

action of desolating in the sense of a place made empty particularly through depopulating it. There are several points worth noting here.

Number one, Warner is correct to identify that Daniel is referring to something that happened to the city of Jerusalem itself. However, as we have seen, the biblical texts clearly state that Nebuchadnezzar came up to the city of Jerusalem on three occasions. And each time he took captive its inhabitants thereby desolating or emptying the city through depopulation.

Number two, we must point out that neither Daniel 9:2 nor Jeremiah 25:11 mention the destruction of the city of Jerusalem or the Temple. Both passages only refer to desolation.

Jeremiah 25:11 And this whole land shall be a desolation (02723), and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve (05647) 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.

Daniel 9:1 In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; 2 In the first year of his reign **I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations (02723) of Jerusalem.** 3 And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes: 4 And I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments;

Number three, earlier we looked at Jeremiah 25:11 alongside Leviticus 26:33 and 2 Chronicles 36:20-21 and saw that all three passages related “desolation” to the removal of the people. Starting with the installation of Jehoiakim by the Egyptian Pharaoh in verses 3-4 and Jehoiakim’s subsequent deportation to Babylon in verse 6 and continuing through verse 10 which records Jehoiachin’s deportation, 2 Chronicles 36 culminates in the deportation at the end of Zedekiah’s reign. (Incidentally, we know from 2 Kings 24:8-18 that the deportation of Jehoiachin entailed a deportation of many other people and likewise Daniel 1:1-4 tells us that others were taken to Babylon as part of Jehoiakim’s deportation.) Then, verses 20-21 of 2 Chronicles 36 specifically take this concept of the deportation of the people and pair it with servitude to the king of Babylon as the fulfillment of Jeremiah 25:11’s call for 70 years of desolation of the land and servitude to the king of Babylon. The fact that Daniel 9:2 refers to “desolations” in the plural suggests further confirmation that multiple deportation events were included by Daniel in the fulfillment of Jeremiah’s prophecy, not merely one depopulation when the city and Temple were destroyed in Zedekiah’s 11th year. This is further biblical indication that the desolation mentioned by Jeremiah and Daniel relate to depopulation of the city, not necessarily the destruction of the city.

Number four, we can contrast the descriptions of desolations provided by Jeremiah and Daniel with the description of Ezekiel. According to Ezekiel 40:1, Ezekiel had a vision during the 25th year of Ezekiel's captivity. Ezekiel states that the 25th year of his captivity was equivalent to the 14th year since the city was smitten.

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 (05221)**, in the selfsame day the hand of the LORD was upon me, and brought me thither.

The Hebrew word translated as "smitten" in verse 1 is "nakah" (05221) which refers to being violently attacked, destroyed, and conquered.

05221 **nakah**

a primitive root; v; {See TWOT on 1364}

AV-smite 348, slay 92, kill 20, beat 9, slaughter 5, stricken 3, given 3, wounded 3, strike 2, stripes 2, misc 13; 500

1) **to strike, smite, hit, beat, slay, kill**

1a) (Niphal) to be stricken or smitten

1b) (Pual) to be stricken or smitten

1c) (Hiphil)

1c1) to smite, strike, beat, scourge, clap, applaud, give a thrust

1c2) to smite, kill, slay (man or beast)

1c3) **to smite, attack, attack and destroy, conquer**, subjugate, ravage

1c4) to smite, chastise, send judgment upon, punish, **destroy**

1d) (Hophal) to be smitten

1d1) to receive a blow

1d2) to be wounded

1d3) to be beaten

1d4) to be (fatally) smitten, be killed, be slain

1d5) to be attacked and captured

1d6) to be smitten (with disease)

1d7) to be blighted (of plants)

From this we can see that Ezekiel was taken captive 11 years before the city was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. In other words, as we have already seen, Ezekiel was deported to Babylon as part of the desolation which took place at the beginning of Zedekiah's reign (when Nebuchadnezzar replaced Jehoiachin with Zedekiah). This captivity involved the deportation of important biblical figures such as Mordecai (Esther 2:5-6) and Ezekiel.

More importantly, Ezekiel's use of "nakah" (05221) coupled with the chronological relationship he provides to the previous captivity produces a meaningful way of specifically identifying the destruction of Jerusalem itself. This can be contrasted with Jeremiah and Daniel who instead use a word which adequately reflects the action of desolating or removing people from the city.

Therefore, because the desolating of Jerusalem took place in three stages over the course of 19 years, Daniel 9:2's reference to desolations of Jerusalem does not provide any support for the conclusion that Jeremiah's 70 years should be started at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.

Second, Warner offers 2 Chronicles 36:21 as support for the conclusion that the biblical authors began counting Jeremiah's 70 years at the destruction of the Temple.

However, 2 Chronicles 36:15-21 makes it very plain that the seventy years are to be calculated from the destruction of Jerusalem. This is when the land was left "desolate," during which it kept 70 Sabbaths, when the Davidic kings were cut off, and when the priesthood and Temple worship were abruptly ended. The early Christians also held this interpretation.¹⁴ – Footnote 14: Theophilus to Autolytus, Book III, ch. Xxvi – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

We can see that Warner offers several reasons why he feels that 2 Chronicles 36 indicates that Jeremiah's 70 years started with the destruction of Jerusalem. Among these reasons, he includes the argument that the destruction of the city is when the land was "left desolate." Since this is perhaps the most significant issue, we will address the issue of the land's desolation more thoroughly in a moment after we have discussed the other points Warner mentions. For now it is sufficient to say that here Warner does not so much provide exegetical support, but only states his conclusion that the land was only "left desolate" at the destruction of Jerusalem.

Before we get into a more detailed analysis of this argument concerning "desolation," we will turn our attention to the other arguments that Warner mentioned in the quote above.

Number one, Warner's offers the conception of Jeremiah's 70 years as 70 accumulated sabbatical years, which had been previously neglected during the period of the kings of Judah and all 70 of which would now be kept back-to-back. We have discussed the potential biblical, chronological, and logical difficulties with this concept earlier in our study. Below is a review of these difficulties.

1. It is unlikely that absolutely all of the sabbatical years from Solomon's reign and afterwards were neglected. Some of the kings of Judah were good kings who God commended for walking in his ways and keeping his commandments as David had done. As with David there is no evidence that these good kings neglected the sabbatical and jubilee years. Nor does God criticize them for such neglect. Moreover, any view which would stipulate that sabbatical and jubilee years were faithfully kept by David would have difficulty suggesting that kings who likewise "walked in God's ways as David did" did not also faithfully keep sabbatical and jubilee years. On the other hand, if "keeping God's commands as David did" doesn't indicate faithful sabbatical and jubilee practice then it

becomes difficult to suggest that sabbatical or jubilee neglect hadn't already started even before Solomon's reign.

2. There are difficulties regarding the relationship of the proposed 70 sabbatical years to a 500-year period of Jewish history. Even in Warner's model, there had only been 430 years between the final portion of Solomon's reign and the destruction of the Temple. This would not be enough time to have 70 sabbatical cycles, let alone to neglect them. Incidentally, as we have seen Warner identifies the starting point for these 500 years at the end of Solomon's reign. Likewise, if we rewind the clock to the preceding 500-year period, we find that the 500-year period that ended near the final years of Solomon's reign, included a 40-year period in which Israel was not even in the Promised Land and a total of at least 50 years in which sabbatical years were not kept. These biblical observations make it difficult to conclude that God was particularly concerned with ensuring that no less than 70 sabbatical years occur in any given 500-year period with particular starting and ending points. On the other hand, if God was concerned with such things, then the start of these 500-year periods must be pushed forward in time at least 50 years to the point when sabbatical years were first kept by Israel. This would, in turn, require pushing the starting point Warner has suggested for the next 500-year period forward in time 50 years past the end of Solomon's reign. The first option undermines the entire concept that the 70-year period was determined by the God's desire to ensure that the land enjoyed 70 sabbatical cycles. The second option would mean that God exiled his people too early and should've waited for another 50 years or so of sabbatical neglect. Both facts show that guaranteeing sabbatical years may not have been the determining factor in God's decision to exile his people from the land or the length of time for which they were exiled.

These considerations undermine any potential exegetical justification 2 Chronicles 36 may provide for a model that starts Jeremiah's 70 years at the destruction of the Temple based on the concept of accumulated sabbatical years.

Number two, Warner discusses the cutting off of the Davidic kings as support for starting Jeremiah's 70 years at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. But it should be stated that neither Jeremiah 25, nor the authors of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles ever connect Jeremiah's prophecy to the cutting off of the Davidic kings. Daniel 9:26 does mention the cutting off of the Messiah, presumably the Davidic royal heir. But the event in Daniel 9 is clearly a future event that has not happened yet but will happen at the end of a coming period of 69 weeks. Daniel does nothing to connect cutting off of past Davidic kings to Jeremiah's prophecy of 70 years. So, while it is certainly true that the Davidic kings were cut off at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, it is not clear that this fact substantiates counting Jeremiah's prophecy from that point.

The same can be said regarding Warner's next point.

Number three, Warner cites the ending of the priesthood and Temple worship. To be sure, both abruptly ended at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as

Warner states, but neither is identified directly with Jeremiah's prophecy by any biblical author. Perhaps more precisely, the cutting of the Davidic kings and the ending of priestly service at the Temple are not given by Jeremiah as defining issues in relation to his 70 years prophecy. Therefore, the cessation of these things at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple does little to add support for starting Jeremiah's 70 years at that point.

Number four, Warner mentions that the early Christians also held to the view of starting Jeremiah's 70 years at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. However, the footnote to this statement only cites one source: Theophilus' letter to Autolycus.

However, 2 Chronicles 36:15-21 makes it very plain that the seventy years are to be calculated from the destruction of Jerusalem. This is when the land was left "desolate," during which it kept 70 Sabbaths, when the Davidic kings were cut off, and when the priesthood and Temple worship were abruptly ended. **The early Christians also held this interpretation.**¹⁴ – **Footnote 14: Theophilus to Autolycus, Book III, ch. XXVI** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

The attestation of multiple and major early Christian writers from the earliest periods could provide some degree of confirmation, although not enough to overturn firm exegetical evidence. However, the lone citation of a single, less significant, later writer doesn't provide as strong of an indication regarding what "the early Christians" as a whole believed on this issue.

Third, we take note that on the last page of Warner's segment on the period from Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus (see Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org) includes a chart displaying the numerical symmetry of his chronological model. The chart includes the 70 years that the bible informs us spanned from Abraham's birth to the time he received the promise from God. Likewise, as scripture explains, after Abraham received the promise from God there was a 430-year period which ended at the Exodus. Afterwards, scripture plainly reports that there is a 480-year period to Solomon's 4th year. If we add another 20 years we arrive at the year Solomon finished his own palace and dedicated the Temple. This was the year that God appeared to Solomon for the second time. As Warner's chart shows there was a 70-year period, followed by a 430-year period, followed by a 500-year period from the Exodus to Solomon's 23rd year. These are biblically derived chronological facts. These numbers are explicitly presented in biblical texts.

After this, Warner's chart places another 430 years between the year that God visited Solomon for the second time and the destruction of the Temple. But unlike the figures described in the paragraph immediately above, these 430 years are not explicitly found or attested to in biblical texts. Rather they are derived by adding 1 year to the amounts the biblical authors provide for each of the reigns of the kings (and seemingly 2 extra years for Queen Athaliah) for a total of 20 "missing" or "uncounted" years added to the period of the kings. To this 430-year

calculation spanning the period from Solomon's 23rd year to the destruction of the Temple, Warner adds the 70 years of servitude and exile in Babylon prophesied by Jeremiah. And as we have seen, Warner starts Jeremiah's 70 years at the destruction of the Temple and ends with Cyrus' decree.

The result of Warner's calculations is a chart displaying a very symmetrical chronology of the period from Abraham's birth to the year of Cyrus' decree. Several points must be noted regarding the symmetry in these charts and their potential for confirmation.

Number one, the calculation of the portion dealing with Abraham's birth to the Exodus is clearly exegetically derived. However, although it is certainly true that Solomon's 23rd year was 500 years after the Exodus, it is unclear why the particular events of Solomon's 23rd year were so inherently significant as to mark the starting point of a new 500-year period. After all, some point had to fall 500 years after the Exodus and there were many important events in Solomon's reign, including building the Temple. Why would one of these events not have been more suitable as a conclusion for a 500-year period?

Number two, as we have seen, the Israelites only started keeping sabbatical and jubilee years some 450 years before the 23rd year of Solomon. Consequently, the first 500-year cycle of jubilees was not completed until 50 years after Solomon's 23rd year, nor did the second 500-year cycle of jubilees begin until 50 years after Solomon's 23rd year. These observations make it difficult to simply identify Solomon's 23rd year as marking the start of a particular 500-year period of sabbatical and jubilee cycles.

Number three, as we have seen there is even less exegetical grounds for identifying the period from Solomon's 23rd year to the destruction of the Temple as a particular 430-year period. The best support for this 430-year calculation (which includes an extra 20 years beyond what is recorded in the biblical texts) is that it allows for the kind of chronological table that Warner presents here in this chart.

Number four, as we have also seen, even though it supports his chronological model, the 70-year period that is placed between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree is also not based on exegetical necessity.

Therefore, while the symmetry created by Warner's chart looks impressive, it is difficult to take the symmetry of the chart as independent or as confirmation of the accuracy of his calculations. If we are afforded the license to potentially add 20 years here or there beyond biblically provided data and perhaps an additional year or two beyond that on occasion, the possibility of creating a chart like the one Warner provides becomes increasingly achievable. The chart would perhaps be more compelling if the second portion of it was derived as simply from the exegetical data as the previous portion is. As it is, the symmetry displayed in the chart may only be a presentation of Warner's particular calculations rather than an attestation to the exegetical soundness of those calculations.

Having discussed the other supportive points that Warner has offered, we will now return our full attention to Warner's citation of 2 Chronicles 36:19-21. We have already noted that 2 Chronicles 36:19-21 mentions the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy. This passage is central to any consideration of Warner's support for starting Jeremiah's 70 years at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.

2 Chronicles 36:17 Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age: he gave them all into his hand. 18 And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the LORD, and the treasures of the king, and of his princes; all these he brought to Babylon. 19 And they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof. 20 And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia: 21 To fulfil the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years. 22 Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the LORD spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the LORD stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, 23 Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the LORD God of heaven given me; and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? The LORD his God be with him, and let him go up.

On its own, it is conceivable that verses 19-21 of 2 Chronicles 36 would indicate that Jeremiah's 70 years began the year Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed. These verses certainly are compatible with that conclusion. However, several factors undermine the necessity and exegetical strength of this conclusion.

First, 2 Chronicles 36:20 mentions the carrying away of the people and their servitude to the king of Babylon. Earlier we discussed how this pairing is a direct parallel to Jeremiah 25:11 which mentions the desolation of the land and servitude to the king of Babylon. It is important to recognize the significance of this conceptual parallel and the proximity of 2 Chronicles 36:20 and 21. The connections give us very sound reason to conclude that 2 Chronicles 36:21's mention of the fulfilling of Jeremiah 25:11 chiefly relates to the removal of the people and to their servitude to the king of Babylon (in verse 20) just as Jeremiah 25:11 specifically calls for in its prophecy of the 70 years. Critical to our current point is the fact that the bible recounts the removal of the people and their servitude to the king of Babylon on two prior instances beginning in the 4th year of Jehoiakim.

In fact, 2 Chronicles 36 covers all three of these removals. We find the removal at the time of Jehoiakim in verses 5-6. The removal of Jehoiachin in verses 9-10. (Incidentally, we know from 2 Kings 24:8-18 that the deportation of Jehoiachin entailed a deportation of many other people and likewise Daniel 1:1-4 tells us that others were taken to Babylon as part of Jehoiakim's deportation.) Therefore, rather than singling out the removal of the people at the end of Zedekiah's reign and the destruction of the city and the Temple as the fulfillment of Jeremiah 25, 2 Chronicles 36 is actually a single chapter summarily recounting all of the removals of the people from Jerusalem in culminating in the final removal of the people when the city and Temple were destroyed at the end of Zedekiah's reign. Because this removal of the people and servitude to the king of Babylon began 19 years before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and because all 3 removals are collectively recounted in 2 Chronicles 36, we are prevented from taking 2 Chronicles 36:20-21 to indicate that Jeremiah's 70 years prophecy only began at the destruction of the city and Temple. In point of fact, 2 Chronicles 36:20-21 seems to focus on the fulfillment of Jeremiah 25 through multiple removals of the people and servitude and only by extension through the destruction that accompanied the final deportation and subjugation.

Second, even if verses 19-21 are intended to specifically relate to the destruction of the city and Temple to Jeremiah's prophecy, they would not necessitate that their destruction was the start of the fulfillment of that prophecy. Rather these verses would only necessitate that the destruction of the city and Temple were included in Jeremiah's prophecy. Notice the next verse, verse 22, similarly states that the decree of Cyrus likewise fulfilled Jeremiah's prophecy. No one would conclude that Cyrus' decree marked the start of Jeremiah's 70 years prophecy, only that Jeremiah's prophecy required the ending of desolation and subjugation which, by implication, came through a royal decree. Cyrus' decree was certainly included as part of the prophecy's fulfillment, but not as the start or the whole of that fulfillment. In the same way, verse 19 does not necessitate that Jeremiah's 70 years began with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, only that their destruction was part of what was required by Jeremiah's prophecy.

So far, it does not appear possible to derive support from 2 Chronicles 36 for demanding that Jeremiah's prophecy of 70 years began at the destruction of the city and Temple at the end of Zedekiah's 11th year. It is certainly not possible to use this text to dismiss the idea of starting the 70 years at the onset of the deporting (desolating) and subjugating which began in Jehoiakim's 4th year.

Third, we must keep in mind that both Jeremiah himself and the parallel accounts of these events in 2 Kings begin the count of the years of Babylonian rule over the Jews with the very year Jeremiah gave his prophecy of the 70 years. This was Jehoiakim's 4th year, which they note is Nebuchadnezzar's first year of reign of Judah. They continue to count Nebuchadnezzar's reign upward from this point in time and even denoting the destruction of the city and the Temple by means of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. This pre-destruction counting method employed by Jeremiah and the chronicler of 2 Kings provides a strong counterargument against

concluding that the biblical authors reckoned the start of Jeremiah's 70 years from the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.

At this point, we have examined Warner's appeal to both Daniel 9 and 2 Chronicles 36. And we have seen that neither Daniel 9:2 nor 2 Chronicles 36 provide the necessary support for the conclusion that Jeremiah's 70 years began at the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the Temple. Neither passage provides an exegetical basis for dismissing the possibility of counting Jeremiah's 70 years from the 4th year of Jehoiakim, especially given the fact that biblical authors began counting as the first year of Nebuchadnezzar.

But there are other points worth noting with regard to Warner's arguments. Chronological issues raise potential difficulties with starting the 70 years at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in Zedekiah's 11th year.

First, although it is of little consequence to this study which focusses on a strictly biblical chronology, we should note that placing the start of the 70 years at the destruction of the Temple would require that the secular chronologies are mistakenly too short by almost 20 years time. We have no problem with disregarding secular constructs in favor of biblical mandate, but we should be aware when neither exegetical details nor secular data support or require this particular conclusion.

Second, and more importantly, we can discuss the chronology that would result if Jeremiah's 70 years are started at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple at the end of Zedekiah's 11th year. Here we will follow Warner's chronology of the relevant events. In his current chronology study, Warner identifies the year of Cyrus' decree as both a jubilee year and the 70th year of Jeremiah's prophecy.

We now add the remaining 17 years of Solomon's reign to the 413 years for the period of the kings, and we have 430 years from God's threat to Solomon that He would destroy the Temple if Solomon did not obey, until it was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. **Add to this the 70 years of captivity prophesied by Jeremiah, 4 and we have a total of 500 years from God's warning to destroy the Temple and His promise to restore it given to Solomon until the decree of Cyrus to rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. 5... The end of the captivity and the decree of Cyrus the Great to restore Jerusalem and the Temple was in the 70th Jubilee year, 3,500AM.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

Likewise, as we have seen, Warner marks the start of the 70 years with the destruction of Jerusalem (and the Temple).

Most modern Christian chronologists do not begin the seventy year Babylonian captivity with the destruction of Jerusalem, but with either the end of Josiah's reign or Nebuchadnezzar's first deportation of Jews to Babylon, when Daniel and Ezekiel were taken captive. This is not done because Scripture requires it, but to align their chronologies with secular chronologies. However, 2

Chronicles 36:15-21 makes it very plain that **the seventy years are to be calculated from the destruction of Jerusalem.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

In his current chronology study, Warner identifies the year before Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple as a sabbatical year.

Fourth, **Jeremiah indicated that the year Nebuchadnezzar had Jerusalem under siege, the year before He destroyed it and burned the Temple, 10 was a Sabbatical year...In our chronology, the year of Nebuchadnezzar's siege was a Sabbatical year.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

Using these endpoints we can construct a timeline of Warner's model for the history of events from the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple to Cyrus' decree. There are several items that should be noted here.

Number one, the ending of Warner's timeline for this period will be the same as the timeline derived from placing the start of Jeremiah's 70 years at the 4th year of Jehoiakim. Both views identify the year of Cyrus' decree as a jubilee year and as the 70th year of Jeremiah's prophecy. In this way both views work very well with Daniel 9:25 which provides indications that the period just after the decree would be a new jubilee cycle as indicated by the grouping of the first seven weeks of years.

Number two, we should also take a moment to comment on jubilee correspondence. One of the hallmarks of Warner's model has been maintaining a chronology which corresponds to 50-year cycles. At times, motivation for selecting a particular option for calculating various periods of biblical history seems to have been derived from the intent to maintain the correlation with a calendar model in which all of pre-millennial world history entails 120 jubilee cycles. However, in this case, Warner's model and the alternative both exhibit jubilee correspondence.

At this point, a couple clarifications are in order.

Number one, to be clear, starting Jeremiah's 70 years at the 4th year of Jehoiakim will not correspond with Warner's chronology. Rather it would present a clear problem for his timeline. Our present point is that with regard to the decree of Daniel 9:25, both chronological models are jubilee correspondent. Moreover, starting Jeremiah's 70 years at the 4th year of Jehoiakim uniquely results in having both the starting and ending events of this period (the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and Cyrus' decree) synchronize with jubilee years. On the other hand, Warner's model only correlates one of these events (the ending) with a jubilee year.

This comparison demonstrates an oddity regarding jubilee-correspondence and the calculation of this period of history. In general the tendency of Warner's

method has been to seek to align key biblical events with the theme of jubilee cycles and to identify jubilee years with important events. However, in this case, adopting Warner's model requires designating a key event as not being a jubilee year as well as assigning a jubilee year to a year that contains no significant biblical events (the 20th year after Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed). There is a potential inconsistency here. In order to maintain a model that is constructed to promote jubilee correspondence we now have to avoid jubilee correspondence for a major event which has good exegetical, chronological, and thematic credentials for being a jubilee year and identify a year with no biblically significant events as a jubilee year.

Number two, a further clarification should also be noted. Identifying the year of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem as a jubilee year is an exegetically mandated conclusion. Recognizing this conclusion is not equivalent to confirming the accuracy of the rest of Warner's chronology. Both models for calculating the period from the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple to Cyrus' decree identify the endpoint as a jubilee year. The question still remains whether Warner's chronology is accurate in its identification of previous biblical events with jubilee years occurring in 50-year increments from creation. It is entirely possible that while Warner correctly identifies the year of Cyrus' decree as a jubilee year, he has somehow inaccurately calculated the amounts of time before this event and mistakenly concluded that certain events took place in 50-year increments from creation when they actually did not. Nor does a rejection of Warner's thesis that jubilee years coincide with major events require simultaneously rejecting that one or some jubilee years may coincide on occasion with major events. It is not an all or none scenario and proving one case doesn't constitute proving all cases.

Third, Warner's model results in a discrepancy between years he has identified as sabbatical and jubilees. For review, as stated earlier, we can use Warner's dating of key events in this period to construct a similar timeline for the model in which Jeremiah's 70 years start at the end of Zedekiah's 11th year after Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed. In order for the discrepancy to become apparent, it is necessary to paint a full picture of the chronological timetable that Warner's model entails.

If we place the beginning of Jeremiah's 70 years at the year after Zedekiah's 11th year, then the year which started a few months after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple was the 1st year of Jeremiah's 70 years. At the other end of this period, we have the final year of Jeremiah's 70 years which was a jubilee year and which corresponds to the year that Cyrus issues his decree. When that year completes, the 70 years are over, a new jubilee cycle begins, and we find the Jewish exiles back living in the land and in their cities with the altar of the Temple rededicated and operational as Ezra 1:1-3:1 reports.

Since Cyrus' decree would be the 70th year of Jeremiah's 70 years and a jubilee year, we could then subtract 50 years (for an entire jubilee cycle) to arrive at the previous jubilee year. The start of that previous jubilee year would correspond to the start of the 20th year of Jeremiah's 70 years. The preceding year, the 19th year

of Jeremiah's 70 years, would be a sabbatical year. (It would be the seventh sabbatical year in the jubilee cycle of seven sabbatical years.)

Counting backwards another sabbatical cycle of 7 years would place us in the 12th year of Jeremiah's 70 years, another sabbatical year. Seven years earlier another sabbatical year occurred in the 5th year of Jeremiah's 70 years. Five years earlier was the start of the 1st year after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Since the 5th year after the destruction was a sabbatical year (the 7th year in a sabbatical cycle) the 1st year after the destruction would correspond to the 3rd year in a sabbatical cycle. Therefore, the year which preceded the 1st year of Jeremiah's 70 years was the year Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. As we know that was the 11th year of Zedekiah's reign. That year, the 11th year of Zedekiah would therefore correspond to the 2nd year in a sabbatical cycle. This means that the preceding year, the 10th year of Zedekiah, would be the 1st year in a new sabbatical cycle. Using this model then we can see that Zedekiah's 9th year would be a sabbatical year (the seventh year in the preceding sabbatical cycle).

At this point a chronological discrepancy becomes apparent in Warner's chronology.

In his study, Warner identifies the year before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as a sabbatical year. Since the year Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed was the 11th year of Zedekiah. This means that, according to Warner's interpretation, Jeremiah 34 would be marking a sabbatical year in the 10th year of Zedekiah.

Fourth, Jeremiah indicated that the year Nebuchadnezzar had Jerusalem under siege, the year before He destroyed it and burned the Temple, was a Sabbatical year...In our chronology, the year of Nebuchadnezzar's siege was a Sabbatical year. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

However, we can see that Warner's method of placing the start of Jeremiah's 70 years at the year after the destruction and ending with a jubilee year during the year of Cyrus' decree, would conflict with Warner's own exegetical conclusions regarding Jeremiah 34. Specifically, Warner requires Zedekiah's 10th year to be a sabbatical year, while starting Jeremiah's 70 years the year after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple would instead mean that the 9th year of Zedekiah was sabbatical year.

As it stands now, Warner's model seems to have a chronological difficulty which would indicate that 70 years cannot effectively be placed between the destruction of Jerusalem and the decree of Cyrus while maintaining sabbatical-jubilee correspondence. Mathematically speaking, there cannot be a sabbatical year in Zedekiah's 10th year and also have Jeremiah's 70 years begin the year after Jerusalem's destruction with a jubilee at the end of those 70 years. While an error of 1 year would not be significant in other chronologies, it is sufficient enough to

cause problems for the “120 jubilee calendar model,” which requires and claims absolute precision down to the exact year in order to maintain correspondence with 50-year (jubilee) increments from creation.

Fourth, a final chronological difficulty which emerges for Warner’s model comes by considering the lifespan of Daniel in relation to these events. Daniel was taken captive to Babylon as a youth during the 4th year of Jehoiakim. If the 70 years prophesied by Jeremiah began in that year, then Daniel would have been in his mid to late 80’s when Cyrus issued his decree. This is a completely natural and reasonable estimate if Daniel was somewhere in his teenage years when he was deported to Babylon.

However, if Jeremiah’s 70 years began the year after Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed, then we must add another 19 years to Daniel’s age at the time of Cyrus’ decree. In his audio recording of his teaching on this section of biblical history, Warner concurs that Daniel was taken captive as a teenage boy. He goes on to conclude that Daniel was “well in his 90s” at the point of the first year of Cyrus. (See audio file *chron_07* entitled “From Cyrus to Christ – Part 1” beginning at 28 minutes and 35second through around 28 minutes and 53 seconds.)

If Daniel was between 13 and 20 when he was exiled, and Jeremiah’s 70 years began 19 years after Daniel’s exile, then Daniel would have been between 103 to 110 years old at the time the 70 years ended when Cyrus issued his decree. Daniel could only have been in his 90’s at the time of Cyrus decree if he was a very young child (below the age of 10) at the time of his exile. If, as Warner agrees, Daniel was in his teens or older when he was exiled, then, according to Warner’s own model, Daniel must have been around 103 to 110 years old at the decree of Cyrus. We must also keep in mind that according to Daniel 10:1, Daniel lived until at least the third year of Cyrus, which, using Warner’s chronology, would mean that he would have been at least 106-113 years old.

Once again we can see that this chronology which starts Jeremiah’s 70 years at the year after the destruction of Jerusalem does not seem to fit with biblical realities recognized elsewhere. While it is not necessarily impossible that Daniel lived into his late 80’s or early 90’s, concluding that Daniel lived to be around 110 years old seems excessive especially since the only reason to suggest this great age would be to maintain an allowable, but otherwise unnecessary, chronology of this period and, in turn, maintain the “120 jubilee calendar model” of history.

We have now arrived at the conclusion of our study of Period Five of biblical history covering the segment of time spanning from the destruction of the Temple to the decree of Daniel 9. We have two major methods of calculating this period.

The first method requires relying on secular chronologies in order to determine the amount of time between the destruction of the Temple and the decree mentioned in Daniel 9. Chronologies which follow this approach identify the

decree of Daniel 9:25 with the decree of Cyrus, the degree of Artaxerxes 7th year, or the authorization given by Artaxerxes in his 20th year. The amount of time contained in this period will depend on which decree is identified as the decree of Daniel 9:25.

Secular chronologies date the Babylonian destruction of the Temple to the year 586 BC. Cyrus' decree is dated to 538 BC. Artaxerxes' decree to Ezra in his 7th years is dated to 458-457 BC. And Artaxerxes' letter to Nehemiah in his 20th year is dated to 444 BC. Therefore, if Cyrus' decree is identified as the decree of Daniel 9:25 then this method results in a 48-year span between the destruction of the Temple and the decree of Daniel 9:25 (586 BC minus 538 BC equals 48 years). If Artaxerxes' decree to Ezra is used then the duration of time contained in this period is 128 years (586 BC minus 458-457 BC is 128 years). And, if Artaxerxes' letter to Nehemiah is used then the duration of time contained in this period is 142 years (586 BC minus 444 BC is 142 years).

The second method for calculating the amount of time in this period relies solely on biblical data. For this reason this methodology is preferable for the purposes of this study. This method involves using exegetical details from Daniel itself which identify Cyrus' decree as the decree mentioned in Daniel 9:25. This data is then connected to Jeremiah 25:11 which prophesied a 70-year period of desolating the land of Judah and servitude to the kings of Babylon. As Isaiah 44:24-45:1, 13, 2 Chronicles 36:22-23, Ezra 1:1-3, and Jeremiah 29:1, 10 (as well as perhaps Daniel 9:2) inform us, those 70 years ended with the decree of Cyrus releasing the Jewish captives to return to Judah and to rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. The result of these biblical observations is that the 70 years prophesied by Jeremiah ended with Cyrus' decree. The only question then is when the 70 years began. Two alternatives have been discussed.

The first alternative involves starting Jeremiah's 70 years in the 4th year of Jehoiakim. This option has in its corner the fact that Jeremiah and the author of 1 Kings count the years of Babylonian rule from the 4th year of Jehoiakim. This makes sense because Jeremiah's 70 years are defined by desolating the land of Judah of its people and the subjugation of the people of Judah to the king of Babylon. Both of these actions began in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, which is also the year that Nebuchadnezzar officially defeated Pharaohnechoh of Egypt who previously held dominion over Judah. In addition, this model has the support of Jeremiah 34 which provides good reason to identify the year after the Temple was destroyed as a jubilee year. The city Temple was destroyed in the 11th year of Zedekiah and the 19th year under Babylonian rule. A jubilee in the following year would have been the 20th year under Babylonian rule. Because the year of Cyrus' decree is, according to Daniel 9:25 also a jubilee year, Jeremiah's identification of the year after the Temple was destroyed as a jubilee year would mean that there were only 50 years in between, with the destruction of the Temple the year before those 50 years and the jubilee year of Cyrus' decree the year after those 50 years. Besides being biblically sound and chronologically viable, this model is also roughly confirmed by secular chronologies which similarly identify the amount of time between the Jehoiakim's 4th year and destruction of the Temple as 19 years

and the amount of time between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree as approximately 48 years. Lastly, this model of placing 50 years between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and Cyrus' decree has on its side the fact that there is no exegetical data which contradicts its conclusions. Moreover, arriving at this model does not require adding years unrecorded in the straightforward count of the reigns of the kings in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

The second alternative involves starting Jeremiah's 70 years the year after the Temple's destruction. One of the stronger reasons to adopt this approach is that it would allow for maintaining Warner's "120 jubilee calendar" of biblical history. While jubilee-correspondence alone is an intriguing possibility, which invites consideration of Warner's model, we want to be aware of potential weak points in this approach.

First, exegetical grounds necessitating this conclusion are somewhat difficult to come by.

2 Chronicles 36:20-21's mention of the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophetic 70 years in the context of the account of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple only requires the conclusion that these events were part of the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy. It does not require that these events started the fulfillment of that prophecy. In immediate proximity to 2 Chronicles 36:20-21's statement about the fulfillment of Jeremiah's 70 years is a reference to the removal of the people from the land and servitude to the king of Babylon. These are the two defining elements of Jeremiah's prophecy and may be all that 2 Chronicles intended to connect to the fulfillment of that prophecy. This becomes particularly important in light of the fact that in its entirety, 2 Chronicles 36 actually chronicles all 3 deportations (or desolations) of Jerusalem beginning with the desolation at the time of Jehoiakim (2 Chronicles 36:5-6 and Daniel 1:1-4). In the context of the whole chapter of 2 Chronicles 36, the destruction of the city and the Temple seem more like the end of a series of actions desolating the city beginning in Jehoiakim's reign rather than the starting point of that desolation.

Furthermore, neither 2 Chronicles 36 nor Daniel 9:1-2 (which Warner also cites in support of his conclusion) provide any clear reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as the starting point of Jeremiah's 70 years. Daniel 9:1-2 only mentions the desolation of Jerusalem. And as we have seen the biblical term "desolation" is used to refer to making empty. While Jerusalem was desolated in the final year of Zedekiah, it was also desolated or emptied on two prior occasions. As we have seen, the desolation of Jerusalem began some 19 years earlier during the 4th year of Jehoiakim when the people of Judah first became the subjects of the king of Babylon. In particular, Leviticus 26:31-33, which is perhaps the earliest and original proclamation by God that he would desolate the cities and land of Israel for disobedience, specifically connects this "making waste" of the cities to the "scattering of the people of Israel to other nations." At the very least, it is reasonable to conclude that even if it did not culminate until Zedekiah's 11th year, the process of making Jerusalem and Judah

desolate, or an empty waste, began in the 4th year of Jehoiakim. These biblical details coupled with the fact that Jeremiah himself and the author of 2 Kings both count the rule of the Babylonians from Jehoiakim's 4th year and not from the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple seems to weigh against the notion that Jeremiah's 70 years began at that time of that destruction. Another exegetical detail that may work against the conclusion that Jeremiah's 70 years began at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple is that Jeremiah's prophecy of 70 years doesn't mention the destruction of Jerusalem or the Temple.

Second, in his study, Warner recognizes the concept of counting the reigns of the Babylonian and Persian kings from the time they gained authority over the Jewish people.

It was Cyrus the Persian who defeated the Babylonians, and immediately began to rule over the entire kingdom. Yet, Cyrus granted Darius the Mede, father of his wife, immediate local jurisdiction over the newly acquired territory of Babylon. **12 Cyrus' years in Scripture are reckoned from his conquering of the Babylonians, when he first absorbed the Jewish nation** in Babylonian exile into his newly expanded kingdom. It was Cyrus who defeated the Babylonians, not Darius the Mede. Hence, the first year of Darius, when Cyrus gave him local jurisdiction over Babylon, was also the first year of Cyrus' reign over the Jews, Darius being a local ruler while Cyrus ruled over the entire Persian Empire. **And since the decree of Cyrus ending the Babylonian exile was in his first year, 13 it is evident that Daniel's 70 week prophecy was delivered to him at the time Cyrus made the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple.** In other words, Gabriel was dispatched to inform Daniel that the captivity had just ended. **Cyrus had just issued the decree from the first day Daniel began praying, 14 which was precisely the end of 70 years from the complete destruction of Jerusalem.** 15 – Tim Warner, Introduction to a Standard Biblical Chronology, www.120jubilees.org

However, Warner does not connect this fact with the stipulation in Jeremiah's prophecy that the 70 years were years of subjugation to the Babylonian kings. Warner agrees that that servitude to the Babylonian kings ended with Cyrus conquest of Babylon. But Warner doesn't identify the beginning of that servitude to Babylon with the Babylonian's similar defeat of Pharaohnechoh of Egypt in Jehoiakim's 4th year despite the fact that biblical authors (including Jeremiah himself) counted the rule of the Babylonians from that year.

Third, Warner's 70-year model entails some potential chronological difficulties. It requires that Daniel lived to be between approximately 105 and 110 years old, an unlikely possibility. It requires us to disregard possible exegetical indications of a jubilee in the year after Zedekiah's 11th year because it would undermine "the 120 jubilee calendar" chronology. Furthermore, Warner's chronology does not fit with his own identification of Zedekiah's 10th year as a sabbatical year. If Cyrus' decree occurred in a jubilee year, then Zedekiah's 9th year, would be a sabbatical year, not his 10th year. A discrepancy of one year is insignificant if we are approximating these durations of time. But for a model which requires and claims

precision down to the exact year, a 1-year discrepancy can be a serious problem. This difficulty is not lessened by the fact that this model requires adding 20 years to this period which is not warranted by the biblical data (and which contradicts information available from non-biblical chronological sources).

Fourth, placing 70 years between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree requires this model, which at its heart is defined by correspondence between major biblical events and jubilee years, to take an inconsistent approach regarding jubilee years and important events during this period. Placing 70 years between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree requires dismissing the otherwise scripturally viable possibility of a jubilee year immediately after a particularly important theological event (the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple) without exegetical warrant while at the same time requiring the identification of a completely insignificant year (20 years after the Temple's destruction) as a jubilee year. The major basis for this uncharacteristic determination may simply be the desire to maintain the "120 jubilee calendar" chronology. This may not be the best reason or most exegetical approach to understanding biblical chronology.

In summary, an approach reliant on secular chronologies would render this period as either 48 years, 128 years, or 148 years. Because this study is interested in a biblically derived chronology of history, we will not use the results derived from secular chronological data. Instead we will rely on chronologies that can be derived solely from the biblical material. A model produced solely from scripture would count the period between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree as either 50 years or 69 years (with Cyrus' decree in the 70th year) depending on which argument one finds to be the most compelling.

In determining which calculation to adopt regarding the duration of this period, perhaps Warner's own recommendations are helpful. When assessing standard chronological approaches which place 50 years between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree, Warner cautions against adopting conclusions about historical periods simply to align our chronological model with non-biblical chronological constructs when the scripture itself doesn't require the conclusions of those constructs.

Most modern Christian chronologists do not begin the seventy year Babylonian captivity with the destruction of Jerusalem, but with either the end of Josiah's reign or Nebuchadnezzar's first deportation of Jews to Babylon, when Daniel and Ezekiel were taken captive. **This is not done because Scripture requires it, but to align their chronologies with secular chronologies.** – Tim Warner, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

The cautionary implications of Warner's remarks above should be employed as we derive conclusions about the history of the period from the destruction of the Temple to Cyrus' decree. We should be careful to avoid adopting a particular conclusion about this period solely in order to align our chronology with ideas that aren't warranted, necessitated, presented, or supported in the scripture itself. As we assess these two possible calculations for the duration of this period let us ask the question implied in Warner's statement.

Is the conclusion that there were 50 years between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree based on scriptural indications or is it instead based on a desire to align our chronology with a particular biblically unsubstantiated (or extra-biblical) chronological construct? Alternatively, is the conclusion that there were 69 years between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree based on scriptural indications or is it instead based on a desire to align our chronology with a particular biblically unsubstantiated (or extra-biblical) chronological construct?