

Now the later of the Shabbats, at the dawning on the first of the Shabbats, Miryam Ha-Magdalit and the other Miryam came to look at the grave.

► 28:1 later of the Shabbats (אהרון של שבתות); the second of two Shabbats in Passover week. The first annual Shabbat was the 15th of Aviv. The first weekly Shabbat followed it. Both Shabbats are *first*, the 15th on account of being the first feast day Shabbat, and the following weekly Shabbat on account of the command to count seven regular Shabbats between Passover and Shavuot. See Lev23:11, Lev23:15. ¶ first of the Shabbats: חַתּוּת הַשַּׁבָּתוֹת = μίαν σαββάτων = aḥat ha-Shabbatot. The phrase could mean *one of the Shabbats* in an indefinite sense, but the Hebrew word *one* is also used for *first*, and it is evident from the instructions to count seven Shabbats in Lev23:15 that *first* is meant. ¶ In the phrase “later of the Shabbats” (Ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων), the word “later” (Ὁψὲ) is used as an adjectival substantive filling the head noun slot of a partitive genitive (cf. Wallace, *Syntax*, pg 84; cf. Moulton, Milligan “The word is construed with a partitive gen. in such phrases as ... ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας .... ὀψὲ τῶν Τρωικῶν”). Compare Rom. 15:26, “the poor of the holy ones”, where the poor is the part of the whole, “the holy ones.” “the late” or “the later” is the part of the whole, “the Sabbaths”, thus “the late [one] of the Sabbaths”; the same word sometimes sees use as both an adverb and an adjective, i.e. “The man was running late (adv)”; “Her late husband had three brothers” (adjective use). Ὁψὲ may also be used as a comparative adjective this way, “the later [one] of the Sabbaths”; also “later/late in the day” = “the later/late [part] of the day” (partitive use of the genitive). ¶ For example, another word used as both an adverb, an adjective, and a substantive: “the man went first” (adv.), “the first man went” (adj.), “the first [one] of them went up”; the substantive is formed by using the adjective where a noun is expected, in which case a helping word is often added in English, “The good [things]”, “The red [ones]”, etc.; ¶ Ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων is the same as Ὁψὲ σαββάτων because the conjunction δὲ is always put after the second word of a sentence, no matter what that word is. It therefore has no effect on the grammar of the words it stands between. It commonly is spliced into a genitive phrase such as this: συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ (Rom 8:17); ἕτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν (Heb. 11:36); Also an indeclinable adverb: ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς (and even [one] of chains and of prison, Heb. 11:36). Also, iiMac15v18: ἔτι δὲ ἀδελφῶν. ¶ Ὁψὲ σαββάτων = late [one] of Sabbaths. The word “one” shows the adverb is treated as a substantive adjective, i.e. the head noun of the genitive construction. To this we apply the English convention of articles: “the late [one] of the Sabbaths”, we can use the dynamic equivalent “later”, or more probably, “later” is in the semantic range of Ὁψὲ: “the later one of the Sabbaths.” ¶ Other uses: ὀψὲ μυστηρίων. = late for the mysteries Phil. VA 4.18. Genitive of purpose, direction; ὀψὲ τῆς μάχης = late for the battle (cf. BDF, sec. 164), from Hermes; BDAG: ὀψὲ οὔσης τῆς ὥρας = late being the hour; ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο = when late it became; μέχρις ὀψὲ = until late; ἕως

ὄψέ = until late; ὄψιας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας = late already became the hour; ὄψε διδάσκεσθαι = late to be taught; ὄψε μανθάνειν = late to learn; ὄψε τῆς ἡμέρας = late [part] of the day; τῆς ὥρας ἐγίγνετο ὄψε = the hour became late; ὄψε τῆς ἡλικίας = late [part] of the life; λείαν γὰρ ὀψαί (1. ὄψέ) σοι ταῦτα ἔγραψα = For very late to you I am writing this; οψε των βασιλευσ χρονων = the late [part] of the king's times ¶ The partitive genitive is illustrated: ὡς ἐν τούτων = as one of these (Mar6v29); τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως = the tenth [part] of the city (Rev11v13). ¶ Wallace 297 says that the regular adjective may sometimes be used in place of a comparative form, hence “late” (adj.), and “later” (compar. adj.); thus “late of the sabbaths” = “later of the sabbaths”. ¶ The reference to “dawning” in parallel with “later of the sabbaths” is equative (referring to the same time). This shows that the translation “late on the Sabbath” or “evening of the Sabbath” (also taking ‘Sabbath improperly as singular) is contradictory to the context. ¶ “The genitive with Οψε and μετ ὀλιγον have become associated in meaning with ὑστερον τούτων [later of these], προτερον τούτων [former of these]” (BLASS, 164.4, pg. 91, A Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature). ¶ Robertson, pg. 646, “It is a point, for exegesis, not for grammar, to decide.” The reason Robertson must say this is that it depends on the interpretation of the following genitive, and not on the lexical meaning of οψε, whose meaning is implicitly conceded by the use of this argument NOT to be “after”, and thus agrees with the main thesis of the editorial objection in Thayer's Lexicon. ¶ Daniel B. Wallace, “For example, the genitive of separation [i.e. ablative], a common idiom in the Attic dialect, is rare in the Koine. It has been replaced, by and large, by απο + genitive” (pg. 163, Basics). Απο, of course, means “from”. Therefore, “Later [from]” where “from” is the interpretation is a rare interpretation in Koine, and the Koine normally inserts the word απο to mean “from” in a case like this. ¶ Liddell and Scott supply an example οψιγενης = later born, “later-born, i.e. younger”, with notice that the prefix form, οψι, is from οψε. ¶ After the first century, usage and opinion about ὄψέ has thoroughly contaminated the tradition and the language itself. The truth may only be recovered by a fresh linguistic analysis of ancient material considering all theoretical usages. The opposition will say that it cannot have a theoretically possible sense because it is not seen in usage. This notion presumes that language speakers or writers will think of and use or write down all possible usages for posterity. It also presumes that no effort would be made to blot out the sense, and then the usage lost to posterity. It also assumes a skeptical approach to language utterances, and not a child's mode of learning. The child regularly hears an unfamiliar usage, and then upon making logical sense of it, adds it to his knowledge, and surely here, “And [the] late [one] of [the] Sabbaths” or “And later of Sabbaths” would be assumed by the child-like approach long before an indoctrinated leap like “after the Sabbath”; one really cannot read it this way and make sense of the two parallel clauses that follow, “at the dawning” and “the first of the Sabbaths.” ¶ Fluency in Greek is only free of bias of

later tradition if the learner was careful to consider the linguistic possibilities independent of modern usages. Fluent speakers must be willing to put the objectivity of linguistic analysis above the subjectivity of modern usage anachronistically imposed on the ancient language. The temptation to close off the parsimonious solution that makes sense of the ancient context through linguistic analysis because one “knows” it cannot mean that from their fluent tradition, or later theological opinion, must be resisted. Time and again the status quo in a field, (whether it be medicine, astrophysics, or historical interpretation or theology) has suppressed or eliminated the very evidence that would destroy their cherished theories. Such group-think evil is the worst and most advanced form of rebellion. Call it cognitive dissonance. Individual sinfulness comes second to it. Man has always committed his most heinous crimes as a group. Science and knowledge only advance by honest individuals making fresh observations using objective principles. The status quo has been infinitely corruptible since the fall of man in all aspects of life. Man is more and more corrupt and so is his language. Sinful man as a group corrupts even the language of revelation, such that the truth may only be recovered by those who will not yield to a dogma simply because it is the status quo in the face of contrary evidence being suppressed by the consensus thinkers. The only groups that can work free of this bias are those in which the researchers have no power to suppress the honest conclusions of their fellows, and where all the participants realize the absolute need to discriminate heavily against subjectively supported arguments. ¶ Equally inexcusable as the translation of Οψέ as “after” is the translation of σαββάτων as a singular; when the plural makes plain sense. See σαββάτων in the concordance. ¶ In Mat28v1 the women go to the tomb “at the dawning.” That the phrase means dawn is proved by similar constructions in Mark 16:2, “And very early on the first of the Shabbats, they arrived at the tomb as the sun rose,” and Luk. 24:1, “but on the first of the Shabbats, at deep dawn they came upon the tomb, bringing the spices” and John 20:1, “Now on the first of the Shabbats Miryam Ha-Magdalit came early, while it was still dark at the tomb, and saw the stone already taken away from the tomb.” ¶ Another approach. This much is non-controversial: “late yet of Sabbaths” represents the literal sense, each word and grammatical element being given its usual rendition. It is also non-controversial to add articles where English expects them: “[the] late yet of [the] Sabbaths.” It is also non-controversial to put the conjunction at the start of the sentence, “Yet [the] late of [the] Sabbaths”, and non-controversial to translate it “And”: “And [the] late of [the] Sabbaths.” Also non-controversial is that the adjective “late” may be used as a substantive noun: “And [the] late [one] of the Sabbaths.” ¶ Hebrew translation: וּבֹאֲהָרוֹן הַשְּׁבִתוֹת כְּעֹלוֹת הַשֶּׁחֶר לְאַחַת הַשְּׁבִתוֹת בְּאֵה מְרִים הַמִּגְדָּלִית וּמְרִים הָאֲחֵרֶת לְרֵאוֹת אֶת-הַקֶּבֶר

► 28:2 The earthquake here happens in the narrative after the women set out for the tomb “at the dawning.” While Messiah surely could have walked through the stone at his resurrection, Matthew’s point is surely that the

resurrection occurred at dawn. For the removal of the stone is simultaneous with the event, and signifies it. We have the sure word of Hos6v3, “His going forth is fixed at dawn” (יִצְאֵהוּ מִן־מוֹצָאֵי); The infirmity of Yaʿaqov held the Son fast “until the early dawn arose” (עַד־עֲלֹתֵי הַשָּׁחַר; Gen. 32:24-26), showing that the infirmity of our sins held Messiah fast in the grave until dawn at the end of the third day. ¶ Many have sought to upset the sequence of the narrative here because they suppose that he rose sometime between 3 p.m. and sunset; however, there is no trace in the original language that vs. 2 should come before vs. 1. The main verbs controlling both verses are a simple aorist, ἦλθεν and ἐγένετο.