

things at the start of the seventh year! So, A.D. 33 cannot be accommodated (with its Friday date) by shifting the seventh year backward.

There are no loose ends in this prophecy. The technical details of all of biblical chronology are dealt with in *The Scroll of Biblical Chronology and Prophecy*. Here I will just summarize some technical points for the sake of those who have already tried to grapple with this subject. (1) Ezra came to Jerusalem in the 7th year of Artaxerxes II, but it was not his first time. (2) His first and second coming corresponds to the “seven sevens” in the prophecy. (3) The solution to Nehemiah 1:1 is to backdate to a Tishri year, and not forward date. This is proved by the time of Xerxes death. More on this later. (4) “Cyrus” is a surname, or “throne name” according to history and Isaiah 45:4, and was thus inherited by Artaxerxes. (5) Josephus gives the title “Cyrus” to Artaxerxes.<sup>321</sup> Thus it is explained how “Cyrus” gave orders to rebuild the city and the temple spanning over three kings who inherited that title, and it is clear that the prophecy began with Nehemiah under Artaxerxes I.

It is confirmed that Daniel 9:24-26 teaches sixty-nine sabbatical years from 445/444 B.C. to A.D. 32/33, and that Messiah was “cut off” after in A.D. 34. And A.D. 34 is the only year that works such that Yeshua died on the 4th day of the week and rose from the dead on the 7th day of the week.

---

<sup>321</sup> *Jos. Ant.* 11:184. We cannot trust Josephus here entirely because he has generally mixed everything up in this period of time. The title was first held by Artaxerxes brother Cyrus, who was crown prince. Both Xerxes and Cyrus were murdered by Artabanus leaving the throne and title to Artaxerxes, who successfully uncovered the plot and punished the crime of Artabanus. Artaxerxes chose to use the title “Artaxerxes” rather than Cyrus, possibly for personal reasons connected to the murder of his brother. The title was nevertheless his. Royal persons often have many titles that cannot be remembered by everyone. I do not see any reason to suppose that Artaxerxes was willingly complicit in either his father’s or brother’s death. Such guilt is exactly what a Greek propagandist would have us believe to tarnish the rule and legitimacy of Artaxerxes.