

Chronology 316: Timeline of Biblical World History



biblestudying.net

Brian K. McPherson and Scott McPherson
Copyright 2012

Period Four: From the Beginning of Solomon’s Reign to the Destruction of the Temple (Part 1)

Basic Numerical Amounts Regarding the Reign’s of the Kings of Judah

Our next period of biblical world history begins with the onset of King Solomon’s reign and ends with the desolation of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Babylonians under King Nebuchadnezzar. This section of our study will parallel section one of our study in that it will be divided into different portions addressing various issues involved in calculating the duration of this period. In this first section, we will examine the chronological data provided in the bible and perform a straightforward count of the years contained in this period. Afterwards we will consider and examine a potential reason that could be suggested for adjusting the straightforward calculation.

The amount of years contained in this period can be determined in two ways. First, we may add the total number of years of the kings of Judah beginning with Solomon and ending with Zedekiah (the final king of Judah) at the time of the Babylonian desolations. Below is a list of these kings, their years of rule, and the biblical passages that provide this data.

David's son, **Solomon reigned** over Israel from Jerusalem **for 40 years** (1 Kings 11:42-43).

Solomon's son, **Rehoboam reigned** over Judah **for 17 years** (1 Kings 14:21).

Rehoboam's son, **Abijam reigned** over Judah **for 3 years** (1 Kings 14:31, 1 Kings 15:1-2).

Abijam's son, **Asa reigned** over Judah **for 41 years** (1 Kings 15:8-10, 2 Chronicles 16:13).

Asa's son, **Jehoshaphat reigned** over Judah **for 25 years** (1 Kings 22:41-42).

Jehoshaphat's son, **Jehoram reigned** over Judah **for 8 years** (1 Kings 22:50, 2 Chronicles 21:1, 2 Chronicles 21:20).

Jehoram's son, **Ahaziah reigned** over Judah **for 1 year** (2 Chronicles 22:2).

Ahaziah's mother, **Athaliah reigned** over Judah **for 6 years** (2 Chronicles 22:12).

Ahaziah's son, **Joash reigned** over Judah **for 40 years** (2 Chronicles 23:1, 2 Chronicles 24:1).

Joash's son, **Amaziah reigned** over Judah **for 29 years** (2 Chronicles 25:1).

Amaziah's son, **Uzziah reigned** over Judah **for 52 years** (2 Chronicles 26:1-3).

Uzziah's son, **Jotham reigned** over Judah **for 16 years** (2 Chronicles 26:23, 2 Chronicles 27:1).

Jotham's son, **Ahaz reigned** over Judah **for 16 years** (2 Chronicles 27:9, 2 Chronicles 28:1).

Ahaz' son, **Hezekiah reigned** over Judah **for 29 years** (2 Chronicles 28:27, 2 Chronicles 29:1).

Hezekiah's son, **Manasseh reigned** over Judah **for 55 years** (2 Chronicles 32:33, 2 Chronicles 32:1).

Manasseh's son, **Amon reigned** over Judah **for 2 years** (2 Chronicles 33:20-21).

Amon's son, **Josiah reigned** over Judah **for 31 years** (2 Chronicles 33:25, 2 Chronicles 34:1).

Josiah's son, **Jehoahaz reigned** over Judah **for 3 months** (2 Chronicles 36:1-2).

Jehoahaz' brother, **Eliakim (or Jehoiakim) reigned** over Judah **for 11 years** until Nebuchadnezzar came and took him away to Babylon (2 Chronicles 36:5.)

Jehoiakim's son, **Jehoiachin reigned** over Judah **for 3 months** and was then taken to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chronicles 36:9).

Jehoiachin's brother, **Zedekiah reigned** over Judah **for 11 years** at which time Nebuchadnezzar came and exiled the remaining residents of Judah and burned Jerusalem, its walls, its houses, and the Temple. (2 Chronicles 26 and 2 Kings 23:36-25:18-21.)

The amounts provided in the books of Chronicles and Kings yield a total of 433 full years from the beginning of Solomon's reign to the destruction and desolation of Jerusalem and the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar in the reign of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah. (Notice also that if Solomon's 40-year reign is excluded from the count, the remaining kings total 393 years.)

Ezekiel 4 provides some insight and confirmation for this number. In this chapter, Ezekiel is told to depict the years of the iniquity of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

Ezekiel 4:1 Thou also, son of man, take thee a tile, and lay it before thee, and **pourtray upon it the city, even Jerusalem: 2 And lay siege against it**, and build a fort against it, and cast a mount against it; set the camp also against it, and set *battering* rams against it round about. 3 Moreover take thou unto thee an iron pan, and set it *for* a wall of iron between thee and **the city: and set thy face against it, and it shall be besieged, and thou shalt lay siege against it. This shall be a sign to the house of Israel. 4 Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it: according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity. 5 For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. 6 And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year. 7 Therefore thou shalt set thy face toward the siege of Jerusalem, and thine arm shall be uncovered, and thou shalt prophesy against it. 8 And, behold, I will lay bands upon thee, and thou shalt not turn thee from one side to another, till thou hast ended the days of thy siege.**

From this passage we can see that Ezekiel is depicting the amount of time that ends with the siege of Jerusalem. This is the siege of Nebuchadnezzar that destroys the city and the Temple during the final year of King Zedekiah (2 Kings 25:2-11, 2 Chronicles 36:11-20, Jeremiah 1: 3). According to Ezekiel 4:4-7, the period before the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem contained 390 years for the sin of Israel and 40 years for the sin of Judah.

There are two basic ways to understand Ezekiel's references to 390 years and 40 years. It is conceivable that the 40 years is part of or overlapping the 390 years. Alternatively, it is conceivable that the 40 years and the 390 years are separate and that one follows the other for a total running time of 430 years.

As we saw above, a straightforward count of the lengths of the reigns of the kings using only the data provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles results in a total of 433 full years from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple at the end of the 11th year of Zedekiah. Solomon's reign was 40 years in length (1 Kings 11:42-43). So, if we rely solely on the biblical presentation of the history of this period, the time from the death of Solomon to the destruction of the Temple was 393 years.

Therefore, if Ezekiel intends for us to understand that the 40 years is part of and overlaps the 390 years, then Ezekiel 4 can be taken to refer to the period of time from Solomon's death to the destruction of the Temple. On the other hand, if Ezekiel intends for us to understand the 40 years to be added to the 390 years, then Ezekiel 4 can be taken to refer to the period from the coronation of Solomon to the destruction of the Temple. Either interpretation provides a confirmation of the straightforward calculation of this historical period using only the chronological information that is provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles. In either case, Ezekiel's total is less than the count provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles by 3 years.

This 3-year difference can be explained in one of two ways. The first possibility is that Ezekiel is only intending to approximate the duration of the period. If this is the case then perhaps it is sufficient for Ezekiel to speak of a 390-year or 430-year period rather than a 393-year or 433-year period. The second possibility would be that Ezekiel is informing us that God's count of this period began 3 years later than the total amount of time contained in the period. Either explanation works. But the second option would be supported by the fact that Ezekiel's vision is clearly concerned with the pending Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.

It is worth noting that according to 1 Kings 6:1 the building of the Temple began in the 4th year of Solomon's reign. At some point prior to the beginning of Temple construction (in Solomon's 4th year), God appeared to Solomon to warn him to walk in his ways and keep his commandments. Using only the amounts of time provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles, the total time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple is 433 years. Three years of Solomon's reign transpired before the Temple began to be constructed. And it

is very possible that God's first warning to Solomon occurred in the beginning of that 4th year just before Solomon began to build the Temple. This would make sense in that God would visit Solomon just before the start of Temple construction and then visit him a second time with a similar message after the Temple was completed and Solomon dedicated it. Therefore, the total time from when God first warned Solomon to obey his commandments and the Temple first began to be constructed until the Temple's destruction would be 430 years. This number fits nicely with the total we would derive by adding the 390 and 40 years provided in Ezekiel 4.

In his current chronology study, Warner argues for the second option, in which Ezekiel is presenting a 430-year period beginning in the reign of King Solomon.

First, a prophecy given through Ezekiel agrees precisely. The prophet was told to take a tile and draw on it a representation of Jerusalem. **He was to symbolically lay siege to Jerusalem, first lying on his left side for 390 days, then on his right side for 40 days.** God told him that **each day signified a year during which Israel and Judah had rebelled** against God's warnings, and **for which He was bringing Nebuchadnezzar to destroy Jerusalem and Temple, just as He had warned Solomon.** **6 This is a total of 430 years, and is to be reckoned from God's warning to Solomon in 3,000AM. Solomon rejected God's warning, and so did most of his dynasty, as well as all the kings of Israel. This 430 year period ends with the destruction of Jerusalem.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

In his previous chronology study, Warner takes the alternative approach and considers Ezekiel 4's prophecy to refer to a total of 390 years which began after Solomon's death and which included and overlapped the period of 40 years for the sin of Judah.

Ezekiel's demonstration shows that it was exactly 390 (continuous) years from the beginning of the divided kingdom (Solomon's death) to the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. Since **Solomon** ascended the throne of David in 2975AM, and **reigned for 40 years, we must add to the year 2975AM the 40 years of Solomon's reign plus the 390 years of the kings. This gives us the year Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem, 3405AM.** – Tim Warner, The Coming Millennial Sabbath, Part II, Bible Chronology, from Creation to the Second Coming, Copyright: July, 2009, answersinrevelation.org

A possible exegetical clue as to how Ezekiel intended for us to understand the relationship of the 390 and 40 years may come from his reference to Israel and Judah. In Ezekiel 4, Israel and Judah are referred to separately from one another. This may indicate that Ezekiel has in mind the period in which Israel and Judah were separate kingdoms with separate kings. This division took place after Solomon's death when his son Rehoboam ascended the throne (1 Kings 11:31,

12:20, 26-30). Since both kingdoms remained united as one under the 40 years of Solomon's reign (1 Kings 11:11-13) it could be inferred that Ezekiel 4 is discussing the period which began after Solomon's death and which, therefore, did not include Solomon's 40-year reign. This conclusion would fit with other information we are provided about Solomon.

Twice during his reign, King Solomon was visited by God and warned to faithfully keep his commandments. The first instance is recorded in 1 King 3:5-15. In verse 14, God instructs Solomon to walk in his ways and keep his commandments as David had done. Because 1 Kings 6:1 reports on events which took place in Solomon's 4th year as king, we know that this first instruction about faithfulness to God was given to Solomon within the first three years of his reign, possibly even during the third year. According to 1 Kings 6:38 and 7:1, it took Solomon 7 years to build the Temple and 13 years to build his own palace. 2 Chronicles 8:1 and 1 Kings 9:1-2 show that it was after these 20 years (after Solomon had dedicated the Temple) that God again visited Solomon for the second time. Since 1 Kings 6:1 explains that Solomon began building the Temple during his 4th year (having already completed 3 years as king), this second visit from God can be dated to Solomon's 23rd year as king.

A comparison of 1 Kings 3, 1 Kings 9:1-9, and 2 Chronicles 7:12-22 shows that both of these two visits from God contained similar instructions. On both occasions, God's instructions are focused on Solomon walking in God's ways and keeping his commandments as David had done (1 Kings 3:14, 1 Kings 9:4-6, and 2 Chronicles 7:17-20). In the second instance God is a bit more specific. He states that if Solomon (or his sons) turn away from God, then God would cast the people out of the land and destroy the Temple (1 Kings 9:6-8 and 2 Chronicles 7:19-21).

It seems that Solomon was faithful to God and his instructions from his first year as king until near the end of his life. 1 Kings 11:4 reports that it wasn't until Solomon was old that he turned away to other gods.

1 Kings 11:4 For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the LORD his God, as was the heart of David his father...9 And the LORD was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the LORD God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice, 10 And had commanded him concerning this thing, that he should not go after other gods: but he kept not that which the LORD commanded. 11 Wherefore the LORD said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant. 12 Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it for David thy father's sake: but I will rend it out of the hand of thy son. 13 Howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom; but will give one tribe to thy son for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake which I have chosen.

This information from 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles fits quite well with Ezekiel's reference to a period of time wherein God counted the sins of Israel and Judah. There is good reason to consider that God began counting the sins of Israel and Judah from the end of Solomon's reign when God first declared that the kingdom would be divided because Solomon had failed to remain faithful to him. If this is the case, then Ezekiel's prophecy would likely be intended to refer to the entire 390-year period that began with Solomon's death and the division of the kingdom because of Solomon's unfaithfulness to God.

If it is accepted that Ezekiel 4's distinction between Israel and Judah indicates that the prophetic period he is discussing began after Solomon's death, then we are left with two options. Either Ezekiel is saying that there were 430 years of sin between Solomon's death and the destruction of the Temple or Ezekiel is saying there were 390 years of sin between Solomon's death and the destruction of the Temple. It is easy to see how Ezekiel could be referring to a 390-year period from Solomon's death to the destruction of the Temple because a straightforward count of the reigns of the kings equals the same total number of years as the time after Solomon's death to the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem at 390 years.

On the other hand, it is difficult to see how Ezekiel would be totaling the time from Solomon's death to the destruction of the Temple at 430 years. If the total time between Solomon's death and the destruction of the Temple is 430 years then the total time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple would be 470 years. This would mean that the counts of the kings' reigns provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles are nearly 40 years short of the actual total. The omission of 40 years in the counts provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles would amount to quite an insufficiency in the biblical data. Since the derivation of a biblical chronology of world history requires the sufficiency of the biblical data, we might be inclined instead toward the conclusion that Ezekiel 4 is only indicating a 390-year period from Solomon's death to the destruction of the Temple which would correspond very closely to the amounts provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

So, if Ezekiel 4 is referring to the period beginning after Solomon's death, then it seems that he is referring to a period totaling 390-years wherein the 40 years are simply the final portion of the 390 years. If this is the case, then the total time from Solomon's coronation until the destruction of the Temple would be 430 years. This 430 years starting from Solomon's coronation would include the remaining 37 years of his reign plus the 393 years that comprise the reigns of all the other kings of Judah until the destruction of the Temple. If, on the other hand, Ezekiel is not necessarily referring to the time after Solomon's death, then the details provided in Ezekiel would still point toward either a 430-year period that starts in Solomon's 4th year when he begins to build the Temple (or a 433-year period that begins with Solomon's coronation) and concludes with the destruction of the Temple.

Whichever way we understand the starting point and relationship between the amounts of time mentioned in Ezekiel 4, based on Ezekiel 4 and the figures

provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles, we are most likely talking about a period of 433 years (from the beginning of Solomon's reign to the destruction of the Temple) and a period of 430 years from the start of the Temple's construction to its destruction. If we use these figures we may reckon the period from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple to be 433 years (or 430 years if we reckon starting from his coronation).

At this point, perhaps we should return to the more peripheral issue regarding why Ezekiel distinguishes between the 390-day and 40-day periods. As indicated above, the textual distinction between Israel and Judah as separate kingdoms itself points to the idea that the time periods counted in Ezekiel may begin after the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon. By extension, just as the kingdoms existed concurrently, the 390-year period and the 40-year period may overlap one another. However, there are several other elements worth commenting on. And there are also several factors worth keeping in mind as we contemplate the rationale behind the designation of the 390 and 40 years.

First, the distinction is not likely to be related to the amounts of time occupied by the sinfulness of Israel and Judah. While most of the kings of Israel were evil, Israel also had a few good kings. Likewise, Judah had its good kings and its bad kings. It is not as if the entire period of the kingdom of Israel from Solomon's death to the destruction of the Temple was filled with wicked kings who led their people astray. Neither is it true that the kingdom of Judah was faithful to God for all but 40 years. These considerations make it difficult to conclude that the delineation of 40 and 390 years has to do with actual periods of sinfulness.

Second, the distinction between the 40 and 390 years does not likely have to do with the duration of the kingdoms. While the kingdom of Judah did survive longer than the kingdom of Israel, the difference between their longevity exceeds 40 years. Israel was conquered by the Assyrians over a hundred years before the Babylonians conquered Judah. So, the difference between 40 and 390 does not refer to the amount of time the kingdom of Judah survived after Israel's fall.

Third, the distinction is not likely intended to specify 390 years worth of prophets sent to Israel and 40 years of prophets sent to Judah. Many of the prophets gave pronouncements of judgment and cries for repentance to both kingdoms (Israel and Judah). For instance Jeremiah, whose prophecies are prominently featured in connection to the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (2 Chronicles 36:21-22, Jeremiah 1:1-3, Ezra 1:1, Daniel 9:2), speaks of Israel in a manner inclusive of Judah while discussing God's judgment of his people and the pending destruction of Jerusalem.

Jeremiah 50:17 Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away: first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath broken his bones.

In fact, one possible way to make sense of Ezekiel's distinction between the 40 years and the 390 years has to do with the prophet Jeremiah.

In his current chronology study, Tim Warner argues that the 40 years that Ezekiel mentions concerning the sins of Judah is a reference to Jeremiah's prophecies and warnings to the people of Judah. According to Jeremiah 1:1-3, Jeremiah began prophesying to Judah in the 13th year of King Josiah. He continued until the final year of Zedekiah when Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. Based on the information contained in 2 Chronicles we can see that Jeremiah's prophetic work did span the final 40 years before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Josiah reigned for a total of 31 years, but Jeremiah began to prophesy in the 13th year of Josiah's reign. This means Jeremiah prophesied for 18 years of Josiah's reign plus the 11 years of Eliakim's (Jehoiakim's) reign, plus the 11 years of Zedekiah's reign. Though it may not be exact, the total amount is around 40 years.

Josiah reigned over Judah **for 31 years** (2 Chronicles 33:25, 2 Chronicles 34:1).

Jehoahaz reigned over Judah **for 3 months** (2 Chronicles 36:1-2).

Eliakim (or Jehoiakim) reigned over Judah **for 11 years** until Nebuchadnezzar came and took him away to Babylon (2 Chronicles 36:5.)

Jehoiachin reigned over Judah **for 3 months** and was then taken to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chronicles 36:9).

Zedekiah reigned over Judah **for 11 years** at which time Nebuchadnezzar came and exiled the remaining residents of Judah and burned Jerusalem, its walls, its houses, and the Temple. (2 Chronicles 26, 2 Kings 23:36-25:18-21, Jeremiah 1:3.)

Therefore, there seems to be good reason to conclude that Ezekiel 4's reference to the 40 years of Judah was intended to refer the period in which Jeremiah prophesied to God's people before the Babylonian destruction of the Temple. Jeremiah's prophecies about the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple are consistently recognized and highlighted in the Old Testament (for examples, see 2 Chronicles 36:21, Daniel 9:2, Ezra 1:1, Jeremiah 1:1-3). It would make sense then for Ezekiel to highlight God's last effort to call his people to repentance through Jeremiah's 40 years of prophecy.

This conclusion works well with Jeremiah's own statements. In Jeremiah 25, Jeremiah refers to his own prophetic ministry to the people of Judah which began in the 13th year of Josiah (v. 3). In verse 4, Jeremiah states that the people had not listened to any of the prophets that God had sent to them to warn and rebuke them for their sin. In verses 8-9, Jeremiah states that because the people did not listen to God's prophets and repent, God would bring Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon against Judah and destroy it and make it desolate. In verse 11, Jeremiah informs us that this period of subjugation to the king of Babylon and the desolation of the land would be 70 years in length.

Jeremiah 25:1 The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah, that was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; 2 The which Jeremiah the prophet spake unto all the people of Judah, and to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, 3 **From the thirteenth year of Josiah the son of Amon king**

of Judah, even unto this day, that is the three and twentieth year, the word of the LORD hath come unto me, and I have spoken unto you, rising early and speaking; but ye have not hearkened. 4 And the LORD hath sent unto you all his servants the prophets, rising early and sending them; but ye have not hearkened, nor inclined your ear to hear. 5 They said, Turn ye again now every one from his evil way, and from the evil of your doings, and dwell in the land that the LORD hath given unto you and to your fathers for ever and ever: 6 And go not after other gods to serve them, and to worship them, and provoke me not to anger with the works of your hands; and I will do you no hurt. 7 **Yet ye have not hearkened unto me, saith the LORD;** that ye might provoke me to anger with the works of your hands to your own hurt. 8 **Therefore thus saith the LORD of hosts; Because ye have not heard my words,** 9 **Behold, I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the LORD, and Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and an hissing, and perpetual desolations.** 10 Moreover I will take from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones, and the light of the candle. 11 **And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years.** 12 And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the LORD, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations. 13 And I will bring upon that land all my words which I have pronounced against it, even all that is written in this book, which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations.

Consequently, it is not difficult to understand why Jeremiah's prophetic ministry, the last of God's efforts through the prophets before the exile, would be highlighted right alongside the entire 390-year history in which Israel was lead by kings and prophets before the destruction of the Temple. Consequently, a study of Ezekiel 4 and Jeremiah 25 provides good grounds to consider that Ezekiel 4 is outlining a period of 390 years wherein God spoke to his people in Israel and Judah about their sins. This period of prophetic warnings and calls to repentance ended with Jeremiah's 40 years of prophetic work which concluded with the destruction of the Temple by the Babylonians.

Our study of the information contained in the books of Kings, Chronicles, and Ezekiel leads us toward the conclusion that the period from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple at the end of the 11th year of Zedekiah was a total of 433 years. The total time from the beginning of the Temple's construction to its destruction by the Babylonians is 430 years. These are the conclusions that can be derived if we solely rely on the chronological data and explanations provided in the bible.

In his articles, Warner discusses an important point regarding the years of these kings. As Warner explains, in biblical times the reigns of the kings were counted in correspondence with calendar years. A calendar year is the period of a year's

time that begins with New Year's Day. As we discussed earlier, in the Hebrew calendar year, New Year's Day is called Rosh Hashanah and it occurs on the first day of the fall month of Tishri, which is traditionally identified as marking the beginning of creation. As Warner elucidates in his study, this means that the amounts of years provided in Kings and Chronicles tell us the number of full, calendar years that each king should be attributed.

First, since events are linked to a particular year of a king's reign, **these must be regular calendar years. 1 If years began whenever a king assumed the throne, and were counted by his anniversary date, it would introduce great confusion into calculating dates based on the number of a king's reign, because years would begin and end at all different times throughout the year.** It is apparent that a new continuous calendar was adopted every time a new king came to power, beginning with his first year. Therefore, **for dating purposes, the years must be regular calendar years, counting from the first month of the year that was reckoned to be that king's first year, not from the actual anniversary of the commencement of that king's reign.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

Our chronology studies operate on this same conclusion. As we reported in the previous version of this study, according to JewishEncyclopedia.com the reigns of kings of Judah were commonly counted in correspondence with the calendar year beginning on Rosh Hashanah or New Year's Day (the first day of the Hebrew month of Tishri.)

Rosh ha-Shanah [Heb.,= head of the year], **the Jewish New Year, also known as the Feast of the Trumpets. It is observed on the first day of the seventh month, Tishri, occurring usually in September...A distinguishing feature of the New Year is the blowing of the shofar (a ram's horn),** which summons Jews to penitential observance. – Columbia Encyclopedia

New Year – This system of dating the New-Year is that which was adopted by the Semites generally, while other peoples, as the Greeks and Persians, began the year in spring, both methods of reckoning being primarily agricultural and based on the seasons of seed-time and harvest. The Regnal Year. The regnal year was evidently reckoned in the same way as late as the end of the seventh century B.C. This is evident from the account of the eighteenth year of King Josiah, in which only by such a reckoning can sufficient time be allowed for the events of that year which precede the celebration of the Passover, assuming, of course, that the Passover was celebrated at the usual time in the spring (II Kings xxii. 3, xxiii. 21-23). Only in the same way can the fourth year of Jehoiakim be made to synchronize with the twenty-first year of Nabopolassar, in which the battle of Carchemish was fought, and also with the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, the Babylonian year having been reckoned from the spring (Jer. xxv. 1, xlvi. 2). The second half of the Hebrew year would thus correspond to the first half of the Babylonian year. – jewishencyclopedia.com

In relation to this, we have noted that Rosh Hashanah (New Year's Day) was heralded as a day of the sounding of trumpets. As established by biblical texts (and agreed by Warner below), Rosh Hashanah, the first day of Tishri, was also the day that was used to mark the onset of sabbatical and jubilee years (Leviticus 25:9).

Each Sabbatical yearly cycle begins and ends in the fall, from Tishri to Tishri. – The Coming Millennial Sabbath – Part II, Tim Warner, Copyright © July, 2009, answersinrevelation.org

Leviticus 23:24 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, **In the seventh month, in the first *day* of the month**, shall ye have a sabbath, **a memorial of blowing of trumpets**, an holy convocation.

Numbers 29:1 **And in the seventh month, on the first *day* of the month**, ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work: **it is a day of blowing the trumpets unto you.**

Leviticus 25:8 And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. **9 Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubile to sound on the tenth *day* of the seventh month**, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land.

Ezekiel 40:1 In the five and twentieth year of our captivity, **in the beginning of the year, in the tenth *day* of the month**, in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten, in the selfsame day the hand of the LORD was upon me, and brought me thither.

Rosh Hashanah – In the earliest times **the Hebrew year began in autumn** with the opening of the economic year... **This took place at the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month (Tishri). On the same day the beginning of the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed by the blowing of trumpets (Lev 25:9)... This first day of the seventh month was appointed by the Law to be "a day of blowing of trumpets"**. There was to be a holy convocation; no servile work was to be done; and special sacrifices were to be offered (Lev 23:23-25; Num 29:1-6). – wikipedia.org

Rosh ha-Shanah [Heb.,= head of the year], **the Jewish New Year, also known as the Feast of the Trumpets. It is observed on the first day of the seventh month, Tishri, occurring usually in September...A distinguishing feature of the New Year is the blowing of the shofar (a ram's horn), which summons Jews to penitential observance.** – Columbia Encyclopedia

Likewise, Ernest L. Martin, in his book *The Star that Astonished the World* reports that biblical custom has long held the blowing of trumpets to be customary at a king's coronation.

1 Kings 1:34 And let Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet **anoint him there king over Israel: and blow ye with the trumpet, and say, God save king Solomon.** 35 Then ye shall come up after him, that he may come and sit upon my throne; for he shall be king in my stead: and I have appointed him to be ruler over Israel and over Judah.

2 Kings 9:13 Then they hasted, and took every man his garment, and put *it* under him on the top of the stairs, **and blew with trumpets, saying, Jehu is king.**

2 Kings 11:11 And the guard stood, every man with his weapons in his hand, round about the king, from the right corner of the temple to the left corner of the temple, *along* by the altar and the temple. 12 **And he brought forth the king's son, and put the crown upon him, and gave him the testimony; and they made him king, and anointed him; and they clapped their hands, and said, God save the king.** 13 And when Athaliah heard the noise of the guard *and* of the people, she came to the people into the temple of the LORD. 14 And when she looked, behold, the king stood by a pillar, **as the manner was, and the princes and the trumpeters by the king, and all the people of the land rejoiced, and blew with trumpets:** and Athaliah rent her clothes, and cried, Treason, Treason.

As Martin continues, he explains how these customs involving the blowing of trumpets were connected to the inauguration of the reigns of the kings of Judah. According to Martin, in the times of Solomon and Jeremiah many of the kings of Judah reckoned Rosh Hashanah (the Day of Trumpets) as the inauguration day of their rule.

As shown before, among the Jews this day was called Rosh ha-Shanah (the Feast of the New Year). The majority belief of Jewish elders (which still dominates the services of the synagogues) was that **the Day of Trumpets was the memorial day that commemorated the beginning of the world...** Each of the Jewish months was officially introduced by the blowing of trumpets (Numbers 10:10). **Since the festival year** in which all the Mosaic festivals were found was seven months long, the last month (Tishri) was the last month for a festival trumpet. This is one of the reasons that **the day was called "the Day of Trumpets."** ...**This was the exact day that many of the ancient kings and rulers of Judah reckoned as their inauguration day of rule. This procedure was followed consistently in the time of Solomon, Jeremiah, and Ezra. The Day of Trumpets was also acknowledged as the time for counting the years of their kingly rule. Indeed, it was customary that the final ceremony in the coronation of kings was the blowing of trumpets.** – Ernest L. Martin, *The Star that Astonished the World*

As we have shown from the Bible, the blowing of trumpets was the sign that kings could then begin to rule (1 Kings 1:34; 2 Kings 9:13; 11:11). Jewish authorities long acknowledged this royal import to the Day of Trumpets. – Ernest L. Martin, *The Star that Astonished the World*

We can see then that from the time of King Solomon to Jeremiah the prophet, the kings of Judah's reigns were counted in correspondence with Rosh Hashanah (New Year's Day). But, kings did not always die on Rosh Hashanah each year. And their successors probably did not wait until Rosh Hashanah came around the next autumn in order to take the throne. Therefore, the kings are likely to have taken the throne months after Rosh Hashanah and likewise died months after Rosh Hashanah. A question emerges from these considerations. How did the biblical authors account for this differential between the date on which each king of Judah began to reign? We will examine this question in the next section of our study.

Period Four: From the Beginning of Solomon's Reign to the Destruction of the Temple (Part 2)

Ruling Date Differentials and Counting Transitional Years

In this section of our study we will examine the possibilities concerning how the biblical authors accounted for the differential between the date on which each king of Judah began to reign. Differences between ruling dates of the kings were due to the fact that kings did not always die on the same day of the year (including Rosh Hashanah), the same month of the year, or even the same season. Therefore, kings took over from their predecessors at various points throughout the year.

The issue of this differential involves understanding how the biblical authors counted the partial calendar years at the beginning and end of a king's reign. The partial calendar year at the beginning of a king's reign contains the number of days and months before Rosh Hashanah that the king ruled after the death (or removal) of his predecessor. The partial calendar year at the end of a king's reign contains the number of days and months after Rosh Hashanah that the king reigned before his death (or removal) in the year when his successor replaced him. As we have seen, the books of Kings and Chronicles do not mention any number of months (or days) when totaling the length of the reigns of the kings of Judah. (There are 2 well-defined exceptions due to the fact that Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin reigned for less than a year. But in all cases in which a king reigned for more than a year, the length of their reign is never noted in months or days.) Instead, the reigns of the kings are given in totals involving only whole years, not years and months (and days).

In his current chronology articles, Tim Warner discusses three potential ways that partial years may have been accounted for by the biblical authors. We will first define each of these potential methods and then we will assess and compare their merits.

The next question concerns **the counting of partial years**. No doubt, **kings ascended the throne soon after their successor died**. And **kings did not likely die or ascend the throne precisely at the beginning or end of a calendar year**.

Therefore, we must have a system of **accounting for partial years. There are three possible systems that could be employed:**

- **Count the year when two kings reigned for both kings**
- **Count the year when two kings reigned for one king**
- **Count only whole years of a king's reign**
- Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

In the first method Warner mentions, partial years would have been counted as whole years and attributed to both kings (to the deceased predecessor and to his successor).

Some ancient kingdoms used **the first method, counting the year of a king's death as both his last year and the first year of his successor.** There is no evidence of that in the kings of Judah. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

If this first method were in use in the biblical accounts, a king would be given credit for a full year at the beginning of his reign and at the end of his reign when in reality he only reigned for some of the months of those years. Likewise, a single year wherein two kings ruled for only several months each would be counted as two years (one for each king) when in reality only one year had elapsed.

Immediately after his statements about the first system, Warner begins his discussion of the third proposed system wherein only whole years were counted. (He provides no discussion of the second option.) Below Warner explains how this third option would operate. If the bible employed this method, then only the full calendar years were counted for each king. Any partial year served by a king before Rosh Hashanah (in the year his predecessor died) or after Rosh Hashanah (in the year he himself died) would not be included in the biblical count of the years of his reign.

In the third proposed system, (assuming a Tishri to Tishri, fall to fall reckoning of years), the first year of a particular king would be counted from Tishri 1 (Rosh Hashanah) after he ascended the throne. If he was installed as King six months before Rosh Hashanah (New Year's Day), the partial year during which he ascended the throne would not be counted as his first year. Rather, the following whole year (Rosh Hashanah to Rosh Hashanah) would be reckoned as his first year. Likewise, if a king died during the middle of a year, his reign would be reckoned through the last full year he reigned. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

As he continues, Warner explains the essential chronological effect that would be inherent to this type of accounting system. If this system was used in the biblical count of kings' reigns, then calendar years which saw the death of one king and the installation of another king were not counted for either king. Therefore, in this

method of reckoning, an entire year of time would be omitted each time a king died and a new king began to reign.

If this was the system used, there would be an intervening year between each of the kings listed, the partial year in which a king died, and the rest of the partial year in which his successor assumed the throne. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

As an example illustrating how this method would work, Warner discusses the hypothetical transition that may have occurred between Solomon and his son Rehoboam.

Therefore, **the year Solomon died and Rehoboam ascended to the throne would not be counted for either Solomon or Rehoboam, because neither reigned that entire year.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

This third option, wherein the biblical texts are said to leave a full calendar year unaccounted for each time a king died and a new one was installed, is the one employed by Warner in his current chronology study. As Warner explains, this system requires adding one extra year to the amounts of years the bible assigns to each of the kings of Judah in order to account for the transitional years which Warner suggests the biblical chronologists omitted.

When adding up the kings of Judah given in 2 Chronicles, we have followed this method, adding one year per king for this transitional year, since we are assuming that only full calendar years were counted. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

Though Warner mentions three possible methods the bible may have used to account for the reigns of the kings, he only comments on two of those methods. He briefly discusses the method in which a single year is attributed to two kings thus adding an extra year each time there is a transition of power (which he rejects). And he discusses the method whereby transitional years are completely omitted in the biblical count of the reigns of the kings of Judah (which he adopts in his study).

But, what about the option whereby a transitional year was credited to one king and not the other? Warner lists this possibility as the second option in his list, but he doesn't discuss its potential merits or any reasons for dismissing it. Since this option would be just as conceptually viable as the other two alternatives we will consider it alongside our assessment of the other options.

Now that we have a working understanding of these three options for how the biblical authors counted transitional years and differentials between the date on which each king of Judah began to reign, we will begin our assessment of them. Two factors are relevant to our consideration concerning which of these three methods were employed by the biblical authors who compiled the record contained in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

The first factor involves recognizing that this issue is another instance inherently invoking the question of the sufficiency of the biblical data. Of the three potential methods for counting the reigns of the kings that Warner mentions, only the second option upholds the sufficiency of the chronological data for producing an accurate count of the duration of this historical period. Consideration of the first and third options would constitute a challenge to the sufficiency of the biblical data itself.

The first option would have the biblical authors counting each transitional year as two years instead of one thereby inflating the total count of the years of this period. There are 21 kings (20 kings and 1 queen, Athaliah) who ruled during this period with a total of 20 transitional years between their reigns.

1. Solomon
2. Rehoboam
3. Abijam
4. Asa
5. Jehoshaphat
6. Jehoram
7. Ahaziah
8. (Queen) Athaliah
9. Joash
10. Amaziah
11. Uzziah
12. Jotham
13. Ahaz
14. Hezekiah
15. Manasseh
16. Amon
17. Josiah
18. Jehoahaz
19. Eliakim (Jehoiakim)
20. Jehoiachin
21. Zedekiah

If the first method was used, then there would be 20 occasions wherein a single, transitional year was counted separately as two years and given to two different kings. Therefore, we would have a total of 20 transitional years which would have been erroneously counted as 40 transitional years. Since the actual total was only 20 transitional years, this method would result in a chronology of this period that was 20 years longer than it really was. This would mean that the chronological data provided by the biblical authors would be insufficient for deriving a total chronology of this period especially since nothing in the biblical record alerts readers to this duplication.

On the other hand, if the third method was used, then we have 20 transitional years which the biblical authors completely omitted from their count of the years

of this period. This method would result in a chronology of this period that was 20 years shorter than it should be. Again, this would mean that the chronological data provided by the biblical authors would be inadequate for deriving a total chronology of this period, especially since nothing in the biblical record alerts readers to this duplication.

Both the first and third options hold that the numbers provided by the biblical authors are inaccurate by a sum of 20 years. If the first method was used then the biblical record of the period of the kings would be 20 years longer than it actually should be and the real amount of time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple would be 413 years rather than the 433 years provided in the biblical accounts. On the other hand, if the third method is used then the biblical record of the kings would be 20 years shorter than it actually should be and the real amount of time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple would be 453 years rather than the 433 years provided in the biblical accounts.

By contrast, the second option would count each transitional year as only one year and ascribe it either to the dying king or to the new king. In this method, no extra years would be misleadingly added in by the biblical authors and no actual years would be omitted by the biblical authors. As such, the second option is equivalent to a straightforward count of the years provided in the biblical texts. Moreover, under this approach the counts provided by the biblical authors adequately reflect the real totals of years that transpired during this period. In other words, the real total of years precisely fit with the numbers provided by the biblical authors of the books of Kings and Chronicles. And, using this option would maintain the total amount of time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple as 433 years. Because this method would uphold the accuracy of the biblical counts, this method affirms rather than challenges the sufficiency of the biblical data for the purposes of providing a correct chronology of world history.

The logical and exegetical necessity of upholding the sufficiency of the biblical data would therefore seem to warrant the conclusion that the second method was employed by the biblical authors. The only reason to overturn this consideration would be if the biblical texts provide solid evidence that the biblical authors instead employed one of the other two options. As we continue we will examine the exegetical details that may be relevant.

Some points of clarity are worth mentioning regarding potential exegetical support for these options.

First, options one and two contain some overlap in their proposed accounting methods for the reigns of kings. Both options one and two propose that partial years served by a king would be counted as a full year.

Option one holds that this inclusion was uniformly applied to partial years at both the beginning and end of a king's reign. Under option one, it is the inclusion of the partial years at both the beginning and end of a king's reign that results in the

double-counting of transitional years as full calendar years for both predecessors and successors when, in reality, each had ruled for only a part of that transitional year.

Option two, on the other hand, holds that partial years were counted as full calendar years at either the beginning of a king's reign or the end of their reign, but not both. Instead of counting the partial years at both ends of a king's reign as full calendar years, option two would only count the partial year at the beginning of a king's reign as a full calendar year while the partial year at the end of their reign would be entirely excluded from the count of their reign (and instead would be counted as the first full calendar year of their successor). The alternative would be to entirely exclude the partial year at the beginning of a king's reign from the count of their years and count that partial year as the final, full calendar year of their predecessor's reign. Whichever version of option two is applied, the transitional years would be correctly counted as only one calendar year because under this system these transitional years (when two kings each reigned for part of the year) would be counted as a full calendar year for one of them, but not both of them. (It is worth mentioning that biblical authors may have employed yet another version of option two in which a full length of a transitional year was credited to whichever king, predecessor or successor, ruled the majority of months. Rather than always lopping off either the leftover months before Rosh Hashanah at the beginning of a reign or end of a reign, the chronologists who originally kept record of each king's reign would be in a suitable position to identify which king reigned for more months, and credit full years accordingly down through their reigns. Just like the other two versions of option two, this scenario would avoid adding transitional years twice and it would avoid omitting transitional years entirely from the count. In fact, this scenario would work equally well in a transitional year during which three kings each reign for only part of the year.)

The fact that both options one and two count partial years of kings' reigns is important regarding the potential exegetical evidence that might be offered in support of one of these options or the other. If we find biblical instances where a king reigned for some number of years and months, and the partial year is credited as a full calendar year, this would not constitute proof for either option one or option two. Since both options propose that partial years were counted as full years in the reigns of kings, finding evidence that partial years were counted as full years would not constitute proof that either option one or option two were being employed by the biblical authors. To discern whether the biblical authors used option one or option two would require determining whether or not any partial years at the end or the beginning of a king's reign were also excluded from the count of their reign. Under option one, no exclusions are made, instead, partial years at both the beginning and end are counted as full, calendar years. Under option two, partial years at either the end or beginning of a king's reign (but not both) are excluded from the count of their years.

Second, a similar relationship exists between options two and three. Options two and three both propose that the biblical chronologists did not include partial years in the total count of the reigns of kings.

Option three holds that the exclusion was uniformly applied to partial years at both the beginning and end of a king's reign. Under option three, it is the exclusion of the partial years at both the beginning and end of a king's reign that results in the omission of transitional years from the count of the reigns of the kings. When a king died part of the way through the year, his successor took the throne shortly thereafter with some portion of that year remaining before Rosh Hashanah (New Year's Day) the following Fall. Under option three, the final, partial year of the predecessor is not included in the count of his reign. Neither is the initial, partial year of the successor counted in the total years of his reign. Therefore, in this system, an entire calendar year is omitted each time there is a transition from one king to another. And the partial years at both the beginning and ending of a king's reign are omitted from the count of their reign.

Option two, on the other hand, holds that partial years were excluded from either the beginning of a king's reign or the end of their reign, but not both. Instead of excluding the partial years at both ends of a king's reign, option two would exclude the partial year at the end of a king's reign from the count of the reign and instead include that partial year in the count of the first year of their successor. In this way, though each king only ruled for part of their first year they would be credited with the entire calendar year by including the partial year of the predecessor's rule into the total count of years of the successor's reign. The alternative would be to omit the partial year at the beginning of a king's reign from the count of their years and count that partial year as the final, full calendar year of their predecessor's reign. Whichever version of option two is applied, the transitional years would be included in (rather than omitted from) the counts of the reigns of kings because, under this system, these transitional years (when two kings each reigned for part of the year) would be counted as a full calendar year for one of them, but not both of them.

The fact that both options two and three include omissions of partial years of kings' reigns is important regarding the potential exegetical evidence that might be offered in support of one of these options or the other. If we find biblical instances where a king reigned for some number of years and months, but is receives credit only for the full years he completes while the additional months are omitted, this would not constitute proof for either option two or option three. Since both options propose that partial years were excluded from the counts of reigns of kings, finding evidence that partial years were excluded from the count of a king's reign would not constitute proof that either option two or option three was being employed by the biblical authors. To discern whether the biblical authors used option two or option three would require determining whether the biblical authors were uniformly excluding partial years at both the beginning and end of the reigns of each king or whether the biblical authors were excluding partial years at just the end or at just the beginning of a king's reign (while attributing either the partial year at the end or beginning to their successor or predecessor).

Taking these considerations into account yields the following measure of exegetical support for determining which option (one, two, or three) was practiced by the biblical authors when counting the reigns of the kings. To conclude that option one was used we'd need to be able to demonstrate that partial years at the beginning and the end of a king's reign were both uniformly counted as full, calendar years for each king. To conclude that option three was used we'd need to be able to demonstrate that partial years at both the beginning and the end of a king's reign were uniformly excluded from the count their reign. If neither of these demonstrations is biblically available and explicit, then we would need to seriously consider whether we can soundly conclude that options one or three were employed by the biblical authors and whether our calculations of this period of biblical history need to find some way to account for the added or omitted years that these options would produce. If we cannot find this kind of explicit biblical evidence for options one or three, then the essential principle that scripture provides sufficient data for adequately accomplishing all tasks it intends, would dictate that the biblical authors employed some form of option two wherein an accurate total of the reigns of kings is provided without omitting years or adding extra years.

Alongside these considerations of how transitional years between two kings are counted, we must also reflect on how transitional years which included more than two kings might be counted. The models we discussed above all relate to circumstances in which one king reigned for some months after Rosh Hashanah and then was replaced by another king who reigned for the rest of that calendar year until the next Rosh Hashanah. But, what if a king reigned for a few months after Rosh Hashanah and then died and was replaced by a successor who only reigned for a few months and was then replaced by another king who reigned for the remaining months of that calendar year until Rosh Hashanah came around the next Fall? In such a scenario, we would have three kings (not two) in a single year, each reigning for part of a single calendar year. How might options one, two, and three count the reigns of each of the three kings who all reigned for part of a single, calendar year?

Warner's list of options for how the years of the kings were counted focuses on how transitional years partially occupied by two kings would be counted.

The next question concerns **the counting of partial years**. No doubt, **kings ascended the throne soon after their successor died**. And **kings did not likely die or ascend the throne precisely at the beginning or end of a calendar year**. Therefore, we must have a system of **accounting for partial years**. **There are three possible systems that could be employed:**

- **Count the year when two kings reigned for both kings**
- **Count the year when two kings reigned for one king**
- **Count only whole years of a king's reign**
- Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

We should note that while options one and two parallel each other, the third option that Warner provides does not parallel the other two. It is clear that options one and two are both defined by how they count a year when two kings reigned. Neither discusses what to do regarding how to count a year wherein three kings reigned. On the other hand, the way option three is worded would adequately explain how a year wherein three kings reigned would be counted. Since, the wording of option three states that only whole (calendar) years of a king's reign are counted, we can deduce that a transitional year would not be included in the count of any king's reign regardless of how many kings reigned for part of that year.

To adequately assess these three options it might be better if all three were worded similarly so that we can compare how potential evidence fits or contradicts each option's treatment of transitional years with two kings or more than two kings. If we were to reword these options so that they parallel each other in a way that informs us of how each would count years with two or three kings, we'd have the following set of methods.

1. Count the year when two kings reigned for both kings.
2. Count the year when two kings reigned for one king.
3. Count the year when two kings reigned for neither king.

The above list rewords option three so that it parallels the wording of options one and two. Now, all three options inform us how to treat transitional years occupied by two kings who each ruled for part of that calendar year. We should note that though we have reworded option three, we have faithfully maintained Warner's approach for how we should count a year when two kings reigned. In such a scenario, Warner states that we should not count that transitional year for either of the two kings. Above we have discussed how each of these three options would relate to potential biblical support. What we need then is to discuss further how each option might count circumstances in which three kings reigned during a single calendar year. We therefore need to appropriately reword the options to address this situation.

1. Count the year in which three kings reigned for all three kings.
2. Count the year in which three kings reigned for one of the three kings, but not the other two.
3. Count the year in which three kings reigned for none of the three kings.

This wording maintains the distinctions each of these three approaches. Understanding the implications for options one and three is fairly simple and straightforward.

If option one were practiced by the biblical authors, then each king would be credited with a full, calendar year including the second king who would be assigned a single year of reign. Furthermore, under option one a single calendar year would be misleadingly counted as three separate years. And lastly under

option one, we would find no instances in the books of Kings and Chronicles in which a king reigned for less than a single, full calendar year.

If option three were practiced by the biblical authors, then none of the three kings would receive credit for this calendar year. The calendar year would be omitted from the count of the period of the kings. And the second king would not be assigned any years of reign at all.

If option two were practiced by the biblical authors, then the transitional year would be counted as part of the reign of one of the three kings, but not either of the other two. There are three possibilities as to how option two might treat this situation. The first possibility would be to count the transitional year as a final, full calendar year in the reign of the first of the three kings while excluding the year from the counts of the reigns of the second and third kings. In this scenario, the reign of the third of the three kings would be counted beginning at the following Rosh Hashanah while (as was the case under option three) the second king would not be assigned any years of reign at all. The second possibility would be to count the entire transitional year as a single, full calendar year attributed to the middle king and exclude it from the counts of the reigns of the first and third kings. The third possibility would be to count the transitional year as the first, full calendar year of the third king while excluding it from the count of the reigns of the first and second king. Again, as was the case under option three, in this version of option two the second king would not be assigned any years of reign at all. (Once again, we might note that the original chronologists who observed and kept record of the kings' reigns would even potentially have been able to assign any particular calendar year based on their knowledge of which king reigned the most months. This remains entirely possible because both of the kings who reigned for only a matter of months, Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin, each reigned for only 3 months, which is significantly less than half of the calendar year.)

It should be noted that while option three and (two versions of) option two would not assign any years of reign at all to the second of the three kings, it is not necessarily the case that the biblical authors would entirely omit the second of the three kings from their historical chronicles. Even though these systems would only be counting full, calendar years, the biblical authors would conceivably still mention the second king and denote that he reigned only for a few months. This kind of notation would not infringe on the approaches of option two or option three. Option two would still only count the full, calendar year for one of the three kings. While option three would still omit the full, calendar year from the reigns of all three kings.

With these observations in mind, we can now turn to potential biblical evidence regarding which option was employed in the books of Kings and Chronicles as they counted the reigns of the kings of Judah.