

# DAY OF THE CRUCIFIXION AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

BY  
URIAH SMITH

Reprinted by [www.acts321.org](http://www.acts321.org)

## HOW LONG DID CHRIST LIE IN THE GRAVE?

THE QUESTIONS, On what day was Christ crucified? how long did he lie in the grave? and on what day did he rise from the dead? are questions which naturally invite the interest and study of every Christian student. They are questions which have an intimate relation to other subjects, and upon which it is therefore important that correct views be entertained. It is a cause of regret that sentiments are being advanced upon these points, and seemingly promulgated with especial activity at the present time, which are not only untrue in themselves, but calculated to work immense mischief to the Sabbath cause.

The views to which we refer are, 1. That Christ must lie in the grave seventy-two full hours, because it is said that he was to be "in the heart of the earth three days and three nights;" and 2. That he was consequently buried at the close of the day on Wednesday, and rose at the close of the day on the Sabbath, or just before the first day of the week commenced.

Against this position we present three indictments:-

1. It is founded on unwarranted assumption.
2. It is calculated to damage, rather than help, the Sabbath cause.
3. It is contrary to the Scriptures.

1. It is founded on assumption. The text to which appeal is first made is the one solitary declaration found in Matt.12:40. "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The statement in Jonah, to which allusion is here made, is simply this: "And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights." Jonah 1:17

How does this prove that the Saviour was to lie in the grave for seventy-two hours? "Why," it is answered, "the expression, 'three days and three nights,' means just seventy-two hours, no more, no less; for as one day and one night embrace twenty-four hours, three days and three nights would be three times twenty-four hours, that is, seventy-two hours; and, secondly, the expression, 'the heart of the earth,' where the Saviour was to be three days and three nights, means the grave. Therefore Christ was to lie in the grave seventy-two hours."

## THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS.

In reference to the first part of this answer we inquire, Where is the proof that the expression, "three days and three nights," means just seventy-two hours, and never any less? The response is, "That is what any one would understand by it at the present time." Yes, but what we understand by it now, has nothing to do with the matter. The question is, What did *they* understand by it, by whom the New Testament was written? In what sense did they use it? What was the *usus loquendi* of that age? If we can ascertain this, we can tell what meaning we must

give the expression in the New Testament, however much the sense in which it is used may have changed between that time and ours.

We easily find testimony to show that the expressions, "three days," "after three days," "three days, night or day," were used by the writers of the Bible as expressions not always signifying a period beginning with the first minute of the first day, and reaching to the last minute of the third, but taking in only a portion of the first and third, including, of course, the whole of the second. Thus we read in Gen.42:17, that Joseph put his brethren in ward *three days*. Here the word "day" is used in its broad sense, covering the dark part as well as the light. It is the same as if it read that he put them in ward three days and three nights; for if we subdivide the day into its light and dark parts, it would take three of each of these parts to make the three days, and the expression "three days" must include all these parts. Yet *on the third day*, presumably in the morning of that day, Joseph made a proposition to them, which they accepted, and their sacks were then filled with corn, and they departed on their journey, which would naturally take the greater portion of the light part of that day. Now it must be shown that Jonah and Matthew used the expression respecting the three days in a different sense from that in which the writer of the book of Genesis used it, or it must be admitted that that expression does *not* mean seventy-two full hours.

Again in 1Kings 12:5 we have a record of what Jeroboam said to the people, in these words: "Depart yet for three days, then come again to me." This would indicate a definite period of just three days, if we should interpret it with the ultra rigidity of modern critics; but in 2Chron.10:5, the same expression is given as follows: "And he said unto them, Come again unto me *after* three days." But in both records (1Kings 12:12, and 2Chron.10:12) it is stated that, in accordance with this arrangement, the people returned *on the third day*: "So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam *on the third day*, as the king bade, saying, Come again to me on the third day."

This testimony shows that the terms, "three days," "after three days," and "on the third day," are used as synonymous expressions. But a little tract has been issued by Elder N. Wardner, entitled "Prophecy of Christ Concerning his Burial and Resurrection," in which he contends that it is a very loose method of interpretation, to claim that "three days and three nights," mean a period that would terminate on the third day; and he attempts to dispose of such passages as we now have before us, by simply remarking, "No nights are named." Indeed! What possible difference can this make? Is not the word "day" here used in its broad sense, including both the light and dark parts? and would not "three days" include "three" each of such parts? Most assuredly the word is so used; and the expression in each of the instances referred to, is therefore exactly equivalent to "three days and three nights."

In Esth.4:16, and 5:1, we find an expression still more puzzling to those who deny that it was the custom of Jewish times and the Jewish people, to use the expression "three days and three nights" to signify a period ending on the third day, and not embracing seventy-two full hours. The verses referred to state that Esther requested the Jews to fast with her three days. She said, "Fast ye for me, and neither eat nor drink three days, *night or day*." She added, "I also and my maidens will fast likewise;" that is, three days, night and day. Would this passage be any stronger, if it read "three days and three nights?" Any one can see that this is just the same as saying, "three days and three nights." Mr. W. attempts to dodge this by saying, "But the number of nights are not named [!], and the statement does not require more than two; depending on the time of day they began to fast." But we submit to the candid reader, if the numeral adjective "three," does not cover both members of the distributive clause, as well as one; thus, "three days," then dividing it up into its light and dark parts, "night or day;" how many of such parts would be required to make the three days? How many light parts - days? - Three. How many dark parts - nights? - Of course the same number, *three*. But Mr. W. would have us read it something after

this fashion: "Three days, *night or day*, that is, *three* days and - well, let's see, *two nights*, that's enough for that." It may seem to him consistent to wrest the word of God by arbitrarily changing the term "three" in the first part of the sentence, into "two" in one member of the last part; but it does not so appear to us. His conclusion in regard to the passage is, "It is *not* parallel to the statement, '*three days and three nights*.'" To make this statement true, the word "not" should be taken out, and the italics transferred to the word "is," so as to make it read, "It is parallel to the statement '*three days and three nights*.'" So after Esther had used the equivalent of the expression, "three days and three nights," during which they were to fast for her, the record says that on the *third* day Queen Esther went into the presence of the king, and obtained her request.

It will be noticed that Mr. W.'s exposition of this passage destroys his claim on Matt.12:40; for he admits that three light portions of the day are here distinctly specified, and yet *on the third* one of these divisions, Esther proceeded to the king. So the expression "three days," does not include the whole of the time embraced in these days, but only the first and second, and a portion of the third. Now if the expression "three days," applied explicitly to these light divisions, may mean only two and a portion of the third, by parity of reasoning, the expression "three nights," applied to the dark divisions, may mean only two and a portion of the third; and the expression "three days and three nights" may be used without signifying absolutely seventy-two hours.

There are nine passages which declare that Christ was to rise "the third day," as Matt.16:21; 17:23; 20:19, etc.; one that he did rise "the third day" (Acts 10:40), and two that he should rise "after three days." Matt.27:63; Mark 8:31. This frequent reference to the "third day," suggests the question,-

### WERE THE DISCIPLES ABLE TO COUNT THREE?

for they have located for us this "third" day. The two disciples on their way to Emmaus after the resurrection of Christ. (Luke 24:21), said, "To-day is the third day since these things were done." And this day is particularly specified as "the first day of the week." Verses 1, 13. Here we have a plain and immovable waymark to guide us in our reckoning; the first day of the week was *the third day*, - a remark evidently brought in here with design to identify the fulfillment of the numerous predictions that he should rise on the third day.

But from what events did they commence their enumeration? How much was embraced in "these things?" Verse 20 answers. After stating what kind of person Jesus of Nazareth was, a prophet mighty in word and deed, they begin the enumeration of the "things" to which they refer. They say, "And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel, and besides all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done."

"These things" certainly include the trial of Christ as well as the crucifixion; and the first day of the week was the third day since this work commenced. Let us then count back and find the beginning. If the first day of the week was the *third* day since these things were done, the day preceding, or Sabbath, was the *second*, and the day before that, or Friday, was the *first*. But if, on account of the word "since," any say that we must go back further still, we can go back only another day, which would carry us to Thursday; and this is as far as it is possible to go; and that, too, for the trial of Christ, and not merely for his crucifixion.

This circumstance and this positive declaration of the disciples, evidently staggers Mr. Wardner in his argument. He meets it by saying: "Is it proper to make an incidental remark of an *uninspired* man, outweigh and set aside a carefully written statement of an *inspired* penman?" This raises again our question, "Were the disciples able to count three?" We do not imagine it

would require a great deal of "*inspiration*" to enable the disciples, under their circumstances, to keep the count, of three or four days at least, after the crucifixion; and we believe they stated it with exact correctness, and Christ did not accuse them of wrong reckoning. No inspired writer, as we shall see, has prepared any carefully written statement which contradicts this.

Not quite satisfied to leave it on that ground, Mr. W. hunts around to find some "prominent item" from which they might have reckoned, and fixes upon the setting of the watch at the sepulcher, as the great desideratum. He says:

"Hence the setting of that watch would naturally be a prominent item among '*all these things*' that they were talking over; and this was the third day after it"!!

How much weight this is entitled to, may be estimated by reading again the words of the disciples to Christ, who say *not one word* about the setting of the watch, but dwell upon the trial and the crucifixion. A position which drives its adherents to such make-shifts as to try to discredit the statement of the disciples because they were not *inspired* (as if they could not keep track of time for three days), and then set up an artificial starting-point from which to reckon, of which the disciples make no mention whatever, sufficiently betrays its inherent weakness.

We have two notable instances which show us how both Christ and the apostles reckoned "the third day." When it was feared that Herod was plotting the destruction of Jesus, and he was desired to depart out of Herod's jurisdiction, he made reply: "Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected." Luke 13:32. Here the day then current when the conversation was held, though a portion of it had of course passed, was counted as *one*, the morrow as *two*, and the third day after the morrow, as *three*.

Again in Acts 27:18, 19, Paul, in giving an account of his shipwreck, says: "And we being exceedingly tossed with a tempest, the next day they lightened the ship; and the third day we cast out with our own hands the tackling of the ship." Here, also, the day on which the event first mentioned occurred, is reckoned as the first, the day following as the second, and the next the third.

Applying the same rule to the time of Christ's death and resurrection, we have the day on which the events first spoken of occurred, the trial and crucifixion of Christ, as the first day of the series; the day which he passed in the tomb as the second day; and the day on which he arose and appeared to his disciples, the third day. And such a period the people of that time were accustomed to speak of as "three days," "after three days," the "third day," "three days, night or day," "three days and three nights," as is clearly shown by the passages already referred to. Elder W. may, if he chooses, call the method by which Christ and his apostles reckoned time, "loose interpretation." We do not so regard it. But whether it was or not, our duty is to follow the same rule when interpreting their words.

A portion of our first proposition (namely, that the view that Christ was crucified on Wednesday and arose on the Sabbath, rests on assumption) is now proved. The claim that the expression, "three days and three nights," means just seventy-two hours, no more, no less, is an assumption. It cannot be proved. All the evidence goes to show that it means, or at least may mean, a less period than that; for the use of equivalent expressions in the Scriptures, demonstrates that it was the custom of Bible writers to use the phrase "three days and three nights" to signify a period less than seventy-two hours; and the fact that they so used it, utterly destroys it as proof that Christ must lie in the tomb just seventy-two hours.

The other leg of the seventy-two hour theory, namely, that the expression, "heart of the earth," means the grave, is an equally unwarranted assumption. If it does not mean that, then the structure built upon their main proof text (Matt.12:40) suffers an utter collapse. If "three days and three nights" do not mean seventy-two hours, as we have shown that they do not, and "heart of the earth" does not mean the grave, as we will show that it does not, what ground is left for the

seventy-two hour theory? - None at all. But we ask, Where is the proof that "heart of the earth" means "grave"? We have, time and again, called for proof on this point, but have never yet succeeded in securing any response. We have carefully searched through a dozen arguments on that side of the question, and not the first attempt do we find to prove that "heart of the earth" means the "grave." The quiet assurance with which all these writers take this point for granted, the imperturbable indifference and obliviousness with which they pass it by, is astonishing. What can be said to awaken in their minds the idea that here is a point that must be *proved*, before their theory will stand?

The expression "the heart of the earth," has no more reference to the grave, than it has to the moon.

The word "heart" primarily means the organ by which the circulation of the blood is kept up in the body. Of course it is not here used in that sense; nor is it used in its secondary sense of the "seat of the affections;" nor yet in its third meaning, as "the part nearest the center," as the "heart of a tree" the "heart of a country," etc.; for Christ was not buried in the center of the earth. Evidently the sense in which it is used is a figurative one; but what is there about the grave to make such a figure appropriate, as applied to it? - Nothing whatever. But if the heart of the earth does not mean the grave, then, even if three days and three nights mean absolutely seventy-two hours, it is not proved that Christ was to lie in the tomb that length of time. These are the two main pillars of the seventy-two hour theory; and both of these are assumptions.

That this view has been adopted by the few who entertain it, with a good motive, we have no question. It has seemed to them a masterly stroke of policy to destroy the Sunday error at one blow. They say, "if the principal and fundamental premise of Sunday-keepers - 'Jesus rose on Sunday' - appears uncertain, or is false, than all arguments, premises, and conclusions of Sunday advocates are ruined at once. It supersedes the necessity, on our part, of following them through all their arguments of assumption, etc., and compels them to acknowledge that the weapon they hold in their hand is only an illusion."

This would be true only on one condition, and that is, that the Sunday-keeper would *acknowledge that the position of the Sabbath-keeper was correct*, that Christ did not rise on Sunday. But this is just what *he will not do*, and what the Sabbath-keeper *cannot prove*. Then what advantage is gained?

Let us imagine an attempt to meet a Sunday-keeper on this ground. The Sunday-keeper says, "I keep Sunday because the Lord arose from the dead on that day." The Sabbath-keeper replies that he is wrong to keep it for that reason, because Christ did not arise from the dead on that day. He must have arisen the evening before the first day; for he was put into the tomb near the close of some day, and was to remain in the heart of the earth three days and three nights, just seventy-two hours, hence his resurrection must have taken place at about the close of the Sabbath, and not on Sunday at all. And his crucifixion was on the preceding Wednesday. The Sunday-keeper asks him to prove that the phrase "three days and three nights" means just seventy-two hours, confining the resurrection to the close of the day; and that the "heart of the earth" means the "grave."

By raising these questions, the point of the controversy is at once shifted from the Sabbath question proper to that of the time of Christ's resurrection. And giving it such a turn is a virtual confession that the resurrection of Christ has a decisive bearing on the question as to which day is the Sabbath; but this is wholly untrue; it has no bearing on the Sabbath question whatever; the Sabbath-keeper takes upon himself propositions which it is impossible for him to prove, and the vantage ground every way is given to the Sunday-keeper. Such is the position a person puts himself in, who undertakes to work the Sunday question on this line of argument. The Sunday-keeper retires from the field triumphant, confirmed in his conviction that the resurrection of Christ determines the day of the Sabbath, and that that day is Sunday. It must, therefore,

inevitably prove a damage, rather than a help, to the Sabbath cause. This is the second indictment we hold against this view.

We believe it is acknowledged to be a sound principle in all discussions, to go as far as possible with an opponent, reducing the issue to as small a compass and as few particulars as practicable; for in this way can questions be the soonest and most satisfactorily settled. But the seventy-two-hour theory enlarges, rather than contracts, the field of discussion, and that, too, on an issue for which there is no foundation whatever. When the Sunday-keeper claims the first-day institution on the fact of Christ's resurrection upon that day, grant him his supposed fact, even if only for the sake of the argument; and then show him that though this was the case, it has not the remotest bearing on the question of which day is the Sabbath, and affords no ground whatever for the observance of the first day of the work. And this can be done *a thousand-fold more easily* than the average Sunday-keeper can be convinced that Christ did not rise on the first day of the week, and the desired object would be as fully gained by this method as by the other. Under these circumstances, why take the impossible side?

Before proceeding to the direct testimony of the Scriptures on the subject before us, a few thoughts concerning that peculiar phrase, "the heart of the earth," will be in order. We have already noticed some things to which it cannot refer. Let us now consider what it may mean. It is here to be carefully borne in mind that the comparison is between the experience of Jonah and that of Christ. Jonah was for a time in a condition that illustrated a condition which Christ would for a time be in. And what part of Jonah's experience is taken? - The time when he was inside the great fish by which he was swallowed. His condition then represented Christ "in the heart of the earth." The point of inquiry then is, What, in Jonah's case, corresponded to "the heart of the earth" in Christ's case? The answer is, The living fish which had actively taken Jonah into its own power, and under whose control he was till he was cast forth upon the dry land. Jonah was not in the bottom of the sea, nor laid in some submarine cavern, nor in dead earth anywhere, but was in a living monster which bore him whithersoever he would. So when Christ was in a corresponding condition "in the heart of the earth," we must look for him not merely in the embrace of the lifeless grave, the inert tomb, but under the dominion of some living power. We must not do violence to the comparison; the living fish is no fit symbol of the grave. But it will be asked, Does not Christ refer to the time he would be in the grave? That time is of course included; but that is not the condition to which he especially referred. He was not in the heart of the earth because he was in the grave; but he was in the grave incidentally, because he was in the heart of the earth; that is, he was under the control of a power which put him in the grave - a power corresponding to the living fish which swallowed Jonah.

It will be conceded by all that the expression "the heart of the earth," is a figurative one, because there is no literal sense in which the application can be made. Now, taken figuratively, in what sense is the word "earth" most frequently used in the Scriptures? - It is used in such a sense to represent the inhabitants of the earth. It is so used in Rev.12:16: "And the earth helped the woman;" also in Isa.1:2: "Give ear, O earth;" and in Jer.22:29: "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord." Here the word is used to denote the wicked inhabitants of the earth. Satan is the god of this world, the head of its prevailing multitudes, who constitute the children of the wicked one. Into the hands of these the Son of man was to be for a time delivered. Christ often makes a special point of this: "The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men." Matt.17:22. The Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners." Matt.26:45. And this is what we understand he meant by declaring that he should be "in the heart of the earth;" that is, under the full control and power of wicked men and devils, so that they could accomplish the evil desires of their hearts concerning him. And when he was thus delivered over to them, he declared plainly, "*This is your hour, and the power of darkness.*" Luke 22:53.

In nine instances where it is declared that he will rise on the third day, the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion are specified as included in the events to occur during the three days; and from the first of these, and not from the burial, the period is to be reckoned. Thus: -

Matt.16:21: "From that time forth, began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day."

Matt.17:22,23: "The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men: and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised again."

Matt.20:18, 19: "The Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge, and to crucify him: and the third day he shall rise again."

Mark 9:31: "The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day."

Mark 10:33,34: "The Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles: and they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him; and the third day he shall rise again."

Luke 18:32,33: "For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on; and they shall scourge him, and put him to death; and the third day he shall rise again."

Luke 24:7: "The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again."

Luke 24:20,21: "And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and besides all this, today is the third day since these things were done."


Luke 24:46: "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."

In all these scriptures it will be noticed that his being given over "into the hands of men," "the hands of the Gentiles," and "the hands of sinners," is made equally prominent with the other events; and the trial and condemnation and crucifixion are inseparably connected with the resurrection, as coming within the three days. During all this time he was "in the heart of the earth" - that is, under the dominion of sinful men. This idea corresponds much better with the case of Jonah. He was in the stomach of the fish, under the control of a living monster, not buried in dead earth; so Christ was under the domination of living men and devils. He was no more in the heart of the earth when in the grave, than he was when hanging upon the cross; no more in the heart of the earth when in the tomb, than he was when the mob had secured actual control over him, after his betrayal by Judas.

Reckoning from this standpoint, how much time have we? Near the close of the day on Thursday, he prepared to eat the passover with his disciples. The evening following (Thursday night as we would now call it; Friday, or sixth day, night as it was then), Judas and his mob came out with torches, and swords, and staves, and he was betrayed into their hands. All that night and the next day till the third hour, was occupied with the trial; from the third to the ninth hour, with the crucifixion. From about the ninth hour to the beginning of the seventh day, the burial was attended to. All that night, the day following, and the succeeding night were passed by him in the tomb. Early on the morning of the first day of the week, he arose. This gives us three full nights, two full days, and a portion of the third day, making it strictly true that *on the third* day he arose. The following diagram will illustrate these points: -

CHRIST DELIVERED INTO THE HANDS OF WICKED MEN.

"Your hour and the power of darkness."



EXPLANATION. - First, The figure "1" marks the betrayal, near the beginning of the sixth day of the week. Second, The figure "2" marks the trial, to the third hour of the daylight part of the same day. Third, The figure "3" marks the crucifixion, from the third to the ninth hour of the sixth day. Fourth, The figure "4" marks the burial, between the ninth hour and the close of the day. Fifth, The figure "5" marks the rest in the tomb during the night and day of the seventh day, and the night of the first day. Sixth, The figure "6" marks the resurrection, early the first day of the week. Mark 16:9.

When Christ said to the chief priests and captains of the temple, who had come out to take him, "THIS IS YOUR HOUR AND THE POWER OF DARKNESS" (Luke 22:52, 53), he set apart a peculiar period in his experience during which he was in the hands of men. This was the time when he was "in the heart of the earth." It began with his betrayal, at the beginning of the sixth day, and ended with the resurrection on the morning of the first day of the week. Thus it will be seen that all was in strict accordance with the Jewish manner of reckoning time, as in Gen.42:17,18; 2Chron.10:5,12; Esther 4:16; 5:1; and with the manner in which both Christ and Paul reckoned the third day (Luke 13:31,32; Acts 27:18,19); and with Christ's repeated declarations that on the third day after his betrayal into the hands of men, followed by his suffering and death, he would rise again.

It has now been shown, in opposition to the seventy-two-hour theory, that the expression "three days and three nights," does not necessarily mean seventy-two hours, and that the expression, "the heart of the earth," does not mean the grave. The principal proof text, therefore (Matt.12:40), which is relied upon to prove that Christ was crucified Wednesday and rose on the Sabbath, utterly fails, in every way, to sustain that proposition.

It has also been shown that as the expression, "the heart of the earth," is used in that text in a figurative sense, the most natural application is to consider it as simply denoting the dominion of wicked men, to which Christ was for a time subjected, beginning with his betrayal, Thursday evening, and ending with that auspicious hour when the guards who were watching him in the tomb, were struck to the earth as dead men by the power of his resurrection, on the morning of the first day of the week.

The time covered by this application reaches to the middle of the third day (using the word "day" here in its broadest sense) from the time these things began to transpire; or, dividing the time into its dark and light parts, it gives us two full days and three full nights, to the growing dawn of the third day, answering completely to the manner in which the Hebrews reckoned time, according to the examples given us in the Scriptures. See again the foregoing diagram.

It now remains to look at the direct testimony of the evangelists upon these points.



It is claimed that Matt.28:1 positively affirms that Christ rose on the Sabbath. The common version reads: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." The Greek reads, "*Opse de sabbaton te epiphoskouse eis mian sabbaton.*" The Revised Version reads, "Now late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." The subsequent narrative states that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, coming at this time to the sepulcher, found that the Lord had arisen; and if this visit was made before the close of the Sabbath, of course the resurrection of Christ occurred upon that day.

The argument on this point is made to turn on the little Greek word "*opse.*" This, it is claimed, always means "late," and never, "after," hence the passage cannot mean "after the Sabbath." Thus Mr. Wardner, in his tract to which reference has been made, p. 7, says: -

"Matt.28:1, says, 'Late on the Sabbath day, he was risen.' Here the Greek '*opse*' is used to represent the closing moments of the Sabbath. It literally means 'late,' and when used with '*hemera*' (day), means late in the day. See Liddell and Scott. '*Opse*' is invariably used in Scripture, to represent '*evening*,' and '*proi*' to represent '*morning*' and they are never used interchangeably."

He then refers, in proof of this last statement, to Mark 11:19, 20; 13:35; and to the Septuagint of Gen.24:11; Ex.30:7,8; and Isa.5:11. But in these references he seems to have overlooked the fact that in all these instances the construction in which the word is used is not like that in Matt.28:1; and he has thus attempted the unscholarly feat of determining the meaning of "*opse*," in one construction, by its definition in another and altogether different construction. Matt.28:1 is peculiar; the word is there used with the genitive case; and no other instance of the kind occurs in the New Testament. Mr. W. notices this, and says: " '*opse*,' with a substantive in the genitive case, as in Matt.28:1, always means late in the period spoken of, and never means '*after*!'"

For so sweeping a statement, this is very positive, and ought to have been backed up by competent evidence, other than the bare assertion of the affirmant. Let us see what others have to say upon this point.

Robinson, in his Greek lexicon of the New Testament, gives the following as the definition of the word "*opse*" when used with a genitive: -

"2. With a genitive, *i.q.*, at the end of, at the close of, after. Matt.28:1, *opse de sabbaton*, . . . at the end of the Sabbath, *i.e.*, after the Sabbath, the Sabbath being now ended, *i.q.*, Mark 16:1, *diagenomenou tou sabbaton*. For the genitive, see Buttm., 132, 5. b."

In his note on Matt.28:1, Dr. Clarke says: -

"In the end of the Sabbath] *opse de sabbaton*. After the end of the week; this is the translation given by several eminent critics; and in this way the word "*opse*" is used by the most eminent Greek writers. Thucydides, lib. iv., chap. 93, *tes hemeras opse en* - the day was ended. Plutarch, *opse ton basileos chronon* - after the times of the kings. Philostratus, *opse ton Troikon* - after the Trojan war. See Rosenmuller."

Bloomfield's Greek Testament, on Matt.28:1, says: -

"*Opse de Sabb.*] This must, with Krebs, Wahl., Tittm., Kuin., and Fritz, be explained, '*after the Sabbath*,' *i.e.*, as Mark more clearly expresses it, *diagenomenou tou sabbaton* [the Sabbath being past] which must determine the sense here. Of this signification the commentators adduce examples from Philostratus, Plutarch, Aelian, and Xenophon."

Olshausen on Matt.28:1 says: -

"As respects first the fixing of the dates, the expression '*diagenomenou tou sabbaton*' in Mark (16:1) serves to explain the *opse sabbaton* in Matthew. For instance, *sabbaton* = [Heb.] *shabbath*, also in the plural (*ta sabbata*), was used for the one day of Sabbath. (Compare the Septuagint version of Ex.20:10, and Lev.23:32.) '*opse*' is, however, used in the sense of '*after*.' It occurs, indeed, in the New Testament only here; but it occurs also in this signification in profane

writers. (Compare Philostratus, Vit. Apoll. iv. 18, *opse musterion* 'after the mysteries.' Thucyd. iv. 93. Aelian V. H. ii. 23.)

These authorities all speak particularly of the use of "*opse*" with a genitive, as in Matt.28:1; and they say that in such constructions it has the meaning of "at the close of, *after*;" and they refer to the works of old standard Greek writers, as Philostratus, Plutarch, Aelian, and Xenophon, as evidence that the word can be used in such a sense. In view of these facts, what becomes of Mr. W.'s assertion that "*opse*," with a substantive in the genitive case, as in Matt.28:1, always means late in the period spoken of, and never means "*after*"? Does he know better how the Greek language should be used than did Plutarch or Xenophon?

But it may be said that Liddell and Scott do not give this definition to the word; and we may add, neither do the lexicons of Donnegan and Parkhurst. But they do not say that it cannot have this meaning; and the only inference is that in giving their definitions, they did not make them broad enough to cover all the uses of the word as it actually appears in Greek writers.

Greenfield and Bagster both define "*opse sabbaton*," after the close of the Sabbath. Matt.28:1."

Another word in the sentence confirms the view that it applies to a time when the Sabbath was past. That word is "*epiphoskouse*," from "*epiphosko*," translated, "as it began to dawn." The root of this word is "*phos*," which means "light." The light of the sun and the light of the day, is, of course, the leading idea contained in the word. The verb "*epiphosko*," signifies the transition from darkness to daylight. It applies, primarily, therefore, to the morning. Liddell and Scott give it this one definition, "to grow toward daylight." Other lexicographers, in addition to this, give it a tropical meaning, signifying the "commencement" of the day, at whatever time that might be reckoned. The Jews reckoned the day as beginning at sunset. Hence the word is once applied to the day so beginning, as in Luke 23:54: "The Sabbath *drew on*." And this text and Matt.28:1, are the only instances where the word is used in the New Testament.

Its use in Luke 23:54, to denote the coming on of the Sabbath, which began at sunset, is easily accounted for. As the word "day" is ordinarily applied to the light part of the twenty-four hours, and as the word "*epiphosko*" signifies the commencement, or opening of that part, it would naturally come to be used, under a figurative meaning, of the commencement of the day in its broader sense, whether that day began at sunset, as with the Jews, or at midnight, as with the Romans. But of course the primary sense should be given it wherever possible. The seventy-two-hour theorists think they have a straight reading when they render "*opse*" "late," and read it, "Late on the Sabbath, as the first day drew on." But we take our stand a few hours later, translate "*opse*" "after," as it means when used, as here, with the genitive, and give "*epiphoskouse*" its *primary* signification; and then we have, "*After the Sabbath, as it began to grow toward daylight on the first day of the week*." This is a less forced reading than the other, and agrees with Greek usage and with the records of the other evangelists, as we shall see.

The reader did not fail to notice the testimony of Robinson, Bloomfield, and Olshausen; that the testimony of Mark 16:1 is parallel with that of Matt.28:1; and that the explicit and definite statement given by Mark must determine the sense of the passage in Matthew. But Mark says directly: -

"And when the Sabbath *was past*, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun."

Our friends endeavor to get over this passage by claiming that the visit to the sepulcher recorded by Matthew was not the same as the one here recorded by Mark. Matthew, they say, speaks of a visit at the close of the Sabbath, and Mark of a visit the next morning, the first day of the week. But all are obliged to admit that the same individuals are spoken of in both records. Thus Matthew says that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the sepulcher.

"And. behold, there was [margin, *had been*] 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."

Mark says that Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James (the same Marys that Matthew speaks of), and Salome, came early on the first day of the week, and, intending to anoint him, queried among themselves who should roll the stone away from the door of the sepulcher for them. Now, if this was a subsequent visit to that recorded in Matthew, we have a tremendous absurdity to wrestle with: we have to explain how the two Marys could go to the sepulcher before the close of the Sabbath, late Sabbath afternoon, in broad daylight, find the stone rolled away and the sepulcher empty, meet an angel who expressly says to them, He is not here; for he has risen, and tells them to go and make it known to the disciples; and then as they return, meet Jesus, receive his welcome, All hail! and hold him by the feet and worship him; and then, after passing through this thrilling experience, go back stupidly to the sepulcher the next morning, expecting to find Jesus there, and to embalm his body, and wondering who would roll the stone away for them!

Mr. Wardner endeavors to surmount this difficulty in the following unique style. After referring to the unbelief of the disciples in regard to the resurrection of Christ, he says: -

"Now if the combined testimony of Peter and John and the two brethren who went to Emmaus and the personal demonstrations of Christ himself in their presence, could not convince those apostles that what they themselves saw and handled was anything but a spirit, until Christ ate before them, is it strange that Mary Magdalene should, by them, be made to doubt the literal reality of what she saw and heard on her first visit to the tomb? She probably had no more idea that he was to rise from the dead than they had, and was as much inclined to believe in spirit manifestations and visions as they; and when they all united in scouting the reality of what she reported, and insisted that it was simply a vision, she would naturally doubt her own senses, as they doubted theirs, and hence her visit to the tomb, the next morning, while yet dark (John 20:1), to satisfy herself whether or not it was a reality."

Now we submit that this explanation is a little hard on those good women. If some of the brethren were "fools, and slow of heart to believe," it is no reason why the same state of mind should be charged upon the sisters. And there is not a hint in all the record that *any of the women ever disbelieved*, after they had seen him, or the fact of his resurrection had been announced to them. Neither did the brethren disbelieve after they had seen him. It was only before they had had a chance to settle the question by the evidence of their own senses, that they doubted; but when they had seen him (as it is claimed the Marys saw him at the close of the Sabbath), that settled the matter, and they were then ready to exclaim, "The Lord is risen indeed!" Luke 24:34. There is only one text which has any semblance of opposition to this view; and that is Luke 24:41: "And while they yet believed not for joy." But this does not imply any settled unbelief, but only that they felt that what they saw before them, was, as we sometimes express it at the present time, "too good to be true." Under these circumstances, to represent Mary Magdalene as being reasoned out of her own senses, or as being persuaded to believe that God (or the devil? which?) had given her a spirit manifestation, setting forth what was not true; and on the strength of it, she had been telling the brethren a lie, that the Lord was risen when he was not - it is too preposterous for a moment's credence.

Two other absurdities are involved in the view that the narrative of Matthew 28, antedates that of the other evangelists, he recording what took place at the close of the Sabbath, and they, what occurred the following morning. These absurdities are, -

1. When Jesus arose, some of the watch immediately hastened to the chief priests, and told them what had occurred. Matt. 28:11. The priests advised them to account for the absence of Jesus from the tomb (first discovered at the close of the day, Sabbath, remember) by saying that the disciples came by night, and stole him away while they slept. Verse 13. "Came *by night*."

That must have been, then, the night before, and they were then asleep, and hadn't waked up enough to discover that the body was gone till the close of the following day! No wonder they were afraid their heads would come off over such a story! A position involving the narrative in such an absurdity will never answer.

2. According to this position, the two Marys (of whom Mary Magdalene was one) met the risen Saviour at the close of the Sabbath, and held him by the feet and worshiped him. Matt.28:9. But Mary Magdalene, according to John (20:1-17), met the Saviour on the morning of the first day of the week; and as she was about to worship him, he said to her, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Now it is absurd to suppose that he would permit her, at the close of the Sabbath (as it is claimed that Matthew declares), to hold him by the feet and worship him; and yet the next morning, as John testifies, refuse to permit her to touch him, because he had not yet ascended to his Father.

The language employed by Matthew in verse 1, is entirely in harmony with the idea that the Sabbath was fully past when the events which he records took place, and some, at least, of the circumstances were such that it is utterly absurd to suppose they could have transpired before the close of the Sabbath.

But it is said that Matthew's record does not agree with that of the other evangelists, in that he states a number of particulars which they do not mention; and therefore he must refer to a different visit to the sepulcher, from the ones which the others record.

But this does not by any means follow. Several witnesses may describe the same scene, and neither of them record what the others mention: yet it cannot be said that there is any discrepancy or disagreement between them, unless what one says would make it impossible that what the others say could be true. And this is recognized as a legitimate principle in harmonizing the records of the evangelists. One writer may state particulars not mentioned by another; but that does not discredit his own testimony, nor prove the other untrue. Thus Matthew (chap. 28:1) says that the two Marys came to the sepulcher. Mark (chap. 16:1) says that Salome was with them. But the fact that Matthew did not see fit to mention her name, does not prove that she could not have been there at the time that he speaks of, and therefore does not prove that Matthew must have referred to a different occasion from that recorded by Mark. So Matthew speaks of the earthquake which had taken place before the Marys reached the sepulcher, the descent of the angel, the prostration of the soldiers who were guarding the tomb, their report to the priests, and the story which the latter invented to try to cover up the truth. But there is nothing in the records of the other evangelists to show that any or all these things might not have happened in close connection with what they relate, they simply choosing to dwell upon other particulars. Nothing further need be said on this point.

We now come to what we offer as positive testimony that Christ did rise upon the first day of the week. It is the testimony of Mark 16:9: -

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

On this point Mr. Wardner remarks: -

"Mark 16:9 is quoted to prove that Christ rose on first-day morning; but he says no such thing. He says that Christ *'was risen'* at that time, without intimating when he rose."

We suppose he is aware that the word "risen" is simply the second aorist participle, and would be properly rendered, "Now Jesus *having risen*," instead of "Now when Jesus *was risen*." His position here reminds us of that of the Sunday Sabbatarian on Acts 20:7. That text reads, "And upon the first day of the week *when* the disciples came together to break bread," etc. Here, says the Sunday-keeper, the expression, "*when* they came together," denotes repeated and customary action. But, we reply, the Greek has simply the noun and its participle - "the disciples having come together" - denoting only an incidental meeting.

The construction of Mark 16:9 is similar; and if we read it, "Now Jesus having risen early the first day of the week," there would hardly seem to be any room to question the meaning of the passage. Such *is* the reading; and such *we believe* to be the plain intent of the passage; namely, to declare explicitly that Jesus rose on the first day of the week; and no criticism that we have yet seen seems sufficient to overthrow it. Meyer, to be sure, endeavors to throw the passage away by making it apocryphal. He argues that the latter part of Mark 16, beginning with verse 9, is an interpolation by some other person, and was not written by Mark. But this is sufficiently refuted by Lange, on the authority of the great majority of eminent critics, who consider this portion of Mark's Gospel as genuine as any other part of it.

In regard to the construction of verse 9, Meyer declares that it is impossible to tell whether the adverb "*proi*" (early) qualifies the participle "*anastas*" (having risen) or the verb, "*ephane*" (appeared) as found in the sentence, "he *appeared* first to Mary Magdalene." This being so, and the construction admitting of *either* application, we are thrown back upon the *sense* of the whole passage to determine which it is. The adverb certainly qualifies one of those words, and it does not qualify them both. We must give it that application which will make the apostle's statement most consistent and reasonable; and that will be the correct one.

We have, then, before us on this point, two positions: one class hold that the adverb qualifies "appeared;" and they would read the passage thus: "Now when Jesus was risen [some time in the past], he appeared early the first day of the week to Mary Magdalene first." This is the position of those who deny that Christ rose on the first day of the week. Thus Mr. Wardner says: -

"Mark's statement is explained by what John says (chap. 20:1-18), who describes a second visit of Mary Magdalene in the morning, while yet dark, to whom Christ again appeared, before he did to any one else that day."

The other position is that the adverb "early" qualifies the participle "having risen;" and those who hold this view would read the passage substantially as it is in our common version. "Now Jesus having risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene;" not merely first on that early portion of the first day of the week, but first after his resurrection; that is, he rose early on the first day of the week, and first showed himself, after his resurrection, to Mary Magdalene.

Now which of these is the more consistent view? The answer to this question we are willing to leave to the candid judgment of any reader who will give the subject a little careful thought. We can easily see that some importance attaches to the fact of Christ's first appearance, and that there is some reason why it should be expressly revealed to whom he first appeared. But where is there the least shadow of reason for stating to whom he appeared first on some particular portion of the day, as the early part of the first day of the week, especially since it is claimed that he had already appeared to the same party the evening before! If it is so important a matter to tell to whom he appeared first, on the different divisions of the day, why does the record not state to whom he appeared first, at the third or sixth or ninth hours of the day? It would be just as important to know these facts, as the one which, it is claimed, is so particularly revealed.

We are referred to John 20, in explanation of Mark 16:9. But let us see how John's record will compare with the interpretation given to Matthew 28, by the seventy-two-hour theorists. John says that Mary Magdalene came early the first day of the week to the sepulcher, and saw the stone taken away. She hastened back to Peter and John, and said unto them, "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him." This is evidently the first intimation that Peter and John or any of the disciples had had of the matter. So Peter and John ran to the sepulcher. But she, it is claimed, had been to the sepulcher the night before (according to Matthew's account), and found the stone rolled away, had seen an angel, who told her plainly that the Lord had risen, and then had met Jesus himself and recognized him,

and held him by the feet and *worshipped him*, knowing of course that he was the Lord; and yet, going to the sepulcher the next morning, and seeing the stone taken away, she runs and reports that some one has stolen the Lord out of the sepulcher, and does not know where they have laid him! Mr. Wardner claims, as before noticed, that Mary Magdalene went to the sepulcher on first-day morning, expecting to find Christ there, because the disciples had reasoned her out of her own senses respecting her visit to the sepulcher and her interview with the angel and Christ the night before. But it appears from this record in John that she, strangely, had said not a word to the disciples about the wonderful scenes of the night before; and the first announcement she made to them was, when she saw the stone taken away the next morning, that some one had stolen the Lord out of the sepulcher! So she had not been reasoned with at all on the subject, and we must attribute her singular conduct to her own obliviousness. Strange that she should have forgotten that she had seen the stone rolled away the night before; had seen and talked with an angel; had met the Saviour and held him by the feet and worshiped him! If this is so, although Christ had cast seven devils out of her, there was still another left - a remarkable imp of forgetfulness! But we will not defame the fair memory of the devoted Mary, by any such un-supposable supposition.

The record in John 20, does indeed agree with Mark 16:9. It shows that Mary Magdalene had not seen him before the first day of the week, and that she was the first one who did see him; and at that first revelation he could permit no one to touch him, because he had not then ascended to his Father. But in his then resumed, exalted, immortal nature, he could go and return more quickly than the angels, whose movements seemed to the prophet like a flash of lightning (Eze.1:14); and we may suppose that he ascended to his Father, to receive his approval of his sacrifice, and was almost immediately again present on earth to receive the worship of the women (Matt.28:9), who could now approach him freely, to show himself to all the other disciples, and talk to them more fully "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts 1:3. And as we go back in imagination to that first-day morning, and consider what a morning it was to them of multiplying wonders, and joyful surprises; how they must have gone many times back and forth, singly and in groups, to the sepulcher, and iterated and reiterated to each other the wonderful tale, while they could scarcely believe their own senses, - it is easy to account for all that all the evangelists have written, and find a place for all which they have individually and collectively described, and even more. And it is certain that Mark declares that the rising of Jesus from the tomb was early on the first day of the week. Any other construction spoils the sense of the narrative.

A few other statements demand a word of notice in this connection. John, in chapter 19:31, says; "The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day (for that Sabbath day was an high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away."

From this we learn that the day following that upon which the Saviour died, was a sabbath, and an "high day," or great day (Gr. *megale hemera*). Those who place the crucifixion of Christ on Wednesday, have this sabbath come on Thursday, and consist exclusively of the passover sabbath. But there was nothing connected with any passover sabbath alone, to entitle it to that designation. Among the annual sabbaths, the day of atonement was the leading day, not the passover. But if the passover sabbath and the weekly Sabbath then came together on the same day, that fact would bring all the ceremonies of the passover sabbath, and the extra sacrifices and services of the weekly Sabbath together, and make the day a great day. On no other supposition than that they did thus come together at this time, can that expression be accounted for. This would make Friday to be the day of the crucifixion, and the day following, that is, the weekly Sabbath, to be the passover sabbath also.

The day of the crucifixion is in several instances called the day of "the preparation," and generally the "preparation of the Sabbath." Luke 23:54: "And that day was the preparation, and

the Sabbath drew on." The women then saw how the body was laid, and (verse 56) "returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." What Sabbath? -Evidently the one which followed the "preparation" in verse 54, and which was "drawing on," when they took the Saviour down from the cross. Now, if we apply this to the passover sabbath, we must surrender verse 56 as applying to the weekly Sabbath, which is one of the best texts for the perpetuity of the fourth commandment, in all the New Testament. It is surprising that any Sabbath-keeper should be willing to give up this text.

Mark 15:42: "And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath." This must be the weekly Sabbath; for the passover sabbath certainly would not be spoken of in this independent manner. It is the opinion of good critics, that the term, "the preparation," does not apply to any feast sabbath, but to the weekly Sabbath alone. Thus Andrews ("Life of Our Lord," p. 452) says: -

"But the main reason that made a time of preparation necessary for the weekly Sabbath, was, that on that day no food could be prepared, whereas it could be upon a feast sabbath. Nor anywhere in Jewish history does the latter appear as equal to the former in sanctity and dignity. All labor but servile labor was then lawful. There seems, then, no good reason why every feast sabbath should have had its day of preparation; nor is there any proof of the fact."

On page 453, he adds: -

"Thus we reach the result, that the term 'preparation,' *`paraskeue`*, is never applied, so far as we know, to any day preceding a feast, but is applied by the Evangelists, by Josephus, and by the Rabbis, to the day before the Sabbath. Recurring weekly, this would readily become the current designation of the sixth day, and equivalent to its proper name, or to our Friday."

John once uses the word "preparation" in connection with the passover. Thus in chapter 19:14, he says: "And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he said unto the Jews, 'Behold your King.'" Such an expression as this is easily accounted for from the fact that they did, on the fourteenth day of the month, prepare the lamb for the passover, and so we find the expression, "prepare the passover," several times used. But this evidently has reference only to the preparation of the lamb to be eaten that evening, and is a very different thing from setting apart a day to be called "the preparation day," with reference to a rest and holy convocation to occur on the following day. On this point we quote again from Andrews, p. 453: -

"It is insisted that the nature of this preparation is expressly defined by the addition, 'of the passover,' and cannot, therefore, refer to the weekly Sabbath. But if *`paraskeue`* is used as equivalent to Friday, it would simply mean that this was the Friday of the passover, or the preparation day for that Sabbath that occurred during the paschal week."

This is certainly a reasonable explanation; and, taken in this sense, the expression, "*preparation* of the passover," would not have been used, had not the rest-day of that passover fallen upon the weekly Sabbath. Thus the evidence still stands good, that the day of the crucifixion was the preparation day; and the preparation day was the day before the weekly Sabbath.

But it is objected that this could not have been the day before the Sabbath, because the women would not have had time to prepare their spices and ointments (Luke 23:56) between the death of Christ and the close of the day. Let us see. It was but little past the ninth hour when Jesus cried with a loud voice, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and bowing his head, expired. Luke 23:44-46. This was about three o'clock in the afternoon. Between that and sunset they had nearly three hours, and the city, where all necessary articles could be procured, was nigh at hand. This would seem to be ample time for what they had to do; and this will appear still more evident, when we consider what others did do: 1. After Jesus was dead, Joseph went into the city, found Pilate in his palace, and obtained leave to care for the body of Jesus. John 19:38. 2. Nicodemus came with a mixture of aloes and myrrh, about an hundred pounds' weight. Verse

39. Where did he get this? He certainly did not carry that amount around with him. He must have gone into the city, after Jesus expired, and bought those spices, and returned to the cross, and that, too, before the body was taken down. John 19:39,40. 3. After Joseph obtained permission to take charge of the body, he bought the fine linen in which it was to be shrouded for the tomb. Mark 15:46.

Now if these noble men had time, as the record says they did, to go into the city, and make these purchases, and duly robe the body in the linen with the myrrh and aloes, the women had time also to purchase and compound the spices and ointments which they designed afterward to use. But if they did not have time to complete the work before the Sabbath, there was still time in the evening following the Sabbath, to make additional purchases, and to finish the preparations. And the record in Mark would indicate that though they had prepared spices, etc., before the Sabbath, as Luke (chap. 23:56) declares, they also made other purchases, after the Sabbath; for he says: "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought [Greek, 1st aorist tense, simple past, *bought*, not *had bought*] sweet spices that they might come and anoint him." This was before any one had been to the sepulcher; but having completed their preparations, early the next morning they repaired to the sepulcher, bearing their spices with them. Luke 24:1. Thus this objection to the view that Jesus was crucified on Friday, disappears.

#### ARGUMENT FROM THE TYPES.

There is one more line of argument, which is absolutely conclusive in favor of the view that Christ was crucified on Friday and rose on the first day of the week; and that is the argument from the types. Christ was the antitype of the passover lamb. "Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us." 1Cor.5:7. The lamb was always to be killed on the 14th day of the month, "between the two evenings." (Ex.12:6, margin), that is, between 3 P.M. and sunset. (See Robinson's Greek Lexicon, under "*opsia*.") So Christ expired at the legal time, on the 14th day of the month, a little after 3 P.M., "between the two evenings." The passover he ate with his disciples the evening before, was by anticipation. We know the day he died was the true time for slaying the paschal lamb, or he could not have been a true antitype. The day following, that is, the 15th, was the first passover sabbath. Lev.23:6. And on the morrow after this passover sabbath, the sheaf of first-fruits was waved before the Lord. Lev.23:11,15.

In proof that "the morrow after the sabbath" (Lev.23:15) was the 16th day of the month, and that the day preceding it, that is, the 15th, the passover sabbath, is the sabbath referred to, we present the following from Smith's Bible Dictionary, edited by S.W. Barnum. Under "Passover," he says: -

"On the 15th, the night being passed, there was a holy convocation, and during that day no work might be done, except the preparation of necessary food (Ex.12:16.) . . . On the 16th of the month, 'the morrow after the sabbath' (i.e., after the day of holy convocation), the first sheaf of harvest was offered and waved by the priest before the Lord."

Under "Pentecost" he says: -

"Pentecost (fr. Gr. *pentecoste* = the *fiftieth* sc. day from the second day of the feast of unleavened bread or the passover). . . . 1. The time of the festival was calculated from the second day of the passover, the 16th of Nisan. The law prescribes that a reckoning should be kept from 'the morrow after the sabbath' to the morrow after the completion of the seventh week, which would, of course, be the fiftieth day (Lev.23:11,15,16; Deut.16:9)."

On the expression "morrow after the sabbath," as given in the foregoing extract, he has this note: -



"It has been generally held that the `sabbath' here = the first day of holy convocation of the passover, the 15th of Nisan mentioned in Lev.23:7 (compare verses 24,32,39). Some have made the `sabbath' here = the seventh day of the week, or *the Sabbath of creation*, as the Jewish writers have called it; and thus the day of pentecost would always fall upon the first day of the week. But Bahr proves from Josh.5:11 and Lev.23:14 that the omer was offered on the 16th of Nisan."

Bagster's Greek Lexicon, under "Pentecoste," says: -

"One of the three great Jewish festivals, so called because it was celebrated on the *fiftieth* day, reckoning from the second day of the feast of unleavened bread, i.e., from the 16th day of Nisan."

Andrews ("Life of our Lord," p. 434), says: -

"The ceremonies of the second day of the feast, the 16th Nisan, were peculiar, and important to be noted. Upon this day the first-fruits of the barley harvest were brought to the temple, and waved by a priest before the Lord, to consecrate the harvest; and not till this was done, might any one begin his reaping. Lev.23:10-12."

Similar testimony might be greatly multiplied; but these quotations are sufficient. Let the reader note the order of these events: 1. The paschal lamb was slain on the 14th day of the month; 2. The 15th day was the passover sabbath; 3. On the 16th day, the morrow after that sabbath, the sheaf of the first-fruits was waved before the Lord. Now as the passover lamb typified the *death* of Christ, so *the wavesheaf typified his resurrection*. Paul not only calls Christ our "passover," but he calls him also our "first-fruits:" "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: *Christ, the first-fruits*, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." 1Cor.15:22,23. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become *the first-fruits of them that slept*." Verse 20. And in fulfilling this type, Christ must follow the same order on the same dates. Thus he was slain on the 14th day of the month, which that year fell on Friday. The next day, the 15th, was the passover sabbath, and chanced that year to be the weekly Sabbath also. On the morrow after the Sabbath, the 16th, which happened that year to come on the first day of the week, *he was raised from the dead*, in fulfillment of the type of the wave-sheaf. There was but one full day, 15th Nisan, between the killing of the lamb on the 14th and the waving of the sheaf on the 16th. So there could have been but *one full day* between Christ's death upon the cross, and his resurrection. Whoever puts in more, shatters the whole typical system into fragments, by making it a failure. But the fact that Christ was crucified the 14th and raised the 16th, does not vitiate the declaration that he was to be "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth;" for that expression includes, as we have seen, more than simply the time he was in the grave: it reaches from his betrayal to his resurrection; and between those points, there is all the time requisite to fulfill the prediction. (See again the diagram on p. 14.)

With the view here presented; namely, that Christ was betrayed the evening following the 13th of Nisan, was crucified Friday, the 14th, expired and was buried between 3 P.M. and sunset of that day, lay in the grave the 15th, and rose on the morning of the first day of the week, the 16th, - with this view, we say, there is the most perfect harmony between type and antitype, prediction and fulfillment, the words of Christ, and the words of his disciples, and the testimony of all the evangelists throughout. There is not a flaw, fallacy, weakness, or discrepancy in the entire argument. And we commend it to all who may have been in anywise perplexed on this subject, as one on which they may rest with all the assurance that is born of demonstration.

U.S.