

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמַם יֵשׁוּעַ
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּוֹת



**The Resurrection Day
Of Messiah Yeshua**

When It Happened

According To The Original
Texts

Order From:

<http://www.torahtimes.org/>

Preview is on next two Pages
(laid out in book order)

has hence been argued that he was emperor as early as A.D. 12. The genuineness of these coins has been questioned by Eckhel, iii. 277. But even admitting them to be free from suspicion, they prove only that Tiberius had then been honored with the title of Augustus, not that he had then begun to reign as emperor. Besides, there are other undoubted coins of Antioch which show conclusively that the Antiochians (and Luke himself was a native, or at least an inhabitant, of that city) dated the reign of Tiberius not from A.D. 12, but from the death of Augustus in A.D. 14. Thus we have one coin of Antioch with the head of Tiberius and the letter A, i.e. the first year of his reign, and coupled with the Actian year EM, or 45, and therefore equivalent to A.D. 14-15. Again, there are other coins with the head of Tiberius, and the letter Γ, i.e. that is, in the third year of his reign, and coupled with the Actian year ZM, or 47, and therefore equivalent to A.D. 16-17.²⁵⁵, ²⁵⁶

Why were the Roman dates “revised” by Christian chronologists? They were revised because the Church of Rome advocated a Friday date in A.D. 30. However, this date is contradictory to the normal Roman chronology when put together with the required length of Messiah’s ministry. The Church started out with the wrong assumptions. First they assumed that Messiah’s ministry was only one year, then finding otherwise, revised Tiberius’ reign backward according to a Friday in A.D. 30. This then was “corrected” to A.D. 33. But the correction too was mistaken as it did not account for the true length of Messiah’s ministry, and missed it due to the commitment to Friday-Sunday.

For now, I am simply pointing out that all of the “mistakes” made by the Church have motives behind them that find their origin in either ignorance of Torah or rebellion against it. And when history contradicts their “mistakes,” things are revised in another mistaken direction due to the desire to avoid the correct conclusion.

One of these mistakes I should repeat here is the dating of Messiah’s birth before 4 B.C., and the dating of Herod’s demise in that

²⁵⁵ Eckhel, iii. 278.

²⁵⁶ Page liii-lv. *Fasti Sacri or A Key to the Chronology Of The New Testament*, Thomas Lewin, Esq., 1865.

year. This came about due to the Church commitment to the Friday date in A.D. 30. The Church was trying to “fix” a problem, and that was that Luke tells us that Yeshua was “thirty years” old in the 15th year of Tiberius. If the A.D. 30 date is to be defended, then the ministry of Yeshua must begin around A.D. 25-27. But this implies a 15th year of Tiberius in A.D. 26/27 instead of the correct A.D. 28/29. This in turn forces the birth year to just before 4 B.C. It is important to know that this chain of reasoning occurred because of the prior commitment to a Friday crucifixion date in A.D. 30.

But now, it has been discovered that Herod did not die in 4 B.C. He died in 1 B.C! Thus, we have to unwind all the damage caused by the Friday crucifixion commitment in A.D. 30. David W. Beyer explains what went wrong:²⁵⁷

A central argument offered by scholars supporting 4 B.C. as the year of Herod’s death focuses on the dating of his son Philip’s reign. Modern editions of Josephus’ *Antiquities of the Jews* unanimously state that Philip died in the twentieth year of Tiberius, that is, in A.D. 34, after ruling thirty-seven years. Therefore: A.D. 34 - 37 years = 4 B.C.

The logic seems concise and irrefutable. Nevertheless, it is flawed by a contaminated evidentiary source....

What Beyer is referring to here is that when the hand copied manuscripts of Josephus were first type set to be printed a mistake was made in *Ant.* 18:106. The word “second” was dropped out of the text. Herod Philip died in the “twenty-second year of Tiberius” and not in the “twentieth.” This means that the 37th year numismatic evidence implies the reign beginning in B.C. 1 for Herod’s son, and thus the death of Herod the Great in that year.

He says:

My visits to the British Library in April 1983 uncovered evidence that substantiates Filmer’s thesis. Out of the forty-six early editions of Josephus’ *Antiquities* published before 1700 that were examined, twenty seven demonstrate the uncommon “twenty-second year of

²⁵⁷ “Josephus Reexamined: Unraveling the Twenty-Second Year of Tiberius,” *Chronos Kairos Christos II*, Ray Summers.

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

<http://www.torahtimes.org/pbook>

