

THE ONE YEAR

MINISTRY OF

CHRIST

Versus the Three and a Half Years Given to Us by

Orthodox Christianity

Pastor John Shane Vaughn

Founding Apostolic Overseer

First Harvest Ministries International

REVISED 7/20/2026 by Pastor John Shane Vaughn, the

author

Published by First Harvest Ministries International

P.O. Box 2757 · Bay St. Louis, MS 39521

www.HisComingKingdom.com

Published by the tithe and offering of the saints of FHMI

as a missionary outreach.

Not to be sold for profit.

Scripture quotations are from the Authorized Version, with the sacred Names YAHWEH and

YAHSHUA restored to their rightful place.

A NOTE ON THIS EDITION

This edition brings the chronological placement of Yahshua's ministry into alignment with the restored biblical chronology documented in Creation Time Restored, Second Revision.

Earlier presentations of this teaching placed the baptism at approximately 28–29 CE and the crucifixion at 30 CE, following the conventional reckoning of the fifteenth year of Tiberius. That placement has been corrected. The ministry is now positioned at 34–35 CE, where the death and burial of Yahshua falls at Year 4000 AM — the exact midst of the seven-thousand-year prophetic week.

The argument of this booklet is unchanged. It was never an argument about which year. It was, and remains, an argument about how long. Every pillar of the case stands exactly as it did: the acceptable year of Isaiah 61, the Torah requirement of a lamb of the first year, the single Passover of the synoptic Gospels, the interpolation at John 6:4, and the witness of the early fathers.

What has changed is that the one-year ministry no longer stands beside the FHMI chronology. It now sits inside it — and confirms it.



INTRODUCTION

Something Scarier Than Halloween

I am writing this in the season of everything scary. And in that season I began to think about something genuinely frightening — far more frightening than anything the season traffics in.

It is how easily the Christian church believes information

it has never once questioned.

That is scary. And it happens to the best of us.

I want to show you one example. Something we have never questioned.

We simply believed it, because everyone around us believed it, and because the men who taught us believed it, and because their teachers believed it before them.

Here it is: the three-and-a-half-year ministry of Yahshua.

And the problem with it is this. It is nowhere in the Bible.

Nowhere.

I am going to prove to you in these pages that Yahshua had a one-year ministry, not three and a half. And if you will follow the argument to its end, you will never again be able to believe otherwise.

The Question That Always Comes

Whenever I bring these kinds of truths, the immediate question arrives: how

did the church miss it all these years? Do you think you are smarter than everybody?

No. I do not.

But I do know what Daniel was told.

"But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

— Daniel 12:4

Much revelation was sealed. Daniel was told to seal it. And we were told that the truth would not come out until the end of days — which is where we are now. We are told that knowledge of His word would be increased just before the coming of the King.

I am not sorry that I happen to be living in the time when more understanding is being revealed. I am grateful for it. And I intend to hand it to you.

The Requirement That Started It All

Before we go one step further, let me put the heart of this in front of you.

If Yahshua is the Lamb of YAHWEH — and we know that He is — then there were two requirements the lamb had to meet to be the sacrifice for your sin.

Number one: He had to be spotless.

We know Yahshua fulfilled that one. The church has preached it from every

pulpit in Christendom for two thousand years, and rightly so.

Number two: He could only be one year old.

He had to be a lamb of the first year. That means from the moment He was baptized, when His ministry began, until the day He died — He could not be more than a year under consecration.

If He was, He did not meet the Torah requirement.

That is why this matters. That is why I will not let it go. This is not a curiosity of chronology. This is the qualification of your sacrifice.



CHAPTER ONE

The Acceptable Year

Let us start with one verse of Scripture that I wonder if you have ever truly thought about.

Yahshua quotes Isaiah in the fourth chapter of Luke. This is immediately after His baptism. This is His inaugural address — the first public declaration of His ministry.

"The Spirit of YAHWEH is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of YAHWEH."

— Luke 4:18–19

And then He said:

"This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

— Luke 4:21

The acceptable year.

One year.

He said the Spirit of YAHWEH is now upon Me — this is right after His baptism — to fulfill the year of YAHWEH. And then He said, today this Scripture is fulfilled in your hearing.

He tells us right there, at the outset, that His ministry will last one single year.

He Stopped in the Middle of the Verse

There is something else here, and once you see it you will understand that Yahshua was reading with surgical precision.

The passage He was quoting — Isaiah 61:2 — reads in full:

"To proclaim the acceptable year of YAHWEH, and the day of vengeance of our Elohim."

He read the first half. And then He closed the scroll, handed it back to the attendant, and sat down.

He did not read "and the day of vengeance";

He stopped mid-verse.

Why? Because the acceptable year was His assignment at that moment.

The day of vengeance was not. The acceptable year belongs to His first coming. The day of vengeance belongs to His return.

A man who stops mid-sentence in a public reading is not being careless.

He is being exact. And a man that exact about where the sentence ends is a man who means precisely what He said about the length of the year.

This Is Jubilee Language

The phrase Isaiah used was not a generic expression for a favorable season.

The acceptable year of YAHWEH is Jubilee language.

Leviticus 25 commands that in the Jubilee year, liberty is proclaimed throughout the land to all its inhabitants. Debts are released. Captives go free. Every man returns to his inheritance.

Isaiah 61 uses that exact vocabulary on purpose: preaching deliverance to the captives, setting at liberty them that are bruised, proclaiming the acceptable year.

Yahshua was not merely announcing a ministry. He was declaring a Jubilee. And a Jubilee is a year. It has a beginning at the trumpet and an end at the trumpet. It is bounded time by definition.

Every person in that synagogue understood the reference. They had been hearing Jubilee language in their liturgy their entire lives.

We are the ones who forgot.



CHAPTER TWO

A Male of the First Year

Now let me give you the argument from Torah, because this is the one that settles it.

Torah is explicit about what qualifies a lamb for sacrifice. There are two conditions, and they are stated in the same breath, in the same verse, by the same YAHWEH.

**"Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year."
— Exodus 12:5**

Without blemish. Spotless. Unmarred. No defect.

A male of the first year. A yearling. Not a lamb of two years. Not a lamb of three and a half years.

The church has proclaimed the first requirement for two thousand years. Spotless. Sinless. Without blemish. Amen and amen — it is gloriously true and I will preach it until I die.

And the church has been almost entirely silent about the second.

You Cannot Take Half a Verse

If Yahshua fulfilled the Passover type — and the entire apostolic witness insists that He did — then He had to meet both conditions. Not the convenient one. Both.

"For even Messiah our passover is sacrificed for us."

— 1 Corinthians 5:7

Paul does not say Yahshua was like the Passover lamb. He says He is the Passover. The identification is total.

But a lamb of the first year is a lamb whose consecrated life is bounded by twelve months.

Which raises the question the church has never thought to ask: from what point is the year counted?

Not from His birth. He was not offered as an infant. The lamb is set apart, examined, and then offered.

The counting begins at consecration — at the moment He was publicly set apart for sacrifice.

And Scripture tells us exactly when that was.

The Jordan Was the Consecration

At the Jordan, three things happened at once, and every one of them is priestly and sacrificial language.

The Spirit descended upon Him — the anointing.

The voice from heaven declared Him — the divine attestation, the examination of the offering.

And He immediately entered the wilderness — the setting apart.

From that moment, the Lamb was consecrated. From that moment, the year began to run.

And precisely one year later, at Passover, He was offered.

Notice what John the Baptist said, and notice where he said it:

"Behold the Lamb of YAHWEH, which taketh away the sin of the world."

— John 1:29

He said this at the Jordan. Not three and a half years later. At the moment of consecration.

He identified the offering on the day it was set apart. That is exactly what a priest does.

Three and a Half Years Ruins the Type

Follow this all the way to the end, because this is where the traditional timeline does not merely bend. It breaks.

If Yahshua's ministry ran three and a half years from His baptism, then at the moment of His offering He was a lamb in His fourth year of consecration.

A fourth-year lamb does not qualify.

Under Torah, it cannot be offered as a Passover lamb. It fails the requirement as surely and as completely as a blemished lamb fails it.

You cannot preach "without blemish" from Exodus 12:5 and then ignore

"a male of the first year" — from the same sentence, of the same verse, in the

same commandment.

Either the verse governs the Messiah's qualifications or it does not.

I am not willing to say that YAHWEH was careless with half of His own requirement. I am not willing to say that the Lamb of YAHWEH failed a

Torah condition and that it did not matter.

It mattered. It always mattered.

The Lamb was of the first year.

Which means the ministry was one year.



CHAPTER THREE

Where the Error Came From

So where did the three-and-a-half-year tradition come from?

It came from counting Passovers in the Gospel of John. And in the end, it rests on a single verse.

The Three Passovers

Three Passovers are identified in John's Gospel:

- **John 2:13 — the cleansing of the temple**
- **John 6:4 — the feeding of the five thousand**
- **John 11:55 — leading to the crucifixion**

Three Passovers. Passover happens once a year. One, two, three. Therefore the ministry lasted at least two and a half years, commonly rounded up to three and a half.

That is where all of the error comes from. And I do not really blame anybody for it. If you read those three references, that conclusion is very easy

to surmise.

But here is the problem.

Three Gospels Say One

Matthew, Mark, and Luke — the synoptic Gospels, the ones that are supposed to line up — record exactly one Passover in the ministry of Yahshua.

The final one. None of them mentions a second. None mentions a third.

Note carefully: one Passover in the ministry. Not in the life. Luke records the boyhood Passover when He was twelve. We are speaking of the ministry. So how can that be, when John mentions three?

They Were Not Written at the Same Time

The Gospels were not written simultaneously. The approximate dating is not seriously disputed:

Gospel Written after the events

Mark about 35 to 40 years

Matthew about 40 to 55 years

Luke about 45 to 55 years

John close to 70 years

Think about that. Three of those four Gospels have only one Passover in the ministry of Christ. And the one that has three is the one written last — nearly seventy years after the events, and thirty-plus years after the other three.

John Was Not Writing Chronology

Scholars routinely acknowledge that John's Gospel is the most theologically developed, the most stylistically distinct, the most reflective and interpretive — and the least chronologically rigid.

What does that mean in practice?

John was a deep, deep teacher. Matthew, Mark, and Luke were, in the main, reporters. They wrote down what happened.

John was doing something else. His book was not written for chronology's sake. It was written for theology's sake. He was making points. He was teaching in his writing.

And I understand that, because my own mind works the same way. The people of my church will tell you that I drive them to distraction, because I am not a man who keeps up with chronology. My mind thinks in a different way. I am always looking for the mystery of it, the insight, the theology. That is how I operate — and I will get dates wrong and timing wrong in my own mind, because that is not where my attention goes.

So I believe I understand why John was not focused on chronology. He was not careless. He was occupied with something deeper.

The Rule of Earlier Sources

Here is the principle that governs every field of historical inquiry:

When a single late source contradicts multiple earlier sources, the earlier sources prevail — unless extraordinary evidence compels otherwise.

There is no extraordinary evidence here.

What exists is one verse. John 6:4. One verse that disrupts the flow of four Gospels.

Remove it, and John's Gospel records two Passovers — the temple cleansing at the outset, and the crucifixion at the end. Which is entirely compatible with a single-year ministry.

The entire three-year framework rests on one

parenthetical clause.

So the question becomes critical: is John 6:4 original to the text, or was it inserted later?

That is the pivotal question of this entire booklet.



CHAPTER FOUR

The Verse That Does Not Fit

Let us read the passage together and watch the flow.

"After this, Yahshua went away to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, which is the Sea of Tiberias. A large crowd was following him, because they saw the signs that he was doing on the sick. Yahshua went up on the mountain, and there he sat down with his disciples.

>

Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand.

>

Lifting up his eyes, then, and seeing that a large crowd was coming toward him, Yahshua said to Philip, ‘Where are we to buy bread, so that these people may eat?’

— John 6:1–5

Are you following the flow?

This is a story about miracles. This is a story about healing the sick. And then suddenly, out of nowhere, verse four appears.

Did you notice it? Did anything stick out to you?

It does not fit.

It does not fit the flow. Nobody is talking about Passover. Nobody there is going to Jerusalem. This is not a chronological treatise — it is a story about buying bread for thousands of people who are watching Yahshua work miracles.

But verse four, parenthetically, almost out of nowhere: now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was near.

It totally interrupts the narrative. It has no connection to verse three, and no connection to verse five. If you remove that verse, you have a beautiful, uninterrupted flow.

And the Passover reference is never mentioned again in the entire feeding of the five thousand. No one goes up to the feast. No lamb is discussed. No observance is kept. The reference does no work whatsoever.

The Synoptics Do Not Have It

When Matthew, Mark, and Luke tell this same story — the feeding of the five thousand, in Matthew 14, Mark 6, and Luke 9 — not one of them says “now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was near.”

Three independent accounts of the identical event. The chronological marker appears in none of them.

The Manuscript Gap

Now here is what many fail to realize, and it is important.

We have no first-century manuscripts of the Gospel of

John.

The earliest manuscript containing John 6:4 is a papyrus dated to approximately 200 CE. That is roughly 165 years after the events. The next is from approximately 225 CE.

That is an enormous gap.

Let me help it make sense. Imagine that the earliest surviving copy of a document describing the American Civil War was written in the present decade. Everyone who was there is long dead. Oral traditions have taken root. Copies have been made from copies.

In that span, all the eyewitnesses are dead. Manuscripts have been copied, edited, and harmonized by scribes — some of them with theological agendas.

Tatian's Diatessaron

Now I want to take you to a document called the Diatessaron.

It is a harmony of the four Gospels, compiled by Tatian in the second century. It is earlier than any major manuscript of John that we possess.

And it omits John 6:4.

Tatian wrote roughly seventy years after John's composition — far closer to the original than our earliest surviving copies of John itself. The earliest manuscript we have of John's Gospel stands about 165 years from the events.

Tatian stands at roughly seventy.

And in Tatian, John 6:4 is not there.

I will be fair with you about the weight of this, because I want this argument to survive contact with a scholar. The Diatessaron is a harmony, and harmonies compress by their nature. Tatian omitted a great deal of material as he wove four accounts into one. His silence on a single verse is suggestive rather than conclusive on its own.

But it is not nothing. And it does not stand alone.

We Know This Happens

We know with certainty that passages were added to the New Testament after the originals were written. This is not disputed by any honest scholar, and you can verify every one of these in the footnotes of nearly any modern study

Bible:

- The woman caught in adultery — John 7:53 through 8:11. Missing from the earliest manuscripts. A later insertion.

- The longer ending of Mark — Mark 16:9–20. Not in the earliest manuscripts.

- The Johannine Comma — 1 John 5:7–8 in its expanded form.

Absent from all Greek manuscripts until the late medieval period.

These are established facts of textual criticism.

John 6:4 belongs in the same category of inquiry. A single parenthetical clause, absent from the earliest harmony, disrupting a narrative that flows perfectly without it, contradicting three earlier Gospels, and single-handedly creating a chronology that violates the Torah requirement for the Passover lamb.

A Word About Inspiration

I must stop here and make something very plain, because when people hear me talk this way, something in them grows afraid. They think I am saying that the Word of YAHWEH is not inspired — that there are mistakes in it.

Perish the thought of such foolishness.

We believe no such thing. In fact, we hold the opposite so adamantly that we come against any scribal insertion that entered the text long after the original manuscripts.

So mark this down:

The Word of YAHWEH is perfect. The translation in your

hand is not.

None of them are. Not one. The only thing that is perfect is the original handwritten Gospels as the apostles produced them.

And the way we study is by obeying the Scripture:

“Study to shew thyself approved unto YAHWEH, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”

— 2 Timothy 2:15

Let me show you what ashamed looks like. It looks like believing in a three-and-a-half-year ministry because you never studied.

Our duty is to seek the original, study it, and identify anything that was added or taken away. That is not disrespect toward the Word. It is the highest reverence a man can show it — refusing to let anything counterfeit sit inside it unexamined.



CHAPTER FIVE

The Voice of the Early Fathers

If the one-year ministry is the apostolic position, we should find it in the earliest voices after the apostles — the men closest to the source, writing before councils and creeds hardened the tradition.

We do.

Clement of Alexandria, in the *Stromata*, discusses the chronology of Yahshua’s ministry and preserves the tradition that it lasted a single year. And notice what he connects it to: Isaiah’s acceptable year — the very passage Yahshua read at Nazareth. Clement is not counting Passovers in

John. He is reasoning from the Messiah's own announcement.

Irenaeus of Lyon records that the one-year reading was held in his time. Irenaeus himself argued against it — he preferred a longer ministry — and that makes his testimony more valuable, not less.

He is a hostile witness. He tells us the one-year view existed and was current, and he takes the trouble to argue with it. You do not argue with a position that nobody holds.

Tertullian reflects a one-year chronology in his reckoning, connecting the ministry to the fifteenth year of Tiberius and the Passover of the Passion without intervening years.

Julius Africanus, one of the earliest Christian chronographers and a serious student of biblical timelines, worked from a framework consistent with a single-year ministry.

When It Changed

Around the third century, multiple views began to circulate. The three-and-a-half-year model became dominant in the era of the great councils and the imperial church.

And I do not think the timing is a coincidence.

That is the same era that gave us a Sunday Sabbath, a Friday crucifixion, a spring festival named after a fertility goddess, and a systematic severing of the assembly from its Hebrew roots.

When a body loses the Torah requirement for a yearling lamb, it loses the reason the ministry had to be one year. And once the reason is gone, counting Passovers in a late Gospel becomes the only evidence left in the room.

What the Fathers Do and Do Not Prove

Let me be exact about the weight of this chapter, because I have seen this evidence overstated by men who meant well.

The fathers were not unanimous. Irenaeus argued for a longer ministry, and he was not alone. I am not claiming a solid patristic consensus that was later overthrown.

What the fathers establish is this: the one-year ministry was a live and respectable position in the second century — held closely enough to the apostolic age that Irenaeus had to argue against it.

It is not a modern novelty. It is an ancient reading that lost a contest — and it lost that contest at precisely the moment the church was losing its Hebrew foundations.

That is a modest claim. It is also a true one. And it is enough.



CHAPTER SIX

Placing the Year

Now we must set the year in history. And here I owe my readers a correction, because those who have followed this teaching for some years will notice a change.

A Correction I Owe You

In earlier presentations of this teaching, I placed the baptism at

approximately 28–29 CE and the crucifixion at 30 CE. That came from reading Luke 3:1 — the fifteenth year of Tiberius — against the conventional reckoning of his reign from 14 CE.

I no longer hold that placement.

And I would rather tell you plainly than quietly revise it and hope nobody noticed. A teacher who corrects himself in the open is worth more than one who was never wrong.

Why Tiberius Does Not Settle It

Luke 3:1 dates the beginning of John's ministry to the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. That anchor is far less fixed than it first appears, and the difficulties are not manufactured:

The co-regency question. Tiberius exercised joint imperial authority with Augustus in the provinces from roughly 11–12 CE, several years before Augustus died in 14 CE. Provincial reckoning — and Luke is writing about a

Roman province — sometimes counted from the co-regency. The two starting points differ by several years.

The accession-year question. Provinces counted a ruler's first year differently. Some counted the partial year of accession as year one; others began at the following new year. This alone shifts the fifteenth year by a full year.

The gap between John and Yahshua. Luke dates the fifteenth year to

the beginning of John's ministry — not to Yahshua's baptism. Some interval

passed between John's public appearance and the day Yahshua came to the Jordan. Luke does not tell us how long it was.

These are the ordinary difficulties of ancient chronology. Any honest chronologist meets all three.

The result is that Luke 3:1 does not fix a single year. It fixes a range — and that range comfortably accommodates a ministry beginning in the early-to-mid thirties.

The Anchor That Does Hold

Here is what I came to see.

The determining anchor is not Tiberius. It is the cross.

Because the cross is where Daniel's prophetic week reaches its midst — and that is a far more fixed point than a disputed regnal count in a distant province.

"And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease..."

— Daniel 9:27

Creation Time Restored demonstrates this in full: the death and burial of Yahshua falls at Year 4000 AM — the exact center of the seven-thousand-year prophetic week, measured from Creation in 3965 BCE.

Year 4000 AM is 35 CE.

Once that anchor is established from Scripture's own architecture, the ministry must be placed to reach it:

Event Date

Consecration at the Jordan 34 CE

The acceptable year of YAHWEH 34–35 CE

Crucifixion at Passover, Nisan 14 35 CE

Year 4000 AM — the midst of the week

35 CE

The yearling requirement is satisfied. The acceptable year is fulfilled. The single Passover of the synoptics is accounted for.

And the Lamb is offered at the precise midpoint of

YAHWEH's week.

Nothing in the Argument Changed

I want to be clear about what moved and what did not.

The one-year ministry was never an argument about which year. It was an argument about how long.

Every pillar stands untouched:

- The acceptable year of Isaiah 61, proclaimed at Nazareth — unchanged
- The Torah requirement of a lamb of the first year — unchanged

- The single Passover of Matthew, Mark, and Luke — unchanged
- The interpolation problem at John 6:4 — unchanged
- The witness of Clement, Tertullian, and Africanus — unchanged

Not one of these depends on the ministry falling in 29 or in 34. They depend only on its duration being twelve months.

What has changed is that the one-year ministry no longer stands beside the FHMI chronology as a separate teaching. It now sits inside it — and confirms it.

It tells us what the final year before Year 4000 actually looked like.

The Lamb was consecrated at the Jordan. The acceptable year was proclaimed at Nazareth. The captives heard that liberty had come. And at the close of that year, at the exact center of the prophetic week, the sacrifice was made to cease.

On His Age at the Cross

One practical objection deserves an answer.

If Yahshua was born around 3 BCE and crucified in 35 CE, He was approximately thirty-seven years old. Does that conflict with Luke 3:23 — “about thirty years of age”?

It does not.

The Greek is *hōsei triakonta* — “about thirty.” That is an approximation,

not a birth record. In Greek usage it comfortably describes a man in his thirties. Luke, who demonstrates real precision elsewhere about rulers and dates, chose an approximating particle here on purpose.

And there is a corroborating detail that has always sat oddly with a

Messiah in His early thirties:

"Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?"

— John 8:57

That is a strange thing to say to a man of thirty-three.

It is an entirely natural thing to say to a man approaching forty.

Those men were not flattering Him. They were estimating His age — and they estimated it high enough that fifty was the nearest round number they reached for.

A small detail. But the small details are usually where the truth has been hiding all along.



CONCLUSION

The scariest thing — scarier than anything the season of Halloween can produce — is how easily we can believe something without ever truly studying it.

And how that leaves us ashamed.

The timelines have to line up. Under the three-and-a-half-year model, they do not line up. Under a one-year ministry, everything lines up.

The Lamb was spotless. And the Lamb was of the first year.

Both requirements. Both fulfilled. Exactly as Torah demanded, exactly as Isaiah foretold, exactly as Yahshua Himself announced in the synagogue at Nazareth on the first Sabbath of the only year His ministry would run.

He came on time.

He served His year.

And He was offered at the midst of the week.



For the full mathematical and Scriptural derivation of the 3965 BCE Creation date, Year 4000 AM, and the prophetic week, see Creation Time Restored (Second Revision), available from First Harvest Ministries International at www.HisComingKingdom.com.

See also the companion volume, The Yearling Lamb, of which this booklet is the addendum.