

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמֵם 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)

younger when he read the Torah and still living to be appointed to a new administration by Artaxerxes II. Tradition does assign Ezra a rather long life.

How then is it better to have Ezra's administration before Nehemiah as the explanation of their association in 445 B.C. and 431 B.C. ? Is a 12 or 13 year difference any better than a 49 year one? As long as a person can live to 90 or 95 years, there is no problem. Ezra could easily have been 40 years old in 445 B.C. and lived to complete an administration starting in 397 B.C. This is a lot more sensible than the constant "explaining away" that traditionalists have to provide against the arguments of putting Nehemiah's administration first. In fact, explaining away is all they do, and they are reluctant to admit that their view depends on only one and a half assumptions.

To say that the lack of population in Nehemiah's time is not an indicator of his priority is simply a special pleading. To say that Ezra 10:6 refers to some other Eliashib and Johanan, or that Johanan was not the High Priest in Ezra 10:6 is another special pleading. To explain away the fact that the people had not before heard the Torah in Nehemiah 8, and that they were weeping is yet another special pleading. To ignore the story in Josephus about the provocative tax placed on the daily offering during the high priesthood of Johanan, and that Artaxerxes II's decree is a direct answer to this is another *ad hoc* argument.

Those are just some of the arguments I have gone through. The truth is that those who want Ezra's administration first only spend time explaining away the opposition arguments because they have no secure arguments of their own to prove that Ezra's administration came first. When one reads the book of Ezra, in 6:14 Ezra mentions the kings in order, skipping at least Xerxes forward to an Artaxerxes. Ezra never comes into the story until this Artaxerxes. There is no mention of any other king in the rest of the book, and no mention of Nehemiah. There are two Artaxerxes after the Darius of 6:14. In Ezra's day, and for several generations afterward, there was no doubt that he meant Artaxerxes II.

On the other hand, in the book of Nehemiah, there is no mention of Ezra before chapter 8, and no mention after until 12:26, which

gives the order of administrations. Then the next mention is 12:36 in the narrative of the wall dedication, which had to happen in 431 B.C. Nehemiah 12:1 and 12:33 have nothing to do with “Ezra the Scribe,” and it may be justly assumed that Ezra himself put the book of Ezra first with Nehemiah as the appendix and some of his own editings of things that happened after the wall builder died. For sure Nehemiah 12:26 is one of Ezra’s additions. In Nehemiah, Ezra is no more than an accomplished and respected scribe recognized as a leader.

The phrase “in the days of” (יָמָיו) applies distributively in a list, which give the religious administrations of the high priestly office:

As for the Levites, the heads of fathers' *households* were registered in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, and Johanan, and Jaddua; so *were* the priests in the reign of Darius the Persian.

One can justly supply “in the days of” before each name in the list, and take the high priestly administrations sequentially. Likewise with Neh. 12:26, which details the administrations of the civil authority:

These *served* in the days of Joiakim the son of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, and in the days of Nehemiah the governor and [*in the days*] of Ezra the priest *and* scribe.

Because “in the days of” is used distributively, we can supply those words for Ezra’s administration after Nehemiah’s. It is plainly obvious that the norm is to list administrations in order. It is special pleading to say otherwise. The parsimonious principle (Occam’s Razor) indicates that we should take these statements under their normal assumptions. Even more unparsimonious is to ignore the contextual clues that Nehemiah’s administration was first, and then try to explain them away.

The way then to argue with traditionalists is to point out that Nehemiah 12:26 has the order of administrations, and that this statement has the normal default sequence unless proved otherwise. This will keep the 458 or 457 B.C. advocates from getting away with assuming their position is correct and then proceeding to explain away the positive arguments for Nehemiah first while failing to provide any proof that Ezra came first. They hope that everyone gets

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

