

Chronology 316: Timeline of Biblical World History



biblestudying.net

Brian K. McPherson and Scott McPherson

Copyright 2012

Final Discussion of the 120 Jubilee Calendar

Before we conclude this study we should return once again to Warner's hypothesis that from the start of creation world history has corresponded to the 50-year jubilee cycle that was later kept by the nation of Israel once they conquered the Promised Land after the Exodus.

In his chronology study, Warner states that his jubilee-correspondent hypothesis can be tested and verified.

Our proposed Jubilee calendar, of 120 Jubilee years from creation to the second coming, can be tested and verified. If we can establish from biblical data an accurate chronology from the creation until the Jews began using the Jubilee calendar under Joshua, and if the Jubilee years on our creation calendar synchronize with Joshua's Jubilee calendar, this is sufficient proof for our Jubilee calendar theory. There is only a 1 in 50 chance that our creation calendar would synchronize perfectly with Joshua's actual Jubilee calendar by chance. – Tim Warner, *The 120 Jubilee Year Calendar According to Scripture*, www.120jubilees.org

In the above quote, Warner explains that his hypothesis can be verified by establishing from biblical data an accurate chronology from the creation until the Jews began using the Jubilee calendar under Joshua. Warner concludes that if the chronology derived from biblical data synchronizes with the jubilee cycle established under Joshua, then his hypothesis will be sufficiently proved. He goes on to express his assessment that this hypothesis can be and is sufficiently demonstrated in his studies.

Not only does our creation Jubilee calendar synchronize perfectly with Joshua's Jubilee calendar, but **the year of the exodus from Egypt, which was above all else the "year of release," 27 falls exactly on the 50th Jubilee year from creation, the year 2,500.** If every 50th regular year is a "Jubilee," the 50th Jubilee year (50x50) would be a Jubilee of Jubilees! **It cannot be mere coincidence that the "year of release" from Egypt, the "year of liberty" 28 from slavery, falls in precisely the middle of the 2500th year, the Jubilee of Jubilees!** But, there is more. **The decree of Cyrus, setting the Jews at liberty after the 70 years captivity, falls on the 70th Jubilee!** Jeremiah prophesied that the captivity would end after 70 years. 29 And sure enough, it lasted exactly 70

regular years. **However, the year of their release from captivity was also the 70th Jubilee year from creation! Coincidence? Hardly!** Here's more. **The birth of Abraham was on the 40th Jubilee. The birth of Isaac was also on the 42nd Jubilee year. God gave David the Davidic Covenant, the promise of the Messiah from his loins, on the 59th Jubilee year! The 70 weeks prophecy in Daniel 9 begins on the 70th Jubilee year. And the "70th week" of Daniel (the 7 year tribulation) necessarily ends on the day before the 120th Jubilee, at sundown on Tishri 9th, exactly 6,000 years from Adam's expulsion from Eden!** 30 We will demonstrate the above in the articles to follow, which will develop a complete chronology from the Bible, from creation to the second coming of Jesus the Messiah. – Tim Warner, The 120 Jubilee Year Calendar According to Scripture, www.120jubilees.org

Below we have provided a diagram charting the jubilee correspondence that Warner presents in his chronological studies. The purpose of this diagram is to summarize the results of Warner's study of the 120 jubilee cycles he states occur over the course of the first 6,000 years of human history. Highlighted in red are the years and events that Warner's model identifies as occurring in jubilee years which correspond to the calendar begun at the time of Joshua. Occasionally, we have included quotations from Warner's chronology study to corroborate our listing.

Jubilee Years: 1-20

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 50-1000

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 21

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 1050

Event: none recorded or claimed

Description of how date for event was derived:

This date for Noah's birth was derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Noah at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age. Warner reckons Noah to have been born in the year 1651 AM, which would be the year after a jubilee year. In Warner's model, the bible records nothing significant to have occurred in the year prior to Noah's birth, which he reckons as a jubilee year.

The flood was in the year 1651AM, the first year of a new Jubilee cycle. Noah was born on the first year of a new cycle (1051AM), and so was Peleg (1751AM). It makes perfect sense that Noah's birth and the flood began on the first year of a new Jubilee cycle, since both represent a new direction in God's plan. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Creation to the Birth of Abraham, www.120jubilees.org

Jubilee Years: 22-30

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 1100-1500

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 31

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 1550

Event: God announced plans to destroy the world with the Flood, Noah begins to build the ark.

Description of how date for event was derived:

This date was derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Noah at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age.

Jubilee Years: 32

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 1600

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 33

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 1650

Event: none recorded or claimed

Description of how date for event was derived:

The date Warner derives for the Flood itself begins in 1651 AM and ends in 1652 AM. These dates were derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Noah at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age. To this amount is added Noah's age at the time the Flood began, plus an additional 6 months. In Warner's model the Flood does not occur in a jubilee year, but rather occurs the year after a jubilee year. The jubilee year which Warner reckons to have concluded before the Flood began would be the 33rd jubilee year from creation. By Warner's calculation the bible records no significant events in that jubilee year.

The flood was in the year 1651AM, the first year of a new Jubilee cycle. Noah was born on the first year of a new cycle (1051AM), and so was Peleg (1751AM). It makes perfect sense that Noah's birth and **the flood began on the first year of a new Jubilee cycle**, since both represent a new direction in God's plan. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Creation to the Birth of Abraham, www.120jubilees.org

Jubilee Years: 34-39

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 1650-1950

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 40

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 2000

Event: Abraham's birth

Description of how date for event was derived:

This date was derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Abraham at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age.

Jubilee Years: 41

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 2050

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 42

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 2100**Event:** Isaac's birth**Description of how date for event was derived:**

This date was derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Isaac at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age.

Jubilee Years: 43-44**Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi):** 2150-2200**Event:** none recorded or claimed**Jubilee Years:** 45**Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi):** 2250**Event:** Joseph's birth**Description of how date for event was derived:**

This date was derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Isaac at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age. To this amount is added Isaac's age at the birth of Jacob and Jacob's age at the birth of Joseph.

Jubilee Years: 46-49**Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi):** 2300-2450**Event:** none recorded or claimed**Jubilee Years:** 50**Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi):** 2500**Event:** The Exodus**Description of how date for event was derived:**

This date was derived by subtracting 1 year from the ages of each of the patriarchs prior to Isaac at the birth of their son and then adding 6 months each to each age. The total amount of time to the birth of Isaac is then added the 400 years which the biblical texts state transpired between Isaac's birth and the Exodus.

Jubilee Years: 51**Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi):** 2550**Event:** Israelites complete conquest and inheritance of Canaan land.**Description of how date for event was derived:**

Scripture reports that the Israelites spent 40 years in the wilderness, but the number of years it took for the Israelites to conquer and inherit Canaan land is not provided in scripture. A range of dates are possible based on the biblical data. Warner has concluded this to be a total of 50 years by assigning 10 years for the conquest and adding those 10 years to the 40 years in the wilderness to get a round number of 50 years. Acts 13:16-19 may also be understood to indicate that 450 years took place between God's "choosing our fathers" and the inheritance of Canaan land. If the phrase "choosing our fathers" refers to Isaac's birth and the phrase "about 450 years" is taken to mean that exactly 450 years ended when Israel inherited the land, then the passage would support Warner's date. However,

the exegetical data itself neither supports nor contradicts this conclusion. While his conclusion may be allowable it is not required or dictated by the text. The date of this event is therefore derived, in part, from assumption and then added to the date derived for the Exodus. Using this approach, Warner marks the beginning of the Israelite practice of keeping Jubilee cycles from the year 2551 and places the first jubilee year 50 years later in 2600 AM.

It is evident that Joshua divided the last of the inheritance and dismissed the Israeli army on the 51st Jubilee year from creation. **Israel then began to count the Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles from the end of the 51st Jubilee, the year 2550AM. So, to the Israelites in Canaan, the year 2551AM was the first year of the first Sabbatical and Jubilee cycle. The 52nd Jubilee from creation would have been the 1st Jubilee that Israel observed in the land.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Exodus to God’s Promise and Threat to Solomon, www.120jubilees.org

Jubilee Years: 52-58

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 2600-2900

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 59

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 2950

Event: God initiates the Davidic Covenant

Description of how date for event was derived:

This date is not provided in scripture. Warner derives this date by assuming the amount of time it took David to finish building his house and the amount of time it took after that before God appeared to David and initiated the Davidic covenant. These amounts are then added to the previous chronological calculations that Warner has derived.

Before we move on, we ought to consider the year of the Davidic Covenant. Solomon had reigned only 3 full years when he began to build the Temple. Thus, Solomon’s reign began in the year 2978AM. David his father reigned a total of 40 years, but only 33 years in Jerusalem. So, David’s reign in Jerusalem began in the year 2945AM. After this, David built his house in Jerusalem. We do not know how long it took David to build his house. However, about the time he completed it, He decided that God needed a permanent “house” also, since the Ark of the Covenant was merely being housed in a tent. So, David brought the Ark of the Covenant up to Jerusalem in a procession of praise to God with instruments and dancing. In response to David’s desire to build God a permanent house, God gave David the “Davidic Covenant,” which promised him a permanent dynasty, a Son from his loins who would sit upon his throne and reign forever. This promised Son is Jesus Christ.⁸ **If we suppose that it took David 5 years to build his house, the Davidic Covenant would also be on Jubilee Year, the year 2950AM, the 59th Jubilee.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Exodus to God’s Promise and Threat to Solomon, www.120jubilees.org

Jubilee Years: 60

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3000

Event: God makes a threat to Solomon

Description of how date for event was derived:

The date of this event in relation to the Exodus is explicitly derived from specific and clear exegetical data. 1 Kings 6:1-2 reports that Solomon's 4th year was the 480th year after the Exodus. 1 Kings 7-8 report that it took Solomon a total of 20 years to complete construction on the Temple and his palace construction. It is at this point that God appeared to Solomon a second time and issued his warning to Solomon. However, dating this event to the year 3000 AM is based on adding the clear exegetical data about the years between the Exodus and Solomon's 23rd year to Warner's calculations for the date of the Exodus. But, when it comes to the question of correspondence with the jubilee calendar, the important question is how many years passed between the first jubilee year and Solomon's 23 year, not how many years passed between the end of the Exodus and Solomon's 23rd year. The Israelites first practice of a jubilee year depends on the length of time it took to complete that conquest. And we have seen that scholars estimate that the conquest and allotment of land took anywhere from 5-25 years. On this point, Warner's timetable depends on his selection of the round number of 10 years for the conquest and allotment of land. So although Solomon's 23rd year (in which God appeared to him) clearly took place 500 years after the Exodus, the jubilee-correspondent dates of both events are derived solely from Warner's methods including his particular calculations for the ages of the patriarchs and the settling of Canaanite Land, not from exact biblical data.

Solomon began to build the Temple in the year 2980AM. Temple construction took 7 years, after which Solomon built his palace, taking 13 more years, for a total of 20 years. **9 We now arrive at the year 3,000AM, the 60th Jubilee year from creation. On this Jubilee year, as soon as Solomon had completed his palace, God appeared to him with a promise and a stern warning.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Exodus to God's Promise and Threat to Solomon, www.120jubilees.org

Jubilee Years: 61-64

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3050

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 65

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3300

Event: Isaiah's vision in the year Uzziah died

Description of how date for event was derived:

The date for Isaiah's vision (Isaiah 5) is derived by adding 1 year to the reigns of each of the kings before Uzziah plus the number of years Uzziah reigned before his death. This amount is then added to the previous date ascribed to the 23rd year of Solomon.

Jubilee Years: 66

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3300

Event: Hezekiah's 15th year

Description of how date for event was derived:

The date for Hezekiah's 15th year is derived by adding 1 year to the reigns of each of the kings before Hezekiah. This amount is then added to the previous date ascribed to the 23rd year of Solomon.

Jubilee Years: 67-69

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3350-3450

Event: none recorded or claimed

Jubilee Years: 70

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3500

Event: Cyrus issues his decree authorizing the Jewish exiles to return to Judah and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple.

Description of how date for event was derived:

The date for this event is derived by adding 1 year each to the reigns of all of the kings of Judah from Solomon to Zedekiah (plus a second extra year for Athaliah's reign). These calculations are intended to cover the time period ending with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. To this amount is added 70 years of Babylonian exile. The addition of 70 years rather than 50 years may be possible, but it is not the only or necessarily best exegetical option. The selection of 70 instead of 50 is, therefore, an assumption. By placing 70 years between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree along with an additional year to each of the reigns of the kings of Judah, Warner derives the year of Cyrus' decree as 3500 AM by adding his calculations for this period to his calculations for the previous periods.

Jubilee Years: 71

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3550

Event: The Jewish exiles who have returned to Judah rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple in difficult circumstances.

Description of how date for event was derived:

This event corresponds to the first 7 weeks of Daniel 9's prophecy. Daniel 9 provides good reason to conclude that the amount of time it took for these events was equivalent to one jubilee cycle after the decree of Cyrus. Therefore, we have sound evidence to place the conclusion of these events 50 years after Cyrus' decree. However, the date (from creation) for this event is derived by adding 50 years to Warner's method for calculating the period of time from Solomon's 23rd year to the destruction of the Temple, plus the 70 years he places between the destruction of the Temple and Cyrus' decree, plus the derived dates for the Exodus and preceding events.

Jubilee Years: 72-80 and 81-119

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 3600-4000

Event: none recorded or claimed

Description of how date for event was derived:

Jubilee years 72-80 are equivalent to the 62 weeks of Daniel's prophecy. They conclude with "Messiah the prince." But this is not a jubilee year. The jubilee year that follows this 7 and 62 weeks is attached to no significant events in Daniel's prophecy or in the New Testament. Jubilee years 81-119 are equivalent

to every jubilee that occurs between the jubilee after the close of Daniel's first 69 weeks and the final jubilee at the end of the 70th week wherein Christ returns. None of these jubilee years are associated with or marked by significant events in biblical world history, including the official restoration of the nation of Israel or the restoration of Jerusalem to the control of Israel.

Jubilee Years: 120

Corresponding Years (Anno Mundi): 6000

Event: Jesus' returns

Description of how date for event was derived:

While it is reasonable to conclude that the year of Christ's return will be reckoned as a jubilee year, there is no biblical indication that jubilee years will be kept in the period immediately before Christ's return. Jubilee years have not been kept by the people of Israel for millennia. Therefore, the date for this event cannot be derived historically or scripturally and is only derived from the view that Christ will return at exactly 6,000 years after the start of creation. The precision is exegetically plausible, but it is not exegetically necessary.

Now that we have reviewed the chronological conclusions of Warner's model, we can return to our evaluation of the model itself. Once again, Warner's model claims to establish a jubilee calendar for all of history comprised of 120 jubilee years occurring in 50-year increments over the span of 6,000 years from the beginning of creation until Christ's return.

Our proposed Jubilee calendar, of 120 Jubilee years from creation to the second coming, can be tested and verified. If we can establish from biblical data an accurate chronology from the creation until the Jews began using the Jubilee calendar under Joshua, and if the Jubilee years on our creation calendar synchronize with Joshua's Jubilee calendar, this is sufficient proof for our Jubilee calendar theory. There is only a 1 in 50 chance that our creation calendar would synchronize perfectly with Joshua's actual Jubilee calendar by chance. – Tim Warner, The 120 Jubilee Year Calendar According to Scripture, www.120jubilees.org

As he has explained, to verify his 120 jubilee calendar, Warner must show that the jubilee calendar that was instituted by Israel at the time of Joshua synchronizes (in a 50-year increment) with the first year of creation.

It should be noted, however, that even if Joshua's institution of the jubilee calendar synchronize with the date of creation, Warner's model would still not be proven. We must ask what exactly is demonstrated if God deliberately placed the start of jubilee celebrations under the Israelites on a date that is perfectly divisible by 50-year increments from the beginning of creation? At the least, this would prove that Israelite jubilee years were meant to denote 50-year anniversaries of creation. But this doesn't necessarily prove Warner's model for several reasons.

First, such a conclusion isn't really all that surprising since we have already seen that Rosh Hashanah itself, which marked the start of a new year, was thought to

be a yearly anniversary of creation. Second, would this synchronization necessarily prove that God himself marked off all the centuries prior to Joshua by jubilee years? If we define jubilee years in the way that they are described in Leviticus, as a year of civically dispensed universal release of land, servants, and debts after a period of seven sabbatical cycles, then we hardly have sufficient evidence to conclude with certainty that God marked off all of creation by jubilee years. Perhaps in God's wisdom, He simply combined awareness of the average human lifespan, his use of the Sabbaths as a covenantal sign for Israel under the Law of Moses, 50-year anniversaries of the creation, and memorable, familiar cultural precedents (such as Jacob and Laban or Joseph and the years of famine and abundance in Genesis 29 and 41) to create an ideal timeframe for a brand new event, the jubilee year.

Third, even if we conclude that God himself was marking off history from the start of creation by jubilee years every 50 years, this still wouldn't prove that God intended to mark off all of history by a total of 120 jubilee years, as Warner has argued. Such a conclusion requires that human history will be exactly, not just roughly, 6,000 years prior to Christ's return. But such precision is part of the very question under investigation. Therefore, we cannot assume such precision when attempting to prove that all of history entails 120 jubilee cycles. Fourth, as noted in an early segment of this study, Warner's assertion that history will span 120 jubilee cycles is derived from his interpretation that Genesis 6:3 "almost certainly indicates that the Spirit's struggle with the whole human race is limited to 120 years." And as already noted previously, the idea of "struggling" is a critical component of Genesis 6:3. Yet it is clear that God continues to struggle with men in some sense during and even after the end of the seventh millennium. (During the reign of Christ, God will withhold rain from disobedient nations, which not only shows ongoing resistance to God's will but also poetically mirrors God's declared method of judgment by means of the Flood proclaimed in Genesis 6). Synchronization between creation and jubilee years under Joshua does nothing to limit the count of jubilee years to 120, especially since if jubilee years before Joshua cannot be defined in strict Mosaic terms. Fifth, synchronization between the date of creation and the inauguration of jubilee years under Joshua still wouldn't do anything to corroborate Warner's specific table after Joshua, including which years and events he identifies as jubilee years from Joshua to Jesus.

Warner is correct that proving his theory will require this synchronicity, but we should not conclude that proving such synchronicity is tantamount to proving his entire "120 jubilee calendar" model. Logically speaking, Warner's "proposed Jubilee calendar, of 120 Jubilee years from creation to the second coming" is not actually verifiable by means of identifying synchronization between the date of creation and inauguration of the jubilee cycles under Joshua.

However, having reviewed the exegetical data and the conclusions of Warner's chronological model, we can now examine whether Warner has successfully demonstrated a synchronicity between Joshua's jubilee calendar and the first year of creation.

We must recognize that biblically establishing the date of the first jubilee year at the time of Joshua is absolutely critical to verifying Warner's "120 jubilee calendar." If we cannot establish that the first jubilee of the Jews occurred precisely at a 50-year increment from the first year of creation, then, as Warner's explanation demands, his 120 jubilee calendar cannot be and will not be confirmed.

However, the first jubilee year of the Jews is one of the events that is most difficult to date precisely using the chronological data provided in the scripture. Unlike the 40 years spent between the Exodus and the entrance into Canaan land at Jericho, and unlike the year the Temple began to be built by Solomon, the Old Testament nowhere mentions the exact number of years between the Exodus and the start of the jubilee cycle under Joshua or between Jericho and the settlement of the land by the tribes, both of which had to occur prior to the Israelites first celebration of a jubilee year. The Old Testament never informs us of the all-important date of the first jubilee cycle of Israel. If the "120 jubilee calendar" was taught in the Old Testament we would expect to find a clear scriptural declaration of the critical event necessary to synchronize the start of creation with the jubilee cycle that Israel began to keep at the time of Joshua. The fact that the Old Testament never provides this essential data may inform us about whether the biblical authors intended to teach the "120 jubilee calendar" of history.

In his study, Warner points to the New Testament passage of Acts 13:19 as evidence that the settling of Canaan land by the tribes of Israel under Joshua's leadership took place 50 years after the Exodus. As we have seen, in our study of Period Two: From the Birth of Isaac to the Exodus, the amount of time between Isaac's birth and the Exodus can be derived from specific chronological data provided in Genesis 15:13-16, Exodus 12:40-41, Galatians 3:16-17, Genesis 11:3-12:4, and Acts 7:2-8. By comparing the data provided in these texts we can easily conclude that God gave his promise to Abraham when Abraham was in his 70th year, Isaac was born when Abraham was in his 100th year, and the Exodus took place 430 years after Abraham received the promise and 400 years after Isaac's birth.

Using the NASB, Warner shows that Acts 13:19 can be taken to refer to a period of "about 450 years" between "God's choosing the fathers" (verse 17) and the conquest and inheritance of Canaan land (verse 19).

Acts 13:16-19 NASB

16 Paul stood up, and motioning with his hand said, "Men of Israel, and you who fear God, listen: 17 **"The God of this people Israel chose our fathers** and made the people great during their stay in the land of Egypt, and with an uplifted arm He led them out from it. 18 "For a period of about forty years He put up with them in the wilderness. 19 " **When He had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, He distributed their land as an inheritance — all of which took about four hundred and fifty years.** 6; Footnote 6: The KJV and NKJV, following the Textus Receptus, place the words "after these things" before "about

four hundred fifty years.” But, **the oldest manuscripts are agreed that the correct word order should be, “about four hundred fifty years, after these things He gave them judges, etc.,”** as in virtually all modern translations.

– Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Exodus to God’s Promise and Threat to Solomon, www.120jubilees.org

In this way, Warner seeks to biblically establish that the first jubilee of Israel took place in harmony with 50-year cycles going back to the Exodus, to Isaac’s birth, and ultimately to Abraham’s birth. From there it is necessary for Warner’s model to show that Abraham’s birth took place in a 50-year increment from creation. If both can be biblically demonstrated then Warner will have succeeded in verifying that some synchronizing of major events with 50-year increments, a critical step on the road to proving Warner’s “120 jubilee calendar.”

To be clear, the biblical data makes it clear that Abraham’s birth, Isaac’s birth, and the Exodus all took place in 50-year increments from one another. However, the critical element for verifying Warner’s 120 jubilee calendar is being able to synchronize these three events with the first year of creation and with the first jubilee year of the Jews. The first step is synchronizing these three events with the first jubilee of the Jews after the Exodus. The second step is demonstrating that any (and, therefore, all) of these events took place in 50-year increments from the first year of creation. If the birth of Abraham, the birth Isaac, and the Exodus can’t be synchronized with the first jubilee year which took place at the time of Joshua, then it will not be possible to verify Warner’s 120 jubilee calendar.

Below we will first discuss the feasibility of synchronizing the birth of Abraham, the birth Isaac, and the Exodus with the first jubilee kept by Israel at the time of Joshua. Then we will discuss the feasibility of synchronizing the birth of Abraham, the birth Isaac, and the Exodus with the beginning of creation.

There are some potential difficulties with the line of evidence Warner presents for synchronizing the first jubilee of the Jews with the Exodus (and therefore, with the births of Abraham and Isaac).

First, Warner’s interpretation of Acts 13 requires understanding the phrase “God’s choosing our fathers” to refer to the particular event of the birth of Isaac. In his study, Warner explains why he feels this interpretation is sound. He cites Deuteronomy 4:37, 7:6-8, and 10:15-16 which all contain Moses’ statements that God loved and delighted in the fathers of Israel and chose their descendents after them.

Deuteronomy 4:37 And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose (0977) their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt;

Deuteronomy 7:6 For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen (0977) thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. 7 The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose (0977) you, because ye were more in number than any

people; for ye were the fewest of all people: 8 But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which **he had sworn unto your fathers**, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.

Deuteronomy 10:15 Only the LORD had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose (0977) their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day.

In his study, Warner states that God's choosing begins with Abraham's seed, Isaac, and not Abraham himself. In this way, Warner takes Acts 13:17-19 to refer to a 450-year period beginning with Isaac's birth and ending with the inheritance of Canaan land under Joshua.

Paul's recounting Israel's history begins with God's ,choosing our fathers.' The key word here is "choose." **According to Deuteronomy, God's "choosing" (election) did not start with Abraham, but with Isaac – Abraham's "seed."** Three times God spoke of "choosing" Abraham's seed in order to fulfill His covenant with Abraham... **The Bible portrays Abraham's "seed" as being "chosen," not Abraham Himself. This "choosing" (election) begins with Isaac**, then Jacob, then the 12 tribes. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Exodus to God's Promise and Threat to Solomon, www.120jubilees.org

As Warner points out all of the verses in Deuteronomy state that God chose the descendents of the fathers. The difficulty here is that on all three occasions Moses mentions "the fathers" using a plural, not the singular "father." In Moses' vernacular, the fathers of the people of Israel were Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Exodus 3:15 And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.

Deuteronomy 6:10 And it shall be, when the LORD thy God shall have brought thee into the land which he sware unto **thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob**, to give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not,

Deuteronomy 9:5 Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the LORD thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may perform the word which the LORD sware unto **thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob**.

Deuteronomy 29:13 That he may establish thee to day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn **unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob**.

Deuteronomy 30:20 That thou mayest love the LORD thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him: for he is thy life,

and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell in the land which the LORD sware unto **thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob**, to give them.

Deuteronomy 1:8 does not help Warner's attempt to exclude Abraham from the group of those who were chosen while including Isaac and Jacob. In this verse, we again see Moses identify "the fathers" of Israel as including all three men, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But, we also see that these three men are distinguished from "their seed."

Deuteronomy 1:8 Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which **the LORD sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them.**

Therefore, Deuteronomy could be interpreted as though Moses stipulated that the seed (or descendents) of the fathers, and not the fathers themselves, were chosen, but such an interpretation would not permit us to exclude Abraham from the group chosen by God while including Isaac and Jacob (as Warner's interpretation of Acts 13 requires). If we intend to use Deuteronomy to establish who was chosen by God, then we cannot include any of the fathers as part of the chosen group. Neither can we include some of the fathers, but not all of the fathers. We must include all or none, and either case is incompatible with Warner's identification of the beginning of Acts 13 with the birth of Isaac.

Further difficulties emerge when we read Paul's statements in Acts 13:17-19 in light of these passages from Deuteronomy which Paul apparently has in mind. Unlike Deuteronomy 4:37, 7:6-8, and 10:15 which state that God chose the descendents because he loved their fathers, in Acts 13:17 Paul states that God, in fact, chose the fathers themselves. Paul's statement that God chose the fathers coupled with Moses' identification of the fathers as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob poses a problem for Warner's interpretation that Abraham himself was not chosen, while Isaac and Jacob were.

These observations make it difficult to be sure that Acts 13:17-19 intends for us to understand that the "about 450 years" begins with the birth of Isaac. Therefore, since we cannot exclude Abraham from the key phrase in Acts 13:17 we are prevented from necessarily counting the time from Isaac's birth in particular. If we cannot count the period of "about 450 years" from Isaac's birth precisely, then we are without justification for dating the inheritance of Canaan land to 450 years after Isaac's birth and 50 years after the Exodus. Consequently, we would be unable to date the first jubilee of the Jews to a 50-year increment after the Exodus.

Additionally, we should note that Acts 13:19 does not specify whether the destroying of the Canaanite nations and the distribution of their land is meant to refer to a process which took place over a number of years or to the point in time when that process was finished. Warner's interpretation requires that Acts 13:19 refers to the exact point in time when the conquest of the Canaanite nations and distribution of their land was completed. However, it is just as possible that Acts 13:19 is simply discussing the process of conquering the Canaanites and

distributing their land over the course of a decade or more, rather than the point in which these activities were completed. And, while Acts 13:18 does specify the period of time that Israel was in the wilderness after the Exodus as the standard 40 years, Acts 13 doesn't specify the amount of time between the end of that 40 years in the wilderness and the conquest and distribution of Canaan land. As such, the essential chronological component of Warner's model is still missing.

In addition we should address the fact that Warner's model requires that Acts 13:19 is referring to an exact 450-year period. However, Acts 13:19 seems to qualify the 450 years with the word "about." The Greek word used here is "hos" (5613) which means "as, like, even as, etc." For comparison, earlier in Acts we can see how Luke uses the word "hos" when referring to numerical amounts. In Acts 1:15 Luke states that there were "about 120 people" in the upper room. The word translated as "about" is "hos" (5613).

Acts 1:15 And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, **(the number of names together were about (5613) an hundred and twenty,)**

Likewise, in Acts 5:7, Luke describes a period of time as "about three hours."

Acts 5:7 And it was about (5613) the space of three hours after, when his wife, not knowing what was done, came in.

In both of the above passages, it is reasonable to conclude that Luke intends to describe an approximate, but not exact figure.

Another instance of "hos" (5613) in Acts occurs in Acts 7:23. In Acts 7:23, Luke speaks of Moses' age when he first visited his Israelite brothers in Egypt. Here Luke couples the Greek word "hos" (5613) with the Greek word "pleroo" (4137). The Greek verb "pleroo" (4137) refers to the action of completing something. However, it is conceivable that Luke is simply saying that these events occurred at around the time Moses had completed forty years rather than at the exact time when Moses completed 40 years of life.

Acts 7:23 And when (5613) he was full (4137) forty years old, it came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel.

When we turn to Acts 13, we have to decide what Paul and Luke mean by their use of the Greek word "hos" (5613). In Acts 13:18, Paul and Luke use the word "hos" (5613) to refer to the 40 years Israel spent in the wilderness. We are assured from other biblical passages that the time in the wilderness was a 40-year period.

Acts 13:18 And about (5613) the time (5550) of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness.

Because of Acts 13:18, it is conceivable that verse 19 (or 20 depending on the translation) is using "hos" to refer to an exact amount of time. But, Luke's other usages of "hos" coupled with the fact that neither Paul, nor Luke, nor any other

biblical text provides a specific amount of time between the Exodus and the conquest and distribution of Canaan land provides reason to consider that Acts 13:19-20 may simply be giving us an approximate time at which the distribution of the land was completed rather than the exact amount of time.

In his previous chronology study, Warner advocates for the phrase “about 450 years” being understood as an approximation not an exact amount of time. He also argued for the alternative interpretation of the phrase “about 450 years” as a description of the time from the Exodus to the Davidic covenant.

The portion in bold above was a parenthetical statement by Paul, summing up the whole period. The word “afterward” means after the events referred to in verse 17. **It is apparent that Paul’s intent was to sum up the time of the whole period,** from the exodus (including the 40 years in the wilderness) until the Davidic Covenant, when God promised David that the Christ would come from his seed. **And this is indeed “about four hundred fifty years,”** as we will see...**No doubt, Paul was estimating...and thus rounded out his estimate to “about four hundred fifty years.”** - Tim Warner, The Coming Millennial Sabbath – Part II, Bible Chronology, from Creation to the Second Coming, Copyright © July, 2009, answersinrevelation.org

In his current study, Warner offers a different interpretation of Acts 13’s chronology in which the phrase “about 450 years” is applied to the period from Isaac’s birth to the conquest of Canaan land. This is useful for his current chronological model which requires that there were exactly 450 years between these two events. Therefore, Acts 13:19-20 is taken to refer to an exact 450 years, rather than an approximation of the duration of the period. In his current study, Warner never addresses, contests, or explains Paul’s use of the word “about” (“hos” 5613) to qualify the 450 years. Nor does he explain why his previous conclusion (that Acts 13:19 refers to the approximate amount of time from the Exodus to David) is exegetically unsound.

Furthermore, because the amount of time from Isaac’s birth to the Exodus and from the Exodus to Solomon’s reign is already known from other biblical texts, other chronological models do not require that we make an absolute determination of what the 450 years mentioned in Acts 13 pertain to or regarding whether they are exact or approximate. Only Warner’s chronological model requires particular conclusions about the 450 years of Acts 13. To be clear, we do not intend to say that Warner’s current interpretations of Acts 13:19-20 are impossible. We only wish to state that we should be careful not to let decisions about the 450 years be driven by the specific needs of our chronological model. Doing so interferes with the ability to independently verify the model through exegetical analysis because the exegetical determinations that are being made may, in part, be motivated by the desire to support the model. In addition, it is important not to mistake the possibility that Acts 13 is referring to an exact 450 years from Exodus to David as though this is the only valid or necessarily the most reasonable interpretation of Acts 13. Consequently, with regard to the phrase “about 450 years” in Acts 13,

Warner's model remains a possibility, but this phrase by no means proves or confirms his model.

In summary, while it is of critical importance to Warner's model that the first jubilee year of Israel synchronize with the first year of creation (and other events), dating the first jubilee year of Israel is very difficult to do using only the data provided in the scripture. The Old Testament doesn't provide us with an indication of the exact number of years that transpired between the destruction of Jericho and the distribution of the land to the tribes by Joshua. Using Acts 13:19 requires concluding that the phrase "about 450 years" mentioned in the text is an exact figure, that this amount of time ends with the year that the conquest and distribution of Canaan land was finally completed, and that it begins with Isaac's birth by excluding Abraham from the phrase "choosing the fathers." As we have already indicated, these observations demonstrate the degree of difficulty that is involved in dating the first jubilee of Israel. If the year of the first jubilee cannot be clearly exegetically established with precision, then it is not possible to verify Warner's model of "120 jubilee year calendar" that starts at the beginning of creation.

In addition to the difficulties that exist for synchronizing the Exodus with the first jubilee of Israel, there are also difficulties with the equally necessary synchronization of the birth of Abraham, the birth of Isaac, and the Exodus to the beginning of creation. Earlier in our study we examined the manner in which Warner's chronology synchronizes the birth of Abraham, the birth of Isaac, and the Exodus with the first year of creation. Even if someone is inclined to conclude with Warner that the first jubilee took place 100 years after the Exodus, 500 years after Isaac's birth, and 600 years after Abraham's birth, it would still be necessary to show that these events all took place in 50-year increments from the first year of creation. Again, as we have seen, this is no simple exegetical feat.

The chronological data recorded in Genesis provides a total count of the years from creation to Abraham's birth using genealogical information about the ages of the patriarchs at the births of their sons. The timing of the Flood in relation to Noah's age is also involved in the calculation of the amount of time from creation to Abraham's birth. Below, for reference and review is the list of passages which provide the relevant and critical chronological data.

Adam was created on the sixth day of creation (Genesis 1:23-31) and he was **130 full years** old when Seth was born (Genesis 5:3).

Seth was **105 full years** old when Enos was born (Genesis 5:6).

Enos was **90 full years** old when Cainan was born (Genesis 5:9).

Cainan was **70 full years** old when Mahalaleel was born (Genesis 5:12).

Mahalaleel was **65 full years** old when Jared was born (Genesis 5:15).

Jared was **162 full years** old when Enoch was born (Genesis 5:18).

Enoch was **65 full years** old when Methusaleh was born (Genesis 5:21).

Methusaleh was **187 full years** old when Lamech was born (Genesis 5:25).

Lamech was **182 full years** old when Noah was born (Genesis 5:28-29).

Noah was **599 full years** old when the Flood occurred (Genesis 7:6, 11, 8:13).

The flood waters remained on the earth for **1 full year** (Genesis 7:6, 11, 8:13).

Noah's son Shem had a son named Arphaxad, **2 full years** after the Flood (Genesis 11:10).

Arphaxad was **35 full years** old when he had a son named Salah (Genesis 11:12).

Salah was **30 full years** old when he had a son named Eber (Genesis 11:14).

Eber was **34 full years** old when he had a son named Peleg (Genesis 11:16).

Peleg was **30 full years** old when he had a son named Reu (Genesis 11:18).

Reu was **32 full years** old when he had a son named Serug (Genesis 11:20).

Serug was **30 full years** old when he had a son named Nahor (Genesis 11:22).

Nahor was **29 full years** old when he had a son named Terah (Genesis 11:24).

Terah was **131 full years** old when he had a son named Abram (Genesis 11:26,32, 12:4, Acts 7:4).

Abraham was **99 full years** old when Isaac was born (Genesis 21:5).

The numbers provided in these passages give us a total of 1655 (or perhaps 1656) years before the Flood and 353 (or perhaps 354) years from the Flood until Abraham. The result derived from adding these two numbers together is 2008 (or perhaps 2010) years. (The difference is derived from whether we understand Noah to have been exactly 600 when the Flood started or only 599 full years old and whether Terah was 130 or 131 when Abraham was born.)

If 2008 (or 2010) AM is the year of Abraham's birth, then neither Abraham's birth, nor any of the subsequent events which synchronize with it in 50-year increments align with the first year of creation. Isaac was born in Abraham's 100th year. If Abraham was born in 2008 (or 2010) AM, then Isaac was born in 2108 (or 2110) AM. The Exodus, which took place 400 years after Isaac's birth, would have occurred in 2508 (or 2510) AM. And consequently, even if we can place the inheritance of the land of Israel in a 50-year increment from the Exodus, the conquest of the land would be completed in 2558 (or 2560) AM and the first jubilee year would be dated to 2608 (or 2610) AM.

As these exegetical observations show, if the numbers provided in the scripture are taken at face value, then Warner's model cannot be verified because the first jubilee year of Israel would not synchronize with the first year of creation in a 50-year interval. The dates for these events would be 8-10 years off of the 50-year increment. By itself then, the available chronological data provided in the bible does not verify Warner's "120 jubilee calendar model."

Now, 8-10 years might at first seem awfully close, maybe even too close not to be true. After all, we're less than a decade from synchronization with jubilee cycles. With only 10 years out of sync over so many generations, maybe we're just wrong somewhere in our data. However, there are two things we must realize. First, we must realize that the period from creation to Abraham's birth is not the only period of history where there are problems synchronizing jubilee years, as we have seen throughout this study.

Second, and more importantly, with 50-year intervals, 10 years is significant statistical departure. In a 50-year interval, the synchronization can't be off by 100

or 200 years. After all, there are only 5 decades in any 50 year period. So, by definition the maximum deviation is going to be less than 50 years. In fact, a deviation couldn't be more than 25 years, which is half the length of a jubilee cycle. For instance, a deviation of 49 years would simply be regarded as a deviation of 1 year. The same would be true for any deviation greater than 25 years. A deviation of 26 years is really only 24 years from 50. While it might be tempting to see a deviation of only 8-10 years and think this is too close to be an accident and close enough to warrant adjusting our understanding of the data to fit, it is important to realize that a deviation of a decade is nearly half the size of the largest possible deviation of 2.5 decades (25 years). Since the largest possible deviation is 25 years, a deviation of 8-10 years isn't merely a deviation of 20 percent (which is already statistically significant). Instead, it's a deviation of 33-40 percent. Consequently, although 8-10 years may seem "too close not to be true," the reality is that with intervals of only 50 years, being off by 8-10 years is about what you could reasonably expect if there was no synchronization. Being a few years off in intervals of 200 or 500 might present some intriguing possibilities. But being 8-10 years off of a 50-year interval isn't really all that tantalizing.

However, in his study, Warner overcomes the difficulties presented by a straightforward calculation of the biblical data. To do this, Warner subtracts 1 year from the ages of each of the pre-Abrahamic patriarchs at the birth of their son. This new amount results in a total reduction of 19 years to the period prior to Abraham's birth. (Incidentally, with 25 years as the maximum potential deviation in a 50-year interval, 19 years represents adjusting the data by nearly 80 percent.) The result of Warner's reduction would place Abraham's birth at around the year 1989 AM. Again, even if we grant the alignment of the first jubilee of Israel with the birth of Abraham, this figure would still leave Warner's chronology unable to synchronize the first jubilee of Israel with the first year of creation. A straightforward calculation of the biblical data resulted in a discrepancy of 8 or 10 years between Warner's "120 jubilee calendar" and scriptural count. Removing 20 years from the ages of the patriarchs has only increased that discrepancy to 11 years.

To overcome this, Warner proposes adding 6 months to the ages of each of the patriarchs at the births of their sons. This 6-month addition is offered on the basis of the need to compensate for unaccounted for time between the birthdays of the fathers and sons in the Genesis genealogies. Over 19 generations, these 6-month additions would produce another 9.5 years of time. (Incidentally, with 25 years as the maximum potential deviation in a 50-year interval, 9.5 years represents adjusting the data by nearly 40 percent.) Adding these 9.5 years to the reduced total of 1989 would result in a birth of Abraham in the year 1998. (If taken together, subtracting one year from each patriarch and then adding 6 months to each patriarch does get us within 2 years of synchronization, but it requires reinterpreting the data from 2008-2010 years to 1998 years. This combined reduction of 10 years equates to adjusting the totals by roughly 40 percent of the maximum 25 years possible for deviation from synchronization.) And yet, while it

is closer, this date still fails to synchronize Abraham's birth with the first year of creation.

In his study, Warner does synchronize Abraham's birth with the first year of creation. However, it requires some additional fine tuning beyond reducing the years of the ages of the patriarchs by 1 year each and then re-inserting 6 months of that subtracted year. While Warner's methods and chronology show that synchronization between the beginning of creation and the first jubilee of Israel may be possible, it also shows that this synchronization is certainly not the result of simple exegesis or simple calculation of the biblically-provided chronological data.

Moreover, as we have seen, difficulties with synchronization requiring adjustments to biblical data do not end with the first jubilee year of Israel. Warner's model also has to show that the jubilee cycle remains intact through the rest of the 6,000 years of pre-millennial history. Even if the synchronization of the first jubilee year of Israel under Joshua can be established, it is necessary to maintain correspondence between that first jubilee and later events including the decree mentioned in Daniel 9. If Daniel's timetable which does include the sabbatical and jubilee calendar system does not synchronize with the first jubilee of Israel and the beginning of creation, then Warner's "120 jubilee calendar" cannot be maintained. And, as we have seen, similar adjustments methods continue to be necessary in order to maintain ongoing synchronization over all these later periods of biblical history.

Two particular types of adjustments to the biblical data are required to maintain synchronization between the first jubilee of Israel and Daniel's prophetic timetable. First, Warner's model requires adding 1 year each to the reigns of all of the kings of Judah from Solomon to Zedekiah (plus a second extra year for Athaliah's reign). (With roughly 20 kings reigning over Judah in this period, this results in an adjustment of 20 years, which is 80 percent of the maximum possible deviation of 25 years that could occur in a 50-year interval. In other words, without adding in transitional years, the deviation from jubilee synchronization is nearly as great as it possibly could be.) These calculations take us to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. To this amount is added 70 years of Babylonian exile. The addition of 70 years rather than 50 years may be possible, but it is not the only option, or even the best option. It is an assumption whose main justification is perhaps in that it allows jubilee correspondence to be maintained. (With 20 years difference between 50 or 70 years, this again represents an adjustment of 80 percent of the maximum possible deviation of 25 years that could occur in a 50-year interval.) Again, when maintaining jubilee correspondence becomes the basis for directing particular exegetical choices the ability to independently verify the 120 jubilee calendar through biblical means becomes untenable.

A study of the chronological material contained in the bible alongside Warner's chronological model is informative. While Warner's chronology may be considered exegetically allowable, it is certainly not exegetically necessary (or in

some cases even exegetically preferable). The alternative to Warner's model is that God instituted the sabbatical and jubilee calendar system for the first time when Moses delivered the Law of Israel at the Exodus. This calendar system was supposed to start when the Israelite tribes settled Canaanite land and to continue as long as Israel remained in the land. However, Israel did not remain in the land perpetually. Because of their sin they were removed for a period of time to Babylon.

Likewise, Daniel indicates that the return of the Jewish exiles from Babylon marked the onset of a new jubilee cycle. However, it is important to note that Daniel 9 does not outline the rest of all human history according to sabbatical-jubilee cycles. Warner's chronology places Daniel's reception of this prophetic timetable in the year Cyrus issued his decree which he dates as the year 3,550 AM.

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

This means that even in Warner's model, at the time Daniel was given this prophetic timeline there was some 2,500 years left in the 6,000-year period prior to Christ's return. Daniel 9-12 coupled with other passages in both the Old and New Testament indicates that Daniel's prophetic timetable concludes with the return of Christ. However, even though some 2,500 years of history remained until the last events described in Daniel's prophecy, Daniel specifies that amount of time as 70 weeks of years. As Warner has explained, in accordance with Leviticus 25, 70 weeks of years including the accompanying jubilee years would only span a total of 500 years, not 2,500 years. If 120 jubilee years mark a 6,000-year period from the start of creation to Christ's return and Daniel's prophecy employs that "120 jubilee calendar" and ends with Christ's return, then why does Daniel 9's timetable only mention 500 years and not 2500 years? Why doesn't Daniel 9 contain a prophecy of 350 weeks (the amount of weeks that would be equivalent to 2,500 years) instead of a prophecy of 70 weeks (equivalent to only 500 years)?

The fact that Daniel 9 only entails 10 jubilee cycles that would correspond to 70 weeks containing 500 years provides reason to consider the notion that the 2,500 years between the start of Daniel's prophetic timetable and its conclusion, only contained 10 jubilee cycles in God's view, not the 50 jubilee cycles that would be required in Warner's "120 jubilee calendar." As is the case from the time of Joshua, the first 9 jubilee cycles included in the first portion of Daniel's prophecy (the first 69 weeks) refer to a period in which Israel occupied the Promised Land. These jubilee cycles began with Cyrus' decree releasing the Jewish captives to return to Judah and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple.

Likewise, it is important to note that Daniel 9 specifically places certain events outside of the jubilee calendar that Daniel's prophecy is attesting to and using. These events are mentioned in Daniel 9:26.

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. 25 Know therefore and understand, *that* from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince *shall be* seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. 26 **And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.** 27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make *it* desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

As we have stated previously, verse 26 lists the destruction of the Temple right alongside the death of the messiah as occurring "after" the 69 weeks. Yet the Temple was destroyed 40 years after the death of Christ. This 40-year gap ultimately means that the language of verse 26 does not require either of the events listed "after" the 69 weeks to necessarily occur immediately at the conclusion of the 69 weeks. In fact, the 40-year gap concerning one of the events suggests that maybe neither event occurred immediately at the conclusion of the 69 weeks. And in any case, the destruction of the temple 40 years after the death of Christ means that Daniel is identifying at least one event that fall outside of the 70 weeks of his prophecy. If Daniel is prophesying about events that occur outside of the 70 weeks, this implies that certain intervals of history are not measured by God in accordance with sabbatical and jubilee cycles. Otherwise, Daniel's prophecy would need to include at least 77 weeks (adding another 49-year sabbatical cycle and jubilee year) to reach to the destruction of the Temple by the Romans, and even more if the 69 weeks ended with the birth or baptism of Christ instead of his death.

Again, the central question here is this. Why isn't Daniel given a prophecy of 350 weeks or 50 jubilee years to span the remaining 2,500 years till Christ's return?

Daniel 9:25 specifies events that take place within the first jubilee cycle which include the rebuilding of Jerusalem, its walls, and its street. Why doesn't he similarly state that the Messiah would be killed and Jerusalem and the Temple would again be destroyed in the jubilee cycle beginning after the 69th sabbatical week? He could then continue counting and grouping sabbatical and jubilee cycles until the next important events took place just as the prophecy already does for other events.

Furthermore, Warner's model proposes that the first 6,000 years of creation is contained in 120 jubilee years. As we have seen in our listing above, many of those jubilee years contained no significant biblical events. Warner's own chronology only identifies 13 of the total 120 jubilee years as having biblical events occur within them. This means that in the "120 jubilee calendar model" 107 jubilee years are still counted even though no events are recorded for them in the bible. Daniel could easily have specified the events up to the Roman destruction in relation to sabbatical and jubilee cycles. But he doesn't. Nor does he count jubilee cycles spanning from the Roman destruction in 70 AD until the time of Christ's return. Yet Warner's model proposes that jubilee cycles were being counted by God and were available for marking such events in this future period just as Warner proposes they occurred in relation to other key biblical events, long before Israel existed as a nation and regardless of whether or not they were in Canaan land or have a tabernacle or temple structure.

We should also consider that Warner's chronology places a jubilee year in the Fall six and a half years after Christ's crucifixion. This factor results from Warner's conclusion that Daniel's first 69 weeks at the Fall before Christ's crucifixion. The close of those first 69 weeks falls 1 week of years short of a 500-year period and the accompanying jubilee year, which would occur at the end of that 500-year period, would subsequently have to occur 6 and a half years after the crucifixion.

Using this new understanding of the 70 weeks, the crucifixion of Jesus after the end of the 69th week must be dated to 493 years after the command given by Cyrus, one week short of the 70 weeks which totals 500 years. – Tim Warner, Daniel's 70 Weeks On Second Thought, www.answersinrevelation.org

The 7 plus 62 that we see here until Messiah came to an end at those Fall festivals six months before Jesus was crucified. Now look what it says next. **It says "after the 62."** So, we've got the 7 and then the 62. It says "Messiah shall be cut off." **And I want you to note that its says "after," "after the 62 weeks Messiah will be cut off."** How long was it "after" that Messiah was cut off? **Six months. It was six months after because, remember, these years and these weeks go from Fall to Fall. They go from Rosh Hashanah to Rosh Hashanah. But Jesus was crucified on Passover which is six months later in Spring. So, when it says "after the 62 weeks" it is 492 complete years plus six months. So, it's in the middle of the 493rd year that Jesus was crucified counting from Cyrus and his decree.** – Tim Warner, From Cyrus to Christ, Part II, chron09.mp3, starting at 18:08, www.120jubilees.org

In the audio recording of his teaching entitled "From the Crucifixion to the Second Coming" (see chron_10.mp3 at www.120jubilee.org, between 2 minutes and 30 seconds), Warner states that his chronology uses the year 30 AD as the year of Christ's crucifixion. Since Christ was crucified at Passover in Spring Warner's model would place a jubilee year six and half years later in Fall of 36 AD.

As we pointed out earlier, it should be noted that the formation of the modern state of Israel occurred in 1948. Likewise, the city of Jerusalem came under the control of the state of Israel in 1967. If Warner is correct that 36 AD was a jubilee year, then neither of these events took place in correspondence to the sabbatical-jubilee calendar. The year 1948 is 1912 years after the year 36 AD. And, the year 1967 is 1931 years after 36 AD. Neither number is divisible by sabbatical or jubilee cycles. Both events correspond very closely to the type of events which mark the start of Daniel's prophetic timetable, the release of the Jewish exiles to the land of Judah and their subsequent restoration of Jerusalem. Why doesn't Daniel explain the occurrence of these events with relevance to the "120 jubilee calendar" system, after all, his prophetic timetable already outlines similar events within a sabbatical-jubilee system? Moreover, why doesn't Warner's model allow for synchronization of the formation of the modern Israeli state in 1948 and the Jewish acquisition of Jerusalem in 1967 with the "120 jubilee calendar?" Perhaps these twentieth-century events shouldn't be biblically related to Daniel's prophecy, jubilee cycles, and release from exile. But, since they may be commonly taken as having biblical significance, it seems Warner's model would be helped by offering an explanation of why they aren't relevant or how they fit within his model.

The fact that key events in the bible and outside the bible don't take place on sabbatical or jubilee years coupled with the occurrence of jubilee years in which the bible records no significant events erodes our ability to verify the "120 jubilee calendar model." In a 6,000-year period certainly some major events will happen in 50-year increments from each other, many other major events will happen in between the 50-year increments, and many of the 50th years will contain no significant events at all. If we can't consistently trace the "120 jubilee cycle" through the occurrence and non-occurrence of key events within the cycles, then how can we verify the "120 jubilee calendar model" at all? Even if we accept the adjustments Warner's model involves, how can we be sure that we aren't just selecting the few years in which some kind of event took place in 50-year increments and ignoring other significant events that don't align with the 50-year cycle just to find support for the "120 jubilee calendar?" This kind of selectivity in regard to evidence and assessment undermines the ability to independently and objectively verify any model.

Furthermore, the fact that a forward-looking chronology like Daniel utilizes the jubilee calendar instituted by Moses and ends with Christ's return but only counts 10 jubilee years (70 weeks containing 500 years) rather than 50 jubilee cycles (350 weeks containing 2,500 years) at least implies that God doesn't use a jubilee calendar system to mark all of creation history and all events prior to Christ's return.

We cannot simply respond that Daniel doesn't specify all future events using the jubilee timetable because God didn't want to disclose the amount of time between the Messiah's death and his return. Such an objection is simply a non-starter in this model. After all, if Warner is right, and creation is defined in Genesis 6:3 as 6,000 years marked by 120 jubilee cycles and biblical chronology allows us to

date Daniel 9 and its decree to the year 3550 AM, then the amount of time between the Messiah's death and his return is already disclosed. Not mentioning this timetable in Daniel's prophecy would not serve to conceal this fact, especially since it would already be apparent that God wasn't seeking to conceal this information in the first place. Likewise, the fact that Daniel 9 does specify the events of a final week before Christ's return indicates that God is providing information so that people will be able to know these things ahead of time.

Therefore, we are without any clear reason to explain why Daniel's prophecy doesn't include a count of all the sabbatical and jubilee cycles before the end of the events he is discussing, but instead only includes a discussion of 10 jubilee cycles (or 70 weeks) with regard to a period that is five times larger than Daniel's timetable. The most available reason is that Daniel doesn't describe the entire period using sabbatical and jubilee cycles because God doesn't count the entire period or all of history in sabbatical and jubilee cycles. He only counts a portion of that time using the jubilee calendar system.

In conclusion, the lack of a purely exegetical basis coupled with the need for ramified approaches to calculating the biblical data does not mean that synchronization between the beginning of creation and the first jubilee of Israel is impossible or must be ruled out. What it does mean, however, is that we cannot exegetically verify the "120 jubilee calendar."

Furthermore, we should be aware of both the amount of exegetically unnecessary assumptions that are required and also how many of them occur at crucial points in the evidence. These observations give us good reason to consider whether the synchronicity produced by Warner's model is the product of verifiable exegetical work performed on biblical data or of circular choices dictated by the needs of "the 120 jubilee calendar model" itself. When the "120 jubilee calendar model" itself dictates exegetical decisions at critical points in the evidence, the ability to verify the soundness of the "120 jubilee model" independently using the bible becomes completely untenable. Along with these considerations, we should keep in mind that the fundamental support text for "the 120 jubilee model" is Genesis 6:3. An assessment of that text in relation to "the 120 jubilee model" shows that the exegetical basis for Warner's interpretation is not the strongest. This again undermines the ability to verify "the 120 jubilee model" through a simple, straightforward count of the biblically-provided chronological data alone.

Lastly, we would like to acknowledge that this is a lengthy, involved, and at times complicated study. Much of the length and complexity of this study is mandated by the need to fully consider and examine proposals made by other chronological systems. If this complexity is undesirable or seems less than ideal for biblical truths, then we always have the option of returning to a straightforward counting of the biblical data itself. This can be done in much fewer pages and with much less analysis. From our perspective, more straightforward approaches and chronologies which simply count the biblically-supplied amounts are preferable for several reasons. First, they don't require what may appear to be ad hoc mechanisms which can serve only to validate a particular hypothesis that

otherwise may not fit with exegetical data. And second, they uphold the consistency and sufficiency of the bible for supplying us with all we need to properly grasp world history. Those who share this sentiment that a complicated approach is unnecessary may also want to steer clear of chronological systems and models which necessitate the kind of complexity that has made this evaluation of biblical chronology so lengthy and cumbersome. And those who do choose to go with the straightforward calculations can rest assured that the chronology it results in is not naïve or oversimplified. Rather, a straightforward count of the history of creation which is solely based on the chronological data provided in the bible is at least as exegetically, biblically, historically, and logically sound as any alternative calculation.