

## **Resurrection on the Sabbath or on Sunday?**

.... with regard to Visits at the tomb

### **DW:**

*John 20:19 and Acts 20:7 are not the only references to the church meeting on the Lord's Day - Sunday. In addition to those quotations are John 20:29; Acts 2:1 and 1 Cor. 16:1-2.*

### **GE:**

*"...the Lord's Day - Sunday" --- Not only 'wrong', but FALSE!*

*"...the church meeting on .... Sunday" Please SHOW in*

*"John 20:29";*

*"Acts 2:1" or,*

*"1 Cor. 16:1-2" ..... please QUOTE!*

### **DW:**

*.... John makes it as clear as language can make it that this assembling was on the first day of the week not the second day of the week. With this over emphasis of language to prove it is the first day of the week, "even" only means late afternoon not the second day of the week."*

### **GE:**

Which 'over emphasis of language'?

Quote where "John makes it clear .... "even" only means late afternoon"?

Quote where "John makes it clear .... "it is the first day of the week .... not the second day of the week"?

Quote where "1 Cor. 16:1-2", makes it clear, "this assembling was", on the first day?

Of course you cannot. Because John and Luke make it clear as common language can that 'it' --- the disciples "having been thronged together still" --- while it must have been after sunset and "IT

BEING” - by now - AFTER, “VESPERS” Lk24:29 and no longer “afternoon” or “towards ‘vespers’”; and day had had “declined”- ‘kekliken’ fully already and was not ‘declining’ any longer and “BEING EVENING” (‘ousehes opsias’) Jn20:19 AFTER sunset and ‘day’- ‘hehmera’ HAD HAD begun its next cycle—

that then: as John says “THEN (‘OUN’) having been (‘ousehs’) on THAT ‘EKEINEHI miai (hehmerai)’ --- which RELATIVE PRONOUN REFERS TO: \_ “THAT” \_ PAST, and “First Day of the week” (Sunday). It does not say ‘BEING on the First Day’; it says “being EVENING REFERRING TO the First Day of the week”: “the EVENING” RELATIVE to “THAT day”.

Just like to this day we refer BACK FROM the ‘evening’ to the PAST and no longer current, day.

**Quote: DW,** *Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. - John 10:19*

*Your interpretation would have to read “Then ANOTHER day at evening being AFTER the first day of the week” Quite a difference don’t you think, IF you are going to simply follow plain old English ....*

**GE:**

My dear DW, YOURS – “*being the first day of the week*” –, is an “*interpretation*”.

John reads:

“ousehs oun opsias” - “then being evening”;

“on THAT DAY” - ‘tehi hehmerai EKEINEHI’;

“WITH REFERENCE TO the First Day of the week” - ‘tehi miai sabbatohn’: Dative of Reference. In other words, the NORMAL Dative!

YOUR ‘*interpretation*’ – “*at evening being AFTER the first day of the week...*” –, Dr. (NOT mine!), needs an ACCUSATIVE in order to make possible the concept of “*AFTER the first day*” which in context makes inexplicable NONSENSE.

I am talking about ‘Sunday evening’; not about ‘Saturday evening’. So does John. But ‘evening on the First Day’ would have been the beginning-part of “the First Day of the week”, which would have been ‘Saturday evening’ --- which would in any case have meant the Resurrection was on the Sabbath. So, whichever way YOU ‘*interpret*’ John, you are left in the lurch by YOURSELF concerning Sunday-sacredness.

Therefore by now we have TWO factors that demand ‘*it*’ – the disciples’ “having been thronged together STILL” --- continued on the First Day while it had had begun at an indeterminate time BEFORE, except that the context demands that it was BEFORE “it being evening on THAT day”: The two factors of:

- 1) The Relative Pronoun ‘*ekeinehi*’; and
- 2) The Dative of Reference.

In fact, we by now have THREE factors, the third one being the Perfect Participle “having been thronging together STILL”- ‘*ehthroismenous*’ Lk24:33, that demands the disciples continued ‘being squeezed in’, “it being evening on THAT day”, “still”.

Now I have not looked at A.T. Robertson whom you referred to but whom you did not quote but told us what you say he said. I want to bet he did NOT say what you said he said.

**Quote: DW,** .....*Acts 2:1 is recognized by most commentators to fall on Sunday, the first day of the week, and there is an established pattern John 20:19, 26; Acts 2:1.....*

**GE:**

What pattern? There is NO ‘pattern’. A ‘pattern’ in John 20:19, 26; Acts 2:1 is the dream of Sundaydarians. It turned out to be a nightmare.

**Quote: RS,** .....*As regards Acts 2:1, the verse is referring to the annual festival of Pentecost and not to a weekly first day gathering....*

**GE:**

The Church traditionally holds to “Palm Sunday” as the fifth day before the Feast of Passover, John 12 which makes the day “before Passover”, Thursday – the day on which, according to all the Gospels, Jesus was crucified. That in turn makes Jesus’ resurrection “the third day”, on the Sabbath. Tradition – Palm Sunday, contradicts tradition – Friday crucifixion and Sunday resurrection.

The same kind of enigmatic tradition is displayed in the tradition of Pentecost. The Church at large teaches that God’s promise of the Holy Spirit was fulfilled on the “Fiftieth Day” according to Acts 2:1. The Church teaches that Jesus was crucified on a Friday. The Church teaches that that Friday was the 15th Nisan of the Jewish calendar. NAT 1979 Word-list The Church teaches that the 16th Nisan, the day after the Passover “sabbath”, was the first day of the fifty counted days. The Church teaches that the fiftieth of the fifty counted days was a Sunday. Now let us see how that is calculated.

## The Last Week

“ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES”[1] ... “THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS IN THE HEART OF THE EARTH”[2]

The First Month for You

“Observe the Month of Abib!”[3] Christ our Passover sacrificed[4]; Lamb of God[5]; A Lamb stood on the mount; they sang a new song before the Throne[6]

Friday

“The eighth day of Abib, they came”[7], He came to Bethany.[8]

Saturday (Abib 9)

Six days before the Passover Feast; where Lazarus stayed; lunch.[9]

‘Palm Sunday’ (5 days before Feast)

The next day[10], “tenth day of Abib”[11], Jerusalem; branches of palm trees.[12] Late; to Bethany.[13]

Monday (Abib 11; 4 days before Feast)

The next day[14] From Bethany; fig tree; in temple; when late out of city; to Bethany.[15]

[1] 1Cor15:3-4

[2] Mt12:40

[3] Dt16:1-3, 2Chr29:15a

[4] 1Cor5:7

[5] Jh1:29,36

[6] Rv14:1,3, 15:3; Ps40:2-3, 138; Ex15:1-3, 6-7, 16-18; Eph1:17-23; Ro6:4; Col2:12b, 15

[7] 2Chr29:15b

[8] Jn11:56, 12:1a

[9] Jn12:1b

[10] Jn12:12a

[11] Ex12:3,6

[12] Jh12:12b-13

[13] Mk11:11

[14] Mk11:12-13, Mt21:18-19

[15] Mk11:19, Mt21:17

Tuesday (Abib 12; 3 days before Feast)

The next day[1]; returned to city; saw fig tree; in temple; out of temple; mount of Olives.[2] = “When Jesus had finished these sayings, he said to his disciples, You know that after two days is the Passover when the Son of Man is to be crucified (Abib 14).”[3]

Wednesday (Abib 13; 2 days before Feast)

In the night (Tuesday-night) He abode in the mount.[4] Early in the morning; all the people came to the temple[5]; The Feast Day when they began to eat Unleavened Bread drew nigh[6]; After two days was the Feast Day[7] of the Passover of Unleavened Bread; The priests sought how they might take Him; not on the Feast![8]

And He being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper ... Judas went to the priests to betray Him unto them without tumult.”[9]

[1] Mk11:20, Mt21:18,23, Lk20:1

[2] Mk13:1,3

[3] Mt26:2, Jesus’ own words to his disciples; “two days” to Nisan 14, but 3 days to Nisan 15.

[4] Lk21:37

[5] Lk21:38

[6] Lk22:1

[7] Mk14:1, Abib 15; Mark’s words to the readers.

[8] Mk14:2, Mt26:5, Nisan 13 – “Not on the Feast Day”, Nisan 15, yet!

[9] Mk14:3,10, Mt26:6,15, Lk22:3

### **Thursday (Abib 14; 1 day before Feast)**

“The fourteenth day”[1] Before the Feast[2]; the first[3] day Leaven had[4] to be Removed; began[5]; the night in which He was betrayed[6]; the Preparation of the Passover[7]; when always[8] the Passover must[9] be killed; My time is at hand.[10] In the evening[11] when the hour was come[12] He sat down with the disciples. His hour was come.[13] It was night.[14] This day in this night[15]; this hour[16]; Enough, the hour had come[17]; Behold, the Son of Man is betrayed!

[1] Lv23:5

[2] Jn13:1

[3] Mt26:17a

[4] Ex12:19

[5] Lk22:7a

[6] 1Cor11:23

[7] Jn19:14

[8] Mk14:12a/17, Mt26:17a/20, Lk22:7a/14, Jn13:1

[9] Lk22:7b

[10] Mt26:18b

[11] Mk14:17, Mt26:20

[12] Lk22:14

[13] Jn13:1

[14] Jn13:30b

[15] Mk14:30

[16] Mk14:35, Mt26:39a

[17] Mk14:41b Mt26:45b

[18] Jn18:28

[19] Jn19:14

[20] Mk15:25

[21] Mk15:33

[22] Mt27:50

[23] Lk23:48

It was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover.[1]

It was the Preparation of Passover six o'clock am ... Behold, your King![2] It was the third hour when they crucified Him.[3] When the sixth hour was come, there was darkness until the ninth hour.[4] Jesus then after, yielded up the ghost.[5]

And all the people that came to that sight, when having seen the things which were done, went away and returned.[6]

[1] Jn18:28

[2] Jn19:14

[3] Mk15:25

[4] Mk15:33

[5] Mt27:50

[6] Lk23:48

### **Friday, The Feast**

After this because it was the Preparation, Joseph of Arimathea, secretly for fear of the Jews, went[1] in[2] boldly unto Pilate[3], (and) besought (him) that he might take away the body of Jesus.[4] And Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore and took down[5] the body of Jesus (and) away[6]. Having bought linen[7], Joseph wrapped[8] the body. There came also Nicodemus who the first time came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh about an hundred pound. Then prepared[9] they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen with the spices as the manner of the Jews is to bury.[10]

[1] Mt27:58

[2] Mk15:43 – cf. Jn18:28

[3] Lk23:52

[4] Jn19:38 ‘arehi’

[5] Mk15:46a, Lk23:53a ‘kathelohn’

[6] Jn19:38c ‘ehren’

[7] Mk15:46

[8] Lk23:53 ‘kathelohn – enetulicsen’

[9] Jn19:40a, ‘elabon – edehsan’; Mt27:59a ‘labohn – enetulicsen’

[10] Jn19:39-40

## Daylight Procession

The women also, who came with Him from Galilee (Mary Magdalene and the other Mary), followed the procession.[1]

There was a garden in the place where He was crucified, and in the garden a new sepulchre, hewn out of rock[2], wherein was never man yet laid.[3] There laid they[4] Jesus because of the Jews’ preparations.[5]

Mary Magdalene and the other Mary sitting over against the sepulchre[6] beheld where[7] (and) how his body was laid.[8]

(Joseph) rolled a great[9] stone unto the door of the sepulchre[10], and departed.[11]

(The women) returned home also, and prepared spices and ointments.[12]

The day was The Preparation, afternoon while the Sabbath drew on.[13]

[1] Lk23:55

[2] Mk15:46c, Mt 27:60b

[3] Jn19:41

[4] Jn19:38a, 39a, Joseph and Nicodemus

[5] Jn19:42

[6] Mt27:61

[7] Mk15:47

[8] Lk23:55b

[9] Mt27:60c

[10] Mk15:46d

[11] Mt27:60d

[12] Lk23:56a

[13] Lk23:54

## **Saturday (Abib 16)**

“First Sheaf Wave Offering Before the LORD; on the day after the sabbath (of the Passover, Abib 15).”[1]

The women began[2] to rest the Sabbath Day according to the (Fourth) Commandment.[3]

The morning sunrise, all their precautions despite, the chief priests and Pharisees had a meeting with Pilate, and protested, But Sir, we remember this deceiver said while he was yet alive, After[4] three days I will rise again! Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day has passed; lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say, he is risen.[5] So they secured the tomb by sealing the stone and setting a watch.[6]

[1] Lv23:10,15-16

[2] Ingressive Aorist. Cf. Lv23:32, Dt24:15

[3] Lk23:56b

[4] “After” is used idiomatically for Matthew’s usual “the third day”, 12:40, 16:21,23, 20:19. “After tree days” – not ‘after the third day’! It does not mean on a fourth day after three days. Cf. 26:2, “after two days the Feast”, inclusive of first and last days.

[5] Mt27:62-64

[6] Mt27:66

In the slow hours[1] of the Sabbath’s[2] after noon[3], towards the First Day of the week – explained the angel[4]:– When suddenly there was a great earthquake, (and) Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out[5] to go[6] have a look at the grave[7], Behold! For the angel of

the Lord descended from heaven and came and hurled back the stone from the door, and sat on it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. And for fear of him the keepers did shake and became as dead.[8]

[1] Dionysius

[2] ‘Sabbath’s-time’

[3] ‘Being (day)light tending’

[4] Mt28:5a

[5] Wenham

[6] Infinitive of intention

[7] Mt28:1

[8] Mt28:2-4

### **Sunday (Abib 17)**

And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought sweet spices that when[1] they come, they might anoint Him.[2]

Early darkness still the First Day of the week, Mary Magdalene comes[3] to the sepulchre and sees the stone taken away from it! Then she runs and comes to Peter.[4]

On the First Day of the week, deep dark morning[5], they[6] and certain other with them, went[7] to the grave bringing their spices which they had prepared. And they found[8] the stone rolled away from the grave.[9]

[1] They did not then, immediately, go to the tomb, but first waited.

[2] Mk16:1a Salome did not know of events.

[3] Notice the Present!

[4] Jn20:1 futher

[5] Lk24:1 ‘órthrou bathéohs’

[6] The two Marys and Salome. A variant has “three women”.

[7] Notice the Past!

[8] Just as Mary must have told them!

[9] Lk24:1 further

Very early before sunrise on the First Day of the week, they[1], came[2] to the tomb. Talking among themselves, they wondered: Who could have rolled the stone away for us (for it was exceedingly big!)?[3] So on re-investigation[4] they found that the stone was thrown back uphill![5] ... They fled from the sepulchre, for they trembled and were amazed. They told nobody anything, because they were afraid.[6] ... But Mary had had stood after[7] in front of the tomb. Weeping, she bent over and looked inside the sepulchre. ... She turned herself around, and saw Jesus ... supposing Him to be the gardener ...[8] Risen (Jesus), very early daylight on the First Day of the week, first appeared to Mary Magdalene.[9]

[1] Mary Magdalene, the other Mary and Salome, but probably 'others with them' again.

[2] 'erchontai', Present of past meaning; they first 'come' = 'came', KJV, then 'talked'.

[3] Mk16:4c, They were familiar with the situation already; it was not their first visit to the tomb!

[4] Mk16:4a, 'anablepsasai'

[5] Mk16:4b, 'anakekúlistai'

[6] Mk16:8

[7] Jn20:11a, "heistehkehi", Pluperfect

[8] Jn20:15b

[9] Mk16:9 The other women must have returned to the grave after Jesus had appeared to Mary, when "The angel explained to them", and they believed, and Jesus appeared to them while they went to tell the others. Refer to Mt28:5 further.

**RS:**

*Quote: re: DW, "...you have to have objective mind..."*

*Agreed. An objective mind would take or not take scripture for what it does or doesn't say. It wouldn't make assumptions - as a subjective mind would - in an effort to help validate one's already seated positions with regard to doctrinal issues. ??*

*re: "Sorry, it was John 20:26 not John 20:29 and note the word 'again' and the same group in the same place with the doors locked again and 'eight days' begins with the day in John 20:19..."*

*Your subjective mind is assuming that the "after eight days" comment is in relationship to the first day mentioned in verse 19. You are assuming that it was still the first day when Thomas was told about the appearing of the Messiah in verse 25. But even if the "after eight days" comment was referring to eight days after the "first day" in verse 19, you would end up at the second day of the week at the earliest. What if verse 26 had said; "And after one day, His disciples were again inside..."? To what day would that be referring?*

**GE:**

**Quote: DW,** *"I believe you are wrong in what you say above on several counts. John 20:19 and Acts 20:7 are not the only references to the church meeting on the Lord's Day - Sunday. In addition to those quotations are John 20:29; Acts 2:1 and 1 Cor. 16:1-2."*

*"...quotations..."? "... references to the church meeting on the Lord's Day - Sunday ...."? "John 20:19"?*

*"John 20:19"— "Being evening on that day the First Day of the week referring, where the disciples were Jesus came and stood between them, He SAID to them ...."*

Where is the disciples' action – their action of “*meeting*”? There is absolutely NO action of the disciples', except their passively having ‘been there’. In other words, John records Jesus' action – not the disciples'; and he uses the clause “where the disciples were” as Adverbial Clause of Place and Time to tell where and when it was that “Jesus came and stood between them ....”— Jesus is the Subject of the main Verb of the Sentence. The ‘action’, was Jesus' — not the disciples'. To ‘*interpret*’, ‘*the CHURCH met on the Lord's Day – Sunday*’, is deceitful untruth.

The disciples on ‘*Sunday*’, from Jerusalem to Emmaus AND back to Jerusalem, all day long AND after, “because they believed not, walked into the country” Mk16:11-12. From “the darkest morning” Lk24:22, when they had received confirmation that the body was gone – Lk24:24 – until where “they found the eleven STILL crammed in” Lk24:33 the following night “STILL”, ‘*the Church*’, for “their hardness of heart and unbelief” Mk16:14, just “walked” in disbelief and rebellion. They “walked” when Jesus caught up with them; and they kept on ‘walking’ in unbelief. Not before “He was received up into heaven” and another ten days of waiting, did ‘*the Church*’, “go forth and preached everywhere and at every opportunity” (‘pantaxou’), “the Lord WITH them WORKING”, Mk16:19-20.

Now Paul is saying in Colossians 2, “That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding .... This I say lest any man should beguile you with enticing words .... of your Reward .... DO NOT YOU LET YOURSELVES BE JUDGED AND CONDEMNED BY ANYONE WITH REGARD TO YOUR EATING AND DRINKING OF SABBATHS'-FEAST” on Christ and in Christ, “.... and holding to the HEAD from which all the Body (‘the Church’) by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.” DW, please supply us with only ONE such example of the Apostolic Church celebrating ‘Sunday’?

**Quote: RS,** “..... What if verse 26 had said; “And after one day, His disciples were again inside...”? To what day would that be referring?”

Yes!

“...being seen of them FORTY DAYS speaking in fact of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God” means EVERY ONE OF the forty days the first, First Day of the week included. Jesus skipped NO day to appear to the disciples and teach them between his Resurrection and Ascension. Only a few instances of these were - at random - recorded, however.

**DW:**

*What STRANGE translation are you quoting from? Whatever translation it is, it is completely biased rather than objective in how it handles the Greek text.*

*The Apostles were saved people from the baptism of John (Acts 1:21-22) and confessors of Christ (Matthew 15, 16:17) in keeping with progressive gospel of the Old Testament (Acts 10:43). The proclamation of the cross and death and resurrection of Christ is the final completion of what was progressive in revelation previous to the cross. It is this completion that Jesus emphasized and taught the two on the road to Emmaeus as well as the apostles on the first Lord's Day service.*

*If you will take a look at Luke 24:36-48 you will see the first Lord's day worship service of the church began when the head of the Church entered in among them and broke the word of God to them. He established church service that time and from that point out (John 20:26; Acts 1:4; 15-27; 2:1) it was the habitual day of worship.*

*You may explain the doors being locked is due to fear but you cannot say the day they chose to gather together was due to fear as that makes no sense, especially when Thomas chooses to assemble with*

*them on the eighth day and their doors are still locked. A.T. Robertson says of the language in John 20:29: After eight days (mey hmerav oktw). That is the next Sunday evening, on the eighth day in reality just like “after three days” and “on the third day.”*

**GE:**

I must ask your pardon, DW that I distrusted you before about what “A.T. Robertson says of the language in John 20:29”. But that doesn’t mean what Dr Robertson says of the language in John 20:26 is correct. Because it is completely ANOTHER MATTER in the case of the PASSOVER-CONCEPT of “three days”, “according to the Scriptures”, “after the third day of which” that Christ would rise from the dead on. Of THIS “third day” we have SEVERAL phrasings of the SAME PROPHETIC concept expressed in other ways (like the one Robertson referred to, “on the third day”). And again, it must be pointed out, John does NOT speak of it ‘having been the First Day of the week’ in verse 19 as the point in time departed from, but of it “having been EVENING ON THAT DAY relative to the First Day of the week”— so, from the point of departure of the second day of the week. In this sense and sentence therefore, the use of ‘meth’ hehmeras ....’ has simply NO ‘idiomatic’ force but is intended purely ‘literal’.

In this regard it should also be remembered that after He resurrected, “Until the day that He was taken up He was seen of” the disciples “forty days” EVERY DAY— Acts 1:2. John in 19:26 refers to this particular instance for no reason other than that Thomas then was in the company of the other disciples whereas in the event of Jesus’ first appearance to the disciples recorded in verse 19, he was absent.

**DW:**

*Re: “having been the First Day of the week” - Gerhard*

*This is an impossible translation for John 20:19. You cannot make the two perfect participles modify the day. The perfect participles may refer to actions that began prior to the stated day but they cannot be used to modify the stated day.*

*Luke may be referring to Roman time instead of Jewish time.*

*However, if he is, then he is emphasizing that the Roman day Sunday is to be understood as equal to the Jewish first day of the week in regard to the Christian Sabbath. Therefore, here is a transition from Jewish to Roman in counting the Christian Sabbath to be the Roman day Sunday. Hence, by Roman counting if you begin with Sunday as equal to the Jewish first day of the week and start counting the Roman Sunday as the first of eight days it brings you to the next Sunday.*

*This was a worship service conducted by Christ on this first Christian Sabbath (“protos tou sabbatou” - Mk. 16:9).*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** *“The perfect participles may refer to actions that began prior to the stated day but they cannot be used to modify the stated day.”*

Yes. ‘Ehthroismenous’ in Luke— who mentions no ‘*stated day*’, refers to actions that began prior to when the disciples were “found” “being thrust in together still”. But we know Luke has the same evening “afterward / later”— that Mk16:14a and Jn20:19 refer to, in mind. If we put the various bits of information together, it follows ‘ehthroismenous’ indirectly ‘*is used to modify the stated day*’, viz., “IT BEING evening on that day with reference to the First Day of the week”.

The story of the Emmaus disciples serves as a good example of how we should understand the whole Gospel story. No Gospel paints the

whole picture. They are like transparent pages each with its own detail, which when placed precisely on top of each other will give the full likeness. Or like a symphony or oratorio is composed with every instrument and voice, on separate bars.

I like to listen to the Gospels sung in melodious antiphony refrained in wondrous harmonious counterpoint.

**DW:**

*What crazy translation are you reading that translates a present tense participle into past tense English???*

*'having been the First Day of the week' in verse 19 The KJV correctly translates it as "BEING" not HAVING BEEN! This proves that "even" merely means late afternoon as he says explicitly it was the "SAME" day, not another day!*

**BR:**

*Quote: DW, "for fear of the Jews" can modify "the doors being shut" rather than "assembling." The worst thing a group can do is assemble together in one place if they fear being dragged off to jail.*

**BR:**

*That this is then the first introduction of a mythical sunday-sabbath cycle we would need MORE of an introduction than 'doors shut for fear of the Jews' as the week-day-one transitional statement to being the weekly Creation Sabbath.*

*The fact that we have no mention at all of such a thing - is devastating to your argument.*

*Quote: DW, "John makes it as clear as language can make it that this assembling was on the first day of the week not the second day of the week.*

**BR:**

*We agree that the resurrection was on week-day-one and that 8 days later (rather than 7 days later) they were still hiding out.*

*But at no point do we have “resurrection memorial” language associated with a “7 day cycle”. Not in John - not in all of the NT. Again - a devastating fact to be overlooked by your argument so far.*

**Quote: DW,** *“Paul went to the synogoue on the Jewish Sabbath because his modus operandi was to the Jew first and then to the gentiles. In the synogouge they gave visiting rabbi’s the floor. This does not mean that the church met on the Jewish Sabbath as there is no record of the church ever meeting on the Jewish Sabbath.*

**BR:**

*Sadly for the week-day-one argument, the Act 13 and Acts 17 example of Sabbath after Sabbath meetings for worship and Bible study are far more explicit than anything in all of the NT for week day one.*

*So while you are free to discount each successive Sabbath observance explicitly shown for NT saints - you have nothing of the sort for introducing the supposed new idea of swithing the 4th commandment to week-day-one.*

*Even worse - the fact that we all know that the Sabbath term in Acts 13 and Acts 17 is NOT a reference to week-day-one is proof that such a term was not the NT term for Sunday.*

**Quote: DW,** *“Your arguments concerning I Cor. 16:1-2 are extremely weak.”*

**BR:**

*My only point there is that NO meeting of any kind is mentioned in 1Cor 16 as having taken place on week-day-one. Not even one meeting.*

*This was the perfect place “again” to introduce the idea.*

*Your lack of objectivity at that point is apparent.*

**GE:**

**Quote: DW,** *“What STRANGE translation are you quoting from? Whatever translation it is, it is completely biased rather than objective in how it handles the Greek text. ....”*

No, DW, I am “quoting from” the actual text— ‘the Greek’ and virtually transliterate rather than use a “STRANGE translation” like you do. I am not going to repeat it here; you can look it up ON THIS THREAD since my first post in it on 16.9.2010, above.

You find ‘my’ translation “STRANGE” because it is both CORRECT, and, COMPLETE. You see, it is easy to ‘translate’ the Perfect Participle ‘ehthroismenous’- with an Indicative Verb “STILL crammed in”— that has no past, perfect, initial act, that introduced a present ongoing result. It is easy to mention the RESULT for a finite ACTION. In other words, to LIE, and say “the first Lord’s day worship service of the church began”. And make the Adjectival Adverbial Participle the main Verb of the sentence. Or, likewise, handle the Present Participle used in Jn20:19 in the same disrespectful way such as I have explained already in this thread, above.

**DW:**

*My friend I have had five years of class room Greek under teachers who have their Ph.D in Greek. I don’t claim to be a Greek scholar but I am perfectly capable of translating a text and determining if someone else is dealing with the text honestly.*

*Your translation is wrong. The Perfect Participle describes THEIR CONDITION during “the same day” not the identity of the day. The present participle actually modifies “the SAME day” which in turn modifies “the first day of the week.”*

*Better go back to Greek class.*

**GE:**

From ‘*strange*’, to, ‘*crazy*’; that’s progress....

So, does DW say John 20:19 is happening at this moment, in the present because it is written in the Present Tense? O my, DW, ever heard of Greek Aspects of Time rather than Tenses? Ever heard of a Past Tense sense of use of the Present Tense --- in whichever language? Sometimes it gets called the ‘Historic Present’; it has other names as well --- every scholar has his own ‘name’ for the ‘Past Present’. But DW maintains “‘*having been the First Day of the week in verse 19*’ is “*a present tense participle*” in present tense English-meaning and not ‘past tense English’-meaning. Because the ‘past tense English’-meaning— for DW, means it’s a “*STRANGE*” and “*crazy translation*”.

**DW:**

*You exposing your ignorance of the Greek language. The present tense does not speak concerning the time of the reader but the time of the writer.*

*Secondly, there has to be a contextual reason that demands that the normal meaning of the present tense be disregarded and another meaning be sought. Furthermore, the other meaning must be contextually demonstrated rather than arbitrarily demanded by someone who obviously has had poor training in Greek grammar.*

*Furthermore, your perfect tense term does not modify the date but the condition of those during that day. The present participle modifies the day. Hence, your whole translation is a complete falsification.*

*It would not IF you count what John identifies in verse 19 as “the SAME day” as the first day in this number of eight. This is exactly how the previous three days are counted by Luke. Luke counts the first day of the week as “this is the third day” and counts the day of crucifixion as the first in the promise of three days he will rise again.*

*Therefore, I have counted these eight days just as Luke has counted the previous three days.*

**ST:**

*Dr. Walter, re: "It would not..."*

*What "would not"?*

*re: "...IF you count what John identifies in verse 19 as "the SAME day" as the first day in this number of eight."*

*But why do you HAVE to do that? Why not just take the "after eight days" comment to mean exactly what it says. What is there in scripture that makes it necessary for you to try to find a way to make "after eight days" wind up on the first day of the week?*

*And I ask again; If John had said in verse 26 that "after one day, His disciples were again inside..." to what day would John be referring?*

*Your subjective mind is assuming that the "after eight days" comment is in relationship to the first day mentioned in verse 19. You are assuming that it was still the first day when Thomas was told about the appearing of the Messiah in verse 25. But even if the "after eight days" comment was referring to eight days after the "first day" in verse 19, you would end up at the second day of the week at the earliest. What if verse 26 had said; "And after one day, His disciples were again inside..."? To what day would that be referring?*

**DW:**

*Your chronology is in error. Mark uses the technical term for the fourth watch of the night which occurred at 3am to 6am (Gr. proee") and places it on the first day of the week in Mark 16:9.*

**GE:**

*Dear DW, Kindly point out to me where I DID NOT say that "Mark uses the technical term for the fourth watch of the night which*

*occurred at 3am to 6am (Gr. proee") and places it on the first day of the week in Mark 16:9"? Well, yes, I make it after sunrise, not before, because Mary supposed Jesus for the gardener who would have been on duty by sunrise normally.*

Is the difference that great in meaning to you? Why? Because 'proh-i' ONLY means "*the fourth watch of the night which occurred at 3am to 6am*"? Then naturally, I must disagree, because 'proh-i' could and does mean the fore- or early- or beginning-part of any period of time.

**DW:**

*Jesus uses the same Greek term for the fourth hour of the night twice but the clearest is found in the SAME gospel of Mark 13:35*

*Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning [Gr. proee]:*

*Now when Jesus was risen early [Gr. proee] the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.*

**GE:**

Self-correction, with my apologies:

**Re: Quote: GE,** "..... In this sense and sentence therefore, the use of 'meth' hehmeras ....' has simply NO 'idiomatic' force but is intended purely 'literal'....."

--- which of course is wrong. Please read: In this sense and sentence therefore, the use of 'meth' hehmeras ....' has simply THE 'idiomatic' force intended purely 'literal', 'on the eighth day'. Just like Robertson meant. It would be on a 'Tuesday' eight days later.

**DW:**

*Robertson NEVER said that. Robertson said the exact opposite. Robertson said that the proper way to interpret those eight days was exactly as Luke interpreted the previous three days. Luke began his count with the day of crucifixion. Likewise, John would begin his count with the “SAME DAY” in verse 19 end thus end his count with the next first day of the week.*

*My friend, who in the world taught you Greek???????*

**GE:**

**Quote: DW,** “.....*The Perfect Participle describes THEIR CONDITION during “the same day” not the identity of the day.....*”

Absolutely! That’s what I’ve been saying all the while and DW all the while has been denying.

The Perfect Participle describes THEIR CONDITION: “being crammed in together STILL after having been crammed in BEFORE” Lk24:33 ANY TIME, not necessarily “*the same day*”.

NOWHERE IS “*the same day*” written in Greek!

In John it is written “It being evening on THAT DAY”- ‘ousehs opsias hehmerai ekeinehi’ Jn20:19. The disciples were thus “found” Lk24:33.

Subsequently, i.e., by means of the Locative Dative or Dative of Time, “ON THAT day”-’hehmerai ekeinehi’, the RELATIVE DATIVE identifies “the day TO” which REFERENCE or RELATION is being made, which was, “TO the First Day of the week”- ‘tehi miai sabbatohn’.

Don’t switch the functions of relation of the Dative!

Thus the present participle actually modifies “THAT day” which in turn modifies “the first day of the week.”

**Quote: DW,** “*Robertson NEVER said that. ....*”

I do not say Robertson said that; but I do say what Robertson said – from your quote of him – amounts to exactly that.

Again, NOWHERE do the words “*SAME DAY*” appear “*in verse 19*”.

And: Luke’s ‘*interpretation*’ of “*the previous three days*” has NOTHING to do with John’s “*count*”. John does not ‘*count*’ at all; and his reference to “That day with reference to the First Day of the week” has NOTHING to do with Luke’s reference to “today is the third day since” “*the day of crucifixion*”.

I hope you also studied ‘*interpretation*’ of the Text or ‘hermeneutics’ or ‘exegesis’ or something like that I think the scholars call it.

And, honourable DW, who cares about who taught me, a plumber called of God to pour molten lead down the Eustachian tubes of the sleeping watchmen on the walls of the Holy City?

**DW:**

*If you want to make a fool of yourself that is your business. The KJV simply translates “ekeinos” which is translated “same” 20 times in the KJV and modifies “day” or “this” day. The present participle also modifies “this” day which is identified as “the first day of the week.”*

*the perfect passive participle has nothing to do with identifying what day it is only what they had been doing on “ekeinos” that day or the first day of the week.*

*Give it up pal!*

**GE:**

Who denied “*The KJV simply translates “ekeinos” which is translated “same” 20 times in the KJV and modifies “day” or “this” day*”? Me? But who does NOT mention the KJV may be ten times 20, translates “ekeinos” “THAT” only?

and each time of the (believed) 20 times, “THAT same”, “the VERY same”, “the SELFsame” etc.?

and not once “*same*” as such?

And of those (believed) 20 times modifies other things than “day” or “this day” like “year”, or, “hour”?

And most important, NOT ONCE THROUGHOUT, ‘translates’ “ekeinos”, “*same*”, in context with the Dative of Relation or Reference?

And that, if one would wish to IDENTIFY “THAT day” with the ‘*SAME day*’, he would use the Genitive in the way that the same John uses it where he IDENTIFIED “THAT day” with “great day OF Sabbath” of the Passover in nearby verse 31 in chapter 19?

So yes, the Perfect Passive Participle has nothing to do with identifying what day it was. Not what DW has been saying so far though .... Because he is still alleging the Perfect Passive Participle is identifying “*what they had been doing on “ekeinos” that day or the first day of the week*”— while “the first day of the week” was the PAST day “TO” which “that (‘ekeinos’) day”, ‘referred’ through the medium of the ‘Basic Functional Dative’ of Reference or Relation.

We are making progress though: From “*STRANGE*” to “crazy” to ‘*foolish*’. I hope we are going to end up at despised and ridiculed yet TRUE.

**GE:**

**Quote: DW**, “*Your chronology is in error. ....*” and of course the Doctor could not resist the temptation---

**Quote: DW,** “..... *Now when Jesus was risen early [Gr. proee] the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.*”

Dear DW, Does it say ‘Jesus rose early the First Day of the week’? Is it what you wanted to say?

**DW:**

*Psalm 26:4*

**GE:**

Ps26:4, “I have not sat with vain persons, neither will I go with dissemblers.”

DW, Why not verse 5 as well, “I have hated the congregation of evildoers and will not sit with the wicked”? Afraid? Because it is ME you are referring to? Or afraid to answer my question, ‘Dear DW, Does it say ‘Jesus rose early the First Day of the week’? Is it what you wanted to say?’ IS IT WHAT YOU ARE AFRAID TO ANSWER, DW?

**DW:**

*¶ 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[proii] 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.*

*6 And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the*

*place where they laid him.*

*7 But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.*

*8 And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.*

*9 ¶ Now when Jesus was risen early [proii] the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.*

*“Risen” does not refer to rising up from a nap or from a night’s sleep in verse nine. Verse 9 uses the same language as verse 2 for the same event - his resurrection. It is his resurrection in verse nine because it identifies the first person he appeared unto - Mary. To suggest that he arose from the grave the previous evening but then took a nap and rose up from the nap Sunday morning is ludicrous. Not only ludicrous, but pure blindness to the language used in verse 2 and verse 9. Mark uses the same term Jesus used in Mark 13 or the technical term of the fourth watch (3am to 6 am) on the first day of the week pin pointing the resurrection of Christ from the grave before sunrise.*

*Sorry, my mistake I meant Prov. 26:4*

**GE:**

Alright then, let’s see—

**Quote: DW,** “*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.....*”

This of course is Mk16:1..... verse ONE. Not verse 9.

The time of day given:

1: “when the sabbath was past”. i.e., after sunset ‘evening’, ‘Saturday’ night.

9: “early on the First Day”, i.e., after sunrise, on ‘Sunday’ morning.

The Verb of the sentence:

1: “had bought”.

9: “appeared”.

The Subject:

1: “Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome”.

9: “He (Jesus)”.

Place of occurrence:

1: At the traders.

9: In the garden.

Present at place:

1: The three women themselves.

9: Mary Magdalene and Jesus.

Witnesses (angels):

1: None.

9: “He appeared to Mary (alone) first” while two angels were inside tomb, Jn20:11-17.

**Semblance between verses 1 and 9: None.**

DW’s comment: “¶ *And when the sabbath was past, ..... 9 ¶ Now when Jesus was risen early [proii] the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene.....”*

Note DW’s use of the bullet-sign, supposed to indicate the same time for supposedly the same event.

Conclusion: A misleading indicator.

Let's look at verse 2:

**Quote: DW**, “2 *And very early in the morning[proii] 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?.....”*

The time of day given:

2: “very early in the morning”. i.e., BEFORE just “early” [proii]. i.e., EARLIER than “early”-’proii’-AFTER-sunrise. Therefore, “VERY early”- ‘lian proh-i’, BEFORE sunrise ‘Sunday’ “morning”.

9: “early on the First Day”, i.e., after sunrise, “early” [proii] ‘Sunday’ morning because Mary thought Jesus was the gardener who would start work, sunrise.

Conclusion: It makes good sense, because **according to Mk16:2 Jesus had not appeared yet.**

The Verb(s) of the sentence:

2: “come / arrive”; “said”; “behold”; “saw”.

9: “appeared”.

The Subject:

2: “they (women)”.

9: “he (Jesus)”.

Place and purpose of occurrence:

2: “unto the sepulcher”--- “specifically”- ‘EPI to mnehma’, TO MAKE SURE.

9: In the garden, outside and some distance away from the tomb, TO FIND OUT.

Present at place:

2: women not specified.

9: only Mary Magdalene and Jesus.

Witnesses (angels):

2: one angel “sitting on the right side” inside tomb.

9: “He appeared to Mary (alone) first” while two angels were inside tomb away from Jesus appearing to Mary (in John).

Semblance between verses 2 and 9: **None**.

DW commented: “[*proii*]”: “...*very early in the morning[proii] the first day*”; “*Verse 9 uses the same language as verse 2 for the same event - his resurrection*”.

Note that DW does not give the whole time-phrase --- “*lian proh-i anateilantos tou hehliou*”, “VERY early daybreak / sunrising” --- only what suits his agenda, so as to make it appear the same event and the same time of event, falsely insinuating it was the Resurrection that occurred “*very early in the morning[proii] the first day*”, falsely suggesting Appearance and Resurrection occurred **simultaneously**.

Conclusion: The event of verse two was much earlier than the event of the first Appearance according to verse 9, and certainly not the already past Resurrection!

Now, let’s look DW’s further comments:

**Quote: DW**, ““*Risen*” does not refer to rising up from a nap or from a night’s sleep in verse nine.....”

My question remains for DW to answer,

Does “*Now when Jesus was risen early [Gr. proee] the first day.....*” mean Jesus was raised “*early [Gr. proee] the first day*”? Put in other words, Does ““*Risen*” in verse nine” refer to Jesus ‘*rising up*’ from the dead “*early [Gr. proee] the first day*”? I ask for two reasons: 1) To hear the meaning DW attaches to the Participle; 2) To make sure everybody sees DW identifies moment and occurrence of Appearance to Mary and Resurrection.

**Quote: DW,** “.....Verse 9 uses the same language as verse 2 for the same event - his resurrection. It is his resurrection in verse nine because it identifies the first person he appeared unto - Mary.” His words, yes; not mine.

So here we find DW’s answer to my above question, “*It is his resurrection in verse nine because it identifies the first person he appeared unto – Mary*”.

Conclusion One:

Superior logic! “*It is his RESURRECTION in verse nine because it identifies the first person he APPEARED unto - Mary*”!

Conclusion Two:

Superior Grammar Skills: A Participle is not a Participle but a Verb; and a Subject of a sentence is not the Subject but the Object.

**Quote: DW,** “.....To suggest that he arose from the grave the previous evening but then took a nap and rose up from the nap Sunday morning is ludicrous.”

I suppose it is! But who, suggested it? No other than DW who supposed these suppositions.

**Quote: DW,** “..... Not only ludicrous, but pure blindness to the language used in verse 2 and verse 9.....”

Absolutely! That’s why DW could make such suppositions, “*pure blindness to the language used in verse 2 and verse 9*”!

**Quote: DW,** “..... Mark uses the same term Jesus used in Mark 13 or the technical term of the fourth watch (3am to 6 am) on the first day of the week pin pointing the resurrection of Christ from the grave before sunrise.”

DW, are you speaking about verse 1 or verse 2 or verse 9 now? According to the above analysis, you speak about the time-phrases in all three verses as if they were one and ‘*the same*’. Nevertheless --- even had all three verses used “*the same (technical) term of the fourth watch (3am to 6 am) on the first day*” --- kindly ‘*pin point*’ the words or concepts that say or indicate “*the resurrection of Christ from the grave before sunrise on the first day of the week*”? Please do not answer, “*It is his RESURRECTION in verse nine because it identifies the first person he APPEARED unto - Mary*!” Appearance is only possible after Resurrection and Resurrection only before Appearance, and Mark in 16:9 speaks of Jesus who “As The Risen early on the First Day of the week APPEARED to Mary Magdalene first.”

DW, before you attempt to find those words or indicators; they are not there; they are non-existent; they are not even hinted at or suggested or imagined --- anywhere in Scripture. It’s all your own surmising they are in the Text. They are not in the verses we have been looking at, and they are in NO Scripture at all in any manner whatsoever.

Because the ONLY Scripture that (by implication) supplies information IN SO MANY WORDS about the day and time of day of Jesus’ resurrection, is Matthew 28:1, and it, places the circumstances of the Resurrection --- QUOTING: “Fully on the Sabbath Day mid-afternoon as daylight began to incline towards the First Day of the week.”

**DW:**

*IF the women got there Saturday evening, Our SDA friend will have to explain how is it the women began while it was yet “dark” and yet got there at the “rising of the Sun” “morning” and “dawn”? When it gets dark on Saturday night it STAYS DARK till Sunday morning. But these women started when it was already dark and then the terms “morning” “rising of the sun” “dawn” “early” are used to describe their arrival time at the sepulchre. This only makes sense if they*

*began in the dark sometime between 3am to 6am at the fourth watch (proii) and arrived when the sunlight was just beginning to dawn or in the twilight of morning*

*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 [Gr. proii] the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising [Gr. anatello “rising UP”] of the sun.*

*Lu 24:1 ¶ Now upon the first day of the week, very early [Gr. proii] in the morning, [Gr orthos day break] they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.*

*Joh 20:1 ¶ 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.*

*Now when Jesus was risen early [Gr. proii] the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. - Mk. 16:9*

*Mt 28:1 ¶ In the end of [Gr. opse - after] the sabbath, as it began to dawn [Gr. epiphosko - get brighter] toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.*

*You don't need Greek or grammar, but just common sense and the ability to read English to tell that these women did not come Saturday evening after 6 p.m but came Sunday morning between 3am to 6am at sunrise.*

*1. Every text above gives the day they came - the first day of the week And very early in the morning the first day of the week - Mk 16:2*

*Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, - Lk. 24:1*

*The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early - Jn. 20:1  
Mt 28:1 ¶ In the end of [Gr. opse - "after"] the sabbath, as it began to dawn [epiphosko - to get brighter] toward (eis - into) the first day of the week,*

*2. Every text above gives the time they came to the tomb was at sunrise*

- a. "sunrise" (not sunset)*
- b. "morning" (not evening)*
- c. "early" proii - 3am to 6pm or 4th watch*
- d. "dawn" - epiphosko - to get brighter (not darker)*

*3. They started while it was yet "dark" between 3 a.m to 6am*

*4. They arrived at sunrise not sunset*

*5. The rest of the women went back but Mary stayed.*

*6. 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.*

*2. They came "early" on the first day of the week*

*3. They arrived at the selphchre at SUNRISE Sunday morning.*

*4. They got their at Sunrise while it was twilight, saw it was empty and all the women but Mary Magnalene ran back to tell the apostles.*

*5. Jesus appeared to Mary - Mk 16:9.*

*It is just that simple and that clear.*

*There was a "watch" at the tomb (Mt. 28:11) and the precise watch is designated by the repeated Greek term "proii" or the fourth watch between 3am to 6am.*

*Our SDA friend will have to make change the common technical meaning of “proii” mean something else. Our SDA friend will have to make “sunrise” mean sunset. Our SDA friend will have to change “morning” to evening*

**GE:**

**Quote: DW,** *“You don’t need Greek or grammar, but just common sense and the ability to read English to tell that these women did not come Saturday evening after 6 p.m .....*”

Absolutely! All you need is eyes to see what you say yourself, dear DW. But you seem to be blind to what you say yourself..... that’s the problem, not only with you, but with just about every ‘*traditional Christian*’. You NEED AN EYE-OPENER!

And I am, God willing, going to give it to you, were it my last day alive.

First off.....

**Quote: DW,** *“IF the women got there Saturday evening, Our SDA friend will have to explain ...”*

I am NO Seventh-day Adventist OR COG Arian! I am --- I thank God I may and can believe and confess with my heart and mouth and pen and life (though ever sinful) --- a Reformed Protestant Christian according to the Apostolic Confession and Confession of Athanasius, and the Formulae of Unity the Netherlands Confession of Faith, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of Dordrecht with two reservations about the Sunday and water-baptism. For which latter two reasons I am excommunicated, banned, and persecuted— ever more cruelly for its sophisticated ways and methods, but that I accordingly find greater comfort, peace and joy in the Lord Jesus my Lord and Saviour for the sake of His Honour. Sola Gratia! Solus Christus!

Next....

**Quote: DW,** “.....*You don’t need Greek or grammar, but just common sense and the ability to read English to tell .....*”

Unfortunately you do *need Greek grammar*, especially since the twentieth century and the appearance of so many new ‘Versions’ and ‘Translations’ and ‘Bibles’ that go out of their way and completely off The Way of Christ and Truth in order to entrench ‘Tradition’ --- “the traditions of men” and of antichrist Rome.

Therefore....

**Quote: DW,** “*IF the women got there Saturday evening ..... how is it the women began while it was yet “dark” and yet got there at the “rising of the Sun” “morning” and “dawn”? When it gets dark on Saturday night it STAYS DARK till Sunday morning. ....*”

**Re: DW,** “*IF the women got there .....*”

The basic premise of your argument, contra- or pro-, is, A single arrival and presence of all the women together and at once at the grave, WHILE, the Resurrection occurred. That, is the crux of your premise. There are multiple interrelated reasons why that cannot have been the case, and the Gospel is one; it NEVER contradicts itself.

**DW:**

*Don’t put words in my mouth that I never said. I said the resurrection occurred during the fourth watch which the term “proii” is a technical designation of the fourth watch just as Jesus used it in the same book for the fourth watch (Mk 13:35; 16:2,9). That spans a period between 3am to 6am. Jesus arose BEFORE the women got there not “while” the resurrection occurred as you falsely represent me. I NEVER said that anywhere. So your first STRAW MAN argument perishes.*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** “.... *how is it the women began while it was yet “dark” ....*” “....*the women began....*” “*Began*” to do what? Began to go to the

tomb. Where do we read about that? In any texts thus far ‘*looked at*’ in this discussion? Mark? Luke? John? You will not find in any of these Gospels that the women ‘*began*’, ‘*to get there*’, i.e., at the tomb.

In John, “Mary had had stood after next to the grave”; In Mk16:2 the women “come” or “arrive”, “upon the tomb”. In Luke, “they came unto” but in Greek the same as in Mark, “upon”- ‘epi’ the tomb. In all three Gospels we find the women at the grave having HAD arrived there and the rest of what immediately AFTERWARDS happened; in neither what happened BEFORE or how or when they “*started*” to get there!

In other words, Each Gospel records an ACCOMPLISHED VISIT AT the tomb.

Now to ‘*interpret*’ this fact for the same and only visit to, or, at, the tomb, is in no way guaranteed by it; the fact each Gospel records an accomplished visit at the tomb DOES NOT MEAN IT IS THE ONLY OR THE SAME visit. Each Gospel can and in fact does record ITS OWN SEPARATE AND ACCOMPLISHED VISIT AT the tomb.

This is the alternative to solving every of the assumed ‘*discrepancies*’ about the Gospels’ ‘*stories*’ which I have proposed now for over 40 years which no one would even look at but couldn’t counter with a better solution OR, could substantiate a single flaw from!

Therefore: It is not simply a matter of “*When it gets dark on Saturday night it STAYS DARK till Sunday morning*”. The night has its own twelve hours and each ‘part’ or ‘watch’ of night (4x) MUST be distinguished by the degree or stage or ‘hours’ of night of its occurrence.

**DW:**

*Every single account uses the SAME day of arrival to the tomb:*

*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 [Gr. proii] the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising [Gr. anatello “rising UP”] of the sun.*

*Lu 24:1 ¶ Now upon the first day of the week, very early [Gr. proii] in the morning, [Gr orthos day break] they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.*

*Joh 20:1 ¶ 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.*

*Now when Jesus was risen early [Gr. proii] the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. - Mk. 16:9*

*Mt 28:1 ¶ In the end of [Gr. opse - after] the sabbath, as it began to dawn [Gr. epiphosko - get brighter] toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.*

*All the texts use expressions that are either identical or synonymous for the same time of arrival by all the women on the same day.*

*1. Mark 16:2 uses “proii” “early in the morning” with “at rising of the sun” on the first day of the week.*

*2. Mark 16:9 uses “proii” “early in the morning” on the first day of the week.*

3. Luke 24:1 uses “*proii*” or “*very early in the morning*” on the first day of the week

4. John 20:1 uses “*proii*” or “*early*” when it was yet “*dark*” on the first day of the week.

5. Matthew 28:1 uses the term “*dawn*” which represents a Greek word that means to “*GET BRIGHTER*” not darker, therefore the exact time as in the other three gospels (morning, rising of the sun). This was “*opse*” or “*AFTER*” the Sabbath and “*toward*” (*eis*) or *INTO* the first day of the week.

*Numbers 1-4 above are IDENTICAL as to the day and as to the time of the day with the identical women “they” and they are named in Mark 16:1 and Mary Magdalene is named in all four accounts because she is specifically the one that Jesus appeared to that same morning. So there can be no debate that 1-4 happen on the same day - the first day of the week at the same time in that day - proii - early morning - rising of the sun - dawn (getting brighter) or “early”.*

### **GE:**

It is most significant that the individual events and time-indications in the four Gospels historically, logically and chronologically,

PERFECTLY SYNCHRONISE. So there is no such ‘*problem*’ as

**Quote: DW,** “..... *how is it the women began while it was yet “dark” and yet got there at the “rising of the Sun” “morning” and “dawn”?*”.

No; Every Gospel uses

- 1) **different** words for
- 2) really **different** TIMES; of
- 3) **different** events of VISITS— of or by
- 4) **different** PERSONS under
- 5) **different** CIRCUMSTANCES at
- 6) **different** PLACES—

EVERYTHING is different, **separate** and in chronological **sequence**, but for the mutual similarity every Gospel records A, VISIT, AT, the

tomb.

**DW:**

*This is pure imagination gone wild. Every text identifies it as the SAME DAY - the first day of the week. Every text identifies it as the same time on the same day “proii” “early” “early in the morning” “at the rising of the sun” “dawn”.*

*Every text includes all the women with Mary Magdalene - “they” doing the SAME THING come to prepare the body.*

*John gives no mention of any women but Mary Magdalene but restrict it to the same day, same time in the day and it perfectly harmonizes with the same events recorded by the other gospel writers on the same day at the same time of that day.*

**GE:**

Except that no two tell about ““they” doing the SAME THING come to prepare the body”— something ONLY Luke, implies.

**DW:**

*The Gospel of John excludes all the women but Mary Magdalene but includes everything that the other gospels declare that Mary Magdalene did with all the other women.*

**GE:**

Which really “*is pure imagination gone wild*”. You won’t be able to give one example!

**DW:**

*Going to tell the disciples and their responses. It pinpoints it at the very same time on the very same day with all the rest of the women.*

**GE:**

You only pretend; you don't 'quote; you CANNOT quote. There is NOTHING the same in either of John's stories in chapter 20 and any or all the other Gospels except for Mark 16:9.

**DW:**

*In each of the gospel accounts the emphasis is upon Mary Magdelene and no wonder John simply zeros in on her at the exclusion of all the rest even though they were present with her.*

**BR:**

**Quote: DW,** *““Risen” does not refer to rising up from a nap or from a night's sleep in verse nine. Verse 9 uses the same language as verse 2 for the same event - his resurrection. It is his resurrection in verse nine because it identifies the first person he appeared unto - Mary. To suggest that he arose from the grave the previous evening but then took a nap and rose up from the nap Sunday morning is ludicrous.”*

*Granted - but to suggest that people were fasting “twice each Sabbath” instead of “twice a week” is also ludicrous.*

*And the fact that the term “Sabbath” in Acts 13, Acts 17, Acts 15 is “still” the designated name given to the creation memorial 7th day refutes the obtuse “Sabbath means Sunday” speculation.*

**Quote: DW,** *“Not if there are TWO Sabbaths, a high sabbath and a regular sabbath.”*

*Correct Luke not me, because I am just following how he counted the prophesy of three days. He started his counting with the first day as*

*day one. I will follow an inspired man and you can follow whoever you like.*

**ST:**

*re: "Correct Luke not me, because I am just following how he counted the prophesy of three days."*

*But we're talking about John here - not Luke. Luke and John don't exactly see time in the same way. John says it was about the 6th hour when the Messiah was before Pilate waiting to hear His fate. And Luke says it was about the 6th hour when the darkness began which was 3 hours after the start of the crucifixion?*

*re: "He [Luke] started his counting with the first day as day one." What scripture says that?*

**DW:**

*John is merely giving the Roman time instead of the Jewish time when it came to the hours of the day not when it comes to counting days.*

**GE:**

John views the time on the clock as it were the 'Roman way' midnight to midnight; he still views the cycle of days according to the 'week' - 'sabbatohn' / 'sabbatou', the 'Jewish way'.

The other Gospels view the reckoning of time or hours the Hebrew and or Greek way, from sunrise to sunset and from sunset to sunrise.

**GE:**

**Quote: DW,** "..... *But these women started when it was already dark and then the terms "morning" "rising of the sun" "dawn" "early" are used to describe their arrival time at the seplechure. This only makes sense if they began in the dark sometime between 3am to 6am at the fourth watch (proii) and arrived when the sunlight was just beginning to dawn or in the twilight of morning"*

None of this “*makes sense*” for no “*if*” whatever— it is not stated “*they began*” anywhere anyhow (except in Matthew 28:1). It is not stated “*they began in the dark sometime*” anywhere anyhow Matthew included.

Then there is no reason why “*proii*” MUST ALWAYS mean “*between 3am to 6am at the fourth watch*”, especially not if context, event, setting and chronology and or combinations of Adverbial phrases demand it otherwise.

You have said it yourself, “*When it gets dark on Saturday night it STAYS DARK till Sunday morning.*” So where did the women ‘*start*’ to move and when did they stop to move to the tomb? Using variables like “*the dark sometime*”, “*between 3am to 6am*”, “*at the fourth watch*”, “*when the sunlight was just beginning*”, “*to dawn*”, “*in the twilight*”, “*morning*”, as synonyms or equivalents of the same or of two moments in time, offers nothing better than an array of unrealism for the answer of a self-created enigma.

We ‘*need Greek*’, is the only solution.

First REALISED visit AT, the tomb: Luke 24:1.

Why Luke? Because it is “*just common sense*” ‘*needed*’ “*to tell*” if the women “came unto the sepulcher bringing the spices which they had prepared” (“prepared” on Friday afternoon and Saturday evening), they would not already have known that the body no longer was there. So they got to the grave for the first time according to Luke 24:1.

Mark 16:1 implies this visit mentioned in Luke where it tells the women “Bought sweet spices so that WHEN-they-come (‘*elthousai*’), they might anoint him”. The question therefore arises why the women did not buy their spices and straightaway went to the grave to anoint the body?

Two ‘logical’ reasons why not:

Luke says they came, “carrying prepared and ready spices” (‘ha hehtoimasan arohmata’). So when they bought it, the spices were not prepared and ready; the women still had to do something with it before they could use it. That accounts for the time that passed between after they had bought the spices after sunset on Saturday evening, and Saturday night when they actually got to the tomb to apply the spices.

Matthew contributes another explanation for why the women “after the Sabbath” (Mk16:1a) did not just go to the tomb to salve the body. In 27:62-66 he tells of the guard which Pilate ordered to watch the tomb “for the third day” because Jesus “predicted that He would rise up again on the third day”. But days for the Roman guard --- and their watch --- changed midnight. Nobody --- especially not ‘his disciples’ --- would be allowed near the grave before day expired midnight for the Roman guard. And the women knew it. It only needs common sense to know the women knew it. And that’s why they did not immediately after they had bought spices, went to the tomb straightaway.

Therefore, according to Mark and Matthew, **circumstances forced the time of the women’s first visit** at the tomb according to Luke.

What about Luke itself? Why does Luke not mention these involved factors of circumstance? O, he mentions not the same things word for word, would he? Isn’t this Luke’s personal Gospel? He is not going to just repeat what the other Gospels told; or the other Gospels are not going to just repeat what Luke had told?

Nevertheless, Luke does suggest a valid indication of why not the women had bought spices “as soon as the Sabbath was over” (Mk16:1a), but only got to the tomb after midnight. Told Luke: The

women “rested the Sabbath Day according to the Commandment” --- “evening until evening” naturally. And then many things in between after evening until midnight might have happened, like the things mentioned by Mark and Matthew, but also other things we do not know of.

So then, after all, Luke agrees with Mark and Matthew that the women would have gone to the tomb not before midnight Saturday night, and uses the very words USED in the Old Testament already (LXX) for the “deep morning” just after midnight, ‘orthrou batheohs’.

LUKE GIVES DEFINITELY THE EARLIEST of time-indications in the four Gospels. The times given by the other three Gospels impossibly can be equaled or identified with Luke’s. The nearest in chronology to Luke’s is at least three hours later, namely, the time indication given in Mark 16:2, “very early sun’s rising” or “dawn before sunrise”. There is just this one way to interpret Mark’s words of ‘lian proh-i anateilantos tou hehliou’. No two ways; certainly “*BEFORE sunrise*”.

“Before sunrise”, because the same Mark also tells WHEN Jesus “appeared to Mary Magdalene first”, which must have been AFTER the visit by the several (unnamed) women recorded in Mk16:2 **because there, no appearance occurred yet**. Just the needed common sense tells you that .... and the inevitability of chronology, event and circumstance combined.

**Quote: DW**, “*Correct Luke not me, because I am just following how he counted the prophesy of three days. He started his counting with the first day as day one. I will follow an inspired man and you can follow whoever you like.*”

DW, WHICH “*three days*” are you talking of?

You say: “*the prophesy of three days*”; now how do you “*count the prophesy of three days*”? Are you not perhaps speaking about “today”

is the third day since they crucified Him”?.... which three days were not the ‘*three days*’ of “*the prophesy*”.

Your first point made, “*Every text identifies it as the SAME DAY - the first day of the week.*” .... “*John ... restricts it to the same day ... on the same day ... that day ... on the very same day*”

Show me where I differed, DW?

Your main point though, made:

“*Every text identifies it as the same time on the same day “proii” “early” “early in the morning” “at the rising of the sun” “dawn”.*”  
 “*John ... restricts it to the ... same time in the day ... at the same time of that day ... It pinpoints it at the very same time ...*”

JOHN MENTIONS, “*gives*”, “*restricts*”, “*pinpoints*”, NO “*time*”, NO “*time in*”, NO “*time of*”, NO “*time on*”, whatsoever of Mary (or of other women), at, the tomb, or ‘standing next to the tomb’, or “turning” and walking away from the tomb; NONE! It says, Mary “had had stood after” --- from after another visit IMPLIED in Jn20:11.

The time of day or night – because it was ‘sunrise’ as one would have supposed a gardener should come on duty – is **deduced** in John from this very mistake of Mary’s of the Jesus for the gardener, and, from the fact she “had had stood after next to the grave” after an implied PREVIOUS, visit by herself and some other women who, tells Mark, had “fled from the tomb in great fear”, “very early BEFORE sunrise” 16:2, AT the grave, ON site, NOT departing or starting to go there,

Your third point, made:

“*Every text includes all the women with Mary Magdalene ... John gives no mention of any women but Mary Magdalene ... excludes all the women but Mary Magdalene*”;

Your fourth point, made:

*“but.....”* CONTRADICTING AND BELYING YOURSELF.....

*“BUT includes everything that the other gospels declare that Mary Magdelene did WITH all the other women. Going to tell the disciples and their responses. It pinpoints it at the VERY SAME TIME on the very same day WITH ALL THE REST of the women.”* (Empasis GE)

Your next point attempted:

*“In each of the gospel accounts the emphasis is upon Mary Magdelene and no wonder John simply zeros in on her at the exclusion of all the rest even though they were present with her”*--- thus CONTRADICTING AND BELYING Mark 16:9 as well as John, that Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene, “FIRST” which implies, ALONE the way John recorded it, and NOT *“with all the rest of the women”*.

The Gospels explain one another; they do not repeat one another.

- 1) different words for
- 2) really different TIMES; of
- 3) different events of VISITS— of or by
- 4) different PERSONS under
- 5) different CIRCUMSTANCES at
- 6) different PLACES—

EVERYTHING is different but for the similarity every Gospel records A, VISIT, AT, the tomb.

*“Pure imagination gone wild”?* Tsj tsj

**DW:**

*You are a very desparate man who consistently stoops to perverting my words because you cannot honestly and objectively deal with the evidence.*

*1. The evidence is that in every gospel account of the women - all of them - act upon the very same day together in this matter - the first day of the week.*

2. *The evidence is that in every gospel account the women come to the tomb in the morning, NEVER the evening, as the words used consistently in every gospel account are synonymous with morning on the first day of the week - “at the rising of the sun” or “very early in the morning” or “in the morning” or “early” at “dawn” (getting brighter) thus a consistent use of “proii” in all accounts for the first day of the week during the morning.*

3. *Christ arose on the very same day - first day of the week using the very same term “proii” as used with the women on the first day of the week in the morning. However, he arose BEFORE they got to his tomb and before sunrise.*

*The only time question is not the day, nor that it happened in the morning of that day, nor that they arrived before or at His resurrection. The only time question is what precise time did Christ arise in the fourth watch between 3am to 6am and what precise time in the fourth watch did the women begin their trip and arrive at the tomb between 3am. to 6am.*

*Since Mary Magdalene is included in every account of this trip to the tomb ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK during “proii” (early) John says she left for the tomb when it was yet “dark” (John 20:1) but arrived as it was getting brighter (“dawn”).*

*The evidence is conclusive and proves beyond any reasonable doubt to any objective student that Jesus arose between 3am to 6am BEFORE the women got to the tomb but neither the resurrection or the women’s arrival occurred prior to sunrise. The resurrection of Christ and the departure of the women to the tomb both occurred before sunrise on the first day of the week.*

*Now, you can argue anything you please but you will not be able to overturn this evidence because it is plainly there and clear to anyone*

*who can read English and doesn't know a bit of Greek or English grammar. All the women came in the morning to the tomb and arrived at sunrise on the first day of the week. Jesus arose from the tomb on the same day - the first day of the week during the morning between 3am and 6am before sunrise.*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** *“You are a very desparate [Sic.] man who consistently stoops to perverting my words because you cannot honestly and objectively deal with the evidence.”*

Subjective personal judgment .... No comment, but, that it gives me great pleasure.

**Re:** *“1. The evidence is that in every gospel account of the women - all of them - act upon the very same day together in this matter - the first day of the week.”*

“Account” of what “of the women” in every Gospel, DW? There are many ‘accounts of women acting upon the very same day’. Even on the three days involved that Jesus was crucified, buried and raised. So, even more, if the fourth day on which Jesus appeared to women, is also reckoned in.

**Re:** *“2. The evidence is that in every gospel account the women come to the tomb in the morning, NEVER the evening, as the words used consistently in every gospel account are synonymous with morning on the first day of the week”*

Quote me where I not honestly and objectively dealt with THIS?

**Re:** *“- “at the rising of the sun” or “very early in the morning” or “in the morning” or “early” at “dawn” (getting brighter) thus a consistent use of “proii” in all accounts for the first day of the week during the morning.”*

Utter nonsense. This is an issue of substance. You ranting absolute irrelevancies, consistently ignoring and circumspectly avoiding detail obviously out of great desperation, contributes nothing to its solution.

**Re:** “3. *Christ arose on the very same day - first day of the week using the very same term “proii” as used with the women on the first day of the week in the morning. However, he arose BEFORE they got to his tomb and before sunrise.*”

Did Jesus appear to Mary, “first”? or, to Mary “*WITH the other women*”? or, to ‘*the other women*’ separately, on a SECOND OCCASION, PLACE, TIME ETC.? The only chronology DWs would acknowledge, is that “*he arose BEFORE they got to his tomb and before sunrise*”.

That is not the issue; I have repeatedly referred to every Gospel’s narrative of women visiting the tomb, using the SPECIFIC TERMS OF TIME in each, of the Sunday morning. So don’t every time sulk about it having been on the Sunday morning. Rather BE SPECIFIC and come forward with WHICH TIME OF MORNING each Gospel mentions and for which event each Gospel mentions those times.

Still it’s not the actual issue between us.

Here is the core of the trouble:

“*he arose ... the first day of the week during the morning*”; or more precise: “*he arose ... the first day of the week*”. And I shall ask you my original question to you, DW, again: What does Mark 16:1 say, Did Jesus rise from the dead on the First Day according to Mark 16:1? Please answer my question with one simple sentence, so that I won’t have to search your answer between your lines. And please, not what YOU say and have said, but what the Text, Mark 16:1, says.

How can you accuse me of “*perverting (your) words*” but you refuse to answer me straight?

**Re: DW,** *“The only time question is not the day, nor that it happened in the morning of that day, nor that they arrived before or at His resurrection. The only time question is what precise time did Christ arise in the fourth watch between 3am to 6am and what precise time in the fourth watch did the women begin their trip and arrive at the tomb between 3am. to 6am.”*

Alright DW; forget my question; you have given me good enough answer now. Now it has become clear you base your entire argumentation on your own premising. You make it a foregone conclusion *“Christ did arise ... in the morning of that day”*. Will you write – ‘translate’ – Mark 16:1 with these words of yours DW? Because if you CANNOT, YOU HAVE NO SCRIPTURE-BASIS for your view. If you cannot, you merely, audaciously PRESUME AND PRETEND.

Yes, in fact, you argue in a circle; you suppose the Resurrection on the First Day and use your supposition for the proof of your supposition. You first claim a falsity for truth, then build the lie of your falsity on your claim.

*“The day”* is not *“the only time question”*; *“the day”* is NO ‘question’. Have we not agreed upon it already? We did.

*“That it happened in the morning of that day”* is not ‘the question’; What is ‘it’?; WHAT *“happened in the morning of that day”*?, is the question—the very question I have been asking you from that I entered this conversation.

Now see how you evade ‘honesty’ and ‘objectivity’: You pose all sorts of unreal, false suppositions of NOT being *“the question”* (the third one in one sentence): *“that they arrived before or at His resurrection”*. Yet how did it upset you when I said that it is what you in effect are arguing towards!

But look at your masterpiece in deceptive evasion of the true issue:  
*“The only time question is what precise time did Christ arise in the fourth watch between 3am to 6am and what precise time in the fourth watch did the women begin their trip and arrive at the tomb between 3am. to 6am.”*

As I said before, you assume things unreal to make them look there’s more to it than looks. You take the old crook, *“The only time question is not the day”*, put a cloak around the fellow, and call him: *“The only time question is what precise time did Christ arise in the fourth watch between 3am to 6am and what precise time in the fourth watch did the women begin their trip and arrive at the tomb between 3am. to 6am.”* Who would guess under that cloak old man ‘Day’ hides? Meantime the underlying question was— or rather, is, Did Christ rise on the ‘day’ so made fuss of? Meanwhile the pertinent ‘question’ was, whether the Gospels speak of ONE ‘time-slot’ or more at which only one event or more events occurred --- ‘events’ of visits at the tomb, to be precise. And in between other question still real, also popped up, such as: A “trip”, or no “trip” or ‘trips’? But never got answered..... Gulliver’s Travels; imagination! The Gospels are not a book of myths.

**Re:** *“Since Mary Magdalene is included in every account of this trip to the tomb ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK during “proii” (early).....”*

When ““proii” (early).....”, Jesus rose?

But she did not see Him?

When Jesus “appeared to Mary”, “included”, first”?

But Mary ‘excluded’ twice in Luke’s “account of this trip to the tomb ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK” because Luke’s ‘accounts’ (twice) contain no ““proii” (early)”, nevertheless Jesus appeared to Mary twice: ““included”, first” “in the garden” and “included” a second time on the way into the city? How do you explain that?

**DW:**

*John says she left for the tomb when it was yet “dark” (John 20:1) but arrived as it was getting brighter (“dawn”).*

**GE:**

Plain rubbish, every word of it. Quote please!

*“All the women came in the morning to the tomb and arrived at sunrise on the first day of the week”..... “in the morning”..... “at sunrise”..... “before sunrise” and everything is possible because DW tells them the one word and the one word only, ‘proii’ in Greek, means all these things, and that’s why they don’t need “know a bit of Greek or English grammar”; they must just trust DW, or be deceived by GE.*

**ST:**

*Dr. Walter, re: “John gives no mention of any women but Mary Magdalene but restrict it to the same day, same time in the day and it perfectly harmonizes with the same events recorded by the other gospel writers on the same day at the same time of that day.”*

*Actually, that’s not true. Unless it is a flat out contradiction, Matthew 28:1-8 and John 20:1 and 2 have to be referring to two different events at two different times of the day.*

**DW:**

*Quote: GE, “.... WHAT “happened in the morning of that day”, is the question—the very question I have been asking you from that I entered this conversation.”*

*So you agree the Lord’s resurrection occurred on Sunday:*

*Quote: GE, “.... The day” is not “the only time question”; “the day” is NO ‘question’. Have we not agreed upon it already? We did”*

*So you agree that the Lord’s resurrection and the women coming to the grave occurred on Sunday morning:*

*Quote: GE, “.... That it happened in the morning of that day” is not ‘the question’” So what is it you are quibbling about?*

*Quote: GE, “.... What is ‘it’; WHAT “happened in the morning of that day”, is the question— the very question I have been asking you from that I entered this conversation”*

*Of course this is not what you have been asking from the time you entered into this conversation. In fact, you have been denying all of the above since we entered this conversation because I have been asserting nothing more than the above since I have entered into this question.*

*You want to quibble over the precise chronology of events in regard to the women on Sunday morning, whether there was more than one trip made by the women to the grave on Sunday Morning.*

*You want to prove that Mary made a separate trip from the rest of the women on Sunday morning! I don’t believe you have a case but suppose you do? Big deal!*

*I have gone back to the beginning of where you entered into this debate and I think I see the problem why we are not communicating.*

*You entered a debate where the issue was whether the resurrection occurred Saturday evening versus Sunday morning.*

*You entered not attacking the Saturday debaters but attacking my position which was merely defending Sunday morning as the resurrection timing. I was proving this timing by the use of “proii” in regard to Mark 16:9 in connection with “proii” with all the women in each gospel account coming to the grave.*

*Instead of introducing yourself and saying, “Dr. Walter, I am in agreement with your position even with Mark 16:9 in regard to the day and time of the resurrection but I take exception for your use of Mark 16:9 in the case of Mary as the same time with all the other women that same Sunday morning” you just started in with an attack without any clarification joining with the Seventh Day Adventists who were already engaged and denying that Mark 16:9 had anything to do with Sunday morning resurrection.*

*If all you wanted to do was discuss the chronological order of events on Sunday morning then you should have started another thread for that purpose or informed me that was your purpose instead of just joining in with the SDA in their attack of a Sunday morning resurrection use of Mark 16:9.*

*If you notice the thread subject this is about the fourth commandment and its application in regard to Saturday or Sunday.*

**GE:**

Everything I have said on this thread is about the Sabbath, and therefore about the Fourth Commandment.

I believe the Sabbath for its CHRISTIAN REASON D’ETRE STOLEN FROM IT AND BESTOWED UPON THE FALSELY CLAIMED DAY OF JESUS’ RESURRECTION.

I approach everything I argue from the standpoint of a Reformed Protestant Christian as I have told everyone always. Since the Lord took hold on me I have studied this subject and shall stop when I cannot go on any more. A few times already I thought today is the last day, so put in, put in! All my effort; I tell myself. (I believe the Lord tells me it.)

Thank God He gave me a wife who kept it out with me and for the most respectful and loving of children and family.

And thank God He gave me the toughest of opposition from everywhere, so what I believe got tested thousands of times, and by as I said the very best in the manner of criticism.

I am thankful for it; with exceeding joy. May this be the word that shall be last over my lips: I am thankful for what the Lord has shown me in and through his Written Word in the face of strongest onslaught humanly speaking.

**BR:**

*If all you wanted to do was discuss the chronological order of events on Sunday morning then you should have started another thread for that purpose or informed me that was your purpose instead of just joining in with the SDA in their attack of a Sunday morning resurrection use of Mark 16:9.*

*If you notice the thread subject this is about the fourth commandment and its application in regard to Saturday or Sunday.*

*One more not-so-subtle correction if you please.  
Seventh-day Adventists teach that Christ was crucified on Friday evening and was raised on Sunday Morning - week-day-one.*

*Not sure how you missed that.*

*GE (who claims on another thread that his former local SDA congregation is to be condemned for not disfellowshipping him) appears to claim a Sabbath resurrection --  
Past history on this board will clearly show that the only person that GE would gladly debate on this topic - more than you -- is me.*

*Quote: DW, "Second, the Hebrew term translated "week" is missing from the fourth commandment terminology in Exodus and Deuteronomy, as well as, from the creation account terminology in Genesis.*

*My position is that Moses intentionally avoided using the term “week” in the fourth command, as well as, from the creation account. The fourth command specifies nothing more than six periods of “yom” (day) followed by, and thus also, preceded by a seventh period of “yom” (day) sabbath without any specific application to any particular “yom” in the Jewish calander week, month or year nor limited to a 24 hour “yom.”*

*The SDA response would be to note that your argument is flawed in Moses’ writings because prior to Ex 20:8-11 “REMEMBER the Sabbath day... SIX Days you shall labor” we have in Ex 16:23 “Tomorrow is THE Sabbath” and we have in vs 22-28 - the example of the weekly cycle of manna in which the exact weekly cycle was determined down to the very day. This is the precise selection of the day - context in Ex 20 for “REMEMBER the Sabbath”.*

*It would be impossible to suppose that the exegetical rendering of the statements in Ex 20:8-11 was translated as “pick any day in 7”.*

*Quote: “It cannot be successfully denied that God’s ultimate design for the Sabbath command is seen by his OWN APPLICATION of it. It can be easily shown that His OWN APPLICATION exceeds the Seventh Day Sabbatarian restriction to the seventh day “of the week.”*

*2Tim 3:16 “ALL scripture is given by inspiration from God”*

*2Peter 2:21 “Holy men of old moved by the Holy Spirit - spoke from God”.*

*Quote: “Therefore, my hypothesis has some validity. God applies the Sabbath law not only to other 24 hour periods “of the week” than the seventh day “of the week” (1st, 8th, 10th, 15th, 22nd, 50th) in Leviticus 23, but he applies it to greater periods of 24 hours (month, year) in both Leviticus 23 and 25. The exclusion “of the week” was*

*necessary to provide God's wider application of the Sabbath law to other days in the week and other periods greater than 24 hours."*

*Your efforts to make Ex 20 God's Word and Lev 23 some derivative of God's Word is noted - and flawed.*

*Lev 23 is ALSO God's Word and establishes the annual feast days every bit as much as Gen 2:1-3 established the 7th day Sabbath.*

*Quote: "Second, the omission "of the week" was necessary to prohibit the exclusive application and understanding of the Sabbath law to the seventh day of their current week"*

*AT this point you are in the realm of total nonsense as the Ex 16 and Ex 20 language specifically refute your speculation above.*

*Quote: "There are other substantial evidence found in both the Old and New Testaments to confirm this transition from the seventh to the first."*

*AT this point your argument is totally flawed by the devastating fact that Acts 13, 15, and 17 all make references to the Sabbath that CLEARLY show the Sabbath to be in keeping with the day that the Jews were keeping.*

*Furthermore - even 1Cor 16:1-2 was shown to flatly contradict your assertion - since the designator for "week day one" was not SABBATH but was still "week day one" in a context where you try to eisegete the idea of a "week day one Worship service" for the supposedly new Sabbath - even though none is mentioned there -- yet the term for the day is "week day one" and in Acts 15 the term for the SABBATH is still SABBATH.*

*Quote: “The beginning of the first day of the week in Jewish times occurs on Saturday in our calendar as it begins 6 p.m. our Saturday evening.”*

*Much of that is true - although A portion of that also is wrong. In Lev 23 God says “from evening until evening shall you celebrate your Sabbaths” and in Genesis 1 “evening and morning were the nth day”. It is sunset that begins the Sabbath.*

*Quote: “From the New Testament it can be easily proven that Christ arose from the grave before sunrise on the first day of the Jewish week no earlier than 3 a.m before sunrise. This is the new Sabbath of Psalm 118 and Mark 16:9 and the better Sabbath observance in Hebrews 4:9-11.”*

*Psalms 118 makes no mention at all of Sabbath OR of week day 1.  
Mark 16:9 makes no mention at all of week-day-one as Sabbath.  
Heb 4 makes no mention at all of Week-day-one as Sabbath.*

*Your argument never actually gets off the ground.  
That is the SDA response to your OP - and I do not see it as being the same as the one-on-one differences you are having with GE.*

**DW:**

***Psalm 118:20-24 – From Type to Prophetic Command***

*Psa. 118:20 This gate of the LORD, into which the righteous shall enter.*

*21 I will praise thee: for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation.*

*22 The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.*

*23 This is the LORD'S doing; it is marvellous in our eyes.*

*24 This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.*

*This whole portion is a Messianic prophecy as verse 22 is quoted six times in the New Testament and each time it is applied to Christ.*

*Matthew 21:42 Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?*

*Mark 12:10-11 And have ye not read this scripture; The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner: This was the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?*

*Luke 20:17 And he beheld them, and said, What is this then that is written, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?*

*Acts 4:11 This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.*

*Ephesians 2:20-22 And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy*

*temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.*

*1 Peter 2:4-8 ¶ To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.*

*However, what is significant about this Old Testament quotation is its special application to the resurrection of Jesus Christ in the New Testament (Acts 4:10-11). The builders “refused” Him by condemning and crucifying Him. The Father’s response to their rejection of Him was to raise Him from the grave or reverse their work of rejection. Luke spells this contrast between the builders and the Father in Acts 4:10*

*“Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole.”*

*The contrast between the builders and The Father is clearly seen in the phrase, “whom ye crucified”, VERSUS “whom God raised from the dead” In order that the reader have no doubt that Peter is referring to such a contrast he immediately quotes Psalm 118:22*

*“This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner”. – Acts 4:11*

*However, the Psalmist continues to speak about this resurrection work of the Father by saying:*

*“This is the LORD’S doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.” – Psa. 118:23-24*

*The first phrase explains how the refused stone became the “head of the corner” – THIS IS THE LORD’S DOING. They killed Him but God raised Him.*

*The second phrase identifies the day of resurrection as a day to be SET APART to commemorate the resurrection as a work of God. The Hebrew term translated “made” can mean “set apart to be observed.” There is no question that this is the meaning because of the words that directly follow – “We WILL rejoice and be glad in IT” These words describe the kind of commemoration intended “in it.”*

*The day of resurrection is to be observed with rejoicing and gladness because without it the Apostle Paul says there would be no hope of salvation (I Cor. 15:10-16).*

*The seventh day Sabbath commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption and is now groaning under sin and awaiting redemption. The first day of the week as typified in the feasts of the New Covenant and prophetically commanded in Psalms 118:20-24 commemorates a greater work of God that ushers in a New Creation – the resurrection of Christ.*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** *“The seventh day Sabbath commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption and is now groaning under sin*

*and awaiting redemption. The first day of the week as typified in the feasts of the New Covenant and prophetically commanded in Psalms 118:20-24 commemorates a greater work of God that ushers in a New Creation – the resurrection of Christ.”*

Why did you not make this your introduction to your contemplations on Psalm 118, DW? I suppose your answer would be something like, ‘Because it would be putting the cart before horse.’ And I would reply, So it’s harnessing the horse behind the cart. Instead of pushing the cart in the wrong direction, the horse pulls it in the wrong direction. .... However.....

**Re:** *“The seventh day Sabbath commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption and is now groaning under sin and awaiting redemption.....”*

Is that really what you concluded from Psalm 118, DW?

Behold all ye saints,

*“The seventh day Sabbath commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption”..... SIN TRIUMPHANT! “.....a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption”!! “The seventh day Sabbath commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption.....”* and you complain MY English is difficult? What about the English of DW? Or is it his theology; or perhaps his confession?

But here’s the most upsetting about this --- especially for the Seventh-day Adventists --- I even agree with DW on certain aspects! Now it cannot get madder..... the man must get to an asylum – me, not DW. It’s the SDAs I hear saying.... about yours faithfully, GE.

But I’m going to bed now..... DV I’ll see you tomorrow again. I’ve got as much as you to think about on my pillow.

**Re:**

*“The seventh day Sabbath commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption and is now groaning under sin and awaiting redemption.....”*

So yes, The Sabbath— “The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD-your-God”, is about and “*commemorates a work of God that has fallen into sin and corruption*”— is about and commemorates a PERFECT work of God— his creation, that has fallen into sin and corruption. In a word, The Sabbath— “The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-the-LORD-your-God” is about and commemorates Redemption; not so much creation even though it was God’s sinless and perfect creation.

The Sabbath celebrates— or rather is for celebrating by God’s People, the REDEMPTION / SALVATION of this perfect and then in sin and corruption fallen and then again from sin and corruption saved and redeemed creation, in Jesus Christ and through Jesus Christ— and in that order! Creation does not first improve itself for God to only help it the last inch out of the pit of sin and corruption or death. That’s why Arminians just cannot tolerate Psalm 118 is a Song of David and the Lamb on the Lord’s Day. Like Exodus 15 is a Song of Moses and the Lamb on the Lord’s Day, so is Psalm 118 .... and Revelation 14 .... and the entire New Testament and Bible! In its entirety the Story of Redemption by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is God’s Song He sings on the Sabbath Day with his People. The Sabbath is a hymn— a Church song. This hymn, its melody, harmony and rhythm, is taken up throughout the Scriptures by ALL saints of all dispensations on the sea of glass of their eternal salvation. Rv14:3. Therefore it from eternity lay before hand that Jesus Christ would rise from the dead “Sabbath’s”— never, on a Sunday.... The nearest it came to on a Sunday was in the hit, ‘Never on a Sunday’ of somewhere in the twentieth century— but God’s love is bestowed upon his beloved every day of the week and especially on the Sabbath Day. God can have his favorite things the same as He can have his

favorite persons; who says He can't?

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** *“Don’t put words in my mouth that I never said. I said the resurrection occurred during the fourth watch which the term “proii” is a technical designation of the fourth watch just as Jesus used it in the same book for the fourth watch (Mk 13:35; 16:2,9). That spans a period between 3am to 6am. Jesus arose BEFORE the women got there not “while” the resurrection occurred as you falsely represent me. I NEVER said that anywhere. So your first STRAW MAN argument perishes.”*

Yes; I may have put words in your mouth that you never said; I only put in writing what they, never, said. I put into your mouth what you, “never said”, but all along meant to say. In other words, I read and expressed your mind; your real intention WHICH THROUGHOUT YOUR ARGUMENTATION COMES THROUGH, which is, Yes; or, No:

Quoting Dr W: (emphasis GE) *“THE RESURRECTION OCCURRED during the fourth watch which the term “proii” is a technical designation of the fourth watch just as Jesus used it in the same book for the fourth watch (Mk 13:35; 16:2,9)” .... JUST LIKE ....*

Quoting Dr W: (emphasis GE) *“THESE WOMEN started when it was already dark AND THEN the terms “morning” “rising of the sun” “dawn” “early” are used to describe THEIR ARRIVAL time AT the seplechure. This only makes sense if they began in the dark sometime between 3am to 6am at the fourth watch (proii) and ARRIVED when the sunlight was just BEGINNING TO dawn or in the twilight of morning” (proii).”*

Yes! I DO *“want to quibble over the precise chronology of events in regard to the women on Sunday morning, whether there was more than one trip made by the women to the grave on Sunday Morning.”* Call showing what stands written in the Word of God ‘quibbling’; it

does not bother me, as long as it is shown. Read Phil:15-17. It always does me very good.

And Yes! I DO want to SHOW --- not, “*to prove*” mark well, it ‘proves’ itself ---, not, “*that Mary made a separate trip from the rest of the women on Sunday morning*”, but that Mary “had had stood after (‘heistehkei’) Pluperfect ‘*separately*’ on her own alone when “first of all” the Lord (OUR Lord – yours and mine) “appeared” to her, “PROH-I”- ‘EARLY’ at a TIME ALL ITS OWN, ALONE, AND ‘*separate*’! John 20:11-17.

In all sincerity, Praise the Lord, DW, for as Jesus THEN AND THERE TO MARY ONLY SAID: “Now your Father and My Father and now your God and My God, Go! Tell my disciples”. Because: “HE AS THE RISEN ONE APPEARED TO” her, The Risen Lord Jesus Christ, who “Sabbath’s, mid-afternoon, IN (its) FULLNESS of day” ROSE FROM THE DEAD: for ALL of us! “Much more then, now being justified by his blood (death) shall WE be saved from wrath (of the last enemy destroyed, death)” BY HIS LIFE THROUGH AND IN AND BY, HIS, RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD. (Also 6:8, in fact the whole chapter; in fact, the whole Gospel; IN FACT, THE WHOLE BIBLE!)

Jesus’ APPEARANCE and appearances after were “*separate*” and ‘*separately*’; His Resurrection was separate and separately for ALL, for his Elect, for The Church “The Body of Christ’s Own” --- “FEASTING OF SABBATHS’ FEAST” on HIM, “eating and drinking” spiritually of Christ, “the Head ... nourishment being ministered, growing with the growth of God”. This, song, sung, “feasting of Sabbaths whether of months or of Sabbaths’ occurrence”, is “the Song of Moses AND of the Lamb” sung by the New Testament, Christian, Church. “Do not you, let yourselves be condemned or judged whatsoever by anyone of the world with regard to your eating and drinking of Feast-- whether of month’s or of Sabbaths’ (perpetual observance) for this is but the shadow of things”

in store for you, which is the Body of Christ's Own .... Do not allow you be robbed of your Reward (which is Christ)!"

"Be ye separate, My People!"

**DW:**

*Quote: GE, ".....why did you say the following:*

*"The day" is not "the only time question"; "the day" is NO 'question'. Have we not agreed upon it already? We did. "That it happened in the morning of that day" is not 'the question'; What is 'it'; WHAT "happened in the morning of that day", is the question—the very question I have been asking you from that I entered this conversation. - Gerhard*

*Let us start again and clarify the issue.*

- 1. Do you believe Christ rose from the grave Sunday morning?*
- 2. Do you believe the passages I have given concerning all the women coming to the grave occurred on Sunday Morning WITH THE EXCEPTION of Mary Magdalene?*
- 3. Do you believe Mary Magdalene came on a different day OR a different time on Sunday morning to the grave?*

**GE:**

Question 1. I believe Mt28:1, "Sabbath's fullness of day mid-afternoon as it began to dawn towards the First Day of the week" ('dawn' - Tyndale, KJV - equivalent of 'eve' BEFORE, like in Lk23:54: "That day was The Preparation ('Friday afternoon') as it began to dawn towards the Sabbath" ('Saturday')).

Question 2. I believe the passages concerning all the women and Jesus' first two appearances portray a condition or circumstance – a VISIT AT the grave – or and, leaving from, the grave, on different times of morning after midnight until after sunrise on Sunday

Morning.

Question 3. I believe Mary Magdalene got her first sight of the OPENED tomb on Saturday evening “while yet EARLY darkness” - ‘proh-i skotias eti ousehs’.

**DW:**

*Sorry I don't buy it! John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 are the same not different accounts.*

*Mark 16:1-2 describe the same coming to the tomb. Verse one simply notes the Jewish Sabbath was over. Verse 2 simply notes what day after the Jewish Sabbath they commenced to the tomb. Mark 16:8 is qualified by Matthew 28:9-10 but same return trip to disciples.*

*Matthew 28:1 is the very same account of Luke 24:1 and John 20:1 as well as Mark 16:1-2.*

*Matthew 28:1 places the Sabbath “behind” them and they went to the tomb “INTO” (Gr. eis) first day of the week when the light was getting brighter NOT DIMMER.*

*Mark 16:9 occurs on the first day of the week, Sunday morning AFTER Jesus rose that morning between 3am to 6am BEFORE sunrise and BEFORE the women came with Mary Magdalene the first time. Verse 9 marks the return trip of Mary with disciples that same day.*

*Discussion about Mary was not part of the discussion I entered into concerning the resurrection time of Christ. However, I agree that Mary Magdalene in John 20 made two trips to the tomb on Sunday morning. First, with all the women (Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:1-2; Lk. 24:1). Then they went back and told the apostles and she came back with them and that is when Christ appeared to her (Jn. 20:2-17).*

*However, I do not believe that the texts I gave including John 20:1 refer to another visit to the tomb apart from the rest of the women but that John 20:1 is synonymous with Mark 16:1-2; Mt. 28:1; Luke 24:1. John 20:1 gives the condition “dark” when the women left for the tomb including Mary Magdalene and they arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun.*

*It is very very clear from the Scriptures that John 20:1; Mt. 28:1; Mark 16:1-2 and Luke 24:1 all occurred on the very same day - the first day of the week and in the morning not the evening of that day.*

*It is also very very clear that Mark 16:9 occurred on that very same day in the morning and not the evening between 3am-6am Mary Magdalene came with the rest of the women in Mat. 28:1; Lk. 24:1 and Mk. 16:1-2.*

*John 20:1 also occurred on the same day - the first day of the week where Mary is singled out by John because John is not going to talk about the rest of the women at all even though he is going to talk about what happened on the same day as in Mt. 28:1; Lk. 24:1 and Mk 16:1-2 in connection with going and telling the disciples as in Mt. 28:7-9; Lk. 24:9-10; Mk. 16:7-8 in which ALL THE WOMEN were involved.*

*John 20:1 simply traces Mary Magdalene without denying that the other women were also with her in John 20:1-2 as John 20:1-2 is parallel with Mt. 28:7-9; Luke. 24:9-10 and Mark 16:7-8.*

*Jesus arose from the grave BEFORE the women got to the grave and he arose between 3am to 6am Sunday morning.*

*The term “proii” describes the EXACT SAME PERIOD of time - 3am to 6am on Sunday Morning for the resurrection of Christ (Mk. 16:9) as well as the time the women began their journey to the grave (John 20:1) and the time they arrived before sunrise.*

*Mary Magdalene's second trip (Jn. 2:3-11) on the very same day occurred after her initial trip with the other women (Jn. 20:1).*

*Mark 16:9 makes it clear that Jesus rose from the grave on the first day of the week during "proii" during the very same period "proii" that the women came to grave "proii" on the very same day - Period - end of story.*

*Quote: GE, "In the slow hours[1] of the Sabbath's[2] after noon[3], towards the First Day of the week – explained the angel[4]:– When suddenly there was a great earthquake, .....*"

*Here is the crux of our disagreement in regard to Matthew 28:1-4. You see this as describing Christ's resurrection on Saturday evening based on Matthew 28:1 while you see Mark 16:1-8 as a different visit on Sunday morning.*

*"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 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."*

*However, I agree with many great Greek scholars in the past and present who translate the term "opse" to mean "after" the Sabbath was completed and "into the twilight of sunrise" they came to the tomb on Sunday morning.*

*There are several contextual reasons why this is the proper interpretation.*

*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.*

*Hence, the supposed objection that the women ran away and didn't tell anyone is countered by Matthew 28:9 as Jesus relieved their fears and they did go tell the disciples.*

**TS:**

*re: DW, "I agree that Mary Magdalene in John 20 made two trips to the tomb on Sunday morning. First, with all the women (Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:1-2; Lk. 24:1). Then they went back and told the apostles and she came back with them and that is when Christ appeared to her (Jn. 20:2-17)."*

*You have that reversed. If John 20:1-2 is correct, then Matthew 28:1, Mark 16:1-2 and Luke 24:1 would have to be at least the second time at the tomb.*

**GE:**

Very observant, ST; I missed that one for sure! It's revelations like this that gives me such pleasure and encouragement that everything is not vergebens.

Did you notice, this: quoting DW, "*John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 are the same not different accounts*" ETC., against, "2. *Do you believe the passages I have given concerning all the women coming to the grave occurred on Sunday Morning WITH THE EXCEPTION of Mary Magdalene?*" ETC.?

Did you see what DW has not seen or pretend blind to, that Matthew in 28:1 says when – just as – "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out to go have a look at the grave, THERE SUDDENLY was a great earthquake..." that obviously marked the moment of Jesus' resurrection? Dr Walter of course avers "*Mary Magdalene and the other Mary ARRIVED at the grave*" just then, but then again he

DENIES the women (all of them, by the way) “*arrived*” while the resurrection took place, but something like three hours later. O yes, only Mary Magdalene, says he, one mustn’t forget to mention.

**DW:**

*Mark 16:9 only pin points the Lord’s resurrection at “proii” - between 3am to 6am*

**GE:**

**Quote: DW,** “*Every single account uses the SAME day of arrival to the tomb:...*”

Say, ‘*Every single account uses the same DAY ....*’— change your emphasis.... and call a spade a spade and say, ‘Every single account uses the same DAY of a VISIT AT the tomb’.

Then,

In Luke 24:1, Yes;

In Mark 16:2, Yes;

In John 20:11-17, Yes;

In Mk 16:9, Yes.

In “*Mark 16:1*”, NO!

In “*Joh 20:1*”, NO!

In “*Mt 28:1*”, NO!

Why NO! in “*Mark 16:1*”, NO! in “*Joh 20:1*”, NO! in “*Mt 28:1*”?

NO! in “*Mark 16:1*”— I have already said enough on this one. But....

The Text states, “When the Sabbath was past / has gone through”.

That would be sunset and the evening-dusk afterwards. Not “*at sunrise*” or near ““*proii*” or the fourth watch between 3am to 6am.”

In “*Mark 16:1*” the Text states, “Mary Magdalene and Mary of James and Salome”; in Luke 24, it states, “It was Mary Magdalene and Joanna and Mary of James, AND OTHERS WITH THEM”.

In “Mt 28:1” the Text states, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary”.

In “Joh 20:1” the Text states, “Mary Magdalene”.

Clearly in “*every single account*” the PERSONS are different, so it could not have been the same time – not to mention day – that things happened in “Mark 16:1”, in “Joh 20:1”, in “Mt 28:1”.

In “Mark 16:1” the Text states, the women “bought spices”. Clearly in “*every single account*” the ACTIONS are different, so it could not have been the same time – not to mention day – that things happened in “Mark 16:1”, in “Joh 20:1”, in “Mt 28:1”.

No wonder therefore, in “Mark 16:1” the Text states nothing about “*DAY of arrival to the tomb*” or at the tomb.

Conclusion:

This, “*Every single account uses the SAME day of arrival to the tomb*”, is an UNTRUTH.

So what does the Text say in “*Joh 20:1*”?

First, what it does not say or “*use*”,

“deep(est) morning (after midnight)” in “*Luke 24:1*”;

“very early before sunrise” in “*Mark 16:2*”;

“Mary ... supposing Him to be the gardener” in ‘*Joh 20:11,15*’ or,

“early (on the First Day of the week)” in “*Mark 16:9*”;

“the angel explaining to the women” or,

“as they went to tell his disciples” in “*Mt 28:1*”.

Then, what it DOES say or “*use*” in “*Joh 20:1*”—

NOT, ““*proii*” or “*early*” when it was yet “*dark*” on the first day of the week”;

NOT, “*that same morning ... the first day of the week*”;

NOT, “*at the same time in that day - proii - early morning - rising of the sun - dawn (getting brighter) or “early”*”;  
 NOT, “*They GOT THERE at Sunrise while it was twilight, saw it was empty and all the women BUT Mary Magdalene RAN BACK to tell the apostles.*” — blatant UNTRUTH!

Then, what it DOES say or “*use*” in the actual Text “*in Joh 20:1*” —

- 1) “On the First Day of the week ...
- 2) Mary Magdalene COMES ...
- 3) being EARLY darkness still ...
- 4) TOWARDS the sepulchre and ...
- 5) SEES ...
- 6) the STONE ...
- 7) taken AWAY FROM the sepulchre ...
- 8) THEN she RUNS and comes TO Simon Peter and the other disciple...”

Mary saw only what John tells, she saw: “the STONE”, “taken AWAY FROM the sepulchre”. What she told the two disciples, “They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid them”, is no more than what she suspected; not what she had seen. If it had been what she had seen then Mary had seen ‘them’, ‘taking away the Lord’, and would not have wondered but would have known exactly what happened; which in any case was not the case so she could not have known anything really, because she did NOT “SEE”, the inside, of the grave, but, only, “the STONE”, outside, it.

But the grave WAS empty --- which we, know, but Mary, did not know. Mary therefore, STILL THINKING THE BODY WAS IN THE GRAVE, “came unto / arrived at / got to the sepulchre”, “with others”, “carrying spices ready and prepared” Lk24:1,10, TO SALVE THE BODY! It MUST be the women’s first and earliest REALISED VISIT AT the tomb, and it just makes sense that Luke ‘uses’ ANOTHER time-indicator than any of the other Gospels to tell that

the women “came earliest / deep(est) morning” just after midnight – ‘orthrou batheohs’.

Noticed that there is no story of a “*trip*” to the tomb here?

Therefore John 20:1 in time and event and logic, comes BEFORE Luke 24:1, and before midnight. So what is “*used*” “*in Joh 20:1*”?— Literally the above, “On the First Day of the week Mary Magdalene COMES being EARLY darkness still TOWARDS the sepulchre and SEES the STONE taken AWAY FROM the sepulchre. She RUNS and comes TO Simon Peter and the other disciple...”

“Being early darkness still”, but Sunday-resurrectionists HATE it because they worship Sunday; so they CHANGE it to, “*Being darkness still*”, which is in the morning before dawn, and no longer in the evening before dark. Only leave out, “early” and say only, “*dark*” or “*darkness*”. Innocently, oh, so piously....

Further notice that in John20:1-10 no angel or angels feature; no women than Mary Magdalene; no interior description of the tomb; no ‘message’ or ‘witness’ like in Luke 24:1-11, Mark 16:1-8 or Mt28:5-10; no mention of the women’s reactions to it.

Notice the story of Peter and John’s race to the grave at the news it was opened and their “return home”, in between Mary’s first glimpse of the OPENED tomb and her having “had had stood after without at the sepulchre-door”. Mary standing, weeping, talking to the angels inside; whereas in Jn20:1 she “sees”, “then runs back”. That in 20:11-17 Jesus appeared to Mary, whereas in 1-10 to those involved, excitement about an opened grave and disappeared body.

Then talk of “*1. Every text above gives the day they came - the first day of the week*”, and “*2. Every text above gives the time they came to the tomb was at sunrise*”; “*Every single account uses the SAME day of arrival to the tomb*”.

Notice “1. Every text”, “2. Every text”, “Every single account” included --- dotted down: 1) “*Joh 20:1 ¶*”; 2) “4. *John 20:1*”; 3) “3. They started while it was yet “dark””; 4) “4. *They got their at Sunrise while it was twilight, saw it was empty and all the women but Mary Magnalene ran back to tell the apostles.*”; 5) “*the sunlight was just beginning to dawn or in the twilight of morning .....Joh 20:1 ¶ 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.....*”— FIVE TIMES!

Then five times, with reference to “*Joh 20:1*”, talk of “Every text above gives *THE DAY THEY CAME - the first day of the week*”, and “2. Every text above gives *THE TIME THEY CAME TO THE TOMB was at sunrise*”; “Every single account uses *THE SAME DAY OF ARRIVAL TO THE TOMB*” (Emphasis GE)— then five times, DW, you abuse and corrupt the Word of God with reference to but this one reference of yours, “*Joh 20:1*”.

Matthew 28:1 next, though I don’t feel like it for fear of words thrown at the wind.

**Re: DW**, “*Mary Magdalene in John 20 made two trips to the tomb on Sunday morning. First, with all the women (Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:1-2; Lk. 24:1). Then they went back and told the apostles and she came back with them and that is when Christ appeared to her (Jn. 20:2-17).*”

Mary Magdalene in John 20 made ONE “*trip to the tomb*”, NOT “*on Sunday morning*”. “*On the First Day*”, yes, but “*while early darkness still*” which means during the First Day of the week’s first- and beginning-part— its ‘evening’-part after sunset and before dark and “while it is early darkness still”— whereas in ‘*Roman time-reckoning*’, ‘evening’ of night until midnight is the last and CLOSING part of a day. Now you yourself in this discussion have stated, “*John is merely giving the Roman time instead of the Jewish*

*time when it came to the hours of the day not when it comes to counting days.” Therefore John in 20:1 is speaking about ‘Saturday evening’.*

**DW:**

*Better read my other post because it won’t sound to “perfect” for you then! John is clarifying that the Roman Sunday is EQUAL to the first day of the week in regard to the resurrection and counting SUNDAY as the first day in his eight day count which ends up on the next SUNDAY.*

**GE:**

Mary Magdalene therefore, made

- 1) one ‘*trip to the tomb*’ “on the First Day”, in John 20:1, on ‘Saturday evening’, alone; “*she came back*”, alone; “*and told the apostles*”, herself only;
- 2) a second ‘*trip to the tomb*’ “on the First Day deepest morning of night”, NOT MENTIONED OR IMPLIED in John 20:1, but mentioned by only Luke in 24:1, when Mary ‘*with all the women*’ named in Lk24:10, in verse 1 “came unto / arrived at the sepulchre” (described above);
- 3) a third ‘*trip to the tomb*’ “on the First Day very early before sunrise”— NOT MENTIONED, BUT IMPLIED through the word ‘*heistehkei*’ - “had had stood after / stayed behind” in John 20:11-17—the ‘*trip*’ or rather VISIT AT the tomb mentioned in Mark 16:2-8, when Mary together with any number of women but more likely together with only the other two women named in verse 1, must have had gone back to the tomb after their first visit according to Lk24:1-10, to ascertain their findings (at discovering the EMPTY tomb earlier according to Lk24:1-10). At THIS visit recorded in Mark, was it that the women “fled from the tomb for they trembled and were amazed neither told they anything to anyone” .... “**BUT**” — according to John 20:11 — “Mary Magdalene had had stayed behind....”!

The same INITIAL ‘*trip*’ or visit at the tomb by Mary Magdalene on ‘*Sunday morning*’ MENTIONED in Mark 16:2-8, is PRESUPPOSED in John 20:11-17. And this “had had stood after”-visit at the tomb on ‘*Sunday morning*’ of Mary’s in John 20:11-17, again is PRESUPPOSED in Mark 16:9.

Mark 16:9 presupposes John 20:11-17 with regard to Jesus’ appearance to Mary. Where John gives no time indication (than the suggestion of a gardener for whom Mary supposed Jesus and who would start working sunrise “twelve hours in a (working) day” sunrise to sunset), Mark 16:9 states that it was “early on the First Day”. Now this “early”- ‘proh-i’ must of course have been later than when Jesus (in 16:2) “VERY early sunrise”- ‘lian prohi anateilantos’, had not yet appeared to anyone.

Mk16:2 was “VERY early sunrise” and Mk16:9 was just “early”—like John’s gardener’s day that began ‘sunrise’.

There are many other differentiating time and circumstance factors I shall not now pay attention to. These for any reasonable person should be sufficient to show the various visits at the various times of night and morning at the tomb but also away from the tomb. See many discourses and studies, besides books 1/1, 1/2, 2— ‘Passover to Crucifixion’, ‘Burial’, ‘Resurrection’.

This therefore should show the MANY misconceptions, DW, in your above statements, so that I am sure it will not be necessary to go into finer detail. A positive statement simply of the real thing should give the desired insight, as I have tried to make with my explanation of Mary’s more than one or two visits at the tomb during the Saturday night and Sunday morning before sunrise, and after.

**DW:**

*Gerhard* – “*having been the First Day of the week*”.

*This is an impossible translation for John 20:19. You cannot make the two perfect participles modify the day. The perfect participles may refer to actions that began prior to the stated day but they cannot be used to modify the stated day.*

*Luke may be referring to Roman time instead of Jewish time. However, if he is, then he is emphasizing that the Roman day Sunday is to be understood as equal to the Jewish first day of the week in regard to the Christian Sabbath. Therefore, here is a transition from Jewish to Roman in counting the Christian Sabbath to be the Roman day Sunday. Hence, by Roman counting if you begin with Sunday as equal to the Jewish first day of the week and start counting the Roman Sunday as the first of eight days it brings you to the next Sunday.*

*This was a worship service conducted by Christ on this first Christian Sabbath (“protos tou sabbatou” - Mk. 16:9).”*

**GE:**

Dear DW, it was you saying, not me!

Here’ your statement: **DW:**

*“What crazy translation are you reading that translates a present tense participle into past tense English???”*

*‘having been the First Day of the week’ in verse 19 The KJV correctly translates it as “BEING” not HAVING BEEN! This proves that “even” merely means late afternoon as he says explicitly it was the “SAME” day, not another day!”*

Here’s my statement having quoted YOU:

<And again, it must be pointed out, John does NOT speak of it ‘having been the First Day of the week’ in verse 19 as the point in time departed from, but of it “having been EVENING ON THAT DAY relative to the First Day of the week”— so, from the point of departure of the second day of the week....>

It was that statement where I made the mistake I soon afterwards corrected .... <.... In this sense and sentence therefore, the use of ‘meth’ hehmeras ....’ has simply NO ‘idiomatic’ force but is intended purely ‘literal’. >

**DW:**

*“evening” is not modified by the perfect tense participles. It is not “having been evening” but rather “BEING evening the same day, the first day of the week having been....”*

**GE:**

John 20:19, ‘Ousehs oun opsias’ --- ‘ousehs’ Participle Feminine Singular, “being”, ‘ruling’, ‘opsias’ Subject-Noun Feminine Singular, “evening”.

I translated the Present ‘Tense’ ‘ousehs’ q.d. ‘Past Present’, ‘Tense’, for its historic, narrating function or force in Jn20:19, just like one might translate the Present ‘Tense’ ‘erchetai’ - “Mary cometh” in 20:1, with a Past Tense in English. We (I) did refer to this ‘Aspect’ of the Greek ‘Present’, which is a common thing in most languages.

Then again, I could not find I once used the Past (Tense) meaning of ‘ousehs’ elsewhere in this discussion.

Here are my references:

as John says “THEN (‘OUN’) having been (‘ousehs’) on \_THAT\_ ‘EKEINEHI miai (hehmerai)” --- which RELATIVE PRONOUN REFERS TO: \_THAT\_ PAST, and “First Day of the week” (Sunday). It does not say ‘BEING on the First Day’; it says “being EVENING” REFERRING TO: “the EVENING” RELATIVE to “THAT day” whichever day of the week.

John reads:

“ousehs oun opsias” - “then being evening”;

“on THAT DAY” - ‘tehi hehmerai EKEINEHI’;  
 “WITH REFERENCE TO the First Day of the week” - ‘tehi miai sabbatohn’: Dative of Reference. In other words, the NORMAL Dative!

In John it is written “It being evening on THAT DAY”- ‘ousehs opsias hehmerai ekeinehi’ Jn20:19. The disciples were thus “found” Lk24:33.

**Quote: DW**, “*Luke may be referring to Roman time instead of Jewish time. .... This was a worship service conducted by Christ on this first Christian Sabbath (“protos tou sabbatou” - Mk. 16:9).*”

**GE:**

Luke does not ‘refer to Roman time instead of Jewish time’. Luke consistently used ‘Jewish time’ in both his Gospel and Acts.

Now DW supposes, “.....*IF he (Luke) is (refer(ring) to Roman time instead of Jewish time), then he is emphasizing that the Roman day Sunday is to be understood as equal to the Jewish first day of the week in regard to the Christian Sabbath.*”

What firm basis is such a supposition for Luke to ‘**EMPHASIZE**’, “*that the Roman day Sunday is to be understood*”, “**HENCE**”-**FORTH**, “*as equal to the Jewish first day of the week in regard to the Christian Sabbath*”! (Emphasis GE)

It is this very same summary, absolute, **PREMISE**, upon which DW, “**HENCE**”-forth (from Luke), also pens his own dogmatic stake, declaring, “*This was a worship service conducted by Christ on this first Christian Sabbath*” and sommer at the same time, spans its perimeters with stolen ropes “*protos tou sabbatou*”, from Mark, “-*Mk. 16:9*” .... **INCREDIBLE!** “*Therefore, here is a transition from Jewish to Roman in counting the Christian Sabbath to be the Roman day Sunday.*” (Just a repetition.) “*Hence, by Roman counting if you*

*begin with Sunday as equal to the Jewish first day of the week and start counting the Roman Sunday as the first of eight days it brings you to the next Sunday.” (And another repetition with an extra of superior arithmetic skills we have seen before of DW.)*

Now folks, we all meet next Sunday for a blessed Sabbath! See ya there! Then sought they for Jesus, and spake among themselves, as they stood in the church, What think ye, that He will come to the Feast? Ye know He never saw this day or knew by Roman counting if you begin with Sunday as equal to the Jewish first day of the week and start counting the Roman Sunday as the first of eight days it brings you to the next Sunday in counting the Christian Sabbath to be the Roman day Sunday....

First, let us see the KJV only,

“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.”

Now according to THIS, DW avers,

*“1. Every text above gives the day they came - the first day of the week”*

*“2. Every text above gives the time they came to the tomb was at sunrise*

*a. “sunrise” (not sunset)*

*b. “morning” (not evening)*

*c. “early” proii - 3am to 6pm or 4th watch*

*d. “dawn” - epiphosko - to get brighter (not darker)*

*3. They started while it was yet “dark” between 3 a.m to 6am*

*4. They arrived at sunrise not sunset*

*5. The rest of the women went back but Mary stayed.*

*6. 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.*
2. *They came “early” on the first day of the week*
3. *They arrived at the selphchre at SUNRISE Sunday morning.*
4. *They got their at Sunrise while it was twilight, saw it was empty and all the women but Mary Magnalene ran back to tell the apostles.*
5. *Jesus appeared to Mary - Mk 16:9.*

.....

*There was a “watch” at the tomb (Mt. 28:11) and the precise watch is designated by the repeated Greek term “proii” or the fourth watch between 3am to 6am.”*

### **GE:**

The determining concepts are,

First of course, WHO act in Mt28:1, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” only, or, “*they*” and “*the rest of the women*” therefore “*all the women*”?

Well, if we should go according to the words Matthew used, only “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” were the actresses during this episode of the Gospel Story. But obviously DW thinks different, and reckons “*they*”, “*the rest of the women*” and therefore “*all the women*”, were involved, from start to finish, because he says, “1. *Every text above gives the day they came - the first day of the week*” “2. *Every text above gives the time they came to the tomb was at sunrise*

- a. *“sunrise” (not sunset)*
- b. *“morning” (not evening)*
- c. *“early” proii - 3am to 6pm or 4th watch*
- d. *“dawn” - epiphosko - to get brighter (not darker)*
3. *They started while it was yet “dark” between 3 a.m to 6am*
4. *They arrived at sunrise not sunset*
5. *The rest of the women went back but Mary stayed.*
6. *Jesus rose between 3 am. to 6 a.m and then appeared to Mary.”*

So who is right, Matthew or DW?

See, that DW only in the last position --- last in chronological position --- places “5. *Jesus appeared to Mary - Mk 16:9*”. He places Jesus’ first appearance AFTER everything in Matthew. Except DW’s postscript about the guard, of course .... as a parenthesis, one might say.

Matthew does not do that though; Matthew mentions the Marys and the guards present and involved in the period of time which he had in mind, never mind now what period of time that was. That is what we must find out; we cannot at this stage of our investigation make assumptions and claim what period of time it was. I do not want to argue ‘in a circle’ which I have before shown, is the method used by DW.

We conclude therefore that DW takes **Mary Magdalene right through all the events in company with all the other women ....** Even right through Matthew 28 from verse 1 of the chapter until .... where shall we say? .... until all the disciple men and women were found together in Jerusalem somewhere where and when all the women Mary Magdalene included, told all the disciples men and women together that the Lord actually “met them”, and that they “held Him at his feet” and that He actually spoke to them all and told them all to go to ‘the twelve’ (eleven by then) and tell them that He had raised from the dead. THEN after it all, comes DW’s point number “5. *Jesus appeared to Mary - Mk 16:9*”.

So did Jesus appear to Mary alone AFTER He had had appeared to her and the other women together, again? What shall we believe, that Jesus appeared to Mary alone AFTER He had had appeared to her and the other women together, AGAIN, and not “first” and because “first”, all by herself, “first”— “Mk 16:9”?

Shall we believe DW, and not Mark— “Mk 16:9”?

So, WHO, act in Mt28:1, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” only, or, “*they*” and “*the rest of the women*” therefore “*all the women*”? And the answer is inevitable: “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” only— as Matthew wrote it, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary”.

Now,

WHAT did “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” actually DO, according to Matthew 28:1? (Wait with asking or answering ‘when?’ now. That question will soon enough have answered itself.) WHAT did “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” actually DO, according to Matthew 28:1?

KJV, “came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.”

**DW at first says:**

“*the day*” ....

“1. *they came -*”;

“2. *they came to the tomb*”;

“3. *They started*”;

“4. *They arrived*”;

“5. *The rest of the women went back but Mary stayed*”;

“6. *Jesus rose then appeared to Mary*”.

**Then says:**

“*the chronological order is*” ....

“1. *Began their journey*”;

“2. *They came*”, “*They arrived*”

“3. *saw it was empty*”;

“4. *“They got there”*; “*all the women but Mary Magdalene ran back to tell*”

“5. *Jesus appeared to Mary - Mk 16:9.*”

In all fairness to see what was in DW's mind — is to understand that *“The rest of the women went back but Mary stayed”*; *“all the women but Mary Magdalene ran back to tell”*— BUT, *“to tell”* that *“Jesus rose”* BEFORE— and, *“then appeared to Mary”*, points “6.” and “5.”. But that is about all DW deserves credit for, because every other statement he makes, is erroneous. Why? Because DW just will not admit separate visits at the tomb that night and morning were the order of the day literally! These errors are so obvious they hit the eye. These errors are all, also due to DW's refusal to admit Mary undertook

- 1) once to go to the tomb on her own and see the stone was removed from the opening, and run back to tell it Jn20:1;
- 2) once to on her own stay behind at the tomb and Jesus then appeared to her Jn20:11-17.

They are all, also due to DW's refusal to admit Mary and other women were at the tomb together more than once when they

- 3) first “arrived with sweet spices ready and prepared” Lk24:1, “and remembered... and returned... and told all”;
- 4) and AGAIN “arrived... and said... and looked... and entering... saw... and FLED... and told no one anything” Mk16:2-5;

And they are all, also due to DW's refusal to admit the other women without the company of Mary Magdalene at the very last had to have been at the tomb

- 5) “when EXPLAINED the angel to the women”, Mt28:5, “Fear not ye.... BECAUSE, He is not here, BECAUSE He is risen.... And they going.... Jesus suddenly met them”. So that it may be understood how “In the end of the Sabbath, being-mid-daylight-inclining as it towards the First Day of the week began to dawn”, “Sabbath's”— BEFORE— Mt28:1-4, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out to go have a look at the grave WHEN SUDDENLY there was a great earthquake and the angel of the Lord descending from heaven approached and hurled away from the tomb the doorstone and sat on it.”

I'll repeat it in bold for it is everything, everything is about:  
**“The angel answered and explaining, said to the women...”, so that it may be understood how “In the end of the Sabbath being-mid-daylight-inclining Sabbath’s— as it Sabbath’s— towards the First Day of the week began to dawn, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary Sabbath’s— set out to go have a look at the grave WHEN Sabbath’s— there suddenly was a great earthquake and the angel of the Lord Sabbath’s— descending from heaven approached, and Sabbath’s— hurled away from the tomb the doorstone and, Sabbath’s— sat on it.” “Sabbath’s” everything! NONE OF ‘SUNDAY’ anything! Because “it is written”: ‘opse de SABBATOHN tehi epiphohskousehi eis mian sabbatohn.... apokritheis de ho angelos eipen tais gynaiksin....’.**

**DW:**

*John 20:1 is the first time to the tomb with the rest of the women, thus concurrent with Mt. 28:1; Mk 16:1-2; Lk. 24:1.  
 John 20:11 is Mary’s return trip with the disciples*

**GE:**

So obviously made up it’s unnecessary to point out.

**Re: DW,** *“Mark 16:9 separates the time of the resurrection of Christ between 3am to 6am from the return trip of Mary with disciples (Jn. 20:11-18)”....*

*“...from the return trip ...”? Mary’s “return trip” was “between 3am to 6am” yet AFTER the Resurrection yet “the time of the resurrection of Christ” is “between 3am to 6am”....? When and where are we going to conclude, ‘stop’, and decide Jesus rose “between 3am to 6am from the return trip of Mary with disciples” and never have read something like it?*

**DW:**

*Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. - KJV*

*When therefore it was evening, on that day, the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. - ASV*

*At evening on that day, the first day of the week, when, for fear of the Jews, the doors were shut where the disciples were, Jesus came among them and said to them, May peace be with you! - BBE*

*When therefore it was evening on that day, which was the first day of the week, and the doors shut where the disciples were, through fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and says to them, Peace be to you. - Darby*

*Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith to them, Peace be to you. – Webster*

*John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 are the same not different accounts.*

*Mark 16:1-2 describe the same coming to the tomb. Verse one simply notes the Jewish Sabbath was over. Verse 2 simply notes what day after the Jewish Sabbath they commenced to the tomb. Mark 16:8 is qualified by Matthew 28:9-10 but same return trip to disciples.*

*Matthew 28:1 is the very same account of Luke 24:1 and John 20:1 as well as Mark 16:1-2.*

*Matthew 28:1 places the Sabbath “behind” them and they went to the tomb “INTO” (Gr. eis) first day of the week when the light was getting brighter NOT DIMMER.*

*Mark 16:9 occurs on the first day of the week, Sunday morning AFTER Jesus rose that morning between 3am to 6am BEFORE sunrise and BEFORE the women came with Mary Magdalene the first time. Verse 9 marks the return trip of Mary with disciples that same day.*

### **GE:**

Dear DW, you bought yourself a cat in a bag (as we say in Afrikaans) when you ‘*bought this*’, somewhere along your way:

*“John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 are the same not different accounts.”* John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 in fact contain FOUR “*different accounts*”, or one must account for contradictions exponentially.

Say the factors involved were, to mention ONLY, the Persons; Acts; Places; Times; Circumstances. Reckoning ONLY 3 variants to each ‘category’, Persons could be, 1, Mary; 2, the other Mary; 3, Salome (3+ “others with them”); Acts could be “to go see”, “bought”, “inspect”; Places could be the traders, home, grave; Times could be “Sabbath’s-time”, “after the Sabbath”, “very early before sunrise”; Circumstances could involve “the angel of the Lord”, not to mention “two angels”, “the door-stone away from the tomb”, an angel “from heaven descending” or an angel “sitting inside”, and you have to explain 59049, liberally, difficulties; but strictly, irreconcilabilities. You bought yourself a bag with 59049 vicious cats and there are several other bag fulls of cats where you bought this one from.

Four stories; not one. How? Well,  
It is Jn20:1-2 (not 3-10 or 11-17);  
It is Mt28:1-5a (not 5b-10);

It is Mk16:1; and  
It is Mk16:2-8 (not 9).

Repetition won't change the stories! It is vain you multiply or divide by 1, 59049 will stay 59049— 1”*John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 are the same not different accounts*” x 1”*Mark 16:1-2 describe the same coming to the tomb x 1Verse one simply notes the Jewish Sabbath was over*” x 1”*Verse 2 simply notes what day after the Jewish Sabbath they commenced to the tomb*” x 1”*Mark 16:8 is qualified by Matthew 28:9-10 but same return trip to disciples*” =1.

It is also vain or worse you multiply or divide by 0, 59049 will immediately become 0!—

x (0”*Matthew 28:1 is the very same account of*”) x 0(“*Luke 24:1 and x 0John 20:1 as well x 0as Mark 16:1-2*”) x 0(*Matthew 28:1 places the Sabbath “behind” them and they went to the tomb “INTO” (Gr. eis) first day of the week when the light was getting brighter NOT DIMMER*”) x 0(“*Mark 16:9 occurs on the first day of the week, Sunday morning AFTER Jesus rose that morning between 3am to 6am BEFORE sunrise and BEFORE the women came with Mary Magdalene the first time*”) x 0(“*Verse 9 marks the return trip of Mary with disciples that same day*”)  
= 0 !

**Quote: DW,** “*Mark 16:9 only pin points the Lord’s resurrection at “proii” - between 3am to 6am*” This is how any Christian would suppose from the standpoint of the sanctity that Christianity has attached to Sunday for thousand and a half thousand years.

My post referred to Matthew; not to Mark 16:9. Quoting myself, “Well, if we should go according to the words Matthew used, only “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary” were .....— as Matthew wrote it, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary”.

One thing is **INDISPUTABLE**: The translators of the Bible into English before the twentieth century were **NOT ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN ANY SUNDAY-SABBATH CONTROVERSY**; they all accepted the status quo and establishment's preferences **WITHOUT QUESTIONING**. What can you expect differently in the translation of the Bible? But I'll tell you what you will find, since **AWARENESS OF THE ISSUE, PRECISELY WHAT YOU SEE IN 'modern' quasi translations. EVERY OBVIOUS OR SUBTLE 'alteration' or attempt at 'improvement' or updating or whatever, betrays and reveals the EMBARRASSMENT and increasing AUDACITY with which every 'new translation' is undertaken by reason of Christianity's fear, dishonesty and SINNING in regard to Sunday worship.**

**BR:**

*".....Psalms 118 makes no mention at all of Sabbath OR of week day I"*

**GE:**

Psalm 118 is speaking of the Sabbath Seventh Day of the week, the Lord's Day **AND ITS REASON FOR BEING: CHRIST'S RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD** as if He is speaking today this very "Seventh Day The Sabbath of the **LORD** your God."

**DW:**

*Mark 16:9 only pin points the Lord's resurrection at "proii" - between 3am to 6am*

**GE:**

DW, how can you straight faced keep on maintaining this untruth vis a vis first, Mk16:9 does not mention the Lord's Resurrection, and, vis a vis Jn20:11-17 which places this appearance at earliest after the gardener should have been at his place of work; would he have started '3 to 4 am'? It's not even cynical or comical. And vis a vis Mk16:2-8 which does make mention of the time of morning "very early before

sunrise” even up to 3 to ZERO hours before sunrise YET CHRIST HAD NOT APPEARED YET?

**DW:**

*I agree that Mary Magdalene in John 20 made two trips to the tomb on Sunday morning. First, with all the women (Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:1-2; Lk. 24:1). Then they went back and told the apostles and she came back with them and that is when Christ appeared to her (Jn. 20:2-17).*

*I think your chronology as well as your interpretation of John 20:1 and Matthew 28:1 is completely messed up.*

*John 20:1 does not record a separate instance where Magdalene does a solo trip to the tomb. If you will notice that John gives no visit to the tomb by the women and their return to tell the disciples but THIS ONE. This is like the difference between the gospel accounts about the blind beggars. One gospel mentions two while the other mentions only one. Why? Because the focus is upon the one begger not because there was not another beggar. Likewise in John 20:1. The focus of John is on Mary as she is the main character in all of the gospel accounts because she was the first one that Jesus appeared to (Mk. 16:9). However, all the rest of the women were with her when she left in the dark early (proii) Sunday morning on the same day Jesus rose fromt the grave (Mk. 16:9).*

**GE:**

I think DW agrees with Bob Ryan (the Seventh-day Adventist here), obviously, only.

According to Jn20:1-2 Mary ALONE made ONE ‘return-trip’. According to Jn20:11-17 Mary made ONE ‘standing after / behind’ after ANOTHER implied ‘one-way-trip to the tomb’, that ‘trip’ being mentioned by Mark in 16:2-8.

**BW:**

*The real miracle would be that the days of the week were accurately tracked for 6000 or more years.*

**GE:**

THE REAL miracle was that the very Maker of all the days and seasons and years was born in the flesh and personality of man, and that this very ONE and the SAME, confirmed “all the works of God” in that He rose from the dead “In the Sabbath Day” so that “GOD, the Seventh Day (of “ALL HIS WORKS” in Christ and through Jesus Christ, “RESTED”. Who can still be confused for which day in our lives of believers in This One, is the “Seventh Day” of the completion, blessing, sanctification and “RESURRECTION / REVIVAL / UP-LIVING” and “RESTING-UP” of --- “GOD --- on the Seventh Day”?

For it declares in Is57:15 that He, “whose Name is the Most Holy Place”, “RESTED-UP”, that is, “revived” exactly Ex31:17 the very day “the Seventh Day”.

**ST:**

*No need to go back that far. Assuming that the Messiah knew which day of the week the Sabbath was, we can know what day it is today. Although the calendar in use, a Roman calendar, has indeed been changed, that change did not break the weekly cycle. As you know, prior to the change, it was called the Julian calendar because it originated at the time of Julius Caesar, 45 B.C. - several decades before the birth of the Messiah. The one change was ordered by Pope Gregory, and since then it has been called the Gregorian calendar. However, as mentioned above, the change did not alter the weekly cycle. The “Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 9, p. 251, under the article “Lilius,” says, regarding this change, that “...every imaginable proposition was made, only one idea was never mentioned, viz, the abandonment of the seven-day week.” Vol. 3, p. 740, under the article “Chronology,” the same reference, says that “It is to be noted that in*

*the Christian period, the order of days in the week has never been interrupted.” So it would seem that the weekly cycle of the calendar that has been in effect since 45 B.C. has never had any alteration from the time of the Messiah until now. The Saturday of today is the same seventh day of the week as it was in the Messiah’s time. One could, therefore, be pretty sure that they would be keeping the same Sabbath day that the Messiah kept, setting an example - the same day He said He was Lord of.*

*Here are several quotes regarding the continuity of the seven day week:*

*“The week of seven days has been in use ever since the days of the Mosaic dispensation, and we have no reason for supposing that any irregularities have existed in the succession of weeks and their days from that time to the present.” --Dr. W.W. Campbell, Statement. [Dr. Campbell was Director of Lick Observatory, Mt. Hamilton, California.]*

*“As far as I know, in the various changes of the Calendar there has been no change in the seven day rota of the week, which has come down from very early times.” --F.W. Dyson, Personal letter, dated March 4, 1932. [Dr. Dyson was Astronomer Royal, Royal Observatory, Greenwich, London.]*

*“As to Question (1)--I can only state that in connection with the proposed simplification of the calendar, we have had occasion to investigate the results of the works of specialists in chronology and we have never found one of them that has ever had the slightest doubt the continuity of the weekly cycle since long before the Christian era.*

*“As to Question (2) --There has been no change in our calendar in past centuries that has affected in any way the cycle of the week.” --James robertson, personal letter, dated March 12, 1932. [Dr. robertson was Director of the American Ephemeris, Navy Department, U.S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D.C.]*

*“In spite of all of our dickerings with the calendar, it is patent that the human race never lost the septenary [seven-day] sequence of week days and that the Sabbath of these latter times comes down to us from Adam, through the ages, without a single lapse.” --Dr. Totten, Statement. [Dr. Totten of New Haven, Connecticut, was Professor of Astronomy at Yale University when this statement was made.]*

*If you have documentation that shows that the seven day cycle has been interrupted at some point between the first century and now I would very much like to see it.*

*re: DW, “John 20:1; Mat. 28:1 and Mark 16:1-2 are the same not different accounts.”*

*They can't be the same. If John 20:1-2 is correct, then Matthew 28:1-8 and Mark 16:1-7 are either incorrect or they are referring to a later visit by Mary M. to the tomb.*

*Matthew 28:1-8 says that when Mary M. went to the tomb that she was told by an angel that the Messiah had risen and would be seen in Galilee. Matthew then says that she ran “with great joy” to tell the disciples and while on the way that she met the Messiah (this occurred before she got to the disciples).*

*However, John 20:1 and 2 say that when she came to the tomb and didn't find the Messiah there, that she ran to the disciples and told them that He had been taken away and that she didn't know where He was. In Matthew she knew where He was (or at least had been) and where He would be, but in John she didn't.*

**GE:**

**Re: ST,** *“John 20:1 and 2 say that when she came to the tomb and didn't find the Messiah there, that she ran to the disciples and told*

*them that He had been taken away and that she didn't know where He was."*

John doesn't say that "*she ... didn't find the Messiah*". It says she "comes ... sees the STONE taken away from the sepulchre; THEN (without any further '*finding*') runs ...". She did not enter or see the tomb was empty; Mary only saw the tomb was opened.

John does not say Mary "*didn't find the Messiah there*"; John says what he says and ONLY what he said must be attributed to John; not what tradition tells he supposedly also is telling us. Mary did find the Messiah there, a little distance from the grave. In fact, He found her.

No, "*this*" – according to "*John 20:1 and 2*" –, when "*she ran*", occurred before the Lord had appeared to Mary, before she even knew the grave was empty. And "*this*" – according to Mt28:8 –, when "THEY, ran", occurred AFTER the Lord had had appeared to Mary, "first", Mk16:9 = Jn20:14-15, because in Mt28:8 it tells of Jesus appearing, to MORE than one women, on their way into Jerusalem and not in the garden. Which is confirmed that in John Mary did not touch Jesus, but in Matthew, all the women held Him at his feet. In John Mary saw Jesus first, then He spoke to her; in Matthew "Jesus met them".

**Re: ST**, "*Matthew 28:1-8 says that when Mary M. went to the tomb that she was told by an angel that the Messiah had risen and would be seen....*"

Please quote? No; it's not said. Mary was never told anything like this. The only angels Mary had seen were first, the TWO angels as she CAME OUT of the tomb, according to Lk24:4-6. Then the one angel like a "young man sitting on the right hand" after she had gone into the grave (a second time a NEXT time). And again, last, two angels after "she had had remained standing after next to the tomb-door" outside, whom SHE spoke to, and never THEY, to her. Directly

hereafter as she had “turned away” from the tomb and had seen Jesus, “Jesus, said to her, Mary ....!” = Mk16:9. JOHN then tells, Mary “came and told the DISCIPLES (men) that she had seen the Lord” 20:18. No ‘running’, no ‘they’ – other women. No emotions or promises or commands. Most important: Read Jesus’ words to Mary and his words to the other women. **THEY ARE NOT THE WORDS OF DIFFERENT WRITERS; THEY ARE THE WORDS OF THE SAME JESUS IN DIFFERENT SITUATIONS ON DIFFERENT TIMES!** But, allege some people, ‘*John’s focus was on Mary*’. No, John’s focus was on the meaning of Jesus’ Resurrection for his disciples. Read verse 17!

No, it is not “*In Matthew she knew where He was (or at least had been) and where He would be, but in John she didn’t.*” The other way round! In JOHN she knew where He was (or at least had been) and where He would be, but in MATTHEW she didn’t **BECAUSE SHE WASN’T WITH THE OTHERS.**

Matthew says nothing like “.....*that when Mary M. went to the tomb that she was told by an angel that the Messiah had risen and would be seen in Galilee*”. Matthew 28:1-8 says that when Mary M. “set out to go have a look at the tomb” God intervened and “THERE SUDDENLY (unexpected) was (this) GREAT EARTHQUAKE”, when “the angel of the Lord descending from heaven approached and hurled away the door-stone from the grave”. So when could the Marys ever have got “to see the tomb”? They could not! ....

**ONLY** if that day had been over and the next morning had begun, could “THE ANGEL” have “EXPLAINED to the women” what had happened “On the Sabbath Day” **BEFORE! Mt1:5a!** The angel would not explain or answer the women if the Resurrection was happening; he would only explain it as a PAST occurrence. And the angel explaining on which day specifically and at which time of day actually “there was a great earthquake”, in fact, “Sabbath’s”, “Sabbath’s mid-afternoon”, presupposes it was the past “Sabbath’s

Day”, the past “Sabbath’s Day before the First Day of the week”, and not the ongoing day upon which he “explained to the women” how “there was a big earthquake”.

The angel in Matthew 28 “informing the women” present THE ACTUAL CIRCUMSTANCE OF THE RESURRECTION, is absolute proof the Resurrection did not happen on the morning of the First Day of the week. The Resurrection occurring while the angel “explained / informed”, or the angel ‘explaining / informing’ while the Resurrection occurred, is absurd. Therefore, exactly as Matthew wrote: “And behold there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descending approaching rolled ....” It is not the action or event **of the present**, but of the **past** “Sabbath’s” “ANSWERED / EXPLAINED / INFORMED to the women” by “the angel” with dramatic, ‘live’, effect.

Therefore on Sunday morning  
 UNNAMED women—  
 not “*Mary*”, because Jesus had had appeared to her “first” already—  
 must have been at the tomb AGAIN,  
 where they (not “*Mary*”) were “informed and told”  
 by “the angel” outside the grave—  
 not inside like in Mark and John and  
 not two angels outside the tomb like in Luke—  
*‘that the Messiah had risen and would be seen in Galilee’*.  
 And Matthew does NOT say that they (not “*Mary*”)  
 ‘*ran with great joy*’ and that  
 THEN the Messiah met them  
 (not “*they, the Messiah*”!)—  
 Matthew says that they (not “*Mary*”)  
 “ran with great joy” BEFORE the Messiah met them.  
 The Messiah according to Matthew was not met by “*Mary*”  
 because He already had appeared to her— Jn20:11-17 Mk16:9.

And what about the guard who were set to keep away specifically “the disciples of his”? The Mary’s would be prevented to get near the tomb.

No! The women— AFTER Mary already MUST have seen the Lord (Jn20:11-17) and they, the OTHER women, not yet had seen Him, were “*told by an angel that the Messiah had risen and would be seen in Galilee*”.

**BW:**

*It doesn’t matter. You get excited over chippy details that don’t matter. The point is the women tried to do something while they cried in their soup.*

**GE:**

*Chippy detail, without were no log.*

**Re: DW,** “*Here is the crux of our disagreement in regard to Matthew 28:1-4. You see this as describing Christ’s resurrection on Saturday evening based on Matthew 28:1 while you see Mark 16:1-8 as a different visit on Sunday morning.*”

I am glad you noticed the Text-demarcation, “*Matthew 28:1-4.*” Remarkable properties separate this pericope from the foregoing and following Text.

Only for about two years of late have I begun to stress the interrelationship of verse 28:5a as Matthew’s connective interpolation in the angel’s ‘explanation’ or ‘answer’ or ‘story’ or ‘witness’.

**Re: DW,** “*You see this as describing Christ’s resurrection on Saturday evening based on Matthew 28:1*”.

If you rectify this, “*You see this as describing Christ’s resurrection on Saturday evening based on Matthew 28:1*”, you will see that I ‘see

*this*’ as describing Christ’s resurrection on ‘Saturday’=“Sabbath’s-time”- ‘sabbatohn’, NOT “*on Saturday evening*” which would have been

- 1) after “afternoon”;
- 2) after sunset;
- 3) on the NEXT having started day the First Day of the week (‘Sunday’)— and NOT what I believe or what Matthew says in “*Matthew 28:1*”.

**Re: DW**, “...*while you (GE) see Mark 16:1-8 as a different visit on Sunday morning.*”

You have failed to see that I do nothing of the kind because “*Mark 16:1-8*” contains Mark’s relating of TWO completely ‘different’ EVENTS—

- A) the first, in **verse 1**, NOT a “visit” but a **purchase** at the trader “when the Sabbath had run out / had passed”;
- B) the second event, in verses **2-8**, a “visit” by (possibly the three women only) at the tomb “very early dawn / before sunrise”.

But it is fully true, “*the crux of our disagreement*” is in fact, that I “*see this*” – “*Matthew 28:1*”, “*as describing Christ’s resurrection*”, “Sabbath’s fullness in Sabbath’s being-mid-afternoon-daylight, BEFORE-the-First-Day-of-the-week”. Refer everything almost, I have ever written.

**Re: DW**, “.....*the term “opse” to mean “after” the Sabbath was completed and “into the twilight of sunrise” they came to the tomb on Sunday morning..... 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.*

*Hence, the supposed objection that the women ran away and didn't tell anyone is countered by Matthew 28:9 as Jesus relieved their fears and they did go tell the disciples."*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** ".....the term "opse" to mean "after" the Sabbath was completed and "into the twilight of sunrise" they came to the tomb on Sunday morning", see above two paragraphs and many more.

**Re: DW,** "as they quickly departed from this visit (In Matthew 28:7-8) 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)."

It is untrue. **Mark** EMPHATICALLY tells "they FLED and told NOBODY NOTHING they were too AFRAID!" **Matthew** tells they "with great and fearful JOY DID GO EVEN RAN to bring his disciples word."

Mark in 16:2-8 tells NOT of an appearance; Matthew DOES tell of Jesus' appearance. And what is more, Jesus tells of SEVERAL women who physically were confronted by Jesus. Now if "*this*" was not Jesus' SECOND appearing, how could He have "appeared to Mary Magdalene, FIRST" (ACCORDING TO Mark16:\_1 to 9\_ a la DW)? According to Matthew, Jesus met women among whom Mary Magdalene was ABSENT, but DW declares: "*Here*", viz., the SAME and NO "*different visit on Sunday morning*", "*is the crux of our disagreement in regard to Matthew 28:1-4*". DW should have said in regard to "*Mark 16:1-8*" as well! Therefore, DW maintaining, "*Matthew 28:1-4*" and "*Mark 16:1-8*" are the SAME and ONLY "*visit on Sunday morning*", DIRECTLY is contradicting HIMSELF not to mention the Scriptures!

So what does DW do because he is so acutely aware of his self-contradiction? HE INVENTS! "*Jesus met them. (vv. 9-10) to calm their fears.*" DW is forced to force the Scripture to say, "*as they were*

*not going to tell anyone*". Mark says they DID 'go', that "they FLED FROM THE TOMB BECAUSE THEY WERE SO AFRAID". And after all. Mark says, "they DID NOT TELL anyone anything so afraid were they." DW says, No, that was only how they felt for so long as it took them to run a few hundred meters. But then they were stopped in their tracks by Jesus "*to calm their fears*". In the meantime, He had appeared to Mary Magdalene --- a matter of seconds, a few yards away; but Mark said nothing about her or that appearance, o no! Mark thought it best to leave that, for last in verse 9.

According to DW, Jesus appeared first before "He appeared to Mary Magdalene first of all".

**Despite**, DW insists it was the exact same event, same women..... Then the women ran on, and told the disciples.... "*This special appearance to the women as they ran away gave them the boldness to go ahead and tell*". Was Mary Magdalene also so calmed? Who else heard what Jesus ordered Mary to go and tell? No one, it is clear; but it's the one and only '*trip to the tomb*' by all the women together, and the one and only '*return trip*'..... while Mark EMPHATICALLY STATED "They did NOT TELL anyone anything!" Mark, you liar! Matthew, you liar, because you wrote, the women, believing, and with God-fearing "fear-and-great-joy, did run TO, BRING WORD"!

*"IMMEDIATELY FROM the tomb, they departed and did run to bring word believing and with God-fearing fear-and-great-joy."* We must take up the cudgels for Matthew, and stress that that's what he said, and not what DW said he lied. And so we shall take up the cudgels for Mark also, who claimed "that the women ran away and didn't tell anyone anything", and emphasize, that Mark "countered Matthew" in no manner whatsoever.

To close, it should be noted where – according to Matthew – the women got their "*boldness*" from "*to go ahead and tell the disciples*". It was NOT from no "*special (unrecorded) appearance to the women*

as they ran away” or rather according to Mark “fled from the tomb”. The women got their “*boldness*” from “the angel”, who, “EXPLAINING / ANSWERING / GIVING RECORD, told the women: Be YOU not afraid! (as those guards who fell down like dead for fear of the angel’s brilliance, verse 4) I know, Jesus is the One you are looking for.... He is not here.... He is risen, just as He said— just, as He said! (‘gar kathohs eipen’) Come on in, let’s go see the place where the Lord lay” and take courage and receive boldness “and go quickly and tell....!” But that the angel did not tell Mary, Tradition goes; or goes it? Two angels it says, told all the women. Then they fled; then Jesus calmed them; then He left them, so that He first could appear to Mary Magdalene. STOP! ENOUGH! It’s blaspheming!

Hence, indeed, “*Matthew 28:9*” DID “*occur after Mark 16:8*”, but not “*immediately*”, for it would be impossible; but some time after Mark 16:2-8. Because — according to the time of day Jesus “*first appeared to Mary early on the First Day*” Mk16:9 when the gardener could be expected in the garden Jn20:15 — “*Matthew 28:9*” must have been about one to three hours AFTER “very early dawn before sunrise” when the women “fled from the sepulchre in such terrible fear they did not tell anyone anything”.

So, one may conclude Matthew 28:1-9 in actual event, chronologically had to have occurred

- 1) about one night or 12 hours after Mark 16:1;
- 2) about three to one hours after Mark 16:2-8 “very early before sunrise dawn” ‘*on Sunday morning*’ and a little while after Mark 16:9 “early” ‘*on Sunday morning*’— and therefore Mk16:1-9 contains THREE ‘*separate*’ anecdotes of events two of which were “*separate visits*” at the tomb and one, no visit to or at the tomb at all.

**DW:**

*Your chronology as well as your interpretation of John 20:1 and Matthew 28:1 is completely messed up. John 20:1 does not record a separate instance where Magdalene does a solo trip to the tomb. If you will notice that John gives no visit to the tomb by the women and their return to tell the disciples but THIS ONE. This is like the difference between the gospel accounts about the blind beggars. One gospel mentions two while the other mentions only one. Why? Because the focus is upon the one beggar not because there was not another beggar. Likewise in John 20:1. The focus of John is on Mary as she is the main character in all of the gospel accounts because she was the first one that Jesus appeared to (Mk. 16:9). However, all the rest of the women were with her when she left in the dark early (proii) Sunday morning on the same day Jesus rose from the grave (Mk. 16:9).*

**GE:**

Al right, let's see whose "chronology is messed up".

**Re: DW,** "John 20:1 does not record a separate instance where Magdalene does a solo trip to the tomb."

**GE:**

So she arrived "with all the other women"? But Jesus appeared to her, "first"?

She arrived "with all the other women"? But John wrote, "Mary Magdalene cometh" - 'erchetai' SINGULAR etc. John is directly MADE A LIAR by DW.

**Re: DW,** "John gives no visit to the tomb by the women and their return to tell the disciples but THIS ONE."

Well, what could more or better be "messed up" than this within itself most glaring contradiction? **DW:** Matthew says Mary on her own

*returns to tell; John says all together, return to tell; Mark says no one returns to tell; but all changed their mind and returned to tell.*

**Re: DW,** *“This is like the difference between the gospel accounts about the blind beggars. One gospel mentions two while the other mentions only one. Why? Because the focus is upon the one beggar not because there was not another beggar. ....”*

Totally irrelevant, inept and obstinate. No, this is unoriginal tedious parroting of scholars your peer.

**Re: DW,** *“Likewise in John 20:1. The focus of John is on Mary as she is the main character in all of the gospel accounts because she was the first one that Jesus appeared to (Mk. 16:9).”*

*“The focus of John”* is on Mary; *“However,”* he does not focus on Mary; he focuses on *“all the rest of the women”* who *“were with her”*. Mary saw Jesus in the garden, Jesus spoke to Mary in the garden; he commands Mary in the garden. *“However,”* John has no eye for, no word for, no concern for *“all the women with her”* in the garden. Rubbish!

Why, if the focus of *“all of the gospel accounts”* (‘accounts’ of what, by the way?) is on Mary (not on Jesus or his resurrection, o no!) on Mary-- DW should become or all the while has been a Roman Catholic.

**Re: DW,** *“when she left in the dark”*

John says Mary “comes”, that is, “got TO ...”. *“When she left”* --- ‘left’ for what? For the tomb? John says she “comes AT the tomb”, and AT the tomb Mary “comes and sees”.

“Mary comes, sees, finds: the STONE” --- ‘The focus’ of John is on the STONE! As was Mary’s.

**Re: DW,** “*In John ... Mary ... left in the dark early (proii) Sunday morning...*”

Your LYING “*interpretation*”, DW! John wrote “WHILE BEING EARLY DARKNESS”, not, “*in the dark early (proii) Sunday morning...*”

After everything had been discovered and experienced by every character in all four Gospels, here comes John and tells of Mary’s discovery of an opened tomb.... Amazing!

**DW:**

*The way you write is difficult to follow. Must be a South african English style. I read your responses and I don’t think you provided any evidence to overturn my position at all. You are welcome to your interpretations and that is exactly what they are - interpretations. However, Christ was raised between 3am. to 6am Sunday morning (Mk. 16:9). The women came just after he rose from the dead, including Mary (Jn. 20:1; Mt. 28:1-2) and got there just before sunrise. The women fled in terror not speaking to anyone along the way but Christ appeared to them, calmed their fears and reaffirmed the command of the angel to them and they went and told his disciples with great joy. The disciples ran back and Mary followed them and Jesus appeared to Mary.*

**GE:**

*“The women fled in terror not speaking to anyone along the way but Christ appeared to them, calmed their fears and reaffirmed the command of the angel to them and they went and told his disciples with great joy. The disciples ran back and Mary followed them and Jesus appeared to Mary”, BUT JESUS “FIRST APPEARED TO MARY”!?*

## The Guard

“It is difficult to see how ... the guards (could have gone) to the city ... on a late Sabbath afternoon”. (Incidentally, Matthew does not so much speak of a late afternoon as of a late time of the day, which could be quite early in the afternoon.) The Sabbath is understood as the day of resurrection, but the guard went to the city on Sunday morning. The Sabbath is least imagined when they went. The guards on the Sabbath were struck down like dead by the appearance of the angel and would certainly not come by soon. Matthew continues the guard’s history from only much later ... on the Sunday morning. And what they could tell the Jews was nothing of the resurrection. The only information they were able to supply was the fact that the seal was broken, the stone removed and the body missing. They did not know of Jesus’ resurrection. He did not appear to them and they did not even see the grave being opened. They were like dead!

Greater “difficulties” “arise” for the supposition of a Sunday resurrection than for the supposition of a Sabbath resurrection as a result of Matthew’s story of the guard. See par. 5.3.4 and 5.3.3.1.1.3.2.5. A Sabbath resurrection does take into account the event of the Saturday night. A Sunday resurrection approach does not. A Sabbath resurrection does not assume though that the night “intervened between the beginning of their vigil and the resurrection”, but between the resurrection and their meeting with the priests. Had Sunday been the day of resurrection – “the third day” – the excuse of the guard’s sleeping would have been no excuse but as good as asking to be crucified because it would have meant that they slept on duty. Their excuse would have been nonsensical. “The third day” was the Sabbath – for the Jew to end with sunset, for the Roman guard to end with midnight. On the Sabbath afternoon the Marys went to have a look at the grave not realising a guard was appointed. They obviously did not reach their aim – most probably because of the earthquake. As soon as they had left their home they in a thousand ways could have learned of the guard. Having heard of the guard they knew not to even attempt a visit before midnight. The women not knowing of the

angel's arrival at the grave and its consequences could not know that the guard was out of action. Mary Magdalene, however (Jn.20:1), might have tried to steal a glimpse of the grave despite knowing of the guard. If "early darkness still" indicates early in relation to the night as a whole she might have come to the tomb before midnight. If "early darkness still" indicate early in relation to the morning hours after midnight it must have been very soon after midnight. In any event the guard was gone by the time she actually saw the stone, away from the sepulchre. If Mary Magdalene expected a guard at the tomb, she now knew there was no guard any more. She would have told the others if they thought it necessary to ask her about it. Fact is that with the women's visit to the tomb recorded by Luke, they were not concerned about a guard – there is not a word about the guard recorded. This fact gives skeptics reason to discredit Matthew who is the only one who mentions the guard. Their doubt would be founded if the resurrection occurred on the First Day because it would still have been "the third day" on Sunday – and still time on duty for the (missing) guard. The usual explanation of the resurrection and the women's visit as simultaneous or separated with but at most a few minutes gives so much more substance to the skeptic's protestations because the guard must have been still at the grave – conscious or unconscious – while the women arrived. But again the women clearly never met or noticed or expected the guard, and it is never mentioned in connection with any appearance of Jesus. Either one makes Matthew a liar or one accepts a Sabbath's resurrection.

The guard would have had enough time to recover and to leave before the women arrived – even before Mary had seen the stone. They were supposed to watch till midnight because midnight, for Roman guards, ended "the third day". The guard may even have stayed on post at the grave after they recovered till their watch expired at midnight, and then could have left – the women shortly after arriving.

Nothing suggests reason to allege that a Sabbath's resurrection implies that the guard "told the people on Saturday-evening that the disciples stole Christ's body ..." "when no night had yet intervened between". Bacchiocchi is quick to suppose a night where no night is

suggested, but stops dead before recognising a night where it is mentioned in so many words and supposed for many and tangible reasons – the night that “intervened between” Jesus’ crucifixion and interment and here again between the resurrection and the Sunday mornings’ events! The guard did not tell “the people on Saturday-evening that the disciples stole Christ’s body”. (Who said so?) The guard told nobody that – they told the priests of the empty tomb on the Sunday morning. The guards also didn’t tell anybody, whether “people” or priests “that the disciples stole Christ’s body”. “Some of the watch coming to the city explained to the high priests everything that happened”. The guards told them just the truth, and that could not have been much seeing they were unconscious during the events. They had lots to explain which they couldn’t tell for sure. (Incidentally, the soldiers “fabricated” no story. Their story originated with the Jews on the Sabbath’s morning at Pilate, 27:64. Nestle obviously overlooked this inference where he omits the recurrence in 28:13. See par. 5.3.3.)

The time on the Sunday morning of their meeting cannot be deduced from Matthew itself. Matthew supplies no time indication of this event. The time of the resurrection is given independently and has nothing to do with the time of the guard’s meeting with the Jews. The time of the meeting can only be concluded from taking into account information from other Gospels, as follows: Jesus’ first appearance was to Mary Magdalene (Jn.20:11-16); and the time of his appearance to her was “early on the First day” (Mk.16:9). John says it was when the gardener was in the garden already. He would begin to work with sunrise. The appearance mentioned by Matthew being the only appearance to women in general mentioned in the Gospels, it had to have been Jesus’ second appearance, and consequently was later than the first. Matthew then implies that the guard assembled with the priests about the time Jesus appeared to the women, and the time of the guard’s discussion with the Jews had to be some time after sunrise. A Sabbath-resurrection accommodates these inferences perfectly. But a Sunday-resurrection, by “attaching the time

designated in verse one” to the “many events which are described in Matthew 28:2-15” (inter alia the event of the guard’s meeting with the Jews) as well as to the resurrection, implies a time for the resurrection, later, than the time given for the appearances in the other Gospels! Which is absurd and which is why the Gospels are ridiculed! This traditional explanation of things forms the basis and origin of every and all and distinct contradictions that – according to the Sunday resurrection perception of things – can and must be pointed out in the narratives of the appearances.

### **Connection and Relation Between Matthew 28:1-4 and verses 5 further**

#### **5.3.3.4.1. Single Approach**

To translate “Now when he rose early the First Day of the week, he appeared”, Revised Standard Version – also Modern Language and Authorized Version, simply is incongruous. The New Afrikaans Bible renders Mt.28:1, “After the Sabbath when it began to get light the Sunday morning, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went and looked at the grave. Suddenly there was a tremendous earthquake. An angel of the Lord came from heaven, went to the tomb, rolled the stone away and sat on it. His appearance was as bright as lightning and his clothes as white as snow. Of fright for him the guards trembled and became like dead. Then says the angel to the women, ...”. The impression created by all these translations is an immediate and single event at the one moment of the angel’s opening of the tomb, of resurrection and appearance to the women – an impression which contradicts every of the many and unambiguous indications that such a coincidence was impossible.

#### **5.3.3.4.2. Continuous Narrative But No Unbroken Chronology**

As has been noticed on numerous occasions thus far, it is clear that a break occurs between verses four and five of chapter 28. The whole chapter is no continuous history of events, which took place at the

time given in verse one. It has also been indicated above that the Gospels made each its own choice of tradition or source from the resurrection accounts available at the time they were written. Matthew used different sources or traditions. The source used for the first four verses obviously is unique.

#### 5.3.3.4.2.1. **Only Matthew**

Matthew, in the first four verses of chapter 28, is the only Gospel to write of Christ's resurrection – or at least of the occasion and time of the resurrection, because he does not describe the event per se. Only Matthew tells how the grave was opened. Only he tells of the great earthquake. Only he tells of the resurrection of the many dead and the opening of their graves when Jesus died and who appeared after his resurrection. Only Matthew mentions the time of the opening of the grave, the great earthquake and the women's setting out to go and look at the grave. Only Matthew does not mention the time of any realised visit to the tomb. For him the important moment in the unfolding of God's purpose was the moment of Christ's resurrection. That initiated God's challenge to man to believe in the Jesus who by the power of God was declared Son of God through resurrection from the dead (Paul). Matthew's account is a lively and dramatic description. No mortal could experience what Matthew describes as if told by an eyewitness. It can for certain be stated that his source was not the guard, or the women as eyewitnesses. But the women could have learned from the angel at first hand to become the source of Matthew's source. Simply nothing in the other Gospels can be compared with what Matthew narrates in 28:1-4. These verses must be accepted for what they are and should not be identified or confused with the other Gospels, or every detail supplied by all the Gospels creates irrefutable inconsistencies and constitutes contradictions never-ending – which can only be reconciled in a dishonest manner, nothing to the benefit of the Christian faith.

#### 5.3.3.4.2.2. **Sequence of Times**

John records the earliest time of the Saturday night. Mary sees the grave opened “early darkness still being” – prohi skotias eti ousehs. Then Luke records “morning deep being” – orthrou batheohs, the several women led by the Trio coming to anoint the body. Mark says, “very early sunrise” – lian prohi anateilantos tou hehliou, “They came upon the grave” – 16:2. “They” is a relative pronoun that refers to either the three women mentioned in verse one, or, independently, to any number of women. That Mark has The Three in mind is suggested by the fact that the Marys and Salome only “after the Sabbath had gone by”, went to buy spices for salving Jesus’ body – 16:1. They came to ascertain their findings of earlier (Luke) when they wanted to anoint the body. And lastly Mark (16:9) says that Jesus appeared “early ... to Mary first (of all)” – prohi. John implies the same time of day through mention of the gardener who would have been there to start work from sunrise on of course. John, Luke and Mark state that the visits to the grave were “on the First Day of the week” – tehi miai hehmerai sabbatohn.

Here is more than remarkable coincidence. Deliberate attempt at supplement and agreement between the Gospels is apparent and undeniable. The attempt could have lasted over many years and could have undergone redactory changes, and needs not to be restricted to the period of initial composition of each Gospel. Nevertheless historical sequence of Mark, Luke, Matthew, John, seems to have been the order of first genesis while the chronological order of their source-stories was John, Luke, Mark, Matthew.

#### 5.3.3.4.2.3. **Independence and Relations**

The total independence of Mt.28:1-4 is unmistakable although resemblance with the other Gospels from verse five on is just as unmistakable. Mt.28:1-4 contains no indication to the effect that the women, on the First Day, came to the tomb – once, or, once more – and that Jesus, on the First Day, appeared to them on their way. These verses have the infinitive for a prospective and tentative event – the

women went to see the grave. The time these verses give is not intended as the time of the women's intended action, but of the realised event of the resurrection. In contrast, the other Gospels all mention an accomplished fact – the women came upon the grave. The time these Gospels give is intended to state the time of an accomplished visit to the grave. In all the Gospels, remarkable coalescence is a hallmark of the narratives of the visits and appearances – all being distinctly separated from the resurrection per se. The resurrection, the visits and the appearances clearly are not the same or a single event, but several. They are not of one point in time, but of consecutive days and moments in time. No contradiction or discrepancy can be pointed out if they are understood accordingly. But the moment these narratives are forced to agree with Mt.28:1-4 whether as pertains the time mentioned there or whether as pertains the events mentioned there, chaos results.

#### **5.3.3.4.2.4. Appearances Can Be Deceiving**

No large and learned treatise is needed to explain or to exclude the chaos. Translation does it all. The chapters can be so divided that the appearance only will lead to conclusions different from conclusions the present division of chapters lead to. For example, if the first four verses of Matthew are read in conjunction with the incident of the sealing of the grave, as explained above, the chances for misunderstanding the event and time of the resurrection for the time of Jesus' appearance would be avoided. The same can be said of Mark 16:1. This verse belongs with the story of the burial. The Marys – on Friday – “saw where Jesus was buried”, and, “when the Sabbath was over” they and Salome bought spices. If, translations could begin by visibly to combine the related passages and to visibly separate the unrelated passages, any reader will associate events accordingly where he used to blindly follow the visibly misleading divisions of chapters and verses.

### 5.3.3.4.3. **Matthew's Source in 28:1-4** 5.3.3.4.3.1. **Sources Clarify**

The characteristic use by Matthew of different source-materials (Mark, to the present writer's judgment Luke also, "G", and at least one other written source – see many "Introductions" and commentaries) can be seen in the change between passages of dialogue and narrative. For example, in chapter 28, verses one to four are narrative, and five further are dialogue. Matthew also uses his sources by omitting!

The above already abundantly provides indication to the effect that Matthew used another source besides the one (or those) he used for his story of the visit to the grave and the appearance, 28:5-15 (or even 5-20), and besides any source the other Gospels might have used. If Matthew for both his stories – of resurrection, and of appearance and visit – used the same source the other Gospels used for their stories of the visits and appearances, then the differences must be attributed solely to the own interpretation of each writer or author. If the events were reduced to the one, reliability and historicity are sacrificed. The differences would then be impossible to solve. But the sources are different being derived from traditions of different events of different times and days.

Also the original oral informers were several. In the case of Mt.28:1-4 (and even from 27:62 on) the original teller of the story was the angel to the women (so Calvin), who again told the disciples (apostles) on whose authority the traditions of the Church were based – which the writers of the Gospels used.

### 5.3.3.4.3.2. **Peculiar Usage**

Therefore, If Matthew says opse, he does not mean "after" – meta, or, "past" – diagenomenou, but, "late". If Matthew says sabbatohn, he means not, "no longer Sabbath" – meta sabbaton, but, "in / on / of the Sabbath's (time)". If Matthew says tehi epifohskousehi, he means not "while becoming light" – fohs anetelein, Mt.4:6 or, lian prohi anateilantos hehliou, or, "toward light" – heohs hou diefause / pros ton orthron, but, "while being of the essence of light". If Matthew

says *eis mian sabbatohn*, he does not mean “on the First Day of the week” – *tehi miai sabbatohn / miahs sabbatohn*, but, “toward the First Day of the week”. If Matthew says “there came a great earthquake” he does not mean such an insignificant tremor that the other Gospels could see fit to ignore it. If Matthew says the Marys went to look at the grave, he does not mean Salome included and / or other women as well. If Matthew says the two women went to see the grave he does not mean that they saw the grave or that they actually “came upon the grave”. If Matthew tells of one angel that descended from heaven and rolled the stone away and sat on it, he does not mean two angels coming from behind the women or an angel already in the tomb sitting on the bench. If Matthew mentions the guard he thinks of them as present while the angel descended and unconscious afterwards and not in conversation with the Jews.

**Re: DW**, *“the Jewish counsel did not place the resurrection in broad daylight or in the afternoon but: Saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. - Mt. 28:13*  
*This would make no sense if it occurred in “broad daylight” but it would make perfect sense if it occurred early Sunday morning in the dark during 3am to 6am before Sunrise.”*

**GE:**

And what would have made a difference? It would NEVER make sense because the whole story was a concocted lie. Why build an argument for the truth on a lie?

The “*Jewish counsel did not place the resurrection*” at all! They denied it until the last, even on Sunday morning when facing the guards, they and the Roman guard KNEW NOTHING ABOUT THE RESURRECTION. Because the guards NEVER SAW the resurrection or dead men do see. “LIKE DEAD” without having ‘seen’ anything! Both the high priests and the guard were ABLE ONLY to speculate on what THEY thought or pretended was the TRUTH: “*His disciples came by night, and stole him away.*” The

priests and the guard struck a deal: Guards, you LIE and say “we slept”; and we, give you large sum of money.

What sense would it make if the guards said they slept? Ja well, we were on guard during day of course! You thought a Roman guard would sleep on duty? I’ll cut your head off, man! No one ever would even think of accusing a Roman guard he slept on duty! But no one would ever think to argue with a Roman guard if he slept AFTER duty, either! So we watched the tomb our total watch, for three hours after the first watch clocked off duty until midnight. It was then, “by night” we tell you Jews, that his disciples came --- by night after midnight! --- and stole the body. Any objections we go to sleep after our watch?

Meantime the TRUTH was that these guards – 100 of them – “Late in the Sabbath mid-afternoon towards the First Day of the week when suddenly there was a great earthquake ... for the brilliance of his appearance fell down like dead men” before the “approach” of “the angel of the Lord”.

Time and the elapse of time do not exist for unconscious like dead men. Next thing the guard knew was that the tomb was opened and empty. They had no clue how. Nobody was near the grave of course because everybody knew the guard was on duty until midnight and day for them would have ended. But Mary Magdalene, the guard regardless, “When being early darkness still comes and sees: The Stone! Taken away from the sepulchre! And runs, and tells Peter and (John).”

Now notice what Mary said: “THEY” – she must have thought the GUARD – “have taken him away”! Mary very well realized a Roman guard NEVER LEAVES POST. (She didn’t even think sleep on guard a possibility!) No, she thought the guard’s ORDERS MUST HAVE BEEN CHANGED because she expected the guard to have been on

duty still “when being early darkness on the First Day of the week”. And that (besides her shock at the moved away door-stone of course), must be why Mary did not go nearer or into the tomb but straight away at the sight of the MOVED AWAY STONE, ran back. “THEY” could still have posted some guards INSIDE the tomb!

Then how is it possible the women can have the audacity to “come with spices prepared and ready” to anoint Him, “deepest morning”, according to Luke 24? Because they KNEW the specific ‘third day’ the guard was stationed, for them, expired at midnight, and so their watch. And like the guards for sure, also the women thinking the Lord was still dead, “came with their prepared spices ready” to salve the body which --- although Mary had told them of the opened tomb --- they must have thought was in the grave still. The guard on their part must have thought the disciples stole the body while they allegedly “slept” but were unconscious “like dead men”— that, they would never admit to anyone, hey, would they?

Every aspect points at a “broad daylight Sabbath’s Resurrection”— every word spoken by every character in the drama, every act of God, and every memory recorded by the ‘Evangelists’— even Matthew’s story of the guard and John’s story of Mary coming after sunset and finding no guard.

#### 5.3.3.4.4. **Matthew Compared with Matthew**

These are not seeming differences between Matthew and the other Gospels, but real and factual. If they don’t indicate the obvious solution to the problem of a different source based on a different event and announcer, nothing else will. Nevertheless comparison of Matthew with Matthew will firmly establish the finding that in 28:1-4 an independent source was used. Between, on the one hand, the foregoing and following context, and, on the other hand, 28:1-4, the following preference of words, is found,

**ST:**

*DW said, "Matthew 28:1-8 says that when Mary M. went to the tomb that she was told by an angel that the Messiah had risen and would be seen...." And GE asked, "Please quote?" and said, "No; it's not said. Mary was never told anything like this." In the immortal words of John McEnroe - "You Cannot Be Serious!!!".*

**GE:**

Mary was never told anything like this in Matthew 28:1-8!

**DW:**

*Gentleman, If your position of John 20:1 is correct then John had NOTHING to say about any other women EVER coming to the tomb except Magdalene! Why would John omit all references to ALL of the women but Mary when every other gospel includes them??? John would be guilty of failing to give his readers the whole story if that were true. John's account of Mary in John 20:1 is the same account given by all other gospel writers of Mary with the women as Mary is also highlight by the other gospel accounts.*

*The women were frightened and did not tell anyone as they went back of fear UNTIL Jesus met them along the way. Ask yourself why would Jesus meet them along the way and reaffirm what they had already been told by angel IF that was sufficient and nothing warranted that special additional reaffirmation? Just use common sense!.....*

*Matthew 28:1 can be genuinely interpreted differently than what you are suggesting. Mark 16:9 separates the time of the resurrection of Christ between 3am to 6am from the return trip of Mary with disciples (Jn. 20:11-18).*

**Re: DW,** *"John's account of Mary in John 20:1 is the same account given by all other gospel writers of Mary with the women as Mary is also highlight by the other gospel accounts."*

If what you say were true—that “*all other gospel writers*” ‘give’ and “*also highlight*” “*the same account*” as “*John’s account of Mary in John 20:1*”,

1) Why does Luke in 24:1, not do like John does in 20:1 and 11 and mention Mary Magdalene only; but does not mention her at first?

2) Why does Luke in 24:10, not do like John does in 20:1 and 11 and mention Mary Magdalene only; but mentions her just like he mentions the “others with THEM” (‘the three’ from Galilee)?

3) Why does Luke in 24:22-23, not do like John does in 1 and 11 and mention Mary Magdalene only; but only mentions “certain women”; and ‘Mary Magdalene’, not at all?

4) Why does Mark in 16:1, not do like John does in 20:1 and 11 and mention Mary Magdalene only; but mentions her just like he mentions “Mary the mother of James, and Salome” (‘the three’ from Galilee)?

5) Why does Mark in 16:2-8, not do like John does in 1 and 11 and mention Mary Magdalene only; but merely mentions “they came”; and ‘Mary Magdalene’ specifically, not at all?

6) Why does Matthew in 28:1, not do like John does in 20:1 and 11 and mention Mary Magdalene only; but mentions her just like he mentions “the other Mary”— only the two, ‘Marys’?

7) Why does Matthew in 28:5-10, not do like John does in 20:1 and 11, and mention Mary Magdalene only; but only speaks of “the women”, and of ‘Mary Magdalene’ howsoever, not at all?

Because every Gospel has two stories in connection with visits at the tomb, and the Appearances.

John has two:

Jn20:3-10 Simon and Peter;  
and 20:11-17 the first Appearance to Mary only.

Luke has two:

Lk24:1-10 discovery of the empty tomb; repeated in 24:22-23;  
and 24:13-32 to Emmaus and in Jerusalem 24:33ff.

Mark has two:

Mk16:2-8 ascertaining visit;  
and 16:9 first Appearance, and “Mary had had stood after”  
Jn20:11ff— the only ‘parallel accounts’.

Matthew has two— one of the Resurrection, 28:5a, 1-4;  
and one of the second Appearance, 5a-11a.

Jn20:1-2, discovery of the opened tomb,  
and Mk16:1, purchase of spices,  
are not stories about the Resurrection, visits at the tomb, or,  
Appearances.

Therefore it is not a matter of “*Why would John omit all references to ALL of the women but Mary*”, or that “*every other gospel includes them*”— These are two, false, premises. And therefore, that John or another Gospel “*would be guilty of failing to give his readers the whole story*” is another false premise. No Gospel would ‘fail’; each fulfills its OWN chosen purpose. And therefore – once again – is it a false premises and conclusion that “*John’s account of Mary in John 20:1 is the same account given by all other gospel writers of Mary with the women*”.

I am therefore afraid my ‘*common sense*’ cannot grasp the following,  
“*The women were frightened and did not tell anyone as they went back of fear UNTIL Jesus met them along the way. Ask yourself why would Jesus meet them along the way and reaffirm what they had already been told by angel IF that was sufficient and nothing*”

*warranted that special additional reaffirmation? Just use common sense!”*

But I do understand the challenge “*why*” what for Dr. Walter is “*the obvious*”, cannot be ‘*seen*’ is an “*unscriptural Saturday resurrection theory*”. I think it is because DW is looking PAST the historic truth of the Resurrection and Appearances to an already apostate Christianity, while he should be looking BACK to a true Christianity that already existed within the ranks of the Old Testament prophets, who - Ignatius said -, “Sabbath-keeping”, had been “Christians” before Christ! Yes; the totality of the Old Testament ultimately became Christianity through Jesus Christ, but most tragically soon after Him, returned to its old pagan ways of Sunday-worship.

According to “*Jn. 20:11-18*”— which happened AFTER Jesus’ appearance to Mary, John only says Mary “came and told”; not, that “*she ran*”. There is NO “*return trip of Mary with disciples*” in “*Jn. 20:11-18*”. “*Jn.20:11-18*” tells of the return trip of Mary to, the disciples, ALONE. As John’s anecdote began with Mary only, it ends with Mary only.

To allege “*John would be guilty of failing to give his readers the whole story if that ...*” — that “*John had NOTHING to say about any other women EVER coming to the tomb except Magdalene!*” — “*were true*”, or, that “*John’s account of Mary in John 20:1 is the same account given by all other gospel writers of Mary with the women*”, is audacious and factually untrue.

My ‘point’ here (“*Matthew 28:1 can be genuinely interpreted*”) was – or is, There are TWO stories in Matthew 28:1-11, BOTH the angel’s “Information” or “Explanation” or “Answer to the women” 5a, namely the story of the Resurrection “Sabbath’s”— verses 1-4; and the story of the SECOND Appearance in 5b-11a— NOT TOLD WHEN however IN MT28, AT ALL!

Refer also if you like Book 2, ‘Matthew according to Matthew’ etc. references given above in this thread for ‘source-technicalities’, and many other studies. It is not that I have changed my mind, on the contrary....

‘My point’ with this post is simply Mary M. was not in 28:1-8\_ “*told by an angel that the Messiah had risen and would be seen...*” because by the time the angel told the OTHER women that, Jesus had already appeared to Mary Magdalene. (So, it’s impossible to ‘quote’ because it ain’t there ....) IF THE APPEARANCE IN Mt28:5b-11 WERE Jesus’ first, it would be UNTRUE “He appeared to Mary M first” as BOTH Mk16:9 and Jn20:11-17 state.

Mary Magdalene was in fact told that Jesus had risen, as I have said MANY times, first by TWO angels when she visited the tomb the first time to salve the body which she must have thought was in the grave still; and a second time according to Mk16:2-8 when she and some other women had gone back to the grave to ascertain the things she and they must have thought about after their first visit – Lk24:6 and 8 and 22 and 23! After the Mk16:2-8 visit Mary Magdalene must have “had had stood after” as Jn20:11 clearly states and Jesus appeared to her alone, “first”!

**Quote: DW,** “.....*Why would John omit all references to ALL of the women but Mary when every other gospel includes them?*”

Simple. Because “He the Risen, APPEARED TO MARY FIRST OF ALL early on the First Day of the week.” Mk16:9. Compare Jn20:11-17. Do not compare with Jn20:1-10 because that section contains no less than two stories OF EARLIER THAT NIGHT, verses 1 to 2 and verses 3 to 10!

**Re: DW,** “*John would be guilty of failing to give his readers the whole story if that were true.*”

NOT ONE Gospel or Gospel-writer gives “*his readers the whole story*”.

In fact NO Gospel-writer except Matthew --- or rather the angel of 28:5a --- gives the story of the RESURRECTION!

And ONLY John in ONLY 20:11-17 and Mark in ONLY 16:9 tell of the FIRST appearance;

And ONLY Matthew in ONLY 28:5-11 tells of the SECOND appearance.

So what in principle is here supposed against John for that matter must be brought against every Gospel.

What is here brought against the ONE Gospel as good as against every Gospel, is NO argument and has NO substance whatsoever, and contains the preconceived idea only that the Resurrection MUST have been on the First Day of the week.

Here is the best and most obvious PROOF I am not talking nonsense, but truth:

See the CHANGES made in ‘modern translation’ to each and every Scripture with regard to the Sabbath in the New Testament,

for example:

Mt28:1 from “In / On the Sabbath”, to, “*after the sabbath*”;

Mk16:9 from “Now risen, Jesus appeared”, to, “*When Jesus rose early that First Day*”;

Mk15:42 from “And now when the even was come”, to, “*Late noon*”, “*As evening approached*” etc.

There is not a single Text not thus corrupted --- and for what reason? Gal4:10, the “return back to your dismal former no-gods superstitiously worshipped: days, months, seasons, years” the chief the hermaphrodite “Queen of days” and “Day of the Lord Sun”.

**DW:**

*I don't rely upon SOME modern translation but upon the Greek text itself and the KJV is the more natural translation.*

**A. First Set**

*Mt. 28:1 ¶ In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn (growing light – sunrise) toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.*

*Mk. 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.*

*Mk 16:2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.*

*Jn. 20:1 ¶ The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre,*

*Lk. 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.*

**B. Second Set**

*MT 28:2 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.*

*Mt. 24:3 His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow:*

*Mt. 24:4 And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.*

**C. Third Set**

*Mk. 16:3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?*

*John 20:1 ....and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.*

*Mk. 16:4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great.*

*Lk.24:2 And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.*

*Mk 16:5 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.*

*Lk 24:3 And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.*

*Lk. 24:4 And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments:*

*D. Fourth Set*

*Lk. 24:5 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?*

*Mt. 24:5 And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified.*

*E. Fourth Set*

*Lk. 24:6 He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee,*

*Lk. 24:7 Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.*

*Lk. 24:8 And they remembered his words,*

*Mk 16:6 And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him.*

*Mk 16:7 But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.*

*Mt. 24:7 And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you.*

*G. Fifth Set*

*Mk 16:8 And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre;*

*Mt. 28:8 And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word.*

*Mk. 16:8 ...for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.*

*Mt. 28:9 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.*

*Mt. 28:10 Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.*

*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.*

*Lk. 24:9 And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest.*

*Lk. 24:10 It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles.*

*Mk. 16: 10 And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept.*

*Jn. 20:2 Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.*

*Lk. 24:11 And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.*

*Lk. 24:12 Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.*

#### *F. Sixth Set*

*Jn. 20:3 Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre.*

*Jn. 20:4 So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.*

*Jn. 20:5 And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.*

*Jn.20:6 Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie,*

*Jn. 20:7 And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.*

*Jn. 20:8 Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed.*

*Jn. 20:9 For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.*

*Jn.20:10 Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.*

#### *H. Seventh Set*

*Mk. 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.*

*Jn. 20:11 ¶ But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre,*

*Jn. 20:12 And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.*

*Jn. 20:13 And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*

*Jn. 20:14 And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.*

*Jn. 20:15 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.*

*Jn. 20:16 Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.*

*Jn. 20:17 Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.*

*Jn. 20: 18 Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her.*

**GE:**

**The above, re-arranged chronologically, historically and logically understandable,**

1) Mt. 28:1 In the end / FULLNESS of the Sabbath'S, Sabbath'S MID-AFTERNOON ('opse de sabbatohn tehi epiphoskousehi), as it began to dawn TOWARDS / before / unto ('EIS mian (hehmeran) the First Day (Accusative, not 'on'; not Dative or Genitive) OF the week (not 'on' Genitive or Dative), WENT Mary Magdalene and the other Mary TO SEE the sepulchre.

2) Mk. 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....

=

....Jn. 20:1 The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene when it was YET EARLY darkness ('proh-i skotias eti ousehs'), unto the sepulchre, sees the STONE (not inside grave) ... runs"— discovery of OPENED tomb Saturday evening. **Sets all subsequent visits in motion.**

3) Lk. 24:1 Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning ("deepest morning" 'orthrou batheohs'), they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them. FIRST realized visit; purpose to anoint body frustrated by finding tomb was EMPTY.

4) Mk 16:2 And very ('lian') early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun ("dawn before sun-up" 'anateilantos tou hehliou'), re-inspecting ('ANA-blepsasai') taking notice that ('theohrousin hoti')" ASCERTAINING, SECOND visit.

*“Second Set”*

.... Remove

*“MT 28:2 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*

*Mt. 24:3 His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow:*

*Mt. 24:4 And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men”;*

it belongs in 2),

after ‘Mt. 28:1’.

*“Third Set”*

.... Remove

*“Mk. 16:3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?”*

it belongs in 4),

simultaneous with “they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun (“dawn before sun-up” ‘anateilantos tou hehliou’), re-inspecting (‘ANA-blepsasai’) taking notice that (‘theohrousin hoti’)”

ASCERTAINING, SECOND visit.

.... Remove

*“John 20:1 ....and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre”,*

it belongs in 4),

after *“Mk. 16:1 And when the sabbath was past”,* and simultaneous with *“Jn. 20:1 The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene when it was YET EARLY darkness”.*

.... Remove

*“Mk. 16:4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great”,*

it belongs in 4),

simultaneous with “they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun (“dawn before sun-up” ‘anateilantos tou hehliou’), re-inspecting

(‘ANA-blepsasai’) taking notice that (‘theohrousin hoti’)  
 (ASCERTAINING, SECOND visit).

.... Remove

“*Lk.24:2 And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre*”,  
 it belongs in 3),

simultaneous with “Lk. 24:1 Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning (“deepest morning” ‘orthrou batheohs’), they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them, and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre” JUST LIKE MARY MUST HAVE INFORMED THEM SHE HAD SEEN, “Jn. 20:1 The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene when it was YET EARLY darkness (‘proh-i skotias eti ousehs’), unto the sepulchre, sees the STONE (not inside grave) ... runs”— discovery of OPENED tomb Saturday evening.”

.... Remove

“*Mk 16:5 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*”,

it belongs in 4),

after “Mk 16:2 And very (‘lian’) early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun (“dawn before sun-up” ‘anateilantos tou hehliou’), re-inspecting (‘ANA-blepsasai’) taking notice that (‘theohrousin hoti’)”

.... Remove

“*Lk 24:3 And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus*”,

it belongs in 3),

after “Lk. 24:1 Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning (“deepest morning” ‘orthrou batheohs’), they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them”, and the above, “Lk.24:2 And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre”.

.... and continue in 3) ....

“Lk. 24:4 And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments”.

.... and continue in 3) ....

“Lk. 24:5 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?”

*“D. Fourth Set”* ....

.... Remove

*“Mt. 24:5 And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified”*,

it belongs with 1),

as rhetorical introductory remark to BOTH the anecdote of the Resurrection in verses 1-4, “In the end / FULLNESS of the Sabbath’S, Sabbath’S MID-AFTERNOON....”, and of what the angel continued to inform the women on, Mt28:5ff, that He was risen— upon which information the women gladly went to tell the Good News and as they were going, were met by Jesus.

Now it seems a little slip-up occurred—

*“E. Fourth Set”*

of which senseless arrangements nothing in any case could come because it cuts up and divides and destroys what belong together, “a little bit here, a little bit there” just like the drunkards went about with God’s Word in the days of Isaiah.

WHAT GOD PUT TOGETHER LET NO MAN PART, like DW is going on and on to do.... until he completed SEVEN “SETS” OF INCOMPREHENSIBLE CONFUSION.

**DW:**

*Ignatius says about A.D. 70 – “Let every one who loves Christ, keep holy the Lord’s Day, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of all days.”*

*Ireneus, Bishop of Lyons, disciple of Polycarp says, “On the Lord’s Day, every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath.”*

*Barnabas in about A.D. 120 says, “We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead”*

*Justin Martyr in about A.D. 140 says, “But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose again from the dead.”*

*Theopolis in A.D. 167 says, “Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the Lord’s Day, seeing it was that day, our Lord Jesus Christ, completed the resurrection from the dead.”*

*Dionysius in A.D. 170 says, “We passed this holy Lord’s Day in which we read your letter, from the constant reading of which we shall be able to draw admonition.”*

*Dynidions in A.D. 170 says, “We Celebrate only the Lord’s Day.”*

*Bardesanes in A.D. 180 says, “On one day, the first day of the week, we assemble ourselves together.”*

*Clement in A.D. 192 says that a Christian “According to the commandment of the gospel, observes the Lord’s Day, thereby glorifying the resurrection.”*

*Clement of Alexandria says in A.D. 194, “He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord’s Day, glorifying the Lord’s resurrection in himself.”*

*Tertullian in A.D. 200 says, “We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradiction to those who call this day their Sabbath.”*

*Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in A.D. 250 says, “The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, is the Lord’s Day.”*

*The Apostolical Constitution says in A.D. 250, “On the day of our Lord’s resurrection, which is the Lord’s day, meet more diligently.”*

*Anatolius in about A.D. 270 says, “The solemn festival of the resurrection of the Lord can only be celebrated on the Lord’s Day.”*

*Anatolius Bishop of Laodicea in Asia Minor in A.D. 270 says, “Our regard for the Lord’s resurrection which took place on the Lord’s Day will lead us to celebrate it.”*

*Victorinus in A.D. 300 says, “On the former day we are accustomed to fast rigorously that on the Lord’s Day we may go forth to our brad with giving of thanks, lest we should appear to observe any other Sabbath with the Jewish, which Sabbath He in His body abolished.”*

*Peter, Bishop of Alexanderia in A.D. 306 says, “But the Lord’s Day we celebrate as a day of joy because on it he rose again.”*

*John the Beloved in A.D. 96 says, “I was in the spirit on the Lord’s Day.” – Rev. 1:10*

*Luke in about A.D. 60 says, “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.” – Acts 20:7*

*Mosheim, in Volume one, page 45 says, “In the first century all Christians were unanimous in the setting apart the first day of the week on which the Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn*

*celebration of public worship; and it was observed universally as appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers.”*

*All of the above quotations occur prior to the edict of Constantine concerning Sunday worship. Careful studies of the quotations above show that the “Lord’s Day” is used interchangeable with the “first day of the week” and “Sunday” and “eighth day” and “day of resurrection.”*

*I have personally verified every one of the quotes in the Ante-Nicene Fathers on three separate occasions and they are accurate.*

**GE:**

I agree on some facts and even on some aspects that you mention here, but unfortunately you seem not to have read my commentary which I already in this discussion have given on a few of your statements. To mention the first one and its date only, “*about A.D. 70*”? (Just at a glance.) And you maintain you have personally verified every one of the quotes in the Ante-Nicene Fathers on three separate occasions and they are accurate? ‘*Accurate*’ by 100 years? Are you speaking of “*Careful studies of the quotations*”?

**DW:**

*Accurate as far as the wording of the statements and accurate within the general time frame given as scholars vary their dates from scholar to scholar. All occurred before Constantines Sunday law.*

**GE:**

70 AD is VERY FAR from ‘*accurate*’. It is hopelessly incorrect and dates Ignatius - never mind pseudo-Ignatius - before the Gospels! ‘*Scholar-to-scholar*’ their aunt!

And does it not for you matter that you do not look to the Word in the Old Testament, but rather to heretics of centuries after Christ?

Nevertheless, “*Those who were disciples of the Apostles*”, definitely did not ‘*disagree*’ with the truth of Jesus’ Sabbath’s-Resurrection; and even the first hundred and fifty or so of the “*first three hundred years of Christianity*” do not seem to ‘*disagree with*’ it.

‘*The use of “the Lord’s day” until 300 A.D. was*’ not that ‘*consistent*’ though; there’s a great change in ‘*the use*’ and meaning “*of “the Lord’s day” “to be seen from the end of the second of those ‘300’ years*”, and anyone who denies such change speaks from ignorance.

Also is it an historic untruth ‘*the use of “the Lord’s day” “until at least about 150 AD ‘qualifies’, ‘the Lord’s day’ “as “eighth day” or “first day of the week” or “Sunday”*’“. It – for example – was not Ignatius, but some pseudo-Ignatius, who “*says about A.D. 70 [Sic.] – “Let every one who loves Christ, keep holy the Lord’s Day, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of all days.”*” And the fact it was a pseudo-Ignatius DESPITE, it remains an open question his reference is to Sunday! Nevertheless, the Sundaydarians may have it their way, with pleasure, as far as I am concerned, seeing this interpolation perhaps dates from hundreds of years after the real Ignatius.

And so we could go on. Who says, “*Ireneus, Bishop of Lyons, disciple of Polycarp says, “On the Lord’s Day, every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath”*’“, HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH SUNDAY? Is not this an emphatic confirmation “the Lord’s Day” was kept as “the Sabbath”? “*Every one of us*”— at that point in time, by mainly Jewish Christians! Nothing hints at it having been Sunday that was kept as ‘*the Lord’s day*’!

And “*Barnabas in about A.D. 120 says, “We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead”*’? In fact, where in the whole of Barnabas, does Barnabas NOT associate the “Seventh Day”, “Sabbath”, with or as “the eighth day”? Not in as much as one word or phrase or thought or hint!

**DW:**

*Dr. Cleavland Cox editor of the American Edition of The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, "Apostolic Fathers" concerning Ignatius dates his birth at 30 A.D. and his death at December 20th in December of 107 A.D. Hence, he would overlap all the apostles and would be in his upper twenties when most of the apostles were alive and would be nearly 40 years old at the time of Peter and Paul's death and the destruction of Jerusalem and would overlap the life of the Apostle John by 40 more years.*

***Barnabas and the Sabbath***

*The epistle of Barnabas found in the first volume of the Ante-Nicene Fathers under "Apostolic Fathers" clearly teaches that the early Christians observed Sunday as the Christian Sabbath.*

*You sir, misrepresent Barnabas in your online book. Barnabas takes us back to the creation seventh day Sabbath not to prove that Christians observe that Sabbath, but to prove that God's plan for this world is on a seven day period, each day regarded as a thousand years and that the seventh day Sabbath has its ultimate application in the seventh thousand year when Christ comes back and brings rest to this present world.*

*However, He argues for an EIGHT THOUSAND YEAR after this sabbatical year as an eternal Sabbath and it is in regard to this EIGHTH thousand year he directly says:*

*"I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world. WHEREFORE, also, we keep the EIGHTH day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead."*

*He identifies the Old Testament Jewish sabbath as the SEVENTH day but demands the Christian Sabbath is the EIGHTH day. He denies*

*that Jesus rose again on the Seventh day of the week but asserts he rose again on the EIGHTH day.*

*Therefore Barnabas disputes your whole chronology of events just as I do. Neither does Ignatius support your seventh day Sabbath interpretation of his words.*

*Just previous to making his famous statement concerning the Lord's Day observation he says this:*

*“Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after te Jewish manner....And aft the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's Day as a festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and cheif of all days [of the week]. Looking forward to this the prophet declared, ‘To the end, for the EIGHTH DAY.’ on which our life both sprain up again, and the victory over death was obtain in Christ.....” - Longer version*

*“If therefore, those who were brought up in the ancient order of things, have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but livng in the observance of the Lord's Day, on which also our life has sprung up again by Him and by His death....Lay aside, therefore the old, the sour leaven, and be ye changed into the new leaven, which is Jesus Christ....It is absurd to profess Christ Jesus, and to Judiaze.” - shorter version*

*The Lord's Day is defined as the EIGHTH day not the Seventh. The Jewish seventh day Sabbath is regarded as the “old” and the Lord's Eighth Day as the “new.”*

*In the context of both Ignatius and Barnabas the Jewish Seventh day sabbath is contrasted with the “EIGHTH” day and it is the EIGHTH day that they identify the resurrection. Hence, your argument that the term “Lords” (kuriakos) or “day” “hemera” do not occur is rendered stupid because there is a direct comparison between “seventh” and “eighth” and the “eighth” is identified as the*

*resurrection day not the “seventh.*

*Hence, both Ignatius and Barnabas repudiate your interpretation of them and repudiate your chronology of the resurrection.*

*I read the first chapter in your book dealing with Ignatius, Barnabas and Justin Martyr and then I went and read the Apostolic Fathers. After reading that first chapter and reading the what Ignatius and Barnabas said in context and then comparing it with how you interpreted them - what a mess. You took common sense and threw it out the door. It makes no difference if the Greek text has no “kuriakos” or “hemera” in them at the points you say. The context exposes your reasoning as twisted and completely a distortion of what these writers were saying.*

*Barnabas was saying in the clearest terms that the Seventh day application of creation has reference to the seventh thousand year yet to come where Israel is restored but it has nothing to do with the Christian. The Christian looks beyond the seventh thousand year day to the NEW BEGINNING of the Eight thousand year and that is precisely why we observe the EIGHTH day as the resurrection day NOT THE SEVENTH. Could not get more clear than what Barnabas says. Only a mind going in a with preconceived theory could miss his obvious point.*

*Likewise, with Ignatius, regardless if you take the shorter or longer reading. He rejects the Jewish Sabbath as the “old” or “ancient” manner and places the Christian under the “new” or EIGHTH day observance because it is the resurrection day. He mows down your interpretations like dead grass under the chopping blade of the lawn mower.*

*I read your chapter on the “Eighth day and the Sabbath pages 20-51! What a joke! You simply explained away what Barnabas and Ignatius said. The Eighth day is put in direct contrast to the seventh day*

*Sabbath. The Lord's resurrection day is defined as the EIGHTH day and as the "LIVING" day - NEW LIFE - because Christ rose again victorious over death on that day and thus it is a "LIVING" Sabbath for Christians that looks forward to the EIGHTH thousand year when a NEW beginning occurs and this SEVENTH DAY SIN CURSED EARTH IS DESTROYED and a NEW and BETTER eternal Sabbath day with a NEW and BETTER creation comes into being and that is why, Barnabas says, We observe the EIGHTH day as the resurrection day, the LIVING day for Christians NOT THE SEVENTH. Your book is total perversion of history, of the scriptures and of common sense.*

**GE:**

DW correctly concludes that the WHOLE ISSUE GOING ON THIS DAY OF OURS --- which by far is not the issue that went on in Barnabas's day --- depends on WHICH DAY— OF THE WEEK, Christ rose from the dead. Yes, Barnabas as well as Ignatius, take the day of Jesus' Resurrection as point of departure for their plea for true CHRISTIAN observance of the Christian Day of Worship Rest. THAT, I have all through maintained is the ONLY basis for Christian Sabbaths' observance. On that, or this point, DW and I are in agreement, let it be understood.

So everything DW rails against me is unnecessary and baseless.

There exists only one point of contention between DW and myself and between me and the rest of Christianity— THE CHRISTIANITY OF OUR OWN DAY, and that is ON WHICH DAY OF THE WEEK according to the creation-order of "ALL God's works" Hb4:4 of both creation and redemption, did Christ actually, rise from the dead?

Then there is a second point of importance of difference between us, and that is, that to determine which day of the week Christ rose on, TWO factors should be brought into account, namely,

1) the New Testament, historical REALITY as in and through Jesus Christ Himself the Alfa and Omega of the creation of God, and  
 2) the LIVING ETERNAL PROPHETIC WORD OF GOD of the Old Testament Scriptures FULFILLED by “the all in all fulfilling Fullness of God” Jesus Christ, because these two are ONE and in no respect whatsoever in opposition.

To which may be added that any document after, or later than the New Testament, should be tested by the Scriptures; and the Scriptures never by it.

Therefore, with all due respect DW, your railing against me from the ‘Church fathers’ Barnabas and Ignatius— without once allowing an actual quote from me, is a railing against yourself.

**Re: DW,** *“Dr. Cleavland Cox editor of the American Edition of The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, “Apostolic Fathers” concerning Ignatius dates his birth at 30 A.D. and his death at December 20th in December of 107 A.D. Hence, he would overlap all the apostles and would be in his upper twenties when most of the apostles were alive and would be nearly 40 years old at the time of Peter and Paul’s death and the destruction of Jerusalem and would overlap the life of the Apostle John by 40more years.”*

Thank you, DW, for this information which must have seen the light the first time some time after the time that I worked on the post-New Testament Christian writings. In ‘my days’ Ignatius (the genuine Letters) was dated earliest round about the 110s, 120s! I would not contend any researcher on this issue (Being only God’s poor plumber), but I will contest a false reading and or interpretation of the real documents with boiling lead in them ears and mouths of liars. We agree to the Resurrection being the reason for Christian celebration of the Christian Day of worship Rest. We disagree as to on which day of the week Jesus actually rose from the dead. Let us stick to that issue because I think energy spent on anything besides, is a waste of breath.

**DW:**

*Barnabas defines the resurrection day by several terms and then he directly says:*

*”Looking forward TO THIS, the prophet declared.....”*

*The antecedent for “this” is the resurrection day just previously described in a number of ways. Then Barnabas goes right on to quote the prophet: “To the end, for the EIGHTH DAY,”*

*And then Barnabas picks back up and says, “ON WHICH our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death WAS obtained IN CHRIST ...”*

*The antecedent for “ON WHICH” is “THE EIGHTH DAY” and it is therefore ON THE EIGHTH DAY that “our life” did TWO things; (1) “sprang up again” and (2) “the victory over death WAS obtained in Christ.” The words “our life” refer to Jesus Christ as “our life.” The connecting verb “was” demonstrates this is a past action and this past action was “obtained in Christ.” In other words, Jesus Christ is “our life” because on the EIGHTH day he sprang up again and obtained victory over death. Barnabas is not talking about himself, he is not talking about Christians, he is talking about what happened on that new Sabbath morn when Christ arose again victorious over death on the EIGHTH day or the day AFTER the Jewish Seventh day Sabbath.*

**GE:**

*DW, you said everything so beautifully and, I am sure, just as Barnabas intended.... UNTIL you improvised your OWN ideas, and said, “...on the EIGHTH day or the day AFTER the Jewish Seventh day Sabbath.”*

I believe Barnabas meant ..... on the EIGHTH day of the eschatological fulfillment of the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Old Testament.

**DW:**

*I don't see how you can possibly argue that the EIGHTH DAY resurrection of Jesus Christ is being applied by Barnabas to the seventh day of the week when it cannot possibly be applied by Barnabas to the seventh thousand year day of his eschatological week but rather to the EIGHT thousand year day or the day following the seventh thousand year day of the eschatological week?????*

*Likewise, neither does he apply the EIGHTH day resurrection to the Seventh day of the week as that is oxymoronic. For your position to be correct he would have to be consistent and apply the EIGHTH eschatological day to the seventh day of the eschatological week but he clearly does not as the EIGHTH eschatological day COMES AFTER the seventh eschatological day. The EIGHTH day resurrection of Christ occurs after the seventh day of the week JUST AS the EIGHTH eschatological day occurs after the seventh thousand day of the eschatological week.*

**GE:**

**Barnabas XIV**

1...Let us see whether THE COVENANT WHICH God swore TO THE FATHERS (Abraham et al, XIII) to give to The People of God— whether God has given it. God HAS GIVEN IT. 2-3.....

4...Moses received it (from God) but they were not worthy.

NOW LEARN HOW WE, RECEIVED THE COVENANT:— Moses received the covenant when he, was (the) servant; but the LORD HIMSELF, gave it to US AS The People of the Inheritance, by having suffered for our sakes.

5...Thus it was shown that their tale of their sins should be completed in THEIR sins, and WE, through Jesus the Lord who inherited the Covenant, deserved it; for He was prepared for this purpose that when

HE appeared, He might redeem our hearts from darkness .... And by word of his own, might close covenant with us. For it is written that the Father enjoins on HIM, that HE, should redeem us from darkness and prepare a People for Himself.

7...The prophet therefore says, I the LORD thy God did call Thee in righteousness, and I will hold thy hands, and I will give Thee strength, and I will give THEE FOR A COVENANT OF THE People, for a Light to the Gentiles, to open the eyes of the blind, and to bring forth from their fetters those that are bound and those that sit in darkness of the prison house.

We know then whence WE, have been redeemed!

8...Again the prophet says, Lo. I have made Thee a Light for the GENTILES, for Thee to be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. Thus saith the LORD the God who did redeem thee.

9...And again the prophet saith, The Spirit of the LORD is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach the Gospel of Grace (the New Covenant) to the humble. He sent Me to heal the brokenhearted, to proclaim delivery to the captives, and sight to the blind; to announce (The) Acceptable Year to the LORD and (The) Day of Recompense to conform all who mourn.

Barnabas referring to Luke 4:14-31 and the whole chapter and the whole Gospel.... Continues:

XV

1...FURTHERMORE CONCERNING THE SABBATH it was written in the Ten Words .... And in another place, If my sons .... God speaks of the Sabbath at the beginning of the creation .... NOTICE WHAT IS THE MEANING” --- says Barnabas of this speaking of God “CONCERNING THE SABBATH”. “NOTICE WHAT IS THE MEANING OF, He made and END IN SIX DAYS? God means this: That the LORD made an end of everything in SIX” -- - not, to quote DW, “*the EIGHT thousand year day or the day following the seventh thousand year day of the eschatological week*”.

Which is not the worst. What is worse, is DW relying so much on Barnabas in stead of the SCRIPTURES ONLY.

### **Barnabas XV.....**

4....So then, in SIX days, that is, in SIX thousand years, EVERYTHING will be completed. 5...And God rested the Seventh Day” (Banabas quoting Hb4:4) THIS (God’s rest of the SEVENTH Day) MEANS: When God’s Son comes He will destroy the rule (or time) of the wicked one ... and THEN He will TRULY rest the SEVENTH Day.”

6...If then anyone by being pure in heart has AT PRESENT, the power to keep holy THE DAY WHICH GOD MADE HOLY, we are altogether deceived. 7...Understand, that we shall ONLY keep it (the Seventh Day Sabbath) holy WHEN .... there is no more sin, and all things have been made new by the Lord : THEN we shall be able to keep it (THE DAY WHICH GOD MADE HOLY) holy.”

### **How much do I share the sentiment!**

So far Barnabas speaks of the ‘current’ and only Sabbath ever sanctified by God, the Seventh Day of the week. In these lines, Barnabas contemplates NO ‘eschatological’ or mystical ‘meaning’ of the Sabbath. He plainly speaks of the real thing according to the Scriptures, the Sabbath currently NOT being truly kept but on the new earth being recovered and properly kept ‘HOLY’.

Kirsopp Lake translates verse 7 wrongly, where he INSERTS the words, “We shall indeed keep it holy AT THAT TIME when we enjoy true rest”. Barnabas only wrote, “We shall indeed keep it holy WHEN we enjoy true rest .... WHEN all things have been made new” after Jesus has returned on the New Earth.

Only from verse 8 on, does Barnabas resume with mysticisms.

“God says to them (the Old Testament People of God) , I cannot stand your new moons and sabbaths! Do you understand what God SAYS? (Not “means”, K. Lake) As God says (Not “means”, K. Lake), the PRESENT (Seventh Day) Sabbaths (so profaned and desecrated by ‘you’ as in the foregoing verses God cannot stand them) ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO ME! But that (Sabbath) which I, have made (Barnabas quoting from Mk2:27-28 i.a.) in which I will give rest to all things (Barnabas presupposing Ex20:10) and MAKE BEGINNING OF DAY EIGHT....” Barnabas for no moment presupposing another day than the SABBATH, being “made the beginning of an eighth day”— “of an eighth (mystical day) THAT IS the beginning of another WORLD (not of another day).”

Barnabas --- just like Hebrews --- distinguishes the ‘rest’ and the ‘sabbath’ and does not identify or equalize them, even while he – unlike Hebrews – mystifies both.

No Comment .....

### **Barnabas XV.....**

4....So then, in SIX days, that is, in SIX thousand years, EVERYTHING will be completed. 5...And God rested the Seventh Day” (Barnabas quoting Hb4:4) THIS (God’s rest of the SEVENTH Day) MEANS: When God’s Son comes He will destroy the rule (or time) of the wicked one ... and THEN He will TRULY rest the SEVENTH Day.”

“The last enemy destroyed is death ..... Death is swallowed up in Victory” “Christ in it TRIUMPHED”: in and through and by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead: “Sabbath’s”!

**ST:**

*GE, Since you like to do a lot of writing, how about intermeshing (without paraphrasing) the actual verses of Matthew 28:1-10, Mark 16:1-8, Luke 20:1-12 and John 20:1-18 together - one after the other - in the order that you think they occurred?*

**GE:**

That's the problem, people '*intermesh*' the anecdotes --- like you, here have done --- whereas they should distinguish them. And that's the problem too, that people do not read attentively; otherwise you would not have asked me this. How many times have I exactly given -- without paraphrasing --- the order that events and stories occurred to?

You have '*intermeshed*' "*Matthew 28:1-10*" which contains

- 1) story number one, the Resurrection, in verses 1-4;
- 2) followed by Matthew's rhetorical introductory remark for the angel's 'witness' in 5a, "...explained the angel, and said to the women....",
- 3) followed by the angel's telling about The Resurrected One in vss. 5-7,
- 4) followed by story number two, of the second Appearance, in verses 8-10.

Being TWO stories, and not one, it follows they could not happen simultaneously.

Four pericopes '*intermeshed*' into one, "*Matthew 28:1-10*"! No wonder people get confused.

Therefore:

Event number one, verses 1 to 4 --- the Resurrection --- happened "Sabbath's late— Sabbath's mid-afternoon— Sabbath's as it began to dawn towards the First day of the week". 'opse de sabbatohn'; 'sabbatohn tehi epiphohskousehi'; 'sabbatohn eis mian (hehmeran)

sabbatohn'. LITERALLY, EXACTLY, NOT '*intermeshed*'! "The angel explained!"

Humanity involved through The Son of Man raised from the dead by the Glory of the Father; no mortal present or able to behold!

So, different events to follow:

You have '*intermeshed*' "*Mark 16:1-8*" which contains TWO events: Event number one, in verse 1, "They bought sweet spices".

WHEN?

(Humanity blissfully unaware of the Resurrection,) "when the Sabbath had gone through / was past / over." 'diagenomenou tou sabbatou' — Saturday evening after sunset. No buying on the Sabbath! Salome had no spices "prepared" from Friday afternoon; quickly buy and make ready.....

WHY?

"So that" as soon as they could "when they would go, they might anoint Him". As soon as they could because of the Roman guard Mt27:62— for whom day and watch would end only MIDNIGHT.

Event number two, in MARK

verse 2-3, "They got to the sepulchre, and said among themselves, Who after all would have moved the stone out of the door for us it is so BIG!?"

WHEN was THIS? For BEFORE THIS ---LUKE

24:1 tells us--- "They arrived at the sepulchre BRINGING THEIR SPICES WHICH THEY HAD PREPARED and entering, found the stone rolled away" (as Mary Magdalene according to JOHN 20:1-2— after she had discovered that the tomb was opened, must have told the other women too). "But they found not his BODY" Lk24:23!

Luke recorded the first time the women entered into the tomb and discovered it was EMPTY, and indisputably therefore recorded the women's FIRST and EARLIEST visit that night, just after midnight, "earliest morning" 'orthrou batheohs'.

Therefore the women's visit at the tomb TO MAKE SURE in Mark 16:2-8, naturally occurred AFTER the women's visit at the tomb in Luke (24:1, 22-23 when they discovered that the tomb was EMPTY). And Mary's first glimpse of the moved away door-stone from the OPENED tomb according to John 20:1, naturally MUST have occurred before any of the two, completed visits according to Lk24 and Mk16:2-8, and John says exactly that: "Mary Magdalene when EARLY DARKNESS STILL on the First Day of the week, sees the STONE, moved away".

Mary, after she and the other Mary and Salome had gone to buy spices (Mk16:1), undertook her '*solo trip*' to spy out the situation (with the guards) at the tomb. "Mary Magdalene nears", and as she nears, "Mary Magdalene sees"; and as she sees— it was "EARLY darkness still"— not too dark "YET" to see— she could see, "The STONE!" "The stone was rolled AWAY from the sepulchre!" And without hesitation Mary Magdalene "RUNS"! "She runs" back and cries out: "Peter! John!! They have taken away our Lord! And we DON'T know where to!" Waaa, Mary's chest ripped, and Mary's crying that night never stopped! Until the Lord "appeared to Mary Magdalene out of whom He had driven seven devils" Mk16:9 that night as it seems, she never stopped crying! "Mary Magdalene had had stood after at the grave WEEPING" Jn20:11 all the while until "early morning"!

Meanwhile, after Mary had told them of the stone, Peter and John had gone to see the grave for themselves (It was the first time they would see the grave.), Mary must have informed the other women also. This is not recorded; one must conclude it, because just "after midnight"

morning on the First Day of the week” Saturday night, “they arrived at the grave, and observing the stone was away from the sepulchre (just as Mary had told them). They ENTERED” Lk24:1, “BUT THE BODY THEY FOUND NOT” verses 22-23!

Therefore the women’s visit in Mark 16:2-8 was a SECOND and ascertaining visit, by then, “very early dawn before sunrise.” “And AGAIN having a close look, they observed THAT the stone was indeed flung upwards away from the tomb, its size despite.” “But”, as, this time, “they entered into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right hand side, and they were exceedingly astonished”, while, before – according to Luke –, they were encountered by two angels as they exited the tomb. Nothing is exactly the same; everything suggests ANOTHER visit.

So, there are TWO stories in every Scripture-reference you have made, ST; you have “*intermeshed*” properly and improperly. Don’t expect of me to do the same. However, in terms of actual time-indications the chronological sequence demands separate and different visits at the tomb.

### **ST:**

*re: GE, “That’s the problem, people ‘intermesh’ the anecdotes —”  
And why would that be a problem if all four gospel accounts are accurate?*

*re: “And that’s the problem too, that people do not read attentively...”*

*I’ve tried, I really have. But your South African English is extremely difficult to follow - at least for me. And apparently American English is for you, also.*

### **GE:**

ST, concentrate on this, the English here cannot be a problem:

1) “Sabbath’s”:

Mt:1-4— the INTENDED BUT THWARTED ‘visit’—  
“But Sabbath’s-time late (‘opse de sabbatohn’) mid-afternoon as it began to dawn towards the First Day of the week Mary Magdalene and the other Maty SET OUT TO SEE the grave. BUT SUDDENLY there was a great earthquake ....”

DON’T ‘*intermesh*’ verses 5-10! 1-4 and 5-10 are two histories joined by the words, “....the angel explaining to the women, said, But don’t you be afraid, for I know you are looking for Jesus ....””

Verse 5a is the narrating angel’s rhetorical introductory remark for EVERYTHING contained in Matthew but in no other Gospel account. If 27:62 is taken for the beginning of the angel’s “informing the women”, 28:1 must translate, The authorities of the world “Sealed the tomb and even set a watch, but despite (‘de’), in the end of the Sabbath Day....””.

2) “After the Sabbath had gone through....” Mk16:1— nowhere near the tomb— the THREE women “bought spices”.

3) “Early darkness still ....” Jn20:1— “Mary Magdalene sees the stone rolled away.” Discovered the tomb was OPENED.

4) “Earliest morning ....” Lk24:1,22-23— just after midnight— the women discovered the tomb was EMPTY.

5) “Very early dawn before sunrise ....” Mk16:2-8— Second visit after which all the women but Mary must have “fled from the tomb and they did not tell anybody anything they were so afraid” (but Mary Magdalene must have “had stood after at the door of the grave weeping” Jn20:11).

6) “Early on the First Day ....” Mk16:9— “Mary Magdalene had had stood after at the door of the grave weeping .... saw Jesus .... thought He was the gardener” Jn20:11, “HE AS THE RISEN APPEARED to Mary Magdalene FIRST.” Mk16:9.

7) “Explained the angel to the women and told them.... (Mt28:5a) Then suddenly there was a great earthquake and the angel of the Lord descended from heaven .... And for fear of him the keepers like dead men were hit down by the brightness like lightning of his countenance .... But don’t YOU, be afraid, because I know— you, are looking for Jesus!” Not like those scoundrels who thought they could prevent Him from rising again! “He isn’t here, but He IS risen as He said (He would); come (convince yourself) and see the place where the Lord lay” if you like. But the women didn’t; now they understood, because **so the Lord has led them to come to faith** “And immediately they departed from the grave with God-fearing fear of great joy, and did run to bring his disciples word. And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them!”

That was Sunday morning AFTER Jesus “early”— about sunrise when a gardener should start his day— “appeared to Mary Magdalene first”. Can it be clearer? But they hate the light of God’s Word, and love the Sun’s Day more.

THE HONESTY OF ANY MAN CAN BE TESTED: “TO THE LAW AND TO THE PROPHETS”; THE INTEGRITY OF EVERY CHRISTIAN CONFESSION TO: Luke 24:25-26.

**EB:**

*Here’s the sequence I determined for the Resurrection accounts:  
<http://www.erictb.info/resurrection.html>*

*The key is to realize that groups such as “the women” and “the eleven/twelve” are not always necessarily the same exact people.*

*Here is the summary:*

*0 Women besides 2 Mary’s and Salome prepare spices before the Sabbath*

- 1 2 Mary's and Salome buy spices
- 2 at end of Sabbath/beginning of first day, the two Mary's set out to come to the tomb.
- 3 Mary Magdalene gets there first, when it is yet dark
- 4 Earthquake, and angle rolls away stone
- 5 Mary Magdalene sees stone rolled away and tells Peter, who comes with John and sees empty grave cloths, and both leave.
- 6 Other Mary and Salome arrive after the sun has risen, and find stone rolled away and single angel, still there.
- 7 he tells them Jesus has risen
- 8 But they run away afraid, and don't tell anyone
- 9 Mary returns from having gotten Peter, and weeps. By now, a second angel has joined the first, and then the risen Jesus makes his first appearance.
- 10 She goes and tells the other women, who don't believe; except, apparently, for...
- 11 the other Mary and Salome, who NOW "depart with fear and joy and ran to bring His disciples word", but Jesus meets them, and gives them the instruction that the disciples should meet them in Galilee.
- 12 They tell them, but they do not believe
- 13 Now, we pick up with Luke's account of the rest of the women, who did not believe Mary Magdalene. They now go to the tomb themselves, after all the others, but still "very early"; bringing the spices they had prepared before the Sabbath.
- 14 They find the empty tomb.
- 15 They now see the two angels, who give them the message, which they run to tell the eleven.
- 16) Guards and Pharisees fabricate their "Passover plot" myth.
- 17 The OTHER of "the eleven disciples" goes up to Galilee
- 18 and assemble, with the doors closed, and Jesus appears to them
- 19 Some (notably, Thomas, who wasn't there) still doubt, but then eight days later, Jesus appears again, so he can see.
- 20) Christ appears to men on the road to Emmaus.
- 21 They tell the eleven and others at Jerusalem (including that he had apparently already appeared to "Simon", in the other group). They at

*first still don't believe, but then Jesus appears to them, and corrects their unbelief. He also is given fish and honeycomb to eat.*

*22 He appears to them again in Galilee (sea of Tiberias), and causes them to catch a huge net of fish, which he gives them to eat.*

*23, 24 Jumps to end of forty days, with different parts of Great Commission reported by Matthew and Mark*

*25 ascension*

*26 Disciples begin to carry out commission. Picks up in book of Acts.*

*1 Corinthians 15*

*3 For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures,*

*4 and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures;*

*5 and that He was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve.*

*6 Afterward He was seen by over five hundred brothers at once, of whom the greater part remain until this present day, but also some fell asleep.*

*7 Afterward He was seen by James, then by all the apostles.*

**GE:**

**Re: EB,** *“The key is to realize that groups such as “the women” and “the eleven/twelve” are not always necessarily the same exact people.”*

Yes! If “*not always the same people*” necessarily the events aren't the same. That is the real and ‘*exacting*’ “*key*”. Or one must accept “*the same*” event is being recorded in the different Gospels with contradictions and irreconcilabilities.

**Re: EB,** *“0 Women besides 2 Mary's and Salome prepare spices before the Sabbath”*

No! Luke states “That Day was The Preparation and the Sabbath (Saturday) drew on. And the women WHO CAME WITH HIM

FROM GALILEE also followed after (in the procession to the grave) and, looking into the sepulchre, watched while his body was laid (inside by Joseph and Nicodemus). And THEY, went home and prepared spices and ointments (before) they started to rest the Sabbath according to the (Fourth) Commandment.”

1) They weren't “*women besides 2 Mary's*”; they WERE, the “*2 Mary's*”! And

2) they weren't “*2 Mary's and Salome*”; they were the “*2 Mary's*” ONLY.

Matthew 27:61 and Mark 15:47 NAMED THESE TWO, women AT THE BURIAL: “Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses / the other Mary .... sitting over against the sepulchre .... saw where He was laid.”

**Re: EB,** “*1 2 Mary's and Salome buy spices*”

Yes! But when? You don't say! But Mark 16:1 says it was, “When the Sabbath had gone through”— which is in the beginning of the First Day on ‘*Saturday evening*’.

**Re: EB,** “*2 at end of Sabbath/beginning of first day, the two Mary's set out to come to the tomb.*”

No! You have it completely wrong. Matthew 28:1 says “Late in the end of the Sabbath as daylight began to incline towards the First Day of the week (on ‘Saturday’) mid-afternoon Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out to come TO LOOK at to the tomb when suddenly there was a great earthquake.” You cannot just ignore the intention of theses women “to come TO LOOK at to the tomb”, because it is important they did not finish what they “set out to” do. The “great earthquake” PREVENTED their visit TO, the tomb, “TO see the grave”.

**Re: EB,** “3 Mary Magdalene gets there first, when it is yet dark”

Your fabricated illusion.

**Re: EB,** “4 Earthquake, and angle rolls away stone”

Out of place, far behind schedule....

**Re: EB,** “5 Mary Magdalene sees stone rolled away and tells Peter, who comes with John and sees empty grave cloths, and both leave.”

When? You don't say, but John says it was – literally – “while early darkness still”. Discussed above a lot! It was ‘Saturday evening’, dusk after sunset. Not “while DARK still” or Sunday ‘morning-dawn’ as tradition corrupted the truth.

**EB:**

*Remember, it's all in sequence, so just look at the last and next time given you, and that gives you the time frame.*

*Sat evening when it just became dark would still be “First day of the week when it was YET dark”. That's what the texts I'm using say.*

*How you rendered it is probably correct, and would be another support for my premise. But I'm not using whatever translation or study tools you're using.*

*If you think I'm trying to argue for Sunday against the sabbath based on the resurrection; you're going after the wrong person. I believe the resurrection was on Saturday Nght according Roman and modern reckoning, and the First Day according to Hebrew reckoning.*

**GE:**

**Re: EB,** “6 Other Mary and Salome arrive after the sun has risen, and find stone rolled away and single angel, still there.

*7 he tells them Jesus has risen”*

Contrary all facts of Scripture in John 20:1-2 or for that matter, in John 20 from verse 1 to the end!

Mary alone discovers the stone was rolled away from the tomb;  
 NO ‘Salome’,  
 NO ‘single angel’ nearby!  
 No ‘tells them’ anything!  
 Not “*after the sun has risen*”, but,  
 “while yet early darkness / dusk / evening”.  
 See above discussed thoroughly and strictly to what is written and to  
 the chronology of events and the dictates of logic.

**EB:**

*You’re referring to John, but Salome is mentioned in Mark, and the single angel is in Matthew. In Mark, even though v.1 mentions Mary Magdalene and the other Mary as buying the spices with Salome, v.2 says only “they” came to the sepulchre.*

*The entire point here is that the different Gospels are reporting the account from totally different perspectives, and looking at different people. If you just look at just one gospel by itself to explain everything; you’re missing the whole point.*

*If you insist that Mary Magdalene was present at every visit to the tomb, then you run into the contradiction of one angel or two. One angel appeared first, but Mary Magdalene had not seen inside the tomb yet. Other women were going to the tomb, in the meantime. By the time of Mary Magdalene’s first visit to the tomb, a second angel has joined the first one.*

**GE:**

**Re: EB,** “*You’re referring to John, but Salome is mentioned in Mark, and the single angel is in Matthew.*” So? I’m referring to JOHN; not Mark or Matthew.... And I DON’T “*just look at just one gospel by itself to explain everything*”; goodness; haven’t you read my posts? You’re missing the whole point.

“*The entire point here*”, IS NOT, “*that the different Gospels are reporting the [SAME] account from totally different perspectives*”;  
 The entire point here is that the different Gospels are reporting

DIFFERENT accounts of VISITS from exactly the same perspective of AFTER the Resurrection.

It's because you are missing 'my' whole point here that you out of the blue make a statement like that I "*insist that Mary Magdalene was present at every visit to the tomb*"! Ridiculous! Go read what I wrote! At no less than two occasions I am the person who pointed out here, that it was Mary by herself.

And I NEVER "*run into the contradiction of one angel or two*" because I abide to the only possible successful '*perspective*' of individual visits for every specific time-indication and every specific event and circumstance.

If you want to state your view then state it by itself. Don't use mine as a fictitious convoluted negative of yours.

And if this, "*One angel appeared first, but Mary Magdalene had not seen inside the tomb yet. Other women were going to the tomb, in the meantime. By the time of Mary Magdalene's first visit to the tomb, a second angel has joined the first one*" ..... is your analysis of events of the Saturday night and Sunday morning at the tomb, then supply the support-Scriptures..... which you never in your life will be able to supply, because every facet of your analysis and your thinking is contrary the Word and all logic and chronology— and very easily can be SEEN.

In plain language, you don't know what you are talking, EB, except that you have BEGUN to see the '*perspective*' from various and separate visits at the tomb. Persist along that way and you will find that if you do it honestly, that you will end up explaining your WHOLE end-result with and in the words of the Scriptures purely.

Now PLEASE TEST my view given several times in this discussion to the exact same criteria which I have proposed for testing your

analysis and see if we cannot find further common ground. But the way you carried on above I can tell you now it will never be found.

**Re: EB,** *“8 But they run away afraid, and don’t tell anyone.”*

That was “very early dawn before sunrise” according to Mark 16:2-8; not John 20. And Mark gives NO names of women.

**EB:**

*What are you talking about? Look at 16:1. You even cite it next.*

**GE:**

What are YOU talking about, EricB? Mark 16:1 is a ‘story’ on its own and totally by itself. It belongs with the ending in verse 47 of chapter 15 of Mark. Mark 15:47 tells what happened before the Sabbath on Friday afternoon --- see Lk23:54-56 --- and 16:1 tells what happened “after the Sabbath had gone through” ‘diagenomenou tou s.’ 16:1 is totally irrelevant to 16:2-8. It contains its OWN actors in the persons of the three mentioned women; its own time-adverbial clause; its own Predicate; its own sub-clause of explanation of INTENTION. And 2-8 is just as clearly a pericope all by itself which mentions a VISIT REALISED that both logically and chronologically can only fit in BETWEEN Luke 24:1-10 and BEFORE John 20:11-17.

**Re: EB,** *“9 Mary returns from having gotten Peter, and weeps. By now, a second angel has joined the first, and then the risen Jesus makes his first appearance.”*

Surmising, surmising....

**Re: EB,** *“10 She goes and tells the other women, who don’t believe; except, apparently, for... 11 the other Mary and Salome, who NOW “depart with fear and joy and ran to bring His disciples word”.”*

You mix up no Scripture, *“She goes and tells the other women”*, Mk16:1 perhaps which mentions, *“the other Mary and Salome”* but

not in these terms, and Mt28:8-10. The only thing seemingly correct is your supposition the other women (whoever they were) “depart(ed) with fear and joy and ran to bring His disciples word” WITHOUT Mary Magdalene.

**EB:**

*It's not about 'mixing up' scripture; it's about **harmonizing** the four gospel accounts which means, in a way in which there are no contradictions.*

**GE:**

**Re: EB,** “12 They (the other Mary and Salome) tell them (His disciples), but they do not believe 13 Now, we pick up with Luke’s account of the rest of the women, who did not believe Mary Magdalene. They now go to the tomb themselves, after all the others, but still “very early”; bringing the spices they had prepared before the Sabbath.”

It is the other way round!

Imagine the women after that they had discovered everything, that the tomb was opened, that the tomb was empty, even after that Jesus had appeared to them— according to you, EricB, “came with their spices prepared and ready... and entered the tomb ... but his body they found not ... and Him they saw not...” Lk24:1-3,22-24

You should BEGIN with Luke’s account of ALL the women, who yet did not believe He rose, INCLUDING Mary Magdalene, because, so said Luke in verse 10! But all this confusion just because it is PRESUMED Jesus rose from the dead on Sunday morning!

And you should have ENDED with Matthew’s record of the angel’s witness about Jesus The Risen in 28:5-8; and about Jesus’ subsequent second appearance to the women OTHER THAN Mary Magdalene in verses 9-11a; and of Jesus Resurrection in verses 1-4.

**EB:**

*OK, again, you have to read the full text on the link. The “women who came with their spices” does NOT specify anyone! It is just “they”, meaning a group of women. So it is “other” women, who had prepared the spices, and didn’t believe the Marys’ report—#10. else, again, you run into the problem of how many angels were there.*

**GE:**

**Re: EB,** “14 They find the empty tomb. 15 They now see the two angels, who give them the message, which they run to tell the eleven. 16) Guards and Pharisees fabricate their “Passover plot” myth. 17 The OTHER of “the eleven disciples” goes up to Galilee 18 and assemble, with the doors closed, and Jesus appears to them”

Luke’s account does not say “*they run to tell*”; it describes how the women meditating over what Jesus had told his disciples, “returned from the sepulchre, and told them ALL THESE THINGS” which the two angels advised them to “remember”.

**EB:**

*And then (next verse, 9) it says they went and told the eleven.*

**GE:**

I deal with Luke; you throw in Matthew. It’s not the same story!

**Re: EB,** “Guards and Pharisees fabricate their “Passover plot” myth” not after Mary had seen the moved away stone – the first in the series of events of Saturday night – but after Jesus had appeared to the women without Mary Magdalene— after sunrise early Sunday, about the same time when the women were entering the city to go tell his disciples— the last in the series of events of that Saturday night and Sunday morning before and after sunrise.

**EB:**

*They weren't the only women who followed Him from Galilee, and the Marys weren't the only women at the Burial.*

*If you try to make them all the same people every time "women" are mentioned, then you run into contradictions.*

**GE:**

EB, you are the one who makes the women "*all the same people every time "women" are mentioned*". I don't; I say it's the same women every time it's the SAME EVENT, PLACE AND TIME which in this instance, was the Burial's closing scene and directly after, the women WHO WERE THERE 's preparation of spices mentioned by Luke.

I also quoted Matthew and Mark at the same or 'parallel' places. The women in that scene and at that occasion were those, the Scriptures MENTION; no more; none of women we wished were there. "It is written" or it is not!

**EB:**

*Part of my realization of this sequence was precisely this fact that they did not finish what they set out to do. Hence, multiple visits. My outline does not deny that. I'm using the King James Clarified version, and it says "SET OUT to come...". What I posted here was just the outline, if you go to the link, you can see the sequence with more details, and explanations.*

**GE:**

It would be wonderful if we in fact agreed on this one point of "*multiple visits*". Absolutely delightful! Because it is the KEY to prevent and exclude each and every of the infamous contradictions in the Gospels at this point.

The textual sequence is not the same as the chronological sequence. Every Gospel writer or compiler chose which story or stories he was going to record. It is not simply a matter of '*multiple visits*'.

Understanding without the contradictions requires one should SEE WHY one visit comes before or after another visit, logically, and, chronologically. Therefore one MUST look at the PRECISE time given in the Greek, at the nature of each visit and how it fits in the WHOLE picture without irreconcilabilities, and THAT, gives you the time frame.

Tradition says “*First day of the week when it was YET dark*” that is, morning— the opposite of your, correct but incomplete, “*Sat evening when it just became dark*”, and would NOT “*still be “First day of the week when it was YET dark*”. That’s a clear opposite. The complete Greek is “When still EARLY darkness”— which can ONLY be “*Sat evening when it just became dark*”.

I don’t think you will find ONE ‘modern’ translation that will give you the FULL picture because they don’t desire it because they desire the Sunday to be the day of Jesus’ Resurrection.

“*Saturday night*” after sunset “*Sat evening*” is First Day of the week according to the Gospels; no two ways about it. But the Resurrection occurred LITERALLY AND PRECISELY “**in the broad daylight being of Sabbath’s fullness towards the First Day of the week**”. I say, LITERALLY AND PRECISELY according to Matthew 28:1 and— “according to the Scriptures” the rest of the Bible. On the Sabbath Day it was and COULD NOT BE on any other day or time. That is the Bible; not what I say. Because “On the Seventh Day God rested from ALL his works.” Hb4:4. “On the third day I FINISH”. God on the Seventh Day FINISHED, ON NO OTHER DAY. God finished “through the Son”, “in these last days”, once for ever establishing “The Lord’s Day”-Sabbath, “Sabbath of the LORD your God”. (Don’t call it ‘Saturday’ because it’s not Saturn’s but God the LORD’S Day.)

**EB:**

*The “women who came with their spices”..... does NOT specify anyone!*

**GE:**

I have told you, the women who it was in 24:1 are in fact mentioned ONE BY ONE in verse 10! And Mary is mentioned first in the row. Also see their report to the disciples referred to in verses 22-24.

But yes, you are correct that “*it is “other” women, who had prepared the spices*”, because these women referred to by Luke in 23:55 are those mentioned by name by Mark and Matthew and they were **ONLY THE TWO MARYS**, Mk15:47 and Mt27:61. **Don’t confuse them with the women who are mentioned in either Mk15:40 and Mt27:56 or in Lk24:10!** And let me tell you the reason these two groups of women are always confused for the same group of women, because the Burial is always placed on the day of the Crucifixion incorrectly, while Crucifixion and Burial happened on subsequent days, and not on the same day! Mk15:42 Mt27:57 Lk23:50 Jn19:31,38.

**Re:** “*and didn’t believe the Marys’ report*” The spices were prepared after the Burial before the women “Started to rest the Sabbath” Lk23:54-56. No one at that stage have heard or disbelieved a report of Mary’s because no one even believed He would rise again (the next day). Also at this stage no one has seen any angel or angels yet. Therefore this is a senseless observation of yours.

**EB:**

*That’s exactly what the Bible skeptics would like to believe. Of course it’s the same story; just different parts of it being told by each gospel writer.*

**GE:**

Praise the Lord!, this was EB’s conclusion. Only, every “*part*” is a

story on its own of a VISIT at the tomb on its own!  
 And praise the Lord I admit this to what EB confesses being a  
 BELIEVER of the Scriptures, and no “*Bible skeptic*”!

**EB:**

*You may have some kind of point with the Greek, but then I have seen you (and others) use that method to completely change the meaning of various scriptures until they are unrecognizable (e.g. Col.2:6), and it gets to the point that you cannot know what anything in scripture means, even if you are a scholar, since anyone can twist even the Greek any way they want.*

**GE:**

EB, WHO deals fraudulently with God’s Word? They who at first translated it at the cost of their lives; or they who corrupt it at their convenience at the hand of present popular preference?

Take Col2:16. Paul says in 2:2 his purpose with writing is to COMFORT the believers in the Faith; Verse 16 supports Paul’s intention and says, “Don’t you let anybody condemn / judge / damn you” because of your Sabbaths’ Feast. The NEW translations say things like my Afrikaans 1983 version: “Do not allow anyone PRESCRIBE TO YOU THAT YOU SHOULD KEEP THE SABBATH.” I say it is blasphemy; taunting God in the face; ridiculing the authority of His Word.

Let me here repeat what I on every copy of my books declare on its back-page with Tyndale, “I pray God who alone knows the heart, beseeching Him that my part in the blood of Christ BE TAKEN FROM ME, if I wrote of all that I have written throughout all my books, aught of an evil purpose, aught of against my conscience, or to stir up a false doctrine or opinion in the Church of Christ. .... As concerning all that I have translated ... I beseech all men to read it for that purpose I wrote it even to bring them to the knowledge of the Scripture. And as far as the Scripture approve it, so far to allow it; and

if in any place the Word of God disallow it, then to refute it, as I do before our Saviour Christ and his Congregation.”

**EB:**

*So you say you're arguing for multiple visits like me. So I don't understand your argument, then. Your whole agenda seems to be this whole Sabbath/Sunday thing, and that is skewing your perspective. I see you have the resurrection in “**broad daylight**” in the afternoon, now!*

*So you just go on the attack, and hence, in disputing what I said, it looked to me like you were trying to say Mary Magdalene was in every account, or that all the women were the same. Like you're disputing just to be disputing someone, and who knows what you're really even arguing for!*

*I forgot where you stood on this, and even now am not sure. Are you arguing the Wednesday crucifixion? Thursday? Traditional Friday, but with a Sabbath resurrection? (which really would be stretching it to be called “three days” ).....*

**GE:**

I am arguing for multiple visits – not like you; but CONSISTENTLY.

And you are right, my whole concern is this “*Sabbath/Sunday thing*”, and that is keeping my perspective straight.

I am arguing the “Sabbath’s”-Resurrection, which requires and implies a THURSDAY-crucifixion which ANSWERS THE GOD-GIVEN AND THEREFORE ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE WHOLENESS AND FULLNESS OF THE “three days” of “three days and three nights” “on the third day according to the Scriptures” of which, “Christ rose from the dead”.

**PC:**

*If Jesus said that around the time of Passover in Jerusalem there are twelve hours of day then that must leave twelve hours of night and if Jesus said that the Son of man (meaning himself I think) would be in the heart of the earth (meaning the tomb I think) three days and three nights and he was put into that tomb moments before a new day began, Jewish time, would he not have to come forth from that tomb three days and three nights later moments before a new day began?*

**GE:**

Jesus said he would be in the HEART of the earth --- that is, that He would spiritually, consciously, LIVE and alive, taste and pass through hell's anguish of death and dying death. That He did in the first half of the first of the three days and for the whole of that "first day" which was the first of three of the three nights of the three days and three nights according to the prophet Jonas. "In the heart of the earth" is not "in the earth" like in the grave simply. "In the heart of the earth" is what Christians confess in the Confession, "descended to hell" BEFORE Jesus died or was buried.

**PC:**

*Would this be a correct translation of Mark 16:9?  
And he having risen in the morning of the first of the sabbaths did appear first to Mary the Magdalene out of whom he had cast seven demons Young's*

*Here is A. T. Robertson's comment on first part of Mark 16:9.  
It is probable that this note of time goes with "risen" (anastav),  
though it makes good sense with "appeared"*

*I guess it could be twisted. Oh I left out the punctuation, I'll insert.  
And he having risen, in the morning of the first of the sabbaths did appear, first to Mary the Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons;*

**GE:**

PC, how right you are! For the second time this day, I say, praise the Lord! This has been the question I now how many times put to Dr Walter and which he has so far answered by saying the Participle in principle is a Finite Verb, and the Verb, a Participle— DIRECTLY TWISTING ABOUT THE WRITTEN WORDS AND THEIR MEANINGS. You may even read Dr Walter doing this repeatedly over again on the last two pages.

**PC:**

*I know no Greek, and do not know what aorist tense means, however I agree that by the time of the appearance spoken of that Jesus the Christ had been raised from the grave. How long I do not know but I think twelve to fifteen hours.*

**GE:**

PC, God give you strength in your conviction of the truth ON the truth!

Here is the WRITTEN WORD OF GOD:

Resurrection: “Late in the Sabbath, Sabbath’s MID-AFTERNOON as it BEGAN, to dawn (“broad daylight MID-AFTERNOON”) towards the First Day of the week .... WHEN SUDDENLY there was a great earthquake ....”

NEVER “LET MAN BEGUILÉ YOU OF YOUR REWARD!”  
(Col2:18).

First Appearance: “Early on the First Day of the week He, The Risen One, APPEARED to Mary Magdalene, first of all.”

“This I say, lest any man BEGUILÉ you with ENTICING WORDS.”  
Col2:4

“THEREFORE LET NO MAN INTIMIDATE AND INCRIMINATE YOU because of you eating and drinking (spiritually) of Christ’s Feast of month’s or of Sabbaths’ (once or perpetually) which is but the shadow of things-a-coming, (viz.) The Body of Christ’s Own .... holding to the Head .... NOURISHMENT BEING MINISTERED GROWING WITH THE GROWTH OF GOD.”

“DO NOT BE BEGUILLED OF YOUR REWARD!”

**DW:**

*As noted by A.T. Robertson the adverb “proii” CAN modify the participle “risen.” Note both the aorist participle “risen” and the verb “appeared” are both in the aorist tense but with different subjects connected by the same time frame. Christ rose “proii” on the same Sunday Morning when he made his FIRST appearance to Mary.*

*According to your theory Christ rose mid afternoon Saturday and appeared to no one until Sunday. My position fits far better.*

**GE:**

A.T. Robertson is not infallible or super human; he had his prejudices and preferences (just like I have mine), and those could overrule even his good sense for Greek Grammar, like in this one of very rare instances. Again I must stress, that is said, on what you have ‘quoted’ from him. Kindly supply us with a full quote and source reference, so that we may all speak from the same information.

But this, this ‘backbush-rhetoric’ plumber ‘from South Africa’ can tell you and shall tell you and everyone in this world on strength of Mark 16:9 ITSELF and pure Greek Grammar found in any unbiased, disinterested linguistic authority, that “the adverb “proii”“ \_DOES NOT\_ “modify the participle “risen”“, in this instance. But that the PARTICIPLE precisely for being an Aorist Participle, FUNCTIONS

BOTH ADVERBIALY AND ADJECTIVELY, virtually making of itself the SUBJECT, of the sentence and Predicate “appeared”— the Subject in this instance being, “He, The Risen One”. “He The Risen (Jesus Christ) early on the First Day of the week appeared”. This is the nearest Robertson could ever get to get the Participle to be ‘*modified*’ by the Adverb --- if he considered the Participle as the Subject - Jesus - who “early appeared The RISEN”. Exactly what I say.

I can say this much without hesitation, because I know A.T. Robertson well enough to know that he would not make of an Aorist - --Ingressive and Constative ‘punctual’ Aspect INEVITABLY from its very nature ALWAYS PAST ‘Tense’ (‘Perfect Past ‘Tense’!)--- a PRESENT Participle as though Jesus ‘was-rising-as-He-appeared-first-on-the-First-Day of the week to Mary’ --- which would have been untrue, plainly.

**DW:**

*There is no possible way that the resurrection of Jesus Christ occurred in full daylight on the Jewish Sabbath. Mark 16:9 thoroughly repudiates that unbiblical suggestion. There is no way you can twist the Greek language in Mark 16:9 to say that - it is impossible.*

**GE:**

I never said “*Mark 16:9 to say ..... that the resurrection of Jesus Christ occurred in full daylight on the ... Sabbath*”; I said Matthew 28:1 says that.

But I have now many times shown YOU, “*it is impossible*” the way you twist the Greek language in Mark 16:9 to say “*He rose from the grave between 3am to 6 am. Sunday morning or “proii” on the first day of the week*”.

Who posted this? *“Here is A. T. Robertson’s comment on first part of Mark 16:9. It is probable that this note of time goes with “risen” (anastas), though it makes good sense with “appeared”“? I think it was DW.*

Fine, whoever it was.... **Dr Robertson did NOT say: ‘It is probable that this note of time goes with “ROSE” (anastav), though it makes good sense with “appeared”‘.**

It makes good sense with both “appeared” and “RISEN” as Mark has it - as I explained in my previous post.

**Quote: DW, “Matthew 28:1 says no such thing. Your interpretation says that.”**

‘opse’ - “late”, “slow hours”, “fullness”;

‘sabbatohn’ - “Sabbath’s”, “of the Sabbath”, “in the Sabbath”, “Sabbath’s-time”;

‘tehi epiphohskousehi’ - “in the center - light - being”

‘epi’ - “very middle”, “centre-inclining towards”, ‘emphatically over’, ‘on’, ‘upon’;

‘phohs’ - “light”, “day”, “shine / shining”;

‘ousas’ - “being”, “while is”, “actually is”;

‘ousehi’ - “in the being”, “while verily”.

**‘sabbatohn tehi epiphohskousehi’ “SABBATH’S in the being mid-afternoon”;**

‘eis’ - “towards”, “beginning in the direction of”, “before”;

‘mian (hehmeran)’ “First Day” in itself being an Accusative: “towards the First Day”;

‘sabbatohn’ - “of the week”.

My ‘interpretation’? Literal, dictionary, sterile ‘Greek usage’ rather, I would say please!

**DW:**

*What is unique about 16:9 is its wording compared to 16:2. In 16:2 it is “mia” with the plural sabbatwn however, in 16:9 it is “protos” with the singular sabbatou. The difference between “mia” versus “protos” is that “protos” signifies the “first” in a series whereas “mia” is simply the ordinal one. The 16:2 is the normal wording for “first of sabbaths” or the first day of the week but the 16:9 is unusual and it is my contention that Mark is first identifying the first day of the week in Mark 16:2 and then signifying it as the first in a new series of Sabbaths in 16:9 that commemorate the resurrection of Christ. So with that in mind “proii” modifies the first day pinpointing the precise time the resurrection occurred on Sunday Morning as “proii” is also the technical expression for the fourth watch of the night and used that way by Christ in Mark 13:35. Hence, the resurrection occurred between 3am to 6am Sunday morning on the first of a new series of Sabbaths.*

*.....According to your theory Christ rose mid afternoon Saturday and appeared to no one until Sunday. My position fits far better.*

**GE:**

I am very happy with the fruits on my labour seen so far here, that DW understands just what I believe. I thought nobody ever would.

**DW:**

*When he had risen early on the first day of the week (anastav prw prwth sabbatou). It is probable that this note of time goes with “risen” (anastav), though it makes good sense with “appeared” (efanh). Jesus is not mentioned by name here, though he is clearly the one meant. Mark uses mia in verse #Mr 16:2, but prwth in #Mr 14:12 and the plural sabbatwn in verse #Mr 16:2, though the singular here.*

*First (prwton). Definite statement that Jesus appeared (efanh) to Mary Magdalene first of all. The verb efanh (second aorist passive of fainw) is here alone of the Risen Christ (cf. eleiav efanh, #Lu 9:8), the usual verb being wfyh. {#Lu 24:34 1Co 15:5}*

*From whom (par hv). Only instance of para with the casting out of demons, ek being usual. {#Mr 1:25,26 5:8 7:26,29 9:25} ekbeblhkei is past perfect indicative without augment. This description of Mary Magdalene is like that in #Lu 8:2 and seems strange in Mark at this point, described as a new character here, though mentioned by Mark three times just before. {#Mr 15:40,47 16:1} The appearance to Mary Magdalene is given in full by #Joh 20:11-18. - A.T. Robertson on Mark 16:9*

*There is the full quote from A.T. Robertson as you asked. ....*

**GE:**

Thank you very much. It helps a lot. Because here you can see for yourself the legitimacy of my induction Robertson’s ONLY possibility to have the Adverb “early” ‘*modify*’ (as Dr Walter puts it) the Participle “risen”, is to make the Participle the Subject. Robertson actually says – as we all now can see here – “*Jesus is not mentioned by name here, though he is clearly the one meant.*” “... *the one meant*” — “The Risen One meant” — the Subject meant! Did I contrive or invent or surmised? No! I simply kept to common-sense linguistics ANY unprejudiced human being MUST see and understand. It is for the love and worship of Sunday that people

WON'T see or understand Jesus "APPEARED early as the risen one" and WON'T see or understand He 'ROSE' not "early" but "late", 'opse' Mt28:1!

**DW:**

*The Expositors Greek New Testament says basically the same thing as A.T. Robertson. If it is so clear then why do the best Greek scholars say it is not so clear?????? Do you claim superior grammatical skills than Robertson or the Greek scholars that write the Expositors Greek New Testament????*

*Both the resurrection and the appearance occurred on Sunday Morning but the appearance to Mary was not "proii" as that is a technical term already used in Mark by Christ for the fourth watch (Mk. 13:35) and his appearance to Mary was not during the fourth watch. This means that "proii" modifies his resurrection and thus "But having risen early on the first day of the week..." is the correct translation in spite of what you allege to the contrary. Moreover, this is the proper translation and understanding when all other Biblical data and post-Biblical data by those who knew the apostles is considered.*

**GE:**

How can "this"— your own 'translation'— not Robertson's, be "the proper translation and understanding" despite there is no 'understanding' in it and it is full of contradictions and gross discrepancies?

Viz, (Emphasis GE)

1) "**Both** the resurrection and the appearance occurred on Sunday Morning" ..... ("He **arose** between 3am to 6am during the darkness of "proii"")

versus,

"but the **appearance** to Mary was not "proii" ... the fourth watch...."

Versus,

*“Now when Jesus was risen early [Gr. proee] the first day of the week, he **appeared** first to Mary Magdalene\*\*\*”*

2) *“the appearance to Mary was **not** “**proii**”... and his appearance to Mary was **not** during the fourth watch.”*

versus,

*“Christ rose “proii” on the **same** Sunday Morning **when** he made his **FIRST** appearance to **Mary**.”*

*“Mary Magdalene is named in all four accounts because she is specifically the one that Jesus **appeared to that same morning** ...at the same time in that day - **proii** - early morning - rising of the sun - dawn (getting brighter) or “early”.”*

3) *“They started out in the dark somewhere between 3am to 6am or “proii” and arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun or as Matthew says at “dawn” or when “light was growing” brighter.”*

Versus,

*““proii” as that is a technical term already used in Mark by Christ for the fourth watch” “Used by Christ” for what? For his Resurrection AND TWO Appearances. “Christ arose on the very same day - first day of the week **using the very same term “proii” as used with the women** on the first day of the week in the morning.”*

4) DW: *““But having risen early on the first day of the week...” is the correct translation”,*

VERSUS,

Mark: “Risen”, [DW meant ‘being raised’ ...] or, Mark: “AS The Risen One He early on the first day of the week (anastas de proh-i prohtehi sabbatou) APPEARED”—

[\*\*\*Note, it’s not “Now, when Jesus was raised...”; it’s not, “Now, Jesus having risen He appeared...” It should be, and in fact is, *“Now, when Jesus was risen, He early the first day of the week **appeared** first to Mary Magdalene...”*. Actually it’s not even that, but, JUST “So, RISEN, He – early the first day of the week – appeared to Mary

Magdalene, first.” (‘de’, “So” connects verse 9 with the foregoing.) Remember, the women told nobody, verse 8; so Mark tells it himself.]

This incomplete “*note of time*” which DW arrogates to himself, by itself is meaningless. Where is the Predicate Mark uses to make it make sense? As **Robertson preferred**: “*It is probable that this note of time goes with “risen” (anastav), though it makes good sense with “appeared” (efanh).*”

Who “*claim(s) superior grammatical skills than Robertson*”?! And while “*The Expositors Greek New Testament says basically the same thing as A.T. Robertson*”, who is it who “*claim(s) superior grammatical skills than Robertson or the Greek scholars that write the Expositors Greek New Testament????*”

I beg your pardon, not GE.

### **DW:**

*Dr. William Hendricksen a well know Greek scholar and commentator translates Matthew 28:1 as follows:*

*”Now after the sabbath, at dawn on the first day of the week....”*

*The women would not begin their journey to the tomb DURING the Sabbath day but would wait until the Sabbath was past or “after the Sabbath” and they would not go to the tomb after 6 p.m. on Saturday night as it would be getting dark. They started out in the dark somewhere between 3am to 6am or “proii” and arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun or as Matthew says at “dawn” or when “light was growing” brighter.*

### **GE:**

“Journey”, is presumed. The Gospels don’t write about any journey; they write of a visit AT the tomb.

By the way, Dr. William Hendricksen and all the host of well known

Greek scholars and commentators translate Matthew 28:1 like that, simply PARROTING Justin Martyr. They don't know it themselves even. The newbies so INVENTED from pure prejudice against God's since creation and for eternity chosen Sabbath Day.

Then, Dr. William Hendricksen is talking about Matthew; not about Mark; he is not even thinking about “*proii*” and arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun or as Matthew says at “dawn” or when “light was growing” brighter”— THAT IS YOU, DW, CLAIMING falsely Dr. William Hendricksen is saying!

**Re: DW**, “*The women would not begin their journey to the tomb DURING the Sabbath day but would wait until the Sabbath was past or “after the Sabbath” and they would not go to the tomb after 6 p.m. on Saturday night as it would be getting dark. They started out in the dark somewhere between 3am to 6am or “proii” and arrived at the tomb at the rising of the sun or as Matthew says at “dawn” or when “light was growing” brighter.*”

“*The women would not ....*”; “*they would not ....*” while Matthew wrote “they began their journey” in the affirmative and Mark wrote “when the Sabbath was past they did go to buy ointments....” in the affirmative. Now what IS so difficult to understand or accept about that?

The women experienced NO difficulty when they have “*started out in the dark somewhere between 3am to 6am*”, but it would be impossible for them to “*begin their journey to the tomb DURING the Sabbath day*” “in the broad daylight”?

**Re: DW**, “*They started out in the dark somewhere between 3am to 6am or “proii”“ --- meaning, Mark says in 16:9; and they, Dr Walter says, “arrived .... as Matthew says at “dawn” or when “light was growing” brighter*”.

Now Mark in 16:9 did not write “*they*” – the Plural; he did not write anything about “*started out*” howsoever or about “*arrived at the tomb*” howsoever!

And Matthew in 28:1 did not write “*arrived at the tomb*”, or, “*at dawn*” (like “*proii*”), or, “*when light was growing brighter*” in any manner!

But Matthew like LUKE in 23:54, wrote about the time of day that Joseph had closed the grave on Friday literally “mid-afternoon” (from ‘epiphohskoh’).

**Re: DW**, “*Nothing is hard to understand about that but Mark also says that the women did not come to the tomb until Sunday morning (Mk. 16:2).*”

‘*Sunday morning*’ as you say, ‘*the fourth watch*’ --- 3-4 am? Yes, because “VERY early”, dawn before, “sunrise”. ‘lian proh-i anateilantos tou hehliou’. NOT simply ‘*early*’ - ‘*proii*’ which can be after sunrise as well. And Mark did NOT say “*the women did not come to the tomb until Sunday morning*”. Mark says they DID come (in verse 2) “very early”; that doesn’t mean they did not come even earlier than “the fourth watch”. They could have come and they in fact DID come in the THIRD watch, as LUKE described it, “DEEP(est) morning” - ‘orthrou batheohs’. Because the women had to wait for the Roman GUARD who watched “until the third day” (‘Saturday’) Jesus “spoke about while He lived” which would be over, but a Roman soldier regarded as over, only by midnight. And then as Mark says DID come AGAIN (in verse 2) “very early before sunrise” during “the fourth watch”.

**Re: DW**, “*Mark 16:9b occurs after the women have told the disciples and the disciples return with Mary*”

I think you meant to write Matthew 28:9ff. Even then, what the women were going to tell the disciples they still had to tell the

disciples; not “*after the women have told the disciples.*”

And nowhere in any Gospel do “*the disciples*”— the men, “*return with Mary*”. Least of all in John 20:1-10 because after “*Mary Magdalene had had stood after at the grave*” Jesus appeared to her, ALONE. So no men or women could have ‘*returned with Mary*’. She, returned to them.

**Re: DW**, “*The term translated “dawn” in Matthew 28:1 can legitimately be understood as sunrise*”

‘If’, two things:

1) If the literal and simplest and clearest reading (as dissected above) could be discarded with; and

2) If actual application in all of Greek literature from the classical times until the third century AD could be provided of either ‘opse’ or ‘epiphohskousas / -oh’ or ‘epousas’ or even only ‘epi’, could be presented used with the meaning of ‘up’ in stead of ‘over, onto’ etc or with the meaning of ‘new, up’ like in ‘ana-teilontas tou hehliou’ or ‘dia’ like in ‘dia-phohskoh’ .... EPIPHOSKOH “*in Matthew 28:1 can legitimately be understood as sunrise*” or “*dawn*”, because “*dawn*” DOES NOT EXIST “*in Matthew 28:1*”.

**DW:**

*The common aorist tense relates the general time of both events (resurrection and appearance)- the first day of the week and common sense dictates that Jesus had to arise before appearing to Mary on the first day of the week.*

**GE:**

First, NO “*common aorist tense*” is anywhere Finitely or Indicatively directly ‘*related*’ to the Resurrection. The Resurrection as such or its occurrence in word of Verb, occurs nowhere in the Gospels. The Resurrection further, ONLY in Matthew, is per se, IMPLIED, in relation to its CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE through time-

indications and actual events of the great earthquake and the approach of the angel who rolled away the door-stone.

“SABBATH’S” is the ‘*common sense dictating*’ event– and time-relating word of the Resurrection. “Late” and “broad daylight” – ‘opse’ and ‘tehi epiphohskousehi’ are found in apposition or additional ‘relation’ to “Sabbath’s”; while “towards the First Day of the week” – ‘eis mian (hehmeran) sabbatohn’ is found in juxtaposition or opposite ‘relation’ to “Sabbath’s”.

Therefore, for sure yes, “*common sense dictates that Jesus had to arise before appearing to Mary on the first day of the week*”.

#### **DW:**

*Come on Gerhard you are supposed to know Greek. The terms translated “risen” and “appeared” in Mark 16:9 are both AORIST in tense. So don’t tell us there is no Aorist in relationship to his resurrection found in Mark 16:9 or to his appearance to Mary in Mark 16:9*

1. “risen” - second Aorist active participle (participle = VERBAL adjective)
2. “appeared” - second Aorist active indicative

#### **GE:**

I never said what you say I said. You do not pay attention to two specific words I used to make clear what the Gospels do not use, “Finite” and “Indicative” Verbs. I said NOTHING about the Aorist being used or not being used.

A Participle is NO VERB! A Participle is an Adjectival and Adverbial Functional word-Form that – in this case, ‘anastas’ – describes :

- 1) through its Adverbial aspect, how the subject “APPEARED”- ‘ephaneh’ : “risen, He APPEARED”; and,
- 2) through its Adjectival aspect, how the SUBJECT, “appeared” : “AS THE RISEN, he appeared”.

That is why the flexion or conjugation of the Participle --- UNLIKE a Verb’s --- is BOTH to Gender and Tense.

### **DW:**

*The Talmud has two divisions, the Mishnah is the first division believed to be put into writing about 200 A.D. and the second division is the Gemara written about 500 A.D.*

*J.B. Lightfoot a respected Greek scholar and Jewish authority of days past says this concerning the talmud’s view of what Christians observed as their 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.”*

*Hence, even the Jews living during this era recognized Christians called the first day of the week the “Lord’s day” and “sabbath.”*

### **GE:**

At least half a millennium in between John’s use of ‘kyriakeh hehmera’- ‘Lord’s Day’ and them Jews. What has it got to do with the price of eggs?, as we say in Afrikaans.

And while you supplied us with this reference of Lightfoot's to them, do I not notice satire somewhere?, them Jews ridiculing them Christians for having believed the Messiah would rise on the First Day of the week?, whereas instead, them Jews very well knew the Messiah would appear on the Sabbath Day?

Just asking.

**DW:**

*You talking about reading something that cannot be found or even hinted at in a quotation, well, you take the cake Gerhard! What they are ridiculing is the Christians observing the first day of the Week as their Sabbath and forbidding their people to associate with Christians because they do not recognize the Jewish Sabbath as the Lord's Day.*

**GE:**

Alright! Alright! I back off on this one .... was just asking, remember?

**DW:**

*The main verb in a sentence determines the time of action in participles used in the same sentence. If the main verb is Aorist and the participle is Aorist that means the action of the participle preceded the action of the main verb. Both events occurred on the first day of the week but the action of the participle "risen" occurred prior to the action of the main verb "appeared" on that same day.*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** "..... *the main verb in a sentence determines the time of action in participles used in the same sentence. If the main verb is Aorist and the participle is Aorist that means the action of the participle preceded the action of the main verb.....*"

Well isn't that what I maintain? Only difference is OUR different points of view of the action presupposed. I maintain it is the WRITER who uses the Aorist as a communication tool with his readers; HE, tells a story as it happened IN THE PAST. From the viewpoint of the writer both the Appearance and the Resurrection happened in the past. The 'Constative Aorist' "best rendered with an English Past Perfect" (according to Dana and Mantey).

But there is another difference between what you aver, and what I maintain, here. And that is, that you aver, "*the main verb in a sentence determines the time of action in participles used in the same sentence*", which simply is not only nonsense, but untrue. The Participle is constituted of its OWN determination of its built-in time-element. What do you think the Participle in Mk16:9 is in the Aorist for? But the fact you maintain a simultaneous time for both the Participle and Verb, requires – in fact demands – a Present Participle in the Greek! So you are not only talking nonsense; you are actually contradicting yourself by maintaining the Verb of the sentence determines the time of action in a Participle used in the same sentence. It also demands Mary actually saw Jesus rise!

Yours is a totally unwarranted assertion, "*Both events occurred on the first day of the week*". The very LOGIC of the sentence is "*the action of the participle "risen" occurred prior to the action of the main verb "appeared"*" "FULL STOP! To add "*on that same day*" is a long chance you take, dear Dr Walter! The Aorist of the sentence DOES NOT determine the time of action in the Participle "risen"- 'anastas'. The time of action presupposed in it must and is determined ONLY by obtaining the FULL picture from ALL the Gospels, so that is becomes clear Matthew is the only Gospel that actually GIVES the 'time-of-action' of the Resurrection— not Mark.

**Re: DW,** "*Both occurred on the same day but both did not occur the same time on the same day. If both occurred the same time on the same day then that would call for the present tense participle as you*

*say. However, it is Aorist participle because it is a prior action to the appearance but both on the same day.”*

**GE:**

NOTHING in or about or of the Aorist guarantees or demands or even SUGGESTS the time-expiry-limit “*on the same day*”, Dr Walter. Jesus eight days later appeared this VERY SAME ‘ANASTAS’ - “The Risen One” of Mk16:9; and for forty days, this VERY SAME ‘ANASTAS’ - “The Risen One” of Mk16:9; and ascended into the air this VERY SAME ‘ANASTAS’ - “The Risen One” of Mk16:9.

**Re: DW**, *“They were placed at the disposal of the high priest and Sandhedrin and therefore was not accountable to their own command for this guard. Their own command could care less about this tomb and who was in it.*

*The only lie was that they were asleep. They were witnesses of the earthquake, the angels, the rock being rolled away. They were as “dead” men because they were frightened to death.*

*The time they lied about sleeping was not the broad day light because that would not harmonize with their lie that the disciples came by “night” and took him. The tomb was guarded during the “night” and so any charge that the body was stolen during the “night” would equally incriminate them whether they were sleeping or not sleeping. However, they were sleeping at the time they purported the body was stolen - ”NIGHT”*

*Your theory makes absolutely nonsense! You don’t say you were asleep in the DAY TIME but charge that the body was stolen at “NIGHT.” What correlation does that have in anyone’s brain????? Put yourself in their place. Does it sound very convincing as an excuse to say his body was stolen “by night” when you were sleeping by day????????????? What correlation would your excuse have with that action by night????????? Nonsense!!!!!!*

**GE:**

Tralala .... who spoke of sleeping or lying about sleeping during day, my dear fellow? And that, on duty?! Ridiculous!

**DW:**

*He arose between 3am to 6am during the darkness of “proii”*

*Matthew 28:1 and the Greek term translated “dawn” can mean at the rising of the Sun because the term literally means “light growing” not light “decreasing.” Hence, the women may have bought their spices after 6 pm on Saturday night but they did not come to the grave until “after” the Sabbath was past and in the “proii” Sunday morning “at sunrise.”*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** *“The only lie was that they were asleep. They were witnesses of the earthquake, the angels, the rock being rolled away. They were as “dead” men because they were frightened to death.”*

Indeed, *“The only lie was that they were asleep”* because they actually were “like dead” unconscious.

Therefore the guard could not have been *“witnesses of the earthquake, the angels, the rock being rolled away”*. So the question arises precisely at what moment or stage in the sequence of events were the guard struck unconscious : before, or after, *“the earthquake, the angels, the rock being rolled away”*?

Here is Matthew’s description,

*“Suddenly (at the same time as) there was a great earthquake....”* That – the “SUDDEN, GREAT, earthquake” – already, could have struck the guard unconscious, *“They were as “dead” men **because** they were **frightened** to death.”* The earthquake was enough; the angel could

not frighten them more than they already were— “*frightened to death*”.

However.... Matthew continues,

“There was a great earthquake BECAUSE the angel of the Lord descended from heaven.” So already it actually was the ANGEL that was the cause of all the consternation, and therefore, of the guard’s ‘fear’! At the occurrence of the great earthquake, the guards were in fact “*frightened to death*” by the ANGEL! The earthquake began BEFORE or AS the angel descended. Then already the guards were frightened clean out, and unconscious “like dead”! They knew nothing further or earlier, really, and certainly NOTHING, of “*the angels, the rock being rolled away*”. By the way, it was only one angel.

What is more, is that Matthew continues, “because an angel of the Lord DESCENDING out of nowhere (out of heaven), and APPROACHING, rolled away the stone.” The angel rolled the stone away BEFORE he was even seen, from somewhere out of heaven, and before the guard could know what hit them. Like the boxer’s fist that plants the knock-out comes from nowhere and cannot even be seen or remembered. So, JOB DONE, the angel “sat upon the stone”.

Things happened too fast for words. Matthew the dramatist, needs to use a parenthesis. He ‘graphically’, describes that which had had happened, further. Verses 3-4 give detail of past things; not of in time next, things. Matthew supplies the particulars for the reader’s convenience which the angel gave to the women for their convenience: “His (the angel’s) appearance (his ‘descending’ or ‘approach’, rather than his ‘face’) was like lightning, and the array (the ‘decoration’ of his appearance) white as snow”— like the gleam of the lightning flash all about is white as snow. The guard at no stage or moment was able to distinguish an angel; it was blinding whiteness round about, so that they, “convulsing like a dying person were struck down of immense SHOCK”, rather than prolonged ‘*fear*’.

The guard could not discern the features of an angel at all; it is Matthew who recorded that it was an angel— NOT THE GUARD! And it is not even Matthew who gives this additional information on the circumstances of the Resurrection. The women told him. And neither were the women the source of Matthew's information about the angel and the guards, because all these things, "the angel informed the women and told them" about --- every little bit of knowledge about the angel of the Lord and his appearance at the occurrence of the great earthquake "Sabbath's", and the guard.

When one read Matthew 28:1-5, ignore the full stop after verse 4 and the capital letter word "And", and read verses 1 to 5 in one breath. That was how Matthew told the story which "the angel explained to the women...."

Or shall we become followers of Ellen G White and Jacob Lorber, who had visions (about the same time in the 1840's) of the guard who watched inside the grave as Jesus arose, and became the first witnesses of the Risen Christ?

**Re: DW**, "*Matthew 28:1 and the Greek term translated "dawn" can mean at the rising of the Sun because the term literally means "light growing" not light "decreasing"*

It is no "*Greek term*" which in *Matthew 28:1* is "*translated "dawn"*" in the KJV; it is the PHRASE, 'eis mian (hehmeran) sabbatohn'- "TOWARDS the First Day of the week". The KJ did very well with FURTHER having described this particular 'stage' of the day, by having ADDED: "As it BEGAN to dawn .....", "towards the First Day".

Why do I say the KJV did well? Because it in agreement with the foregoing, concurs with, and confirms, that this particular 'stage' of day-time has BEGUN, and did not END. It was "In / On the Sabbath"

late, Sabbath's MID-afternoon", with the REST of the afternoon – three solid hours of it – REMAINING before end of day, sunset.

It is of tremendous importance, as this point in time of the day-cycle has been mistaken for 'sundown' right at the periphery of the Sabbath. Which is begging the question, and worse, is plain incorrect and false --- with NO 'due respect' to the COG-fundi's.

And of even greater importance is it, because this point in time of the day-cycle AT THE BEGINNING OF THE LAST THREE HOURS OF THE FRIDAY, has in Luke 23:54 been mistaken for 'sundown' right at the periphery of the Sixth Day of the week or "Preparation".

**Matthew 28:1****DW:**

.....*Matthew 28:1 and the Greek term translated “dawn” can mean at the rising of the Sun because the term literally means “light growing” not light “decreasing.....*

**GE:**

It is no “*Greek term*” which in *Matthew 28:1* is “*translated “dawn”*” in the KJV; it is the PHRASE, ‘eis mian (hehmeran) sabbatohn’ - “TOWARDS the First Day of the week”. The KJ did very well with FURTHER having described this particular ‘stage’ of the day, by having ADDED: “As it BEGAN to dawn .....”, “towards the First Day”.

Why do I say the KJV did well? Because it in agreement with the foregoing, concurs with, and confirms, that this particular ‘stage’ of day-time has BEGUN, and did not END. It was “In / On the Sabbath late, Sabbath’s MID-afternoon”, with the REST of the afternoon – three solid hours of it – REMAINING before end of day, sunset. It is of tremendous importance.

**DHK:**

*Quote: GE, “It is of tremendous importance,” Why?*

**GE:**

It is of tremendous importance, as this point in time of the day-cycle has been mistaken– by the COG for example –, for ‘sundown’ right at the periphery of the Sabbath; which is begging the question because, for all practical purposes that would mean the Resurrection occurred on the First Day anyway, and not on the Sabbath Day as the COG maintains.

And of equal importance is it, because this point in time of the day-cycle AT THE BEGINNING OF THE LAST THREE HOURS OF

THE FRIDAY, has in Luke 23:54 been mistaken for ‘sundown’ right at the periphery of the Sixth Day of the week or “Preparation” and thus three hours’ “time of the Jews’ preparation” in Jn19:42, has been wiped out so that the Burial of Jesus’ body can be squeezed in on the same day still after the Crucifixion that supposedly also occurred on the Sixth Day which would have ended sunset— as the ‘Good Friday Tradition’ has it.

**DHK:**

*Romans 14:5 One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*

**GE:**

What is important in what you are saying, dear DHK, is not about 'days'; it's trying to be honestly persuaded in one's own mind, first of all; Next it is to find out the true Word of God-- whether it says left, or whether it says right; whether it says true or false. And then not to be persuaded otherwise .... otherwise than the Truth of God's Word.

Not about days or the veneration men might have for days, this one or that one.

That is my purpose; that was Paul's purpose in Romans 14. But why do you, DHK, moderator, bring Romans 14 up here? To steer me off-track? I'm an old fox, DHK. I smell a rat a mile off. They say smell is the only sense organ that improves with old age... despite a brain that deteriorates. That's the way life goes.

Do I now persuade men? If, may I be persuaded thoroughly myself. Maybe I can persuade other men too (maybe only find out who are worthy of the Gospel of Jesus Christ); that will be a gratuity of God's goodness. Not about days ... but about “Now when the Church

adjourned and separated and WAS BROKEN UP”— ON THE SABBATH DAY— BECAUSE OF JESUS CHRIST— “many (were) PERSUADED TO CONTINUE IN THE GRACE OF GOD.”

Discord, faction regardless BaptistBoard even have a special forum for those of different persuasion. Thanks to BaptistBoard. God bless you for this medium to try to persuade people of another’s opinion. Why be hypocritical about it?

**DHK:**

*I am not hypocritical. What makes you think I am? I asked Why? What difference does it make. The early Christians worshiped every day. One day was not more important than another. Christians in Muslim lands that I have been to worship mostly on Fridays because that is the Muslim holy day. It is for a practical reason. It is the day that they can get off work and find the time to worship--a day that God ordained as a day of rest. Does the name of the day really matter?*

*In another place I know of a man who pastored five different churches. He went to one congregation on a separate day of the week. Each day of the week would be considered “holy” to that particular congregation. No! It isn't the day that you worship; it is the importance of the worship. It is important that you worship Christ, period. Choose a day; any day, and worship Him who died for you. The day you choose is not important.*

**GE:**

When I wrote that last remark, I KNEW DHK is going to take it personally. At first I meant it with regard to myself; then thought, ah well, if DHK is going to take it personally, so be it. But take it in context DHK, with reference to the last statement I made, not with reference to the introductory statement way back, please.

But you keep on trying to distract from the real issue, DHK, with your philosophizing about Romans 14. Find every point you are raising, answered, here,

<http://www.biblestudents.co.za/books/Book%204,%204.Rom.pdf>

I am not going to answer any of your objections with reference to Romans 14, on this thread.

**DHK:**

*What makes you think I took anything personally. I did not. I pointed out to you the reality of the situation, even today. Many people around the world, even today, cannot worship except on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, etc., for the same reason that churches in America a few hundred years had the same problem. They had circuit riding preachers, and would gather whenever the preacher came. The day wasn't important to them. The preacher and the preaching of the Word of God was. There is no command in the Bible given as to what day of the week we are to assemble and worship--not a command. As I pointed out to you, the early Christians did it every day.*

**GE:**

DHK, the New Testament Sabbath is from the New Testament. That is the ONLY point I am trying to make; and that the New Testament Sabbath in the New Testament, is NOT Sunday. I have peace with the morals surrounding the issue EXACTLY FOR THE REASON PAUL GIVES IN ROMANS 14, which is, that morals and judging are not MY job, but God's.

Sorry, DHK, I cannot understand myself, that people always get the impression I'm putting up a fight, while I honestly don't. I have been struggling with this now for as long as I have been communicating with FELLOW Christians as a brother in Christ. I refuse to even communicate with non-believers no matter how humanitarian they

may appear to be. We just do not have that common ground on which to stand. You might have noticed that I contribute but little on the established foundations of the Christian Faith on Baptist Board, for two reasons,

First, that these foundations are so thoroughly established and expounded upon by men of integrity and true greatness, my contribution might only detract from the excellent defense of the Faith they have given us.

Second, that I am fully occupied with what I consider is more in the field of what I believe is my calling. It is not because I am one track minded; it is because this aspect of the Christian Faith --- as seen in these threads --- I consider as my job.

Now this is resented most by my Brethren in the Faith, that I speak out on the Sabbath-Sunday issue in the Church from a common platform, the platform of the believing Christian man, and more, from a Reformed Protestant believer's standpoint. Man, I am intolerable to most if not all BECAUSE OF IT.

Anyway.... To answer your question I shall retort with a counter-question --- as I usually do --- Are you a legalist? For it is only the legalist that requires, yea, demand, a direct Commandment before he will acknowledge God's Authority in any matter. I have said it countless of times, DHK, Christ is become the Christian's sole Law. And if we see the Sabbath through the life of Christ and The Body of Christ's Own, we have seen all possible Christian Law. Moreover if we see it in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, we shall be without excuse!

But then on top of it all, God disposed that we as Christians DO find the Sabbath Commandment as it were re-enacted in the New Testament. And that also I have shown over and over on also this forum, BaptistBoard.

And lastly, I have always believed the Christian believes the WHOLE Bible for God's Word, and that the Old Testament : is SINCE JESUS CHRIST : as valid as ever for the People of God. No wonder therefore that when *\_inter alia\_* the writer of Hebrews wants to make this very point, he quotes from the Old Testament on the same plane and Authority as the Word of Jesus Christ in chapter 4.

Therefore, kindly consider that I am trying to stay with the subject, and cannot now and on this thread, go into your question further.

If I were a 'Bible-skeptic' or an atheist I today would have been respected and famous because of my critique on Christian Sunday observance; now that I am a fellow-believer I am ignored and laughed at up the sleeve.

Are you a legalist?

**DHK:**

*No I am not a legalist. A legalist would require worship on a certain day, such as the Judaizers in Paul's day did. They were the trouble-makers for Paul. They demanded that the Gentile believers kept the law, which would include worshipping on the Sabbath. They were the legalists.*

**GE:**

It is the legalist who judges his fellow Christian who "*would require worship on a certain day*". You altogether missed Paul's whole point, DHK. Paul **CONDONED** the "*worship on a certain day*". You do exactly what Paul did NOT condone. You act the Law yourselves and judge believers' regard (for whatever reasons) for one day above another day.

Throughout the Gospels and New Testament the Sabbath Day happened to be ‘required’ for the corporate worship of the Church. You judge the Sabbath DAY incompatible with the life of the Church. What Paul found incompatible with the life of the Church in Romans 14 was the judging spirit against the People’s freedom to regard certain days.

Paul judged incompatible with the Christian confession and life of the Church,  
 first, **legalists’** judging of others; and,  
 on par, **legalists’** regard for the “food and drink” associated with the observance of certain days, as were it— the “food and drink ..... the kingdom of God”.

“*The trouble-makers for Paul*” were these legalists; not the freemen in Jesus Christ. The legalists demanded that the Gentile believers do not keep the law of Christian love and regard for and tolerance of one another.

The Christian ‘*worshiping on the Sabbath*’ was no issue and in this issue, was irrelevant. Legalists, force ‘*worshiping on the Sabbath*’ into the issue. Forcing the Sabbath into the Romans 14 ‘issue’ is the definition of legalism and forcing the Sabbath into the Romans 14 ‘issue’ defines the protagonists of the idea as the legalists they are.

I have said it countless of times, DHK, Christ is become the Christian's sole Law.

**DHK:**

*“Christ did not become our law. It does not say that. Rather it says that Christ fulfilled the law.”*

**GE:**

You beat about the bush. If Christ did not become our Law, then what is the Christians', Law? The Ten Commandments? Yes, for when we are become the transgressors of it. But while we have peace with God— “For HE, is our Peace”, we have the “Law of Eternal Life” even Jesus Christ for our Law.

A Christian is not the lawless; “lawlessness is sin”— the Word of God defines sin. To have “Christ our righteousness” is to have Christ our “Law that is able to give life”.

**DW:**

*I have no idea what Greek text you are using but my Greek text uses the word “epiphoskouse” which is the present active participle of the term “epephosko” and it literally means “getting brighter” or “to grow light”*

*Look at the Greek participle before the prepositional phrase you are quoting!*

**GE:**

Fine, this is your negation of my statement,

“It is no “Greek term” which in *Matthew 28:1* is “translated “dawn”” in the KJV; it is the PHRASE, ‘eis mian (hehmeran) sabbatohn’ - “TOWARDS the First Day of the week”, which I made in reply to your statement,

*“Matthew 28:1 and the Greek term translated “dawn” can mean at the rising of the Sun because the term literally means “light growing” not light “decreasing....” ‘epiphoskousehi’ — (with “the Greek term” ‘tehi’, its Article).*

So we find translated in the KJV,  
 ‘opse de sabbatohn’= “Late in the Sabbath”;  
 ‘tehi epiphohskousehi’= “as it began to dawn towards”;  
 ‘mian (hehmeran) sabbatohn’= “the First Day of the week”.  
 Fine.... Then “*the Greek term*” ‘eis’= ?.... Then “*the Greek term*”  
 ‘eis’— according to Dr Walter, is not translated at all!

Or, Dr Walter’s alternative was, to translate “*the Greek term*” ‘eis’  
 and its accompanying Accusative, with the concept of “*into*”! Now,  
 Dr Walter, please explain the Greek grammar and syntax for doing  
 THAT? Matthew’s, isn’t Septuagint Greek! Matthew’s Greek, isn’t  
 using a Dative.

I quoted (transliterated) to you the text I’m using. You know as well I  
 do which it is. ‘Koineh’, ‘Hellenistic Greek’.

So far I have not referred to or used the Greek text for the words “tehi  
 epiphoskousehi” Participle-Noun which is the Dative Feminine  
 Singular Present Active from the Noun ‘epiphoskousas’ which is  
 from the Verb “*epiphosko*”, and it literally means “BEING IN THE  
 VERY BRIGHTNESS”— OF DAYLIGHT; i.e., “MID-  
 AFTERNOON”. Look at this Greek Noun with THIS meaning used  
 for as long as it was used up to and including the third century AD  
 with NO exceptions, once. (You can find that information or the best  
 part of it, here,

[http://www.biblestudents.co.za/books/Book%202.%20Resurrection.p  
 df](http://www.biblestudents.co.za/books/Book%202.%20Resurrection.pdf)

.....

I was in a hurry here and have said some things in an odd way. But  
 I'm sure you will get my point, which was in short a denial of the  
 opinion “as it began to dawn towards the First day” is supposed to  
 be translated from 'tehi epiphoskousehi' and not from 'eis mian  
 (hehmeran) sabbatohn'.

However, were “as it began to dawn towards the First Day of the week” translated from 'tehi epiphoskousehi', IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE— the fact that ‘tehi epiphoskousehi’ virtually does translate into “as it began to dawn towards .....”, confirms the supposed time of day, fell upon the current day “of-the-Sabbath-Day”- ‘sabbatohn’, “BEFORE” and “TOWARDS, the First Day of the week”. Then the two phrases are complementary just from another angle, so that the Dative functions as the Dative of Relation or Reference both ways, to “Sabbath’s” (Genitive) and, “towards the First Day” (Accusative). These factors by themselves indicate the Greek is not to be translated pleonastic— the same thing unnecessarily being repeated through the different phrases of ‘eis mian sabbatohn’ AND, ‘tehi epiphoskousehi’. Both phrases each has its own peculiar meaning, which must ALWAYS be expected to be as near to the literal meaning as possible. Therefore I say no, “as it began to dawn towards the First day of the week”, MUST and IS, correctly translated (in the KJV) from the LAST phrase, ‘eis mian (hehmeran) sabbatohn’. Whether the translators were so aware of the fact or not.

This last phrase IN ITSELF is an example of Matthew’s most economic use of words for their commonly known, ‘literal’ meaning and usage, which in the phrase ‘eis mian sabbatohn’ is elliptical of the concept, ‘day’— “the First DAY, of the week”. (OMITTING the word ‘day’ as such as most effective way to imply its presence and function within the phrase.) And this linguistic phenomenon of the Ellipsis shows Matthew would not have used the phrases “in the being mid-afternoon” and “towards the First Day of the week” pleonastic or superfluously by having supposed an identical meaning of both.

**DW:**

*Your statement above is factually wrong. It is not the “phrase” translated “dawn” but it is the Greek participle translated “dawn.”*

*Neither does the term epiphosko mean “being in the very brightness” but it consists of the preposition “epi” and “phosko” or literally “upon light” and most lexicographers translate it “dawn” or “to grow light.” It is used in a figurative sense as we use the word “dawn” when we say “it began to dawn upon him” or the idea of something coming upon you. Luke 23:54 it is used in the figurative sense as it was just before 6 pm when Jesus was buried and the Sabbath EVENING - period of darkness was coming upon them and yet Luke says the Sabbath “drew on” (epiphosko) meaning the Sabbath day was coming upon them - the sundown period - was coming upon them. Hence, it is obvious it does not mean “being in the very brightness” or “mid-afternoon” in Luke 23:54 but rather it was near sun down in the evening. Remember this time of year the sun sets earlier (march/april) in Israel.*

*However, as John Broadus, the Greek mentor of A.T. Robertson points out that Matthew 28:1 most likely means after the Sabbath passed and the dawn of the daylight hours of the first day of week was come they arrived at the tomb. He refers to the oriental expression “the gates would be closed at sunset and opened at dawn” to support this position.*

*DHK, It is true that the ultimate application of the fourth commandment is day in and day out worship for eternity. It is also true that PERSONALLY we should be in a state of worship every day of the week. However, it is equally true that there is a day of the week designated by the Scriptures as the “Lord's day” set apart for PUBLIC worship. Nothing makes that day more holy than any other day except for the Lord's designation as “the Lord's day.”*

*I believe that Hebrews 4:1-11 argues for a present “sabbath day*

*observance” for the people of God that is BETTER than the Jewish seventh day of the week Sabbath because it commemorates a GREATER work than original creation - the work of redemption and because it points forward to a BETTER created world than this present one (v. 11). The “he” in verse 9 and his finished work is compared to God's creative FINISHED work in Genesis 2:1-3 when there WAS NO SIN! The distinction is the first SINLESS work of God became condemned by sin, however the finished work of “him” who is later identified in verse 14 as our “Great High Priest” finished a work that REVERSED the first work of God which was SINLESS TO SINFUL whereas Calvary dealt with the SINFUL to usher in a SINLESS new creation (v. 11).*

*For this cause it is “the Lord's Day” and the best place to be “on” the Lord's Day is in God's House “in the Spirit.”*

*GE denies it but from Revelation 1:10 for the next three hundred years up until but BEFORE Constantine's Sunday law the universal practice of Christians was to observe the EIGHTH day, first day, Sunday, resurrection day as the “Lord's Day.”*

*It is the command of the Scriptures (Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; Heb. 4:9; Mark 16:9; 1 Cor. 16:1-2 as well as the practice of the early churches (Jn. 20:19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1-2).*

*How do we observe it? By going to the house of God giving our tithes, time and service according to the worship that is in Spirit and in truth = we will rejoice and be glad IN IT (Psa.118:24).*

**GE:**

**Re: DW,** “....the term *epiphosko* means “being in the very brightness” but it consists of the preposition “*epi*” and “*phosko*” or literally “upon light” ....” Exactly. Have I said something different? Yes, in the way I emphasized; but in nothing else. Because this combination of elements, Article, ‘*tehi*’ + Preposition ‘*epi* +

Substantive ‘phos’ + Participle ‘ous-- + Dative ‘--ehi’ is in every respect of it, as emphatic as can be. Its translation in the simplest way possible with “mid afternoon” cannot be improved on; it may only be described in more detail and emphatically, like I did, “being in the very brightness (with reference to “of the Sabbath’s)”. I have not translated one iota or tittle that is not in the meaning of the literal Greek.

If a person who didn’t know Christianity but had only a knowledge of Greek before Christianity, were given Mt28:1 from ‘opse’ to ‘ehlthen Mariam’ to translate into now-a-days English, he might have translated “*the term epiphosko*”, “*literally*”, “*upon light*” as you, Dr Walter say. Or more probably, “light upon”, or, “light on” or “onto” or “over”; but most likely, not “light on”, but “light IN”; “SHINING”, “IN shining of the Sabbath’s Day it being late in / on the Sabbath”.

That person would have had NO other precedent of the use or meaning of the term or group of akin terms of ‘epiphohskoh’ in all of Greek literature with the use or meaning of *after the Sabbath passed and the dawn of the daylight hours* NEXT MORNING! Dis a feit soos ‘n koei! Now in the light of these considerations, let us again look at what YOU – not GE! – further have to say....

“.....*the term epiphosko .... consists of the preposition “epi” and “phosko” or literally “upon light” and most lexicogophers [sic.] translate it “dawn” or “to grow light.”*“

“*To grow light*” is the direct opposite of ‘to GLOW LIGHT’, which is the ONLY, “*literally*” possible ‘*translation*’ of “BEING / IN THE being / in the VERY being LIGHT / DAY / DAYLIGHT”.

Then must it always be kept in mind the Preposition ‘epi’ has that specific connotation of something “inclining towards” (like in ‘episxeroh’- ‘to time’ something ‘by degrees’), besides its emphatic meaning of “right IN” / “in the EPI-CENTRE” of something, and

besides its ‘descending’ connotation like in being “struck by lightning”- ‘episkehptoh’.

Therefore “epiphohskoh” is the DIRECT OPPOSITE of ‘episkoteoh’- ‘to throw darkness / shadow over’. So ‘epiphohskoh’ is not while midnight darkness blankets the earth or while the shadow of night retreats before sunrise— is not “*GROW light*”— but is “to throw light over / upon”— “to SHINE LIGHT / DAYLIGHT”, and in our context, to “shine light in its fullness of Sabbath’s mid-afternoon”. **Contrast** “light shining up from the darkness into your hearts” in 2Cor4:6, ‘ek skotous phohs lampsei en kardiais’.

THAT, is what ‘epiphohskousehi’ in Mt28:1 “*literally*” means, forget that silly excuse for “*literally*” of scholasticism, “.....*the term epiphosko .... is used in a figurative sense as we use the word “dawn” ....*” as in before sunrise dawn. .... “*literally*’ “*figurative*”? To use your words, Dr Walter, “*What a joke!*”

But look at your own ‘explanation’, Dr Walter. You say, “*as we use the word “dawn” when we say “it began to dawn upon him” or the idea of something coming upon you*” .... dawn ON him .... as when we say the BRIGHT idea coming OVER you....? Indeed, “.....*the term epiphosko .... consists of the preposition “epi” and “phosko” or literally “upon light” or rather “light upon” like that ‘BRIGHT idea’!*”

So what *most lexicographers* “*translate*” in the first place must carefully be concluded from to make sure one does not conclude wrongly from them; and in the second place must not be taken for granted for correct— whoever they are; however great they are.

**DW:**

*Luke 23:54 it (the term epiphosko) is used in the figurative sense as it was just before 6 pm when Jesus was buried and the Sabbath EVENING - period of darkness was coming upon them and yet Luke says the Sabbath “drew on” (epiphosko) meaning the Sabbath day was coming upon them - the sundown period - was coming upon them.*

**GE:**

Now what on earth could have brought about the change? I mean – to above – in “*Matthew 28:1 ...the term epiphosko ...is used in the figurative sense as ...we use the word “dawn” when we say’, “3-4 am” before sunrise; here – “in Luke 23:54 ...it was near sun down in the evening.”*

‘Epiphoskoh’ isn’t used figuratively in Matthew or Luke. But it is used figuratively in Ephesians 5:14. O what wonderful Scriptures!

“ARISE (‘anásta’ < ‘aná’ ‘up’ + ‘theoh’ - ‘set up’)

out (from under) (‘ek’)

the dead (as the sun would rise out and up from the night’s darkness), and Christ will SHINE (from above) ON and OVER (‘epiphausei’) you”!

“Light shining over and upon even IN you” EMPHATICALLY! That is, because of ‘epi’+‘phohs’+‘ei’ the 99% exact same constituent parts of the 99% same word used in Mt28:1— “Mid-afternoon Sabbath’s”!

**DW:**

*Hence, it is obvious it does not mean “being in the very brightness” or “mid-afternoon” in Luke 23:54 but rather it was near sun down in the evening. Remember this time of year the sun sets earlier (march/april) in Israel.*

**GE:**

You are splitting hair from my Dutchman uncle’s bald head. “*In Luke*

23:54" being "*near sun down in the evening*" is nothing than "being in the very brightness" or "mid-afternoon" winter or summer in Israel.

**BW:**

*The OT reports that on at least one occasion the sun stood still for half a day. If so, then half of the first day of the week is not on the first day of the week but we don't know which half.*

**GE:**

Does the OT (I think there were two occasions) report that the sun set twice and came up twice during that one and a half day long one day?

**DW:**

*There is a vast difference between something beginning to dawn upon your mind and a "bright idea." The former is GRADUAL whereas the latter is FULLY DEVELOPED. to "grow light" is GRADUALLY GETTING LIGHTER but "FULL LIGHT" is something far different.*

*I believe Dr. Broadus is correct here when the overall context is considered with his oriental illustration that it refers to the following morning from Sabbath evening to Sunday morning light dawning.*

**GE:**

DW, kindly ponder your own statement here!

Would I be lying if I said,

"Sabbath's fullness of day,

Sabbath's MID-AFTERNOON it being "**FULL LIGHT**" in day ('tehi epiphoskousehi')

as it began to dawn towards the First Day of the week" ('eis mian sabbatohn')?

Where is the idea of "GRADUALLY GETTING LIGHTER"? The idea cannot be accommodated ANYWHERE or in ANY WAY! But BOTH the idea of "Sabbath's MID-AFTERNOON it being "**FULL LIGHT**" in day" AND, "*gradually DECLINING*

*daylight*” (both factors from 'tehi epiphoskousehi') are perfectly accommodated!

That is what my sinner's conscience tells me and that is what I have been contending, all the while.

**DW:**

*It is true that the ultimate application of the fourth commandment is day in and day out worship for eternity. It is also true that PERSONALLY we should be in a state of worship every day of the week. However, it is equally true that there is a day of the week designated by the Scriptures as the “Lord's day” set apart for PUBLIC worship. Nothing makes that day more holy than any other day except for the Lord's designation as “the Lord's day.”*

*I believe that Hebrews 4:1-11 argues for a present “sabbath day observance” for the people of God that is BETTER than the Jewish seventh day of the week Sabbath because it commemorates a GREATER work than original creation - the work of redemption and because it points forward to a BETTER created world than this present one (v. 11). The “he” in verse 9 and his finished work is compared to God's creative FINISHED work in Genesis 2:1-3 when there WAS NO SIN! The distinction is the first SINLESS work of God became condemned by sin, however the finished work of “him” who is later identified in verse 14 as our “Great High Priest” finished a work that REVERSED the first work of God which was SINLESS TO SINFUL whereas Calvary dealt with the SINFUL to usher in a SINLESS new creation (v. 11).*

*For this cause it is “the Lord's Day” and the best place to be “on” the Lord's Day is in God's House “in the Spirit.”*

*GE denies it but from Revelation 1:10 for the next three hundred years up until but BEFORE Constantine's Sunday law the universal*

*practice of Christians was to observe the EIGHTH day, first day, Sunday, resurrection day as the “Lord's Day.”*

*It is the command of the Scriptures (Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; Heb. 4:9; Mark 16:9; 1 Cor. 16:1-2 as well as the practice of the early churches (Jn. 20:19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1-2).*

*How do we observe it? By going to the house of God giving our tithes, time and service according to the worship that is in Spirit and in truth = we will rejoice and be glad IN IT (Psa.118:24).*

**GE:**

There are large books waiting to be written on what you say; here is not the place for it.

**DW:**

*“Luke 23:54 it is used in the figurative sense as it was just before 6 pm when Jesus was buried and the Sabbath EVENING - period of darkness was coming upon them and yet Luke says the Sabbath “drew on” (epiphosko) meaning the Sabbath day was coming upon them - the sundown period - was coming upon them.”*

**GE:**

DHK, you asked why it is important when I said it is tremendously important to note

“that this particular ‘stage’ of day-time has BEGUN, and did not END”, and that “It was “In / On the Sabbath late, Sabbath’s MID-afternoon”, with the REST of the afternoon – three solid hours of it – REMAINING before end of day, sunset”.

Well here is, why! Here is just what I anticipated! Because, says DW — just as I said he would —

*“Luke 23:54...is used in the figurative sense as it was just before 6 pm when Jesus was buried and the Sabbath EVENING - period of*

*darkness was coming upon them and yet Luke says the Sabbath “drew on” (epiphosko) meaning the Sabbath day was coming upon them - the sundown period - was coming upon them”*— which ‘conclusion’ of his DW of course applies to Mt28:1.

(I’m not now referring to DW’s observation ‘epiphoskoh’ in “*Luke 23:54...is used in the figurative sense*”. I have already shown how meaningless and contradictory remark that was.) I’m referring to my perception of the tendency people presume the time of day indicated with ‘epiphoskoh’ is ‘sundown’ right at the periphery of the day and that therefore the Resurrection must have occurred on the First Day.

This is exactly what Dr Walter is doing, guising, “(epiphosko) *Luke 23:54...is used in the figurative sense as it was just before 6 pm when Jesus was buried and the Sabbath EVENING - period of darkness was coming upon them and yet Luke says the Sabbath “drew on” (epiphosko) meaning the Sabbath day was coming upon them - the sundown period - was coming upon them”*.”

Now all this harangue of DW’s is turned upon himself, in that to say that “tehi epiphoskousehi’ in Matthew or Luke has the “sense” of “....before 6 pm”,  
of “when Jesus was buried”,  
of “the Sabbath EVENING - period of darkness was coming”,  
of “drew on”,  
of “meaning the Sabbath day was coming .... the sundown period - was coming” —  
.... means but that it was “....before 6 pm” = “towards the First Day”;  
means but that Jesus was buried and resurrected, BEFORE “the EVENING”,  
means but, BEFORE the next “day”,  
means but BEFORE the after-”sundown period”, and  
means but that “the EVENING”, the next “day”, the after-”sundown period”, was yet, and was still, “coming”— and was still, and was yet, NOT yet or already, “upon them”!

All this means but that neither of Matthew or Luke said, or meant, or made innuendo, that on the Friday Preparation “*the Sabbath*”, or on the Sabbath, the First Day of the week was in fact “*upon them*”— which to assert is open disclaiming of these Scriptures.

There now you and everyone can see, DHK, ‘WHY’ it was so important to keep reckoning of the TRUTH that this particular ‘stage’ of day-time INDICATED WITH ‘epiphohskousehi’ - “MID-AFTERNOON”, had BEGUN, and did not END, and that “It was IN / ON the Sabbath late, Sabbath’s MID-AFTERNOON”, with the REST of the afternoon – three solid hours of it – REMAINING before end of day sunset, and NOT, with “*the EVENING*”, or the next “*day*”, or the after-”*sundown period*”, “*upon them*”!

That ‘tehi epiphohskousehi’ in Matthew or ‘epephohsken’ in Luke means “*the EVENING*”, or the next “*day*”, or the after-”*sundown period*”, is “*upon*” someone, is a fallacy.

**But, how ironic for the Sunday-resurrectionist is it, the nearest his contention “*the Greek term epiphosko*” means Sunday MORNING (before “*the fourth watch 3-4 am*”), could get the Resurrection to Sunday “*early (proii)*” before “*the fourth watch 3-4 am*”, was – ostensibly – “*before 6 pm*” or “*sundown period*”. Nine— in reality 12 to 15 hours, off target!**

**DW:**

*I believe Dr. Broadus is correct here when the overall context is considered with his oriental illustration that it refers to the following morning from Sabbath evening to Sunday morning light dawning.*

**GE:**

If this is so --- and I believe you it is --- then Dr A.T. Robertson deserves the more respect and acknowledgement for having taken stand directly the opposite of his mentor's.

However, I'm very sorry, but I very much doubt your interpretation of Broadus, Dr Walter! Again you do not give the statement by Broadus in full quote or in "*the overall context*". I think it says more or less the opposite of what you are contending, Dr Walter. I shall not be surprised in the least if Broadus meant the first clause of his statement "the gates would be closed at sunset" as representing the meaning of "the term epiphosko"— in contradistinction to the concept contained in the second clause of his statement, "and opened at dawn".

I may be wrong of course. I shall wait for your bringing us his full statement, please, to see....

**DHK:**

*Re: GE:, "And if we see the Sabbath through the life of Christ and The Body of Christ's Own, we have seen all possible Christian Law. Moreover if we see it in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, we shall be without excuse!"*

*The only way that we see the Sabbath through Christ is figuratively."*

**GE:**

Do you see the Law '*only figuratively through Christ*'?

Are you a Jesus revolutionist? Do you see Christ's resurrection "*only figuratively*"? I know you don't. I know you believe and you "say Christ came in the flesh" from the dead and from the grave, 'literally'. (Or you aren't a Christian at all but "is antichrist".) Therefore there is no basis on which to aver the DAY of Christ's resurrection, "Sabbath's" Mt28:1 was not 'literally' "mid-afternoon" as well when Christ rose from the dead, and "gave them rest ... so that therefore indeed there remains for the People of God keeping of the Sabbath Day."

The only way the New Testament sees the Sabbath is through the availing of “Jesus”, who “had given them rest”— ‘literally’ through resurrection from the dead and the grave, “Sabbath’s” --- as God willed it, executed, and “perfected”, “FINISHED” HIS will from “before the foundation of the world” and WITH the foundation of the world in Christ and through Christ.

**DHK:**

*“We are to enter into His rest. He is our Sabbath. He gives us rest. We are commanded to enter into His rest, and that is not a day. It is because of His death and Resurrection that we can have this rest in Him.”*

**GE:**

Truly “*We are to enter into His rest*”; but not because “*He is our Sabbath*”, but because “*He gives us rest*” and because “*He is our ... rest*”.

And yes, hear yourself saying it: “*We are commanded to enter into His rest, and that is not a day.*” “**NOT A DAY**”— NOT “*our Sabbath*”! Remember your own way to explain your belief about baptism, DHK! With the only difference the Sabbath is not an Apostolic prerogative but the direct injunction through the act and example of Christ by having risen “Sabbath’s”— thus having “*fulfilled the law*” of the “Sabbath” for the Body of Christ’s Own the Church of all time and times— not ‘figuratively’, but ‘literally’. I say again, as ‘literal’ as his Resurrection was ‘literal’. You cannot make the one ‘figurative’ and the other ‘literal’.

So, it is absolutely true what you say, “*It is because of His death and Resurrection that we can have this rest in Him.*” JUST AS TRUE it follows, is it to learn from God’s act and living example through Jesus Christ “*It is because of His death and Resurrection that we can have this rest in Him*”, that it serves unto our **LAW**: “**THAT**

**THEREFORE**, there remains valid keeping of the Sabbath Day for the People of God.” For us, the Christians.

Nothing about all this is ‘figurative’ any more; Christ who had fulfilled the figure, fulfilled the Law and fulfilled it literally and therefore, thereby and therein, became our Law in its fullest grandeur in the reality of his own Being.

“His Name is Innermost Sanctuary” of the full fellowship (Schilder) of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, having “RESTED-UP”, “Sabbath’s”! Cf. Is57:15 and Ex31:17, ‘literally’. In both Scriptures it is the one and same event of “The Truth of Thy Salvation ... in an acceptable day o God, in the MULTITUDE OF THY MERCIES!” Ps69:13. In both Scriptures it is Jesus’ “prayer” answered both ‘figuratively’ and ‘literally’.

**DHK:**

*Re: GE, “But then on top of it all, God disposed that we as Christians DO find the Sabbath Commandment as it were re-enacted in the New Testament. And that also I have shown over and over on also this forum, BaptistBoard.” And this is where I challenge you. Show me from Scripture where there is any command for the believer to keep the Sabbath. I don't believe you can. There is no such command. Where is the Sabbath Command, as you call it.*

**GE:**

Just above, shown.

And there are many more Commands audible to the ear that God “dug”, as the Psalmist says.

But let’s let go a bit....

Do you agree to Isaiah being called the Gospel in the Old Testament? Why therefore could Is58 not be ‘interpreted’ as a prophecy of Jesus Christ? I believe that is the prophecy’s FIRST meaning and

application in no way secondary. See God’s Sabbath Commandment in there? See Jesus’ “delight in the Sabbath” in there? BUT NOT HIS RESURRECTION IN THERE? Astonishing! Unbelievable!

And so I could go on illustrating with thoroughly NEW Testament Scriptures from the Old. Then we find THESE Scriptures in the New Testament “*fulfilled*” by Christ especially in and with and through his resurrection from the dead, but DHK can’t see the Sabbath Commandment repeated in the New Testament? Amazing!

Will you admit the Genesis story in essence is the Gospel of Jesus Christ “*fulfilled*” under the New Covenant of Grace? Will you admit the same as pertains the Exodus story of the LORD’S Passover? Or the redemption from the idolatrous tyranny under queen Ataliah— on the Sabbath Day? Or the cleansing of the Sanctuary during the reign of Jehoiada from “the filth Agas brought into the temple”, “finished”, on the Sabbath Day? “Behold, the King’s Son shall reign, as the LORD hath said of the Son\* of David! And this is the thing that YE ... in the HOUSE of God (the Church) ... shall do ... entering on the SABBATH...”? Are these not New Testament Scriptures “*fulfilled*” by Christ in his Resurrection?

If not, what for then were the Gospels ever written full of Sabbath’s events and stories by a Church half a century after the events and stories? But DHK does not see a Sabbath-Command because he insists on his own sort of ‘command’ which is that of the Jewish scribes and leaders, ‘engraved in stone’ ‘in letters’— and that, in the NEW Testament?! To me, it sounds much like the Seventh-day Adventists think and argue....

**DHK:**

*Re: GE: "Then lastly, I have always believed the Christian believes the WHOLE Bible for God's Word, and that the Old Testament : is SINCE JESUS CHRIST : as valid as ever for the People of God."*

*Are you consistent with the law then?*

**GE:**

Found in Christ, Yes! (DHK: "Are you reborn?")

**DHK:**

*Do you keep the Levitical diet?*

**GE:**

Through Christ, I did. (Christ: "My meat is to do the will of my Father.")

**DHK:**

*Do you wear only one type of clothing--not wearing divers clothing.*

**GE:**

Clothed with the righteousness of Jesus Christ, I do; and wear the only clothing of righteousness which is "of God", "without the Law".  
Ro3:21.

DHK, the trouble with you is you are 'figurative' when you should regard the Law 'literally', and 'literal' when you should regard the Law 'figuratively'.

**DHK:**

*When keeping the Sabbath do you travel within a Sabbath day's distance 5/8 of a mile and no more.*

**GE:**

In Christ I travel across the heights of the earth on the Sabbath Day, and am exalted to above every name that is named at the right hand of

God in heavenly places ON THE SABBATH DAY into eternity.

**DHK:**

*Do you prepare all your food the day before and do absolutely no cooking on the Sabbath, not even to make a cup of coffee or tea?*

**GE:**

“Because Christ triumphed in it” (having been raised from the dead) and I “having been co-raised with Him”, the Word tells me, “THEREFORE do not you let yourselves be judged with regard to eating and drinking, whether of occasional month’s or of perpetual Sabbaths’ Feast ... holding the Head, Christ ... having nourishment ministered, growing with the growth of God. ... If ye be dead with Christ ... Christ is all in all ... put on therefore ... BOWLS OF MERCIES ... let the peace of God rule in your HEART ... and the WORD of Christ dwell IN YOU, RICHLY.” Christ shall be my food and drink, all ready and prepared and ‘decadent’ so “rich”, for me as for his Body the Church, **prepared and served** specifically as according to the Old Testament Law, **on the Sabbath Day!**

**DHK:**

*Do you really keep the Sabbath as it should be kept?*

**GE:**

I sincerely regret I do not. I hope in that new day to, though.

**DHK:**

*Re: GE, “No wonder therefore that when inter alia the writer of Hebrews wants to make this very point, he quotes from the Old Testament on the same plane and Authority as the Word of Jesus Christ in chapter 4.”*

*He makes a parallel between the OT and the NT. He gives no command to keep the Sabbath.*

**GE:**

Exactly, my friend in Christ; exactly!

**DHK:**

*Whether the resurrection happened on the Sabbath or the first day of the week (Sunday), as the Bible says it did ...*

**GE:**

... which is of course the real point “*challenged*” here on this thread, for everyone to read and observe for himself and his own conscience.

**DHK:**

*Whether the resurrection happened on the Sabbath or the first day of the week (Sunday) ..... should make no difference.*

**GE:**

Then why enter into debate over it? It does make a difference, the difference between obedience and disobedience to God’s Law.

**DHK:**

*There is still no command to worship on the Sabbath, or any other day for that matter.*

**GE:**

DHK is headstrong. He thinks it’s a matter of his own choice, see.

**DHK:**

*Whether the resurrection happened on the Sabbath or the first day of the week (Sunday) ..... should make no difference. There is still no command to worship on the Sabbath, or any other day for that matter. The early disciples did it in commemoration of the Resurrection...*

**GE:**

Why would “*the early disciples ... commemorate ...the Resurrection*” if it “*should make no difference*”? You must be consistent DHK. It did

make a difference, and that was why the early disciples commemorated the Resurrection on the specific day of the week on which the resurrection actually occurred. And that constituted to the disciples the LAW which commands the day of the commemoration of Jesus' resurrection should be observed and kept holy. That in itself; that in itself which DHK closes his eyes for to see. And that's why the Church today has tried to change the total perception of which day of the week the Resurrection occurred upon. (Through mass miss-information, inter alia by miss-translation of the Scriptures..... like.....) that

*“the early disciples ..... believed the first day of the week”* was the day on which *“the resurrection happened”*.

**DHK:**

*That is made clear in Acts 20:7 where it says the first day of the week, in opposition to “Sabbath.”*

**GE:**

Which only shows how clever you can steer away from the actual issue. And which claim I often on this Board have proved untrue.

**DHK:**

*Re: GE, “If I were a ‘Bible-skeptic’ or and atheist I today would have been respected and famous because of my critique on Christian Sunday observance; now that I am a fellow-believer I am ignored and laughed at up the sleeve.”*

*We are commanded not to think too highly of ourselves.*

**GE:**

This is what others think or might think of me; not I of myself. And it is not thinking high of; it is thinking very low of me.

In any case, we are commanded “not to think above what is written”.

**PMH:**

*I stumbled upon this forum while looking for an answer to my question of how “after eight days” beginning with a Sunday brings one back to Sunday. It has always struck me as being illogical. If that is the Greek way of counting then that explains much to me on why the Greeks are broke.*

*Anyway, I read through every single post from the original thread about the fourth commandment started by Dr. Walter through this thread that sprang from it (Whew!). I learned a thing or two while reading through the posts but I came across a couple of terms I am hoping somebody can explain to me. One term is “COG Mob” and the other is “Arians”. What does COG Mob mean? Is this a church or group that promotes some sort of social anarchy? Are they similar to Westboro Baptist Church? The other term was “Arians”. I know about the original Arianism that developed from Arius of Alexandria but to whom does it apply today?*

*Any help would be appreciated.*

**GE:**

PMH, it was I - GE - who used those 'names'.

You would have read somewhere on this thread I said I only respect the religion of the Christian man (or words to the effect). That means I do NOT respect any 'religion' per se. I won't even say 'any OTHER religion than the Christian Faith' because that might sound like I sort the Christian Faith under all 'religion'. I shall deride and insult as hard as I can, any and all 'religion' because I am a Christian in the world we are living in, in this day our day.

Now what makes a person a Christian for me – do with it what you like; it's none of my business – what makes a person a Christian is that he believes in his heart and confesses with his mouth that Jesus Christ is God, was God, and shall be God for ever as the Father is

God and as the Holy Spirit is God. (Like Athanasius' Confession confesses.) In other words, what makes a person a Christian is that he believes the 'Trinity' and the worship of God Tri-Una makes of someone a Christian and a Believer, first and foremost.

Then whenever someone boasts he is a Christian Believer but DENIES Jesus is God HE IS A LIAR AND NO DIFFERENT THAN ISLAM, and Arius the first false Christian who started the heresy. Mohammed did not begin this thing about 'Allah', Arius did! Mohammed only gave the god of Arius, the name of 'Allah'.

The Church of God group of cults today carried on with Arius' heresy, and what is more unfortunate, is, they also are carrying on his legalist and perverse Seventh Day Sabbath belief.

Most unfortunate however, is that this same perverse Sabbath-doctrine of Arius and the COG 'Mob' as I call them, was taken over by certainly the monopoly-holding 'Church' on the Seventh Day Sabbath, the Seventh-day Adventists who say they are Jews (as John explained them in Revelation) but are not Jews—the 'Nicolaitanes' "which thing God HATES"! What a PERFECT definition of the Seventh-day Adventist 'Church'; absolutely fitting!

**PMH:**

*Thanks for the reply.*

*I am not sure I understood you correctly. Are you saying there are churches out there that use the name "Church of God" and deny Jesus is God? Do they believe He did not always exist but was created? I googled for some names but could not find any. Could you supply me a couple of names so I can research them?*

*I was also not aware of a "perverse Sabbath-doctrine" held by Arius. I will have to read up on it.*

**L4D:**

*The only 'Church of God' that may fall into this heresy would be the 'Worldwide Church of God' and that being the folks that still follow Armstrongism. Part of the 'Church of God' has swung into closer alignment with orthodox Christian belief on the trinity.*

*I don't know of any of the other 'Church of God' synods that deny the deity of Christ.*

**GE:**

Alright; there may be thousands of them. I have found as many exponents of the 'three days and three nights', as many sects among them. I have had to do with them MANY times as can be seen in MANY debates between myself and them, and I have not found any who believe the Eternal Divinity of Jesus Christ. The Armstrongites have their die-hards, and their belief about Jesus' Divinity differs from the newer sects in that they believed and still believe Jesus BECAME God, just like the saved will BECOME God. They speak of the 'God-family' that one day will include all the saved.

Some shoot-offs or off-shoots may have rejected this Armstrong viewpoint; but I still have to find a 'church' of them that believes Jesus' eternal Divinity ('Deity'). Also the lot who maintain their weird view about the three days and three nights equals 72 hours and a Wednesday Crucifixion, are very strong on Jesus' inferior and subjected, human status. I am every day in conflict with them in South Africa on several Afrikaans forums, and assure you, the conflict is not nice. Please note that I do NOT enter into debate with these people or anyone else about God's Being, ever! And that precisely is what these people find MOST INSULTING about me. And I, so PREFER it, thanks.

The group refers to itself on the internet with the letters 'cog' in just about every webpage of theirs, and there are plenty! They are strong on the internet.

They have become very subtle with their denial of Jesus' Divinity because they are clever enough to have seen how their agenda repels any sane Christian. (I am also speaking from personal experience.) Be warned if you care about the Divinity of our Lord Jesus! They have not given in, in the least; they are DENIERS of God, the God of the Christian. And they are just another name for Islam with one difference, that they insult the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your God in chorus with the Jews rather than with Islam through the veneration of the Sixth Day of the week.

**PMH:**

*When you say, "I have not found any who believe the Eternal Divinity of Jesus Christ", what do you mean? Is this related to your statement, "they believed and still believe Jesus BECAME God"? Does that mean some of these folks believe Jesus was created and did not always exist? I wish I knew Afrikaans so I could read your debates with them. I am sure it is pretty lively stuff.*

*I wrote earlier that Worldwide Church of God is now Grace Communion Church. That was incorrect, they are actually named Grace Communion International.*

**GE:**

As many variations on the 'three days'-theme, 'Yehashua'-variations do they have, and more. As many a-divine arguments as spellings of Jesus' Name. In a word, their teaching is so confused and corrupt it cannot be explained by anyone of them, what by someone outside. But they all come down to Jesus is not God as the Father is God. They also deny the Holy Spirit is a Person of the God-Head, God, the Father, the Son AND the Holy Spirit.

But if you want to see how ugly things can get, check this conversation here on BB,

<http://www.biblestudents.co.za/docs/...on%20Finch.htm>

Paul R. Finch's last lines to me were these,

*“Your entire case is so weak, it should be dismissed and entered into the realm of fiction. It has no basis in fact, grammar, historical precedent, nor just plain logic. To believe such a scenario doesn't take spiritual insight, nor expert grammar, but just plain gullibility. As I said before, its like the story of the Emperor's new clothes. Is the fabric real, or is it just wishful thinking? Personally, I see right through it.*

*Quoting Gerhard: “To say “the word “JESUS” should be translated Joshua”, would mean to rob THIS “Jesus Christ to whom be glory for ever” of both his rest and glory. Josua did NOT give the People of God, the rest that is God’s. For “his rest” is God’s “glory”, and God’s glory is “his rest”. God’s Glory is the Son “As He hath OBTAINED a more excellent NAME by inheritance.” God declared Christ Son and Inheritor, “Thou art my Son, THIS DAY (when He raised Him from the dead) have I begotten Thee.” 1:4-6.”*

*This entire post is like listening to a mad man, someone on drugs. It is total psycho-babel in the extreme. After reading Gerhard, one still never knows what he really thinks. But here's the bottom line. The context is about Joshua leading the Israelites into Canaan and the fact the he did not give them the spiritual rest back then, because if he did, then why should we look forward to a millennial rest in the future? Therefore, there does remain a sabbatismos for the people of God in the future, the millennial Sabbath that is to come.*

*Now, If Gerhard is saying that Jesus (a name that was given to him at his birth [Luke 1:31], who came into existence in the time of Ceasar Augustus [Luke 2:1]) lead the Israelites into the promised land back in Joshua's day, then there is nothing here for me to discuss any further. A pre-existing Jesus is a doctrine of demons and I will not have any part of it!”*

I did not answer, or shall.

**PMH:**

*Wow! That is a stunning statement by Mr. Finch.*

*I see that Mr. Finch has a website called [thepassoverpapers.com](http://thepassoverpapers.com). He has the following about himself on the site:*

*Quote: Mr. Paul R. Finch is an independent researcher residing in central Florida. He was once a member of the Worldwide Church of God during the time when many of these issues were being brought up in the 1970's. Mr. Finch wrote his first paper on the Passover in 1975, and has been accumulating data on the subject ever since. As an insider, his background well suits him to deal with this ever complex subject from the perspective of one who has witnessed first hand one of the biggest controversies in all of Christianity.*

*As far as I can tell though, he is not an active member of any church of God. I came across one site stating that Mr. Finch had dedicated one of his books to Ernest Martin of Associates for Scriptural Knowledge. I went to the website for Associates for Scriptural Knowledge and sure enough, Mr. Martin claimed that Jesus was created. Like Mr. Finch, Mr. Martin was a former member of the Worldwide Church of God and it appears that he was not a member of any church of God when he died in 2002.*

*I have visited several Church of God websites in that past day or so and as far as I could tell, they all claim the eternal existence of Jesus Christ and none of them claim he was created. I copied the following statement from one site that seems to be common among the ones I have been to:*

*Quote: We believe in one God, the Father, eternally existing, who is a Spirit, a personal Being of supreme intelligence, knowledge, love, justice, power and authority. He, through Jesus Christ, is the Creator of the heavens and the earth and all that is in them. He is the Source of life and the One for whom human life exists. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, who is the Word and who has*

*eternally existed. We believe that He is the Messiah, the Christ, the divine Son of the living God, conceived of the Holy Spirit, born in human flesh of the virgin Mary. We believe that it is by Him that God created all things, and that without Him was not anything made that was made. We believe in the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of God and of Christ. The Holy Spirit is the power of God and the Spirit of life eternal (2 Timothy 1:7; Ephesians 4:6; 1 Corinthians 8:6; John 1:1-4; Colossians 1:16).*

*At this point I can see why Mr. Martin and Mr. Finch are former members. Their views appear to be incompatible with the Churches of God that I have been to so far.*

*I will read the info at the link you provided. That should keep me busy for a while!*

**GE:**

PHM, don't be fooled, young man! Am I right you're still young? I am sure you are still very young, because you do not distinguish the subtlety in the quote above.

You will not see that they say that Jesus is God, or that the Holy Spirit is a person in and of the God-Head the Trinity, God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Now place before ANY of these people the straight and simple question, Is Jesus God? You will get no answer or some vague evasion of the question.

Place before these people the Confession of Athanasius, and they will get red with anger, and will wipe that Confession from the table. To them it is blasphemy. Is Athanasius' Confession the Truth for you PHM?, then I shall rejoice with you in Christ our Lord and, GOD! But they, will throw you out of their congregation if you already got in, and will slam the door in your face if you have not.

I once visited an assembly of theirs; they did not know who I was, asked a casual question or two which directly had bearing on the 'issue' of Jesus' Divinity. When the 'pastor' began his 'sermon', he said, I prepared my sermon for today ... (I don't remember what it was) but because we have our visitor for the first time today, I shall speak on the being of our Lord Jesus Christ at this time. He then proceeded with about a two hour long reading from a standard 'study' of theirs, the whole thing their DENIAL of Jesus' Divinity. Text upon text upon text .... I had to be polite, but till this day blame myself for having been too cowardly to leave there and then.

They say, “We believe in one God, the Father, eternally existing, who is a Spirit, a personal Being of supreme intelligence, knowledge, love, justice, power and authority.” They mean, Only the Father is God and the Almighty; neither the Son or the Holy Spirit is.

They say, “We believe in one God, the Father .... He, through Jesus Christ, is the Creator ...” They mean The Father only is the Creator, not the Son; the Son was only the Mediator through whom the Father created.

They say, “Christ, .... who is the Word and who has eternally existed.” They mean, 'the Word' pre-existed; not Jesus Christ. .... And so on.

Now I invite ANY of these people under whatever 'name' of a church they may be known or prefer to be known, to deny what I am saying here about them --- PMH, let them know what I am telling you here; let them come tell me I am lying about them. Please do!

**The tragedy further is, churches of people like these with dogmas like these, act the guardians of the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your God.**

I have MUCH better things to keep me busy with than debunking and profaning the deceit and vanities of these arch-deceivers.  
 What happened to the subject of this thread, Matthew 28:1?!

PS,

Please correct this mistake somewhere in the above referred web page, “Crucified on Friday risen on Sunday also fails ....” It must be “Crucified on Friday raised on Sunday also fails”

**PMH:**

*Sorry, I didn't mean to take the thread off track. I am in the process of reading your lengthy discussion with Paul R. Finch covering the chronology of the crucifixion that will no doubt cover Matthew 28:1.*

*It's just that as I was reading through the posts I kept coming across derogatory remarks directed at a group or groups labeled COG Mob and/or Arians. I wanted to know who they were and what they did to garner contempt.*

*Actually I am not young - just ignorant. Only recently have I decided to put 1 Thessalonians 5:21 into practice.*

**GE:**

PMH, I can now see that you are not young, but are a man who got wise with age.

I apologise for having created the impression I implied you for having taken the thread off track. I should rather blame myself. You certainly are more mature than I am. Have had this problem with myself of impatience and unreasonableness all my life and seems I'll never overcome it. Thank God He had forgiven all my sins unconditionally. I just keep on harming my own cause and which I believe God's, and I KNOW it!

“HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD!” God bless!

Originally Posted by **Gerhard Ebersoehn**

If this is so --- and I believe you it is --- then Dr A.T. Robertson deserves the more respect and acknowledgement for having taken stand directly the opposite of his mentor's.

However, I'm very sorry, but I very much doubt your interpretation of Broadus, Dr Walter! Again you do not give the statement by Broadus in full quote or in "*the overall context*". I think it says more or less the opposite of what you are contending, Dr Walter. I shall not be surprised in the least if Broadus meant the first clause of his statement "*the gates would be closed at sunset*" as representing the meaning of "*the term epiphosko*"— in contradistinction to the concept contained in the second clause of his statement, "*and opened at dawn*".

I may be wrong of course. I shall wait for your bringing us his full statement, please, to see....

**GE:**

**Post repeated here as a courteous reminder of my request....**

6 August 2010