

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוּמַם יֵשׁוּעַ  
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּתִים



**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)

Artaxerxes [I] would have been too busy to bother about Judah and the journey of some eight hundred miles from Babylon far too dangerous to contemplate. By 398, on the other hand, Egypt had already won its independence and the rebellion of Cyrus the Younger had been crushed (ibid.).

Between 459-448 B.C. Egypt was under revolt against Persia, led by Megabyzos. The Persians would have been worried about revolt in Judea at this time too, that is that the Judeans might join with Egypt, or simply use the chaos to declare their own independence. This is just what Judah's enemies accused in Ezra 4:7-23.

It would appear that traditionalist advocates of 458 B.C. think that their position is secure by default. While they come up with *ad hoc* explanations that the reverse order is not compelling against the specific points made, they fail to *prove* their own position. What do they have on their side of the question? It seems that the only thing they have is some untrustworthy assumptions. The first of these is that Ezra 7:1 means Artaxerxes I and not Artaxerxes II. That is a fairly hazardous assumption given that only 49 years separates 445 B.C. in the 20th year of Artaxerxes I from the end of Ezra's reform in 397 B.C. during the reign of Artaxerxes II. The other assumption is that since Ezra read the Torah in Nehemiah 8 that he must have accomplished his reforms earlier than that. There is no reason that his final reforms could not have been 49 years later during his old and wizened age. And there is no reason that Ezra could not have found his first opportunities to present Torah on a national scale under Nehemiah's administration.

The 458 B.C. advocates would assume that the reverse view is refuted by the contemporaneity of Nehemiah and Ezra. This is easily countered by positing a young Ezra in 445 B.C. vs. an older one in 397 B.C. The order of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah also are not compelling to the traditional err. Ezra moves from Cyrus to Darius, and then from Xerxes to Artaxerxes without ever including himself, until chapter 7. Tellingly, he skips at least Xerxes in his final statement of chapter 6:14, and it is obvious that the mention of "Artaxerxes" passes beyond any obvious rebuilding commandment. There is therefore no proof that he means Artaxerxes I over

Artaxerxes II. Also the edict by Artaxerxes I to stop building the city “until a decree is made by me” is related by Ezra as past history before his coming in Ezra 7 is detailed.

Also devastating to putting Ezra’s administration before Nehemiah’s is the fact that Nehemiah does not mention the exiles who returned under Ezra. The only list Nehemiah has is the list of returnees under Zerubbabel! (cf. Neh. 7:5-73 and Ezra 8:1-14). If Ezra had come earlier, then the complete omission of those who returned with him is inexplicable. It would seem that a return 13 years before would be worthy of mention if one was going to go to the trouble to mention the returnees all the way back to Zerubbabel.

The reverse order of Ezra and Nehemiah was proposed long before Van Hoonacker in 1890:

This was suggested as long ago as 1699 by Aegidius Strauch[ius] in *Breviarium chronologicum: being a Treatise describing...the periods, and epoch's used in chronology...Now done into English by R. Sault* (London, 1699) 360. He mentions Joseph Scaliger as a supporter for this date. It was also advocated by S. Patrick, *A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament* (London, 1727) 1.674 (cf. 2.687 in 1822 ed.), and by W. H. Mill, *The Evangelical Account of the Descent and Parentage of the Saviour Vindicated* (Cambridge: University Press, 1842) 153, but given a new lease of life by Maurice Vernes in 1889 in his *Précis d'histoire juive depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque persane* (Paris: Hachette, 1889) and A. van Hoonacker, “Néhémie et Esdras. Une nouvelle hypothèse sur la chronologie de l'époque de la Restauration,” *Le Muséon* 9 (1890) 151-84, 317-51, 389-401.<sup>375</sup>

---

<sup>375</sup> *Was Nehemiah Contemporary with Ezra in 458 BC?* Leslie McFall, note 7. McFall also details some other notable supporters: Others who championed this view were W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (repr. New York: Doubleday, 1957), who later abandoned this date in favour of 428 in *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra* (New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963) 93, 111, and in “Brief History,” 13; cf. also Batten, *Ezra*, 28, 47; R. A. Bowman in *The Interpreter’s Bible* (New York & Nashville, 1954), 3.551-68; L. H. Brockington, *Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther* (Century Bible; London: Nelson, 1969) 21; H. Cazelles, “La mission

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

