

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמַם 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)

From all these scholars, and many more could be listed, it appears that the 458 B.C. advocates have been unable to vanquish the scholarly advocates of the reverse view. This is because they have no magic argument, and no final proof of their own position. The very existence of the alternative, without compelling eschatological reasons for holding to the alternative, argues eloquently for its independent truth. And now I have given most excellent eschatological and prophetic reasons for seeing why the order Nehemiah first, and then Ezra is correct. Ezra fulfills the “seven sevens” after 49 years. If this consideration is not the spiritual prize to be won after all the academic drudgery, then nothing else will be.

It may simply be noted that the real reasons that the traditional view endures are 1) it is traditional. 2) It is foundational to the most plausible errant view of Daniel 9 and Passion Chronology. That is, it discards the minimum number of facts necessary to construct a chronology that arrives at a Friday crucifixion and yet gives a sellable explanation of Daniel 9. It would not be enough to err by equating 458 B.C. with the 7th year of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7. A corresponding err has to be accepted in ignoring the 15th year of Tiberius, so that the beginning of Messiah’s ministry can be moved back from A.D. 30 or 31.

The only nagging question is not why the view I have presented in this book is better, but why the incorrect view seems to “correlate” to when Tiberius was given charge of the provinces in A.D. 11 or 12. If there must be a reason, then sometimes it is better to give people something to “believe in” rather than to insist they be perfect. This is the parable principle. Let sinners find what they will in the symbolism so that they do not find what they do not want to find. I think the principle extends to the way the Almighty arranged history. So there are 3 Artaxerxes, 3 Darius, and Cyrus turns out to be a throne name, and two Friday’s in A.D. 30 and 33 to compete with the real deal in

---

d’Esdras,” VT IV (1954) 113-40; J. Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1949) 200; Saley, “Date of Nehemiah,” 151-65; de Saulcy, *Chronologique*, 46; N. H. Smith, “Ezra’s Arrival,” 53-66; Torrey, *Ezra Studies* 38 n. 1, 170, 239, 260 n. 11; G. Widengren, “The Persian Period,” in *Israelite and Judean History* (ed. J. H. Hayes & J. M. Miller; London: SCM, 1977) 503-09.

A.D. 34. If these byways were not there, then there would be nothing to think about, and no parable principle.

That the one is golden truth for the seeker, and the other only a bone thrown to the dogs to keep them from rending the truth completely seems to be clear enough. The real question is what prodigal Ephraim will decide to do, to keep chewing the same bone with the dogs or to come to his senses and return to his Father's house? The reality is that the meat on the bone is only a mist and the "correlations" are an illusory comedy of errors.

### THE ARGUMENT FOR EZRA COMING FIRST

I have touched on this before briefly at several points. The advocates of the 458 or 457 B.C. date assume that they do not have to defend it. They spend their time explaining away the arguments put for the reverse order in ad hoc and non-parsimonious ways. What then do they offer as an argument that Ezra came first, other than the fact that there is a tradition that he did? Is tradition the truth by default? Many "traditions" have been proved false after being "tradition" for the longest periods of times. So tradition itself is not an argument for the priority of Ezra.

We may ask what arguments the traditionalist puts forth that we who hold that Nehemiah's administration comes first have to answer? When the traditionalist says that Ezra came in the seventh year of Artaxerxes I, he is assuming that is what Ezra meant. Is there anything unparsimonious to assuming that he meant Artaxerxes II instead? No, of course not. So the first pillar of the traditionalist against the reverse order has nothing to recommend it as better. The second argument that we may have to explain is that Nehemiah and Ezra are obviously together at the reading of the Torah in 445 B.C. and the dedication of the walls in 431 B.C. The answer to this is that they were together, but it was Nehemiah's administration. Nehemiah went back to Persia, and was appointed to a second administration. Later, apparently Ezra went to Babylon, and came to the notice of Artaxerxes II who appointed him to a new administration in 397 B.C. This was only 49 years, so it is not impossible that Ezra was 49 years

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

