('eirehken gar pou')
 CONCERNING _the Seventh Day_ SPECIFICALLY
 ('peri tehs hebdomehs houtohs')
 And God did _REST_
 ('kai katepausen ho Theos)
 in / on / by the Seventh Day
 (en tehi hehmerai tehi hebdomehi')
 from / after all his works."
 ('apo pantohn tohn ergohn autou')

DW:

In Hebrews 4:3-4 - we enter by faith into the same kind of rest - a very good work - a finished work - a completed work of Jesus Christ - thus resting from ALL OUR OWN WORKS. Anyone who is still working for their salvation as Adam and Eve were PRIOR to the fall have not entered into God's rest. The creation Sabbath commemorates a finished, completed and very good work by God without the help, participation or works of man. All who believe in the gospel enter into a SINLESS STATE before God called Justification by faith. Eventually all who believe in the gospel will enter a SINLESS STATE not merely positionally but practically in spirit soul and body in a NEW creation of a new heaven and earth.

GE:

Truth is, God's first token of mercy and grace and Divine CARE AND LOVE AND SYMPATHY – even promise of FORGIVENESS of sin –, was when God COMMANDED Adam and his wife against not trusting and believing HIM and LOVING HIM with all their heart and mind and power

BEFORE by falling for the lie of the devil they ate of the tree of good and evil.

Dr. Walter:

All you have to ask is one thing to expose your fallacy! That one question is “from WHAT did God rest”?

GE:

There is a gap between you and me as wide as the gap between your view and my view which are as wide apart as midnight and midday. And in that order.

No! That is not the 'question'; that, is NO 'question'. Exodus 20:11 in unmistakable words --- as I explained above but you SHUT your eyes and heart to --- emphatically **DECLARES: ”THEREFORE-ON-THE-BASIS GOD, RESTED, REMEMBER THE SABBATH DAY, THEREFORE-ON-THE-BASIS GOD, RESTED, THE SEVENTH DAY HE BLESSED THE SABBATH AND HALLOWED IT.”**

The 'question' therefore is NEVER, “from WHAT did God rest?”, but WHEREIN, did God “REST”?

And the answer is: God rested, in HIS WORKS of and on the Sabbath Day!!!

Nothing than God's “OWN WORKS” could give God, “God's Rest” : ”HE - Jesus - AS GOD HAVING ENTERED INTO HIS OWN REST”, Hebrews 4:10.

WRITE IT IN GOLDEN CAPITAL LETTERS
ACROSS THE HEAVENS!

“Because THEREFORE ('ARA' = 'EL-KEHN') there remains valid for the People of God keeping of His Sabbath Day.” Hebrews 4:9.

SBM:

As can be seen, the Creation Sabbath was not given to all mankind as a Law, but to a Chosen Covenant People. Israel.

That's very significant. Adam [And those He represented] was made under a Covenant with God. So Adam in the beginning before the Fall was representing a chosen people. He stood as the Natural federal head of the elect.

GE:

Keen observation!

Mark there, in chapter 3, how that Jesus Christ already featured as “the Second Adam” and was 'representing a chosen people' of whom He, “STOOD”, as the Federal Head of the elect “AS A LAMB SLAIN FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD”!!!

The Light is beginning to break through, I see; and am glad!

WHO, “*quote*” “*Genesis 1:31 by leaving out the words “everything”*”, Dr Walter? I did not once quote Genesis 1:31. I every time, quoted you, Dr Walter, where quoting Genesis 1:31. And here above, you do not quote me at all, but YOURSELF, and then rant against me, poor GE. So how am I supposed to defend myself? I stand by what I said; by everything I said, vers en kapittel. And it simply is, YOU misquote the Scriptures. As you do it right here, AGAIN:

“...I simply state that the seventh day institution of the Sabbath is the consequence of those words spoken at the end of the sixth day in verse 31”;

And again:

“Genesis 1:31-2:1 which forms the closure of the sixth day and EVERYTHING GOD CREATED” blurred with emphasis on words not those that do the misleading.

Anyone can see you actually mean to say, “*Genesis 1:31-2:1 which forms the closure of the sixth day AND everything God CREATED*”. But the truth – to repeat what I have explained above – is, that Genesis 2:1 forms the closure of the sixth day AND creation-WEEK; not of the things God did on the Sixth Day only.

After that God had finished his very last creation which is recorded in Genesis 1, Eve and Adam still went on, on that same Sixth Day-of creation-week, to do all that they did which is recorded in Genesis chapter 2 which included that they sinned and fell— from the Grace in which they were created by God in chapter one.

And then after it, in chapter 3, it goes on to tell what God did in return to redeem things again back to normal and atonement, reconciliation and “REST” --- God's WORK on, and OF, “The Seventh Day Rest-Day”. Although ‘normality’ returned only by faith, with the view to Christ who would still come in the flesh of mortal man. This is the gist of the ‘question’ which you deny and I believe. “Simply”.

DW:

All your nitpicking over the word “from” is missing the point. The argument of the writer of Hebrews is that we enter into spiritual rest with God - His rest - by ceasing FROM our own works as God ceased FROM His works that occupied him in the past six days.

The rest we enter into is a rest based upon God's finished work as in the original creation wherein humanity was in a sinless condition and at harmony with God and all creation. This is precisely why the fourth commandment is to be remembered in regard to God's creation and God's redemption (Ex. 20:8,11; Deut. 5:15).

GE:

All MY “*nitpicking over the word “from”...*” that I pointed out, does not even exist?!

My “*nitpicking*” the FACT you CANNOT because you ARE unable to refute the SCRIPTURES --- GOD --- let write WORD as clear as Christ Jesus is the LIGHT that is “FROM” and “BASED ON GROUNDS” of God's WORD, “HE RESTED”.

And my argument is that the argument of the writer of Hebrews in 4:8-10 is: That, quote:

“Because Jesus had given them REST ...
(‘gar autos ’Iehsous katepausen’)

[“rested them into THAT-OF-HIM-OF-GOD-REST ...
(‘eis ekeinehn tehn katapausin’)

“... the Rest of HIM which HE RESTED ...
(‘katapausis AUTOU kai AUTOS katepausen’) v10],

“THAT ON THE BASIS THEREFORE...
(‘ara’ = ‘el kehn’)

“... a cultural-ism of the Sabbath-DAY ...
(‘sabbatismos’ of the “Sabbath-of-the-LORD”)

“... remains obligatory ...
(‘apoleipetai’)

“... for the People of God ...
(‘tohi Laohi tou Theou’)

“because / on the grounds He (Jesus) having entered ...
(‘HO-GAR-eiselth-OHN’)

“... into HIS-OWN-REST ...
(‘eis tehn katapausin autou’)

“... as indeed GOD, from his own works-resting ...
(‘hohsper apo tohn idi-ohn, ho Theos’)

“... we LABOUR TO enter into”
... ‘_spiritual_’, ‘rest’, with God IN CHRIST,

... in Jesus Christ, God's "Rest"—
 NOT in our work of "ceasing from our own work"!—
 but, in God's "Rest" "as God from His own works",
IN CHRIST, "RESTED, THE SEVENTH DAY"—
 "The Seventh Day-Sabbath- DAY", and
 <<CULTURAL-ism-of-the-Sabbath-DAY>>,
 "which GOD, THUS, CONCERNING, SPAKE." 4:9

and

"which for the People of God remains
 to be kept and cultured, an -ISM"!

Where did you fetch YOUR, "...works that occupied
 him in the past six days" from? From your own skull, that's
 wherefrom.

But yes, Dr Walter; and all this is summed up in a word:
 If we have entered into Jesus Christ through faith; "IF JESUS
 HAD GIVEN THEM REST"; IF "WE ARE CONVINCED
 OF BETTER THINGS ABOUT YOU, OF THINGS THAT
 ACCOMPANY SALVATION".

It – the Sabbath or Sabbath's Rest or Sabbath Day –, is
 NOT ABOUT THE WORKS OF MAN BUT ABOUT THE
 WORKS OF GOD is all I say, God's PRIME WORK having
 been God's REST in Jesus Christ and through HIM, executed
 and finished and given glory and given SUBSTANCE even
 the substance everything God had made, has.

"ALL OUR WORKS" is nothing! God's REST is
 everything, even the "GROUNDS AND SUBSTANCE /
 BASIS WHERE ON" and "WHEREFORE" --- it is written
 --- God "made the Sabbath" and "the Son of Man is Lord
 EVEN of the Sabbath Day". God's REST; not man's works OR
 EVEN GOD'S OWN WORKS OF THE FIRST SIX DAYS
 OF CREATION-WEEK!! BUT GOD'S WORK OF HIS
 REST AND REST OF HIS WORK ON AND OF THE
 SABBATH DAY!

DW:

Again, your interpretation is based upon unstated INFERENCES not the explicit scriptures. Again, your interpretation restricts the sabbath to the seventh day “of the week” making God a violator of His own Sabbath law from which all Sabbath applications are derived.

No one denies the seventh day “of the week” is a legitimate application but I wholly deny that it is the restrictive application of the creation Sabbath or fourth commandment.

Again, the Biblical calander provided in Genesis through Deuternommy is based upon a Lunar year of 360 days and 30 day months not equally divisible by seven. If God intended or designed the set of seven days to be the basis for calendar calculations we would read of 28 day months and years divisible by seven.

GE:

Perfect! Just REMEMBER what you are saying here....

I say, perfect, if you do not mean the opposite of what you say...? “*_IF_ God...*” What “*_IF_ God...*” not?

“*God intended*” and, “God designed the set of seven days to be the basis for” and of his creation – his WHOLE creation, “the Day the Seventh Day Sabbath”, included!

And because “*God intended (and) designed*”, “*_the set-of-seven-days_*” “*to be the basis for*” and of his WHOLE creation, “the Day the Seventh Day Sabbath” as well, God therefore and thereby, “*intended*” and “*designed*” THE ‘WEEK’ “*-of-seven-days*”, “*to be the basis for*” and of his WHOLE creation, “the Day the Seventh Day Sabbath” INCLUSIVE!

So we FIND in fact that we DON’T “*read of 28 day months and years divisible by seven*” but through inference, that, quote, “*the Biblical calander provided in Genesis through Deuternommy is based upon a Lunar year of 360 days and 30 day months not equally divisible [Sic.] by seven*”, and

as a result, that the by name “The Day The Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD GOD”, and “the sabbath/s”, OTHER than “The Day The Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD GOD” did NOT COINCIDE with “The Day The Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD GOD” but seldom by pure incidental coincidence, and **originally at the creation and finally at Christ’s Last Passover, by God’s direct appointment and Providence.**

Which what YOU say, confirms what I said, here, <http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71977> ...

... “these ‘sabbaths’ “in the FIRST day” and “on the TENTH day” “of this Seventh Month”, ARE ONLY POSSIBLE IF they were ‘sabbaths / sabbath-days’ quote: “_BESIDE THE SABBATHS (—of “the day the Seventh Day Sabbath”—) of the LORD GOD”— apart from them and separately from them!

Therefore these ‘sabbaths’ were to be “UNTO YOU a sabbath” and, “YOUR sabbath”, verse 32, because, “THESE ARE THE FEASTS / ‘Feast-sabbaths’, of the LORD”,

“DISTINCT FROM / BESIDE, the Sabbaths OF THE LORD”. The two kinds of ‘sabbaths’ continued together; the Seventh Day Sabbath never stopped when the Law of the other sabbaths commanded that they must be observed. It never was a case of either or; the laws of the different ‘sabbaths’, “*applied*”, EACH TO ITS OWN ‘sabbath’.

And thus it was made crystal clear right from the start “in Leviticus 23” but was simply discarded by Dr Walter.

Leviticus 23:2-4...

“Concerning the feasts of the LORD which YE shall proclaim holy convocations ... (Now, before anything else,)

These are MY feasts : Six days shall work be done, but on the day The Seventh Day is THE Sabbath of Sabbath’s-rest, an holy convocation. Ye, shall do NO work therein. (It is for the LORD’s work!) It is the Sabbath Day wherever you may dwell (over all the earth. It is not for you to

declare or to connect to seasons of the earth.)

(But) the following, are the feasts of the LORD, even holy convocations WHICH YOU, MUST DETERMINE / PROCLAIM IN RESPECT TO THEIR SEASONS (of the year: ‘days, months, seasons, years’)

See how the “sabbaths”

“BESIDE the Sabbaths” ordinary: “Seventh-Day-Sabbaths of the LORD GOD”,

in BOTH

the “Feast of Booths” and the “Feast of Unleavened Bread”,

the **THREE** “sabbaths-of-feast”

of the “Feast of Booths”,

the “TENTH day”,

“the FIFTEENTH day”, and

“the eighth day” on the TWENTY SECOND day of the Seventh Month,

and

the **ONLY** “sabbath-of-feast”

of the “Feast of Unleavened Bread”

from “on the FIFTEENTH day”

“until on the one and twentieth day of the First Month”,

are “appointed” DIFFERENTLY through the month,

that is, are “appointed” independent and irrespective and

“BESIDE, the Sabbath”, “the Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD” ...

... which makes it IMPOSSIBLE “*the Sabbath days in Leviticus 23 demand they were observed on what would be regarded as the first day “of the week” in a 28 or 29 day month*”

and PROVES ...

... these ‘feast-sabbaths’ in any of these feasts could never in EVERY instance have coincided with the Seventh Day Sabbath ...

... OR, had to be in any way connected to or determined

by the recurrence of the ‘weekly’ Sabbath Day “ON THE DAY THE SEVENTH DAY, GOD, RESTED”, by having “finished”, and “FINISHED”, by having “rested” through and in Jesus Christ, through and in Resurrection from the dead, “SABBATH’S”!

DW:

The truth is that we simply have **a set of seven days**, six days preceding the Sabbath and six days following the Sabbath and that set of seven days can fit any calander at any time regardless of the number of days in the month or days in the year.

GE:

... on which I, 100% percent agree, and in fact, take my own stand!!

But remember what you are stating, here! For what you are stating here, is true and “truth” time and again **CONTRADICTED** elsewhere by **YOURSELF**.

The **IRONY** is **YOU**, Dr Walter, are the one who with vehemence **FORBID**, the fact “*the Sabbath is NOT restricted to Saturday*” in Leviticus 23:11,15.

Which explains everything....

Therefore what is there **LEFT** which we might disagree on... ...but this:

*“Again, your interpretation is based upon unstated **INFERENCES** not the explicit scriptures. Again, your interpretation restricts the sabbath to the seventh day “of the week” making God a violator of His own Sabbath law from which all Sabbath applications are derived.”*”

In God's Name as a Christian to a Christian, what is the truth about this matter?

DHK:

The truth? The truth is that God rested on the seventh

day. Literally it says that He ceased from working, for God doesn't work. He spoke everything into existence. What is work for God? He is omnipotent!

I work on Saturday, and I work on Sunday. My day of rest is on Monday. If I had to have a day that was called a Sabbath I suppose it would be Monday.

GE:

I'm not concerned about what you do on weekends; you sort that out between yourself and God.

First, let us look at this statement, again,

“No one denies the seventh day “of the week” is a legitimate application but I wholly deny that it is the restrictive application of the creation Sabbath or fourth commandment.”

I would more exactly to my own opinion, have phrased your statement, as follows,

‘I believe the Seventh Day “of the week” is what it says in the Fourth Commandment, namely, “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your (the People of God’s) GOD”, which, in the reality of its CREATION-ORDER in the Commandment AND in the creation-saga, is “*accepted to a legitimate application*”, in other words, is believed a legal requirement that must be obeyed by the People of God.

That is not to say though, that the Hebrew word for ‘the sabbath’, ‘shabbath’, or the Hebrew words for ‘the sabbath’, “in the day the seventh day”, ‘yom shebii’, are “*the restrictive*”, or are restricted, “*to*”, “*application*”, either, of the creation Sabbath or, of the Fourth Commandment Sabbath.

BUT, in the COMBINING of these words together into, “The Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD-your-God” ever so often WITHOUT EXCEPTION, they are perfectly conditioned upon the reality of both “the Sabbath” and “The Seventh Day” BEING, LITERALLY, ”THE DAY, THE,

SEVENTH, Day”-OF-THE-WEEK and “SABBATH-OF,-the Lord God”: “The Sabbath” which, within the seven-day-cycle KNOWN by any right-minded person upon earth today, is ‘the last day-OF-THE-WEEK’ (or also in some cultures, is ‘Saturday’).

You may regard this summary of mine of your statement and its implications above, as a statement of faith of mine on the issue.

DW:

Your error is so clear and so easy to see that one must be blind not to see it. Your theory RESTRICTS the Sabbath to Saturday and thus the SABBATH law to Saturday when in fact the Creator of the Sabbath does not restrict the Sabbath law to Saturday. No one denies it may be applied to Saturday but God certainly denies it can be RESTRICTED to Saturday as He applies the Sabbath law to other days.

It makes no difference if it is “a” Sabbath or “the” Sabbath as both find their only basis as a “sabbath” in the sabbath law.

GE:

Yes, you are without excuse. You comprehend perfectly what the truth is. You, saying, “Your theory RESTRICTS the Sabbath to Saturday and thus the SABBATH law to Saturday when in fact the Creator of the Sabbath does not restrict the Sabbath law to Saturday” shows it.

But it is not my, “*theory*”, that “*RESTRICTS the Sabbath*”, to the Seventh Day-OF-THE-WEEK, “*and thus the SABBATH law to*” the Seventh Day-OF-THE-WEEK, but God, who created the first seven days known as the ‘week’—‘week’, because ended and fulfilled in the Seventh Day-OF-THE-WEEK, the Sabbath Day. Therefore God is it who calls the Seventh Day the Sabbath “the Day the Sabbath Day of the LORD GOD” ... not, my, “*theory*”. And is it God who

commanded “*the SABBATH law*” so that it shall be “the Day the Sabbath Day of the LORD GOD ye shall keep holy” ... not, my, “*theory*”. Because “*in fact the Creator of the Sabbath*”, DOES RESTRICT both the Sabbath and the “*Sabbath law*” to “the Day the Sabbath Day of the LORD GOD”. And, never did restrict the Sabbath or the “*Sabbath law*” to ‘Saturday’ or any day except “the Day the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

Every ‘sabbath’ of the Bible had its OWN ‘Law’. It is not true ANY ‘sabbath’ “*find(s its) only basis as a “sabbath” in the sabbath law*” of the Fourth Commandment the Seventh Day of the creation order-‘week’ Commandment or “*law*”, or, in the creation saga and the origin of “the Seventh Day”. God, certainly, “*RESTRICTS the Sabbath to ... the SABBATH law*”, and “*... the Sabbath law*”, to “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”, ONLY!

You say “*No one denies it ...*”, “*The Sabbath law ... may be applied*” or “*RESTRICTED*” to the Sabbath Day; but I tell you, God certainly applies the Sabbath law to NO, other day or days than “the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”. You QUOTE to me where I am wrong! Place your claim to “*Leviticus 23*” here, so we can read it!

DW:

The truth is that the Sabbath law is not RESTRICTED to any day “OF THE WEEK” but is simply the “seventh day” in a set of seven days and is at one and the same time the day that follows as well as precedes six working days and thus the principle is merely six working days preceding and following a sabbath day.

GE:

“*The truth*”? You have no inkling about what truth is! Saying, “*The truth is that the Sabbath law is not RESTRICTED to any day “OF THE WEEK” but is simply the*

“*seventh day*” in a set of seven days”, you’re saying yes with the left corner of your mouth while you say no with the right corner of your mouth and nothing in between where your brains should be, because it exactly is the same whether you say the Sabbath or “*the “seventh day”*” is the last day ‘in a week’, or, the last day in “*a set of seven days*”— the “*seven days*” : “OF THE WEEK”— being determined by the last of the seven days of the week being the SABBATH DAY! Let us be honest like Christians should— you’re talking UNTRUTH and nonsensical vanities.

DW:

As a principle the Sabbath MAY be applied to ANY DAY in the week ...

GE:

It’s not “*the Sabbath*” that “*may be applied to ANY DAY in the week*”; it’s the LAW of the Sabbath Day that may NOT “*be applied to any other day in the week*” or year, **or it’s not the Sabbath’s Law.**

DW:

... As a principle the Sabbath MAY be applied to ANY DAY in the week as long as six days precede and six days follow and therefore can fit ANY CALANDER whether Jewish, Babylonian, Egyptian, etc.

Jewish TRADITION is the only basis for SATURDAY Sabbaths not scripture.

GE:

How reckless can you get?! Not even “*Jewish TRADITION*” tolerates ‘*SATURDAY Sabbath*’; what “*Scripture*”! ‘*SATURDAY Sabbath*’ exists nowhere, not even in the mind of the legalist except he is a legalist of your sort!

DW:

Scripture allows the Sabbath law to be applied to any day in a SET OF SEVEN DAYS.

GE:

Scriptures does not only ‘*allow the Sabbath law to be applied*’; it **COMMANDS** the Sabbath law to be applied to the Seventh Day Sabbath and the Seventh Day of the week **ONLY!**

DW:

Neither Genesis, exodus or Deuteronomy use the words “of the week” because that would condemn God's very own application of the Sabbath law in Leviticus 23 and 25.

GE:

“*The Sabbath law in Leviticus*”, 25:4,6 reads, “In the seventh year shall be a sabbath (rest) UNTO THE LAND, a sabbath (rest of the LAND) unto the LORD. ... the sabbath OF THE LAND.”

And mark,

1) **the fiftieth YEAR** – the year after the “forty and nine years” of seven seventh-year-sabbaths – was **NO “sabbath”** as you falsely claim! **TWELVE** times in that chapter, the fiftieth year is called a “jubilee”; but not once, a ‘sabbath’! (Dr Walter: “*God applies the Sabbath law ... to the ... 50th year*”; “*he applied the principle to ... also the 50th or ... “first year” of the week of years*”; “*the 50th Sabbatical year*”; “*the SABBATH command is applied to ... “years” especially the 50th year*”.)

Just so,

2) **the fiftieth DAY** or Pentecost – the day after the forty and nine days of “seven complete sabbaths” or “seven complete weeks” – was **NO “sabbath”** as you falsely claim!

The fiftieth day, ‘Pentecost’, is simply called “the day after the seventh sabbath-week ... and ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day an holy convocation ... it shall be a statute” Leviticus 23:16,21— but is not “*applied*” as, or called a, “*sabbath*”! (Dr Walter: “*God can apply the Sabbath law to the FIRST day, 50th day*”.)

And just so,

in the third place, note Dr Walter: “*the Sabbath law can be applied by God to longer lengths of time such as a “month”*” NO “month” ever— “*the seventh*”, or, “*the first month*”, is “*applied*” as or called a “*sabbath*”, as you falsely claim! (Dr Walter: “*This ... allow God to apply the sabbath law to a month which is both the seventh and the first month*”.)

SS:

When defeat seems certain the only recourse is to declare victory.

DW:

There is no defeat here at all. Adam was not the head of the elect but the head of the human race - see Romans 5:12-18. Christ alone is the head of the elect (Rom. 5:15-18).

Gerard's arguments are based upon pure nonsense. He has an appearance of scholarship but when it is all boiled down it is only appearance and empty of truth.

He has to change not only the text of scripture to fit his nonsense but the obvious context. Anyone seeking the truth can see easily see that in Genesis 1:31-2:3 that “from his works” means that he ceased from doing the activities that he was formerly occupied with in the past six days - that is simple common sense.

Likewise, the point of the writer of hebrews is just as simple. God stopped working in regard to what He formerly was doing in those six days. The application is simple, in order for a person to be saved they must “pauo” CEASE from all

works and simply trust in the gospel (Heb. 4:1-4) as it is “BY FAITH” in the gospel that we enter into “his rest.” His rest is not merely the ceremonial observance of an actual sabbath day but more importantly, it is what that ceremonial observance typifies - the rest pictured in the first creation - a creation without sin in perfect harmony with God. By faith we are justified and have PEACE with God and thus enter into SPIRITUAL REST. However, that is not the COMPLETE fulfillment of entering into “his rest”! No, the complete fulfilment is when we enter not merely SPIRITUALLY by faith in the gospel as hebrew 4:2-3 explicitly states but when we enter into the NEW CREATION yet to come (Heb. 4:11) Spirit, soul and body when again God can look upon all that he has created and made and again say “it is very good” - that is the promised rest which is YET TO COME. However, Gerard cannot see the truth for the bias that blinds his eyes.

This is so straight forward and simple one must trip over it to miss it. Gerards ignorance is his attempt to APPEAR scholarly when in fact his scholarship is pure ignorance.

GE:

Re: *“He Gerard has to change not only the text of scripture to fit his nonsense”*

You have made this accusation now several times; you have yet to substantiate it with an example or more. Thanks.

Re: *“in Genesis 1:31-2:3 ... “from his works” means that he ceased from doing the activities that he was formerly occupied with in the past six days - that is simple common sense.”*

Now show me where I did not admit or denied this implied ‘*meaning in Genesis 1:31-2:3*’ of “*that he (God) ceased from doing the activities that he was formerly occupied with in the past six days*”? I can say with a clear conscience I never did any. I never denied or rejected the obvious and

“*simple common sense*” IMPLICATION, that God “*ceased from doing the activities that he was formerly occupied with in the past six days*”. THAT, is and was not, the Rest of God, or the Sabbath Day.

Not to repeat my answer which I had given, I would like to only point out Dr Walter’s conspicuously suspicious and covert methodology.

Again, Dr Walter QUOTES HIMSELF, alleging he quotes me, GE! It is getting boring, Dr Walter, it no longer is funny any more, you know....

Now I, GE, did NOT write, or, quoted you like this: “*in Genesis 1:31-2:3*”. I made a LABOURED point to DISTINGUISH between what YOU wrote, which was, “*in Genesis 1:31-2:3*”, and what I wrote, which was: “in Genesis 1:31”. Go back, see for yourself,

here: <http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=8#post1685808>;

and you actually quoted me,

here: <http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=3>, funny enough, correctly!

But let me in any case repeat, that I maintained consistently, that God stopped doing what He before He stopped, was doing, ON the Sixth Day WHEN He had FINISHED to form Eve from Adam’s rib bone, AND had given Adam and her Command AND, had pronounced, “Very good!”

That was NOT, as Dr Walter alleges, “*at the closure of that day (“Satan” or Adam, “had fallen”)*” – which by the way as you may recall, was another instance where Dr Walter misquoted me. I mean that satan’s fall stuff he accused me about.

God did not “*at the closure of that day*” the Sixth Day on which Adam and Eve were created, declare, “Very good!” IT MUST HAVE BEEN WELL BEFORE “*at the closure of that day*”! It could have been ANY time EARLY on the Sixth Day.

Who can say it wasn't?! "God spoke, and it was!" ... instantaneously.

Fact remains, Adam did not see one day through ere he fell in sin "Adam abode not one night" says a Psalm.

Genesis recorded the history of Adam and Eve, of but that the one day on which they were created, and after "Evening-cool of day had come", the Seventh Day of the creation week, he and his spouse very early on the Seventh Day must have been sent out and locked out of the garden of Eden. The simple and bare and unabridged or embroidered, TEXT of the Scriptures!

GE:

Dr Walter, Is it true "*Sabbath days equal the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th Sabbaths in the Jewish calendar Feast months*"?

DW:

Since the Calendar of the Jews is a DATE calendar and not a NAMED DAY (Monday, tues, Wednes, etc.) then necessarily such would be the case. This is not true for the feasts months only but for every month in the Jewish calendar year.

GE:

But that is Dr Walter contradicting Dr Walter!

DW:

This is particular true in the calendar given them by God. Notice that in the Penteteuch not even the Canaanite names for the months is recognized by God but rather God identifies the months by NUMBERS not by NAMES. God recognizes the days by NUMBERS not by NAMES.

Ge 7:11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day

were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened.

4 And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat. 5 And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.

13 And it came to pass in the six hundredth and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth: and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and, behold, the face of the ground was dry. 14 And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried.

This method of Calendar by NUMBER is consistent all the way through the Pentateuch. Later the Israelites used Canaanite and Babylonian NAMES for their months but even until the New Testament they still did not adopt the pagan NAMES for days.

GE:

“(I)n Genesis 2”, to which “*the sabbath command*” refers and on which it relies, it is stated word for word in the Hebrew, “On the day the Seventh Day God ended his work which He had made; and He rested on the day the Seventh Day from all his work which He had made. And God blessed the day the Seventh Day, and sanctified (put apart “the day the Seventh Day”) BECAUSE THAT: in IT (“the day the Seventh Day”), He rested from all his work which God had created and made : THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS / CREATING ... WHEN, they were created.” Period.

The Sabbath was, therefore, specified in Genesis 2 “THE DAY THE” particular “Day The Seventh Day”, of the first ever ‘WEEK’ of seven days in which God created and made and finished “all his work”. Thus does the Sabbath

Command, specify “the day The Seventh Day” as such as “the day The Seventh Day”— OF THE WEEK!

We are speaking English, which has a perfect equivalent of the first ever seven days in which God created and made and finished “all his work”, namely, the idiomatic expression, ‘THE WEEK’, which people who speak Hebrew, would express in the IDENTICAL PARTICULAR words as are found in the texts of Genesis 2 and Exodus 20.

DW:

Both you and DHK must add to the Scriptures what the scriptures do not say in order to maintain your position. The Scriptures do not use or say “OF THE WEEK” - nada, zip, nowhere!

What you have is seven days and the seventh day - period. Yes, seven days became the measurement of time known as the “week” but that is not the wording used by God or the restriction used by God in creation or in the fourth commandment. Be honest enough to at least admit this to be true. YOU ADD “week” God does not.

Therefore what you have is a set of seven days - six days are for work and the “seventh day” in that set of seven days is the Sabbath. This Sabbath follows as well as precedes six working days and it is not limited to the calendar “week” by God or by God's Word. That is precisely why the Sabbath law can be applied to other days in the month.

Fact number 2 the term “yom” in the Genesis account and in direct relationship with the institution of the creation Sabbath is used in two different senses. It is used for 24 hour time lengths AS WELL AS FOR TIME LENGTHS GREATER THAN 24 HOURS - READ AND NOTE:

2 And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. 3 And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work

which God created and made. {created...: Heb. created to make} 4 These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens,

This is precisely why the Sabbath law can be applied by God to longer lengths of time such as a “month” (seventh) and “year” the Seventh. This combination of truths also allow God to apply the sabbath law to a month which is both the seventh and the first month.

GE:

Only, God does not “*apply the Sabbath law ... to longer lengths of time*”! The **_word_** or name, ‘sabbath’, is applied “*to longer lengths of time such as “year” the Seventh*”; not “*the Sabbath law*”.

I also don’t know though about your story of “*a “month” (seventh)*”. What a “*combination*” of tripe of yours! Never read the Seventh Month had to be observed a ‘*sabbath*’. “*The Sabbath law*” not even ‘*restricted*’ or ‘*applied*’ the First Month the Passover Month of which it is written “Ye shall observe the First Month”, as “*a “month” (first)*”, *sabbath-“month*”.

DW:

This combination of truths also allow God to apply the sabbath law to a month which is both the seventh and the first month. This combinatin of truths also allows God to apply the Sabbath law to the TENTH day in a month that is neither the seventh or the first in numerical counting.

This combination of truths is why God can apply the Sabbath law to the FIRST day, 50th day, 50th year, etc.

GE:

God applies the **_word_**, “sabbath”, to EACH of “the first day (every year on the fifteenth day of the First Month) ye

shall eat no leavened bread”; and to every seventh year, calling them ‘sabbath-years’.

He, God, does NOT “*apply the Sabbath law*” to ANY ‘day’ other than “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

The word or ‘name’, “sabbath”, though, is “*applied*” in Leviticus 23 to every seventh year being called ‘sabbath-years’.

So the word or ‘name’, “sabbath”, is “*applied*” to the Day of Atonement, the tenth day of the Seventh Month— it also being called a ‘sabbath day’; but NOT “*the Sabbath law*”.

Thus also, is the word “sabbath” – not “*the Sabbath law*” – “*applied*” to the first day of every month.

But God does NOT “*apply the Sabbath law*” to ANY “*longer lengths of time such as a “month” ... and “year”*”, OR, to ANY ‘**day**’ other than “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

So God does not “*apply the Sabbath law*” to “the first day (every year) ye shall eat no leavened bread”. The Scripture – Leviticus 23 – only REFERS TO the passover-”sabbath” through the Demonstrative Pronominal phrase, “the day after the sabbath”.

God does not apply the word, ‘sabbath’, to “*the FIRST day*” of the week, or to the “*50th day*”; or, to the “*50th year, etc.*” whatever— which are each and every one, a corrupted example for your FALSE theory, Dr Walter. You undeniably MEANING the First Day-of-the-WEEK, it is a blatant UNTRUTH God applies “*the Sabbath law*” OR the name of “The Day the Sabbath Day” to any of these things.

Now, When it’s the First Day of the week, it’s no problem for you to presuppose and speak of the First Day-of-the-WEEK! But when it is the Seventh Day that is presupposed, “*The Scriptures ...*” or God, “*... do not use or say “OF THE WEEK”!*”

Why don't you take to heart your own preaching, and Be honest enough to admit, to ADD "week", is inevitable and correct, and that it does not help you or make any difference to its factual correctness, that you avoid using the words, "of-the-WEEK" audibly and honestly.

DW:

If the Sabbath law, as you and DHK argue, must be restricted to the seventh 24 hour "day" OF THE WEEK then God could not LAWFULLY apply the Sabbath law to anything other than the seventh 24 hour day OF THE WEEK. The fact that He does, and does repeatedly demonstrates your position and DKH's position to be wrong.

GE:

Why do YOU worry "*If the Sabbath law is restricted to the seventh 24 hour "day" OF THE WEEK*", that "*God could not LAWFULLY apply the Sabbath law to anything other than the seventh 24 hour day OF THE WEEK*", **while He does not?** God, perfectly "*LAWFULLY*" DOES NOT "*apply the Sabbath law to anything other than the seventh 24 hour day OF THE WEEK*"! But that of course is exactly what you won't be obedient to but insist God – untruthful to Himself – "*appl(ies) the Sabbath law to anything other than the seventh 24 hour day OF THE WEEK*".

Do you know yourself what you are saying? Just listen to yourself! You non-stop are contradicting everything you say yourself!

DW:

Finally, the Jewish month is not divided by the "week" division as that would require every month to be limited to 28 days. However, we read of months that have a 29th day in scripture. However, since the calendar given the Jews by God used neither NAMES for years, months or days but only

NUMBERS in the Penteteuch then 7th day Sabbaths would necessarily be the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th in their months.

However, what both you and DHK will not admit to is that the FEAST MONTHS are Old Covenant TYPES of the NEW COVENANT under Christ where the FIRST day sabbaths (1st, 8th, 22nd) predominate the 7th day Sabbaths in relationship to types of Christ and His work of redemption. They prefigure ANOTHER DAY, a greater Sabbath observance for the people of God that commemorates HIS WORK of redemption that is the basis for bringing in a NEW CREATION whereas the 7th day Sabbath is a sign of the OLD CREATION and the OLD COVENANT.

In order to save your own skin you must insist that the 7th day Sabbath is restricted to only a 24 hour use of the term “day” and restricted to what the Scriptures NEVER EVER use in either the creation account or the 4th commandment and that is the terms “OF THE WEEK.”

GE:

“... *the FIRST day sabbaths (1st, 8th, 22nd) predominate...*” in absentia.

Once only as the first day in a grouping of seven consecutive days, namely, in the case of the first day of unleavened bread eaten for seven days, is “the first day ye shall not eat leavened bread”, called a ‘sabbath’, and that, indirectly, Leviticus 23:11,15. But NEVER is the First Day of the week, or, of any other grouping of seven consecutive days, called a ‘sabbath’. Rather could the last day in a grouping be viewed as a sabbath day because the grouping is closed and completed with the last day of the ‘sabbath’s-week’, e.g., Leviticus 23:15c.

Then if the first and the last of every ‘sabbath’s-week’-grouping of days were ‘sabbaths’, like possibly in the feast days of unleavened bread, only five days in between would be non-‘sabbath’ days and an “8th day sabbath” won’t ever occur.

An “8th day sabbath” is a contrived unreality, and so a “22nd day sabbath”.

Of course you talking nonsense again, as the Hebrew automatically – that is, ‘idiomatically’ – in both “*the creation account*” and “*the 4th commandment*” ‘using’ the word “Sabbath”, is saying, MEANING, ‘of the week’. Or in Greek the New Testament ‘using’ the Genitive Singular or Plural, ‘sabbatou’, ‘sabbatohn’, literally, “OF-the-Sabbath”, is saying, MEANING, ‘of the week’. Hebrew and Greek like English and virtually every language upon the earth ‘using’ the Genitive literally, “OF-the-Sabbath”, is saying, MEANING, ‘Sabbath-of-the-week’ — that is “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”, the ‘weekly Sabbath Day’.

DW:

However, the truth is that both uses of the term “day” are found in connection with the institution of the creation Sabbath and in connection with the fourth commandment in Leviticus 23. Your position would necessarily make God a Sabbath law breaker as God applies the Sabbath law OUTSIDE of your restrictive definitions.

GE:

This the second time that I have noticed where you assert “*the fourth commandment*” is found “*in Leviticus 23*”. You before, have stated, “*The fourth commandment was incorporated into the Biblical monthly calendar given in Leviticus 23*”. Which is not true; but you need the idea for your claim repeated over and over, “*the application of the Sabbath law ... cannot be restricted to the Seventh day “of the week” as God applies the Sabbath law to a variety of other days “of the week” as well as to other periods of time than the 24 hour day but to the seventh “month” and to the seventh “year” as well as to the first day, 50th year etc.*”

‘The truth is’, the “*Sabbath law ... found in connection*

with the institution of the creation Sabbath” and “in connection with the fourth commandment”, is NOT found “in Leviticus 23”. Prove me wrong with a quote of “*the Sabbath law*” from *Leviticus 23*!

Etymology of the concept and expression, “OF-THE-WEEK” with reference to the Septuagint.

Re: Dr Walter, “*Both you and DHK must add to the Scriptures what the scriptures do not say in order to maintain your position. The Scriptures do not use or say “OF THE WEEK”!*”

Do you consider any English translation “*the Scriptures*”?

Then have a look here in the **KJAV** 1611 – as in every English Bible I suppose – Young’s Analytical Concordance, 1977, page 1041 3rd column,

“Week” from Hebrew, ‘shabua’ (from ‘shabbath’ – ‘sabbath’), 19 times;

“Week” from Greek, ‘sabbata’ Plural, (from Hebrew ‘shabbath’ – ‘sabbath’), 7 times;

“Week” from Greek, ‘sabbaton’ Singular, (from Hebrew ‘shabbath’ – ‘sabbath’), 2 times.

Altogether, one score and eight times!

Now I’m not conversant with Hebrew, but to me it looks like of the 17 times the word ‘week’ appears in the English from a Hebrew equivalent, in exactly 9 of those instances you, Dr Walter, claim with insatiable bravado,

“Therefore what you have is a set of seven days - six days are for work and the “seventh day” in that set of seven days is the Sabbath. This Sabbath follows as well as precedes six working days and it is not limited to the calendar “week” by God or by God’s Word”

YOU, saying, ”*the “seventh day” in that set of seven*

days is the Sabbath”, **YOU, ADDING** the words, “*a set of seven days*”

--- you “*do not say what the Scriptures say in order to maintain your position*” ---

because you CANNOT say it in English WITHOUT “*ADDING*” the words, “*set-of-*”, to “*seven days*”—

you CANNOT define the Hebrew concept of “*a set of seven days*”

ANY ”*set of seven days*”

UNCONNECTED with “The Seventh-Day-” of the creation-week / Commandment,

OR ,

connected with “The Seventh-Day-” of-the creation-week / Commandment,

WITHOUT DEFINING, “THE WEEK”— “*a set of days*”,

and ANY ”*set of seven days*”,

whether appearing as “*of-the-week*”, ‘sabbatou’ Singular Genitive,

or, as “*of-the-weeks*”, ‘sabbatohn’ Plural Genitive

--- NO DIFFERENCE!

It’s ‘ANY’ WEEK’ you are talking of AND ARE DEFINING, and therefore to allege “*The Scriptures do not use or say “OF THE WEEK-” with reference to the creation story or the giving of the Ten Commandments*”, is to contradict YOURSELF talking of the ‘week’ in your own words, “*set of seven days*”.

The exact same thing could be done in the English translations of the Bible. Instead of having used the expression “week” for “*a set of seven days*”, the Bible could have been translated with “*a set of seven days*” instead of ‘week’ OR POSSIBLY in place of where ‘week’ is not used though implied. So you would have had to resort to still OTHER words to deny “*The Scriptures do not use or say “OF THE WEEK”*”, because the Scriptures ALSO do not use or say,

“*SET OF SEVEN DAYS*”.

How you scalded me, for having spoken of “seven seven days” in Leviticus 23:11,15 ... while you insisted it must be “seven Sabbaths”...!

But the IRONY is YOU are the one who assert the fact “*the Sabbath is not restricted to Saturday but may be applied to Saturday*”, JUST as it –consequently and consistently – is in fact NOT restricted to “*a set of*” ANY “*seven days*”, but applies to ONE only day of “*a set of seven days*”— the last one, “The Seventh Day”.

The IRONY, is, yes – as I have before shown –, The great flaw in your ‘argument’ is your indiscriminate generalizing “*the Sabbath days in Leviticus 23*” as were they “*regarded as*” all of the same category and kind or “law”, and the ‘day’ per se, “the day the Seventh Day” ... OF THE WEEK surprise, surprise!

Maybe the even bigger misconception in your reasoning is YOUR – nobody’s than YOUR – taking for granted, “*what would be regarded as the first day “of the week”*”! Thus you ARE getting entangled in your own words and “*demands*” and “*specifications*” and stuff.

Now listen to yourself! “... *the Sabbath days in Leviticus 23 demand they were observed on what would be regarded as the _first_ day “of the week” in a 28 or 29 day month*”— that now, BESIDES the fact there is nothing like “... *the Sabbath days ... in a 28 or 29 day month*” to be found “*in Leviticus 23*”. I thought you meant the Sabbath Days as were they observed on what actually WAS, the last or “the day The Seventh Day”, “...of the week” ... according to you, without exception.

But, forget about this and let the Sabbaths fall on the first or, on the last and Seventh Days “of the week”, how does your arithmetic work out “*in Leviticus 23*”? For example, in between verses 24 to 39.... “*in a 28 or 29 day month*”?

“In the FIRST day of the (Seventh) Month shall ye have a sabbath. ... Also on the TENTH day of this Seventh Month ... that same day ... shall be unto you a sabbath of rest.”

Now work out how these ‘sabbaths’, every time with six days in between them, fell “on the day The Seventh Day” ... “of the week”— or, “*would be regarded as the first day “of the week” in a 28 or 29 day month*”?!

Nonsense!

No, these “*sabbaths*” “in the FIRST day” and “on the TENTH day” “of this Seventh Month”, ARE ONLY POSSIBLE IF they were ‘sabbaths / sabbath-days’ quote: “ BESIDE THE SABBATHS (—of “the day the Seventh Day Sabbath”—) of the LORD GOD”!

I asked **Dr Walter** in connection with his claim, “*Both you and DHK must add to the Scriptures what the scriptures do not say in order to maintain your position. The Scriptures do not use or say “OF THE WEEK” - nada, zip, nowhere!*”,

Do you consider any English translation “the Scriptures”?

I now ask you, Dr Walter, Do you consider ANY (good) translation, “the Scriptures”?

Then what about the **Septuagint**? Would you agree the Septuagint is the Old Testament Scriptures?

You would?

Good!

Then have a look here in the Septuagint, in ...

Exodus 31:15,

variant “*hebdomehi sabbata anapausis*” for “*hebdómehi **HÉBDOMOS** anapausis*”, “on the Seventh(-day-the-) Seventh(-day) is rest” = “on the Seventh(-day-)**OF-THE-WEEK** is rest”.

Exodus 16:26,27,

“*hex hehmeras sulleksete: tehi de hehmerai tehi hebdomehi sabbata hoti ouk estai en autehi. Egeneto de en tehi*

hehmerai tehi hebdomehi eksehlthosan tines.”

Note: “hebdomehi” = “hebdomehi **sabbata**”.

“On the Seventh Day, “hebdomehi” = “on The (identical) Seventh-Day-Sabbath-**OF-THE-WEEK**”, “hebdomehi sabbata”.

Exodus 16:29, “Kurios edohken humin sabbata tehn hehmeran tautehn ... tehi hehmerai tehi hektehi artous (sulleksete).”

Note the NAMES of the days-OF-THE-WEEK, “Sabbata” for ‘The Sabbath’, and “Heh Hekteh (Hehmera)” for ‘The Sixth (Day)’.

‘The Sabbath’

= “**Sabbata**” Plural

= “**heh Hebdomeh**”

= “**heh Hehmera heh Hebdomeh**” (20:11)

= “**heh Hehmera-TOHN-SABBATOHN**” (20:8)

= “**Sabbaton**” Singular.

All the above NAMES, ‘the Seventh’, ‘the Seventh Day’, ‘the Seventh Day Sabbath’, are names OF, ‘The Sabbath’, “the Seventh Day-OF-THE-WEEK-SABBATHS”-Sabbath”, “heh Hehmera-TOHN-SABBATOHN”.

‘The week’ is derived from, “the Seventh Day Sabbath” from Plural - “sabbaths” FOR: “Sabbath” – Singular GIVING ORIGIN TO THE CONCEPT of Western (and English) thought, “OF-THE-WEEK”.

That is why ‘The Sabbath’-”Sabbata” IS THE PLURAL although always Singular in the Hebrew. The Plural MORE than the Singular, stronger, and better than the Singular, indicates and specifies “The Seventh-Day-OF-THE-WEEK-Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

The Seventh Day Sabbath is uniquely the ‘**WEEKLY Sabbath**’ of the Bible, of Hebrew, Greek, Western, and since time immemorial, of universal thought-reference.

Exodus 31:13 et al,

“My Sabbaths” English and Greek Plural, always from

Hebrew Singular. Hebrew has ‘shabbath’ Singular, only, each time, 110 times.

So the Singular (Hebrew) often has a Plural meaning.

In the Greek the opposite occurs, the Plural has a Singular meaning. So the Greek ‘sabbaton’ or ‘sabbata’ (together 110 times) always represents the Hebrew Singular but a Singular with Singula OR, Plural meaning.

Context determines, common sense, and most important, IDIOM! In several cases then where Greek uses the Plural, the idea, “OF-THE-WEEK”, may apply.

And that – again – explains where the unmistakable, ingenious and useful concept, “OF-THE-WEEK”, especially in the New Testament, comes from, and WITHOUT which, most modern languages will be unable to render the proper idiomatic and literal connotations of the Hebrew and Greek words, “shabbath”, “sabbatou / sabbatohn” - ‘sabbath’ or ‘sabbath’s’.

Re: Dr Walter, *“The application is simple, in order for a person to be saved they must “pauo” CEASE from all works and simply trust in the gospel (Heb. 4:1-4) as it is “BY FAITH” in the gospel that we enter into “his rest.””*

I have said scarcely anything about the meaning of the Scripture “Heb. 4:1-4”. Of “Heb. 4:1-4” as speaking of the Sabbath Day, I never said a word! And I am NOT talking about the Sabbath Commandment either – but of the Sabbath, that IT, is ALL about what “_GOD_” did by either “saying” or “working” or “resting”. God is one and so is He and his work whether his work of creating, sustaining or resting. No matter what or which. God’s ‘rest’ or ‘ceasing’ NEVER IS DOING NOTHING. God is God; not a man!

Hebrews 4:9 specifically or Genesis 2:2-3 specifically or the Sabbath Commandment specifically, have absolutely NOTHING to do with Dr Walter’s fantasies about God’s “rest” that *“is not merely the ceremonial observance of an*

actual sabbath day”, or that is “*a creation without sin in perfect harmony with God*”. That, is ‘merely’ reducing the Sabbath (and its Commandment) to ‘merely’ the work of men. His work of rest or not, it is man’s work.

Instead the Sabbath and in certain respects its Commandment, are about God, who “THUS CONCERNING the Seventh Day SPAKE: And _GOD_, in the day the Seventh Day from ALL, HIS, _WORKS_ —which “works” are no ‘ceasing’ but a FINISHING of and by the fact, God— _RESTED_ ”!

Therefore however ‘spiritually’ subjective Dr Walter interprets the in and through Jesus Christ objective Gospel-Rest of God, makes no difference to what the “Sabbath” and the “Sabbath-Rest” in the able hands of God, is, and means, and signifies.

Re: Dr Walter,

“...you must insist that the 7th day Sabbath is restricted to only a 24 hour use of the term “day” and restricted to what the Scriptures NEVER EVER use in either the creation account or the 4th commandment ...”

And yes, so is the foggy air slowly subsiding, and is becoming clearer and clearer TO ME AS WELL, just what is awry in this discussion.

See for the umpteenth time Dr Walter misconstruing my statements and standpoints!

See how he uses HIS words and ideas to camouflage his smuggled in falsities into the statements I am making on the basis of the PURE words that are actually, ‘WRITTEN’ IN THE SCRIPTURES.

I before said, it no longer is even funny. I now say, it is scandalous, Dr Walter, for you as a professing Christian, to act so unbecoming your profession!

That, though, is not the ‘point’ I am seeing better focused on as this conversations is progressing

DW:

If you spend less time making personal attacks upon my person and deal with the objections that I have placed before you we would get further along in this discussion.

The Seventh day is the Seventh day in a set of seven days - -period. It is not the seventh day “of the week.” You have jumped from principle to tradition when you add to God's Word “of the week.”

As I have stated many times previously, there is nothing wrong in applying the Sabbath law principle of the Seventh day in a set of seven days to the Seventh day “of the week” but it is wrong to RESTRICT it to such when God Himself does not restrict it to the seventh day “of the week.”

Again such a TRADITIONAL RESTRICTION violates not merely God's own application of the SEVENTH DAY SABBATH in regard to a set of seven days but God did not create the very things He says are for “times and seasons” to fit the “week” mode of counting time as the very things created for “times and seasons” are 29-30 day months rather than 28 day months.

Gen. 1:14 ¶ And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

Hence, the use of the terms “seventh day” have to do with the set of seven days in creation not to the tradition of “the week.” The Sabbath law has to do with this principle of six working days FOLLOWED and PRECEDED by a Sabbath. The principle or set of seven days concluding / beginning with a Sabbath can fit ANY CALENDAR regardless if the tradition is an eight day division, ten day division, etc. It can fit a 28 day calendar, 29, 30, 31, 10 day, etc. The tradition of a seven day “week” is not essential to the Sabbath law as the set of seven days is not dependent upon any human/tradition calendar divisions. God's own calendar in Leviticus 23 is not established upon a seven day “week”

division but rather upon a 29-30 day lunar division according to God's design for the moon and sun in Genesis 1:14.

Simply put, YOU are adding to God's word the terms “of the week” and YOU are restricting the sabbath to the “seventh day of the week” when God's Word does not make such a restriction although God's Word by principle allows for such an application. The application is fine but the restriction is not! Why? Because God's Word, and thus God Himself does not keep it within that restrictive use.

God created everything within six days and rested on the seventh day - this is a set of seven days without any names for any day. There is no monday, Tuesday, etc. division in God's Word - nowhere.

There is no mention of the seventh day “of the week” in Genesis, Exodus or Deuteronomy or any other reference for the fourth commandment.

DHK:

No, but the Hebrews had a calendar and they followed it. They had a name for a day that they called the Sabbath day. It was the seventh day of the week. On our calendar that day is called Saturday--the seventh day of the week, also called the Sabbath (according to the Jews).

DW:

They used NUMBERS not NAMES for both days and months and years just look at Genesis through Deuteronomy when Israel received the ten commandments. Look at the calculations used to recount the flood, they used 30 day months and 360 day years - neither of which is divisible by seven evenly, yet the stars, sun and moon (Gen. 1:14) were specifically given to provide a Calendar time table. God did not provide natural divisions in the month for an evenly divided seven day week for the month or the year. The fact is you have absolutely no evidence to prove your assumptions

above while I have lots of Biblical evidence to prove they NEVER used NAMES for their days, months or years and the days, months and years were NEVER evenly divided by seven.

Second, neither the creation Sabbath or the fourth commandment which is explicitly based upon the creation of Sabbath ever confines the Sabbath to the seventh day “of the week” by any human Calendar method whether it is Egyptian or Jewish. Your whole theory is based solely upon HUMAN TRADITION and not one iota of God's Word. Why? Because creation days are set forth as a set of seven days that can fit any calendar anywhere in the world at any time in history. Hence, the “seventh day” Sabbath can fall upon any day in any calendar at any time and history.

The principle is very simple. Six days both precede and follow the Sabbath day. Nowhere does God demand what day “OF THE WEEK” according to human calendars must this set of seven days begin - nowhere!

DHK:

Correct! And you, therefore, should not complain if I declare my day of rest on perhaps “Tuesday” then on any other day. Is that not right? God does not demand what day of the week to keep--**your words**.

DW:

Wrong by two counts. The First day of the week is explicitly stated in scripture to be day set apart by Christians for public worship (Acts 20:7) and by Apostolic command (1 Cor. 16:1-2) as “the Lord's day” (Rev. 1:10) and nothing you can say can change those explicit Biblical facts. If you want to follow tradition then there is solid tradition to support these Biblical facts for the first three hundred years prior to Constantine.

DHK:

Your post is so full of contradictions. This one paragraph summarizes it. You maintain that the “Lord's Day” must be on the first day of the week, no matter what calendar you follow. But you deny the same logic when applied to the Sabbath. The Lord's Day must fall on Sunday, but the Sabbath does not necessarily have to fall on Saturday (the seventh day). You totally contradict yourself.

DW:

No contradiction at all. I also said in that post that the Sabbath was fixed under the new covenant on the resurrection day which is explicitly defined to be the “first day of the week” which is also called “The Lord's day.”

DHK:

The Sabbath is always Jewish. There is no Christian Sabbath. The Lord Himself is our Sabbath. We enter into his rest. Your theology has put us once again under the law, under a curse (Gal.3:10).

The sabbath day will always be on Saturday the seventh day of the week. You cannot change God's decrees.

DW:

Please provide just one text in Scripture where the Biblical writers ever say that the Seventh day is Saturday?

GE:

Then why don't you stick to the Bible-terminology, but lead the gang derogatively referring to the Sabbath and Seventh Day as ‘Saturday’?!

DW:

[To DHK] Please provide just one Biblical writer who ever says the seventh day is the seventh day “of the week”?

Please provide just one text in the Bible where any day is identified by NAME rather than by NUMBER?

Don't respond with your mental gymnastics but with "Thus said the Lord"

DHK:

God never changed the Sabbath Day. He never changed the fourth commandment. Exodus 31 he never rescinded. What gives you the power to think you can? The Jews still exist today, and still worship today. They worship on the sabbath, the seventh day of the week. They always will.

DW:

Second, the New Testament, and particularly the words of Christ explicitly state the Sabbath is a DAY OF WORK and only REST from self-centered works. Jesus explicitly states "IT IS LAWFUL TO DO GOOD ON THE SABBATH" and he explicitly claims that both the Father and Himself WORK on the Sabbath and he explicitly defends three classifications of work on the Sabbath - works of mercy, works of necessity and works of peity. Don't take too much Bible study to see these things IF you really want to be honest with the scriptures. You are so tunneled visioned on this you can't even except the explicit and clear statements of Scripture:

Mt 12:12 How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days.

Joh 5:17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

Both of the above statements were given in defense of DOING WORK on the Sabbath day. Isaiah 58:13 defines the nature of work that we are to REST from doing on the Sabbath day - it is clear, it is simply and there is no excuse to ignore or reject it in light of the above texts.

Therefore your SERVICE on Sunday is REST from the work that is prohibited on the Sabbath!!!!!!!!!! If not then you

must charge Christ with VIOLATING the fourth commandment and thus being a SINNER as he WORKED the very same kind of work you do on the Sabbath - the Ministry, acts of mercy, acts of necessity!!!!

The Egyptians can start it on their Saturday with the Seventh day Sabbath falling on their Friday (which they did). The Jews can start it on the seventh day “of the month” without any reference to NAMES given to particular days “of the month (which they did in Leviticus 23).

The fourth command does not prescribe any NAMED day “of the week” upon which this set of seven days must begin or end.

Can it begin upon Sunday and end upon Saturday? Certainly, nothing wrong with that and that is the tradition of the Jews. Can the Bible be used to restrict it to the Jewish tradition? No! It is simply a set of seven days where the seventh day both concludes as well as precedes six working days. Thus the Seventh day Sabbath may act as the end as well as the beginning of the six work day cycle, it may conclude as well as introduce the six day cycle. Hence, the principle is six working days followed and preceded by the Sabbath day.

Can it be permanently fixed by God to a certain day “of the week”? Under the New Covenant types and New Covenant application it is fixed by God to the “first day of the week” (Lev. 23; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1-2; Mk. 16:9; Rev. 1:7). Jesus said the Sabbath was made for “man” while YOU say it was made for “Jews” only (Mk. 2:27) and Jesus in context is speaking directly of the Creation Sabbath in Genesis 2.

DHK:

The Sabbath was made for man. So was every other day of the week. Your understanding of this verse is pitifully weak.

DW:

This is a pathetic response!!!! Find any scripture that

says God set apart any other day???? To say that God made “every other day of the week” for man in the same sense as the Seventh day is to repudiate the Sabbath law altogether from Genesis 2 to Revelation 22! That is an absurd line of reasoning! If every day was ALWAYS ALIKE - for man - then what is the point of the fourth commandment???

You need to read the context of Mark 2 and you will see that Jesus is not defending “EVERY OTHER DAY” but he is defending and defining one day set apart “for man” UNLIKE EVERY OTHER DAY! You have tossed common sense out the window.

DHK:

I have challenged you before to take the entire passage (the verse with the surrounding verses) and explain or expound it publicly here, but you have never done so. Are you reluctant to expound Scripture on the board, especially Scripture that would expose your position?

DW:

That is false! I have done so twice! I have answered your eisegesis of this passage thoroughly and I will be happy to do it again!

We do not enter rest any more than pre-cross saints as they also entered into rest when they believed in the gospel equally as much as we do (Heb. 4:1-3) and yet they still observed a Sabbath day.

DHK:

But we never observe the Sabbath day, for Christ is our Sabbath. That is the difference.

DW:

We are not put under the curse for observing a Sabbath day which is the fourth commandment any more than we are

put under a curse for observing any of the other nine commandments.

DHK:

You put yourself under a curse by putting yourself under a needless law. If you keep one law you must keep them all. How many are there? 613??

DW:

Pathetic! You have to go so far in this pathetic response to divide the fourth commandment from the other nine when God's word says they are inseparable (James 2:10). You have to jump the fence and take the side of legalistic Jews who abused the law for justification and use that same abuse as the basis to charge me with putting people under a curse when that is only true if the law was given to JUSTIFY men!!!!!! Do you believe the Law can justify men????? If not, then what is the valid use of the Law? Is it not to reveal the knowledge of sin? Is it not to reveal the standard of righteousness? I believe we should keep the other nine for no other reason than I believe we should keep the fourth and neither is for justification and only if I believed keeping the law was for justification could you JUSTLY condemn me for bringing people "under the curse." Therefore, you are intentionally and purposely distorting my position as well as God's design for giving Law. You are intentionally distorting the discussion here as you know very well that the law justifies no one and never did and therefore observing the fourth commandment does not put us under a curse any more than observing any of the other nine!

DHK:

The other nine are known as God's moral law. There is nothing immoral about not keeping the Sabbath day holy? What is moral or immoral about that?

DW:

What is moral and immoral about it is that it is GOD'S LAW and that is all that is required to make it moral as to violate any law of God is to REBELL against God and that is a MORAL sin!

DHK:

If you are a missionary to a tribe in Africa is the first thing you tell them: worship God on the Sabbath or you cannot be saved! This is God's moral law. Is this the law that is written in their hearts (Rom.2:14,15)?

DW:

Pathetic, pathetic!!!!!! You really believe that I teach that salvation is obtained, that man is justified by keeping any law????????????? Please quote me at any time anywhere saying that??? Do you really think that the law was given for salvation or justification of any man?????? I use the law according to God's design and purpose for giving the law - to reveal sin - to reveal the knowledge of righteousness. I use the fourth commandment just as I do all other nine and NONE are designed to be used for justification.

What right do you have to subtract and divide any of the ten commandments from the others? Who gave you that right?? Just because the fourth is not listed in some of the lists means nothing as it is missing in the list that Jesus gave to the Rich Young Ruler and so should we conclude that Jesus did not believe in the fourth commandment and violated it????????????? Would not the violation of the fourth commandment by Christ make him a sinner or can you violate this law of God without impunity?????

You need to rethink not only your position but your senseless and pathetic arguments.

It only puts you under the curse if you are attempting to

be JUSTIFIED by the law. Are you accusing me of teaching JUSTIFICATION under the law???????????????????? The only valid use of the ten commandments was to reveal the knowledge of sin and that is still the valid use of the ten commandments.

DHK:

You have been attempting to justify yourself and why you should keep the Sabbath. Is there a difference? The Sabbath has always been fixed on the seventh day of whatever the societal calendar was being used.

DW:

This is true BUT it was not fixed by God but by that particular Society and it was not fixed on SATURDAY but only the SEVENTH day after six working days. In Egypt that Sabbath fell on FRIDAY not Saturday. The point is that it was NEVER fixed by God on Saturday at ANY TIME but it was fixed by different societies according to their own calendar computations which were not the same. The resurrection on the first day of the week under the New Covenant is the SEVENTH day Sabbath fixed upon Sunday after six working days, thus Sunday being the SEVENTH DAY after six working days and thus it is called “The Lord's Day.”

If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: (Isaiah 58:13)

Be consistent with yourself!! You just stated previously that the Sabbath is the Seventh day according to whatever societal calendar it may be applied and thus is NOT THE SAME between different societal calendars. Isaiah 58:13 says nothing about the societal application of what day other than “the seventh day” in their societal calendar which could fall on

any day in their traditional way of counting time. In Egypt it fell on Friday! Hence, Isaiah 58 has nothing to do with determining the traditional application of a society but with the kind of work forbidden on the Sabbath day as a principle. you are the one jerking this text out of its theological context as it has nothing to do with fixing a Societal application but with the NATURE of work prohibited on the Sabbath day.

DHK:

In this case our Julian calendar states that Saturday is the seventh day, and therefore Saturday is ALWAYS the Sabbath. No other day can be the sabbath, for the Sabbath is given to the Jew (Ex.31)

DW:

Our dear brother DKH complains that he works on Sundays? May I ask what KIND OF WORK?

DHK:

Sunday is not the Sabbath and never was. This is a complete misnomer. It is not even a Biblical concept. Our Julian calendar shows that Saturday is the seventh day and thus it is the Sabbath. It is the same day that the Jews go to their synagogues; that their Rabbis teach them. It is the same day that the SDA's worship. You are absolutely wrong in your reasoning here. God is a God of order; you have made him a God of disorder. God used calendars. Please read your Bible and find all about the calendars that God used and commanded Israel to use.

Yes, I work on Sunday.

DW:

Does he really believe the Bible forbids all kinds of work on the Sabbath? Jesus explicitly states that the Sabbath is given to the work of God, the work of the ministry...

DHK:

Chapter and verse please. I would like to read that one for myself.

DW:

The Sabbath is given to the work of God, the work of the ministry, the work in the house of God but is a “rest” from the kind of work that is all about self interests (Isa. 58:13).

DHK:

If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: (Isaiah 58:13)

--Scripture taken out of context. What does the next verse say?

Then shalt thou delight thyself in the LORD; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it. (Isaiah 58:14)

--Obviously it is not speaking of this day and age. It has nothing to do with “our ministry today, or on any Sunday.”

DW:

This kind of work Jesus says that God continues to do upon the Sabbath and so does Jesus. Jesus says it is LAWFUL to do this kind of work on the Sabbath. Hence, does DKH think that doing the LORD'S WORK on the Sabbath violates the Sabbath “rest”?????????

DHK:

The Sabbath is Saturday as is confirmed by the context of Isaiah 58. Don't take Scripture out of context.

DW:

Neither the context or the text confirms Saturday to be the Sabbath as nowhere in the Old Testament did the Jews ever use *NAMES* for days but only NUMBERS.

GE:

Folly! And you know it! Their “*NUMBERS*” were the days’ “*NAMES*”; only the last day of the creation- and redemption-week had a double name, “The Day the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

DW:

The fourth commandment does not provide any **FIXATION** of the Sabbath on any particular day in the Jewish Month ...

GE:

Foolishness! Who, here, says or argues it does?!

DW:

The fourth commandment does not provide any **FIXATION** of the Sabbath on any particular day in the Jewish Month - that is simply false based completely on tradition without a single scripture to support it.

The facts are these:

1. The fourth commandment is based squarely upon the Creation Sabbath and the word “remember” puts this beyond all question.
2. The fourth commandment fixes only that the Sabbath is the “seventh day” following six working days - nothing more, nothing less.

GE:

Remember this YOUR statement ... “2. *The fourth*

commandment fixes only that the Sabbath is the “seventh day” following six working days - nothing more, nothing less.” How recently did you and how soon will you declare the direct opposite!

DW:

3. The creation Sabbath is explicitly stated by Christ who claims to be the One who instituted it in Genesis 2:2-3 to be made for “man” not merely for the Jews or for Israel and NO OTHER DAY does Christ make such a claim setting it apart from all other days. Indeed, the other six days are given to men for a completely different reason - to do their own thing (Isa. 58:13).

4. The fourth commandment is no more abolished than any of the other nine as they are inseparable (James 2:10) and the omission in some listings as in the listing given by Christ to the Rich Young Ruler proves nothing.

5. God gave the stars, moon and sun to provide natural time divisions for mankind and the earliest calendar provided in the book of Genesis in the account of Noah's flood NEVER uses NAMES for days, months or years but always uses NUMBERS and NEVER divides time evenly according to seven days “a week” but 30 day months and 360 day years which are not evenly divided by seven.

6. The Creation Sabbath nor any reference to it as given in the fourth commandment ever say it is the seventh day “of the week” but rather it is a set of seven days that can be applied to any societal calendar and fall upon any day of the week just as long as six working days precede it regardless of the length of the month or year.

7. The first day of the week is preceded by six working days and therefore is the “seventh day” following six working days.

8. The first day of the week is the resurrection day (Luke 24:1,13,21-22) and is explicitly selected and set apart by

apostolic command (1 Cor. 16:1-2) for “all the churches” and thus the particular day of the week chosen for public worship (Acts 20:7) and is “the Lord's day.”

9. The prohibition of work on the Sabbath is restricted by Scripture to only one type of work - self-centered work (Isa. 58:13) but does not prohibit the work of the ministry, works of mercy, works of necessity and NEVER did or else Jesus is a SINNER who broke a genuine law of God.

10. Faith in the gospel did not invalidate Sabbath observance before the cross or after the cross (heb. 4:2-3) but rather the redemptive work of Jesus Christ establishes a “sabbath day observance for the people of God” (Heb. 4:9-10) which has its complete fulfillment not with the new birth but only with complete glorification in a new heaven and new earth.

11. Those who adopt the Saturdarian application are in open disobedience to both the example and precepts of the New Testament and those who deny there is a day in the week called “the Lord's day” are in direct disobedience not only to the fourth commandment but to the explicit example and precepts of the New Testament (Heb. 4:9-10; 1 Cor. 16:1-2; Rev. 1:10)

12. The Levitical Sabbatical cycles or plural “sabbaths” found in Leviticus 23 having to do with the feast cycle has been abolished but neither the first or any other of the ten commandments have been abolished as a rule of righteousness for PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN LIVING.

13. Romans 14-15 deals with CULTURAL APPLICATIONS that are neither right or wrong in themselves rather than with any of the Ten Commandments which are right and wrong in themselves. Paul does not use the term “Sabbath” or “Lord's Day” in these chapters but has reference to non-biblical cultural days that scripture says nothing about one way or the other.

Joh 5:17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh

hitherto, and I work.

Mt 12:12 How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days.

Mk 2:27 And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath:

3:4 And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace.

Isa. 58:13 ¶ If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words:

Note that Isaiah 58:13 defines the kind of works forbidden upon the Sabbath and provides the spirit or principle of the Sabbath. The principle of the Sabbath is not completely fulfilled until we are glorified in a body without sin within a new creation without sin - that is the ultimate conclusion of Sabbath fulfillment. We now enter this principle initially by faith when we believe the Gospel and we now obtain complete fulfillment POSITIONALLY "in Christ" but we do not have the PERFECT and COMPLETE application until we are glorified in a new heaven and earth when God can once again look upon everything He has created and made and say "very good."

GE:

Dr Walter's misconstruing my statements and standpoints, was not the 'point' I am seeing better focused on as this conversations is progressing

I shall therefore extract from the above mutilation of reason and Scriptures what is to the point:

"...(GE) insists that the 7th day Sabbath is restricted to a use of the phrase "in the day The Seventh Day" restricted to what the Scriptures actually DO use in BOTH the creation

account AND the 4th commandment.”

Where has GE “*insist(ed) that the 7th day Sabbath is restricted to a use of the phrase “in the day The Seventh Day”*”? So you time and again squeeze some false allegation into your warbled spinning, Dr Walter – You build a straw man of YOUR straw, tag it GE’s straw man, and set it spectacularly ablaze while you in a stupor dance your faked victory war dance round and round.

Note especially DW’s abbreviation, “the 7th day Sabbath”.

It has become clearer and clearer to myself in fact through this very conversation, the ONENESS of the FULL phrase and ideas contained in it, better than I ever before perceived.

The Hebrew word for ‘the sabbath’, ‘shabbath’, and the Hebrew words, “the seventh day”, ‘yom shebii’, are NOT “*restricted*”, in “*application to*” the creation Sabbath or to the Fourth Commandment Sabbath.

BUT, in the **COMBINING** of these words together into, “The Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD-your-God” ever so often WITHOUT EXCEPTION are perfectly conditioned upon the reality of both “the Sabbath” and “The Seventh Day” BEING, LITERALLY “THE DAY, THE, SEVENTH, DAY”-**OF-THE-WEEK** and “SABBATH-OF,-THE LORD GOD”: “The Sabbath” which...

...within the seven-day-cycle or “*set-of-days*” KNOWN by any right-minded person upon earth today, is ‘the last day-OF-THE-WEEK’ (or also in some cultures, is ‘Saturday’).

I am seeing it better and better, but I can’t see how I could improve my explaining of it, EXCEPT by pointing out or by pointing to Dr Walter’s, OWN explanation of the exact SAME element of “truth”, to quote him again,

“The truth is that we simply have a set of seven days, six days preceding the Sabbath and six days following the Sabbath and that set of seven days can fit any calander at any

time regardless of the number of days in the month or days in the year.”

I'll highlight Dr Walter's, crucial, words,

“The truth is that WE SIMPLY HAVE A SET OF SEVEN DAYS, six days preceding the Sabbath and six days following the Sabbath and THAT SET OF SEVEN DAYS can fit any calander (Sic.) at any time regardless of the number of days in the month or days in the year.”

Fine. Now, read this from the pen of Dr Walter, also, just very recently,

“...what the Scriptures NEVER EVER use in either the creation account or the 4th commandment and that is the terms “OF THE WEEK.””

I'll highlight the crucial words further, for you ...

“...what the Scriptures NEVER EVER use in either the creation account or the 4th commandment and that is the terms : _”OF-THE-WEEK”_!!!”

For the life of old Eber, I don't see ANY DIFFERENCE between GE's 'insisting', on the concept implied in “*the creation account or the 4th commandment*” of: _”OF-THE-WEEK”_!!!”, and Dr Walter's 'insisting', on the concept implied in “*the creation account or the 4th commandment*” of: “_”A SET OF SEVEN DAYS”_!!!”, “_ THAT SET OF SEVEN DAYS””_OF-_", in the last analysis, “_-THE-WEEK_!!!”

Man, I feel sommer lus and call the thing by its true name, equivocative ambivalence and overstatement-cover-up, under a heap of baloney, improbity and guile!

With compliments as a piece of my mind right now, Dr Walter ...

That is what has been the TRUTH that from inside out rotted this conversation so far! I now see it clear as bright daylight!

Dr. Walter:

Why not simply be honest with the text? Honest

demands that “of the week” cannot be found at all anywhere in the creation account or in any account of the fourth commandment! Nada, zilch, zippo!

Furthermore, “a set of seven days” with reference to the Creation account precedes the calendar division “of the week.”

GE:

What nonsense again is “*the calendar division “of the week”*”?

DW:

No calendar existed in Genesis 1-2 and the first method of computing months and years does not evenly divide into the “week” ideology but rather 30 day months and 360 day years.

Last, I am setting forth the principle when I say “a set of seven days” rather than quoting word for word from Genesis 2:3-4. There are seven days accounted for and the seventh day in this set of seven days is the Sabbath. However, placing this set of seven days in the Jewish or Julian calendar computations is something quite different. Defining the seventh day of the Egyptian Calendar and this seventh day is something quite different.

You are attempting FIX the “seventh day” in the creation account to a PARTICULAR post-creation type of calendar that does not permit the Seventh day to fall upon any other day in that calendar other than Saturday and that attempt has absolutely no Biblical foundation whatsoever.

GE:

If you can count to seven you’ll see the Sabbath was “The Seventh Day” in “the generations of the heavens and of the earth WHEN THEY WERE CREATED.” I need NO “*post-creation type of calendar that does not permit the Seventh day to fall upon any other day*”. The Scriptures, the Word of God, and the creation, fill that need, thanks.

Is it not Dr Walter who as recently as arm's-length emphasised,

“2. The fourth commandment fixes only that the Sabbath is the “seventh day” following six working days - nothing more, nothing less”?!

After his “set-of-days-theory’ has been debunked, **Dr Walter’s** dogmatism must be looked at from another angle than previously and be properly **reconsidered** for WHOSE they are.

Dr Walter,

You have not been able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the sabbath law to other days than the “seventh day.” The Sabbath law is the only grounds/basis for the idea of a “sabbath.”

You have not been able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the Sabbath law to other periods of time than merely a 24 hour period (month, year).

You have not been able to answer why the Biblical calendar month and year is not divisible by seven but has a “twenty and ninth” day in it. If the “week” is God's basic and essential time measurement then why did He not create the moon, earth and sun orbits and rotations according to that essential time measurement?????? It is obvious from the account of Noah that the first calculations of months and years was strictly lunar with 30 days in the month and 360 days in the year. Just read the account of Noah. This is how God counted months and the year. 30 days is not evenly divisible by seven. 360 days is not evenly divisible by seven.

GE:

Considering:

“You have not been able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the sabbath law to other days than the “seventh day.” The Sabbath law is the only

grounds/basis for the idea of a “sabbath.””

“...the fourth commandment permits God...”

God permits the Fourth Commandment; the Fourth Commandment has no authority over God.

“...permits God to apply the sabbath law to other days...” but in the Fourth Commandment, it is stated *“...the Seventh Day...”*. In every mention of the Fourth Commandment, it is stated *“...the Seventh Day...”*. The Fourth Commandment says that God actually *“appl(ies) the sabbath law to”* “the Seventh Day”, and NOT that God *“appl(ies) the sabbath law to other days than the “seventh day.”*

And so, that *“(t)he Sabbath law is the only grounds/basis for the idea of a “sabbath.””*, is nonsensical because the created reality of a “sabbath-DAY” in the Fourth Commandment — “the DAY the SEVENTH Day” of the creation and creation-ORDER — *“is the only grounds/basis for The Sabbath”*, as well as for *“the sabbath law”* of the Fourth Commandment. The reality of “the Seventh Day” of God’s ‘making’ *“is the only grounds/basis for The Sabbath”*. The reality of “the Seventh Day” of God’s ‘making’ *“is the only grounds/basis for The Sabbath”* and is no mere *“idea of a “sabbath””*.

Is there any possibility left in which way you, Dr Walter, do not twist and bend God’s Word to fit your scheming?! Therefore surely, I am *“not ... able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the sabbath law to other days than the “seventh day.””* May I never like you become able to do it! And therefore yes, again, I *“...have not been able to answer how the fourth commandment permits God to apply the Sabbath law to other periods of time than merely a 24 hour period (month, year).”* Absolutely, yes! Thank God!

So by my answer with reference to the actual facts contained in the creation story and Fourth Commandment, I have been able to answer your faked accusations, and *“have ...*

*answer(ed) why the Biblical calendar month and year (are) not divisible (Sic.) by seven but ha(ve) a “twenty and ninth” day” and of course every other date of the month, “in it”. Because, actually, yes, “If the “week” is God's basic and essential time measurement” to determine his Sabbath Day, then He **did** create the moon, earth and sun orbits and rotations according to **their**, “essential time measurement”.*

Dr Walter's Hoax

I feel like a sheep the only thing I can carry is my woolly brain.

That's why I could not uncover his scheming ... the trick is too obvious to even suspect! An eye-blinder so slick you never noticed. A camel through the eye of a needle so by my kool (upon my soul). Now I understand why every morning my cabbage patch disappears little by little. That camel!

Dr Walter has re-invented the wheel; now he peddles his patent to the gullible half learned road-show hungry evangelists at a tithe and side-kick offering.

For that, all these sesquipedalian 'debates' measured by the yawns!

I really feel sheepish!

Therefore, is it worth further consideration?

What else can be said than what has been said?

We shall have to wait and see; I not now feel like digging dead cows from the trenches (beating the dead poor old horse alive all over again).

But I have my sacred duty; like we all do.

The milled nut is it is God's Word we deal with; or rather, it is God's Word that deals with us gropers in the darkness. May His Word be the lamp for our feet it is supposed to be.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1693422#post1693422>

Dr Walter accumulated an array of descriptions for the Scriptures', "week", but which Dr Walter claims, isn't the

week, but “*a set of seven days*”.

One of his descriptions is “*The Sabbath “sanctified” or SEPARATED from the rest of the previous six days*”. Just don’t say “*The Sabbath “sanctified” or separated from the rest of the previous six days*” : **OF THE WEEK!**

Note Dr Walter’s false emphasis on the word “*SEPARATED*” as if to replace the IMPLICATION THE FACT, “*The Sabbath “sanctified” or separated from the rest of the previous six days...*” : **OF THE WEEK**; namely of the ‘creation-week’ of SEVEN, ‘days’!

Dr Walter’s god “*applies the Sabbath law to a variety of other days “of the week”*”. Be that, as it may. But his statement, “*God applies the Sabbath law to a variety of other days “of the week”*”, is a most obvious insidious untruth which jests at “*the Sabbath law*” which God **NEVER** “*applies to a variety of other days*” OTHER than “*the Sabbath*” : “**The Seventh Day**” of the seven days spoken of in the ‘Law’ and Fourth Commandment in Exodus 20, as well as in the world’s creation in Genesis 2.

“*The Sabbath law*” strictly and without exception **EVER**, in the Bible occurs “**CONCERNING**” “**the Day**”, “**God IN THE SCRIPTURES THUS SPAKE**” : and **God THE SEVENTH DAY from all his works, rested**” Hebrews 4:4. Which is the **END**, the **DEMOLISHMENT**, and the **EXPOSURE** of Dr Walter in his DECEIT that “*the fourth commandment permits God to apply the sabbath law to other days than the “seventh day”*”!

For DECEIT is Dr Walter’s WHOLE, and ONLY aim and purpose and TRUST is deceit’s ONLY trust! Yes, trust in the deceiver is the only thing his deceit demands.

“**The Seventh Day**” is “**The Seventh Day-OF**” that “*set of seven days*” “**-OF**” that GROUP “*of seven days*” “**The Seventh Day**” is the last and “**Seventh Day**” “**-OF**”. Simple! Bare fact! Because TRUTH is, God applies the Sabbath “*LAW*”, to **NO** “*other days*” than “**The Seventh Day Sabbath of**

the LORD GOD". Dr Walter's statement is an outright lie and mis-*'application'* of the Scriptures and *'principle'* of truth and God's *'Law'*.

Dr Walter always mixes and confuses and so identifies the Sabbath LAW and the Sabbath—the Sabbath as such the Seventh Day of the week of the Sabbath Law. He talks of the Sabbath AS SUCH as the "*law*" or "*commandment*" and not as the commanded thing. Then again he talks of the "*law*" per se, as the commanded thing THE Sabbath Day. And God, he portrays as not knowing what He is doing or speaking and always is confusing his Sabbath Day for his Law of the Sabbath Day; and his Law of the Sabbath Day for his Sabbath Day.

And although it seems Dr Walter is able to confuse even God Himself, I don't believe he is so confused as he pretends to be. I think he is systematically and strategically set on confusing his readers so they may accept his confusion for order and truth.

What Dr Walter actually wrote means any one day of the first six days of the creation-week "*separated*" from any five of the first six days of the creation week— Dr Walter's way to prove it wasn't the Seventh-Day-Sabbath following the first six days of the creation-WEEK, "*separated*" and "*sanctified*".

It's Dr Walter's 'logical logic', which I definitely "*do not understand*" but can explain to him better than he can explain it to anyone else himself. No wonder Dr Walter cannot get to the real thing, 'the week' of SEVEN, and not of "*the previous six days*"-**OF-THE-WEEK!**

Says DW in the hope to avoid the origin of the 'week' or first ever "*set of seven days where six days preceded a Sabbath and six days followed a Sabbath*". "*...a Sabbath...*" with a capital letter, but with the indefinite article!

Clever confusing!

The word "*Sabbath*" with capital letter, one would

expect, represents THE Sabbath, “The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath”, whereas the word ‘sabbath’ with no capital letter, would suggest “a”, ‘sabbath’ – any ‘sabbath’ **OTHER**, than “The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD”.

In this way instead of the “*set of seven days*” known as the ‘week’ where six days precede THE Sabbath and six days follow “THE Sabbath-The-Day-The-Seventh-Day”-of-the-WEEK, Dr Walter wangles to get “a set of seven days” NOT THE WEEK, “where six days preceded a (s)abbath and six days followed a (s)abbath”.

Shrewd; but not shrewd enough!

Because it is **NOT NOT NOT THIS**, ‘principle’, THE, ‘principle’ “*where six days preceded a Sabbath*”— “The SEVENTH Day-of-the-week-Sabbath”— “*and six days followed a Sabbath*”— “The SEVENTH Day-of-the-week-Sabbath”— that underlies **Leviticus 23:11,15** where it is prescribed to ‘count’ “seven” “sabbaths”, “*where six days preceded a (s)abbath and six days followed a (s)abbath*” before the next “sabbath”, “seven times”, before “the next” and ‘Fiftieth’, “day” after the last “sabbath” OF SEVEN DAYS IRRESPECTIVE THE ‘WEEK’ AND “*where six days preceded a (s)abbath and six days followed a (s)abbath*”— exactly the OPPOSITE of what Dr Walter, said and directly contradicting and refuting him!

Yes, **THOSE** ‘*weeks-of-sabbaths*’ in Leviticus 23:11,15, were NOT “The Sabbaths” – ‘OF the week’ which the Commandment’s literal definition for, is, “IN-THE-DAY-THE-Seventh-Day-Sabbath”.

“The-day-The-Sabbath” of ‘the week’ in and of the Commandment and creation story, was and still is and forever will be the last and “The Seventh Day” “-IN”, and the last and “The Seventh Day” “-OF” : **THE WEEK!**

The fact both these kinds of ‘sabbaths’ are called ‘sabbaths’

does not identify them;

it does not even make them similar;
 it does not make of them both the “*application*” of the Fourth Commandment;
 it does not make them co-incidental or simultaneous with one another;
 it does not say or imply they required the same ‘observance’ or ‘holiness’ or had the same typological meaning.

The fact both these kinds of ‘sabbaths’ are called ‘sabbaths’ does not say they in space and time originated from the same source;

because “The Day The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”-of-each-and-every-week-**FOREVER**, was once for all determined by the **pure will of God out of pure grace**; while “the sabbaths”-**OF MONTHS’ DATES** on YEARLY calendars, God **COMMANDED** must be determined and proclaimed, quote: “sabbaths : according to their SEASONS” of **nature** as “**ruled**” by the heavenly bodies to the laws of **physics** out of no grace or love.

How many times did Dr Walter admit this differentiation only to completely ignore and deny it again soon after?!

Re: “*The Sabbath commemorates, and remembers God's creation in six days, a creation that God concludes with the words “very good.”*”

The “*creation*”, “*concludes with the words “very good”*”, and the “*original Sabbath commemorated ... creation*”; which words Dr Walter repeatedly emphasises, were spoken “*ON, the Sixth Day of God's creating*”, contradicting that “*the Sabbath was “made” ... “just as the other six days were made”*”— but, “*distinct from the other six days*”.

Dr Walter tries to separate the Sabbath from the previous six days of the creation, and although the whole creation was “*a set of seven days*”, that “*set of seven days*” cannot be “*THE*”

WEEK” the Bible-week of seven days of which the Sabbath is the last and Seventh Day.

“The application of the Sabbath law is consistent with the Seventh day “of the week” but yet cannot be restricted to the Seventh day “of the week” as God applies the Sabbath law to a variety of other days “of the week” as well as to other periods of time than the 24 hour day”.

1) God does NOT apply the Sabbath law *“to a variety of other days”*. He applies both “the Sabbath” and *“the Sabbath law”*, to *“the Seventh day “of the week””*— ‘consistently’!

2) And the writers of the Law to God’s directions applied the concept and word, ‘sabbath / the sabbath’, *“to other periods of time than the 24 hour day”* The Seventh-Day-The Sabbath— clearly seen in the case of Leviticus 23:11,15.

3) But neither have these writers, nor God, EVER ‘applied’, *“the Sabbath law”*, to ANY, *“variety of other days “of the week””*.

Just now, Dr Walter, you have and just now-now you will again and again say, *“... the Scriptures NEVER EVER use in either the creation account or the 4th commandment ... the terms “OF THE WEEK””*, but you use them wholesale in *“application of the Sabbath law”*!

Here is another masterpiece in fraud:

“Hence, the principle is six days work followed and preceded by one day Sabbath regardless of the calendar being used and regardless of the day the Sabbath fell upon.”

“...and” : *“regardless of the day the Sabbath fell upon...”*. *“And ... the day...”* OF WHAT *“...the Sabbath fell upon...”*?! Dr Walter, *“... regardless of the calendar being used and regardless of the day ...”* ... OBVIOUSLY, *“regardless of the day...”* OF THE WEEK, *“...the Sabbath fell upon”*! One ‘applies’ the ‘logical’ Copulative “AND” to include together different things, like here, *“regardless of the calendar being used AND regardless of the day the Sabbath...”* OF THE WEEK, *“fell upon”*!

Fraud!

So the Sabbath-Seventh-Day-of-the-week could fall on any day of the ‘week’, is what Dr Walter falsely asserts, at the same time destroying his own theory there is no ‘week’ in the creation story and Fourth Commandment.

One could go through Dr Walter’s many disputations, line for line, paragraph for paragraph, chapter for chapter, and one will encounter his incessant SAME fraud, which he, pretending and impressing, ‘*applies*’ to confuse and confound others.

Dr Walter

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=7>

I have read your mumbo jumbo responses and can't make any sense out them. God explicitly states in Genesis 1:14 that He made the sun and moon to give the division of time and His time dividers are not divisible by seven. This proves that the “week” is tradition not divine. This proves that the set of “seven” days for creation is not given for the purpose to provide calendar division of time as it is the sun and moon's job to give calendar divisions.

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1693925#post1693925>

Here Dr Walter himself says it all, the truth, contradicting while he thinks he is proving his skewed ideas concerning the relation between natural divisions in time of months and seasons, and the Biblical and creational reality of ‘the week’ of the first “*set of seven days*”.

And how the fact “*in Genesis 1:14*” it is ‘stated’ that God “*made the sun and moon to give the division of time and His time dividers are not divisible by seven*”, “*proves that the “week” is tradition not divine*”, only Dr Walter knows.

It is Dr Walter in his own words, who concludes the **co-existence** in the reality of BIBLICAL time, of BOTH “*the division of time ... as it is the sun and moon's job to give*”—

which “*division*” or ‘*divisions*’, “*of time*”, “*are not divisible* (Sic.) *by seven*”; and “*the set of “seven” days for creation* (which) *is not given for the purpose to provide calendar division of time*”.

But notice the ever so careful confusion and deceit of the Doctor’s. He CONFUSES things so, no one can understand a thing; to appear on the scene the great master in orderliness and understanding. But his confusion is only aimed at DENYING that “*the “week”” “division of time” of “the set of “seven” days for creation*”, “*is tradition not divine*”.

And so is Dr Walter’s WHOLE SCHEME IN FRAUD exposed by himself!

Because, if “*the division of time*” of “*the set of “seven” days for creation*”, “*is tradition not divine*”, then the first seven days of the coming into being of the creation, and the coming into existence of the creation itself, are “*not divine*”, but, are “*tradition*”.

Then every time the Word of God in Genesis says, “God said, let there be ... and it was the First Day...” etcetera, until God said, that He “The Seventh Day rested from all HIS works”, the Word of God actually lies, and Dr Walter is telling us the truth, that “*the division of time*” of “*the set of “seven” days for creation*”, “*is tradition not divine*”.

Therefore, Dr Walter, Have you become an evolutionist of late?

Or is it simply above your understanding that the TWO ‘*divisions in time*’ are possible and in fact are the only reality of and in creation’s time and existence ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES—

- 1) “*the division of time ... as it is the sun and moon's job to give*” for all humanity believers **and non-believers**, and
- 2) “*the division of time*” of “*the set of “seven” days for creation*” for **believers only**?

I don't believe it is above your understanding; I am convinced it is AGAINST YOUR FAITH!

DW:

This proves that the set of "seven" days in creation provides only a PRINCIPLE of six working days that is both concluded and preceded by a Sabbath. The set of seven days is not given as a time divider for calendar purposes but as a principle that can fit or be applied to the NATURAL CALANDER divisions determined by the moon and sun or any TRADITION of calendar division based upon moon and sun calculations.

GE:

Having declared, *"This proves that the set of "seven" days in creation provides only a PRINCIPLE of six working days that is both concluded and preceded by a Sabbath"*, Dr Walter directly contradicts the bare truth *"that the set of "seven" days"*, *"IN CREATION"*, were *"only"* *"CONCLUDED by a Sabbath"*, and were **NOT** *"preceded"* also, *"by a Sabbath"*...

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=8>

Every principle begins somewhere with something! Simply because no Sabbath preceded the original set of seven days is moot! The principle begins with this set and common sense demands any type of continuation is impossible without a Sabbath preceding and following six working days. Gerhard is simply politicing hot air.

GE:

... the bare truth *"that the set of "seven" days"*, *"IN CREATION"*, were *"only"* *"CONCLUDED by a Sabbath"*, and were **NOT** *"preceded"* also, *"by a Sabbath"*.... which

bare fact – from “In the beginning GOD created the heaven and the earth” until the Word of God was made flesh so true and trustworthy is He in principle –, “*proves*” and “*provides*” ONCE-FOR-EVER AND -ALL the “*ONLY*” “*principle*” — defined by Dr Walter himself as “*the set of “SEVEN” days in creation*” — that “*can fit or (can) be applied to the NATURAL CALANDER (sic.) divisions determined by the moon and sun or any TRADITION of calendar division based upon moon and sun calculations*”.

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=8>

The lunar cycle does not promote an evenly divided month of seven day weeks (28) but is nearer to 30 days. The earliest counting in the book of Genesis does not follow calendars divided evenly by seven days but 30 day months and 360 day years. See the account of Noah and the flood the counting method.

GE:

Yea yea for the umpteenth time!
Listen who talks “*hot air*”!

DW:

Your real good at making personal insults but not too good at giving clear responses. I take by your answer you are in agreement that God's natural Calendar indicators do not operate on a seven day cycle and that the earliest recorded calendar of months and year do not operate on an evenly divided seven day cycle. Good, that is a start.

The Sabbath law simply sets forth a set of seven days that necessarily precede and follow a Sabbath ONCE IT IS BEGUN. It can fit any kind of human calendar and fall on ANY DAY OF the calendar whether if the day is defined by

NUMBER or by NAME. Whether it fell on FRIDAY in the Egyptian Calendar or fell on Saturday in the Jewish Calendar.

The bottom line is Gerard and all Saturdarians are wrong because thier view RESTRICTS the Sabbath to only ONE APPLICATION - the seventh day of the week in only one kind of calendar where SATURDAY is the consistent and restricted day for application. However, God applies the Sabbath law beyond any particular day of the week proving it is merely a PRINCIPLE of Sabbath rest after and before six working days and with wider application than SATURDAYISM or the day of SATURN worship.

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=8>

Which “*principle*” — the “*principle*” namely, of “*the set of “seven” days*” or ‘**WEEK**’ “*in creation*” — quite simply is the “*principle*” which Dr Walter will never admit the while it is the exact **same** “*principle*” that underlies both the Genesis history of the creation and the giving of the Fourth Commandment in Exodus 20! Which with respect to Dr Walter is very odd and inexplicable.

Re: Dr Walter, “*This ... the set of “seven” days in creation ... proves that the set of “seven” days in creation provides only a PRINCIPLE of six working days that is both concluded and preceded by a Sabbath.*”

This statement of Dr Walter’s is his conclusion to what he just before this statement had said, which was, “... *the set of “seven” days in creation provides only a PRINCIPLE of six working days that is both concluded and preceded by a Sabbath.*”

I have pointed out and stressed the limitation which Dr Walter himself puts to “*the set of “seven” days*” he was speaking about, the limitation that it was “*the set of “seven” days IN CREATION*”!

Now since it was “*the set of “seven” days IN CREATION*” that was **NOT** “*both concluded and preceded by a Sabbath*”, but was **ONLY** “**CONCLUDED** by a Sabbath”— which ‘*concluding*’ “*Sabbath ... in creation*”, was not just any and later, ‘sabbath’— it was “The-Day-The-Seventh-Day” “*in creation*” and, “The-Day-The-Sabbath-Day” in the Fourth Commandment.

It therefore follows that Dr Walter’s conclusion, that “*this ... set of “seven” days in creation ... proves ... provides only a principle of six working days that is BOTH concluded AND PRECEDED (Emphasis GE) by a Sabbath*”, is unfounded in both the “*creation*” and “*the Creation Sabbath...*”, “*...and the Fourth commandment*”— irrespective the fact that they “*do not contain the words “of the week”*”— They thoroughly contain the IDEA!

Thus Dr Walter’s concluding remark contains NOTHING more or better than his preceding remark; it’s all show, dressed over show, without which the common sense of the fact “*the set of seven days is not given as a time divider for calendar purposes but as a principle that can fit or be applied to the NATURAL CALANDER (Sic.) divisions determined by the moon and sun or any TRADITION of calendar division based upon moon and sun calculations*”, **does perfectly well by itself!**

The only gain reached in the above statements of Dr Walter’s, is that he provided us with still another description of his for the ‘week-concept’ or “*week ideology*” as he called it, derived from the origin and perpetuity of the creation-‘WEEK’ and creation-‘week-DAY’, “the Seventh Day-[OF-THE-CREATION-WEEK]-Sabbath of the LORD GOD”.

This time, instead of having spoken of “*the set of seven days*” for THIS VERY creation-WEEK and creation-week-DAY, Dr Walter wrote of “*the set of seven days ... as a PRINCIPLE*” of and for the creation-WEEK and creation-week-DAY of the Seventh Day and Sabbath of the creation

and Fourth Commandment, “The Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD”. It may have helped us a little, “*as a principle*” to better conceptualize ‘**the week**’, but it really couldn’t have helped for Dr Walter’s disgruntled confusion and confusing and denial “**OF-THE-WEEK**” in the creation story of Genesis and the Fourth Commandment of Exodus 20.

DW:

In regard to principle, what is identified as the “seventh” day in the set of seven days is equally the “first” day preceding six working days when this principle of seven days is applied to any calendar as the seventh day in this set of seven precedes the next six working days.

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1694946&posted=1#post1694946>

“*To principle*”, “*the “seventh” day in the set of seven days is equally the “first” day preceding six working days*”, is quite correct, but, only when one is speaking of, precisely, “*In regard to ... what is identified as ...*”,

One: “... *the “SEVENTH” day in the set of seven days ...*”, and “*_WHEN_*”,

Two: “... *this principle of seven days is applied to any CALENDAR*”!

“*To principle*”, therefore, “*the “seventh” day in the set of seven days...*” in “*any CALENDAR*”, will also be the “*first day preceding six working days*”; which will always be true “*when this principle of seven days is applied to any calendar*”, but cannot be true *when this principle of seven days is applied to “... the set of “seven” days IN CREATION*”. “*When this principle of seven days is applied to any calendar*” and *when this principle of seven days is applied to “... the set of “seven” days IN CREATION*”, are two different scenarios altogether! But quick moves with Dr Walter do make some certain facts seem to disappear like magic. He steals the penny so to speak

from his audience's mind; but that penny is still stuck somewhere between the many folds in his handkerchief.

DW:

Adam was created ON the sixth day and therefore the Seventh day Sabbath was actually Adam's FIRST full day.

GE:

Every time God finished a day's work "*in creation*", it is concluded on God's work of that day, "And it was (1) evening (and ensuing night) and it was morning (and ensuing daylight)." For God darkness is light like light is light. God made both, and God's Kingdom includes the night like it includes the day. God works ALL THE TIME OF DAY AND NIGHT.

No different on the Sixth Day. And God needed nothing to aid Him in doing his work; also not in creating man. God did not NEED time; he USED time because He preferred time – our time – to work in. Which already is prophetic of Christ's incarnation.

God created man with his hands, and formed him from the dust of the earth like the Potter the clay according to and with, his WILL. God's hands are God's omnipotence. He created Adam and Eve from Adam's rib 'IN NO TIME AT ALL' than that He created them man and wife on the Sixth Day of the creation.

The sixth day ... was actually Adam and Eve's FIRST full day ... and therefore the Seventh day Sabbath", was actually their SECOND DAY! The chronology of Genesis 1 through to chapter 3 contains not the slightest indication that there were more days than the actually mentioned days of the first-ever "*set of seven days*" of GOD'S WORKS in having created Adam and Eve, and THEIR, actually mentioned works of disobedience and fall into sin on the Sixth Day of that "*set of seven days in creation*".

DW:

Just as the “seventh” month is equally the “first” month in the Jewish calanders. This dual role is seen in the application of the Sabbath law in Leviticus 23 where the first day application supersedes the seventh day application in regard to what are types of the New Covenant.

GE:

Which of course yet again is pure surmising

Where is “*the first day application ... in Leviticus 23*”? There is no such thing.

And how can “*the “seventh” month ... equally*” be “*the “first” month*”? Utter nonsense!

And where are “*the Jewish calanders (Sic.) ... in Leviticus 23*”? O yes, “convocation which YE shall proclaim in THEIR SEASONS”. I nearly forgot!

But WHERE – again! – is “*the Sabbath law ... seen ... in Leviticus 23*”— “*the Sabbath law*” as seen in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5? Gibberish!

DW:

In regard to principle, what is identified as the “seventh” day in the set of seven days is equally the “first” day preceding six working days when this principle of seven days is applied to any calendar as the seventh day in this set of seven precedes the next six working days. Adam was created ON the sixth day and therefore the Seventh day Sabbath was actually Adam's FIRST full day. Just as the “seventh” month is equally the “first” month in the Jewish calanders.

GE:

But nowhere in the BIBLE!

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71977&page=2>

If you spend less time making personal attacks upon my person and deal with the objections that I have placed before you we would get further along in this discussion.

The Seventh day is the Seventh day in a set of seven days - -period. It is not the seventh day “of the week.” You have jumped from principle to tradition when you add to God's Word “of the week.”

As I have stated many times previously, there is nothing wrong in applying the Sabbath law principle of the Seventh day in a set of seven days to the Seventh day “of the week” but it is wrong to RESTRICT it to such when God Himself does not restrict it to the seventh day “of the week.”

Again such a TRADITIONAL RESTRICTION violates not merely God's own application of the SEVENTH DAY SABBATH in regard to a set of seven days but God did not create the very things He says are for “times and seasons” to fit the “week” mode of counting time as the very things created for “times and seasons” are 29-30 day months rather than 28 day months.

Gen. 1:14 ¶ And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

Hence, the use of the terms “seventh day” have to do with the set of seven days in creation not to the tradition of “the week.” The Sabbath law has to do with this principle of six working days FOLLOWED and PRECEDED by a Sabbath. The principle or set of seven days concluding / beginning with a Sabbath can fit ANY CALENDAR regardless if the tradition is an eight day division, ten day division, etc. It can fit a 28 day calendar, 29, 30, 31, 10 day, etc. The tradition of a seven day “week” is not essential to the Sabbath law as the set of seven days is not dependent upon any human/tradition calendar divisions. God's own calendar in

Leviticus 23 is not established upon a seven day “week” division but rather upon a 29-30 day lunar division according to God's design for the moon and sun in Genesis 1:14.

Simply put, YOU are adding to God's word the terms “of the week” and YOU are restricting the sabbath to the “seventh day of the week” when God's Word does not make such a restriction although God's Word by principle allows for such an application. The application is fine but the restriction is not! Why? Because God's Word, and thus God Himself does not keep it within that restrictive use.

God created everything within six days and rested on the seventh day - this is a set of seven days without any names for any day. There is no monday, Tuesday, etc. division in God's Word - nowhere.

There is no mention of the seventh day “of the week” in Genesis, Exodus or Deuteronomy or any other reference for the fourth commandment.

Why? Because creation days are set forth as a set of seven days that can fit any calander anywhere in the world at any time in history. Hence, the “seventh day” Sabbath can fall upon any day in any calendar at any time and history.

The principle is very simple. Six days both precede and follow the Sabbath day. Nowhere does God demand what day “OF THE WEEK” according to human calendars must this set of seven days begin - nowhere! The Egyptians can start it on their Saturday with the Seventh day Sabbath falling on their Friday (which they did). The Jews can start it on the seventh day “of the month” without any reference to NAMES given to particular days “of the month (which they did in Leviticus 23).

The fourth command does not prescribe any NAMED day “of the week” upon which this set of seven days must begin or end.

Can it begin upon Sunday and end upon Saturday?
Certainly, nothing wrong with that and that is the tradition of

the Jews. Can the Bible be used to restrict it to the Jewish tradition? No! It is simply a set of seven days where the seventh day both concludes as well as precedes six working days. Thus the Seventh day Sabbath may act as the end as well as the beginning of the six work day cycle, it may conclude as well as introduce the six day cycle. Hence, the principle is six working days followed and preceded by the Sabbath day.

Can it be permanently fixed by God to a certain day “of the week”? Under the New Covenant types and New Covenant application it is fixed by God to the “first day of the week” (Lev. 23; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1-2; Mk. 16:9; Rev. 1:7).

Our dear brother DKH complains that he works on Sundays? May I ask what KIND OF WORK? Does he really believe the Bible forbids all kinds of work on the Sabbath? Jesus explicitly states that the Sabbath is given to the work of God, the work of the ministry, the work in the house of God but is a “rest” from the kind of work that is all about self interests (Isa. 58:13). This kind of work Jesus says that God continues to do upon the Sabbath and so does Jesus. Jesus says it is LAWFUL to do this kind of work on the Sabbath. Hence, does DKH think that doing the LORD'S WORK on the Sabbath violates the Sabbath “rest”????????

Joh 5:17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

Mt 12:12 How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days.

Mk 2:27 And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath:

3:4 And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace.

Isa. 58:13 ¶ If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt

honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words:

Note that Isaiah 58:13 defines the kind of works forbidden upon the Sabbath and provides the spirit or principle of the Sabbath. The principle of the Sabbath is not completely fulfilled until we are glorified in a body without sin within a new creation without sin - that is the ultimate conclusion of Sabbath fulfillment. We now enter this principle initially by faith when we believe the Gospel and we now obtain complete fulfillment POSITIONALLY "in Christ" but we do not have the PERFECT and COMPLETE application until we are glorified in a new heaven and earth when God can once again look upon everything He has created and made and say "very good."

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1695211&posted=1#post1695211>

Re: DW, "... *of the week*" *cannot be found at all anywhere in the creation account or in any account of the fourth commandment! Nada, zilch, zippo!*

Why?! Did you expect English in the Hebrew "*creation account or in any account of the fourth commandment*"?

There are as many as there are English words and expressions and idioms in the KJV e.g., that you won't find in the creation account or in any account of the fourth commandment in the Hebrew! Nada, zilch, zippo!

"*The set of seven days*", "*the principle of seven day*" etc. etc. whatever you could come forward with, cannot be found at all anywhere in the creation account or in any account of the fourth commandment! Nada, zilch, zippo!

Re: DW, "*Furthermore, "a set of seven days" with reference to the Creation account precedes the calendar division "of the week."*"

WHERE? A “calendar division “of the week”” cannot be found at all anywhere in the creation account or in any account of the fourth commandment!

And WHERE does ““a set of seven days” with reference to the Creation account precede the calendar division “of the week””?

And HOW does ““a set of seven days” with reference to the Creation account precede the calendar division “of the week”” WITHOUT BEING MENTIONED? There is NO such thing “with reference to the Creation account” as the week of the set of seven days that “precede(s) the calendar division “of the week””.

How do you call it “a division “of the week”” which YOU have all along and just now, DENIED, EXISTS “with reference to the Creation account”?

The “division “of the week”” of “a set of seven days” IN ANY CASE, IS, NO, “calendar division”!

The seven days of and “in the creation” -WEEK, were the first seven days CREATED AND THUS NAMED ONE BY ONE through the creation work of God that CANNOT be 'referenced to' anything in the world that then OR AFTER had not even been! Like you say yourself, not realizing that you contradict YOURSELF, “No calendar existed in Genesis 1-2”!

Re: DW, “... and the first method of computing months and years does not evenly divide into the “week” ideology but rather 30 day months and 360 day years.”

Yes, can it be clearer?

Then why do you call it “the “week” ideology” and don't ACKNOWLEDGE it for THE WEEK-REALITY it was and EVER SINCE the creation had CONTINUED to be?

Re: DW, “Last, I am setting forth the principle when I say “a set of seven days” rather than quoting word for word from Genesis 2:3-4.”

The very same thing all Englishmen except you - it seems -, do, when they are setting forth the principle when they say '*the week and or set of seven days*', rather than quoting word for word from Genesis 2:3-4! Unambiguously, CLEAR!

Re: DW, “*There are seven days accounted for and the seventh day in this set of seven days is the Sabbath.*”

Praise God for it, by worshiping God on it!

Re: DW, “However, placing this set of seven days in the Jewish or Julian calendar computations is something quite different. Defining the seventh day of the Egyptian Calendar and this seventh day is something quite different.”

Do YOU, know what YOU'RE talking?!

Re: DW, “*You are attempting FIX the “seventh day” in the creation account to a PARTICULAR post-creation type of calendar.*”

No! That's what Dr Walter says I am doing; not what I am doing or am trying to do or say or even suppose I am attempting to do. Nonsense!

Re: DW, “*You are attempting FIX the “seventh day” in the creation account to a PARTICULAR post-creation type of calendar that does not permit the Seventh day to fall upon any other day in that calendar other than Saturday and that attempt has absolutely no Biblical foundation whatsoever.*”

That is saying the Scriptures are “*a PARTICULAR post-creation type of calendar*”— an insult to the Written Word of God.

“*The creation account*” in fact was written “*post-creation*”, but there is no “*calendar ... that has absolutely no Biblical foundation whatsoever*” found in it, that – like Dr Walter is attempting to do – permits or attempts to “*permit*” the “Sabbath of the LORD GOD”, “*to fall upon other day(s)*” than “the Seventh Day” of God’s creating spoken of “*in the creation account*”.

Therefore, No, to Dr Walter again!

It is you, Dr Walter, who are confused, and confuse the FIXED “Seventh Day” IN THE CREATION ACCOUNT, for “*a PARTICULAR post-creation type of calendar*”-day; and REFUSE to admit “The Seventh Day” IN AND OF THE CREATION WEEK’S account in Genesis and the Fourth Commandment in Exodus 20 – ALWAYS ‘*fixed*’ – falls upon NO OTHER day than “The-Day-The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD”.

DW:

It appears from the above you are either quoting me and then mocking me or you are asserting your own position! Which is it? Your response format is very confusing. You introduce the above statement with the word “Because” and then seem to be stating your own position! Is that true? If so, then your position is my own position as that is precisely my own position.

Your response format is very confusing and may account for the misunderstandings you seem to acknowledge in previous posts. Why don't you simply quote me and place it in the shaded format the way I do and then place your response in the clear format the way I do so there is no confusion between quoting what I say and what you say?

GE:

So, am I not “*state*” my “*own position*”?

INCIDENTALLY the heathen pagans have a day parallel in sequence with the Seventh Day of and in the creation-week's account in the Bible, known by them as ‘the Day-of-Saturn’ and CONFUSED by Christians for the Sabbath Day, as can be seen in Justin’s very smart corruption of the Scriptures in Matthew 28:1, and also in our Dr Walter’s very confused attempts at corruption.

DW:

Since you admit that the Seventh day Sabbath is not Saturday in any human calendar nor has to fall on Saturday in human calendar but is merely the Seventh day following six work days then what is your beef with me as that is exactly my position!

My position is that “first day of the week” in the New Testament record is that Sabbath day preceded by six working days and thus is the “seventh” day Sabbath in keeping with six preceding working days EXCEPT now it is FIXED upon Sunday by the resurrection rather than on some unknown NAMED day “of the week” in human calendars prior to the resurrection.

Remember the seventh month was at the very same time the first month according to two different Jewish calendars (Civil versus religious). Hence, the “first day of the week” sabbath is also the “seventh day” sabbath as it follows six working days.

GE:

I only want to stress, ‘*your position*’ is by far, not ‘*my position*’. Otherwise, to refute ‘*your position*’, one couldn’t do better than read this publication, your own, once and for all, self-refutation.

Re: DW, “*The Sabbath law simply sets forth a set of seven days that necessarily precede and follow a Sabbath ONCE IT IS BEGUN.*”

Yea yea, “*once it is begun*” **AS PER** “*the earliest counting in the book of Genesis*” in the creation-account there, where and when NO “sabbath”, “*preceded*”, and where and when THE, Sabbath by the Name of “The Day The Seventh Day” – of the creation-week –, FOLLOWED and ENDED the cycle of the week or “*set of seven days*” “*ONCE*” it had “*BEGUN*”! **Surprise surprise....!**

DW:

Once again, I take by your answer you agree that a Sabbath had to begin somewhere and where it began it was followed by six preceding days and hence it preceded the next six working days.

GE:

Re: DW, *“It (the Sabbath) can fit any kind of human calendar and fall on ANY DAY OF the calendar whether if the day is defined by NUMBER or by NAME. Whether it fell on FRIDAY in the Egyptian Calendar or fell on Saturday in the Jewish Calendar.”*

The Sabbath of the Genesis and the Fourth Commandment – of the whole Bible for that matter – **never** *”fell on FRIDAY”*; it **never** *”fell ... in the Egyptian Calendar”*; it **never**, *“fell on Saturday in the Jewish Calendar”*.

DW:

Historically, Friday was the Sabbath of the Egyptians. I don't know of anyone who disagrees with that except perhaps you. That is pretty general knowledge. If as you say it “never” fell on Saturday in the Jewish Calendar then your boat is sunk as that is one of the primary arguments for Saturdarians.

GE:

Eish, the poor Doctor! As my mother in law used to advise me, *The bottom line is*, take an aspro and think positive!

THINK for a change, Gerard and all Saturdarians and their view, are RIGHT because THE ACCOUNTS of the giving of the Sabbath Day in the creation and in the different Commandments, RESTRICT the Sabbath Day and Sabbath-principle, to only ONE APPLICATION— The Seventh Day of the CREATION- and REDEMPTION-week, in ANY kind

of calendar where The Seventh Day of the week might be indicated as ‘SATURDAY’.

DW:

As I understand your statement above you are arguing that the Sabbath always falls on the “seventh” day after six working days regardless of the calendar and regardless of the day of the week in that calendar! Is that correct or am I misunderstanding what you are saying??? If so, that is precisely my own argument. Hence, you are admitting that in some calendars the Sabbath may not fall on Saturday but on Monday or Wednesday IF according to that particular calendar six working days begins with Sunday or Tuesday or Thursday in that particular calendar????? Is that what you are saying? Or are you saying every calendar “week” must begin with Sunday and end with Saturday????? Make yourself clear!

GE:

God, applies the Sabbath and the Sabbath-Law beyond any particular calendar, spot-on, onto the particular ‘day-of-the-week’ : “The-Day-The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD” ... proving it an absolute PRINCIPLE of The Sabbath’s Rest-Day after and before EVERY “*six working days*” THAT MAY NEVER BE CONFUSED FOR the particular ‘day-of-the-week’ : “The-Day-The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD”.

Dr Walter:

Every principle begins somewhere with something! Simply because no Sabbath preceded the original set of seven days is moot! The principle begins with this set and common sense demands any type of continuation is impossible without a Sabbath preceding and following six working days. Gerhard is simply politicking hot air.

GE:

I say it again – and for the last time as I am finishing off with this aspect of the conversation and ‘subject’ if for its confusion it can be called a ‘subject’ (What a ridiculous supposition creation began with a rest-day....),

The Genesis-recording of or “in” the “creation”, “provides” and “applies” and “proves”, _the_ “six working days” that God first created and then created on, “that” without EVER having been ”preceded” “by a Sabbath”, are “only”, “CONCLUDED”, by “The Day-The-Seventh-Day” in Genesis 2, and by “The Day-The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD” in the Fourth Commandment.

GE:

Four further vanities of the Thursday Crucifixion Sunday Resurrection fallacy:

One,

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1712229#post1712229???>

“ ***“TODAY” Luke fixes as “the first day of the week” and says it “IS THE THIRD DAY” - the day of the resurrection - NOT SATURDAY but SUNDAY!***”

Two,

“ ***“TODAY IS” the “SAME DAY” which is “the first day of the week” and therefore Saturday **whether you count Jewish or Roman** would be the **SECOND** day since the crucifixion and Friday **whether you count Jewish or Roman** would be the first day since the crucifixion and that makes Thursday the day of the crucifixion”***

Three,

“ ***... Thursday the day of the crucifixion **and burial.*****”

Four,

“the offering of firstfruits [First Sheaf Wave Offering GE] which is the "morrow after" the REGULARLY weekly Sabbath”

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1703983&posted=1#post1703983>

Re: Dr Walter, *“In Matthew 28:7-8 as they quickly departed from this visit and went toward the disciples Jesus met them. (vv. 9-10) to calm their fears as they were not going to tell anyone (Mk. 16:8). Hence, Matthew 28:9 occurs immediately after Mark 16:8. This special appearance to the women as they ran away gave them the boldness to go ahead and tell the disciples proving that Matthew 28:1-9 is parallel with Mark 16:1-8 and not two separate visits.”*

This is a contradiction; an impossibility; an untruth—

“In Matthew 28:7-8 ... Matthew 28:9 occurs immediately after Mark 16:8. ... Matthew 28:1-9 is parallel with Mark 16:1-8 and not two separate visits”.

The only possibilities are,

“Matthew 28:1-9 is parallel with Mark 16:1 [Sic.] -8 and not two separate visits”;

*“Matthew 28:9 occurs ... **AFTER** [EGE] Mark 16:8” and they are NOT “parallel”, but ARE, “two separate visits”.*

Therefore, to bracket “Mk. 16:8” into one sentence with “Matthew 28:7-8”: *“In Matthew 28:7-8 ... they were not going to tell anyone (Mk. 16:8).”*, is a **misplacement**; an **impossibility**; an **untruth**.

The only true possibility therefore is,

“Mark 16:8” / “Mark 16:1 [Sic.] -8” is

NO “parallel” with “Matthew 28:9” / “Matthew 28:1-9”; is a *“separate visit”*; and

occurs BEFORE “Matthew 28:9” / “Matthew 28:1-9”.

Re: Dr Walter, “... *This special appearance to the women as they ran away gave them the boldness to go ahead and tell the ...*”

If Mark 16:2-8 was under discussion, this is untrue.

In Mark the women did not simply “*run away*” and scarcely away, received sudden “*boldness to go ahead and tell*”.

According to Mark they got no “*boldness to go ahead and tell*”, but “they went out (from the inside of the sepulchre) quickly and fled from the sepulchre for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any; for they were (too) afraid.”

If Matthew 28 :1-8 was under discussion, this is still untrue.

In Matthew the women did not “*run away*”. “They (gracefully) departed quickly from (the outside of) the sepulchre with (holy) fear and great joy: then started to run (Ingressive Aorist) to bring his disciples word” of what they were instructed by the angel and now for the first time had understood.

In Mark the Lord did not appear to the women; in Matthew,

“as they went, behold, Jesus met them.”

In Mark 16:2-8 the time of NIGHT was “VERY early before-sunrise”; in Matthew it was LATER than when Jesus had “FIRST appeared to Mary ... early” AFTER the gardener had come to work in the garden, most probably with sunrise. Mark 16:9 John 20:15.

Jesus did rise before he appeared; naturally! Which is all, Dr Walter, you with huge stress, could ‘argue’.** Nevertheless, the Lord, naturally, could first appear only at the very last and after ALL the visits to and at and from the tomb before He appeared.

What I’m saying, is, You in effect argue for a Resurrection **before or at latest** “*3 am*”, because you –

repeatedly – placed the women’s supposed only visit
 **“between 3 am. and 6 a.m”. Like here,

*“The rest of the women went back but Mary stayed.
 Jesus rose between 3 am. to 6 a.m and then appeared to Mary.*

Thus the clear chronological order is as follows:

*1. Began their journey while it was yet dark between 3 am to
 6pm Sunday Morning.”*

A Resurrection according to this your “*chronology*”,
 could only occur BEFORE, “3 am. to 6 a.m”.

Dr. Walter:

How can you determine what DAYS the DATES of
 Nisan 14-17 fall on without knowing the precise year Christ
 died????

How can you determine the year Christ died without first
 knowing the precise year He was born????

It seems to me your whole theory rests on pure
 speculation of the year Christ died and therefore on the DAYS
 the DATES Nisan 14-17 fell on that year???

GE:

Thank you very much for your question, Dr Walter, for
 what seems to be a very important question to you because
 you are of the mind there is no answer to it; so my whole
 'theory' collapses for

the want of an explanation.

So, your question is not so much a question of real
 interest; it rather is a veiled tactic to dismantle 'my theory'.

But it won't make any difference to my answer.

By the way, I do have an own opinion of which year was
 the year of Jesus' birth. You can read about it in the very first
 three books of 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace'. you
 can find it in my signature line below.

But now, my answer.

It is so simple I wonder if you will believe me.

My answer is, The Passover Lamb of Yahweh in real life supplies every bit of information about the Passover of Yahweh HIMSELF, IN Himself, THROUGH Himself, BY Himself!

If Christ would have died on a Sunday and would have raised on a Wednesday, then we would have known undeniably Sunday was the fourteenth day of the First Month, and Wednesday was the sixteenth day of the First Month, "the very first day" and "the third day according to the Scriptures" respectively IF it so happened.

But now,

1) It did not so happen. It happened as the Scriptures say "the third day" - Resurrection day - "Sabbath's" Matthew 28:1. So "That Day The Preparation Day" the Scriptures tell us, "was The Fore-Sabbath" which everyone KNOWS, was 'Friday' or the Sixth Day of the week Joseph BURIED the body of Jesus. And so it's just natural that the day of the week Jesus would be Crucified on, must be the day before, namely, 'Thursday' or the Fifth Day of the week AND FOURTEENTH DAY of the First Month.

2) Second, but equally important— We do – we MUST – know Jesus would be crucified a Fifth Day of the week and be resurrected on the Seventh Day Sabbath-of-the-LORD GOD because God brought Israel's feet onto free soil out of the land of Egypt, on the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD.

And how do we know that?

- 1) By every single, and all, time-indications that the passover history in Scripture provides, together;
- 2) By taking into account every and all other, Sabbath-Scriptures in the Old Testament as well as in the Gospels and pre-cross history of Christ.

From there, we can go into detail, and AS EXPECTED, MUST from the nature of the Evidence Jesus Christ Himself in the Scriptures, find the passover dates CONFIRMED in

Creation, in Promise, Prophecy, Law, Song, Prayer, BATTLE AND VICTORY:—

the passover dates,
first of all,

the **sixteenth** day of the First Month on First Sheaf Offering Waved IN TRIUMPH of Resurrection from the dead Before the LORD;

two, the **fifteenth** day of the First Month, “That Day” “In-the-bone-of-day Day”, “The Feast” and “great day-sabbath”, “that which remained” of the lifeless body of the Lamb, eaten, and re-assimilated with corruptibility, and brought forth out of Egypt, Bondage and Death’s Anxiety, and Buried;

and, three, the **fourteenth** day of the First Month, “the day leaven (of life) removed and passover killed”.

And we COULD go into yet ‘finer detail’, like the fact the Fourth Commandment commands (until this day in the year of our Lord) that God “in the day the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your GOD, FINISHED ALL HIS WORKS, SO, RESTED!”

That to me, is OVERWHELMING evidence, reason, motive, and LAW whereby to KNOW AND BELIEVE exactly, and, to the best of my sinner’s ability, follow the Passover dates and week-days of our Lord Jesus’ death, burial and resurrection, SIMPLY and “without condemnation (as) The Body of Christ’s Own, eating and drinking of the Substance which is Christ’s feast-of-Sabbaths.”

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1704269&posted=1#post1704269>

Dr. Walter:

Where do you have clear evidence from the Scriptures that Friday was the Sixth day of the week during the month of nisan in the year Christ died? Where in Scripture can you prove "Friday" is the "fore-Sabbath" as every day of the week previous to the Sabbath is be "fore- the Sabbath?"

GE:

John 19:31, "The Jews, BECAUSE (sunset) IT HAD BECOME The Preparation ... asked Pilate ... that the bodies be taken away ... THAT DAY HAVING BEEN great day sabbath" (of passover, Abib **15**)...

Luke 23:50, "Suddenly there was this man, Joseph ... of Arimathaea ...

John 19:38, "And after this (the Jews' "things") Joseph ... asked Pilate if he may take Jesus' body away...

Mark 15:42, "And now when it had already been EVENING (after sunset) having become The Preparation WHICH IS The Fore-Sabbath (night of the Sixth Day 'Thursday-evening') Joseph ... came ..."

John 19:42, "there laid they Jesus because of the Jews' preparations" (time on Friday afternoon).

Luke 23:56, "And the women (after the Burial) returned and prepared spices and ointments; then (after sunset) began the rest according to the Fourth) Commandment of the Sabbath Day."

There is only the Seventh Day that in the New Testament is "The Sabbath Day";

There is only the Sixth Day-of-the-week that in the New Testament is "The Preparation" per se;

There was only "The Preparation" the Sixth Day-of-the-week that "*during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*" was "The Day-Before-The-Sabbath" Mark 15:42 "WHICH IS" or was, "The Preparation" John 19:31 of "the Jews' preparation(s)" John 19:42 "the next morning" after which

was “Sabbath’s Day” Matthew 27:62;28:1 — The Sixth Day-of-the-week, ‘Thursday-night’ and ‘Friday-day’.

There was only THIS, “The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day-of-the-week that “*during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*”, STOOD IN CONTRAST with “The Preparation-of-the-Passover” John 19:14 the day-of-the-week before it on which Jesus was crucified.

There was only THIS, “The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day-of-the-week that “*during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*”, was “The Feast” John 13:1, before which the Sabbath before, was “six days before the passover-feast-day” John 12:1, and five days including Sunday “the next day” John 12:12, ‘Palm Sunday’ and ‘Nisan 10’ the day the Israelite separated their passover lamb.

There was only THIS, “The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day-of-the-week that “*during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*”, was the day AFTER Jesus was “CRUCIFIED” the day He “two days” before He was crucified, on the ‘Tuesday’, had told his disciples that He must go to Jerusalem for to be killed. Matthew 26:1,2.

There was only THIS, “The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day-of-the-week that “*during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*”, “TWO days” before it, on the ‘Wednesday’, the Jews finally decided to kill Jesus, “but not on (it,) the Feast”, “because they feared the people” Mark 14:1,2. They therefore the next day, which was the ‘Thursday’ and “day before the feast” John 13:1,30; 19:14, killed the Lamb of God.

There was only THIS, “The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day-of-the-week that “*during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*”, perfectly reflected the chronological sequence of the historic exodus passover.

There was only THIS, “The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day-of-the-week that “*during the*

month of nisan in the year” of the historic exodus passover, in actual fact

was WRITTEN by calendar’s, MONTH’S, DATE!

What more do you need to “*have clear evidence from the Scriptures that Friday was the Sixth day of the week during the month of nisan in the year Christ died*”?! Goodness, how long have you been a Bible student? What was it that put the veil over you eyes when you read Moses or Jesus for all those years? ONE THING: YOUR BLIND, VENERATION OF SUNDAY!

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1704326&posted=1#post1704326>

Dr Walter:

So, you cannot prove it! I believe that the sheaf offering occurred "on the morrow (after the regular) Sabbath and thus always fixed on "the first day of the week." Whereas, Friday was the "high sabbath" or the first day of unleavened bread thus making Sunday the "morrow after the "regular seventh day sabbath and thus the day of the sheaf offering or offering of "firstfruits."

GE:

I could quote YOU where YOU, how many times, showed and PROVED factually that the 'ceremonial sabbaths' were determined to the rule of the sun and moon and year's cycle : YOU, from the Scriptures and with true logic.

But as soon as it comes to the Sabbath Day of the Seventh Day of the WEEK which GOD, calls "The Day The Seventh Day Sabbath OF THE LORD GOD", determined by GOD at and from the creation as the Seventh and last Day of the CREATION-"SET-OF-DAYS" the 'WEEK', then it seems you THROW OVERBOARD YOUR FEAR OF GOD and ADD and CHOP and CHANGE God's WORD as if it were your own.

I despise the way you deal with the Scriptures, LIKE HERE for the millionth time, "... *the sheaf offering occurred "on the morrow (after the regular) Sabbath ..."*. The TEXT is "on the DAY ('yom') after the sabbath" **in CONTEXT spoken of**, namely, a 'sabbath' which "YOU - ISRAEL - MUST (it is commanded them!)

determine and appoint according TO THEIR SEASONS"!

It is NOT "*on the morrow (after the regular) Sabbath ...*"! **It is "on the morrow after the sabbath ..." THIS 'sabbath' of and in the CONTEXT!**

Here you say it yourself, "*Friday was the "high sabbath" or the first day of unleavened bread"*.

Now in Leviticus 23, verse 5 commands the 'ceremonies' of Abib 14".

Verse 6, "And on the fifteenth day "OF THE SAME month is the Feast Day of Unleavened Bread" --- THE SAME "DAY" YOU yourself here have said "*was ... Friday the "high sabbath" or the first day of unleavened bread."*

Think how you tell Ituttut how wrong his dating of the Crucifixion is because he makes the 'three days' "of the prophesy", four days.

But you also teach on day four!

You say crucifixion day was "Thursday". And it was, but actually, it was the Fifth Day of the week, and thus Wednesday evening until Thursday sunset. Doesn't matter, because now Thursday is the first day of Jesus' having been dead on, three hours, "the ninth hour" until sunset and "evening" according to the FOUR Gospels.

Now if Jesus rose "on the third day", the third day can only be the (regular) Sabbath Day. But no, says Dr Walter, He rose "on the morrow (after the regular) Sabbath", in other words, on 'Sunday'.

That is on the fourth day. A pre-school toddler could count and tell.

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=72741&page=6>

Yes a pre-school toddler could count and tell but you can't!

Your position would make the text read "Today ISN'T the third day" since/from/away from the crucifixion day but today is

the FOURTH day since the crucifixion day.

1. TODAY IS the third day and TODAY IS the first day of the week

2. YESTERDAY IS the second day and YESTERDAY is the Seventh day of the...

3. FRIDAY IS the first day of these THREE DAYS which day (Friday) is the BEGINNING POINT in counting THREE DAYS as they are all counted AWAY FROM the crucifixion day and therefore do not include but exclude the crucifixion day.

In other words Luke does not begin with Thursday saying this is DAY ONE and then proceed to Friday and say this IS DAY TWO and then to SATURDAY and say this IS THE THIRD DAY because Saturday is NOT the Third day since the crucifixion day or away from the crucifixion day but "TODAY" which is "the first day of the week" IS THE THIRD DAY since the crucifixion day. It is not the FOURTH day "from" the crucifixion week. It is not the FOURTH day inclusive of the crucifixion day BECAUSE Luke does NOT INCLUDE the crucifixion day but starts his counting "AWAY FROM" outside the boundary of the crucifixion day and that is why SUNDAY - the first day of the week is "TODAY" and "TODAY IS THE THIRD DAY" since/away from the exterior closure of the crucifixion day.

GE:

Again, you are telling me what you would like I do, I do. Well I don't. Read my lips, Do, not, tell, me, what, I, do!! Every time you tell me what I do, a lie protrudes from your month.

I WROTE my position, you READ it, and your 'position' and my 'position' agreed. How many times now? I cannot remember.

But my 'position' is sane; yours, is crazy.

Mine is sane, because there are three 'positions' from which to perceive the working out of our little adding / subtracting sum.

Two are real and true; and the third, which is yours attempted, fraudulently.

One,

To 'count' "backwards" / retrospectively from "today is ..."

Today is ... (and like you have counted every time so far),

1) Today (Sunday) is the third day since crucifixion;

2) yesterday (Sabbath) is / was the second day since crucifixion;

3) the-day-before-yesterday (Friday) is the first day since crucifixion;

4) Thursday is the day OF crucifixion.

Your 'position' and mine agreed and were almost verbally identical.

Your 'position' and mine counted prospectively, even agreed:

1) Thursday was Crucifixion-day [[and was the fourteenth day of the First Month]];

2) Friday was the first "day after / since / away from" Crucifixion-day [[and was the fifteenth day of the First Month]];

3) "Saturday" / Sabbath was the second "day after / since / away from" Crucifixion-day [[and was the sixteenth day of the First Month]];

4) “Sunday”, “today”, was “the third day after / since / away from” Crucifixion-day [[and was the seventeenth day of the First Month]].

Voila! TWO methods of counting ... and ... agreement every way!

Therefore, if I ‘cannot count’, neither can you.

But, agreement every way?

O no!

Just look at the NUMBERING!

Even when counted “backwards”, there is **disagreement**.

Because, viewed prospectively – **EXCUSE THE PUN** – Sunday is the **FOURTH** day since Crucifixion-day.

Now how did that happen?

Because both the backward and forward methods of counting, count **DAYS-ORDINARY!** But not Dr Walter!

Dr Walter does not count or consider or even suppose, days-ordinary; he reckons Luke presupposes “THE third day” *“of the prophesy”*.

But there is NO ‘counting’ or ‘reckoning’ or ‘considering’ or ‘account’ of **OTHER** kinds-of-days than plain, mentally supposed, counted or added or subtracted ‘days’, IN LUKE 24:21B,20.

But you, Dr Walter, **PERVERT** things.

You refuse to acknowledge Luke / Cleopas presupposed and intended simply four days counted **of which** Sunday was “the third day since” the first one, on which Jesus was crucified.

Luke 24:21b,20 does NOT speak about THE “third day according to the Scriptures Christ rose again”.

Luke 24:21b,20 speaks and presupposes and relies on reckoning ordinary – that is – **COUNTED / RECKONED**, ‘days’. Yes! ... of which **FOUR** days that are **IMPLICATED** and **INCLUDED** as well as actually **RECKONED /**

THOUGHT OF, “_SINCE_ and AWAY FROM” **the first one of them**—‘them’, the four days, for WITHIN these FOUR, ordinary counted days, “today” “Sunday”, “is the third day since” the first one of them, **Thursday**— the first day “**FROM**” **which**, Sunday, was “the third day AWAY”.

Luke does not say, “Today, Resurrection-day, is the third day”! What an arrogant LIE!

So counting to or fro, or, ‘exclusively’ or ‘inclusively’, the ‘days’ which Luke 24:21,20 is about, are “the third day since crucified” or since Crucifixion-day, **PLUS** the two days in between them.

It will never come out on Resurrection-day which was THE “SABBATH’S-DAY”, BEFORE!

All the while, “the third day” mentioned in Luke 24:21b,20 not for one moment was about THE “three days” or “THE third day on” which “Christ according to the Scriptures rose from the dead again”.

That is your problem, that you illegitimately **IDENTIFY** “the third day since ... crucified” / “the third day away from ... (day) crucified” in Luke 24:21b,20, with Resurrection-day “THE third day” “of” (as you put it) “*the prophesy*”.

Dr Walter avers,

“Luke does not include the crucifixion day in his counting”.

But of course he does! Luke **presupposes** “the crucifixion day” as ‘event-of-day’, “crucified”, “from” which ‘day’ and event-of-day, “today (Sunday) is the third day”!

Just listen to yourself, “Luke does not include the crucifixion day ... Luke begins his count "away from" the crucifixion day”

That is saying – yourself – Luke takes cognisance of / takes account of / takes into consideration / MEANS, the Crucifixion-event’s ‘day’, not 'inclusive', but “away from” or ‘*exclusive*’.

But the crucifixion-day IS THERE. Though not mentioned as the 'day', it is implied as the day COUNTED "FROM". 'Apo' is a 'Preposition' of reference; it virtually relates as a Pronoun does. It relates and refers to or implies and presupposes the day's EVENT, in fact, that "our leaders delivered Him to be condemned and crucified Him".

That Luke DOES "*include the crucifixion day in his counting*", is undeniable. But you, Dr Walter, you do deny it. A toddler would not; even though he would not know it his innocence would not allow him.

Therefore, Dr Walter, that you conclude, "It ...", Luke's "today" (Sunday), "*... is not the FOURTH day inclusive of the crucifixion day...*" is ABSOLUTE NONSENSE as it is ABSOLUTE DISHONESTY. "*BECAUSE Luke does NOT INCLUDE the crucifixion day but starts his counting "AWAY FROM" outside the boundary of the crucifixion day and that is why SUNDAY - the first day of the week is "TODAY" and "TODAY IS THE THIRD DAY" since/away from the exterior closure of the crucifixion day.*"

You, Dr Walter, has said it; YOU, PROVED "It ...", Luke's "today" (Sunday), IS, "*the FOURTH day inclusive of the crucifixion day.*"

DW:

The above verses deal with the HIGH Sabbath not the weekly seventh day Sabbath.

GE:

Verse 10-11, "...ye shall reap the harvest and bring the First Sheaf ... and wave The Sheaf-Before-the-LORD on the day after THE SABBATH" just finished spoken of in verses 6 to 8.

DW:

No sir! The sabbath in verse 10-11 is not the "HIGH Sabbath" but the regular weekly Sabbath. He has changed subjects. He is no longer talking about the first day of unleavened bread but the offering of firstfruits which is the "morrow after" the REGULARLY weekly Sabbath which serves as the Beginning point for counting 50 days to Pentecost.

The counting method here takes into consideration that the harvest does not come exactly on the same day every year. Hence, the sheaf offering is offered after the regular Sabbath when it does come. Your theory would demand that no other day but the 16th could be used to offer first fruits. Well, harvest time does not operate every year upon that kind of rigidness. The firstfruit offering is to be offered the "morrow after" the regular Sabbath whenever harvest could be gathered and from that starting point they began to count toward Pentecost using REGULAR weekly Sabbaths.

Therefore, Friday served as the HIGH sabbath but Sunday served as the "morrow after the" REGULAR weekly Sabbath and thus the day of offering the firstfruits - the resurrection of Christ.

GE:

"He has changed subjects"?! You IGNORE it; you DENY it, you DEFY it, and REPLACE it with YOUR vain fallacy.

Do you call that respect for the Word of God?

I must ask you, Dr Walter, Do you believe the Scriptures are the Word of God?

Maybe I have been mistaken like with your belief of the day of Crucifixion, that all the while I thought you believed something, you believed something else altogether! Here you give the clearest of reason for anyone of ordinary discernment to take for granted you despise instead of believe the Scriptures.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1704361&posted=1#post1704361>

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1705314#post1705314>

Dr Walter:

Remember your prepositional chart using a circle????
Eis begins WITHIN the circle to the outside but apo begins from the OUTSIDE EXTERIOR of the circle and Thursday is the circle and Luke begins "AWAY FROM" the exterior of this circle in his counting of first, (Friday) second (Saturday) and third (Sunday).

Could not be more simpler!

GE:

Yes! "*Could not be more simpler!*"

Again you yourself have made it so simple and clear.

But misunderstanding and lack of understanding could not be simpler.

Because Dr Walter 'remembers', but 'remembers', wrong.

I remember Dana and Mantey's 'circle', yes. You do not remember it, Dr Walter; anyway, you do not remember it correctly.

It must have been an accident, Dr Walter, this, you're saying, "*prepositional chart using a circle ... Eis begins WITHIN the circle to the outside*".

But that is forgivable from the context of the present discussion.

But it is UNFORGIVABLE in the context of another discussion about Matthew 28:1 which you and I engaged in. Remember that discussion????

What you bring this matter up here, I wouldn't know.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1704949&posted=1#post1704949>

Dr. Walter:

It seems to me that Thursday evening (our Wednesday evening) the passover supper was partaken of by Christ and the night of judgements occurred. Thursday prior to 6 pm He was buried thus He was in the grave on Nisan 14th the day of his crucifixion. Friday was the "high Sabbath" or first day of unleavened bread - the 15th of the month. He rested in the grave on Saturday the 16th. He arose from the grave on Sunday the 17th the day after the Sabbath when the sheaf offering was presented in the temple or "the firstfruits of the resurrection."

The sheaf offering was to be offered the morrow "after the sabbath" the regular Sabbath and thus fixed on the first day of the week as the day of resurrection. Friday was the "high sabbath" or the first day of unleavened bread and therefore a double Sabbath occurred that year with Friday landing on the 15th of Nisan and the sheaf offering on the 17th of Nisan. All the Scripture says is that the sheaf offering occurs "on the morrow after the Sabbath" rather than on any DATE! You want to fix the date to be the 16th but the Scripture does not do so! Only your theory does so.

However, fixing the sheaf offering to occur every year "on the morrow after the sabbath" the regular Sabbath fixed the sheaf offering every year to occur on the "first day of the week" or the day after the regular Sabbath. This fits perfectly with the emphasis upon the "first day" of the week Sabbaths that characterize Leviticus 23 and the feasts that picture the New Covenant work of Christ.

GE:

"Thursday evening (our Wednesday evening)"

What is this???

“*Thursday evening*” is NOT “*our Wednesday evening*”; it is ‘our “*Thursday ... evening*”!

“(O)ur *Wednesday evening*” is the Bible and ‘Jewish’ Fifth Day’s evening or beginning-part.

You are virtually right, that “*our Wednesday evening*”, “*the passover supper was partaken of by Christ and the night of judgements occurred.*” Only, this “*passover supper*” was the NEW Testament “*passover supper*” that must be eaten in and with FAITH, and therefore BEFORE, by the disciples by physically having eaten and drunk as by faith (which they at first lacked and still had no concept of) partaking of “our Passover”, Christ’s “body and “blood” and sacrifice of Him for our sin(s). Therefore it is called “The Lord’s Supper”, or “The Meal of the Lord’s” body and blood symbolised with the bread and wine of the Christian Passover Meal.

“*Wednesday evening ... the night of judgements occurred.*” Christ lived, and lived through, those very “*judgements*”, and DYING, died the death of death “That Night”— “That Night” so-called in the Old Testament, because “it was night” for the lost (Judas) as for Jesus who became and suffered the death of all lost, “That Night” the first night of “THREE DAYS THICK DARKNESS” OF THE “PLAGUE” wherein all “FIRSTBORN”, DIED in the “judgment” of the Only Begotten Son of God.

Every “night” of every “day” of the “three days thick darkness” constituted the first halve PART OF THE “DAY” itself— its first, and beginning, and OWN!

Not like you PERVERT TRUTH by making it the night of the NEXT day that NO LONGER was part of the particular day every of the “three nights”, belonged to! That’s how you smuggle ‘Saturday night’ in, as were it THE “third” of THE “three nights” of THE “three days and three nights”. No! Christ was crucified on the Fifth Day of the Bible-week that BEGAN with its own night (the equivalent of “*our Wednesday evening*”), and He accordingly rose “on the third day” after,

the Seventh Day of the Bible-week that also, BEGAN, with its own night (the equivalent of “our”, ‘Friday’ night.

Thus Jesus “*was buried*” AFTER “*our*”, “*Thursday*”; NOT “*prior to 6 pm*” but MUCH LATER AFTER “*6 pm*”; and NOT “*on Nisan 14th the day of his crucifixion*”, but *on Nisan 15th the day of his BURIAL* that “HAD HAD BEGUN ALREADY” “according to the Scriptures” the Scriptures Mark 15:42 Matthew 27:57 John 19:31,38 Luke 23:50 which was NOT and NO LONGER “the SAME night in which He was betrayed (and) took bread” “BEFORE the Feast” 1Corinthians 11:23 John 13:1, but which was the NEXT and FOLLOWING “day’s” night, “it having had BECOME the Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath” and Sixth Day of the Bible-week.

“*Friday was the "high Sabbath" or first day of unleavened bread - the 15th of the month...*” “mid-afternoon” *prior to 6 pm* its end Luke 23:54 John 19:42. He thus was put in the grave and the grave was closed and Joseph “left and went home”, “and the women also, went home and prepared spices and ointments”— all BEFORE “they started to rest the Sabbath”.

Jesus ‘rest’ was NOT that “*He rested in the grave on Saturday the 16th*”, BUT, that He from the grave on Saturday the 16th when the sheaf offering before the LORD was presented, “MID-AFTERNOON IN THE Sabbath Day’s FULLNESS”, arose from the grave.

He – Jesus – “in the GARDEN”, “AS-THE-RISEN-ONE” and “*Firstborn from the dead*”, “early on the First Day of the week” Sunday the 17th day of the First Month, “first APPEARED to Mary Magdalene ...”.

“*The sheaf offering was to be offered the morrow "after the sabbath"*”, But not as you are fraudulently asserting, “*"after the sabbath" the regular Sabbath and thus fixed on the first day of the week as the day of resurrection.*” Yours is

sacrilegious manhandling and desecration of the Holy Scriptures. Shame on you!

Let this stand for a monument of your audacity:

“Friday was the "high sabbath" or the first day of unleavened bread and therefore a double Sabbath occurred that year with Friday landing on the 15th of Nisan and the sheaf offering on the 17th of Nisan. All the Scripture says is that the sheaf offering occurs "on the morrow after the Sabbath" rather than on any DATE! You want to fix the date to be the 16th but the Scripture does not do so! Only your theory does so.

However, fixing the sheaf offering to occur every year "on the morrow after the sabbath" the regular Sabbath fixed the sheaf offering every year to occur on the "first day of the week" or the day after the regular Sabbath. This fits perfectly with the emphasis upon the "first day" of the week Sabbaths that characterize Leviticus 23 and the feasts that picture the New Covenant work of Christ.”

What weird self-fabricated concoction of a flying machine ... wherein you try to lift yourself above and over God's Written as well as Living Word.

"The sabbath in verse 10-11" and in fact every 'sabbath' in the verses FROM verse 4 including every word and sentence and section up to and including verse 44 - the WHOLE CHAPTER 23 with the exception of verse 3 - is about 'sabbaths' OTHER than the "Sabbath" mentioned in verse 3.

The WHOLE CHAPTER is about 'sabbaths', at least TWO of, were distinguished according to one single text in all the Bible and that from the NEW Testament, as "great day sabbaths" John 19:31. NOT about "the regular weekly Sabbath".

Bone-Day

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=7>

IT:

What does His Word tell us in this matter?
Israel is made Holy by religious rites. The Sabbath is one they must observe. God chose His people, and the Sabbath is a mark to them, and they only.

GE:

So what?

What about it that Jesus Christ rose from the dead “In the fullness of the Sabbath's Day in the mid-afternoon daylight inclining towards the First Day of the week”?

Does that mean any thing to YOU, or was it a historical fact for the Jews only?

IT:

So then I believe the Lord spoke to Moses. Exodus 31:13, ”Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.”

So what are you saying? The Sabbath day is a sign to me? I am of the Body of Christ, so I know I will not be going through the great tribulation.

I fully agree with you that Jesus arose from the dead on the Sabbath day, the seventh day of the week. This agrees with

all scripture. In this knowledge we then can determine without question the day He was laid in the Tomb. A Wednesday; Right?

GE:

Dear Ituttut, if Jesus were crucified on a Wednesday, He would have needed four days to fulfil the “three days” of the Scriptures and rise on the Sabbath Day.

IT:

Dear friend, if I'm not mistaken you said He arose from the dead on the Sabbath. Three days in the ground, just as He said, and He tells us in the beginning how many hours are in a Day (day/night). He says 72 hours. What does man say?

GE:

Make sure about two factors, and the rest will follow by itself.

One: Distinguish the passover-truth “that which remained” of the passover sacrifice had to be assimilated with mortality and the dust of the earth NOT “on the day that they killed the passover”, the 14th day of the First Month; but on the day AFTER: on the fifteenth day of the month!

And it is not WRITTEN: “*Three days in the ground*”.

IT:

It is difficult to disagree with you here, for many years I too saw Matthew 12:40 referring only to Sheol/Hades; however when we investigate deeply into this verse we find Jesus was also specifically referring to the ground under our feet. Strong's Greek ”ge” can mean “Ground”, and Heart (Greek “kardia”) broken heart.

Look at the verse again. (Strong's) Matthew 12:40, ”
 |5618| even as |1063| For |2258| was |2495| Jonah |1722| in
 |3588| the |2836| belly |3588| of the |2785| huge fish |9999|
 {for} |5140| three |2250| days |2532| and |5140| three |3571|
 nights, |3779| so |2071| will be |3588| the |5207| Son |3588| of
 |0444| Man |1722| in |3588| the |2588| heart |3588| of the |1093|
 earth |9999| {for} |5140| three

|2250| days |2532| and |5140| three |3571| nights”

Matthew 27:60 (KJV) reads, ”And laid it in his
 own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he
 rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed.”
 The Rock was broken open by hand, with pick probably, and
 chisels. Jesus was laid in the heart of the Rock, on the Ground
 in the Tomb. A stone sealed Him in. Jonah was sealed inside
 the special New Fish.

Three days, and three nights Johan's body was sealed
 inside the Fish, and three days, and three nights Jesus' body
 was sealed in the Tomb, while He lay on the ground.

I am not saying this cannot have a double meaning, for it
 does, but to not contradict all other scripture we must make
 this verse in Matthew mean what it says.

He arose on the Third (3rd) day, which was the seventh
 day of the week, on the regular Sabbath. How do we know
 this? If we keep reading in Matthew 27, we come to verse 61,
 and 62. “And there was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary,
 sitting over against the sepulchre.

62. Now the next day, that followed the day of the
 preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto
 Pilate”. The Next day is Nisan 15, the God appointed High
 Sabbath Day. Nisan 15, every year follows Nisan 14. We are
 told He was slaughtered on Nisan 14, which can only be on a
 Wednesday.

GE:

“*Three days in the ground*” is NOT, “*just as He said*”.

Jesus said - extracted from context -, “three days in the HEART, of the earth”.

“*Three days in the ground*” is literal language which means the same as 'three days in the GRAVE'.

“three days in the HEART of the earth” is figurative language, meaning something else than the literal words, ‘heart’, or, ‘earth’.

“three days in the HEART, of the earth” has therefore, spiritual meaning, that Christ AS IF He were “under the foundations of the mountains of the sea”, “AS the prophet JONAS WAS”, SUFFERED THE PANGS OF DEATH AND OF DYING DEATH, LIVE AND ALIVE.

Jesus ENTERED into this the first day of his final sacrificing of his LIFE, here in the Scriptures: Mark 14:12,17 Matthew 26:17,20 Luke 22:7,14 John 13:1-30.

The “MIDDLE-DAY” so called in the Scriptures, started, here: Mark 15:42 Matthew 27:57 Luke 23:50 John 19:31,38, and,

“BEGAN ENDING MID-AFTERNOON THE SABBATH DRAWING NEAR”, here: Luke 23:54 John 19:42.

And “the third day Christ rose from the dead according to the Scriptures”, began, here: Luke 23:56b, and,

“BEGAN ENDING MID-AFTERNOON THE First Day of the week DRAWING NEAR”, here: Matthew 28:1, and ... “had gone through”, here: Mark 16:1.

These are the days and ALL the beginning- and ending-times of them, WRITTEN with reference to the “three days” WITHIN WHICH, Jesus would, like the prophet Jonas, have suffered the “three days thick darkness”, “plague (that) was upon Him”, the 'plague' of the Exodus and the death of the First Born and Only Begotten Son of God, on the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth days of the First Month God commanded must be for The People of God their First Month.

IT:

Would this not lend itself to believing that the Word of God died? I personally find He is the Light to the Gentile, whose flame was, is, and will always be. Is Paradise Thick Darkness?

GE:

YOU MENTIONED IT!!

You name the very two BASICS of the Passover of Yahweh!

“...the Word of God diedParadise Thick Darkness ...”

Now it's only for you to BELIEVE it!

Or do you like the Seventh-day Adventists, reject both Divine Truths?

IT:

I agree the 14th precedes the 15th, just as Saturday precedes Sunday. However Nisan 14 does not always fall on a Friday.

Their night was just ending (about 6PM) Saturday, and their day, Sunday was just beginning to dawn. I understand that, so Jesus had to be put in the Tomb on a day in which they were allowed to attend to such things. So there is only one (1) day that allows for 72 hours to be accomplished. Thursday was a High Sabbath. The High Sabbath (Nisan 15) can fall on any day, including Saturday the regular Sabbath, or the seventh (7th) day of the week. But Nisan 14 that year could not have been on a Friday. The man inserted Friday internment rejects the Word of God.

I posted on this a number of years ago, yet the tradition of man continues to be believed. Some will not believe in a Friday. Some believe Thursday. But Thursday is also impossible if we believe Saturday (Sabbath day) to be the 7th

day of the week, bring it to a close, Wednesday is the only available day in a seven (7) day week.

GE:

“Jesus had to be put in the Tomb on a day in which they were allowed to attend to such things.”

And thus WAS He in fact put in the Tomb on THE day in which they were not only *“allowed to attend to such things”*, but were obliged to do exactly these thing to, and with, “that which remained of” the Passover Sacrifice of Yahweh. Therefore,

Make sure of the God-given – and therefore – imperative eschatological wholeness and fullness [Lohmeyer] of THIS the “Bone Day” of the Passover of Yahweh, “This Day” referred to as “THAT DAY TO BE SOLEMNLY OBSERVED” its whole night and its whole day, “that great day-of-sabbath-of”-passover's-feast! Which meant “THAT DAY” was employed in the service of Joseph to inter the body of Jesus FROM BEGINNING: “WHEN ALREADY EVENING IT HAD BEEN”, UNTIL, “mid-afternoon as the Sabbath Day began to draw near”, **Mk15:42 until Luke 23:54-56a = John 19:31,38 until John 19:42.**

IT:

Your assumptions are wrong. The first Adam had a Body. The Lord God of Joseph had not a Fleшы Body born of a woman, in a sinful Body. Please explain from where you are getting your information. In the image of God we are made FLESH, and that FLESH will die. If Joseph's Dad did not know HIS name, what makes you think Joseph did. Surely centuries later someone would have informed Moses.

GE:

Notice the awe-inspiring typology of the Lord's Supper on the night _BEFORE_ He would be crucified and killed.

Jesus commanded his disciple that THEY, HAD TO EAT the bread as it were his body and THEY, HAD TO DRINK the wine as it were his blood BEFORE his flesh-and-blood life was actually sacrificed, as a token of FAITH NEEDED to be co-buried in HIS death and co-resurrected together with and IN HIM. Or else like the faithless they would have had to eat the passover-meal of the animal and themselves must have been assimilated with death and the dust of the earth JUST LIKE the animal-sacrifice they would have eaten: AFTER Christ would have been crucified and died.

DW:

I agree with you, Ituttut, that Friday is an impossible day. However, there is no possible way that Christ rose from the grave prior to 3 am on the first day of the week. Luke 24 and the precise and exact chronological counting of Luke demands Christ rose before sunrise on the first day of the week:

IT:

We agree, and I know you along with me wish every Christian would believe in a 72-hour confinement in the earth, rather than what a tradition of man wants them to believe. And believing this I see we again agree to what Luke says. A Saturday coming from the dead is hours before 3 am on the first day of the week.

DW:

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.

13 ¶ And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. 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. 22 Yea, and

certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;

Verse 22 refers to verse 1 which day is the “same day” in verse 13 which is pinpointed as “upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning.

Verse 21 pinpoints the first day of the week in verse 1 and 13 as the “third day”. Hence, there is no possible honest way to avoid the conclusion that “the first day of the week” was the “third day” from the crucifixion.

IT:

What will you do with verse 7? “Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.”

DW:

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.

13 ¶ And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs.

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. 22 Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;

The First day of the week is “the same day” the two travelled, it is the “same day” that is the “third day” since He was crucified and buried and thus it is the “same day” predicted in verse 7.

IT:

I stand with God here, and not the testimony of man, and their theology. The sacrifice is mad ready on Nisan 14. It cannot remain on the Tree until Nisan 15.

GE:

Depending on what you mean by “*is made ready*”. The sacrifice is NOT “*made ready on Nisan 14*” if “*roasted*” is what you mean.

It was ONLY, KILLED on the fourteenth day and remained unprepared until after sundown and the fifteenth day had begun. The ‘*making ready*’ of the sacrifice entailed its entrails had to be removed and it had to be roasted— which was done after nightfall and the feast-day of passover had begun Exodus 12:8,10. The sacrifice was THUS “*made ready*” and eaten, ‘on the Feast’— just like it happened with Jesus’ sacrifice on the fourteenth day and interment on the fifteenth day. He HAD to “*remain on the Tree until Nisan 15*”— that was the passover typology and Law.

IT:

I stand with God here, and not the testimony of man, and their theology. The sacrifice is mad ready on Nisan 14. It cannot remain on the Tree until Nisan 15.

It must be Sealed In on The Same Day.

Do the math. It will take time and understanding. Wednesday just as it just starts to be Twilight, is the first day(three Days and then three nights). Thursday is the High Sabbath, which is Nisan 15. Jesus said day and night, so this means He starts His complete confinement on the end of the First day (just as He says), and the third day as it ends, completes the 72 hours required to finish the complete three says.

GE:

The “three days” of Jesus’ Death, Interment and Resurrection IN THEIR ‘day’s’ and ‘night’s’ parts, are whole days each OF THE PASSOVER— the passover’s first, three days, Abib 14, 15, 16.

They are the 72 hours of THESE “three days” and of no other day or days before or after them— in other words, each of the first “three days” of the passover was one of the “three days and three nights” Matthew 12:40 mentions.

The “three days and three nights” were no arbitrary cut asunder six halves of days **not one belonging to the other** made up to form three **patched-up pairs** of first day then night each— anything BUT the "three days" of the Prophecy of Jonas.

Now Jesus spoke of these three days **of the passover** and his experience of them, **retrospectively**, so that the day part of each day is seen as after its night-half, like days are ordinarily ‘reckoned’ or ‘counted’ in the Bible and the world of the Jews and Athenians or Greeks at that time in history.

The daylight halves of the “three days” must be seen as last in time and **completing** each 24 hour “day” of the “three days”.

How many times is it written Jesus would rise or did rise, “on the third DAY”, meaning in the daylight-time of “the third DAY-ACCORDING-TO-THE-SCRIPTURES” the **Passover-of-Yahweh** Scriptures.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1711736&posted=1#post1711736>

IT:

Then you are saying a Thursday Nisan 14th Passover? If so you will wind up on a Monday emerging from the Tomb, if we stay with 72-hour confinement.

I have to use the premise of I find in scripture. Jesus' body had to be placed inside the Tomb by using Israel's time

keeping, which I know you will agree with. About 5:5999 PM, their time, the body of Jesus had to be in the Tomb, and the stone rolled into place. This is Nisan 14, a Wednesday.

GE:

I'm afraid, or rather happy to say, there's absolutely nothing I "agree with".

But yes, I am "saying a Thursday Nisan 14th Passover".

And it is so, that "if we stay with 72-hour confinement" in the grave in the earth BEFORE SUNSET "Thursday Nisan 14th", "you will wind up on a Monday emerging from the Tomb."

Therefore The whole debacle is based on the two false presupposition,

... one, "Nisan 14th Passover" sacrificed AND buried; and

... two, "72-hour confinement" in the grave in the earth.

But

... one, SEPARATE sacrifice and day-of-sacrifice, and interment and day-of-interment; and

... two, give the Scripture, "in the HEART of the earth" its RIGHTFUL meaning of Jesus' LIVE and ALIVE and CONSCIOUS and WILLING and STRIVING conflict in his suffering of the dying and death of death ON "Nisan 14th Passover",

... and "you will wind up on",

... "a Thursday"— 'Fifth Day-of-the-week' "Nisan 14th Passover" "killed", 'night', and, 'day';

... a "great day-of-sabbath...Preparation which is the Fore-

sabbath" 'Friday' interment of "that which remain", 'night', and, 'day';

... and

... “*emerging from the Tomb*” and the dead, “SABBATH’S”— ‘night’, and, ‘day’, “third day according to the Scriptures”, resurrection.

So, using the premise we find in Scripture that Jesus' body had to be placed inside the Tomb by Israel's time keeping which was on the passover's “BONE-Day” and “great day sabbath”, “Feast Day”,

we “*winded up on*”

“*14th*”, 15th and 16th “*Nisan*” “according to the...”

PASSOVER- “Scriptures”.

“He shall not hang ALL NIGHT, but before daylight be taken down and the SAME day, buried.” Deuteronomy 21:23 et al.

Anybody’s time, “Mid-afternoon That Day the Sabbath drawing near” Luke 23:54, the body of Jesus was in the Tomb, and the stone rolled into place Luke 23:53. This is Nisan 15, a Friday. And from about 12.00 PM, their time, “the women began to rest the Sabbath according to the (Fourth) Commandment.” Luke 23:56b.

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1711749&posted=1#post1711749>

I will take Luke's version over both of yours.

1. He was not in the grave 72 hours but three days and three nights
2. He did not arise on the 16th but on the 17th or day of firstfruits
3. Friday was the High Sabbath or first Sabbath day in feast of unleavened bread.
4. Saturday was the regular weekly Sabbath and Christ rested in the grave throughout the whole regular Sabbath to rise out of the grave not before 3 am Sunday morning but before the women arrived at the grave.

GE:

"Luke's version"?

Or Dr Walter's 'version'!

Beautiful! I love the standard of Bible study going on on Baptist Board on this thread today! Outstanding, but NOT to be recommended for above 16 years of age adults! Not especially if you are aspiring to a doctorate or a bachelor's or to be a rugby commentator in Afrikaans in South Africa. The older men aspiring the young ... will cause them to break their necks in the first minute of play.

Most conspicuous characteristic of Dr Walter's posts, are,

... one, the conspicuous ABSENCE of real (quoting of) SCRIPTURE; and

... two, the conspicuous PREDOMINANCE of direct and real, Scripture-annulling contradictory statements.

Nice man, really NICE! We need scholars like you to further destroy any trust some people might have retained in them or in their Sunday-worship-christianity.

DW:

Your very good at insulting other people but lack any objective scholarship. I gave plenty of scripture in my posts dealing with Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-3 and you avoided it like the plague.

IT:

Beginning at 6 pm Thursday no Jew could do any manual work such as this for it is now Nisan 15, the High Sabbath. These seven days of unleavened bread begins.

GE:

No, the Jews were forbidden to do any menial or secular, ordinary, 'rewarded' work on "*the High Sabbath ... Nisan 15*". But they were commanded to do those duties 'holy' to "*the*

High Sabbath ... Nisan 15”, like the roasting and eating of both the sacrifice and the unleavened dough— exactly THOSE DUTIES, **symbolic and prophetic** of the INTERMENT of Jesus. Which duties occupied the Israelites ALL day long night and day, just like the faithful fulfilling their duties on 14 Abib kept them occupied ALL day long, night and day.

So, "*Beginning at 6 pm Thursday*", "EVENING ALREADY HAVING COME IT (NOW) BEING THE PREPARATION WHICH IS THE FORE-SABBATH, JOSEPH OF ARIMATHAEA suddenly came there ..." and he first, but after the Jews, went to Pilate to ask him permission for what he was about to do, namely, "TO BURY HIM ACCORDING TO THE ETHICS / LAW of the Jews" THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, the PASSOVER-Scriptures!

IT:

The required time for Jesus' confinement ended on that Sabbath day of Nisan 17,

GE:

From Nisan 14 to Nisan 17 is four days, dead, that is, four days, “in the heart of the earth”, and would He rise on the fourth, and not “on the third day according to the Scriptures”.

Just too bad for you, dear Ituttut, but praise God, it is not what the Scriptures teach!

IT:

The required time for Jesus' confinement ended on that Sabbath day of Nisan 17, and His Body now again alive having connected with His Soul, and Spirit was not found in the Tomb on that Sunday morn of Nisan 18th.

In the ground for 3 days, and three nights, He arose on the fourth (4th) day as we are told in Matthew 27:63, “Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.”

I'm stopping here so contemplation can begin on the four (days) that are necessary to understand scripture that we must bring together to remove any contradictions.

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1711385#post1711385>

Ja, you stopped just where like clockwork, the contradictions first begin.

You do realise, that your interpretation here in this one / two places, Matthew 27:63 Mark 8:31 totally relies on a non-idiomatic and therefore wrong supposition, and that it totally contradicts

One ... the MANY references to Jesus' resurrection "ON THE THIRD DAY" and not on the day after "the third day"; and

Two ... that it totally contradicts the myriads of other ways for saying Christ would and did rise "ON THE THIRD DAY" and not on the day after that "third day according to the Scriptures".

But I don't now feel like dictating a grammar lesson. Enough to say that no single knowledgeable person in Greek, will support your interpretation of Matthew 27:63 Mark8:31.

Forget it, Ituttut! It's not worth your efforts which I believe are honest and sincere.

IT:

[To Dr Walter] My wife and I have most of our hours planned for the next 48 hours, but I believe I may be able to furnish scripture to show understanding of "two of them went that same day." It will agree with your truth of Sunday, but not inside of the seventy-two (72) hours, of which you make reference.

I believe great liberty of man has been taken to lead us to a Friday Crucifixion, which we agree is error. His Word gives us truth, and not interpretations made by man. We know the

time of His spirit, and soul leaving the Body. Scripture tells us His Body must also be sealed into the Tomb on the same day that His Soul and Spirit departed. This will keep truth with Jonas.

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1711399#post1711399>

“We know the time of His spirit, and soul leaving the Body.”

Yes, *“Scripture tells”*,

“It was the Preparation of the Passover Day” John 19:14a, Abib 14

“Before the Feast” of Abib 15 John 13:1

Abib 14 it was *“When they removed leaven when always they had to kill the passover”* Mark 14:12,17 Matthew 26:17,20 Luke 22:7,14

“the ninth hour” Mark 15:34 Matthew 27:46 Luke 23:44

“and there was a great earthquake” Matthew 27:54

“and all the people that came together to that spectacle ... left and returned home” Luke 23:48

... but there is NO single Scripture, Ituttut, you can present here, for what you allege,

“Scripture tells us His Body must also be sealed into the Tomb on the same day that His Soul and Spirit departed.”

This doesn't *“keep truth with Jonas”*— this takes away all truth from Jonas and from all and every Scripture that tells us His Body must also be sealed into the Tomb on the day **ORDAINED AND SOLEMNLY OBSERVED AFTER** that His Soul and Spirit departed.

DW:

Mt 16:21 From that time forth began Jesus to shew 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.

Mt 17:23 And they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised again. And they were exceeding sorry.

Mt 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.

He is not raised on the fourth day but ON the third day. Three days and three nights do not require it to be precisely 72 hours or

three full days and three full nights.

He was raised between 3am and 6am on the first day of the week as the Greek term for the fourth watch of the night is used to define the precise time he rose on the first day of the week (Greek proii - Mk. 16:9).

Our Thursday just minutes before 6 pm he was buried

Our Thursday evening and Friday morning – first day = 6pm to 6am

Our Friday evening and Saturday morning – second day = 6am to 6 pm

Our Saturday evening and Sunday morning – Third day = 6 pm to 6 am

IT:

You furnished the evidence in the verses you presented, of what they were talking about, to wit 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.” This is Sunday, when the ladies arrived at the Tomb. This I believe we agree on.

13”¶ And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs.” This is Sunday when these two dispels were on their way Emmaus. This I believe we agree on.

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.”

I believe what this verse says.

DW:

No you don't! If you did you would agree the third day since these things were done is the “same day” - Sunday and therefore Jesus must have risen ON the third day as the scriptures repeatedly state and which I quoted rather than AFTER the third day.

IT:

I quote scripture also to make scriptures agree. Dr. Walter I find Israelology helps to explain the day/days involved with Passover. Scripture shows the preparation day to be Nisan 14, and the next day, Nisan 15 is a High Holy Sabbath. Is there something that connects these two specific days together? Passover does this for us. Leviticus 23:5, ”In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover.” Jesus lived in the “time of the Gentiles”, just as we. But God has determined for Israel, when their day begins, and when it ends. The blood has to be shed in order for the Passover to be accomplished. I do believe Passover has to contain eight days, for we find this in scripture.

Are we as smart as Pilate? John 18:39, ”But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?”

This is why I say scripture will prove itself. The specific time of Passover is shown to us, but it cannot be understood until we acknowledge the Preparation day (crucifixion) is Nisan 14 according to God's time for Israel.

GE:

Finish what “*Scripture shows*”!

“Scripture shows” “The Preparation Day”, “to be”, “The Preparation Day OF THE PASSOVER”, “Nisan 14”, and NOT The Preparation Day of the weekly Sabbath, “Nisan 15 ... a High Holy Sabbath”. ('Friday')

And you are right,

“Is there something that connects these two specific days together? Passover does this for us. Leviticus 23:5, ”In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover.”

As we just a while ago have seen,

“The Preparation Day OF THE PASSOVER” was the day

“Before the Feast” John 13:1,

indeed the day “BEFORE” “Nisan 15 ... a High Holy Sabbath”,

the day “BEFORE” “... that day ... The Preparation”

John

19:31

“which is the Fore-Sabbath” Mark 15:42.

And “since THAT DAY” which “WAS”, “was great day-of-sabbath”

– **OF THE PASSOVER** –

“the Jews asked Pilate the legs be broken and the crucified be removed” ...

... **ON AND FOR that Feast-sabbath of the JEWS' passover.**

IT:

Passover is death to some, and life to others. It happened, as scripture can prove, just as Wednesday and Thursday were blending together.

Leviticus 23:6-7, ”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. 7. In the first day ye shall

have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein.”

Leviticus above, 23:5-7 tells us when Passover blood is applied. I believe Jesus' body had to be in the Tomb just at the close of Nisan 14, and the beginning of Nisan 15 in Israel's time keeping. But Jesus' blood has to be available before Passover comes. So when did Jesus die? We know it was on Nisan 14 (preparation day) and this particular year it was a Wednesday, and He died at 3pm. The blood was now available to be applied as Wednesday turns into Thursday.

3pm Wednesday to 3pm Thursday is 24 hours. 3pm Thursday to 3pm Friday is 24 hours. 3pm Friday to 3pm Saturday (the regular Sabbath) is 24 hours. It is just as He says, i.e. three days, and three nights will be accomplished according to HIS TIME.

On His death we know he was in Paradise, and it was at 3pm He died and was in the Heart of the earth. That means his Spirit and Soul returned to His body at 3pm on that Saturday. So He arose from the heart of the earth on the third day.

But we must account for the Passover time, and Jesus arising

in His Body, and coming forth from the Tomb

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1712145&posted=1#post1712145>

I read things I agree on, like, “...*his Spirit and Soul returned to His body at 3pm on that Saturday. So He arose from the heart of the earth on the third day.*” But I admit, I don't see or understand, how you got there.

I also, see things I disagree with – just about everything else of what you say. But I can understand why I don't understand anything of it— it's because I cannot find anything of it in the Scriptures, Ituttut, sorry mate.

The Scriptures that you quote, you mix up so much, it's difficult to follow your logic. But I do know your logic if it could be called that; and it's all wrong of course.

Why is it wrong?

Here's a few things why it's wrong...

... "*scripture can prove, just as Wednesday and Thursday were blending together.*"

Which "Scripture"?

"Leviticus 23:6-7 ... 23:5-7"?

No! These Scriptures "prove" nothing of the kind!

So here's the actual 'proof' of Ituttut's OWN,

"We know ... *this particular year it was a Wednesday*"

"We know" is not "*scripture*" if it's not "*scripture*", but it's "We" who THINK "We know". Meantime it's "We" who ASSUME and then take our assumption for a priori conditional knowledge.

It does not work that way.

So, "We", "prove", "*just as Wednesday and Thursday were blending together*", "*Passover ... happened*", and what "*happened*", was, "*death to some, and life to others*".

But Ituttut, The Scriptures prove, "*death to some, and life to others*", "*happened*", "in the night ... by night", "this night", "And it HAPPENED, that at MIDNIGHT the LORD smote all the firstborn". Exodus 12:30,31,12,29.

Do you believe a midnight to midnight day-cycle, Ituttut?

Do you say Israel killed the passover lamb after sunset before midnight, and ate it after midnight?

If you do, then the firstborn of the Israelites would also have been killed. The blood on the doorposts had to be ON the door posts before sunset because everyone had to be inside his house all night until midnight when Israel had to move out!

So even if you mean the passover was killed literally only "*just as Wednesday and Thursday ...*" or whichever two days "*... were blending together*" at sunset, it still would be

IMPOSSIBLE to have “*happened*” because the blood had to be applied to the door posts and lintel before night and before the Israelites were to be indoors and were to stay indoors and were “not (to) go out of his house until morning” Exodus 12:22 and the turn of day at midnight. The meal and the day of the meal, BEGAN, here, already, “In the evening ye shall eat” Exodus 12:18.

WHAT “*happened*” is most important to know exactly, so that one should not be confused about WHEN it happened.

Passover – sacrifice – was KILLED on, the fourteenth;

Passover – meal – was EATEN, on, the fifteenth.

These two passover events “*happened*” about six hours apart; three hours after sacrifice before sunset plus three hours after sunset before meal.

The demarcation between the passover day of sacrifice and the passover day of feast was clear and central; as the demarcation between the passover day of feast and passover “**bone-**” or “**middle-day-of-that-which-remained**”, was clear and central, RIGHT ON SUNSET! And the same remains for the passover “feast day of great sabbath” and “the day that you waved the sheaf”— the demarcation between them was clear and central, RIGHT ON SUNSET!

Again, Ituttut, “... *it was on Nisan 14 (preparation day ...)*” : “OF THE PASSOVER” John 19:14; “... *and He died at 3pm. The blood was now available to be applied ...*” during the remainder of sacrifice-day the fourteenth, and had to be finished applied, BEFORE, “*as*” the sacrifice-day “... *turns into ...*” the feast-day.

Then, how do you get that “*Leviticus 23:5-7 tells us when Passover blood is applied*”? Blood was applied ONCE, at the actual exodus; never again, and that’s why Leviticus says NOTHING about the blood being applied to doorposts.

Ituttut, it’s not possible what you say, “*I believe Jesus’ body had to be in the Tomb just at the close of Nisan 14, and the beginning of Nisan 15 in Israel’s time keeping.*” It just

doesn't make any sense, and leaves us in total darkness as to what "*Israel's time keeping*" was. All this confusion JUST BECAUSE YOU PRESUPPOSE FOR FACT, THE FALLACY, "*Jesus' body had to be in the Tomb just at the close of Nisan 14*" which is RIGHT ON SUNSET.

No! I repeat what I have said above, "He shall not hang ALL NIGHT, but before daylight be taken down and the SAME day, buried." Deuteronomy 21:23 et al. And that IS PROVEN BY AND IN THE CASE of Jesus Christ the Lamb of God Our Passover forevermore. He died the ninth hour (3 p.m.) and was FINISHED buried, 3 p.m., "mid-afternoon" Luke 23:54. The day He was crucified and died on, began with "evening" after sunset; and the day He was buried on, began with "evening" after sunset.

Never a divergence.

DW:

... the third day since these things were done is the "same day" - Sunday and therefore Jesus must have risen ON the third day as the scriptures repeatedly state and which I quoted rather than AFTER the third day. Absolute proof of this is the fact that there words "these things" refer back to the death of Christ on the cross as verse 20 explicitly states this:

20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.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.

Hence, Sunday was the third day SINCE he was crucified and he was already risen prior to walking with them and therefore he had to arise after 6 pm Saturday night and precisely between 3am to 6am as Mark explicitly states this is when he arose from the grave by the use of "proii" which is a technical term for the fourth watch of the night and so used by Christ Himself in Mark 13.

If Sunday is the “third day since” he was crucified and he was walking with them that very Sunday then obviously if you count backwards Morning and evenings in reverse you will end up precisely during the DAY time of Thursday PRIOR to 6 pm he was placed in the grave.

3rd evening - 6am Sunday morning back to 6pm Saturday evening

3rd day - 6pm Saturday Evening back to Saturday morning 6am –

2nd evening - 6am Saturday morning back to 6pm Friday night

2nd day - 6pm Friday night back to 6am Friday morning

1st evening - 6am Friday morning back to 6pm Thursday night

1st day - 6pm Thursday night back to 6am Thursday morning

Hence it is impossible for Christ to have been crucified Wednesday and buried before 6 pm Wednesday evening as your theory demands. It is also impossible that Christ intended that three days and three nights demand 72 full hours as that would make him FOUR nights in the tomb instead of three if he were buried prior to 6pm our Wednesday.

Finally, you cannot calculate what days the 14th of Nisan fell on unless you know the precise year this occurred. You cannot know the precise year this occurred unless you know the precise year he was born.

Jesus was alive and risen from the dead already on the third

day since He was crucified and Luke 24 demands that the “third day” since he was crucified was Sunday - the first day of the week.

IT:

First, I hope you have read what scripture informs, according to when God considers being the beginning of a 24-

hour day. He tells us in Genesis, and He tells His People this is the way they are to count the hours of their day. Does the World believe God, or do they know better? All that He asks of us is to BELIEVE what He says is true. If we cannot reconcile scripture, then all we have left is to believe mans version. I personally believe in what God tells me in His own words.

Second I have never claimed to know the YEAR, but scripture does tell us the Day. Man by their determination will say they can know the Year, and in the Year they contend WEDNESDAY could not be the Day. I All I know is what He tells me, and that is seventy-two hours (no more and no less) will be attained. By using His time, and understanding that Passover involves TWO Days (ending of Old gives way to New) just as we see in Matthew 9:16-17:

“No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. 17. Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.”

Jesus Christ's blood is new eberlasting blood. The Old Covenant Blood is no longer needed or accepted. But the New Blood had to come from the Old Covenant People. The Old cloth was rent; and the old bottles, that had held Old Lifeless Blood, could never come near restraining the Everlasting Power of the Blood of God. Are we not bottled in(sealed in) the Body of Christ?

You furnished The evidence in the verses you presented, of what they were talking about, to wit Luke 24: ... 22 “Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;”. This agrees, and confirms what verse 1 above says. This is what they are talking about, and I again agree with you.

But what I do not agree with you on is Thursday placement of His Body into the Tomb on the ground, and sealed in. Please understand what I am saying, and that is I believe what Jesus said in Matthew (Strongs) 12:40, “[5618| even as |1063| For |2258| was |2495| Jonah |1722| in |3588| the |2836| belly |3588| of the |2785| huge fish |9999| {for} |5140| three |2250| days |2532| and |5140| three |3571| nights, |3779| so |2071| will be |3588| the |5207| Son |3588| of |0444| Man |1722| in |3588| the |2588| heart|3588| of the |1093| earth |9999| {for} |5140| three |2250| days |2532| and |5140| three |3571| nights”.

Most will agree the hermeneutics here are correct, and ”ge” has a meaning of ground. So Jesus was laid in the ground in the heart of the Stone hewed out by Joseph.

What Jesus says is not three nights, and three days in the ground, but three days, and three nights. At the beginning of the Bible we see in Genesis what Determined the way His people would determine when their full day started,

(NAS) Genesis 1:5, ”God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.” I believe you will agree their day begins at Twilight, or about 6 pm.

Leviticus 23:4-7, ”These are the appointed times of the LORD, holy convocations which you shall proclaim at the times

appointed for them.

5. 'In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at twilight is the LORD'S Passover.

6. 'Then on the fifteenth day of the same month there is the Feast of Unleavened Bread to the LORD; for seven days you shall eat unleavened bread.

7. 'On the first day you shall have a holy convocation; you shall not do any laborious work.”

We see here Jesus used HIS TIME, and not mans time.

His

day begins with the ending of the previous day which ends at about 6 pm our time.

Deuteronomy 21:22-23, "If a man has committed a sin worthy of death and he is put to death, and you hang him on a tree,

23. his corpse shall not hang all night on the tree, but you shall surely bury him on the same day (for he who is hanged is accursed of God), so that you do not defile your land which the LORD your God gives you as an inheritance."

Scripture tells us He was put on the tree on the Preparation day of Nisan 14, body dead at 3PM Nisan 14, had to be taken off the tree the same day. He had to be on the Ground in the Tomb (and sealed in) on that DAY of Nisan 14, for Joseph and Nicodemus would never do this type work on what God said they had better not do. They went on God's time, and not mans.

God is a God of division, and will bring all back together again. In the mean time

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1712225#post1712225> we are to attempt to understand what Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John say about this matter. We are ourselves to study to make ourselves approved of God. We must bring together the four Gospels in our Bible, to get the complete picture. We must believe God in the Beginning.

GE:

Good point, Ituttut! "*We must bring together the four Gospels in our Bible, to get the complete picture. We must believe*

God in the Beginning" of the Gospel of Salvation.

Can't we trust what God is telling us in the Gospels, how can we believe whenever God is speaking to us?!

DW:

You cannot count nor can you read English! "TODAY" Luke fixes as "the first day of the week" and says it "IS THE THIRD DAY" - the day of the resurrection - NOT SATURDAY but SUNDAY! Saturday then IS the second day since the crucifixion not the day of the resurrection. Friday IS the first day since the crucifixion which demands THURSDAY not Wednesday is the day of the crucifixion.

Can't make it much clearer to anyone who has the ability to count and read! You reject plain English because you have a theory based upon presuppositions that you cannot prove.

IT:

It's not that I don't know when I'm being insulted, but hard for me to believe one of your stature, and standing on the Board as a Christian could allow such to come from your mouth.

DW:

My apologies for insulting you. However, I have no such "statue, and standing on the Board." I am just a peon like the rest.

GE:

Speak for yourself. You are a 'peon' of Sunday sacredness thinking 'boards' and kings and queens of manipulating other's thought processes.

DW:

It is the moderator's that have that "statue and standing on the board."

I don't have a problem with those who hold to a Wednesday crucifixion. It is a better position than those who hold to a Friday crucifixion. However, I don't believe the scripture demands three FULL days and three FULL nights or 72 hours.

GE:

The hours are consequential of the TRUE “three days” of Prophecy and Promise – which imperatively means the eschatological wholeness and fullness of THOSE “three days”— which – “*do the maths*” as Ituttut has said –, will amount to 72 hours— but the 72 of THE “three days and three nights” and Jesus’ FULFILLING of them. Not any parts of any days added together, like both you two, TRY to do!

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1712229#post1712229>

DW:

It seems to me that Thursday evening (our Wednesday evening) the passover supper was partaken of by Christ and the night of judgements occurred. Thursday prior to 6 pm He was buried thus He was in the grave on Nisan 14th the day of his crucifixion. Friday was the “high Sabbath” or first day of unleavened bread - the 15th of the month. He rested in the grave on Saturday the 16th. He arose from the grave on Sunday the 17th the day after the Sabbath when the sheaf offering was presented in the temple or “the firstfruits of the resurrection.”

GE:

Jesus Rose from the grave and the dead “on the third day”.

You say He died and was buried on Thursday;

That gives Thursday Abib 14 the first of the “three days” of which Scripture is speaking.

That gives Friday Abib 15 would be the second of the “three days” of which Scripture is speaking.

And that gives “SABBATH’S DAY” Abib 16 would be the third of the “three days” of which Scripture is speaking.

“They finished cleansing the sanctuary on the sixteenth day of the First Month”.

You force Jesus to do over-time, locking Him in another 12 to 15 hours hellish torment, letting Him finish cleaning the sanctuary “*on Sunday the 17th the day after the Sabbath*”.

But "The Sabbath" was "the third day" AND the Sabbath of which the Scriptures have throughout spoken that it is “holy unto” the grand “finishing of all the works of God”.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1712242#post1712242>

DW:

Luke 24:21 confirms my counting as accurate. The Greek preposition “apo” or “away from” demands that Luke is not including the crucifixion day in his count but is counting the days “from” that day - Friday, Saturday and including Sunday as “TODAY IS the third day.”

GE:

“... *as TODAY IS the third day*” ... Dr Walter conveniently refraining from quoting “*Luke 24:21*” in full, ever so carefully omitting the words, “since these things happened” so INSTEAD of MAKING Sunday what it actually is, “the third day SINCE these things happened”, Dr Walter makes "SUNDAY" “*TODAY IS the third day*”, 'included' in and “the third day” _OF_, the “three days” which were the three first days of the passover and last three days of the Passover of Yahweh. Did you really think no one would see right through this, Dr Walter?

How could you think it possible, seeing you yourself concluded, “*Nisan 14th the day of his crucifixion. Friday was the “high Sabbath” or first day of unleavened bread - the 15th of the month. He rested in the grave on Saturday the 16th*”? HOW ON EARTH, Dr Walter!?

Yes, in fact, Jesus remained “*in the grave on Saturday the 16th*”, AS THE THIRD of the “three days” – ‘night’ and

‘day’ “the third day” – on which ALSO, He would and in actual fact “according to the Scriptures”, DID RISE, “When suddenly ON THE SABBATH there was a great earthquake and the angel of the

Lord descending from heaven cast away the stone”.

The Scriptures! Nothing THAN the Scriptures! Nothing than the FULL Scriptures! The Scriptures untwisted; the Scriptures unadapted; the Scriptures unbent; the Scriptures straight forward!

No matter the consequences.

DW:

... the crucifixion day would not be the “third day since”/from (Sunday) nor the second day since/from (Saturday) or the first day since/from (Friday) but the day preceding the first day since/from which is Thursday.

He partook of the Supper on the evening of the 14th (our Wednesday evening) and was crucified on the day of the 14th (our Thursday). He rested in the grave part of the 14th before 6 pm (Our thursday evening) and stayed in the grave on the High Sabbath or the first day of unleavened bread the 15th (Friday) and continued to rest in the grave on the regular Sabbath (Saturday) while arising from the grave between 3am to 6am on Sunday, the day on the “morrow after the sabbath” when the sheaf or “the firstfruits” of the harvest was offered.

Hence, he was in the grave three days and three nights - two full 48 hour days and one partial day and one partial evening but a total of three different days and three different nights.

GE:

So THAT’S how you get to “on Sunday”!!

No, I realized it all the time, don’t worry.

I told you so several times before. Scheming, that's how.

You actually GET to the last day of finality – two times now one after the other – you actually GET to the last day of finality in the Resurrection! But just won't accept. So you unreasonably for not so mysterious reason, skip the last day of finality in the Resurrection of Christ "In the Sabbath Day", and reach too far forward to "on Sunday". Like those Chinese super batmen who like flies climb glass walls and sail overhanging rocks; but when they try to go more than one obstacle at a time, it's all over with them. You only won't believe it's all over with you and your futile attempts at a, "on Sunday" Resurrection, Dr Walter!

IT:

Surely you know what you say is an untruth [Dr Walter], for I gave you a dictionary meaning of the word since. I know you can read, and I'll not insult you with when we Read, and are to try and comprehend what we are reading; just saying you refuse to entertain truth that has been shown to you.

You wrote words in your previous post to me, showing to all what I said was true. Do you now say you did not mean what you said? That does happen some time, and all we have to do is admit it, claim out of context, Linguistics Foreign, or revert to name-calling.

I proved the 72 houses in the heart of the earth, and His coming forth on the first day of the next week. You do not accept that, even though you cannot come close to proving a Thursday crucifixion.

GE:

Give Dr Walter credit where he deserves it, Ituttut. His counting with regard to Luke 24:21 is correct, just the same as

Luke's— "Today", Sunday, "IS the third day since" the day of the Crucifixion. But Crucifixion day was the first day of the three days of the prophecies. So Sunday could not be the third day of the three days of the prophecies. Doesn't matter, Dr Walter argues correctly otherwise and is spot on that the Crucifixion was on Thursday. He only cannot reconcile the fact of the 'Thursday Crucifixion' with a Sunday Resurrection because the prophecies and their fulfilment by Christ, and ordinary adding up, wouldn't allow it.

IT:

The women that day of Nisan 18 arrived as the Sun was beginning to come up,

GE:

From 14 to 18 Nisan ... 'inclusive', it's FIVE days! 'Exclusive' Jesus wasn't crucified on Nisan 15, and He didn't rise on Nisan 17. It's neither here nor there and nowhere near the Sabbath, Ituttut! Jesus wasn't crucified on Nisan 15, and He didn't rise on Nisan 17.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1712251#post1712251>

IT:

The women that day of Nisan 18 arrived as the Sun was beginning to come up, and they saw Him not; neither did they see the guards. The women were not there when the stone was rolled away. I would say He was reviving, and praying to His Father, and then Mary sees Him. She is then able to see, and talk to Him, but not touch Him (John 20:17).

GE:

No, then He had had raised – long ago!

How is it here you argue a Sunday Resurrection, but not so long ago you advocated a Sabbath's Resurrection?

Or what's your difference between resurrected and 'revived' that He resurrected on the Sabbath but here as you say "was reviving ... as the sun was beginning to come up" – on Sunday morning I suppose?

Or are you of the opinion He rose on Saturday morning?
You're quite confusing my man!

Re: IT, *"I have given you proof you've never seen laid out before, and you can't disprove, except with your misunderstanding of what the word SINCE can mean. Why do you pit Luke against what Jesus said? I have disproved your theory of Thursday. Can you offer a 72-hour accounting by time and day to make it agree with scripture? I have done so Wednesday, and will appreciate if you can do the same to prove the Thursday crucifixion.*

But to use your Thursday will dispute scripture, for the women did not put their spices on in the next day, which was Thursday, Nisan 15, a High Holy Sabbath Day; and just as they wished to do, could not be done on a High Sabbath Day. And neither could they offer Him their ointments on Friday because of the Guards, and the Tomb was sealed. The same applies to Saturday the Sabbath, and also they could not do it on a Sabbath, regardless of other circumstances.

Sunday then is the only day that was able to offer their preparations. They never got to do it. Doesn't it make sense if as you [Dr Walter] say Jesus was put into the grave at 6pm, on Thursday, the beginning of their day, which actually begins just as the Sun is setting? Wouldn't your reasoning then tell you He must have been crucified on Wednesday? tWould this be correct? Doesn't scripture say it was 3pm when He expired? Thursday is impossible, as are all other days with the exception of Wednesday.

Three Days Since? It was three (3) days since it happened. Doesn't this mean it happened yesterday, and it is now 3 days since it happened?"

Re: *“I have given you proof you've never seen laid out before”.*

Yes, never seen it *“laid out before”*.

But *“proof”*?

Never seen that either!

Re: *“... and you can't disprove, except with your misunderstanding of what the word SINCE can mean.”*

Answer,

As shown above, you can be very confusing, Ituttut.

How can you be *“disprove”* if one could even understand what you're saying?

Nevertheless, the *“misunderstanding”* lies with you who cannot disprove our correct understanding *“of what the word SINCE”* in fact does mean. *“Our”* correct understanding— at least Dr Walter and me, GE.

Re: *“Why do you pit Luke against what Jesus said?”*

Now come on!

Re: *“I have disproved your theory of Thursday.”*

Easier said than done!

Where, in any case?

Re: *“Can you offer a 72-hour accounting by time and day to make it agree with scripture?”*

I think that's what Dr Walter although unsuccessfully because of his fourth day resurrection idea, has been trying to do this whole discussion, and I, in my own opinion absolutely successfully, have been doing waterproof man, waterproof because SCRIPTURE-PROVED!

Necessary to repeat? Read this thread again, Here's more than enough evidence.

Re: *“I have done so Wednesday, and will appreciate if you can do the same to prove the Thursday crucifixion.”*

Hardly any 'proof', everything being based on two *“misunderstandings”* of yours,

... One, Your literal instead of idiomatic and spiritual meaning of the phrase, *“In the heart of the earth”*;

...Two, The task / duty of a burial “*could not be done on a High Sabbath Day*” specifically the ‘high sabbath’ of the passover.

Just accept these are hardly any ‘proof’, all your ‘proof’ being based on two of your “*misunderstandings*”, and Behold! A new perspective, “*you’ve never seen laid out before*” you—*laid out before*” you all by yourself and the Scriptures (good enough translated in the KJV for salvation).

Re: “*the women did not put their spices on in the next day, which was Thursday, Nisan 15, a High Holy Sabbath Day;*”.

You’re right, “*the women did not put their spices on in the next day*”.

Let’s take it from your point of view, “*the women did not put*

their spices on in the next day, which was Thursday, Nisan 15, a High Holy Sabbath Day”.

Now remember, you said before,

“*He had to be on the Ground in the Tomb (and sealed in) on that DAY of Nisan 14, for Joseph and Nicodemus would never do this type work on what God said they had better not do...*”

“*Beginning at 6 pm Thursday no Jew could do any manual work such as this for it is now Nisan 15, the High Sabbath.*”

“*What about His Body? ... It was put into the earth on that very same Day, about three (3) hours later, just as the Sun was going down,*” “*I proved the 72 houses in the heart of the earth...*”

Luke 23:53-56 says the women, after Joseph had closed the grave, went home and prepared spices before they started to rest the ‘sabbath’. ALL, on the SAME day, BEFORE sunset.

But Ituttut says,

“His Body ... was put into the earth ... just as the Sun was going down”, and “it is now Nisan 15, the High Sabbath”. “Beginning at 6 pm Thursday no Jew could do any manual work such as this for it is now Nisan 15, the High Sabbath.”

This to me sounds like a direct contradiction of Luke, because as Ituttut maintains there was NO time left for the women to prepare their spices on crucifixion day after the grave had been closed and before sunset. They had to wait until “*Nisan 15, the High Sabbath*” (‘Thursday’) was over, and do their preparations of spices on ‘Friday’, the first secular day after “*Nisan 15, the High Sabbath*”. Therefore, it’s also self-contradictory.

Although there are much stronger reasons, for me it is enough to reject the whole theory.

Re: *“... neither could they offer Him their ointments on Friday because of the Guards, and the Tomb was sealed.”*

How is that possible according to your own theory, Ituttut!?

Do you assume the guard was stationed on Thursday, “*Nisan 15, the High Sabbath*” because – as you say, “*Scripture shows the preparation day to be Nisan 14, and the next day, Nisan 15 is a High Holy Sabbath*” – it was “on the day after The Preparation” referred to in Matthew 27:63?

Then was the Resurrection on “*Nisan 15, the High Sabbath*”? Because “on” the SAME “Sabbath Day” that was “the day after the Preparation”, Matthew 28:1 declares, “There suddenly was a great earthquake” at which Jesus rose from the dead. So rose Jesus on “*Nisan 15, the High Sabbath*”? Yes, that is what your surmising amounts to!

Therefore no thanks as far as I am concerned. Your theory is muddled.

DW:

Ituttut, you have not proved there must be exactly 72 hours. There is no text in scripture that says Christ must be in

the grave for 72 hours. There is no text in scripture that states Christ must be in the grave three FULL days and three FULL nights. The fact that Christ was placed in the grave on the same day he was crucified BEFORE the next day began demonstrates he was in the grave for a PARTIAL day.

The term “since” or “away from” does not prove your position but rather proves mine. It proves Luke 24:21 did not begin WITH the crucifixion day and therefore Sunday “IS” the “third day.”

I must admit that I have gotten your posts confused with Gerard's posts. He believes in a Thursday crucifixion with a resurrection on Saturday while you believe in a Wednesday crucifixion with a resurrection on Sunday. It is easy to get confused when dealing with two people at the same time who are arguing two different things.

IT:

To answer your last first, I totally agree, it is difficult to try and keep up with the Bible is telling us, and then try to answer not just one person, but two, and sometimes more. But I believe this

helps us to keep our Sword going forward, while at the same time

trying hold up the shield.

The subject itself is confusing to us, and believe for a purpose. I do believe God wishes us to Study His Word in order for us to try and understand Him. I believe the Holy Spirit helps, knowing what is in our hearts as we search His Word. You know as well as I that such as scriptures involved, has puzzled all humanity, trying to make what seems contradictory, not to contradict. I also believe the Holy Sprit had the writers to say exactly what He wanted each to say, in their own words, at the time appointed.

Any way, I view our conversation as friendly, showing what God has allowed us to see.

The first thing we see in the very beginning, God divides. For my pt I see a full three complete days (Day times, and then Night times, each determined by God to be 12 hours for each by the setting of the Sun, and then its arising, or 72 hours fulfilled, as days blend together. I agree with what you say, viz. “demonstrates he was in the grave for a PARTIAL day.” You may not yet see what I am saying. I do not believe as so very many, that a partial day, in its fullness, falls short of 24 hours. They have convinced people that a partial should mean the day falls short of being 24 hours. They must shorten God's days in order to fit what they believe. I do not believe what they believe, as I had rather believe what God says.

I'll reiterate. I do not believe when I die, my soul, and spirit remains in my Body until I am buried, cremated, eaten by animals, or just waste away. I believe at death I will immediately be in heaven (without a body). With this thinking I know Jesus was in Paradise, and He welcomed the thief on the Cross on that very day. We know Jesus died at 3pm, and not told the time the thief died, but Jesus says it is the same day.

What about His Body? Did it go with HIM? It was put into the earth on that very same Day, about three (3) hours later, just as the Sun was going down, and Seventy two (72) hours later, just as the Sun was setting, the Stone was rolled away. The guards were still there, and evidently became unconscious. The women were not there at the beginning of this Sunday, which began at 6pm.

Did Jonah, after being in the belly of the fish immediately jump up? We know he didn't, and we know Jesus did not either. They both talked to God first, and then went forward. It took a little time, but He was no longer sealed in, when that 72 hour period had passed. He was out of the Tomb sometime before the women arrived.

There are many who scoff at our body resurrection. We must prove a Body resurrection. By using the above Wednesday to Saturday 72 hours, we see it was Sunday when the stone was rolled away by an angel. The guards were there we are told and they fainted at the sight. The women were not there for they did not see the stone rolled away, and they did not see the guards.

Matthew 12:40 has a double meaning, as I pointed out to Gerhard Ebersoehn in a previous post. Jesus was in the heart of the earth, but His body as in the heart of the rock of the Tomb, and His body was on the ground. He broke through the bars of Hades back into His Body on Saturday at 3pm. He emerged from the Tomb sometime after the stone was rolled away, and the guards had fainted when stone rolled away. Do the women tell a different story? I don't believe so.

DW:

Here is your problem! You attempt to count from a positoin of speculation. Speculation because you do not know the precise year of his death because that is determined by the precise year of his birth - all of which is speculative.

IT:

I believe you may have me mixed up with someone else. I said we don't know the year, but scripture tells us the DAY.

DW:

There is no dispute that the passover lamb died on Nisan 14

but Nisan 14th does not occur on the SAME DAY of the week or month EVERY YEAR with consistency. Hence, the day of the week is where your speculative problems begin. However, Luke 24 settles that problem forever.

IT:

Who said it occurred on the same day every year? Not me. You are great at what you do. You divert attention away from what one has said, to what you wish to put into their mouths.

DW:

However, my approach is not speculative. Luke is a historian and he provides explicit chronological data in Luke 24 that is beyond speculation. He explicitly states that the first day of the week "IS" today when they walked together and it "IS" the third day since the crucifixion. It "IS" not the fourth day as your position and Gerard's position necessitates. End of story - period - the Seventh day of the week resurrection theory is proved wrong beyond any shadow of a doubt and all the interpretative speculation will not help that position in the least overcome the explicit and specified data furnished by Luke in Luke 24.

Those who take the position of Gerard or the Roman Catholic position have to first define the year of Christ's birth to determine the year of his death and then determine the meaning of "high" Sabbath to determine the day of his resurrection.

On the other hand, the information provided by Luke in Luke 24 does not depend upon what year he was born or died or what the meaning of "high" Sabbath is or any other speculative interpretations.

IT:

Why do you keep saying one has to determine the YEAR? It is not speculation that we know Jesus was not born in December. We do know, that He was born in the latter part of September, or October. But is speculation on our part to say we know the Day,
month, or YEAR.

We know the Day, and month He died, for scripture tells us, but not the year, for that would be speculation.

As a Baptist, and a Grace believer, I find the Catholic church understands what they believe, and they find it in scripture. They believe, as do some others who say they believe in the name of Jesus Christ. They really believe in the Great Commission. I don't believe in the Great Commission for my Justification. But They Do, for it says you must be Water Baptized by the hand of a man to be saved. I am not getting off subject for you brought the Catholic religion into this conversation, at this time.

Dr. Walker we differ. I know I am right for I see you do not believe what Jesus said. He died on the preparation day, and you are disputing what He said. Scripture tells us the time of day that He died. As you refuse to believe that He was at 3pm in the heart of the earth, and his body off the Tree, and in the ground by 6pm that same day, you cannot see what Luke is saying. The majority of Christianity, as well as others believe as you. But I believe this is error, for you have contradiction with the rest of the Bible.

DW:

The “preparation day” is another speculative issue. If Christ died on the “preparation day” then it was Thursday as Luke's chronology irrefutably and clearly restricts the day of Christ's death to Thursday as he defines Sunday as “TODAY” and demands it “IS” the third day since the rulers delivered him to be crucified. - Case closed.

IT:

But Dr. Walter, when you contend for a Thursday, you will wind up with a Monday arrival of the women at the Tomb on that day when the SUN WAS COMING UP. Please go over your 72 hour, which I know you believe in. Thursday cannot possibly be

the day he died.

DW:

We are bluntly told that “TODAY IS” the “third” day since his crucifixion NOT THE FOURTH DAY and that “TODAY IS” the “SAME DAY” that Jesus walked with the disciples on the road to Emmaeus and that the women went early that morning to the grave.

We are bluntly told that “TODAY IS” the “SAME DAY” which is “the first day of the week” and therefore Saturday whether you count Jewish or Roman would be the SECOND day since the crucifixion and Friday whether you count Jewish or Roman would be the first day since the crucifixion and that makes Thursday the day of the crucifixion and burial.

We are repeatedly and bluntly told that Jesus rose again “ON THE THIRD DAY” and “TODAY IS THE THIRD DAY” and “TODAY IS” the “SAME DAY” which is “the first day of the week that the women went to the grave, Jesus walked with the disciples on the road - Can't get easier and clearer than this - Jesus arose on Sunday, the first day of the week.

IT:

Why do you keep saying one has to determine the YEAR? It is not speculation that we know Jesus was not born in December. We do know, that He was born in the latter part of September, or October. But is speculation on our part to say we know the Day, month, or YEAR.

DW:

The 14th nisan occurs on different days of the week depending upon the particular year you are looking at. You don't know the year of his death until you figure out the exact

year he was born. For example, the 14th of Nisan did not occur on the same day of the week in AD 30 as in AD 29.

Until you know the exact YEAR of his birth you cannot know the exact YEAR of his death nor the exact day in the month of Nisan that the 14th fell upon because it changes from year to year.

IT:

We know the Day, and the month He died, for scripture tells us. However we are not told the year, with surety, the Year that He died.

As a Baptist, and a Grace believer, I find the Catholic church understands what they believe, and they find it in scripture. They believe, as do some others who say they believe in the name of Jesus Christ. They really believe in the Great Commission. I don't believe in the Great Commission for my Justification. But They Do, for it says you must be Water Baptized by the hand of a man to be saved. I am not getting off subject for you brought the Catholic religion into this conversation, at this time.

DW:

Absolute proof of this is the fact that there words "these things" refer back to the death of Christ on the cross as verse 20 explicitly states this: 20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.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.

IT:

The two said "to day is the third day since these things were done." Since that happened, it is now the third day from when it happened. It happened on another day. I read this (since) as a verb, so the happening at a time subsequent to a

reference time. The three days follow in time since it happened. If one died yesterday, it is one day since it happened.

DW:

Hence, Sunday was the third day SINCE he was crucified

and he was already risen prior to walking with them and therefore he had to arise after 6 pm Saturday night and precisely between 3am to 6am as Mark explicitly states this is when he arose from the grave by the use of “proii” which is a technical term for the fourth watch of the night and so used by Christ Himself in Mark 13.

If Sunday is the “third day since” he was crucified and he was walking with them that very Sunday then obviously if you count backwards Morning and evenings in reverse you will end up precisely during the DAY time of Thursday PRIOR to 6 pm he was placed in the grave.

IT:

How can that be true? Please take another look at what you are saying here. Your premise is flawed. Do you agree Jesus the man was dead at 3pm? If so, then the 72 hours in the heart of the earth begins. Start at 3pm Thursday, and you will arrive at 3pm on Sunday? You are really saying the stone was rolled away on MONDAY.

DW:

Your position and logic are based wholly upon a series of speculative interpetations. If Sunday IS the third day and that is what the text demands “TODAY is the third day” and TODAY of the context IS Sunday and therefore Sunday is the third day “since” he was crucified then Saturday is the Second day since he was crucified or else TODAY is not Sunday.

Then Friday is the FIRST day since he was crucified making Thursday the day he was crucified!

Your position requires the omission of “today” from the text and then a rationale that says that three days have already passed prior to Sunday.

The women came to the tomb as you say “WHEN THE SUN WAS COMING UP” not when it was going down! They came on the first day of the week “early in the morning” when the sun was coming up.

Your speculative interpretations lead you to some other conclusions. Luke defines Sunday as the “third day” since the crucifixion day. He does not include the crucifixion day but says “since” or “away from” thus excluding the crucifixion day in his counting. It was on the “third day” Jesus rose again - the third day from the crucifixion day.

IT:

You say it very well Dr. Walter, and I agree with what you said; “the 'third day' Jesus rose again - the third day from the crucifixion day.” This understanding conclusively proves Wednesday is the day He was crucified. I have said nothing else than what you say today. This conclusion allows for Luke to agree with Jesus Christ being in the heart of the earth on that Preparation Day, and Jesus Christ bodily coming forth from the Tomb on that Sunday.

GE:

Dear Ituttut, I have my differences with Dr Walter, and I too often cannot control myself so cross I get with him; but chum, you are the wrong one in this conversation. I mean, the confused one. Gracious, you are far worse than Dr Walter!

Why is it you don't pay attention to what “*Jesus says*”, consistently? For example, hear this, “*So Jesus was laid in the ground in the heart of the Stone hewed out by Joseph.*”

What Jesus says is not three nights, and three days in the ground, but three days, and three nights”!?

Concentrating on IT’s stuff here re-arranged to statements and replies, I answer as follows...

First, keep in mind, my answer excludes conversation after as far as it got up to here recorded.

Also, I answer relevant ‘issues’; no irrelevancies like, “*Israel is made Holy by religious rites.*”

Re: IT, “*Jesus arose from the dead on the Sabbath day, the seventh day of the week. This agrees with all scripture. In this knowledge we then can determine without question the day He was laid in the Tomb. A Wednesday; Right?*”

Conclusion:

Four days, even Five days.... Yea, SIX ‘days’

“*Jesus arose from the dead on the Sabbath day*”, you say.

Yes; that is what I also believe. But I must assume you also meant, “on the third day”— “THE, third day according to the SCRIPTURES” and its Prophecy, so that Jesus arose from the dead “on the third day” that in the year He died Our Sacrifice, was the Sabbath Day— “the seventh day of the week”.

I assume you mean “*This agrees with all scripture*”?

But then, take what you – not I – say, and tell me why I get 5 yes FIVE days, nothing near like “the third day according to the Scriptures”!

How?

Well, you say, “*the day He was laid in the Tomb. A Wednesday...*”. Remember, as you, say! Then, if in the Bible, ‘days’, begin with evening-after-sunset, He was crucified and died on the Tuesday BEFORE.

‘Days’ – in the Bible – begin with evening-after-sunset, hey! That’s why – check Mark 15:42 Matthew 27:57 John 19:31,38,40 Luke 23:50 – these Scriptures say, “It ...” – on the NEW day AFTER He had died – “It ALREADY (‘ehdeh’)

having been EVENING (‘opsias’) BECAUSE (‘epei’), The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath having begun” (‘ehdeh opsias genomenehs epei ehn Paraskeueh’, Ingressive Aorist), Joseph went to Pilate to ask if he could have Jesus’ body that was STILL on the cross: “IN ORDER TO according to the ethics / law of the Jews” = Law of the Scriptures and Prophecy, “bury (Him).”

So – no matter what kind of ‘days’ – Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, “the Sabbath day” = 5 = FIVE ‘days’! Whatever might remain of your theory, this single fact it demands FIVE days of the earth’s rotation, nullifies it COMPLETELY.

Even – according to you in your own words again – from, “*The sacrifice is ... (sacrificed) on Nisan 14*” and is “*sealed In on The Same Day*”, FOUR days are involved until Jesus rose up again on “the Sabbath day”, because He would have risen on a FOURTH day, not, “on the third day” as the Scriptures and the Prophecies and the Law have it.

So, says IT, “*The sacrifice is made ready on Nisan 14 ... Sealed In on The Same Day.*” – “*Wednesday*”; “*arose on the Sabbath day*” = 2 days. Plus – so, says IT –, Thursday and Friday in between “*Wednesday*” and “*Sabbath*”, FOUR days are involved which requires that Jesus on the fourth of those days rose again, and no longer as the Scriptures say, “on the THIRD day” — no matter what ‘days’ whether just ordinary days one after the other or ‘holy days’ set apart for and as some specific “three days” “according to the Scriptures” of Jesus’ FINAL SUFFERING. It makes no difference, it stays four days at least.

So according to Ituttut,

A: If sacrificed as well as buried on the “*Same Day*” and “*arose on the Sabbath day*” = 4 FOUR days;

B: If according to Ituttut, Jesus “*arose on the Sabbath day*” and was “*laid in the Tomb. A Wednesday...*” but according to the Scriptures, was “laid in the Tomb” on the day

AFTER “*The sacrifice is made ready on Nisan 14*”, = 5 FIVE days and not at all, “on the third day according to the Scriptures”.

And therefore, sure, “*In this knowledge we then can determine without question the day He was laid in the Tomb*”, “*A Wednesday*”? Wrong simply because of the wrong number of days implicated!

Re: IT, “*Dear friend, if I'm not mistaken you said He arose from the dead on the Sabbath. Three days in the ground, just as He said, and He tells us in the beginning how many hours are in a Day (day/night). He says 72 hours. What does man say?*”

Answer

Yes, I do maintain Christ “*arose from the dead on the Sabbath*”. But that not in the least demands “*Three days in the ground*” or, “*72 hours*”.

“*What does man say?*” That’s what man says— Ituttut.

Not

“*He*”, Jesus. “*72 hours*”, is NOT, what “*He says*”; “*Three days in the ground...*”, is NOT, “*just as He said*”.

Nothing more needs be said while these things are NOT what Jesus said. You may just as well be ignored flat, Ituttut, your assertions being so unrealistic they are as good as never being said.

So what does it matter “*how many hours are in a Day (day/night)*”? In any case, a ‘day’ in the Bible, Old and New Testaments, isn’t “*a Day (day/night)*”; it’s a ‘day: night / day’.

Re: Ituttut, “*Jesus was also specifically referring to the ground under our feet. Strong's Greek "ge" can mean "Ground", and Heart (Greek "kardia") broken heart.*”

Answer

No, Jesus was NOT “*specifically referring to the ground under our feet*”; He was specifically referring to “the PROPHET, Jonas”. Jesus meant the Scriptures— Prophecy;

and the fulfilment of the Scriptures and Prophecy by Himself through his own experience. Not with one word was Jesus “*specifically referring to the ground under our feet*”, not even with having used the word “earth”, because He meant “earth”, “AS the prophet Jonas” who in the belly of the fish was not near under the ground in any sense than figurative as were he “under the foundations of the mountains under the sea”—which literally was no deeper under them than in the waters of the sea above them. There is no way “*specifically*” one can take Jesus’ words literally as “*the ground under our feet*”, except for the real historic PROGRESSION-IN-TIME of Jesus’ last and earthly suffering according to God’s will and prophetic Word of THE “three days”, “according to the Scriptures”.

Now about your claim, “*Strong's Greek "ge" can mean "Ground", and Heart (Greek "kardia") broken heart.*”

Sorry. Denied!

As I have before answered you on “*the verse ... Matthew 12:40*”, “in the HEART of the earth” is figurative language ... in ANY language. Jesus was NOT “*referring to the ground under our feet*” whatsoever.

About, “*Jesus was laid in the heart of the Rock, on the Ground in the Tomb. A stone sealed Him in. Jonah was sealed inside the special New Fish.*”

Maybe you will win a prose competition with this, but not for exegetical skills.

Re: IT, “*Three days, and three nights Johan's body was sealed inside the Fish, and three days, and three nights Jesus' body was sealed in the Tomb, while He lay on the ground.*”

I am not saying this cannot have a double meaning, for it does, but to not contradict all other scripture we must make this verse in Matthew mean what it says.”

You are saying your own thing; not what “*this verse in Matthew*” means or, says. You are making this verse say what

Ituttut means and says, single meaning or “*double meaning*”, giving it no meaning at all only “*to contradict all other scripture*”.

Take “*sealed inside ... three days, and three nights Jesus' body ... in the Tomb, while He lay on the ground.*” It’s absurd; what about the time He was judged and crucified and unburied? Altogether it would need SIX days by now! Yes, “THREE DAYS” suffered Jesus dying the death of death, was He betrayed, convicted, condemned, abused and judged and abused and hanged and died; and was He deserted, and taken from the cross and away and his body treated and prepared and processed and brought to the tomb and bewailed and “laid in the place” and closed indoor and “*sealed inside*” “the next day after” Matthew 27:62 and YET ANOTHER “... *three days, and three nights Jesus' body (was) in the Tomb, while He lay on the ground*”!— SIX – 6 – FULL DAYS!

Where are you going to end up, Ituttut? Eternity?

So, again, your arguments amounting to nothing, they cannot have bearing at all, on the question about on which days of the week Jesus died and rose again.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1706363#post1706363>

Re: Ituttut, “*He arose on the Third (3rd) day, which was the*

seventh day of the week, on the regular Sabbath. How do we know this? If we keep reading in Matthew 27, we come to verse 61, and 62. “And there was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre.

62. Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate”. The Next day is Nisan 15, the God appointed High Sabbath Day. Nisan 15, every year follows Nisan 14. We are told He was slaughtered on Nisan 14, which can only be on a Wednesday.”

Answer:

“If we keep reading in Matthew 27 ... we know this ... He arose on the Third (3rd) day, which was the seventh day of the week, on the regular Sabbath.”

Reading Matthew 27 does make it clear that the Sabbath was “the third day”, sure; but not in the way you are looking at it.

Verse 62 stating that it was “the day after the preparations” or “the day after the Preparation Day”, directly without any day in between, connects the day upon which the Jews asked Pilate to have the grave sealed, with “the regular Sabbath”, “... which is after ...” it, “the day after the Preparation Day”.

You, Ituttut, are alleging there incurred one day between “The Preparation” referred to in verse 62, and “the regular Sabbath” ... absolutely without reason.

In fact, “the next day which was after The Preparation Day” before it (immediately before it), was *“the regular Sabbath”* after this “Preparation Day” upon which John also, in 19:42, wrote, “They laid the body of Jesus BY THE TIME / BECAUSE OF the Jews’ preparations”— “preparations” naturally and regularly done for the pending, *“regular Sabbath”*— those preparations and that Preparation Day that were the exact same about which Luke wrote, “the women returned home and prepared, (also) spices and ointments and (afterwards) began to rest the Sabbath-according-to-the-(Fourth)-Commandment”— that exact same “Preparation Day ...” which with the “... evening...” BEFORE (“Thursday night / Friday day”) “... ALREADY had had begun it having been the Fore-Sabbath” the unique “Fore-Sabbath” namely, of the ‘weekly’ “Sabbath”.

Which “Sabbath” again, Mark in 16:1 wrote, that “after the Sabbath had gone through”, the three women, “bought spices”, obviously for Salome who had not been present at the Burial the Preparation Day before, also to prepare, “So that,

when they would go, they (all three of them) might / could anoint Him.”

If there is one thing all four Gospels are clear and unanimous about, it is the daily sequence of events of the Last Week and especially the “three days” of Jesus’ earthly life’s sufferings “according to the Scriptures”.

Therefore, reading Matthew 27 does make it clear “*He arose on the Third (3rd) day, which was the seventh day of the week,*” but not in the way you are looking at it, because for you, “*Nisan 14*” on which “*we are told He was slaughtered ... can only be on a Wednesday*” for absolutely NO APPARENT REASON! And because for you, TWO, non-existing days, (Nisan 15 AND ‘Nisan 16’), occurred in between this “*Nisan 14 ... Wednesday*” and “*the regular Sabbath*”.

You can date them what you want, it stays an untrue, INEXPLICABLE, mess!

Now, on a more positive note....

Reading Matthew 27, does make it clear that the Sabbath was “the third day”, for another two reasons than the fact that it was “the next day which is after The Preparation” the day of Burial, the fifteenth day of the First Month.

One,

That Sabbath Day inferred in Matthew 26:62 is specifically – “*bluntly*” – referred to by the Jews (63b) as “the third day” of which Jesus had “said ... after three days I will rise again.” (Mark 8:31)

Jesus also said, “the third day, I **FINISH**” – “the third day” **of passover**; and “God (through and in Jesus Christ) the Seventh Day **FINISHED** – “the Seventh Day”, **of the week.**”

“The third day” in the Passover of Yahweh equals “Seventh Day Sabbath of Yahweh Elohim”, because “God thus concerning the Seventh Day spake, And God the Seventh Day from all his works, RESTED”. “God rested” “by the exceeding greatness of his Power having raised Christ from

the dead”; “If Jesus had given them rest ... there therefore remains a Sabbath-rest-/keeping for God’s People, He having entered into His Own Rest as God in his own”, “In the Sabbath’s Day”.

“The third day” and “the Sabbath Day” in the Life and Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ perfectly agree— in Fulfilment and Prophecy; in Content and Essence; in event and circumstance; and even in time and sequence of days **both of date and of week**.

Two,

Read Matthew 27 from verse 62 to chapter 28:4 without the chapter brake between 27:66 and 28:1. Then the Jews and the Romans “on the next morning which is after the Preparation” for the **Sabbath Day**, make sure to keep Jesus’ grave shut, thinking they could prevent Him to rise from the grave and dead again ... **“BUT FULLNESS OF THE SABBATH IN THE VERY MID-INCLINING DAYLIGHT towards the First Day of the week : SUDDENLY THERE WAS A GREAT EARTHQUAKE ...”** and Jesus ROSE from the dead and grave DESPITE the Jew’s best efforts to keep Him in the grip of hell!

“Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thyself!”

Jesus answered, having raised from the dead “the third day according to the Scriptures”, “The Sabbath” — “The Sabbath of : THE LORD thy GOD”, “(it) being-in-the-epi-centre-of-Sabbath’s-fullness-and-fulfilment”. Matthew’s words.

“The Sabbath” in and of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is “The Sabbath” and “the third day” in its “God-given and therefore imperative eschatological fullness and wholeness” ... (Lohmeyer’s words.) ... here, quote : **“(Jesus Christ) whom God RAISED-UP-HAVING-LOOSED-THE-PAINS-OF-DEATH”** – which is the PERFECT

**EQUIVALENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT'S, “... and God
the Seventh Day from all his works : RESTED!”**

DHK:

Does it?

Every gospel attests to Christ arising on the first day of the week; our Sunday.

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. (Matthew 28:1)

He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. (Matthew 28:6)

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 very early in the morning [b]the first day of the week,[/b] they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. (Mark 16:1-2)

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)

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. (Luke 24:1)

And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, (Luke 24:5-6)

The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. (John 20:1)

And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. (John 20:14)

GE:

I must to be honest deny your every claim; I have no option - and for one reason only - that the Scriptures never say that Christ rose on the First Day of the week. You have yourself quoted every possible pertinent text. NOT ONE says what you claim it says.

Of Course the Resurrection is right through all the Gospels the implied and accepted, and presupposed and conditional fact of truth, but no word about its occurrence as such, where it is said, that “Jesus rose”, exists anywhere in the Gospels. It is ONLY Matthew 28:1-4 where some extrinsic data that surrounded Jesus’ actual resurrection, is provided.

DHK first refers to Matthew; but Matthew should be mentioned last, because “the angel”, AT LAST, “explained to the women” in such a way that they for the first time could understand the angel’s message of Jesus’ resurrection. **That explanation of the angel’s is found in verses 1 to 4!** No other Gospel “explained” how or when Jesus actually, rose.

But DHK mentions Matthew first, so let’s consider it first....

Matthew 28:1,

“In the end OF THE SABBATH- / SABBATH'S(-time), as it began to dawn (“daylight in mid-declining”) TOWARD / against / before the First Day of the week, SET OUT Mary Magdalene and the other Mary TO (go) see the sepulchre WHEN THERE SUDDENLY WAS A GREAT EARTHQUAKE.”

So this “*gospel attests to Christ arising on the first day of the week; our Sunday*” ...???

Never!!!

This *gospel attests to Christ arising “Sabbath’s”, yes!*

“*He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. (Matthew 28:6)*”— DHK quoting “the angel” who **BY NOW the morning AFTER the Resurrection,**

“ANSWERING = informing = explaining to the women, ... told them” with detailed information of day, “Sabbath’s”; time, “late, in the mid-afternoon”; and circumstance, “suddenly there was a great earthquake” **WHEN** Jesus **BEFORE**, HAD

resurrected from the dead. Verses 1-4.

So now, on Sunday morning, “The angel explaining” is **FURTHER** “telling the women, He is risen ... etc.”, like that He as the Risen One would go to Galilee where the disciples would see Him again “as He had told you” before his death in fact. Meantime Jesus was nearby still, and would meet these women within minutes later in person.

So the angel ‘informed’ **these** women, shortly **after** Jesus had “first appeared to Mary Magdalene” on that ‘Sunday’ morning “early” (Mark 16:9), and shortly **before** He **next** on that ‘Sunday’ morning would ‘meet’ them, **these** women, “as they” too, “went to tell the disciples” about the angel’s instructive message, Matthew 28:10.

Mary Magdalene WAS NOT ONE of these women because Jesus had had appeared to her already, “early”, on ‘Sunday’ morning Mark 16:9, about sunrise when a gardener would begin to work, John 20:11-17. “**Thus The Risen** (Saviour), Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene FIRST, early on the First Day of the week” before anyone else, a token of Jesus’ full acceptance of her, her sins and all. But Mary Magdalene by the time that Jesus “met” the other women on their way to tell the disciples, was with the disciples already, busy telling them that He had appeared to her.

The Gospels give SEPARATE, and DIFFERENT, events, Matthew clearly the events accompanying the Resurrection “in the mid-afternoon of the Sabbath Day”, the after-afternoon and the whole following night **BEFORE** the angel’s final explanation or Jesus’ first appearances.

John 20:11-17 / Mark 16:9 and Matthew 28:5-10 pertain to the LAST TWO of FOUR SEPARATE and DIFFERENT,

VISITS of women at the tomb during the course of that ‘early Sunday morning’, but only Matthew, also gives the information about the Resurrection “On the Sabbath Day”, BEFORE!

So, while John 20:11-17 / Mark 16:9 and Matthew 28:5-10 pertain to the LAST TWO of FOUR SEPARATE and DIFFERENT, VISITS of women at the tomb during the course of

that ‘early Sunday morning’, the EARLIER visits were

...

One, ...the visit according to Luke 24:1,2 when the women thinking the body was in the sepulchre still, “came with spices prepared” to anoint Him, just after midnight, “deep(est) morning” of night; and they discovered the grave was **EMPTY**.

Two, ...the visit that night’s morning, according to Mark 16:2-8, an ascertaining, “re-viewing” visit, “VERY early (before) sunrising”— which caused that the women “fled from the tomb and told no one anything so afraid were they...”, “...BUT! Mary Magdalene had stayed behind at the sepulchre weeping...” John 20:11f.

Yes, “Mary HAD HAD STOOD AFTER without at the sepulchre”, verse 11, after a visit NOT MENTIONED IN JOHN, but in Mark 16:2-8, when one would expect the gardener to begin work, sunrise, when Mary saw Jesus approaching at a distance AWAY FROM THE TOMB.

NO ACTUAL Resurrection in either of Mark 16:2-8 and John 20 anywhere!

Mark 16:1-2,

“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 very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.”

So? When was the resurrection? Where does it mention the Resurrection?

In any case, verse 1 does not even mention a visit at the grave! How can it “*attest to Christ arising on the first day of the week; our Sunday*”?!

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.”

See what I did?

Because “AS-THE-RISEN-ONE, He - Jesus – APPEARED to Mary ...”. NOT 'rose to Mary', hihhi.

Luke 24:1,5,6,

“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.

First VISIT just after midnight “deep(est) morning-of-night”.

And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they (the angles) said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee.” ...

“The third day I FINISH”; “God the Seventh Day FINISHED.”

“I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.” “God the Seventh Day RESTED.”

John 20:1,

“The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was YET EARLY DARKNESS, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre and runneth and cometh to Simon Peter...

As quoted by DHK, “...*early, when it was yet dark...* (John 20:1)”; “*early, when it was yet dark*” against what is in truth written, “being yet / still early-DARKNESS”, ‘proh-i skotias eti ousehs’.

Clever change to God's Word, but not clever enough!

In any case, here is NO Resurrection occurring, just the FIRST SIGHT of the moved away door-stone – OUTSIDE and from a DISTANCE from the grave – as being observed by Mary Magdalene.

This must be the earliest ‘coming’ to the tomb, and Mary Magdalene has to be the ONLY person who undertook it because the news that she brought concerning the observed moved away door stone, **SET IN MOTION ALL** subsequent events of the rest of that night, first of which was that Peter and John as the direct result of this first sight of the opened grave by Mary Magdalene, FOR THE FIRST TIME received news of it or of the fact that

Jesus’ body got buried at all!

DHK continues with “John 20:14”, “And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus”, as saw Mary Jesus immediately after 20:1, just after she had observed the moved away door stone! Which is glaring shrewdness.

So yes,

APPEARANCE described, “FIRST, to Mary Magdalene”, according to Mark 16:9

Where's the Resurrection?

ONLY in Matthew 28:5A, “Answered / Described / Informed the angel the women...”, having told them verses 1 to 4 that explain Jesus’ Resurrection!

The angel told the women after sunrise, because this was just after Jesus’ first appearance “to Mary early (= sunrise) on the First Day of the week” and just before Jesus’ second appearance “to the women” other than Mary Magdalene.

DHK:

It is on the first day of the week, which for some strange reason you seem to deny.

Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. (Mark 16:9)

It is as plain as the nose on your face.

He rose early on the first day of the week. You can't get any clearer than that.

GE:

You have made it so much easier to answer and REFUTE your tricking.

First, I entertain NO “*strange reason*” why I should “*deny ... it is on the first day of the week*” **which actually was**, “on the First Day of the week”, namely, Jesus’ first APPEARANCE.

I entertain though, NO “*strange reason*” why I should “*deny*”

... “*it*” – a Sunday-resurrection of Jesus – “*is on the first day of the week*”; to be sure!

But you and the renderers of 'the text' as you here presented it, have no ‘*strange*’, but most obvious ‘*reason*’ why you claim “*it is on the First Day of the week*”— because if you don't have ‘*it*’, on the First Day of the week, you have nothing on the First Day of the week and so nothing for worshiping on Sundays.

You have made it easier for me, I say. For example, Why did you not again, quote the KJV? Why this time, you display another ‘translation’ or ‘version’— rather, PERVERSION?

Ah! For no strange reason!

Because you do not want the text to read, “*Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene*”; you want it to read, “*Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene...*”

Why? Because your first mention by the ‘old’ English as to HOW Jesus “appeared (namely) now when he was risen”

...”, could never mean the UNREAL English, “*when he had risen ... he appeared*” ... which is not English, but pretentious disregard for the languages both English and Greek, to support the false claim of a Finite, Indicative, Predicative Verb where there is no trace of its existence. In other words, “*Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared*” is not only horrible perverse English as well as Greek, but epitomises bad grammar, exegesis, hermeneutics, and just general Christian morals, all for religious conformity. “*It*”, has no obscure or “*strange*” reason in the least, but the ulterior and cynical but open, well known, defiant and contemptuous motive of Sunday worship. THAT is what is “*as plain as the nose on your face*” from and in this reading, “*Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared*”.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1707086&posted=1#post1707086>

Dr. Walter:

There are not four separate visits to the tomb by the women

but only ONE visit. They started out in the dark BEFORE sunrise because they arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun. Mary did not come alone but was attended by the other Mary's as Matthew 28:2 explicitly states as does Mark 16:1-2. As they were coming the tomb they felt the earthquake which scared the guards along with the rock being rolled away thus sending the guards scared into the city which the women passed as they were coming to the tomb. Thus the resurrection occurred just before the guards ran to the city and the women came to the tomb.

Matthews “in the end of the Sabbath” and Mark's “after the Sabbath was past” are one and the same descriptions of the same time.

Matthew's use of “dawn” or “light growing” is the same as Mark's “rising of the sun.”

All the women but Mary ran scared into the city but Mary went searching for Christ in the garden where Christ met her and then Christ left and met the women and thus all the women then returned to the disciples.

Mark 16:9 explicitly states Christ rose early in the morning on the first day of the week and you have to manipulate the text to avoid what it says. [/QUOTE]

GE:

No one is as blind as he who does not want to see.

“They started out in the dark before sunrise
BECAUSE they arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun.” (Emphasis GE)

So it took the women THREE HOURS to “*start... out in the dark BEFORE sunrise*”, “3 am” as you have several times stated elsewhere, until “*they arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun*”, “6 am” as you have elsewhere, several times stated.

THREE HOURS from “3 am” “*BEFORE sunrise*”, before “*all the women*”, “*arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun*”, “6 am”?!

Were they lame? Crippled? Rubbish!

There was “*only ONE visit ... to the tomb by the women*” according to Dr Walter.

“Mary did not come alone but was attended by the other Mary's as Matthew 28:2 explicitly states”.

“*Matthew 28:2*” says, Mary did not come alone but was attended by, quote, “the other Mary”— ONE, “other Mary”. TWO persons. THAT, is “*as Matthew 28:2 explicitly states*”.

Matthew, you explicit liar!

John states, “comes Mary Magdalene”, one name, Singular Present Verb, one person.

“Mary did not come alone”!

John, you liar!

“All the women but Mary ran scared...”

Did Matthew forget to mention it? Did Mark? Luke?
 No, John! Although he doesn't say "*ran*" or "*scared*".
 Not even John can be believed! Yes, NOT ONE of them
 liars says "*All the women but Mary ran scared....*"

"Mary had stood behind at the grave..." ... that's John
 again.

John, you muddled dreamer! You are telling us Mary
 stood at the grave looked inside, talked to the two angels
 inside, stood up straight while she turned around and saw
 Jesus approaching her as she looked at Him, while Dr Walter
 who should know better tells us "*Mary went searching for
 Christ in the garden*".

DW:

"*Mary did not come alone but was attended by the other
 Mary's as Matthew 28:2 explicitly states as does Mark 16:1-
 2.*"

Matthew 28:2, "And behold, there was a great
 earthquake for the angel of the Lord ..."

Is it Matthew, or is it Dr Walter who has his verse
 divisions incorrect?

No matter...

28:1b,2-4 "... set out Mary and the other Mary to go
 look at the grave, but suddenly there was a great earthquake
 the angel of the Lord descending ..."

"*Mark 16:1-2*", "Now when the Sabbath had gone
 through

Mary Magdalene and Mary of James and Salome, had
 bought sweet spices that when they would come they could
 anoint Him. Then very early on the First Day of the week
 before sunrise they again came to the grave"

Confused deceivers! Not Matthew or Mark says one
 thing the same as the other, not "*explicitly*" or implicitly!

Persons:

Matthew 28:1-4, Two Marys
 Matthew 28:5-10, “Women”; Mary Magdalene not with
 them

Mark 16:1, the two Marys and Salome

Mark 16:2-8, unidentified “women”

Luke 24:1,10,22 “women”; named; “some women”

John 20:1, Mary Magdalene

John 20:11, Mary Magdalene

DW:

No discrepancies between the writers. When you have four different accounts, you will have different emphases. In every account Mary Magdalene is the emphasis while other “women” or other Mary's are but added details.

GE:

Purpose:

Matthew 28:1-4, “Set out with the intent to go see the
 grave”

Matthew 28:5-10, “Angel ANSWERED ... Ye seek
 Jesus”

Mark 16:1, At traders, with the intent to buy spices;

Mark 16:2-8, “Arrived (with the intent to) inspect”

Luke 24:1,22, “bringing the spices which they had
 prepared ... found not the body”

John 20:1 “sees” the grave.

John 20:11 “had had stood after weeping ... whom
 seekest thou?”

DW:

Again, no discrepancies. Each writer brings to the table
 different details about the same event.

GE:

Circumstance:

Mark 16:1, Three women at traders

John 20:1 “Mary sees stone taken away from sepulchre”

Luke 24:1-9 Opened tomb entered; “found not the body”

Mark 16:2-8, closer details afterwards

John 20:11-17 Mark 16:9, “appeared first to Mary
Magdalene”

Matthew 28:1-5a, Other women. New information on
Resurrection received, verses 1 to 4.

Matthew 28:1-5bf and Jesus’ instructions through angel.

DW:

Again, no discrepancies between accounts, just different
emphases of the same event.

GE:**Angels:****“Sabbath”:**

Matthew 28:2-4, “... angel from heaven flung stone from
the grave, sat on it”

DW:

Erroneous interpretation by you not by Matthew! Your
partial quote is jerked out of context. This was not on the
Sabbath but on the first day of the week early in the morning
as verse 11 proves as the guards who were present that same
Sunday morning who witnessed the resurrection were going
that same morning to tell what they had seen.

GE:**“After Sabbath”:**

Mark 16:1, ... no angel or angels

John 20:1-2, ... no angel or angels

“On the First Day of the week”:

Luke 24:4 Two angels confronting women coming out from the tomb

Mark 16:2-8, “at the entrance a young man on right side ...”

Sunday, “early”:

John 20:11 (Mark 16:9), “two angels sitting where the body of Jesus had laid”

Matthew 28:5, Outside tomb, “Answered / Explained the angel and told the women ...”

DW:

Artificial contradictions made by your cut and paste jerk out context presentation above. All of the above happened on the very same Sunday morning. Mark 16:1-8 is one narrative and John 20:11 and Matthe 28 do not contradict it.

IT IS YOUR ARTIFICIAL CUT AND PASTE PRESENTATION THAT MAKE MATTHEW, MARK, JOHN AND LUKE LIARS.

GE:

But Dr Walter showed us, all the Gospels’ distinctions and peculiarities and differences are no discrepancies or contradictions, they are purely the Gospel writers’ own interpretations of “*Matthew’s “in the end of the Sabbath” and Mark’s “after the Sabbath was past”*”, “*Matthew’s use of “dawn” or “light growing” is the same as Mark’s “rising of the sun.”*” And that they “*are one and the same descriptions of the same time*” and of the same event and of the same persons etcetera.

Brilliant, unsurpassable insight into and intuition for the Gospel-Message of Jesus Christ, “I-Am-The-Truth”, in whose mouth there is no deceit. *There are not four separate visits but they started out in the dark BEFORE sunrise*

because they arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun. As they were coming to the tomb they felt the earth quake which scared the guards along with the rock being rolled away thus sending the guards scared into the city which the women passed as they were coming to the tomb. Thus the resurrection occurred just before the guards ran to the city and the women came to the tomb, and Mary went to search for Jesus in the garden where Christ met her and then Christ left and met the women and thus all the women then returned to the disciples.

You should publish your New Revelations of John, Matthew, Mark and Luke, Dr Walter, they will be the seal of superiority over ‘The New Revelation’ of Jacob Lorber and Mrs E.G. White’s ‘Desire of the Ages’.

You have once for all proved, “*Mark 16:9 explicitly states Christ rose early in the morning on the first day of the week*” and not in any way whatsoever, had to manipulate the text to avoid what it says, “Christ early in the morning on the First Day of the week appeared, risen, to Mary Magdalene, first.”

Now DHK, tell me Dr Walter is not the liar he makes of Matthew as he makes of Mark as he makes of Luke as he makes of John! Tell me!! Four times, times persons and names, times places and circumstances, times events and times, the times INNUMERABLE MATTHEW AND MARK AND LUKE AND JOHN, ARE MADE LIARS OF BY ONE, DR WALTER!!!

DW:

Quoting GE: < Because you do not want the text to read, “Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene”; you want it to read, “Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene...” >

I am glad you admit this appearance to Mary was very early in the morning on the first day of the week it was that

very same morning on the first day of the week the same women in the very same morning were returning from the tomb when the guards also were going to the city that very same Sunday morning:

Mt 28:11 Now when they [the women] were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.

The guards were those on watch WHEN the earthquake occurred and when the stone was rolled away from the tomb and therefore when Christ arose from out of the grave. We know they were because they are the ones who conveyed to the priests what happened at the grave and these guards were bribed to tell a different story than what they were EYE WITNESSES of!

GE:

No guards “were EYE WITNESSES of ... what happened at the grave” EXCEPT they found it opened and empty when they came by AFTER “the earthquake occurred” and AFTER “when the stone was rolled away from the tomb and therefore AFTER “when Christ arose from out of the grave”, for two indisputable reasons,

... one, that “no man can see God and live” – which is Scripture!; and

... two, that they were struck down “like dead men” by the brilliance of the angel’s appearing BEFORE he opened the grave – which is Scripture, once more and finally.

DW:

They could not have been the guards on watch over the tomb the afternoon before (Saturday afternoon) when you suggest Christ arose as that would require us to believe the nonsense that it took all that afternoon and then evening and all the rest of the night for them to leave the tomb and come into the city - STRANGE nonsense indeed!

GE:

Now ... The true picture about the guards, that Sabbath and

Saturday,

‘Sabbath AND Saturday’ because ...

... for the Jews that Sabbath Day was “the third day” that Jesus said He would rise again, which “third day” for them would end within 12 hours later, sunset exactly; and because ...

... for the Roman guard that Sabbath Day was ‘Saturday’ because an ordinary day of military duty on guard that, for them, would end within 18 hours later, midnight exactly.

“Mid-afternoon Sabbath’s there was a great earthquake as the angel of the Lord descended from heaven ... and the guards frightened by him fell down and convulsed like dying men.” That, is written.

It obviously was the end of the guard, 9 hours before midnight and the end of their watch. Matthew tells nothing further about any guard. For how long after the angel’s descent the unconscious guard lay there “like dead men” (who cannot stand and look on), one can only speculate.

It is not said how many soldiers watched. But Pilate ordered “a watch”, and Matthew tells of “keepers”, therefore, more than one, but it is not indicated how many more than one. Matthew also refers to “some of the watch” in 28:11, suggesting at least two of them. Mary suggested enough soldiers so that they could carry the body of Jesus somewhere else, but there is no allusion to a possibility that the guard could be more than four soldiers.

Pilate ordered the watch at anything before noon on that Sabbath Day because anything between sunrise and noon is ‘epaurion’ Matthew 27:62. He commanded, “YOU – Jews – have custodian!” verse 65 – that is, “You get ONE, guard!” There would be NO change of guard. These soldiers’ watch

would last until Saturday would be over, midnight— a twelve hour shift! Pilate had good reason to be fed up with those Jews!

Mary's speculation meant she knew about the guard, and that she supposed their watch still on, "while yet being early darkness on the First Day of the week" or Saturday evening John 20:1,2. Mary therefore expected the guard on duty still, but found them GONE when she saw the stone rolled away from the tomb and no sign or word of a guard. That Mary expected the guard on duty still – as would a Roman guard their day only ending at midnight – explains why she came on her own and without her spices— she would not be allowed by the guard near or to enter into the tomb to do anything. She also knew very well her adventure was risky; she would not put her women friends in danger by inviting them to accompany her as it were into the jaws of the lion. "Mary Magdalene came"— on her own ... "Mary SEES ..." NO GUARD, JUST "THE DOOR STONE ROLLED AWAY"!

Whatever the guard did BEFORE OR AFTER Mary had arrived at the grave "while yet being early darkness on the First Day of the week" or 'Saturday evening', is not written, and we may guess ourselves blue in the face, we will never know. That the guard must have deliberated among themselves after they had come by again and before they dispersed everyone into his or their own direction, is implicit in view of the seriousness of the tomb found opened and emptied without even their knowing; and their bewilderment about what to do about the situation next.

All further information about the guard is found in Matthew 28:11-15— the next (Sunday) morning; and there, it says "SOME of the guard / watch came into the city"— not all of them. The rest must have decided to go somewhere else or might have gone back to their barracks (in Pilate's palace) long before Sunday morning. After they had come by, each one it seems, decided for himself what for himself would be

the best thing to do. At least two of them seized the opportunity to make a little fortune out of the turn of events, and therefore waited for the right moment in time – early on Sunday morning after sunrise, to confront the high priests in the house of one of them.

So according to the information we find in Matthew, 15 hours of the guard's engagements between the Resurrection and the interview of some of them with the high priests, are unaccounted for.

According to Dr Walter, there were only three hours unaccounted for. And because only three hours instead of 15, "*Mark 16:9 should be read and understood to mean that Christ rose very early on Sunday Morning, the same Sunday morning those guards who were eyewitnessed to the earthquake, removal of the stone and empty tomb came to the city and told the elders "when" the women were also returning to the city to tell the disciples. No amount of mental gymnastics....*" Argument and findings are all based on assumption of things absent and which themselves need proof. (There is an English / Latin / legal expression for this kind of 'argument', but I cannot now remember it. Dr Walter's description in the meantime will have to do, "*mental gymnastics*".)

DW:

Your interpretation of Mark 16:9 is proven wrong by Matthew 28:11 as there is no way you can make Matthew 28:11 occur previous to Sunday morning as Matthew says it happened "when" the women left the tomb ...

GE:

Why would I need to "*make Matthew 28:11 occur previous to Sunday morning*"? I have all the while maintained *Matthew 28:11 occurs on Sunday morning* even later than you do! You have placed verse 11 occurring "*between 3 am and 6*

am”; I have placed it after sunrise! What are you talking, Dr Walter?! Like always you’re telling me what I maintain!

(Also, “*Matthew 28:11 ... happened*” not “*when*” the women left the tomb”; *Matthew 28:11 ‘occurred’* after the women had “*left the tomb*” and after “Jesus (had) met them on their way to tell the disciples”— and “just about when they were going / leaving” from where Jesus had met them.)

DW:

Your interpretation of Mark 16:9 is proven wrong by Matthew 28:11 as there is no way you can make Matthew 28:11 occur previous to Sunday morning as Matthew says it happened “when” the women left the tomb to go tell the disciples early that same Sunday morning:

8 And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word. 9 And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.

10 Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.

11 ¶ Now **when they were going**, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. 12 And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, **they gave large money unto the soldiers,**

13 Saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept.

Therefore Mark 16:9 should be read and understood to mean that Christ rose very early on Sunday Morning, the same Sunday morning those guards who were eyewitnessed to the earthquake, removal of the stone and empty tomb came to the city and told the elders “when” the women were also returning to the city to tell the disciples. No amount of mental gymnastics can make the eyewitness guards wait the rest of

Saturday afternoon, all Saturday night, after the women had come very early Sunday morning and then “when” they were returning to the city go tell their story to the chief priest? No, That would require STRANGE thinking indeed!

Case closed!

GE:

Dr Walter, you quote me as admitting to you being correct and I being wrong.

That is a first infringement on another’s integrity, because I in the above quote reacted to DHK; not to you, and that can and does make a world’s difference to logical deducement from and meaning of what I said.

A next bad manner of yours, is your old habit of telling me

what I ‘admit’ or do not ‘admit’ while you have no idea of what I ‘admit’ or do not ‘admit’. But you are like an iron post to a blunt axe; I can ask you how courteous or uncivilised, you just shrug off appeal.

Then guaranteed, you shall misquote me, and insult me for having said what you in fact are saying. Like right here!

I wrote in answer to DHK, “*Because you do not want the text to read, “Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene”;* you want it to read, “*Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene... ”*”.

You write, “*I am glad you admit this appearance to Mary was very early in the morning on the first day of the week it was that very same morning on the first day of the week the same women in the very same morning were returning from the tomb when the guards also were going to the city that very same Sunday morning.*”

Never mind the broader and bigger false comparison you make, and just look at the single words!

My words as of Mark's, "*Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene*". Exactly, word for word, words contained in the KJV of Mark 16:9— even to word-order.

Now your words that allegedly were my words, "...*appearance to Mary ... _VERY_ early in the morning on the first day of the week...*"— emphasis by GE. DO YOU see ... are you ABLE to see, Dr Walter ... do you REALISE Dr Walter, can you COMPREHEND, Dr Walter, do you have the BRAINS to read, Dr Walter, the word, YOU, inserted into what I quoted from the Scriptures?

Are you really a Christian Dr Walter? Because I very much doubt you are a Christian, Dr Walter, the way you give false witness in direct contravention of God's own Commandment for a Christian man, not to LIE?!

Why do I so rave over one little word?

For VERY good reason, that "very", is the very word that differentiates TWO, and DIFFERENT, indications of TWO, and DIFFERENT actual times-of-day, in THESE, TWO, specific instances, TWO, and DIFFERENT, actual times so to speak 'on the clock', THREE HOURS APART, TWO, and DIFFERENT time-indications WRITTEN DOWN for eternity so eternal as God's Word shall be eternal, the TWO, and DIFFERENT time-indications found in,

first,

the first in chronology as well as first in context indicative-of-time-statement in Mark 16:2, "*_VERY_ early in the morning on the first day of the week...*"; and

next,

the later in chronology as well as later in context indicative-of-time-statement in Mark 16:9, "*early the first day of the week...*"—

two, and different, ACTUAL, REAL, times so to speak 'on the clock', three hours apart, and, "WRITTEN" ... which Dr Walter does not, confuse, but intentionally — ever so

covertly ever so blatantly — IDENTIFIES and SINGULARIZE, thus making not only the two, and different, ACTUAL, REAL times, and time-descriptions, one-and-the-same time and time-description, but making one-and-the-same two, and different, actual, real, EVENTS – the events of THOSE, TWO, and DIFFERENT, actual and real times and faithful and true time-descriptions.

In a word, Dr Walter commits fraud; not just fraud, but fraud against the Scriptures-Word of God. So his fraud becomes fraud from against me, Mr Nobody, to fraud against the Scriptures, to fraud against Truth, to fraud committed against God.

Are you a Christian, Dr Walter? Because I can bring my message only to your senses if you are a Christian man, and it does not seem that I am able to bring anything to your senses.

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=15>

All the discrepancies are MANUFACTURED by your chosen LABELS over your cut and paste peicemeal quotes and twisting of terms.

There is no discrepancy of TIME between Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-2 except for what is MANUFACTURED by Gerard.

Mt. 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.

Mrk 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.
2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

Both say the sabbath ended and what follows the end of the Sabbath day is the first day of the week. So also, the early morning on the first day of the week comes after the Sabbath has ended. Matthew uses the term “dawn toward” which translates a Greek word that literally means “growing of light” whereas Mark says “at the rising of the sun” when the “growing of light” occurs.

GE:

Not so. Matthew uses the words “in the mid-afternoon”, ‘tehi epiphoskousehi’ as in Luke 23:54 for “mid-afternoon before the Sabbath”; not “...as Mark says “at the rising of the sun” when the “growing of light” occurs”— “anateilantos tou hehliou’ “in Mark 16:2” (like ‘diaphoskoh’ in the LXX).

DW:

Matthew uses the term “dawn toward” which translates a Greek word that literally means “growing of light” whereas Mark says “at the rising of the sun” when the “growing of light” occurs.

Absolute proof they are the SAME TIME event is that Matthew says they came to “see” the suplchre and Mark says they were wondering how the stone would be rolled away:

Mark 16:3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?
4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great.

If Matthew 28:1 occurred when Gerard says, late afternoon on the Sabbath day AFTER the resurrection then they would have seen already that the stone had been rolled away and never need to ask this question in Mark 16:3-4 on Sunday morning and yet Mark 16:3-4 demands this was their first trip to the tomb as they were still wondering how the stone would be moved. Hence, they are one and the same visit

early Sunday morning at the rising of the Sun when they arrived.

Moreover, Greek scholars are divided over the meaning of “in the end” of the Sabbath. Some say it is a common expression to mean “going out of the Sabbath” or after the Sabbath has ended (Lightfoot, Broadus) while others take Gerards view. However, the facts of the immediate context prove that Gerard and A.T. Robertson are wrong on the meaning of the term and Lightfoot and Broadus are correct.

GE:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1708330#post1708330>

Dr Walter, just one, civilised, fair, request,
Gives us the statements of Lightfoot and Broadus, here,
and supply us the sources of your quotes?

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1708342&posted=1#post1708342> 06:36 PM

Dr Walter, Are the following, “*correct*”, or, “*wrong*”?
 “opse” - late on / late in / ripe / slow hours / ending
 “sabbatohn” - Sabbath's / sabbath's-time / of the sabbath
 / sabbathly / belonging to the sabbath
 “tehi” - in the / with the / by the
 “epi” - middle / centre / in essence / very / precise /
 emphatic / strong / superior / over / on / onto / down upon / in /
 with / inclining in direction of
 “phohs” - light / day / daylight / brightness / shining
 “ousehs > ousehi - being / is / in the being / while being /
 for being : something Feminine Gender grammatically, like
 'day' - “heh hehmera > hehmerai (by Ellipsis) sabbatohn”
 but being in the towards / in anticipation of / before /
 against / with the view to / prospective
 “eis” IN TERMS OF TIME - towards / in anticipation of
 / before / against / with the view to / prospective
 “mian” - first / first day -

but Accusative BECAUSE towards / in anticipation of / before / against / with the view to / prospective of, First Day?

Do you or Lightfoot or Broadus know of other secret meanings and or rules of words and grammar and syntax A.T. Robertson might not have known about that may explain WHY, Robertson is not “right”, and Lightfoot and Broadus, are not “right”

Re: Dr Walter, *“Artificial contradictions made by your cut and paste jerk out context presentation above. All of the above happened on the very same Sunday morning. Mark 16:1-8 is one narrative and John 20:11 and Matthe 28 do not contradict it.*

IT IS YOUR ARTIFICIAL CUT AND PASTE PRESENTATION THAT MAKE MATTHEW, MARK, JOHN AND LUKE LIARS.”

Typical Dr Walter!

He tells me what I did, that I presented contradictions. He tells me what I did, that I with cut and paste jerked out of context presentations from the Gospels, made up artificial contradictions.

I presented non-contradictory quotes from the Gospels, for the purpose of emphasising the reliability and trustworthiness of each and every Gospel anecdote on the different but never differing events and particulars of that night on the First Day of the week,

namely,

1)... the first glimpse of the opened tomb by Mary Magdalene “while still being early darkness”;

2)... the discovery of the emptied tomb by the women while they came to embalm the body of Jesus “deepest morning-of-night” just after midnight;

3)... certain women’s re-assessment-visit at about “3 am” “VERY early of before-sunrise-morning”, when they fled and told nobody anything;

4)... Mary Magdalene’s “stayed standing outside the tomb” ‘visit’, when Jesus approached her and appeared to her before anyone, “first”, sunrise by the time a gardener might begin his day’s work;

5)... and the visit on Sunday morning when the other women must have had returned to the grave a last time and the angel answered their questions on the events around the Resurrection “on the Sabbath Day” before, after which visit Jesus met them on their way to tell the disciples about the angel’s happy news— news about things they before could not have guessed or experienced but were “Answered = Informed = Enlightened” about first time by the angel on Sunday morning after sunrise.

Not a single contradiction copied or pasted from any Gospel, or contrived by myself! But Dr Walter accuses me of such fraud!

DW:

It was YOUR LABELS and YOUR DIVISIONS and YOUR EXPLANATIONS that present a false picture and I have proved it in the last two posts:

1. Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-2 must be the same event BECAUSE if Matthew 28:1-2 preceded Mark 16:1-2 as you demand then the women would never said what Mark reported them saying in Mark 16:3-4. Therefore, Mark 16:3-4 proves that

Mark 16:1-2 was their FIRST visit to the tomb.

2. Matthew 28:11 proves that Matthew 28:1-2 occurred early on Sunday morning rather than split between late Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning BECAUSE the eyewitness guards went to report what they say “when” the women in Matthew 28:2 went back to the city to report what they had seen - SUNDAY MORNING. Gerards contrived chronology would have us believe these eye witness guards would not have left the tomb late Saturday afternoon to report

what they saw, nor left Saturday night to report what they saw but waited until the next day to report what they saw. However, Matthew infers they had left the tomb to report what they just experienced on Sunday morning.

Mt. 28:8 And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word.

9 And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.

10 Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.

11 ¶ Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.

In addition to the timing problem encountered by Mark's comments in Mark 16:3-4 ...

GE:

Dr Walter accuses me of making artificial contradictions; but what does he do, here? He asserts there exists "*the timing problem encountered by Mark's comments in Mark 16:3-4*".

I am afraid, I do not encounter any *timing problem in, or, caused by, Mark's comments in Mark 16:3-4*.

In fact, I do not even encounter as much as a reference to time *in Mark's comments in Mark 16:3-4*. Not even implied or deduced or whatever—NONE!

So just who makes the timing problems encountered in this

discussion?!

DW:

In addition to the timing problem encountered by Mark's comments in Mark 16:3-4 proving that the women had not previously been to the tomb and thus Matthew 28:1-2 is the same event as Mark 16:1-2, Gerard has the additional

contextual difficulty that the same women who went to the tomb in Matthew 28:2 are the same women who left the tomb “when” the eyewitness guards also were on their way back to the city to report what they saw - stone rolled away, empty tomb, angels, earthquake or as Matthew says “all these things.”

Hence, this proves that the resurrection occurred very early Sunday morning in the dark between 3am and 6am before the women arrived at the tomb as the guards who had witnessed “all these things” did not leave the tomb SATURDAY AFTERNOON or SATURDAY NIGHT but only very early Sunday Morning only arriving to report “when” the women began to leave the tomb to go back to the city to give their report.

Hence, Gerard's whole contrived chronology is wrong! Mark 16:9 does mark the precise time when Christ arose - “proii” or between 3am to 6am very early Sunday morning before Mary Magdalene arrived at the tomb with the other women.[/QUOTE]

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=16>

The timing problem is not with Matthew but with YOUR theory and what Matthew states. Your theory states the resurrection occurred late Saturday afternoon but Matthew 28:2-4 with Mathew 28:11 prove otherwise! How?

It proves that resurrection occurred sometime after 3am on Sunday morning because the guards were reporting back to the city all the things they witnessed “when” the women were also returning to the city to report to the apostles. Both were going to the city on Sunday morning NOT LATE SATURDAY AFTERNOON or SATURDAY NIGHT.

The Bible does not say they were “dead” but rather became “AS” dead men. They were paid to say the body was stolen but that would be unnecessary unless they also reported

the tomb was empty!!!! Hence, they knew the tomb was empty and the body was not there.

GE:

And who is it who finds timing problems are “*proving*” anything constructive? Is it in the nature of encountered timing problems to prove “*the women had not previously been to the tomb*”? Or is it in the nature of encountered factual statements of ‘timing’ that it could be proved “*the women had not previously been to the tomb*”, such as, that not even Mary Magdalene, knew that the grave was opened? Or, such encountered factual statement as that the women came to the tomb, “bringing the spices which they had prepared with them”?

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=16>

Your attempting to ignore the evidence and misdirect the discussion. Mark 16:3-4 explicitly states that the EARLY SUNDAY MORNING SUNRISE TRIP entertained the discussion about moving the stone from the grave. IF as you believe, they had already been to the tomb on a previous visit on Saturday evening, which according to your theory the stone had already been removed then they would not be discussing how to remove the stone IF Mark 16:1-2 was not their first visit!!! Hence, your theory is wrong. Mark 16:1-2 is their FIRST visit to the tomb because they still believed the stone was in front of the tomb - thus they believed Christ was still in the tomb. Period!

GE:

How on earth can the TOTALLY IMAGINED “*additional contextual difficulty ... that the same women who went to the tomb in Matthew 28:2 are the same women who*

left the tomb “when” the eyewitness guards also were on their way back to the city ... prov(e) that the women had not previously been to the tomb and thus Matthew 28:1-2 is the same event as Mark 16:1-2”?!

Easy!

First,

By making it “Gerard’s”, “*additional contextual difficulty*”— Dr Walter’s full-prove proving of and proof for every additional contextual difficulty he had to face himself because of his own one-only-visit- approach and –proof.

Pass the buck! As easy as that.

Next,

By fabricating and presenting another of Dr Walter’s “*closed*”, proven and sealed selections of non-facts, here, quote, “...*the same women who went to the tomb in Matthew 28:2 are the same women who left the tomb “when” the eyewitness guards also were on their way back to the city to report what they saw - stone rolled away, empty tomb, angels, earthquake or as Matthew says “all these things.”*”

I say, selection of non-facts. That means, a selection of lies, as if the more lies like sticks bound together, the better the chance one might start blossoming and bear fruits of yet more lies. The lies-blossoming stick will certainly be the one called ‘*Eyewitness guards-Gibbet*’. His off-spring are called ‘*The same women- Forked Stick*’ and ‘*16:1-2 > 3-4 > 28:1-2 Rod*’.

Matthew does NOT “say”, “*all these things*”, and Matthew does NOT “say”, “*all these things*” as were it *Mark 16:1-2 = 3-4 = Matthew 28:1-2 = ‘The same women’*, even the “*stone (seen) rolled away*”.

DW:

Mt. 28:11 ¶ Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.

Now, what does Matthew in the above verse state that the

some of the watch “SHEWED” unto the priests? “ALL THINGS THAT WERE DONE”!

What was the response of the chief priest to being SHEWED...ALL THINGS THAT WERE DONE??? It was to pay them to say the body had been stolen! Why pay them to say that unless part of the “ALL THINGS” shewed was that they witnessed an EMPTY tomb????????!!!!!!!

GE:

“All these things that happened” were ONLY those things the guards actually saw, and they **actually saw NOTHING** because they were instantaneously “struck down unconscious convulsing like dead men” by the brilliance of the descending angel’s appearance.

DW:

“NOTHING” - really? Then why pay them to say his disciples stole the body if they did not report that the tomb was empty???????????

The text does not say they were dead!!!! It says that they became “AS” dead - meaning they could not move not that they could not hear and see what they reported.

GE:

(Dr Walter tells us the guard was “*scared*”— so that they “*ran*”. Matthew, how could you!?)

Neither saw the women anything that happened according to “*Matthew 28:1-2*”, because “the angel ANSWERED” them on their enquiry into the events of the Resurrection, about the things specifically “INFORMED” them “of the Sabbath Day” before.

DW:

IF as you claim the women had ALREADY been to the tomb Saturday Evening AFTER the resurrection occurred late Saturday afternoon, they knew the tomb was empty (Mt. 28:4-5) and Christ was not there and therefore Mark 16:1-2 could not have been a SECOND or ANOTHER visit to the tomb since in Mark 16:3-4 they were still discussing who would move the stone. Hence, Mark 16:1-4 is their FIRST VISIT believing the stone was still covering the tomb and Christ was still in the tomb. It is just that simple.

Stop avoiding the issues and deal frankly with the evidence!!!

GE:

No Dr Walter, YOU, stop telling things I said which I did not say!

I do NOT “*claim the women had ALREADY been to the tomb*”, I claim just what John says, that Mary Magdalene – alone – “*had ALREADY been to the tomb Saturday Evening AFTER the resurrection occurred late Saturday afternoon.*”

I do NOT “*claim the women ... knew the tomb was empty (Mt. 28:4-5) and Christ was not there*”! I claim just what John says, that Mary “sees the stone away from the grave”. Time and again before have I stated that that implies that Mary did not enter the tomb, and did NOT know whether the body was still in it or not. Why don’t you refer to this also? Time and again before have I stated that in Luke’s story the women – identified in verse 10 – still thinking the body must be in the tomb still, came with their spices, ready to salve the body. Why do you not mention it?

For exactly these indubitable FACTS and inferences, it is IMPOSSIBLE Mark 16:1-2 could be “*the SAME*” or “*their FIRST VISIT*” or only visit to the tomb for your supposed reason “*in Mark 16:3-4 they were still discussing who would*

move the stone". There is no indication the women were "*still discussing who would move the stone*".

Mark states the (three) women "came unto the sepulchre" verse 2b, and **THEN**, they asked their '**DELIBERATIVE** question' – a question of uncertainty "**asking for information**"— a "rhetorical question taking the place of a direct **ASSERTION**". Burton, 'NT moods and Tenses', 36.

Hence, Mark 16:1-4 is ascertaining and **ASSERTING** the stone was "cast away and upwards (topographically) from the opening of the tomb". Verse 3b.

DW:

1. The resurrection occurred sometime after 3am Sunday morning as the guard left the scene the same morning to report back to the city the same morning "when" the women left the scene to report back to the city. The guards left the scene first and then the women left - Mt. 28:4-11

2. Mark 16:1-2 must refer to the **FIRST** visit by the women to the tomb as they still believed Christ was still in the tomb and the stone still in front of the door of the tomb (Mk. 16:3-4) and therefore Matthew 28:1-11 is the same visit as Mark 16:1-4.

GE:

"All these things that happened" in Matthew 28:11 in **NO** manner whatsoever '*prove*' anything "that happened" ...

... in Matthew 28:1 "on **SABBATH'S** mid-afternoon BEFORE the First Day of the week";

or, '*prove*' anything "that happened" ...

... between from Mark 16:1 "after the Sabbath" and John 20:1 "while still early darkness on the First Day" Saturday evening until John 20:15 **SUNRISE**;

or, '*prove*' anything "that happened" ...

... from and including Luke 24:1-10 after midnight

“deepest morning-of-night” until Mark 16:2 to 9
 “very early before-sunrise on the First Day of the week”;
 or, ‘*prove*’ anything “that happened” ...
 ... in Matthew 28:10, **AFTER** sunrise.
 “All these things that happened” in Matthew 28:11, does
 NOT “*prove*” the things that happened, happened ...
 ... with or to “all the women”; happened ...
 ... at only one visit of “all the women”; happened ...
 ... at once during between “3 am” and “6 am”; happened
 ... when Christ also first appeared to Mary Magdalene;
 or
 ... happened ...
 ... as the guards looked on, on “all these things that
 happened” happening; and
 “*also were on their way back to the city to report what
 they saw -*”—
 which is what you, Dr Walter, claim the guard’s
 reference, “all the things that happened”, “*proves*”.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1707277&posted=1#post1707277>

Dr. Walter:

The guards who actually saw the stone rolled back, felt
 the earth quake, witnessed and empty tomb fled the site and
 reported “all these things” back to the city the same time
 “when” the women were returning to the city (Mt. 28:8-11).
 Hence, the resurrection occurred after 3am in the fourth watch
 of the night just before the women came to the tomb as the
 women were fleeing the tomb back to the city the same time
 “when” the eyewitness guards where reporting back to the city
 - ON SUNDAY MORNING

The truth is that the other women fled but Mary stayed
 behind at the Garden seeking the whereabouts of her Lord
 while the other women fled. After appearing to Mary the Lord
 then intercepted the women in their flight and reaffirmed what
 the angels had commanded them and told them.

GE:

Explain :

What is “*precise*”, about “*the precise time when Christ arose - “proii” or between 3am to 6am very early Sunday morning*”?

“...*the resurrection occurred after 3am*”, “*or between 3am to 6am*”, but Jesus rose AND appeared “... *between 3am to 6am very early Sunday morning*”?

Don't have words or time, meaning for you?

... o what's the diffs, “*3am*”, “*6am*”, it's “*very early Sunday morning*”?

How, according to you, Jesus appeared to Mary first, after the guards were the eyewitnesses of his resurrection?

Dr Walter also had to say, “*The guards were those on watch*”

WHEN the earthquake occurred and when the stone was rolled away the tomb and therefore when Christ arose from out of the grave.” Explain, How the guard “*actually saw the stone rolled back*” but they “*witnessed an empty tomb*”? Did Christ rise before he rose?!

Explain,

How the guard was struck down like dead men, yet they “*fled the site*”? Borne on chariots of fire?!

How the guard was struck down like dead men, yet they “*reported “all these things” back*”? Dead men do tell tales?!

How the guard claimed they slept while they “*the same time “when” the women were returning*”, “*reported back to the city*”? The guards trusting fearing Jews and women knowing better? Deceit, deceit's only trust!

How we, “*hence*” – i.e., from the guard's alleged “*actually (seeing) the stone rolled back*” –, know,

“*the resurrection occurred after 3am*”?

“*the resurrection occurred ... just before the women came to the tomb*” ...?

But we from the fact Matthew actually recorded NOTHING of the sort, as well as from the guard's having been "struck down convulsing like dead men unconscious", dare not know the guard actually "*saw*" NOTHING, "*felt*" NOTHING, "*witnessed*" NOTHING, and "*fled*", NOWHERE?!

The art of lying is a crafty art.

So, certainly "*the guards reported back to the city - ON SUNDAY MORNING*".

Who denied it?

And yes, "*the truth is that the other women fled but Mary stayed behind*" John 20:11 and Mark 16:8— but *stayed behind* at the tomb right next to its door-opening, weeping— not "*at the Garden seeking the whereabouts of her Lord*".

And not "*while the other women fled*", but some three hours after "Mary Magdalene had had stood after", 'heistehkei' Plusquam Perfectum.

Also yes, "*After appearing to Mary the Lord then*" a little later "suddenly met" the other women. But He did not "*intercept*" them, "*in their flight*" from the tomb of about three hours earlier Mark 16:8.

Nor did He "*reaffirme... what the angels had commanded them and told them*", but He confirmed *what the angels had commanded them and told them* by having met them in Person, The-Risen.

Just like He did a little while ago when He "appeared to Mary Magdalene first, The-Risen."

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=71766&page=16>

Your questions are irrational. Matthew 28:11 explicitly tells you that they reported "all things" they had witnessed - your argument is with Matthew not me.

GE:

I have no argument with Matthew, because 28:11 *“explicitly tells you that they reported “all things” they had witnessed*”, that is, *““all things” they had witnessed*”; no thing they had not witnessed nor had the faintest idea of.

I love the Greek language here; it is a language of such powerful grammatical functionality! Everything that happened in Matthew 28:1-4, happened as the implications of a single Participle!

The single propelling force of all earthly “things that happened”, was “the angel of the Lord and the “brilliance of his appearance DESCENDING from heaven” – the very same causal power that set off the great earthquake, cast away the door-stone, struck down like dead the guard, and stopped the Marys in their tracks and plans.

After— no, AT— no! BEFORE the “brilliance of his (the angel’s) appearance DESCENDING from heaven” – which is, “FROM the fear – killing fear of him” (‘apo tou phobou autou’), until they came by again, the guards KNEW NOTHING of “all the things that happened”. That’s for you, Dr Walter, to argue with Matthew; not me.

After they had regained consciousness, the guards must have decided what was next for them to do, in view of an opened, and empty grave they had no inkling about how it happened.

Not all the guards agreed... “some of the guard” only, were clever enough to see opportunity when opportunity arrives. “All the things that happened” – “some of the guards” fully realised – had certain worth for the Jews, who believed ‘geld wat stom is, maak reg wat krom is’, dumb money keeps silence.

The guard showed arrogance. They “reported” nothing as if called to account. They were the aggressors. The guard themselves decided to “SHOW the chief priests”, right in their hiding haunt, a thing or two— **“Having happened all things”**

considering, what was it worth? “**What was done**”? What was reached?! (Cynically in their sleeve... your pockets, mates!) You landed up with an opened and empty tomb, my Jew boys; your plans were worth, sultsch! What’s OUR WITNESS worth to you? We have the knife at the haft; we hold the cards. (“Having happened all things” considering, the guards could incriminate the priests of having committed treason; but far worse for the rulers of the Jews, would be to save face before their own people.)

The high priests capitulated, “Say you, his disciples came by night and stole him away ...” and we give you large sum of money, OK?

Not a single word of truth in all the underhanded dealings between them Jews and cocky conscripts most probably themselves clever Jew boys from the local populace! And all questions and answers “*irrational*”, based on the witness of witnesses unscrupulous, and as ignorant the one as the other, of events that happened in the world of reality and truth during Jesus’ resurrection.

DW:

You tell me why the High preists paid them to say their disciples stole the body if the guards had not seen the tomb was empty????

GE:

Please Doctor, Do not tell me I said “*the guards had not seen the tomb was empty*”. I’m not a fool!

DW:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1708292&posted=1#post1708292>

Neither the guards or the priests are responsible for recording Matthew 28:11 but the Holy Spirit did through Matthew. They reported an empty tomb and that is sufficient enough!

They were not knocked out or unconscious but were still present when the women happened upon the tomb as well both seeing the tomb was empty:

4 And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. 5 And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified.

Furthermore, both the women and “some” of these guards went back to the city (v. 11) and both went to the city on SUNDAY MORNING, not Saturday afternoon, or Saturday evening.

There is no Biblical evidence they were knocked out, or unconscious. Indeed, they were very conscious as they were in “fear” of what they saw.

And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.

You tell me why the High preists paid them to say their disciples stole the body if the guards had not seen the tomb was empty????

They were told to report they slept at the time of the incident.

You are just doing a tap dance to avoid the problems placed before you! Just simply be honest enough to admit your wrong.

GE:

Re: DW, *“The guards conveyed to the priests what happened at the grave and these guards were bribed to tell a different story then what they were EYE WITNESSES of!”*

The guards and Jews didn’t agree that the guards must “spread the story” about anything that really happened “mid-afternoon on the Sabbath Day” before. They could not because they knew not because they saw not. They would tell only what they really knew because they had really seen it, and because it could not be denied by anyone in the world because

it was there for everyone to see. So the guard would tell what they already knew and everyone else soon would learn to know, **only, that the tomb was opened and empty.**

The guards were unable to know anything more because they saw no more. They did not even see any of the smaller things which Peter and John had noticed. When the guard came by again, they must have received the fright of their lives, and didn't bother to pay attention to anything but their own safety now. So, they could tell what they really were eyewitnesses of and no more— **EXCEPT what could not be denied by anyone in the world because nobody was there to see for himself.**

How would the guard get away with their story? Exactly by knowing the first question from anyone to them, would be, But how is that possible? Were you not on duty, guards? Were you sleeping on duty, guards?

The Romans and the Jews saw their gap— nobody else actually saw, so nobody else could ever deny. And they decided to lie about something no one would be able to prove them liars, and both the guards and the priests would save face.

THEY LIED:

Yes, we slept! Of course, after duty; what do you think, we would sleep on duty? We finished our watch, the whole of Saturday, from we were stationed on Saturday morning (Matthew 27:62), until midnight last night when Saturday and our watch **expired!** We deserved our little nap, “those” who liked to, and didn't leave there and then after they had come by again. No one can accuse them, and they would certainly never admit to have slept on duty! We slept, yes, and “while we slept, his disciples came by night and stole him!”— “while we slept”, in our rights!

The LIE, put into their mouths by the two scared to life high priests Annas and Caiaphas, in the high priest's private palace, PAID OFF with “large money” in the pockets of

“some of the guard” who dared challenge the cowards. And they delectably went their way. They scored; the rest of the guard gained nothing, but also, lost nothing.

And that explains why, first, “it being early darkness still, comes Mary Magdalene and sees the stone taken away from the tomb” John 20:1, seeing nothing else but a deserted place!

And why, also, in Luke 24 the women, see verse 10, Saturday night “deep(est) morning on the First Day of the week came unto the sepulchre bringing the spices which they had prepared”.

They came THEN, because by midnight they knew, the Roman guard’s watch would be over, and they would be permitted

into the sepulchre.

And they CAME then at all and despite Mary Magdalene’s suspicion after her first sight of the removed door stone that “They have taken away the Lord’s body out of the grave”, because they must have thought Jesus’ body was in the grave STILL, or, if not still in the grave, Mary might have been right that the guard may have moved the body to another place. The only way to find out for sure, was to go to the grave and find out right inside.

Now this lie that the guard slept while the disciples came and stole Jesus’ body “in night-time”, spread around among unbelievers to this day, confirms something else that even believers, to this day do not understand, and when they understand, usually deny non the less because they believe a Sunday resurrection.

It is this TRUTH the REAL “deceivers” the JEWS, perfectly realising, witnessed to “on the morning after The Preparation” : the TRUTH, “after three days I will rise again ... Command THEREFORE that the sepulchre be made sure **until THE THIRD DAY is over....**”

“The morning after The Preparation” is “On the Sabbath

Day”; and the Sabbath Day the morning after The Preparation was “THE THIRD DAY”, both “according to the Scriptures” and the assurance of Jesus Christ HIMSELF.

Which is why Matthew in 28:1f, UNINTERRUPTEDLY CONTINUES with this real history of THIS VERY one and only Sabbath Day in the history of Jesus Christ,

“DESPITE (‘de’), the sealing and the guarding of the sepulchre that morning after The Preparation, “**SABBATH’S**, there was a great earthquake”, and God raised Christ from the dead by the exceeding greatness of the power of his resurrection.

DHK:

Quote: Originally Posted by Gerhard Ebersoehn, <DESPITE (‘de’), the sealing and the guarding of the sepulchre that morning after The Preparation, “**SABBATH’S**, there was a great earthquake”, and God raised Christ from the dead by the exceeding greatness of the power of his resurrection.>

With this entire argument, and all that you say, you cannot get past that one verse: Mark 16:9. Just that one verse defeats all that you say. Jesus rose on the first day of the week. It is clear. It is plain. It is easily interpreted. It cannot be denied.

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)

Now when he had risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. (Mark 16:9) WEB

Now when he had risen very early, the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary of Magdala, out of whom he had cast seven demons. (Mark 16:9) Darby

GE:

No, dear DHK, EVEN were it true what you suppose!
 Because there is the rest of the whole Bible that contradicts your 'version' of the text in Mark 16:9 ... the rest of the whole Bible that in so MANY Scriptures, demand a “Sabbath's-time” Resurrection of the Creator-Saviour of the world.

The FAULT is with you and so many Sunday-resurrection believers, who, DHK, JUST LIKE YOU DO, PUT, an Indicative, Finite, Predicative VERB - a direct action-word - where the TEXT, has an adjectival and substantivisable so to speak, PARTICIPLE! “He The Resurrected (Jesus) appeared ...” “He appeared to Mary, risen”; or, “He appeared to Mary, The Risen”; or, according to the KJV, “Now when he (Jesus) was risen”.

I have shown it from the literal words and syntax and idiom and truest of CHARACTER of the Greek language, how many times now, but you all discard and disown REGARDLESS!

Now I am just as sure of my case when you reach for your Bible to quote me the quotes you made above; for I also know a little about the English language, and that is, to tell you, this, the following words KJV, Mark 16:9, “now when Jesus was risen”, is NO Verb!

And I know you, DHK, well enough, to know that you know it too, as well as if not better than I, a Boertjie, ever could know it. YOU, DHK, and Dr Walter, KNOW before your soul (as we say in Afrikaans, 'voor julle siel'), this WHOLE PHRASE - yes! it's a PHRASE, NO, 'clause', because it - the whole group-of-words the PHRASE - does NOT contain a Verb - this whole phrase COMES FROM THE ONE WORD in the Greek, which is the word, the PARTICIPLE, “RISEN” - “anastas” Masculine Singular Past Perfect Tense in English to the equivalence of the Greek Constative Aorist, here functional as the ADJECTIVAL

SUBSTANTIVE or DESCRIPTIVE NOUN “The-Risen-One”, Jesus Christ, who “early on the First Day APPEARED to Mary, first.”

NOT, the only Verb or a Verb of more than one of the sentence, “He early APPEARED , risen to ...”, because the sentence or its main clause, has THIS, Verb, ONLY: “he APPEARED”.

DHK, Don't you remember the reference on Baptist Board to this Boertjie's “back bush rhetoric”? Well here you receive more of it, of which I am not ashamed in the least, and of which I before the best in the world of Greek scholarship, can, and do, give incorrigible and irreproachable account!

I presented non-contradictory quotes from the Gospels, for the purpose of emphasising the reliability and trustworthiness of each and every Gospel anecdote on the different but never differing events and particulars of that night on the First Day of the week,

namely,

1)... the first glimpse of the opened tomb “while still being early darkness”;

2)... the discovery of the emptied tomb by the women while they came to embalm the body of Jesus “deepest morning-of-night” just after midnight;

3)... certain women’s re-assessment-visit at about “3 am” “VERY early of before-sunrise-morning”, when they fled and told nobody anything;

Dr Walter:

If they had their first “glimpse” into the tomb Saturday evening they would have know the stone had been moved already but Mark 16:3-4 demonstrates that Mark 16:1-2 was their first visit as they were still discussing who would move the stone!!!!

GE:

4)... Mary Magdalene's "stayed standing outside the tomb" 'visit', when Jesus approached her and appeared to her before anyone, "first", sunrise by the time a gardener might begin his day's work;

Dr Walter:

If this was a "re-assessment-visit" as you imagine, then they would have already seen and known the stone had been moved but Mark 16:3-4 says at the time of their visit in Mark 16:1-2 they did not see or know the stone had been removed. Hence, Mark 16:1-2 and Matthew 28:1-2 are one and the same visit just with differing details.

GE:

Re: Dr Walter, *"If they had their first "glimpse" into the tomb Saturday evening ..."*

Not "*they ... their*", but Mary Magdalene ... her...!

NOT - definitely NOT, *"glimpse" into the tomb*!

Not once have I said this! This is Dr Walter telling GE what he said.

It was Mary Magdalene first and obviously VERY HASTY first 'glimpse' of the rolled-away-door-STONE and deserted, sepulchre. "She runs" - back - without having entered "into the tomb".

Now Mary runs to Peter and John and tells them her story, and after them, must have told the other women too just WHAT SHE HAD SEEN.

Now Luke who records the earliest and logically first actual visit of several women AT the tomb, and he says with these words of his, "And they FOUND the stone, rolled away from the sepulchre", EXACTLY as Mary Magdalene had observed according to John 20:1. In other words, They women saw CONFIRMED what Mary Magdalene must have had told them.

Then the women actually ENTERED “into the tomb” and for the first time discovered that it was not only opened, but was EMPTY! This discovery, or the news about this discovery, “SURPRISED” the disciples as 'breaking / first-time', news verse 22.

So what doubt can remain Luke recorded the first of any visit properly AT the tomb?

Dr Walter:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1708292&posted=1#post1708292>

They would have know the stone had been moved already but Mark 16:3-4 demonstrates that Mark 16:1-2 was their first visit as they were still discussing who would move the stone!!!!

GE:

“Mark 16:1-2” contains two totally different and separate events. It’s not necessary for me to say everything over again. Just read the texts again, Dr Walter!

“Mark 16:3-4” does NOT “demonstrate” that Mark 16:2-8, “*was their first visit*”; it proves it was a ‘follow-up’ visit. MANY things show it, and some of them, I have many times highlighted in CURRENT discussions here on Baptist Board.

You mention one of them; I shall react to it, briefly.

“... *they were still discussing who would move the stone!!!!*”

“They come to the tomb”, Present tense. Not, ‘they approached / they were approaching the tomb’. No, like in Luke, the same words, they came to the tomb deliberately, on purpose, AND THEY ARRIVED.

In Luke they wanted confirmed the expectation the grave was opened; they found what Mary had told them, confirmed. They came on purpose to also enter the tomb and see if the body of Jesus was still in the tomb, to see whether what Mary Magdalene feared, was true, that “they must have taken the

Lord away”, which they did not believe because they had brought their spices with and were ready to embalm the body they thought was still in the grave.

But they were disappointed in their expectation.

In Mark the women also “come”, their minds set to find answers to their questions! Urgently!

Mark 16:2-8 “... *was their first visit as they were still discussing who would move the stone!!!!*” In other words, a discussion between them, went on as they were coming, says Dr Walter. But Mark describes this as something the women, each, asked herself; as something in each of their minds. Not a discussion. The women all thought, “Who (on earth!) will (do something like this, and) roll the stone out of the door of the sepulchre for us?”

Their question, presupposes the known fact of the removed stone; it does not anticipate the stone's removal, They already – first hand – KNEW the stone had been removed.

So the text states the women already had been at the tomb when they thought about this – for them –, mystery. They did not all say the same thing while they were coming, but they may all, have thought, the same thing when they were still on their way— which is what Mark says, they did.

Mark uses the Past Present Tense; the women had already come upon (that is, right at) the tomb, and this question, “Who, for (the life of) us, would do something like this and removed the stone— it is far BIGGER than (we ever) expected?!” is a question of speechless wonder RIGHT AT THE OBJECT OF WONDERMENT. In Luke it was not the women’s PURPOSE to pay attention to the finer detail of the stone; they were happy to see what Mary had told them, was in fact so.

“And they looked, and looked again (‘anablepsasai’) and they SAW (‘theohrousin’) that the stone was (actually) rolled / hurled / cast UP and BACK away from the tomb! (‘anakekulistai’).”

Unbelievable! First the outside of the tomb; now its inside!

“They were exceedingly astonished (‘eksethambethehsan’) entering the tomb.” Even the angel’s clothing, is observed in “all-around / total whiteness” (‘peribehlehenon stolehn leukehn.) KJV, “_long_, garment”.

This ‘inspection-visit’, shows NEARER and CLEARER information and confirmation AFTER a visit that raised only questions - Luke; and the angels telling the women to go think about what Jesus had told them. The Markan visit shows the women were really struggling with the angel's advice.

With Mark’s visit, the women’s knowledge and insight improve. They still do not have all the answers , but their answers begin to evoke more question, that eventually answered, would explain everything --- the Matthew visit, 28:5-10.

But at this stage, the questions only increased the women’s confusion and fears, so that “They went out QUICKLY, and FLED from the sepulchre; for they trembled so astonished were they (by what they came to make sure of) that they told no one anything, for that was really how afraid they were.”

This is the end of Mark’s story, as recognised by just about every New Testament scholar.

What follows in verse 9, is Mark’s recollection of John’s story of Jesus' first appearance.

Verse 9 is NOT the continuation or the ending to Mark 16:2-8; it is not called “Mark’s second ending”, for nothing

Dr Walter:

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1708348&posted=1#post1708348>

This is a quote from Lightfoot on Mat.28.

It is found here:

http://philologos.org/_eb-jl/matt27.htm#twentyeight

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.

[*In the end of the sabbath.*] In the Jerusalem Talmudists it is *in the coming forth of the sabbath*; vulgarly, *in the going out of the sabbath*: *On a certain eve of the sabbath*, namely, when the sabbath began, “there was not wine to be found in all Samaria: but *at the end of the sabbath* there was found abundance, because the Aramites had brought it, and the Cuthites had received it”... [*Towards the first day of the week.*] The Jews reckon the days of the week thus; *One day* (or *the first day*) *of the sabbath*: *two* (or *the second day*) *of the sabbath*: “Two witnesses come and say, *The first of the sabbath* this man stole, &c., and, *on the second day of the sabbath*, judgment passed on him.”

The third of the sabbath: “A virgin is married on the fourth day of the week; for they provide for the feast *the first day of the week*. *The second day of the week*: and *the third day of the week*.” “*On the fourth day of the week* they set apart him who was to burn the red heifer.”

On the fifth of the sabbath. “Ezra ordained that they should read the law publicly on the second and fifth days of the sabbath, &c. He appointed that judges should sit in the cities on the second and fifth days. Ezra also appointed that they should wash their clothes *on the fifth day of the sabbath*.”

The sixth day they commonly called *the eve of the sabbath*: “To wash their clothes on the fifth day of the sabbath, and eat onions *on the eve of the sabbath*.” *On the fifth day of the sabbath* [*or week*], and *the eve of the sabbath*, and *the sabbath*.

The first day of the week, which is now changed into the sabbath or Lord's day, the Talmudists call *the Christians'*, or *the Christian day*: *On the Christians' day* it is always *forbidden* for a Jew to traffic with a Christian. Where the

Gloss saith thus: *A Nazarene or Christian* is he who followeth the error of the man who commanded them “*to make the first day of the week a festival day to him*: and according to the words of Ismael, it is always unlawful to traffic with them three days before that day and three days after; that is, not at all the week through.” We cannot here pass by the words of the Glossers on Babyl. *Rosh hashanah*; “The Baithusians desire that the first day of the Passover might be on the sabbath, so that the presenting of the sheaf might be on the first day of the week, and the feast of Pentecost on the first day of the week.”

With good reason did our blessed Saviour remove the sabbath to this day, the day of his resurrection, *the day which the Lord had made*, Psalm 118:24, when now *the stone which the builders refused was become the head stone of the corner*. For,

I. When Christ was to make a new world, or a new creation, it was necessary for him to make a new sabbath. The sabbath of the old creation was not proper for the new.

II. The kingdom of Christ took its beginning principally from the resurrection of Christ: when he had now overcome death and hell. (The Jews themselves confess that the kingdom of the Messiah was to begin with the resurrection of the dead, and the renewing of the world.) Therefore it was very proper that that day from which Christ's kingdom took its beginning should pass into the sabbath, rather than the old sabbath, the memorial of the creation.

III. That old sabbath was not instituted till after the giving the promise of Christ, Genesis 3:15; and the rest of God on that seventh day was chiefly in having perfected the new creation in Christ; that also was the sabbatical rest of Adam. When therefore that was accomplished which was then promised, namely, the bruising of the serpent's head by the resurrection of Christ, and that was fulfilled which was typified and represented in the old sabbath, namely, the

finishing of a new creation, the sabbath could not but justly be transferred to that day on which these things were done.

IV. It was necessary that the Christians should have a sabbath given them distinct from the sabbath of the Jews, that a Christian might be thereby distinguished from a Jew. For as the law took great care to provide that a Jew might be distinguished from a heathen; so it was provided by the gospel with the like care, that partly by the forsaking of those rites, partly by the bringing in of different manners and observances, a Christian might be distinguished from a Jew. The law was not more solicitous to mark out and separate a Jew from a heathen by circumcision than the gospel hath been that by the same circumcision a Christian should not Judaize. And the same care it hath deservedly taken about the sabbath: for since the Jews, among other marks of distinction, were made of a different colour, as it were, from all nations, by their keeping the sabbath, it was necessary, that by the bringing in of another sabbath (since of necessity a sabbath must be kept up), that Christians might be of a different colour from the Jews.

GE:

Thank you very much.

I haven't had a proper look, but at one glance could see the top quote **AGREES** with Robertson.

Re: Dr Walter, *“It was YOUR LABELS and YOUR DIVISIONS and YOUR EXPLANATIONS that present a false picture and I have proved it in the last two posts:*

1. Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-2 must be the same event BECAUSE if Matthew 28:1-2 preceded Mark 16:1-2 as you demand then the women would never said what Mark reported them saying in Mark 16:3-4. Therefore, Mark 16:3-4 proves that Mark 16:1-2 was their FIRST visit to the tomb.”

Again, it is Dr Walter telling GE what he said, what he never said. Anyhow ...

Mark's reference clearly being a rhetorical question of

comparison / estimation, “They asked themselves, WHO, would have rolled the stone away for us, it being so impossibly LARGE!?”, it could, it would certainly be, true, “... *the women would never (have) said what Mark reported them saying in Mark 16:3-4*”, “(BECAUSE) IF”, as you Dr Walter, “demand”, “Mark 16:1-2 ... preceded ... Matthew 28:1-2” in time.

DW:

This is not a rhetorical question but the expression of reality in their own minds of the difficulty that lay ahead of them that morning.

GE:

Refer Burton, above (p. 80).

DW:

This question proved they had not yet known the stone was rolled away and therefore had not yet SEEN the tomb previously in Matthew 28:1-2 as you suggest.

Mark 16:1-4 is precisely the SAME VISIT recorded in Matthew 28:1-2 but Mark gives us their thinking just preceding that SAME VISIT.

GE:

For only if Mark 16:2-8 > 3-4 preceded Matthew 28:1-2 < 1-4 in time, **would the women not have known** the grave had been opened already. But since Matthew 28:1-2 < 1-4 tells of the actual events that accompanied the Resurrection, “Mark 16:3-4” in time HAD to have FOLLOWED on Matthew 28:1-2 < 1-4 in time and timing or time-description.

DW:

What mental gymnastics!!!! No one is denying that Matthew 28:1-4 describes the actual events of the resurrection and no one is denying that BOTH are describing it from a

FUTURE perspective from the events. However, Mark 16:3-4 PROVES that they are describing the SAME visit simply because Mark's description proves they had not yet seen the OPEN grave and therefore according to Mark's chronology they had not PREVIOUSLY to Sunday Morning seen it as described by Matthew 28:1-4.

Mark explicitly DEFINES THE TIME of the visit to be SUNDAY MORNING and on their way to the tomb on SUNDAY MORNING they have not yet seen any tomb where the stone is rolled away and that is exactly why they are discussing what they believe in their own mind, due to their own experience thus far, to be a tomb still SEALED BY THE STONE. Hence, ABSOLUTE PROOF they had not been to any OPEN TOMB previously to SUNDAY MORNING.

GE:

Ja, Dr Walter *“Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-2 must be the same event BECAUSE if Matthew 28:1-2 preceded Mark 16:1-2 as you demand then the women would never said what Mark reported them saying in Mark 16:3-4.”* That – according to YOU – is saying, “16:1-2”, “preceded” “Matthew 28:1-2”! Also, *“Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-2 must be the same event”* ... say YOU! Then YOU say, *“Mark 16:3-4 proves that Mark 16:1-2 was their FIRST visit to the tomb.”* Then you try DENY what YOU yourself have said, as if I said foolish things, like that I am like YOU, not *“denying that BOTH are describing it from a FUTURE perspective from the events”*.

“Mark 16:3-4” in time HAD to have FOLLOWED on Matthew 28:1-2<1-4 in time and timing or time-description—so I am not *‘labelling or dividing to present a false picture’*; it all the time has been you, Dr Walter who with *“YOUR LABELS and YOUR DIVISIONS and YOUR EXPLANATIONS”*, *“present(ed) a false picture”*, and I have proved it in the above two sentences, <For only if Mark 16:2-

8>3-4 preceded Matthew 28:1-2<1-4 in time, **would the women not have known** the grave had been opened already. But since Matthew 28:1-2<1-4 tells of the actual events that accompanied the Resurrection, “*Mark 16:3-4*” in time HAD to have FOLLOWED>. And therefore, “*Matthew 28:1-2 and Mark 16:1-2*” were NOT “*the same event*”; nor did the women ask the question in Mark 16:3 because “... *Mark 16:1-2*” or “*Mark 16:3-4 ...*” was their *FIRST* visit to the tomb”, but they asked the question deliberating, rhetorically expressing their astonishment at the power the feat of the rolled away stone must have required.

DHK:

Here is the most important part of what Lightfoot says:
The first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, is the same as today's Sunday, which again is the same day that Christ arose from the dead. That is the summary of Lightfoot's teaching if you go back and read the full article.

GE:

That to DHK and Dr Walter undoubtedly is the most important part, however impertinent to the text, however.

I for one, do not attach any importance to this part of what Lightfoot says, although I have given more and proper attention to what Lightfoot's first principles of Bible-interpretation are than the two of you together, and I can prove that to you simply to refer you to my writing of twenty to thirty years ago...

DW:

You expect the readers to believe that Lightfoot is so stupid that he draws a conclusion contrary to the facts that he writes down for us to read?????? Lightfoot would have to be an absolute idiot to put these words into print if his conclusions were contrary. NO, he is drawing a conclusion

based upon the facts he presents and that conclusion utterly denies Saturday resurrectionism.

GE:

May I here inform you on Lightfoot's basic approach to 'God's' way for 'timing' the First Day as Christian day of worship in context of the passover just like we - or rather I - am trying to do in this thread.... After having concluded from the exodus that God placed Israel in the land of freedom and true life on the very Seventh Day Sabbath, Lightfoot applies his contrived 'principle' that God under the New Testament improved things one day in time forward and away from the actual day in history and prophecy.

That, gentlemen is not how I believe, and I am sorry ... sorry? No! grateful and proud to admit, I have no schooling or skill or aptitude in such higher wisdom. Because my Sabbath-believing back bush plaasboere parents brought me up in this foolishness, "as it is written" where the scholarship of the world has it "as it is written PLUS ONE DAY".

Thanks, but no thanks!

Retrospection and Parenthesis

Afternoon Friday Burial Day, day inclining west, with Mark concluding, "Joseph laid Him in a sepulchre and rolled... ['prosekúlisen'] ...a stone unto the door..."

...and in retrospective parenthesis, "...and Mary Magdalene and Mary of Joses beheld where He was laid." 15:4.

Matthew in 27:60,61 fills in a few more particulars. He tells the stone was "great", and that Joseph, after "having had rolled..." ['proskulísas'] it – downhill else it would be impossible for even two men – "...to the door of the tomb, he **went away from**... ['apehlthen'] ...the grave, and home...

...and in retrospective parenthesis, “... and there were Mary Magdalene and the **other**, Mary”— “Mary of Joses” in Mark. Matthew describes these two women, “sitting over against”, while they “looked” (Mark) down and into the tomb.

Luke has still more information. 23:53-56, On Friday late, mid-afternoon. “Joseph ... laid ... the body of Jesus ... in a sepulchre ... and That Day was The Preparation, and the Sabbath drew on...

...and the women also, **who came with Him from Galilee**, followed after (in procession to the tomb) and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. Then **they** returned and prepared spices and ointments; and began to rest the Sabbath day according to the Commandment.”

John 19:42, “There, therefore, laid they (Joseph and Nicodemus) (the body of) Jesus, due to the preparation-time of the Jews (having begun).”

Up to the Burial and down from it...

Nothing “is written” for nothing; even topography has its message for us.

The impression of a sloping landscape where the grave opened in the hill, is created in all the Gospels in different ways that every time implies a unique situation and circumstance...

... In Matthew and Mark, at the end of the Burial and day of Burial, Friday afternoon, the stone is rolled downwards into the opening;

... In Matthew, the women “sat, opposite the grave” – lower or higher.

... In Mark the women while the men laid Jesus’ body in the tomb, “looked” – down or up – , and into the tomb.

... In John 19:42, the distance up to the tomb must have been difficult, but fortunately, “the sepulchre was nigh”.

... In Luke, Joseph after he had taken the body “down”, and Pilate had it “delivered” (Matthew) “away” as Joseph

requested (John) that night, he (and Nicodemus) brought it back up again in the afternoon, to lay it down in the tomb that was in the garden where He was crucified (John).

... In Luke, the procession towards the tomb with the embalmed body, the women “following after” is as if with difficulty, uphill.

... In Luke, the women after the burial returned home, prepared spices and ointments, and began to rest the Sabbath Day. At their leisure...

Uphill arrivals to visits, and downhill returns...

...In John 20:1,2, Mary “comes”, to the grave – walking, uphill?

...In John 20:11f, where “Mary Magdalene had had stood after without at the sepulchre ... she stooped down and looked down into the sepulchre.”

...Of only Peter and John has it been recorded that they ran to the grave John 20:3-10. “And they believed...” it was **FIRST WORD THEY RECEIVED** Jesus had been buried! Returning to their homes, they just walked back, obviously exhausted from their uphill run towards the sepulchre.

...In Luke also with the women’s first visit, we see two angels confronting the women, standing higher up in front of the women as they came out of the grave in a bent over forward position.

...In Mark, the women, ascertaining evidence about the things the two angels at their after midnight hours visit (Luke 24) had told them to go and think about, “looked the stone up, re-inspecting” [‘anablepsasai’] it, and could clearly deduce it had despite its huge size, been “cast upwards” [‘anakekulistai’]. That’s why the women were puzzled, and thought by themselves, “Who would have rolled the stone away for us?!” Just to think what immense power was needed for such a feat, “astonished” and “frightened” them, “measurelessly” [‘eksethambethehsan’].

...In Mark, the women on “entering in ...”
[‘eiselthousai...’], went “... down into [‘...eis’] the tomb”.

...In Luke the women “came upon the tomb ... and going in, found not the body”.

...In John 20:11f, where “Mary Magdalene had had stood after without at the sepulchre ... she stooped down and looked down into the sepulchre.”

...In Matthew, the women do not even enter the tomb; the angel stood outside, and “answering, explained... [‘apokritheis ... eipen’] ...to the women the additional and new information about events “of the Sabbath Day” [‘sabbatohn’] before, verses 1 to 4.

Departure downhill:

... In John 20:1,2, Mary “runs” back – as if downhill.

... In Mark they “fled”, away from the tomb, but with real fear of disbelief. They ran from the sepulchre without effort, so, downhill.

... In John, “Mary comes, announcing ... I have seen the Lord...” doesn’t sound like she’s taking her time or was too tired to speak. No, she must have hurried, and hurriedly, she tells the news.

... In Matthew the women ran away from the tomb with joy and enthusiasm to share the news. The angel’s NEW information about the resurrection “In the Sabbath Day”, caused them suddenly to understand and believe everything!

The angel was STILL “explaining to the women...”, when, IN THE MIDDLE of his words to them, “... the keepers became as dead men, but don’t you, be afraid, because I know you are looking for Jesus who was crucified...” **he had to CALL after them**, “...Come, you must see [‘deute idete’] the place where He lay! But they already GOING, with anxious zeal and great joy, were gone from the sepulchre... [‘tachu poreutheisai’] ...and RAN to bring the disciples word!”

Mark's two stories, fused

It would certainly be true, "... *the women would never (have) said what Mark reported them saying in Mark 16:3-4*", "*IF*", as you Dr Walter, "*demand*", "*Mark 16:1-2 ... preceded ... Matthew 28:1-2*" in time, Mark's reference in 16:3,4 clearly being a rhetorical question of comparison / estimation, "They asked themselves, WHO, would have rolled the stone away for us, it being so impossibly LARGE to move!?" For only "*IF*" Mark 16:2-8>3-4 "*preceded*" Matthew 28:1-4 in time, **would the women not have known** the grave had been opened already. But since Matthew 28:1-4 tells of the actual events that accompanied the Resurrection and the women already had been informed about the opened tomb by Mary Magdalene, "*Mark 16:3-4*" in time HAD to have FOLLOWED on Matthew 28:1-2<1-4 in time and timing and time-description.

Two of the several more undisputable reasons that it was not "*all the women*" who together only once went to the grave, are contained,

First, John recorded that Mary "comes to Peter and the other disciple", John. Only Mary is subject of action in verses 1,2;

Next, Only the two disciples, on the news Mary had brought them, had afterwards gone to the tomb. John recorded that the two men immediately went to the tomb. The fact no women went with them, implies there were no other women who could go with.

While all this which John recorded – **Mary's discovery of the OPENED tomb** – happened during that night "on the First Day of the week" (Saturday night), it inevitably and consequently was the single only event that happened BEFORE ANYTHING ELSE, and triggered all subsequent actions and events of that night, until eventually next morning Jesus had "appeared, first to Mary Magdalene", and to '*all the*

women' other than Mary, after her, "early on the First Day of the week" John 20:11-17 Mark 16:9 Matthew 28:8-10 in that order of events, logic and chronology.

It is indisputable.

So, the question arises, If Mary and the two men by this time were the only people who knew the grave was opened, how is it that '*all the women*' named in Luke 24:10, the two Marys "and Joanna AND OTHERS" came to the tomb TOGETHER, Saturday night just after midnight "deep(est) morning ON THE First Day of the week"— apparently unperturbed by the opened tomb and rolled away door-stone?

ONLY IF Mary Magdalene had informed them before!

But it is written there, "THEY, came ... bringing their spices which they had prepared, AND certain others with them".

Who, were these women?! Clearly Luke distinguishes two GROUPS of women. Luke also uses the very basic Plural Verb; he uses no Pronoun, "they". Therefore the simplest deduction points to the women mentioned nearest in context before, "the women who came with Him from Galilee", 23:55, "came to the tomb" 24:1.

Who were they?

They were the women present when the grave was closed, obviously. But in his burial anecdote, Luke did not give their names. Mark and Matthew though, did give the names of TWO women at the Burial, Mary Magdalene, and "the other Mary"— Matthew 27:61, or "Mary of Joses"— Mark 15:47.

These two women from the Burial then, were also in the group who according to Luke came to the tomb. Luke confirms in verse 10, "It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary of James", the "James" in Mark 16:1, the "Joses" in Mark 15:47. Joanna could be Salome, perhaps? We don't know, but it is not impossible Joanna had another name, "Salome", by which name Mark mentions her in 16:1.

Therefore “they” in Luke 24:1 were the THREE “women who came with Jesus from Galilee” – 23:55 – “where they served Him”.

Only TWO of these three, however, the two Marys, were AT THE BURIAL.

There “came to the tomb”, therefore, these three women, “...and others with them ...”, says Luke. But we can’t say who the other women besides the three who accompanied Jesus from Galilee, were.

We followed Mary Magdalene from John 20:1 when she was the first to see the stone was rolled away from the tomb. And we saw her in Luke’s story, accompanied by her two Galilean co-workers and still more other women, just after midnight turn up with the spices she had prepared on Friday afternoon after Joseph had closed the same door stone she had seen rolled away from the grave opening. And we concluded from these two visits of Mary Magdalene to the tomb, that she must have told the other women of what she had seen, and had planned to do, despite all the uncertainties for them at that stage in events.

We concluded that Mary’s sight of the opened tomb set in motion all following events of the Saturday night, that from Peter and John, Mary Magdalene must first of all have told her closest friends, “the other Mary” and Salome maybe Joanna who came with her and Jesus from Galilee where they used to serve Him.

Mary Magdalene had all sorts of bad feelings and suspicions; but in her heart she believed Jesus’ body was still in the tomb, and she desired to salve him farewell. She and the Mary of James had had their spices and ointments prepared on Friday afternoon already. But now Salome also got involved, and she would also wish to pay her last respects. “Therefore the Sabbath Day being past” the three of them “bought sweet spices, SO THAT, WHEN they would come, they could anoint him.”

Their whole PURPOSE was to anoint Jesus' body in the grave. Mark 16:1 leaves the prospect in suspense. Do we find the women anointing or prepared to anoint the body, in Mark's story in verses 2 to 8? No! But we do read the women coming "to the tomb BRINGING THEIR SPICES WHICH THEY HAD PREPARED AND READY, WITH" in Luke's account!

The women bought spices to anoint a body that wasn't even there! They MIGHT have anointed Him but they had not; they could not. Using the Subjunctive, Mark in Mark 16:1 PRESUPPOSES a visit, the disappointment it turned out to be, forbidding its mention!

Luke tells how bemused the women returned from that futile undertaking. Mark rather eludes it altogether, alluding to its relation to reality only by implication evoked by the Subjunctive Mood. Mark by using the Subjunctive in 16:1 actually skips the first visit at which the women discovered the tomb was empty, and only in his narrative in 16:2-8 – a follow-up visit – lets them ask questions and make conclusions, such as about the positioning of the stone and topography— all evidences of, but not the first visit itself.

Day of Interment – 'BONE-Day'

Yes, nothing "is written" for nothing!

It also was not written for nothing that the sabbath-Feast Day of passover was called the "In-the-Bone-of-Day day", of the passover.

"Neither shall ye brake ['shabar'] a bone thereof"
Exodus 12:46

"They shall leave none of it ... nor break any bone of it."
Numbers 9:12.

"A Bruised Reed shall He not break." Isaiah 42:3.

"I have broken thy yoke." Jeremiah 2:20.

"I have broken the bands of thy yoke." Ezekiel 34:27.

“I will break his yoke from off thee.” Nahum 1: 13.

“How is the hammer broken?” Jeremiah 50:23.

“I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which as driven away, and will bind up that which was broken.” Ezekiel 34:16.

“Withered boughs shall be broken off.” Isaiah 27:11.

“The horn of Moab is cut off, and his arm is broken.” Jeremiah 48:25.

Instead of having been taken from the cross and cut into pieces and cast into Gehenna like the other two crucified, no bone of Jesus was either broken or severed from the body, just like the passover lamb was roasted “IN-THE-BONE” : IN WHOLE AND IN ONE, and “that which remained of it” in WHOLE and in ONE – “IN-THE-BONE” –, was “REMOVED FROM” Egypt and burned in the desert. “Leave none nor break any bone of it.” Numbers 9:12. Also Joseph’s bones were all of them taken with Israel and out of Egypt. Exodus 13:19. So the WHOLE of “That Day”, in its ‘_FULL_’ [‘geh-tzem’] God-given eschatological meaning and duration, “The-In-the-Bone-of-day Day”.

Youngs—

‘Etsem’ – 104 x ‘bone’;

‘Etsem’ – 16 x ‘same DAY’ / ‘selfsame DAY’,

‘Bone’ in connection with ‘day’, 6 times—

6 times in references to the fifteenth day of the First Month passover sabbath, Exodus 12:46; 13:19,19 Numbers 9:12 Josua 24:32 Psalm 34:20

Wigram’s—

Geh’-tzem גֶּחַצֵּם ‘bone’,

7 out of 16 times the fifteenth day of the First Month passover sabbath, Exodus 12:17,41,51 Leviticus 23:14 Deuteronomy 32:47,48 Joshua 5:11;

3 out of 16 times Day of Atonement, Leviticus 32:27-30;

2 out of 16 times Shavuot Leviticus 23:21 Exodus 24:10.

12 out of 16 for a ‘middle-sabbath’ [‘metaksu sabbaton’].

The fifteenth day of the First Month is passover “sabbath” IN VERSES 6-9, and is referred BACK TO in 11b and 15a. The first sheaf was both reaped / harvested and brought and waved / offered ON SIXTEENTH Abib whatever day of the week it was, whatever day of the week came before it or whatever day of the week followed after it. Except for the two referrals to the previous day’s PASSOVER-“sabbath”, verses 10-20 entirely are devoted to ”First Sheaf Wave Offering-day” and 49 more days to The Fiftieth Day / ‘Pentecost’— its descriptions and prescriptions. Because ”First Sheaf Wave Offering-day” was “the day AFTER the (passover) sabbath day”. The passover “sabbath” itself, or fifteenth day of the First Month however, was the day described, and for prescribed, and with finished, in verses 6-9 and summarised in verse 21.

Now I have tried with my zero knowledge of Hebrew to puzzle out how, in the single case Leviticus 23:14 where ‘selfsame day’ [‘yom hee-zeh’] is used with “that very” [‘ad’] , the “day AFTER the (passover) sabbath” is meant, and not the passover “sabbath” referred to in verse 11b and 15a, itself. “That very [‘ad’] selfsame day [‘yom hee-zeh’]” is the SIXTEENTH day of the First Month “AFTER the (passover) sabbath” and fifteenth day of the First Month. These idiomatic demonstrative and pronominal Hebrew words and word-combinations serve to make this distinction, CLEAR, even to the mind of one without any knowledge of Hebrew. Only problem is, such ignorant people like myself, do not receive the detail in their own language. They must be showed these details. They don’t need explanation of them; they only need the real facts on the pages.

The passover ‘sabbath’ of fifteen Abib is characterized by unique and specifically ‘passover’ attributes as a passover-day in its own right. But never is its characterisation

illustrated, opened up, or laid bare before the eyes of believers for the truth of the Word of God it is. Has anyone of you ever heard ‘Nisan 15’ called by its most distinctive name in the entire Bible, ‘The Bone-Day’ / ‘The In-the-Bone-of-day Day’ of the passover?

Anyone?

No?

No!

Well, how is it possible?

It is inevitable NO ONE COULD imagine ‘Nisan 15’ is “The Bone-Day” because Christianity REDUCED Nisan the passover DAY-OF-INTERMENT, to the last few if any minutes of Nisan 14, passover SACRIFICE-DAY!

Now the essential meaning of being “in-the-bone”, is, ‘being-in-whole’!

I have always thought the Scriptures that prophesied no bone of Christ would be ‘broken’, meant no bone of his would be ‘crushed’ or ‘shattered’ or ‘broken’, like is popularly believed, the splint bones (fibula) of the crucified, were splintered with a bat stick or something. So that the chest cavity through the support of the legs couldn’t lift up for breath as the victim hung suspended, and he actually suffocated, died sooner and could be removed from the cross sooner ... if permission could be obtained. Otherwise crucified hang for days before death relieved the agony. They could even after death hang until they rotted off from the cross.

The Jews asked Pilate that the legs of the crucified be broken so that they could be removed from the crosses where they hang as a great embarrassment for them, the passover-sabbath Feast Day of Nisan 15 being the most important day to them and which they kept holy to remember their exodus from Egypt and celebrate their freedom from all oppressors like the Romans. The death of the crucified would have to be hastened; so their legs must be broken ... so the Prophecies might be fulfilled. The Jews didn’t know, of course. But Jesus’

bones would not be broken; because it was prophesied they wouldn't. God's Word.

And that is what it means the Burial Day is distinguished as 'The-Bone-Day' of the passover?

"He has broken my bones" Lamentations 3:4— physically possible, yes, but while it was said spiritually of Jeremiah, it was prophetic of Christ. It is meant spiritually because Jesus' legs were not broken nor would be, physically broken. This, "He has broken my bones", much rather has the sense, "He has sent fire into my bones" – Jesus' suffering ALIVE on Nisan 14. 1:13.

Therefore, "He keepeth all my bones" Psalm 34:20,21, "That the Scriptures should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken" John 19:36, will have another meaning than simply 'brake'.

"The passover shall be eaten in one house; thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house; neither shall ye break a bone thereof." Exodus 12:46. All of the sacrifice had to be assimilated with corruptibility, sin and sinfulness and the eater was to realise his own and corporate participation and responsibility in the sacrifice's death and corruption.

"Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that He should be holden of it. For David speaketh concerning Him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for He is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover **my flesh shall rest in hope**: Because Thou wilt **not leave my soul in hell**, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see **corruption**. Thou hast made known to me the WAYS OF LIFE; Thou shalt make Me full of joy with thy countenance. ... David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to Him

... that He would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that **his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.**” Acts 2:23-31 Psalm 15. **“Father, into thy hands I commend My Spirit.”** Luke 23:46.

The sin and the sinners ate all of the flesh of the Passover of Yahweh and left not over nor behind any of his body ... BUT HIS BONES! Not one bone was SEVERED from the whole! The carcass of the passover sacrifice was put on the spit in one piece, head and hoofs intact. And by the heat and the burning of the fires in hell, “My bones are burned with heat ... ONE dieth in his full bones ... His bones are full and young; they shall lie down with Him in the dust.” Job 30:30, 21:24, 20:11. “My bones are consumed ... I will say unto God my Rock, Why hast Thou forgotten Me? ... With a sword in my bones mine enemies reproach Me, “Where is thy God?” Job 7:15 Psalm 42:9,10.

Therefore, symbolically and prophetically of the LIFE’s anguish of the Lamb of God is it written of HIM, “My soul chooseth DEATH rather than my bones ...that the bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice ... O Lord, heal Me; for my bones are vexed” Psalm 6:2.

“Observe ye The First Month” Deuteronomy 16:1 as and for the passover of Yahweh.

Keep in mind that in Exodus or the historic passover of Israel, the two days of the slaughter of the lamb and of the eating of the lamb were not yet clearly distinguished, and that both days of fourteen AND fifteen Abib are dated the FOURTEENTH day, Exodus 10 to 15 Deuteronomy 16:3.

These days however are being separated completely in Scriptures such as Leviticus 23:5,6 Numbers 28:16,17; 33:3, “They departed ...on the fifteenth day in the morning after they had eaten the passover.” That is why in its SECOND night, the passover is made an institution of, “It is a NIGHT to be much observed unto the LORD for bringing them out from

the land of Egypt: THIS IS THAT NIGHT OF THE LORD TO BE OBSERVED". Exodus 12:42. "In the FIFTEENTH day", "IT IS THE SELFSAME DAY IT CAME TO PASS THAT all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt", verse 41.

"IT IS THE SELFSAME DAY IT CAME TO PASS THAT..." "... it is the BONE-DAY it came to pass THAT all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt ...". "The SELFSAME day ... the BONE-day" became in the New Testament in the Gospels, specifically, "That Day" thus named that retrospectively is being looked upon for having been "The Preparation when the Sabbath Day drew near ... because of the Jews' preparations having begun." Luke 23:54 John 19:42; and prospectively is being looked upon "It already having become evening since it was The Preparation ... suddenly came the man Joseph" Mark 15:42 Matthew 27:57 Luke 23:50 John 19:31,38— and he began to undertake to get Jesus' body interred.

Now watch!

"THAT DAY WAS GREAT DAY OF SABBATH" of the passover ON WHICH none of the Passover Lamb's BONES would be broken or severed— **John 19:31 to 37**— '**geh-tzem-**' day— "**Great-day-of-sabbath-**" of **PASSOVER**— "**BONE-DAY**" of INTERMENT ... **having started!!**

'Geh-tzem-' "That Day", "Self-Same Day", "In-the-BONE Day" Abib 15—

Exodus 12:46 "neither shall ye break a bone thereof"— passover "EATEN"

Exodus 13:19,19 "Moses took the bones of Joseph ... ye shall carry up my bones"— passover "OUT"

Numbers 9:12 "nor break any bone of it"— passover "EATEN"

Joshua 24:32 "bones of Joseph ... that day ... brought

OUT”

Psalm 34:20 “He delivereth OUT ... keepeth all my bones ... REDEEMETH the soul”— Passover of Yahweh

2Kings 23:17-21 “the sepulchre of the Man of God ... let no man move his bones ... the King commanded, KEEP THE **PASSOVER** AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK”

“The fifteenth day of the First Month ...

THAT DAY ... THE VERY ... SELFSAME : BONE-DAY”

is passover, when passover is

“EATEN” and “BROUGHT OUT”—

Exodus 12:17 “in this selfsame [‘bone’] day”

Exodus 12:41 “even the selfsame [‘bone’] day it came to pass”

Exodus 12:51 “the selfsame [‘bone’] day that the Lord”

Leviticus 23:14 “neither shall ye eat leavened bread (on Abib 16 second day of Unleavened Bread, as on) the very [‘ad’] selfsame [‘bone’] day (of Abib 15)

Leviticus 23:21 “proclaim on the selfsame [‘bone’] day holy

convocation”

Joshua 5:11 “ate parched corn in the selfsame [‘bone’] day”

Joshua 10:27 “which remain from that very [‘bone’] day”

DW:

Refer < GE: That to DHK and Dr Walter undoubtedly is the most important part, however impertinent to the text, however.

I for one, do not attach any importance to this part of what Lightfoot says, although I have given more and proper attention to what Lightfoot's first principles of Bible-interpretation are than the two of you together, and I can prove

that to you by simply to refer you to my writing of twenty to thirty years ago...>

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. 2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. 3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? 4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great. 5 And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted.

Mt. 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. 2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.... 5 And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. 6 He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay.

1. In both texts the two Mary's came to "see" the tomb.
2. In both texts before they arrived at the tomb the tomb was sealed and they anticipated the problem of gaining entrance into a sealed tomb.

CONCLUSION: The visit in Matthew 28:1-6 discovers an OPEN TOMB and they see it plainly (Mt. 28:5-6). Therefore, the visit in Mark 16:3-4 has to be a record of their thoughts just previous to arriving at the tomb still sealed by the stone thus making Mark and Matthew descriptive of the SAME VISIT on the SAME DAY - when the sun was getting brighter ("dawn") or at the "rising of the sun" EARLY SUNDAY MORNING!

These are not two different visits but the SAME visit

with differing details.

GE:

Re: Dr Walter, “1. *In both texts the two Mary's came to "see" the tomb.*”

Yours, is Wenham’s old trick to argue away the two angels, applied to the women.

It simply is incorrect and UNTRUE “*In both texts the two Mary's came to "see" the tomb*” in more respects than merely the women who REALLY and actually ARE the Subject of the actions— DIFFERENT actions that have NOTHING to do with one another.

The Matthew-text says, “Mary Magdalene and the other (one) Mary”. That is, TWO Marys, no more or other women, not even one, other woman.

Dr Walter, you first tell Matthew his informant(s), and his informant(s)’ informant(s) Mary or the two Marys, didn’t know what they were telling him; didn’t realise themselves they from the very same point in space, together, “departed to go see the tomb”; that they must have been in a maze or short-sighted or one-eyed or plain couldn’t count two persons while there actually were three – as Dr Walter here with authority “ABOVE WHAT IS WRITTEN” states for the truth of God’s Word itself.

Or Dr Walter must tell Mark the same sort of thing and then come tell us we Christians must still believe the Scriptures!

Now what sort of sense is therein to say “*the two Mary's came to "see" the tomb*” if they had come and had arrived at the tomb? If they actually came to / did arrive at the tomb, they should have seen the tomb (more or less like Mary Magdalene when she “it still being early darkness” came to the tomb and actually SAW the stone of the sepulchre moved away from it. So what was wrong that, when the two Marys – or three women according to Dr Walter – “*came*”, but still had

“to *see* the tomb”? What was their problem that they still had “to *see* the tomb” or still had to decide “to *come see* the tomb”? When they arrived at the tomb was the tomb too far for them to see it or did they turn their faces away from it perhaps too afraid to look at it? Then why does Matthew say they wanted, “to go have a look at the grave” and in fact “set out to go have a look at the tomb”, but “*In both texts the two Mary's came to "see" the tomb*” AS IF THEY HAD NOT SEEN it?

If “*the two Mary's*” could realise what they wanted to do, why did they not? Because Dr Walter might think the “great earthquake” was of no more effect than to scare the guard a bit, and the women wouldn’t even have noticed it so they came and they saw as if NOTHING happened!? Matthew, why are you telling us these things if it’s all of no effect or importance?

That is Dr Walter’s BORROWED arguments’ worth; not worth a laugh!

Re: Dr Walter, “2. *In both texts before they arrived at the tomb the tomb was sealed and they anticipated the problem of gaining entrance into a sealed tomb.*”

In neither of these “*texts*”, 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”; Mt. 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”, any women “*arrived at the tomb*”!

Where is written “*In both texts*”, “*they arrived at the tomb*”? Or, that “*the tomb was sealed*”? Or, that “*they anticipated the problem of gaining entrance into a sealed tomb*”?!

Nowhere and in no way!

It is SIMPLY, un-true! Then it logically is impossible.

How can it be the same WOMEN “*In both texts*” while Matthew has it the women were “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” and

Mark has it, they, “AND Salome”?

How can it be the same PLACE “*In both texts*” while Matthew has it from where the two Marys “Set out to go...” and

Mark has it, the three women where they “BOUGHT spices and ointments”?

How can it be the same TIME “*In both texts*” while Matthew has it “IN the Sabbath before the First Day” and

Mark has it, “When the Sabbath WAS PAST”?

How can it be the same CIRCUMSTANCE “*In both texts*” and

Matthew has it before or rather just as, “the angel DESCENDING and there was a great EARTHQUAKE”, and Mark has NO angel and NO earthquake”?

How can Dr Walter speak of “*In both texts*” while he quotes THREE ‘texts’ or pericopes of “texts”, not only “*Mark 16:1*” and “*Mt. 28:1*”, but “*Mark 16:1*” and “*Mt. 28:1*” AND, Mark 16:2 to 6?!

Re: Dr Walter, “*In both texts before they arrived at the tomb the tomb was sealed*”

Only in Matthew was “*the tomb sealed...*” NOT, “... *before they arrived*”, but, before they “SET OUT”. And, “*the tomb sealed...*” NOT, “... *before they arrived at the tomb*”, but “*the tomb sealed*” the morning before already— “the morning after The Preparation Day” in fact AND “the morning after The Preparation Day ... when suddenly Sabbath’s mid-afternoon there was a great earthquake”!

And then in neither of the THREE Scripture Dr Walter quoted, any women “*anticipated the problem of gaining entrance into a sealed tomb*”. **In any case WHY WOULD THEY if Mary Magdalene before had SEEN with her own**

eyes that the door-stone had been moved away from the DESERTED sepulchre and had run back TO TELL everybody the news OF IT?

And again, why would they have “*anticipated the problem of gaining entrance into a sealed tomb*” if they “came upon the tomb and FOUND the stone moved away from the sepulchre and...” – straight away – “...entered in” — NO “*problem of gaining entrance into a sealed tomb*” WHATSOEVER!?

11 07 24

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1710763#post1710763>

Re: Dr Walter, “*CONCLUSION: The visit in Matthew 28:1-6 discovers an OPEN TOMB and they see it plainly (Mt. 28:5-6). Therefore, the visit in Mark 16:3-4 has to be a record of their thoughts just previous to arriving at the tomb still sealed by the stone thus making Mark and Matthew descriptive of the SAME VISIT on the SAME DAY - when the sun was getting brighter ("dawn") or at the "rising of the sun" EARLY SUNDAY MORNING!*

These are not two different visits but the SAME visit with differing details.”

GE:

Last, first answered!

There are NO “*differing details*” whatsoever where so ever in the Gospels or between the Gospels or in the entire Bible or between the Old and the New Testaments as concern the prophetic fulfilment of the Passover of Yahweh in and through the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. There are, several, different events and accounts of events; but NO “*differing*” events or “*differing*” accounts, or, “*differing details*”.

CONCLUSION: “*The visit in Matthew 28:1-6...*” is non-existent in reality as in context— as non-existent as your text-

division “*Matthew 28:1-6*” is unreal.

The real text construct is ...

... the narrative-part told by the angel WHEREIN NO ‘VISIT’ REALISED, verse 1-4 ...

... COUPLED BY the editorial interjection of the Gospel-writer, Matthew ...

“... answering, the angel explained to the women ...”,

... COUPLED TO the dialogue-part in the First Person of the angel ...

... CONTINUING to address the women ...

“...saying to them, Be not you afraid; I know you ...”.

Therefore:

There is NO “*visit in Matthew 28:1-6*” OR a ‘*discovery*’ of “*an OPEN TOMB*” BUT THE ACTUAL OPENING of the tomb by the very DESCENT / “DESCENDING” of “the angel of the Lord”, ‘*seen*’ by NO human being whatsoever (not even by an angelic being, the only one present who having turned his back towards the opened sepulchre went and “sat on the stone”. No created being “sees”, ANYTHING OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST IN THE POWER AND THE GLORY OF THE FATHER AND THE FULL AND EXCLUSIVE FELLOWSHIP OF _GOD_ TRIUNE INSIDE THE GRAVE!

Dr Watson, I challenge you in the Name of THIS GOD, QUOTE where in the Written Word of God IT IS WRITTEN: “... *and they see it plainly (Mt. 28:5-6)*”! I challenge you in the Name of THE TRUTH and THE LIFE versus the forces of hell, the devil and DEATH, present the Scripture!!

Re: Dr Walter, “*Therefore, the visit in Mark 16:3-4 has to be a record of their thoughts just previous to arriving at the tomb still sealed by the stone ...*”

It is so, “*the visit in Mark 16:3-4 has to be a record of their thoughts*”. That’s what he’s said all the time....

BUT, “*the visit in Mark 16:3-4 has to be a record of*

their thoughts...” NOT, “...*just previous to arriving at the tomb still sealed by the stone*”, but, just AFTER.

“Then very early

“... they come—

“... upon the tomb

“... again— before-sunrise

“... and they said to themselves,

“... WHO will have rolled away for us the stone out of the door of the tomb?

“... Then re-inspecting, they see :

“... That, in fact, it has been slung up, backwards,

“... the stone, its great size despite.

“... So again, entering into the tomb,

“... they saw inside on the right (one) young man sitting

“... clothed, enfolded in whiteness.

“... Again they were utterly astonished.

“... Now this one speaks to them,

“... Don’t be so very afraid!

“... Yes, it’s Jesus the crucified Nazarene you are looking for...

“... He was raised; He is not here! (Understand now!)

“... Just see the place where they put Him.

“... But go! Go you now and tell his disciples and that Peter specifically ...”

Dr Walter:

Dear Reader, the truth is so obvious and so clear that Gerard must play mental gymnastics in order to get around it.

1. Mark 16:2 explicitly states that both Mary's came to the grave "AT THE RISING OF THE SUN" on the first day of the week and in coming to the grave they believed in their own minds that it was still sealed by the stone!

2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the

stone from the door of the sepulchre?

2. Matthew 28:2 explicitly states BEFORE both Mary's came to "SEE" the grave and when they came they SAW the stone had already been rolled away from the tomb.

came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. 2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

CONCLUSION: IF both Mary's had already came "to see" the tomb on Saturday evening as Geradr demands that Matthew 28:1-2 describes, then on Saturday they already KNEW AND seen the stone had already been rolled away IF Mark 16:1-4 is another visit at Sunrise on Sunday Morning and thus Mark 16:3 is an absurd and ridiculous statement as Mark is describing their concerns BEFORE they got to the tomb and thus on their way to the tomb "at sunrise" Sunday morning:

However, Mark 16:3 PROVES that Mark is describing the very FIRST visit to the tomb by BOTH MARY's because Mark's notation of what these women were pondering on their way to the tomb ON SUNDAY MORNING demands that both Mary's were still ignorant about any removal of the stone from the tomb. However, there can be no excuse by either Mary and no reason to ponder who would remove the stone IF Matthew 28:1-4 described a previous visit on Saturday.

This is so clear, simple, obvious and totally destructive of Gerards whole theory.

Moreover, the whole reason we have FOUR gospel account instead of just ONE is to provide DIFFERENT perspectives and DIFFERENT details.

Just because one account says other "women" attended them and the other does not include that does not mean they are two different visits and indeed it is impossible it is two different visits because of the obvious statement by Mark in verse 3.

Just because one account refers to two angels while the other records one angel does not mean they are two different visits.

Gerard is wrong and no amount of juggling, mental gymnastics and hot air can explain away the simple facts that in both accounts there are both Mary's and in both accounts they come to the grave and in the account given by Mark it is at "SUNRISE" on Sunday morning and they are pondering who will remove the stone THAT MORNING thus PROVING that Matthew 28:1-6 could not have been an earlier visit as the stone was removed already in Matthew 28 before they arrived at the tomb.

READERS, THE HARDEST THING TO DEFEND IS WHEN THE OBVIOUS IS BEING DENIED. MARK 16:3 MAKES IT OBVIOUS THAT NEITHER MARY HAD PREVIOUS TO SUNDAY MORNING SEEN THE STONE REMOVED FROM THE TOMB BUT MATTHEW 28:1-5 THE STONE IS REMOVED ALREADY BEFORE THEY ARRIVED THUS OBVIOUSLY MAKING MATTHEW 28:1-6 AND MARK 16:1-6 THE VERY SAME VISIT BUT WITH DIFFERING DETAILS.

Reader, it does not make any difference that Mark 16:1-3 makes it impossible for Matthew 28:1-6 to be a previous visit on Saturday because Gerard DOES NOT CARE WHAT GOD'S WORD SAYS.

He has only one agenda and that is to prove his unbiblical inaccurate erroneous SATURDAYISM resurrection view no matter what God's Word says and no matter what anyone else says. He is committed to this error and has built a whole system of interpretation to support this error.

FACT: Mark 16:1-2 is AT SUNRISE ON SUNDAY MORNING

FACT: Mark 16:3 is the thinking of BOTH Mary's AT SUNRISE ON SUNDAY MORNING

FACT: That thinking is IMPOSSIBLE if Matthew 28:1-

6 describes a previous visit by BOTH MARY's to this tomb.

FACT: Matthew 28:1-2 and the term "dawn" means "growing" of light (not decreasing of light) and "at Sunrise" is when the sunlight is "growing"

FACT: Matthew 28:1-4 and Mark 16:1-4 describe the very same visit when the very same stone is removed BEFORE both Mary's came to the tomb

FACT: Matthew and Mark provide different details of the SAME VISIT ON THE SAME SUNDAY MORNING.

FACT: Jesus arose from the grave sometime later than 3 am but BEFORE the women arrived on Sunday morning

FACT: In the Matthew 28:1-6 visit by both Mary's, both Mary's SAW the stone had been removed already from the tomb:

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. 2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

FACT: In Mark 16:1-3 visit by both Mary's, both Mary's ON THEIR WAY to the tomb on SUNDAY MORNING believed the stone was still sealing the tomb:

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. 2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. 3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? 4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away:

FACT: In both Matthew 28 and Mark 16 they came to "see" and "looked" at a moved stone for the very FIRST TIME:

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. 2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. 3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? 4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: [

Mt. 27:66 So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.

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. 2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

So clear, so simple, so easy to see if one simply wants the truth! Both Mary's arrived at the tomb the very FIRST time in Mark 16:1-4 "at sunrise" on Sunday morning.

TCGreek:

I'm more hopeful of the rest of Hebrews 4.

GE:

That Hope has found us already, "Seeing Jesus had given them rest and God not again after (Christ) will speak of another salvation-day, there therefore remains for the People of God a keeping of the Sabbath Day— He having entered into his own rest as God in his own."

DW:

I don't know what you are getting at by this statement. If you believe the "rest" in Hebrews 4 excludes a present day literal 24 hour Sabbath day observance then you are sorely mistaken.

On the other hand, if you believe the fourth commandment Sabbath has its ultimate fulfillment in the ETERNAL REST of a new heaven and earth then you are correct.

If you think the gospel rest terminates or fulfills the Sabbath Commandment you are sorely mistaken as Hebrew 4:2-3 tells you explicitly that all Old Testament saints who believed in the SAME GOSPEL of Christ preached unto them as well as unto us STILL observed a Sabbath day keeping in spite of entering into SPIRITUAL rest in Christ.

Heb. 4:2 For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. 3 For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.

Those in the Old Testament period who believed in the gospel or had the gospel word mixed with faith in them entered into rest just as we do. However, that rest is a SPIRITUAL rest and it is not the complete fulfillment of the PROMISED rest but simply the FIRST introduction. There is a PROMISED rest (v. 11) yet future that only TRUE believers will enter. In the mean time, both Old Testament and New Testament believers still observe a Sabbath day keeping (v. 9 sabbatismos) simply because "he" who finished a GREATER work than the work of Creation as our high Priest (vv. 9, 14) commemorated that work with a Sabbath observance rest just as in creation but a BETTER sabbath day - FREE FROM ALL LEGALISM but rather observed in the spirit of joy and rejoicing in the things of the Lord (Psa. 118:20-24; Acts 4:10-11; Rev. 1:10; 1 Cor. 16:1-2; Acts 20:7; etc.).

Hence, faith in the gospel (Acts 10:43) did not do away with a Sabbath day keeping for Old Testament believers any more than faith in the gospel does away with observance of a Sabbath day by New Testament believers as the ultimate

fulfillment of the Sabbath day has not yet occurred - the promised ETERNAL rest in a NEW HEAVEN and a NEW EARTH.

TCGreek:

It seems to me that the function of the 7th day sabbath was to point to that eternal rest. Beginning with faith in Christ, we already have a foretaste of that eternal rest, thus making the 7th day sabbath obsolete.

DW:

The Sabbath is not obsolete until it is completely fulfilled. It is not completely fulfilled until we enter into the ETERNAL REST with a NEW heaven and NEW earth in a NEW glorified body where there is NO SIN present in that creation.

The Sabbath was not obsolete for David or Joshua and both entered in spiritual rest "in Christ" as both were believers in the gospel just as we are (Heb. 13:2-3; Acts 10:43).

Spiritual rest by faith in Christ is a "taste" but not the completion and the Old Testament saints had as much of this "taste" as we do by faith in Christ and yet they still observed the Sabbath.

This is precisely the point the writer of Hebrews is making. We have a better sabbath day to observe than they did because it is a Sabbath day that commemorates a greater work than creation as that creation fell into sin and will be destroyed. However, the work of Jesus Christ finished with his resurrection obtains a coming NEW heaven and a NEW earth where and when we will be NEW creatures not merely spiritually but totally - spirit soul and body. That better Sabbath day observance now is Sunday as it is giving the Lord the FIRST not the LAST and the NEW not the OLD and it commemorates the NEW covenant not the OLD Covenant as did the Creation Sabbath.

GE:

The function of the 7th day sabbath was to point to that eternal rest in Christ. Beginning with faith in Christ, we already HAVE, that eternal rest, THUS, Hebrews 4:8-10, “If Jesus had given them rest, God afterwards won’t ever again speak of another day of salvation— THEREFORE THEN keeping of the Sabbath Day REMAINS VALID for the People of God HE HAVING entered into his own Rest as God in his own” ...

... but TCGreek has it, quote, “... *making the 7th day sabbath obsolete*”.

No further comment, except that it is so lazy and nauseously indulgent to flatter and curry for favour if you can't present anything of spiritual substance.

DW:

Significantly the fourth commandment has nothing to do with the seventh day "of the week" as no such language "of the week" is ever used in Genesis or in any record of the fourth commandment.

The idea "of the week" is purely a product of human reasoning not revelation. I am not saying it contrary to revelation but the Sabbath law is not restricted to any particular day "of the week" because the Sabbath law is applied by God to longer periods of time (month, year) and to other days in the month that do not fall on the seventh day "of the week" but nevertheless are the "seventh" in a series of seven (days, months, years).

It is not wrong to APPLY the Sabbath law to the seventh day "of the week" but it is wrong to restrict it to the seventh day "of the week" as God does not restrict it to such.

Indeed, the ETERNAL REST is not the "seventh" millennium but the ETERNAL age that begins with a NEW heaven and NEW earth or the EIGHTH thousand year just as

the Sabbath law is applied by God to the EIGHTH "day" in the month and EIGHTH "year" following the seventh sabbath year (50th year) or EIGHTH "day" (Pentecost) following the seventh sabbath.

No one can RESTRICT the Sabbath law to any particular day "of the week" simply Because God does not restrict it to such although it can be APPLIED to the seventh day "of the week" as well as to other days of the week because God applies it to other days of the week (Lev. 23).

However, in any series of seven regardless of the beginning point it is always the "seventh" because it either precedes or follows six (days, month, years). Therefore, the Sabbath can be the "first day of the week" as the first day of the week is preceded and followed by six days and thus in that series of seven days, Sunday is the SEVENTH of that series and thus the Sabbath. In the series of seven years, regardless of what year you begin with the "seventh" or that one which follows six years is the Sabbatical year.

New Testament revelation has fixed the Sabbath command to the "first day of the week" as the "Lord's day" thus the singular day in the week OWNED by God in contrast to the other six days and it is because of the resurrection of Jesus Christ upon that day (Mark 16:1,9; Heb. 4:9; Acts 20:7; Rev. 1:7; 1 Cor. 16:1-2; etc.)

GE:

An alternative of course is to pile a bulk of bull.

Re: Ituttut, “But Jesus' blood has to be available before Passover comes. So when did Jesus die?”

A very, very deep question!

Yes, Jesus' blood had to be available before Passover came.

“So when did Jesus die?” He died dying death and suffered the death of death “In the night in which He was betrayed and took bread”!

Jesus ALIVE AND LIVING, DESIRING AND OBEIENTLY, DIED DEATH FOR OUR SINS. It was his suffering that atones for our transgressions and that makes us whole. It was the beginning of the Beginning of the creation of God. Where it seemed to be its end. Where Paradise was hell. Where the Kingdom of the Father was the kingdom of darkness. Where the hour and day of shame and being cast out into the pit, were the hour and “Day of the Lord” Triumphator. “For the LORD is a MAN of war. He triumphed GLORIOUSLY!”

Jesus Christ triumphed through DEATH.

God Almighty DIED IN VICTORY.

“God had sworn with an oath ... He would RAISE UP CHRIST to sit on His Throne.”

And if Christ died not?

God, God forbid!, would have sworn falsely!

Is Dr Walter tenacious or vexatious?

<http://www.baptistboard.com/newreply.php?do=newreply&p=1712683>

Dr. Walter:

20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.

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.

I have been accused of ignoring part of this text by GE. However, it is GE that not only ignores what it says but perverts what it says.

Here are some facts.

1. "since" in verse 21 represents the Greek preposition "apo" NOT "ek". GE's position requires the use of "ek" NOT "apo." Why? Because "ek" would include the day of crucifixion in his counting but "apo" excludes it. Ek originates within whereas apo originates outside. Take a look at the basic meaning of these prepositions in regard to the circle in Mantey's Grammar.

2. "these things were done" does not refer to his burial but to those things listed in verse 20 "rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him." Luke is not concerned with when Christ was buried in this count but with Christ's condemnation and death.

3. The first day of the week (Sunday) "IS" the third day "since" (apo - away from) the crucifixion day (Thursday 6pm to 6pm or our Wednesday 6pm to our thursday 6 pm) when they condemned and crucified him. Hence, Luke begins his count with the day "since" or that follows the day of crucifixion - not with Thursday but friday or Jewish time (thursday 6pm to Friday 6pm) as the first day "since" the condemnation, thus Saturday the second day "since" the crucifixion day and thus Sunday which "IS" the third day "since" the crucifixion day.

If Luke had used "ek" ("out of") then it would necessarily included the crucifixion day in his counting but he did not. He used "apo" which takes us outside the day of crucifixion and makes the count begin with the day following the crucifixion day.

NOW LUKE KNOWS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE BASIC MEANING OF APO AND EK

GE:

So what? You think nobody but Dr Walter knew it? It helps nothing you make an issue of a non-issue to prove your non-issue an issue. It helps nothing to solve a problem by beating around the bush.

Dr Walter, Where did I “*accuse*” you “*of ignoring part of this text*”? Just like you here persist in making this text an issue between us now, so did you make it an issue between us before I even realised that we actually agree on it or that we both believe Crucifixion was on a Thursday. I have several times shown how we agreed, specifically on the “*part of this text*” which you are here moaning about, the meaning of the Preposition ‘apo’. So where did I “*accuse*” you “*of ignoring part of this text*”?

Then why would “*GE's position require... the use of "ek" NOT "apo"'*”, hey, “*Why?*” while my “*position*” is exactly the same as yours?! Why do you shoot yourself in the foot for no reason at all?

Anyone can make a mistake, so, when YOU wrongly referred to “eis” in D&M’s circle, saying, “*Eis begins WITHIN the circle to the outside*”, I responded, <I remember Dana and Mantey’s ‘circle’, yes. You do not remember it, Dr Walter; anyway, you do not remember it correctly. It must have been an accident, Dr Walter, this, you’re saying, “*prepositional chart using a circle ... Eis begins WITHIN the circle to the outside*”. But that is forgivable from the context of the present discussion.> That’s what I said.

Now, instead of admitting your mistake of then, you pretend as if I made mistake! But that is how I have come to know you, Dr Walter; characteristic of you.... Just take the following ...

“GE's position requires the use of "ek" NOT "apo." Why? Because "ek" would include the day of crucifixion in his counting but "apo" excludes it.” You telling me what my “position requires”, that it does “NOT”, “require...” “**"apo"**”.

Characteristic of you, yes, for sure!

What is wrong with your position – and this is what you won't acknowledge –, is that OUR “counting” which is just Luke's own “counting” as far as **"apo"** is concerned, is not the same as, and is irrelevant to, the “three days ... it behoved the Christ to suffer” as “THUS IT IS WRITTEN” and referred to by Christ in Luke 24:46 and Matthew 12:40.

TWO, “three days” spoken of— WHICH YOU ARE NOT BLIND FOR, BUT PRETEND BLIND TO!

What is wrong with your position – and this is what you ALSO won't acknowledge – is, that THE “three days” “according to the Scriptures”— which are NOT referred to or alluded to or implied or even suggested in between verses 13 and 45— if these “three days” were supposed or meant by Luke in verse 21, and **"ek"** were employed, Luke then definitely would have said “today” Sunday was the FOURTH day. But since Luke does not use ‘ek’, “today” ‘Sunday’ was NOT ‘from inside / inclusive of’ the day “these things (delivered and crucifixion) happened” but “the third day SINCE” ‘apo’ “these things (delivered and crucifixion) happened”.

The ABSENCE of ‘ek’ proves Luke did not write and Cleopas did not speak of the “three days” “on the third day” of which Jesus rose again from the dead.

That; no more! And that is ALL, IF, SUPPOSED; NOT, as ACTUALLY, “three days” were in fact “counted” “since” the “crucifixion had happened” AS it is written IN

LUKE and not ‘in the Scriptures’ in Prophecy, Promise or Law.

Cleopas does not explain to Jesus the events of the Prophetic “three Days”; He expresses his THREE DAYS LONG ignorance and lack of understanding “SINCE THESE THINGS HAPPENED”.

Only when Jesus explained “how the Christ ought to have suffered as it is written” in the Old Testament are the “three days” “according to the Scriptures” first mentioned and are they the object of explanation— by the ONLY One Who at that stage knew anything or understood anything.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?t=73164&page=2>

Dr. Walter:

"Ek" = OUT of but "apo" is "AWAY from" Ek necessarily begins WITHIN something and then moves away from it. In this case, "ek" would begin WITHIN is THE DAY that the rulers condemned and crucified Christ. This is the preposition Luke would have used IF GE's position were correct BUT HE DID NOT.

"Apo" = AWAY from

Apo necessarily begins OUTSIDE something and then moves away from it. In this case "apo" would begin OUTSIDE and AWAY from THE DAY the rulers condemned and crucified Chrsit. This is the preposition Luke used which condemns GE's counting method.

Hence, SUNDAY (6pm Saturday evening to 6 pm Sunday evening) or the first day of the week "IS the THIRD day SINCE ("apo")" or AWAY FROM the condemnation and crucifixion day (Wednesday 6 pm to Thursday 6pm).

So now with the proper understanding of the language used by Luke let us count:

CONDEMNATION/CRUCIFIXION day - Wednesday 6pm to Thursday 6pm

1. The first day "since" (apo) from it would be Thursday 6pm

to Friday 6pm

2. The second day "since" (apo) from it would be Friday 6pm to Saturday 6pm

3. Sunday "IS THE THIRD DAY SINCE" the condemnation/crucifixion or Saturday 6pm to Sunday 6pm

On the other hand GE attempts to make "apo" into "ek" and forces the text to read thus:

1. First day since (ek) OUT FROM the condemnation/crucifixion - Wednesday 6pm to Thursday 6pm

2. Second day since (ek) OUT FROM the condemnation/crucifixion - Thursday 6pm to Friday 6pm

3. Third day since (ek) OUT FROM the condemnation/crucifixion - Friday 6pm to Saturday 6 pm

4. Fourth day since (ek) OUT FROM the condemnation/crucifixion - Saturday 6pm to Sunday 6 pm.

However, the text does not read "ek" but "apo" and therefore GE's counting method is WRONG! Apo EXCLUDES the day of condemnation/crucifixion from Luke's count.

Now, GE attempts to counter this by claiming that it would have to INCLUDE it since Christ was buried on the condemnation/crucifixion day. However, Luke was not counting the days Christ was in the grave but counting the days since the rulers did those things specified by Luke in verse 20. The rulers did not bury Christ! The rulers condemned and crucified Christ. If Luke were considering the time "since" Christ was buried he would have used "ek" as that would include the condemnation/crucifixion/burial day.

However, Luke was not counting the days Christ was in the grave but counting the days AWAY FROM (apo) the condemnation/crucifixion day. Luke did not say "This IS the third day Christ has been in the tomb" BUT "This is the third day since" they had done the things to Christ as described in verse 20.

20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.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.

The Chief Priests and our rulers did not bury Christ and so Luke is not speaking to the time since he was buried but the time since the Chief Priests and rulers did what they did between 6pm Wednesday to 6pm Thursday.

GE:

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING!

That's what's he's been say'n!

Hitting a punch bag to shreds won't win anybody the belt!!

But you do far worse, Dr Walter; you make a video of you punching that bag, then sit down in your sofa and tell yourself, let's watch how silly GE acts.

Re: Dr. Walter, *“20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.*

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.

I have been accused of ignoring part of this text by GE. However, it is GE that not only ignores what it says but perverts what it says.

Here are some facts.

1. "since" in verse 21 represents the Greek preposition "apo" NOT "ek". GE's position requires the use of "ek" NOT "apo." Why? Because "ek" would include the day of crucifixion in his counting but "apo" excludes it. Ek originates within whereas apo originates outside. Take a look at the basic meaning of these prepositions in regard to the circle in Mantey's Grammar. (Emphasis GE)

Dr Walter, you UNABASHED AND UNASHAMEDLY just go on and on to make the most FALSE suppositions and

arrogations and accusations unimaginable!

But I welcome it!

Now expose yourself for what you really are, and BRING HERE THE QUOTES WHERE I made THESE claims or statements or whatever ! BRING THEM HERE! PLACE THEM HERE, because what you HAVE PLACED HERE, I emphatically deny I ever stated or even vaguely implied.

If you are a man ... if you are a CHRISTIAN, PLACE MY OWN statements to the effect of what you are stating for truth in your own words with your own pen as if I am the author thereof.

To end this debate, once for all, because I'll capitulate lock stock and barrel if you brought that stuff of mine, HERE!
God is my Witness.

Ituttut:

[to Dr Walter] *Hasn't your argument been half-day counting? Also you have a coming forth on Sunday just shortly before noon, or in the afternoon. Thursday is not possible.*

GE:

Aah, Ituttut, on the tut!!!

You HAVE seen some light!

Thank God!

The problem in fact IS Dr Walter puts together by "half-day counting" PARTS of SEPARATE DAYS that in fact do form a 24 hour period each PAIR, BUT NOT THE or any "DAY" (consisting of first night then day) THAT IS INVOLVED AND CONCERNED in Scriptures THAT DEAL WITH THE "three days" on "the third day" -OF WHICH - "Christ rose from the dead"!

This is Dr Walter's BASIC fallacy, that He IDENTIFIES the simply COUNTED 'days' involved in Luke 24:21 "SINCE" the Crucifixion, with THE "three days" MEANT,

in the Prophecies and Promises and Law --- THE "three days" of the PASSOVER of Yahweh, the 14th, 15th and 16th days of the First Month the Month-of-Passover. Which "three days" : "ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES" were to be "observed", "remembered", "kept", "kept holy", "obeyed", each, IN ITS OWN RIGHT AND REALITY of "three days and three nights" OF THESE and NO other, days.

How can I make it clearer, "THREE DAYS THICK DARKNESS" OF "THE PLAGUE" that "was upon Him", the "three days" of the last two plagues in Egypt and of the exodus, ONCE FOR ALL FULFILLED IN AND BY AND THROUGH JESUS CHRIST on the 14th, 15th and 16th days of Passover Month, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES" IN EVERY RESPECT, especially in respect of the GOD-GIVEN and therefore eschatological imperative WHOLENESS AND FULLNESS OF EACH AND OF ALL THREE DAYS TOGETHER.

Goodness, do I speak to infidels or infants or what?!

The REAL 'days' of the Word of God; not just three days since the Crucifixion on Abib 14, but THE "three days"

OF WHICH ABIB 14 WAS, QUOTE: "THE VERY FIRST DAY";

OF WHICH Abib 15 was, QUOTE: "the first day ye shall eat no leavened bread ... That Day "

OF WHICH Abib 16 was, QUOTE "the day after the sabbath ... ye shall wave the sheaf".

WHY is it you **REFUSE** to go by the unambiguous, simple and clear identifications which the **GOSPELS** - the **NEW** Testament - meticulously supply in **DETAIL** and in **DIVERS** manners of **THESE** "three days"?

I shall place them again right before your eyes:

Three days NT texts

All these Scriptures are in PERFECT AGREEMENT in every respect :

Abib 14, Wednesday night and Thursday day = Fifth Day

1A) HERE BEGINS the NIGHT and the FIRST of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–

wherein Jesus ENTERED IN in “the Kingdom of my Father” (Jesus’ Jonah’s descent to hell) :–

Mk14:12/17; Mt26:17/20; Lk22:7/14; Jn13:1.

1B) HERE BEGINS the MORNING of the FIRST of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–

in which Jesus was delivered and crucified :–

Mk15:1/Mt27:1/Lk23:1/Jn19:14

1C) HERE is the LATE NOON AND MID–AFTERNOON of the FIRST of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–

when Jesus DIED and was deserted by all :–

Mk15:37–41; Mk27:50–56; Lk23:44–49; Jn19:28–30

.....

Abib 15, Thursday night and Friday day = Sixth Day

2A) HERE BEGINS the SECOND of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :– the day whereon Joseph WOULD BURY the body of Jesus :– Mk15:42/Mt27:57, Lk23:50–51, Jn19:31/38.

2B) HERE is the NIGHT of the SECOND of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :– wherein Joseph begged the body, and according to the law of the Jews – the passover’s law – undertook and prepared to bury Jesus:–

Mk15:43–46a; Mt27:58–59; Lk23:52–53a; Jn19:31b–40

2C) HERE is the LATE NOON AND MID–AFTERNOON of the SECOND of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–

when Joseph and Nicodemus laid the body and closed the tomb; and men and women left for home :–

Mk15:46b–47; Mk27:60–61; Lk23:53b–56a; JN19:41–42

.....

Abib 16, Friday night and Saturday day = Seventh Day Sabbath....

3A) HERE BEGINS the THIRD of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–
 THAT JESUS WOULD RISE FROM THE DEAD ON :–
 Lk23:56b

3B) HERE is the MORNING of the THIRD of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–

Pilate ordered a guard “for the third day” :–

Mt27:62–66

3C) HERE is “IN the Sabbath’s Fullness MID–AFTERNOON” of the THIRD of the “three days”, “according to the Scriptures” – the passover–Scriptures :–
 First Sheaf Wave Offering Before the LORD :–
 Mt28:1–4.

Abib 17, Saturday night and Sunday day = First Day

4A) HERE begins the day AFTER the “three days” (fourth day of the passover season) :–

that Jesus WOULD APPEAR on :-

Mk16:1, “When the Sabbath was past they BOUGHT”

4B) HERE is the EVENING of this day,

Jn20:1–10 Mary sees the DOOR STONE was away from the tomb (discovers tomb has been OPENED);

4C) HERE is the NIGHT of this day,

Lk24:1–10 “DEEP(EST) DARKNESS” — “women with their spices” and ointments go to salve the body; “they found Him NOT” (discover tomb is EMPTY);

Mk16:2–8 “very early (before) SUN’S RISING” — women’s return–visit to ascertain; “they fled terrified and told NO ONE”.

4D) Here is sunrise (‘Sunday’ morning),

Jn20:11f, Mk16:9 “Mary had had stood behind” saw the gardener (sunrise); “Risen, early (sunrise) on the First Day, Jesus first APPEARED to Mary”

Mt28:5–10 “The angel explained to the (other) women (Mt28:1–4) As they went to tell Jesus met them” (after sunrise).

Mt28:11–15 Guard to high priests.

USE BIBLES OF BEFORE THE TWENTIETH CENTURY – they are not as wangled as the later ones. And compare those ancient translations with the modern ones to see the truth of the older ones!

IT:

You may wish to believe your eyes, but I believe what His Word says. You have pointed to Luke 24 so let's stick with what is confusing both you, and Dr. Walter, by including more of chapter 24. It is 3 days since it happened according to Luke. What happened was the fourth day (not the 5th day. You are

having the event of the two having the discussion on a Monday.

Luke 24:7 reads, "Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." Different events. It is good to have another verse to help clarify verse 21. Jesus Arose AGAIN after 3pm on Saturday. This shows they (women & angel/s) were talking on Sunday, and this again shown in verse 9. So verse 21 falls into its proper place, of being the **fourth day** since His burial, and His Body brought alive again, beginning at 3PM on Saturday. Jesus did not emerge from the Tomb until sometime after the stone was rolled away by the Angel, at 6pm, the beginning of their Sunday.

Luke 24, verse 21 plainly tells us Nisan 14- the preparation day, is not included. "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." Besides all that happened on Wednesday they are telling us.

Verse 22. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;" The conversation is not about the Preparation day of Nisan 14, but the 1st day of Passover, which is Nisan 15, that Thursday, the High Sabbath Day.

you should take another look at scripture you are reading as to what day is what. The first day is PESACH, I.E. Nisan 15 the first day of the Passover.

GE:

Ituttut, I can stay calm speaking to you, fortunately. I think I know why. I think it's because I think you're honest.

Ituttut, read Exodus 12:15. It says,

"Seven days ye shall eat unleavened bread." Then it goes on to explain the chronology as well as methodology of

passover days and events --- the 'when' and the 'how' of the passover days and events.

Exodus 12:15 goes on to explain,

"Even the first day (of passover) ye shall PUT AWAY LEAVEN".

That is one day, the first day of passover, "when ye shall put away leaven". Mark 14:12,17 Matthew 26:17,20 Luke 22:7,14 John 13:1,30; 19:14 1Corinthians 11:23 ... and "they had to always kill the passover". "The day BEFORE the Feast ... The Preparation OF THE PASSOVER"!

Now the KJV renders the Hebrew, correctly, yes; it says, "EVEN THE FIRST day ...".

The Hebrew actually is, "On the day the HEAD day / the VERY first day / the FIRST, first day ...".

Because the day on which the leaven was removed, was ... One, the very same day that they KILLED the passover sacrifice Exodus 12:6; and ...

... Two, was viewed as "The Preparation-of-the-Passover" John 19:14.

I think you have a problem though, with the English word, 'evening', in Exodus 12:6. It is a 1611 English word. The Hebrew word is 'ereb' which simply means, 'late'. In modern English the best if not the only word for it in the context of the time the passover lamb was slaughtered, is 'afternoon'. Therefore, afternoon ON the fourteenth day BEFORE sunset— LONG before sunset! Three hours exactly before sunset if Jesus' death is regarded the norm. He died "the ninth hour".

The Jews speak of 'bedikat gamets' – the ceremonial removal of leaven in the night before the lamb the following day would be SLAUGHTERED.

Now on this "very first DAY", dough "WITHOUT LEAVEN" had been 'prepared', and made ready so that when the Israelites just after midnight moved out, they "carried their dough on their shoulders, out"!

Exodus 12 was written of course at a time much later than the exodus itself. But Exodus is the only book of the Torah that gives the history of the exodus AS it happened FROM WITHIN EGYPT, when, and where, days were reckoned sunrise to sunrise still. Therefore Abib 14 and 15 as it were MERGED, both days Abib 14 and 15 being dated the fourteenth in Exodus. That very first night after they had slaughtered the sacrifice, the Israelites HAD their dough prepared, and they ALREADY in THAT VERY FIRST NIGHT, ate bread of the unleavened dough. They ate “the flesh”, “WITH unleavened bread” in the night of their exodus. And that night is found dated the night of the FOURTEENTH day of the First Month. Exodus 12:6,8.

But DAYS OF SLAUGHTER AND EATING in all subsequent Books (Deuteronomy maybe an exception) are dated SEPARATELY, 14th and 15th OF THE First Month. And the night they ATE, is found dated the night of the FIFTEENTH day of the First Month. Numbers 33:3 is one text.

It is clearly observable therefore, that the TWO days 14 and 15 Abib, IN EXODUS, were of TWO days coming first and of TWO nights, coming last.

First day: Exodus 12:6,7— “kill it”; “strike the blood”.

First night: 12:8-13— “eat the flesh, roasted, without anything (‘bitter’), WITH unleavened bread.”

First night-and-day day therefore: 12:14, where we see the FOURTEENTH day called a “memorial” and a “feast”!

Implication:

If in the night “the flesh” was eaten “WITH unleavened bread”, it means the unleavened DOUGH was PREPARED during the day of Abib 14. In other words, leaven had to be REMOVED ON, Abib 14 daylight OR BEFORE, in the night before the day of Abib 14 which in Egypt was the night of Abib 13!

And that is why the Jews to this day have ‘Bedikat Gamets’ – the Removal of Leaven in the night of Abib 14 which while in Egypt was Abib 13 still.

I must say I previously thought they only ate the sacrifice and no unleavened bread. But the fact the Israelites ate unleavened bread “with the flesh” IN THE NIGHT OF THEIR EXODUS, has today been a new insight to me; an exiting first time discovery— for which I thank the Lord as well as my debaters.

The rest then is as I have been maintaining from long ago ...

Exodus 12 continues in verse 15 to describe BOTH days or aspects of passover,

“Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread ...”

As follows ...

... “The VERY FIRST day [Abib 14] ye shall PUT AWAY LEAVEN.”

So ...

... “The very first day [Abib 14] ye shall put away leaven out of your houses FOR / BECAUSE whosoever eateth leavened bread from the FIRST day (of eating unleavened bread) until the seventh day (of eating unleavened bread), that soul shall be cut off from Israel.”

These – the TWO, ‘first’, days – explain verse 18b,

“Ye shall eat unleavened bread until the ONE AND TWENTIETH day in the night.”

‘ereb’ / ‘ ”gēh'-rev ’ in 12:6 is late day, afternoon when the sacrifice was killed.

But in 12:18 ‘ereb’ / ‘ ”gāh'-rav' ’ is “darkened / dark”.

‘ ”gāhrav ’, ‘mixed’, Daniel 2:41.

So ‘ ”gāh'-rav' ’, Isaiah 24:11, “All joy is darkened ...”; Judges 19:9, “It is already dark ... tarry (now) all night.”

Therefore in Exodus 12:18, “Ye shall eat unleavened bread until the ONE AND TWENTIETH day in the night”— “dark / dusk / night / evening”.

Evening is at the BEGINNING of a day. It presupposes the era AFTER the exodus, when reckoning of days had been changed from the pagan and Egyptian sunrise to sunrise reckoning, to the Bible and Hebrew sunset to sunset reckoning.

Exodus 12:18,

“Ye shall eat unleavened bread until the ONE AND TWENTIETH day in the night”—

Evening after sunset 15 Abib : first day unleavened bread;

Evening after sunset 16 Abib : second day unleavened bread;

Evening after sunset 17 Abib : third day unleavened bread;

Evening after sunset 18 Abib : fourth day unleavened bread;

Evening after sunset 19 Abib : fifth day unleavened bread;

Evening after sunset 20 Abib : sixth day unleavened bread;

Evening after sunset 21 Abib : seventh day unleavened bread.

Ituttut:

Luke 24, verse 21 plainly tells us Nisan 14-he preparation day, is not included. "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." Besides all that happened on Wednesday they are telling us.

GE:

Dear Ituttut, you should DISTINGUISH between "The Preparation OF THE PASSOVER" John 19:14 "the day BEFORE the feast" John 13:1,

and,

"The Preparation which is the Fore-Sabbath".

You should, but you do not.

Go do distinguish the two, separate days, and you'll see what I mean.

<http://www.baptistboard.com/showthread.php?p=1716580#post1716580>

Dr. Walter:

Well GE?? I provided YOUR OWN WORDS. You challenged me to provide YOUR WORDS and here they are! What about all the names you called me, such as a "liar" because you claimed you never made any comments that called for my distinction of "apo" versus "ek" in regard to your comments with Luke 24:21????????????????????????????????

GE:

Yes, you provided my words --- without their context.

Luke says, in Cleopas' words, as we agreed on, the day of the disciples' still being so perplexed by events, was "the third day SINCE" the crucifixion and they began to be so confused by the PAST events of "delivered to be condemned and crucified".

Note that they did not mention that Jesus died. Why? Because they fled the scene of the crucifixion BEFORE Jesus died, and would not have known that He died because crucified people could live on for days. And that is why the women's report to them on that same Sunday morning --- FOR THE FIRST TIME --- "surprised" them so greatly! They did not know whether Jesus died or not, and less knew that his body was removed from the cross and least could they expect that his body would be BURIED which was not the privilege of crucified ever!

Therefore, yes, "Today ... the First Day of the week ... since / away from these things" which we actually had seen with our own eyes "happened", "is the third day" IN OUR MEMORY of events that included everything BUT the "surprising" fact that Jesus actually got buried.

PURELY and CONTEXTUALLY, exclusively 'COUNTED' days - nothing to do with the Prophetic "three days" they did not understand anything about, or gave thought in the least. Much later that night only would Jesus Himself

turn their attention to it and explain it to them. AT THAT STAGE that afternoon on Sunday before Jesus explained anything, THE "three days" not so much as entered into the disciples' mind!

Now go back to the context of 'my words', and you will see that I, in the first place, did not utter them as resulted they from a dissertation on the meaning of 'ek' supposed in lieu of 'apo'. It was no grammatical argument I used, but a PURELY LOGICAL inference against YOUR denial that Sunday actually was the first day after the "three days" of the passover, and therefore the FOURTH day reckoned from and including the day of the Crucifixion.

Therefore, here are my words in fuller context, and self-explanatory,

<Today is the third day, that is, today is three days AWAY FROM the day that He was condemned to be crucified and indeed was crucified." Thereby Luke "denies it is the fourth day "since" he was crucified".

You said it— just what I have been saying from day one until today that I am saying the same thing. Difference is though, I mean "from" includes the day that I started; Luke meant 'apo' excluded the day "when" ('hou') He was crucified.

I said it before; I say it again but without the EMPHATIC question-mark I used, Luke does NOT deny Sunday was the fourth day "from", and, INCLUDING, the day of the Crucifixion! Luke by having said, "'TODAY IS THE THIRD DAY" since he was crucified", IMPLIED Sunday was the fourth day "from" and INCLUDING, the day of the Crucifixion in the most definitive and definite manner language could convey the IMPLICATION.>

DW:

Complete double talk! Your interpretation of Luke's word denies exactly what he is saying. Sunday "is" NOT the

"fourth day since" the crucifixion as your "logic" distorts his words and which the use of "apo" explicitly denies but Sunday "IS THE THIRD DAY SINCE" his crucifixion thus EXCLUDING the day of crucifixion in his count as "apo" EXCLUDES the day of crucifixion as it begins the count "AWAY FROM" not "OUT OF" as your interpretation demands. Thus you are ultimately changing the meaning of "apo" to that of "ek" just as I accused you.

GE:

You cannot understand, so you call it '*double talk*'. Then you just repeat your FALSE accusation.

The abstraction from Luke's statement, "today is the third day SINCE these things ... delivered ... crucified ... were done", remains, that he is CONSTATING the logical and consequential fact that IF, the day the "rulers delivered Him to be condemned and have crucified Him" were INCLUDED, "today ... the First Day of the week" would have been the FOURTH day "since" the day "our rulers delivered Him to be condemned and have crucified Him". But Luke obviously did not intend the idiomatic inclusive interpretation of his words, 'aph' hou', but the chronological exclusive meaning of an addition of days, and not an abstraction or inclusion of days.

DW:

There is no subjunctive mode used by Luke here. There is no suppositional "if." He is declaring a fact not providing a suppositional rationalization! He says "third day" not "fourth day." He uses "apo" not "ek" which EXCLUDES the day of crucifixion in his count rather than INCLUDES it. You are simply repudiating the explicit inspired words of Luke because they repudiate your false doctrine of Saturn Day worship.

Ituttut:

Dear Dr. Walter, now add to your calculations the time

of His arising, and the time of His death. It must calculate to the total of 72 hours. Your presentation doesn't agree with when the women arrived, i.e. unless Jesus came forth bodily on a Monday. Doesn't the Bible tell us exactly when His body gave up the Ghost?

Wish to inform you I have never said their day, or ours does not contain 24 hours to complete a day, and a night.

According to God, the 24 hour Day began at sun down (about 6pm which is considered Night ending with the rising of the sun, about 6am. Their daytime then begins at 6am, and ends at 6pm. They together equal 24 hours. Don't we agree this is what His Word tells us?

If so, Nisan 14 at 3PM we are told His Body was dead. Twenty one (21) hours had passed on the 14th day of Nisan, with three (3) hours left. Do you agree, or disagree?

As this is what God tells us, we have a firm foundation to begin our 72-hour countdown from the point of when He arrived in Paradise. Do you agree, or disagree?

3pm Wednesday to 3pm Thursday is one (1) day. DAY 1
 3pm Thursday to 3pm Friday is one (1) day. DAY 2
 3on Friday to 3pm Saturday is one (1) day. DAY 3
 TOTAL 72 HOURS

Does Jesus not say He will be in the HEART OF THE EARTH (Hades), that is to say Paradise on His arrival for a three (3) day working session? The bars of death were broken at 3pm on Saturday Nisan 17, and His Soul and spirit entered back into His dead Body. He also tells us He would arise again, after three Days. After three days, then it must be Sunday when He, in His Body emerged from the Tomb. The Women confirm this as they arrive at the Tomb with the rising of the sun on Sunday, the First Day of The Week. Mark tells us this in chapter 16, confirmed by Luke in chapter 24; also John chapter 20.

Dr Walter:

Both you and GE have your nice little games of mental gymnastics that you play with God's Word. You both have a LOGICAL basis for your positions but both of you begin at the same bottom line - HUMAN LOGIC rather than explicit scriptures.

GE:

Because it does not help I have the "*explicit scriptures*" the passover-Scriptures that state "The very first day ... the fourteenth day ... ye shall kill the passover" Exodus 12:15a = the day OF Him being "delivered over to be condemned and crucified" Luke 24:21 = "the day they removed leaven and always had to kill the passover" Mark 14:12. Dr Walter reckons it does not exist so he can just ignore the fact GE uses it for both "*explicit scriptures*" and "*LOGICAL basis for (his) positions*".

Dr Walter:

For example. Show me just one scripture where it is said explicitly that a "day" must be a full 24 hours and that a part of day cannot be reckoned as a whole in Jewish thinking? For example, on several occasions Jesus spent the night in prayer. According to your LOGIC he must have begun his prayer at 6 pm sharp or when the sun went down and ended his praying at 6 am sharp or when the sun gave first light or a full 12 hours or else he did not spend the "night" in prayer.

GE:

Just of whom are you speaking, Dr Walter? Whose logic is this?

You see Dr Walter, it's no one's but YOURS!

So you sommer make it ours?! What's wrong, dear Doctor, can we be of any help, perhaps?

Dr Walter:

All your figuring is based upon logic, based upon an IMAGINED knowledge of the precise calendar year he died which in turn is based upon an IMAGINED knowledge of the precise calendar year he was born because every year Nisan 13-17 does not fall on the same days of the week.

GE:

Really Dr Walter, I am no medical man; don't expect me to help you, please; not with this ailment.

Dr Walter:

My position is based upon the fact that Sunday "THIS IS" the third day since he was crucified (Lk. 24:21) and that Luke also says that he rose "the third day." Simple, clear and easy to verify regardless of what year he was born or died.

GE:

Now Dr Walter, having said this, I would, if I were a medical man, have diagnosed you for a schizophrenic.

DW:

Look at the character of your responses! You are very good at insulting others but a terrible exegete and a horrible Bible scholar. You resort to insults because you cannot deal with the facts of scripture. You cannot tell the difference between the meaning of "apo" versus "ek" you cannot tell the meaning between "third" versus "fourth" and your Saturn day worship is repudiated by Christ and the apostles and so your only resort left is to resort to insults.

GE:

Ag, of what avail?!

No, I don't! I do not "assert" anything other or against what Luke asserts. And I do not "interpret ... "apo" ... to

include the day of Crucifixion as though "apo" has the meaning of "ek."”

Your old ailment, Dr Walter, for which there seems to be no medicine, you telling me what I do not say I say!

Again, also, you simply ignore how I myself, show how Luke himself, brings the “three days” THE PROPHETS WERE SPEAKING OF, into reckoning— three OTHER days than the three days implied in the DISCIPLES’ reference, “Today is the third day since ... crucified.”

Or, am I forced to conclude, dear Dr Walter, you are hopelessly UNABLE to recognise the difference between or the supposition of TWO unrelated implicated KINDS of ‘three days’? No, I am wrong there; you are not unable; you are UNWILLING!

This is a fruitless conversation. The only good that comes of it, is to let Dr Walter more and more entangle himself in his own ... let’s call it out of courtesy ... ‘LOGIC’.

DW:

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.

2 And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.

3 And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.

6.....remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee,

7 Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.

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. 22 Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; 23 And when they found not his body, they

came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive.

What day did the women go to the tomb and did not find his body in verse 1?

What day were they to remember that Jesus said he would rise on in verses 6-7?

What day was the day was it that very day - verse 21

What day did the women go "very early" and find an empty tomb - verses 22-23?

Sunday is the day the tomb was found empty by the women not Saturday.

The "third day" is the day when the tomb would be emptied and "today is the third day" not saturday - vv. 6-7,21.

Clear, simple and without any mental gymnastics to complicate the passage.

ANY INTERPRETATION THAT MUST EXPLAIN AWAY THE OBVIOUS IS A WEAKER INTERPRETATION AND THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT GE MUST DO - EXPLAIN AWAY THE OBVIOUS THAT IT IS SUNDAY THE TOMB WAS FOUND EMPTY NOT SATURDAY - vv. 1-3 - IT WAS THE THIRD DAY HE WOULD EMPTY THE TOMB - NOT THE FOURTH DAY - vv. 6-7 - AND SUNDAY IS THE THIRD DAY WHEN THE WOMEN FOUND THE TOMB EMPTY - vv. 21-24 Now watch GE's response - it will be a EXPLAIN AWAY response.

GE:

No Dr Walter, I have said everything I could, already.

I have finished with this conversation.

If you feel you have 'WON', enjoy your feeling!

God be with you

GE

