

הַיּוֹם בְּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמַם יֵשׁוּעַ
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּוֶת



**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)

Ginnethoi, Abijah, Mijamin, Maadiah, Bilgah, Shemaiah and Joiarib, Jedaiah, Sallu, Amok, Hilkiah, and Jedaiah. These were the heads of the priests and their kinsmen in the days of Jeshua (Neh. 12:1-7).

Now notice that 15 of the family names listed in vs. 1-7 are all repeated in vs. 12-21. The following verses contain the same list at a later time, with a few surnames dropped, only this time a personal name is connected to the surname for each family during the priesthood of Joiakim.

And Jeshua became the father of Joiakim, and Joiakim became the father of Eliashib, and Eliashib became the father of Joiada, and Joiada became the father of Jonathan [Johanan], and Jonathan [Johanan] became the father of Jaddua. Now in the days of Joiakim the priests, the heads of fathers' households were: **of Seraiah, Meraiah**; of Jeremiah, Hananiah; of Ezra, Meshullam; of Amariah, Jehohanan; of Malluchi, Jonathan; of Shebaniah, Joseph; of Harim, Adna; of Meraioth, Helkai; of Iddo, Zechariah; of Ginnethon, Meshullam; of Abijah, Zichri; of Miniamin, of Moadiah, Piltai; of Bilgah, Shammua; of Shemaiah, Jehonathan; of Joiarib, Mattenai; of Jedaiah, Uzzi; of Sallai, Kallai; of Amok, Eber; of Hilkiah, Hashabiah; of Jedaiah, Nethanel (Neh. 12:10-20).

The Hebrew text: **לְעֶזְרָא מְשֻׁלָּם** = *of Ezra, Meshullam*. There is no possibility of confusing the family name with the personal name here, because each surname is preceded by a lamed (ל). The priestly surnames correspond to the priestly courses or rotations as named at the time. We see that “Abijah” is mentioned above, and that Zichri was serving for that family then. “Abijah” was the eighth lot (1Chron. 24:10). We later learn that Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, was from the “division of Abijah” (Luke 1:5). Evidently then, there was one Meshullam, surnamed “Ezra,” a surname separate from the surname “Seraiah” in the return under Zerubbabel. And this Meshullam personally represented the Ezra family when Joiakim was the high priest, in the time before Nehemiah. But the Ezra family was not the Seraiah family. And our reformer belongs to the latter.

Also it is problematic for 458 b.c. advocates that we have the head of the Seraiah family in the days of Joiakim as one “Meraiah.” If

Ezra the reformer came before Nehemiah, it is amazing that his name is not linked with Seraiah and with the high priest just before Nehemiah's contemporary high priest "Eliashib." It seems that Ezra son of Seraiah is no where in sight in the days of Joiakim. And it seems that way because Ezra the Scribe was not the head of Seraiah at the time, but likely still a student of Torah in 458 B.C., and not the active leader.

So then, when Nehemiah 8:1 refers to "Ezra the scribe," this is to say a scribe from the priestly family surnamed "Seraiah" (whom the reformer gives as his family name in Ezra 7:1). There is no need for "Ezra the scribe" and reformer to appear as a leader in history before Nehemiah 8:1. This is one man personally named "Ezra" that is evidently not from the family surnamed Ezra, but from the family surnamed Seraiah.

Later "Ezra the scribe" in Ezra 7 was given the executive power after Nehemiah by Artaxerxes II. Neh. 12:26 also gives the order of their governance, first Nehemiah, and then Ezra: "These served in the days of Joiakim...and in the days of Nehemiah the governor and of Ezra the Priest, the scribe." The order is given Joiakim, Nehemiah, Ezra, or three Jewish administrations falling into the reign of Artaxerxes I and II. The phrase "in the days of" is used to indicate whose administration it was. Sometimes the administrator was the high priest, and sometimes not.

It was under the administration of Joiakim that the building of the city was stopped by enemies and the wall broken down just before Nehemiah was appointed to restore them. The importance of Neh. 12:26 is that the three administrations were successive. Clearly the mention Joiakim's "days" were not contemporary with Nehemiah's "days." So also for Ezra's days of administration. This is not to say that the two were not personal contemporaries in Neh. 8 during Nehemiah's administration. It is only giving the succession of their administrations which were not contemporary.

Those who would not regard "Ezra," (prior to "Ezra the scribe") or the other names as surnames are left with a massive contradiction. The time between the same names that went up in the first year of Cyrus and the 7th year of Artaxerxes I is at least 70 years. A person

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

