

Chronology 316: Timeline of Biblical World History



biblestudying.net

Brian K. McPherson and Scott McPherson

Copyright 2012

Period Four: From the Beginning of Solomon's Reign to the Destruction of the Temple (Part 3A)

Evaluating Biblical Evidence Relevant to Calculating the Period of the Kings of Judah

In the previous section of this study we discussed the specifics of three different options for calculating the length of the period of the kings of Judah as well as the nature of exegetical proof that would be necessary to corroborate or prove each of them. In this section we will examine some of the specific, potential exegetical data that is relevant to which of these three options might be used in our calculations of world history. To help us organize and keep track of these issues, we will discuss them in sections numbered 1 through 10.

1. Although he briefly states that there is no evidence that option one was practiced regarding the kings of Judah, Tim Warner's current chronology study does not spend any time discussing option two. In his calculations, Warner employs option three. As support for this conclusion, he cites the fact that 2 Chronicles records two kings (Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin) who each reigned for only 3 months.

In the third proposed system, (assuming a Tishri to Tishri, fall to fall reckoning of years), the first year of a particular king would be counted from Tishri 1 (Rosh Hashanah) after he ascended the throne. If he was installed as King six months before Rosh Hashanah (New Year's Day), **the partial year during which he ascended the throne would not be counted as his first year**. Rather, the following whole year (Rosh Hashanah to Rosh Hashanah) would be reckoned as his first year. Likewise, **if a king died during the middle of a year, his reign would be reckoned through the last full year he reigned...When adding up the kings of Judah given in 2 Chronicles, we have followed this method, adding one year per king for this transitional year**, since we are assuming that only full calendar years were counted. **Our theory is supported by the fact that when a king reigned less than one full year, his reign is given in months and not years. If partial years were counted as whole years, such a king would be said to have reigned one year. Two of the kings of Judah reigned 3 months each. In these cases, three different kings reigned for parts of a single calendar year (the king who died, his successor who only reigned 3 months, and the next king).**

Therefore, we do not count these two kings at all in our chronology, but only add the

single intervening year in each case. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God’s Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

As we have explained above, it is certainly true that the treatment of Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin in 2 Chronicles conflicts with option one. According to option one, these two kings should have been credited with a full, calendar year each. Because 2 Chronicles does not credit them with a full calendar year, it would seem that the biblical authors were not utilizing a manner of counting the kings’ reigns in which partial (transitional) years were credited to kings as full, calendar years. But, how does 2 Chronicles’ treatment of these two kings relate to options two and three?

Option three would exclude counting the transitional year from the reigns of either Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin or their predecessors and successors. This certainly fits with the data provided in 2 Chronicles 36:1 and 5, just as Warner suggests. However, it is not clear how the information in 2 Chronicles contradicts option 2. To the contrary, option 2 would seem to work sufficiently well with the data in 2 Chronicles. Option two dictates that transitional years (in which two or more kings reign) are counted as a single, full calendar year and ascribed to only one (but not all) of those kings. Take Jehoiachin as an illustrative example. Option two would assign the transitional year to either Jehoiachin on one hand or on the other hand to Jehoiachin’s predecessor or successor (but not both) without attributing a full calendar year to Jehoiachin. (The same would be true for Jehoahaz). If the authors of the biblical texts did employ option two, we would expect that they would denote the length of kings’ reigns in terms of whole calendar years for those kings who reigned for at least one year and would only break from that pattern and use months in cases when a king failed complete even a single year. This would be the only way to retain such brief reigns in the record without adding misleading, extra years in the count.

It should be noted that neither option two nor option three is intended to deny that kings reigned for a few spare months here and there that didn’t fit into a full, calendar year. To the contrary, both option two and option three assume that kings frequently reigned for several months short of constituting a full year. The purpose of these options is to address how such extra months factor into an overall tally of a king’s reign, not to deny extra months. Consequently, the occurrence of odd or extra months here and there is not really contrary to either model, even the infrequent occurrence of a couple of kings who only reigned for a few months. If the issue is not the fact that there are a few, spare months short of a full year, then the question becomes whether the sudden designation of months in the record constitutes proof or disproof of either particular option. Warner’s insistence that 2 Chronicles proves option three centers on the notion that the unusual mention of months in these verses somehow favors option three. However, on face value, the sudden utilization of months in the record of king’s reigns is very much unexpected and contrary to the central expectation of option three. As worded by Warner, option three is defined as “count only whole years of a king’s reign.” According to this model, we should not expect any accounting whatsoever of a king who reigned less than a whole year. Thus, the data in 2

Chronicles would actually disprove option three. While it could be argued that option two likewise predicts that we will find no incomplete years in the record, we are left with a scenario in which if option two is disproved by 2 Chronicles, option three must likewise be admittedly forfeit as well. The only way to avoid this forfeiture is to regard the sudden utilization of months as an exception to the rule necessitated by the unusual break from normal circumstances. But, if this is true, then the designation of months in the case of Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin doesn't necessarily tell us anything about the standard rule. After all, they are by definition an exception to the rule. Ultimately, since both option two and option three would tend to erase all record of a king who reigned for only a few months, both options equally mandate and predict the use of months to retain record of any king who reigned for less than a full, calendar year.

Consequently, finding the sudden utilization of months in the count of kings' reigns is an exception we would entirely expect under either option two or three. Moreover, 2 Chronicles 36 does not address or specify how the reigns of the predecessors or successors of Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin were counted in relation to these transitional years. Nor, does it specify how transitional years shared by only two kings were counted. Therefore, from the evidence presented in 2 Chronicles 36, it seems we may only conclude that the biblical authors were not employing option one. But we have no evidence from 2 Chronicles that would dictate which of options two and three is correct. As such, while Warner's utilization of option three is allowable based on 2 Chronicles 36, it is not necessitated by it. Option two is in no way ruled out by 2 Chronicles 36:1 and 5.

And without contrary evidence regarding option two in 2 Chronicles, the principle of biblical sufficiency would still lead us to adopt option two over option three. Option three holds that the biblical authors not only omitted some 20 transitional years in the history of the kings of Judah, but left no information establishing that omission, thereby rendering the biblical record insufficient for preserving an accurate chronology. Under these considerations, option two would seem preferable since it maintains the both sufficiency of the biblical data and the intent of the authors to provide us with an accurate count of the reigns of the kings for the purposes of deriving a total chronology of this period.

2. Other examples of biblical timekeeping methods during the reigns of the kings of Judah can also be discussed. For instance, 2 Samuel 5:3-5 states that David reigned as king of Judah for 7 years and 6 months in Hebron followed by 33 years wherein he reigned in Jerusalem over all of Israel. Adding these amounts together produces a total of 40 years and 6 months, but the biblical texts total David's reign simply at 40 years.

2 Samuel 5:3 So all the elders of Israel came to the king to Hebron; and king David made a league with them in Hebron before the LORD: and they anointed David king over Israel. **4 David was thirty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years. 5 In Hebron he reigned over Judah seven years and six months: and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty and three years over all Israel and Judah.**

1 Kings 2:11 And the days that **David reigned over Israel were forty years: seven years reigned he in Hebron, and thirty and three years reigned he in Jerusalem.**

These accounts from 2 Samuel 5 and 1 Kings 2 provide an instance in which a partial year of a king's reign is neither rounded up to a full, calendar year nor is it included in the total count of his reign, which is designated in years only.

Therefore, we have another example of biblical timekeeping methods contradicting option one which would count partial years as full, calendar years. However, both options two and three allow for partial years of a king's reign to be omitted from the total count of their reign. Therefore, 2 Samuel 5:3-5 and 1 Kings 2:11 do not inform us whether the biblical authors are employing option two or three. They only provide evidence that option one was not in use. Perhaps, the extra six months of David's rule was counted as part of Saul's reign or of Solomon's reign, which would be perfectly consistent with the expectations of option two. Or, perhaps these six months were not counted in the reigns of any of the kings, as option three would predict.

Additionally, 1 Kings 6:1 and 2 Chronicles 3:1 state that Solomon began to build the Temple during the 4th year of his reign in the month of Zif, which was the second month.

2 Chronicles 3:1 Then Solomon began to build the house of the LORD at Jerusalem in mount Moriah, where the LORD appeared unto David his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshingfloor of Ornan the Jebusite. **2 And he began to build in the second day of the second month, in the fourth year of his reign.**

1 Kings 6:1 And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, **in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif (02099), which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the LORD.**

02099 Ziv

probably from an unused root meaning to be prominent; n pr m; {See TWOT on 533}

AV-Zif2; 2

Zif=" brightness"

1) name of the 2nd month of the year, corresponding to Apr-May

The month of Zif was the second month after the month of Nisan. In Exodus 12:2, God instructed the Israelites that they should count the months of the year based on the Passover.

Exodus 12:1 And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, **2 This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you.** **3** Speak ye unto all the congregation

of Israel, saying, **In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb**, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house:

After the Exodus (but not before), the Jews counted the months beginning with the month of Nisan in Spring during which Passover is held. However, as we have seen, Rosh Hashanah in the fall was regarded as New Year's Day, which was celebrated with the blowing of trumpets in the seventh month after Nisan. And we have also seen that kings' reigns were counted from one Rosh Hashanah to the next Rosh Hashanah. As odd as it may sound, this dual system of biblical, annual timekeeping is both well-known and well-established. With this information in mind, we can understand that the Temple began to be built by Solomon in the Spring of his 4th year as king in the second month of the year (Zif) by the Passover reckoning but actually eight months into the year by the Rosh Hashanah reckoning of the calendar. So, Solomon's 4th year of reign began at Rosh Hashanah in the fall and the Temple began to be built about 8 months later in the month of Zif which took place during the following spring.

According to 1 Kings 6:37, the Temple was completed during the Fall month of Bul, which is the eighth month of the year (according to the Passover reckoning), in Solomon's 11th year of reign.

1 Kings 6:38 And in the eleventh year, in the month Bul (0945), which is the eighth month, was the house finished throughout all the parts thereof, and according to all the fashion of it. So was he seven years in building it.

0945 Buwl

the same as 0944 (in the sense of rain); n m; {See TWOT on 215}

AV-Bul 1; 1

Bul = "increase: produce"

1) the eighth Hebrew month, corresponding to modern Oct-Nov

From 1 Kings 6:1 and 38 we can see that Temple construction was begun in Spring during Solomon's 4th year and was completed in Fall during Solomon's 11th year. Since the years of a king's reign began at Rosh Hashanah in the Fall, this means it took Solomon a total of 6 years and 6 months to build the Temple. It was 6 years from the month of Zif in Spring during Solomon's 4th year to the month of Zif in Spring of Solomon's 10th year. Four months later, the seventh month began with the blowing of trumpets heralding Rosh Hashanah and the start of Solomon's 11th year. The following month, the month of Bul, Solomon finished building the Temple. This is a total of 6 years and 6 months, but 1 Kings 6:38 counts this as 7 years, not 6 and a half years.

While the account of the building of the Temple is not discussing the transition of the reigns of kings, it does provide some potential insight into the timekeeping methods that were practiced by the biblical authors of the books of Kings and Chronicles. Of the three potential options we discussed for the method of counting the kings' reigns, option three proposed that partial years were excluded from the total counts of time. If the biblical authors were using option three to

count amounts of time they would have excluded the partial year (6 months) from their count of the time it took to build the Temple, and instead only counted 6 full, calendar years. But, they did not. Instead, they counted these 6 months as a full calendar year and credited the construction of the Temple as occupying 7 years.

Fortunately, we also have an example of the biblical authors using this timekeeping method to count a partial year as a full year with regard to the reign of a king. This method of counting the years of the king's reigns would conflict with option three which Warner employs in his current study. Option three proposes that the biblical authors did not include partial years in the reigns of their kings.

The example we have provided in the bible pertains to the final king of Judah, Zedekiah. According to the biblical reports, Zedekiah reigned for 11 years.

2 Kings 24:18 Zedekiah was twenty and one years old when he began to reign, and he **reigned eleven years in Jerusalem**. And his mother's name was Hamutal, the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah.

2 Chronicles 36:11 Zedekiah was one and twenty years old when he began to reign, and **reigned eleven years in Jerusalem**.

Jeremiah 52:1 Zedekiah was one and twenty years old when he began to reign, and he **reigned eleven years in Jerusalem**.

In his current chronology study, Warner takes these texts to credit Zedekiah with a full 11 years of rule.

<i>Kings of Judah</i>	<i>Yrs</i>	<i>Acc. Yrs</i>
18. Jehoiakim	11	400 (2 Chron. 36:5)
19. Jehoiachin	3 m.	– (2 Chron. 36:9)
20. Zedekiah	11	412 (2 Chron. 36:11)

– Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

However, a study of the biblical accounts of the end of Zedekiah's reign shows that he fled the city and was taken captive to Babylon in the fourth month of his 11th year and that Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the city and the Temple in the fifth month of that year. (Notice how chapter 52 expounds upon and explains the more succinct, summary language of chapter 1.)

Jeremiah 1:3 It came also in the days of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah, **unto the end of the eleventh year of Zedekiah the son of Josiah king of Judah, unto the carrying away of Jerusalem captive in the fifth month.**

Jeremiah 52:1 Zedekiah was one and twenty years old when he began to reign, and he **reigned eleven years in Jerusalem**. And his mother's name was Hamutal the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah. 2 And he did that which was evil in

the eyes of the LORD, according to all that Jehoiakim had done. 3 For through the anger of the LORD it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, till he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon. 4 And it came to pass in the ninth year of his reign, in the tenth month, in the tenth day of the month, that Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon came, he and all his army, against Jerusalem, and pitched against it, and built forts against it round about. 5 **So the city was besieged unto the eleventh year of king Zedekiah.** 6 **And in the fourth month, in the ninth day of the month,** the famine was sore in the city, so that there was no bread for the people of the land. 7 **Then the city was broken up, and all the men of war fled, and went forth out of the city by night** by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king's garden; **(now the Chaldeans were by the city round about:)** and they went by the way of the plain. 8 **But the army of the Chaldeans pursued after the king, and overtook Zedekiah** in the plains of Jericho; and all his army was scattered from him. 9 **Then they took the king, and carried him up unto the king of Babylon** to Riblah in the land of Hamath; where he gave judgment upon him. 10 And the king of Babylon slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes: he slew also all the princes of Judah in Riblah. 11 **Then he put out the eyes of Zedekiah; and the king of Babylon bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon, and put him in prison till the day of his death.** 12 **Now in the fifth month,** in the tenth day of the month, which was the nineteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, which served the king of Babylon, into Jerusalem,

2 Kings 25:2 And the city was besieged unto the eleventh year of king Zedekiah. 3 **And on the ninth day of the fourth month** the famine prevailed in the city, and there was no bread for the people of the land. 4 And the city was broken up, and **all the men of war fled** by night by the way of the gate between two walls, which is by the king's garden: (now the Chaldees were against the city round about:) **and the king went the way toward the plain.** 5 **And the army of the Chaldees pursued after the king, and overtook him in the plains of Jericho:** and all his army were scattered from him. 6 So they took the king, and **brought him up to the king of Babylon** to Riblah; and they gave judgment upon him. 7 And they slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes, and **put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and bound him with fetters of brass, and carried him to Babylon.** 8 **And in the fifth month, on the seventh day of the month,** which is the nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem: 9 **And he burnt the house of the LORD, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire.** 10 **And all the army of the Chaldees, that were with the captain of the guard, brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about.**

Assuming Jeremiah 52 and 2 Kings 25 are numbering months starting from Passover in the spring brings us much closer to the next Rosh Hashanah, which would mark the completion of the eleventh year of Zedekiah's reign. However, since Rosh Hashanah was in the seventh month by the Passover reckoning of the calendar, the fifth month would still be two months short of a full, eleventh year.

This would mean that Zedekiah did not reign for a full eleven years but for 10 full years and the eleventh year was only a partial year, or ten months.

Warner's methodology operates on the conclusion that the biblical authors did not count partial years at the end and beginning of king's reigns at all. Therefore, the fact that both the biblical authors and Warner himself credit Zedekiah with 11 full years when, in fact, his 11th year was only a partial year (comprised of 10 months at the most) shows that Warner's model is at the least not consistently being applied. More importantly, it provides additional evidence that the biblical authors did, at times, count partial years at the end of a king's reign as full years. On the other hand, crediting a king with a full year when, in fact, he only ruled for part of that year is a cornerstone component of option two.

Earlier we saw that 2 Chronicles 36:1 and 5 as well as 2 Samuel 5:3-5 and 1 Kings 2:11 report instances where partial years of kings' reigns were not counted as full, calendar years or included in the reigns of the kings. Therefore, 2 Chronicles 36:1 and 5 along with 2 Samuel 5:3-5 and 1 Kings 2:11 provided us with accounts of biblical timekeeping which contradict option one. What 1 Kings 6 and 2 Chronicles 3 and 36 along with Jeremiah 1 and 52, and 2 Kings 24 and 25 tell us then is that the authors of these books employed a timekeeping methodology in which partial years were, at times, counted as full calendar years, including the years of a king's reign. This methodology fits with options one and two, but it contradicts the methodology employed by option three. In short, 2 Chronicles 36, 2 Samuel 5, and 1 Kings 2 contradict option one and 1 Kings 6, 2 Chronicles 3 and 36, Jeremiah 1 and 52, and 2 Kings 24 and 25 contradict option three. Option two has been confirmed by both sets of passages.

Consequently, this survey of the timekeeping methods of the books of Kings and Chronicles has yielded evidence consistent with option two, but contradicting options one and three. This information coupled with the principle of sufficiency supports chronological calculations which adopt option two. And although the evidence supportive of option two is comprised of only a few cases, we must keep in mind that the exegetical support for options one and three is even more slight.

3. Our study has provided good reason to consider calculating the period of the kings of Judah with the understanding that the biblical authors provided us a history in which king's reigns were counted as full, calendar years starting in Rosh Hashanah, and wherein transitional (partial) years of rule were attributed either to the predecessor or the successor, but not to both kings.

In his book, *The Star that Astonished the World*, Ernest L. Martin discusses Luke 3:1's statement regarding the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

Luke 3:1 Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene,

As Augustus' heir, Tiberius became emperor of Rome when Augustus died on August 19, 14 AD.

Tiberius – He was succeeding at everything now, and **in ad 14, on August 19, Augustus died. Tiberius, now supreme...** – Encyclopedia Britannica

Augustus – Augustus; Emperor Gaius Julius Caesar Augustus; 23 September 63 BC – **19 August AD 14**) is considered **the first emperor of the Roman Empire**, which he ruled alone from 27 BC until **his death in 14 AD.** – wikipedia.org

Tiberius – **Augustus died in AD 14**, at the age of 75. [39] He was buried with all due ceremony and, **as had been arranged beforehand**, deified, **his will read, and Tiberius confirmed as his sole surviving heir.** – wikipedia.org

Tiberius – **Tiberius succeeded without difficulty on the death of Augustus in AD 14.** – Columbia Encyclopedia

In his book, Martin explains that though Tiberius' reign began at the end of the Jewish year, it was nevertheless probably considered to have begun at Rosh Hashanah the previous year. Martin explains the historical evidence indicating that the people of Judaea employed a method of timekeeping wherein the start of a king's reign was antedated so that it was counted to have begun on Rosh Hashanah (the first day of the month of Tishri) the previous year.

Further, we are not told whether it was the Roman **method of reckoning** Tiberius' 15th year, or that which **people in Judaea and Syria were accustomed to, which antedated the reign of kings and emperors to Tishri One of the previous year.** In spite of this, it will not be difficult to determine that **Luke was using the ordinary method of dating Tiberius' 15th year as was common among easterners in the Empire.** 2 This is an important thing to understand in identifying the Star of Bethlehem. This is because we must know the year in which Jesus was born to see if the celestial pageantry of 3 to 2 B.C.E. would fit the chronological indications in the New Testament. Indeed, it fits remarkably well. The method of reckoning the 15th year of Tiberius is an interesting one, but very understandable and consistent. It simply means that **in the eastern part of the Empire, the whole of the year in which Tiberius became emperor of Rome (August 19, 14 C.E.) is awarded to Tiberius as his first year. It means that New Year's Day for the beginning of that year begins the first year of Tiberius. This would have been on Tishri One (the first day of Tishri) in the year in which Tiberius came to rulership. Thus, the whole first year was from Tishri One in C.E. 13 to Tishri One in C.E. 14.** Consequently, Tiberius' 15th year would have been from Tishri One in C.E. 27 to Tishri One in C.E. 28. I will have more information showing this matter in a later chapter. – Ernest L. Martin, *The Star that Astonished the World*

We have already seen that the reigns of the kings of Judah were counted in correspondence to the Jewish calendar year which began on Rosh Hashanah (New Year's Day). Likewise, we have a good logical, biblical, and historical basis to

conclude that when a king took over for his predecessor the new king's reign was counted to have started at the previous Rosh Hashanah with the final partial year of his predecessor not being included in the count of the predecessor's reign. And, while it may be hypothetically possible to suggest that the biblical authors failed to account for some 20 years of time in their history of this period, this suggestion is not based on biblical data, nor is it necessitated by anything stated in the biblical accounts. Therefore, since there is no biblical mandate to suggest the omission of years, since this suggestion calls into question the sufficiency of the chronological data provided in scripture, and since the alternative, straightforward calculation of the biblically-provided data is both exegetically sound and upholds the sufficiency of the biblical information, it may be advisable not to employ option three as our means for calculating the history of this period.

These considerations support the conclusion that the biblical totals of years for each of the kings of Judah have been correctly and adequately totaled for us in the books of Kings and Chronicles by the original authors (who themselves already employed in the texts their own means to account for partial years) and are in no need of supplementation since they neither omit years nor add extra years. If this is the case, then we can simply add the numbers provided in the bible to derive the total amount of time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple. No further calculations would be required on our part and there is then no need to adjust biblical counts of years. As we have seen this total is 433 years.

4. We can also discuss our options for how partial years were counted by the biblical authors in reference to details from Ezekiel 4.

In part one of our study of this period, we saw that Ezekiel 4 provides a count of the years of the sin of Israel and Judah which involves 390 and 40 years. In that portion of our study we discussed whether these numbers should be added together totaling 430 years or if the 40 years are part of the 390 years yielding a total of only 390 years. We also discussed possibilities for the starting point of the period of time Ezekiel is discussing. Because Ezekiel's prophecy corresponds so well with the straightforward count of the history of this period as provided in the books of Kings and Chronicles, we suggested that there was a good exegetical basis for concluding that Ezekiel was either describing a 430-year period of time beginning with the onset of the construction of the Temple or an approximation of the 393-years period that started with Solomon's death and the division of the kingdom. In either case, the terminus is the same (the destruction of the Temple).

Earlier in this section, we stated that had the biblical authors counted each transitional year as a full, calendar year for both kings, then the 433 years counted in the books of Kings and Chronicles would be 20 years longer than the actual amount of time contained in this period. Using this method then, the time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple would actually be only 413 years. (In other words, there would be 433 years tallied, i.e. ascribed to kings, but only some 413 years of real history.) This 413-year total does not fit with the information provided in Ezekiel 4 as easily as the 433-year total that results from Kings and Chronicles if the authors counted transitional years for only one of the

kings who ruled during it. This difficulty of reconciling option one with Ezekiel 4 is another reason to potentially reject option one in favor of option two. But what about option three?

Earlier in this section, we also stated that if the biblical authors omitted each transitional year entirely from their counts of the reigns of the kings (as option three supposes), then the 433 years counted in the books of Kings and Chronicles would be 20 years shorter than the actual amount of time contained in this period. Using this method then, the time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple would actually be 453 years. (In other words, there would be 433 years tallied, i.e. ascribed to kings, when in reality there is some 453 years of actual history.) This 453-year total does not fit with the information provided in Ezekiel 4 as easily as the 433-year total that results from Kings and Chronicles if the authors counted transitional years for only one of the kings who ruled during it. This difficulty of reconciling option one with Ezekiel 4 is another reason to potentially reject option three in favor of option two.

In his current chronology study, Tim Warner adopts option three as the correct way to calculate the reigns of the kings of Judah. In line with this approach, Warner inserts an additional 20 years into the total that results from simply adding the actual years tallied by the biblical authors regarding the kings' reigns. Therefore, using Warner's calculation, the amount of time from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple is 453 years. Warner reconciles this 453-year total with Ezekiel 4 by suggesting that the start date of Ezekiel's timeframe is the warning God gave to Solomon after he completed building the Temple and his palace (in his 23rd year).

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

According to 1 Kings 6:38 and 7:1 it took Solomon 7 years to build the Temple and 13 years to build his own palace. 2 Chronicles 8:1 and 1 Kings 9:1-2 show that it was after these 20 years (after Solomon had dedicated the Temple) that God again visited Solomon for the second time. Since 1 Kings 6:1 explains that Solomon began building the Temple during his 4th year (having already completed 3 years as king), this second visit from God can be dated to Solomon's 23rd year as king.

The amount of time for the period after Solomon's death which can be derived solely from the counts of reigns provided by the biblical authors of the books of Kings and Chronicles is 393 years. To these 393 years we would then add the final 17 years of Solomon's 40-year reign after this warning was given to him by God. The total would be 410 years. If we then add the additional 20 years that would be required if the biblical authors omitted 20 transitional years from the reigns of the kings, the total would be 430 years from God's visit to Solomon during his 23rd year to the destruction of the Temple and 453 years from Solomon's coronation to the destruction of the Temple. Using this approach, Warner shows that Ezekiel 4 can be reconciled with the third option for calculating the transitional years if we place the start of Ezekiel's vision in Solomon's 23rd year as king rather than at the beginning of Solomon's reign or after Solomon's death.

However, there are a few points worth considering about this method for reconciling the chronological data provided in the books of Kings, Chronicles, and Ezekiel with the suggestion that the biblical authors omitted 20 years from their record of the history of the kings. First, neither the problem nor the solution is exegetically driven. The biblical authors in no way indicate that they have omitted 20 years from this period. Nor do they indicate that they omit transitional years from their counts of the kings' reigns.

Furthermore, as we saw earlier God's warning during Solomon's 23rd year contains the same essential message as we find in God's first visit to Solomon which occurred near or before Solomon's 4th year. Both warnings are predicated on Solomon's remaining faithful to God. The main difference is God's stipulation during the second visit that if Solomon didn't remain faithful the people would be cast from the land and the Temple would be destroyed. The fact that God's visits to Solomon occurred just before construction began on the Temple and just after Solomon dedicated the Temple may, likewise, show the similarity and related intentions of God's messages to Solomon at these points. These observations make it difficult to argue that starting Ezekiel's timetable at Solomon's 23rd year is exegetically superior to starting it in Solomon's 4th year or, for that matter, in Solomon's first year or after Solomon's death.

At most, Warner has provided a scenario in which his addition of 20 unrecorded years is compatible with and not necessarily contradicted by Ezekiel's data. He has not, however, demonstrated that option three is superior to option two with regard to Ezekiel's data or the general count of years provided in Kings and Chronicles. Nor has he demonstrated that option two is insufficient in any way. Therefore, the compulsion for placing the start of Ezekiel's timetable in Solomon's 23rd year seems not to come from any exegetical supremacy, but from the fact that it would accommodate the otherwise difficult issue of having a total timeframe for this period which exceeds and conflicts with the total derived simply from the chronological data provided by the biblical authors themselves in the books of Kings, Chronicles, and Ezekiel. So, while Warner's solution certainly seems viable for resolving this potential difficulty, it shouldn't be taken

as confirmation or exegetical proof for his methodology or as a refutation of the alternatives.

As such, we are left with the same recurring question. Which is better? An interpretation founded on the idea that the biblical authors provided a sufficient count of the years for the purpose of deriving a total amount of time for the period? Or an interpretation founded on the idea that the data provided when the biblical authors tallied the years of the kings is insufficient and requires inserting an additional 20 years that are otherwise unmentioned and not necessitated by the biblical authors? This rhetorical question highlights that there remains no exegetical basis for speculating about the insufficiency of the counts provided in the text or subsequently speculating about additional years not recorded in the official counts.

5. Earlier we noted that books of Kings and Chronicles inform us of the reigns of 20 kings and 1 queen from Solomon to Zedekiah.

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

We start this section by examining the information concerning Queen Athaliah. It is worth noting that 2 Chronicles 22 and 23 indicate that the amount of time that Athaliah ruled Judah was 6 years and that she was replaced by Joash at some point during the seventh year.

2 Chronicles 22:10 But when Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah saw that her son was dead, she arose and destroyed all the seed royal of the house of Judah. 11 But Jehoshabeath, the daughter of the king, took Joash the son of Ahaziah, and stole him from among the king's sons that were slain, and put

him and his nurse in a bedchamber. So Jehoshabeath, the daughter of king Jehoram, the wife of Jehoiada the priest, (for she was the sister of Ahaziah,) **hid him from Athaliah, so that she slew him not.** 12 And he was with them hid in the house of God **six years: and Athaliah reigned over the land.** 3:1 And **in the seventh year Jehoiada strengthened himself**, and took the captains of hundreds, Azariah the son of Jeroham, and Ishmael the son of Jehohanan, and Azariah the son of Obed, and Maaseiah the son of Adaiah, and Elishaphat the son of Zichri, into **covenant with him.** 2 And they went about in Judah, and gathered the Levites out of all the cities of Judah, and the chief of the fathers of Israel, and they came to Jerusalem. 3 And all the congregation made a covenant with the king in the house of God. **And he said unto them, Behold, the king's son shall reign**, as the LORD hath said of the sons of David...11 **Then they brought out the king's son, and put upon him the crown**, and gave him the testimony, **and made him king. And Jehoiada and his sons anointed him, and said, God save the king.** 12 Now when **Athaliah heard** the noise of the people running and praising the king, she came to the people into the house of the LORD: 13 And she looked, and, behold, the king stood at his pillar at the entering in, and the princes and the trumpets by the king: and all the people of the land rejoiced, and sounded with trumpets, also the singers with instruments of musick, and such as taught to sing praise. Then Athaliah rent her clothes, and said, Treason, Treason. 14 Then Jehoiada the priest brought out the captains of hundreds that were set over the host, and said unto them, Have her forth of the ranges: and whoso followeth her, let him be slain with the sword. For the priest said, Slay her not in the house of the LORD. 15 **So they laid hands on her;** and when she was come to the entering of the horse gate by the king's house, **they slew her there.** 4:1 **Joash was seven years old (01121) when he began to reign**, and he reigned forty years in Jerusalem. His mother's name also was Zibiah of Beersheba.

This passage indicates that Athaliah only reigned for six whole years. Note that chapter 4:1 states that "Joash was seven years old." In the Hebrew, this is actually the familiar phrase "Joash was the son of seven years." This is noted in the quote above by the Strong's No. 01121 behind the word "old." As we established earlier in this study, this Hebrew expression "son of" with regard to time means that the period of time designated had not yet been completed. The most prominent example of this is circumcision, which had to occur on the eighth day after a son's birth (Leviticus 12:3) but which Genesis 17:12 records was performed when a child was the "son of eight days," indicating that that the eighth day had not been completed yet. Therefore, Josiah had not yet completed seven years of life when he began to reign and, consequently, Athaliah must have reigned less than seven complete years.

The seventh year was a transitional year between Athaliah and Joash. In that seventh year, Jehoiada made Joash king and had Athaliah killed. Using option three would require that the scriptures did not include the partial seventh year in the total count of Athaliah's reign. Therefore, Athaliah should only be credited with 6 years. This is how Warner calculated Athaliah's reign in his previous chronology study. In the following quote of that study the data is read as follows: name of the king of Judah – years of reign, scripture reference, running total of

time elapsed in the period. The totals at the right confirm that Athaliah's reign was tabulated as 6 years.

6. Ahaziah – 1, 2 Chron. 22:1-2, **96**

7. **Athaliah** – **6**, 2 Chron. 22:10-12, **102**

8. Joash – 40, 2 Chron. 24:1, 142

– The Coming Millennial Sabbath – Part II, Tim Warner, Copyright © July, 2009, www.answersinrevelation.org

However, in his current chronology study, Warner totals Athaliah's reign at 7 years, not 6. The column to the far right below from Warner's current study keeps a running tally of the amount of years when kings' reigns are totaled together. Notice that the total amount of elapsed time shows (Acc. Yrs) that Warner now adds an 8th year to Athaliah's reign as a transitional year between her reign and Joash. (This 8th year is exhibited by the difference between the previous running total of 101 years and the running total listed after Athaliah's reign which is 109 years.)

<i>Kings of Judah</i>	<i>Yrs</i>	<i>Acc. Yrs</i>
6. Ahaziah	1	101 (2 Chron. 22:1-2)
7. Athaliah	7	109 (2 Chron. 22:10-12)
8. Joash	40	150 (2 Chron. 24:1)

– Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

Using the biblical numbers, the application of option three would seem to require that Athaliah's reign should be totaled at 6 years plus a 7th year added to account for any omitted partial (transitional) year at the beginning or end of her rule. Here Warner is simply in error with regard to the total number of completed years that Athaliah reigned according to the biblical record. It is difficult to pinpoint the reason for this discrepancy except for the fact that crediting Athaliah with an extra additional year has the particular benefit of maintaining the alignment of the Temple's destruction with Warner's proposed jubilee-cycle. The jubilee-correspondent chronology requires absolute precision to the exact year. Without adding an extra additional year to Athaliah's reign the timing of the Temple's destruction falls out of sync with the proposed jubilee-correspondent chronology. And although 2 Chronicles 22 doesn't particularly inform us concerning whether option one, two, or three was employed by the original biblical chronologists, the passage does reveal that extending Athaliah's reign with an eighth year seems neither biblically justified nor warranted simply by the provisions of option three.

6. In his current chronology study, Warner offers 2 Chronicles 36:21 as independent support and confirmation for concluding that biblical authors omitted transitional years from their record of the reigns of the kings.

Second, we have independent confirmation from the last words of 2 Chronicles. Here the writer explained why God chose 70 years for the length

of the desolation of Jerusalem. – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God’s Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

2 Chronicles 36:13-23 states that, in accordance with Jeremiah’s prophecy, the land of Israel would lay desolate for 70 years. Verse 21 states that during this time, the land would enjoy her Sabbaths.

2 Chronicles 36:13 And he also rebelled against king Nebuchadnezzar, who had made him swear by God: but he stiffened his neck, and hardened his heart from turning unto the LORD God of Israel. 14 Moreover all the chief of the priests, and the people, transgressed very much after all the abominations of the heathen; and polluted the house of the LORD which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. 15 And the LORD God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place: 16 But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the LORD arose against his people, till there was no remedy. 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. 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.

For reference, in ancient Israel there was not only a weekly Sabbath day but there was also a cycle of six regular years followed by a sabbatical year in the seventh year. With that in mind, there are at least two ways to understand the meaning of verse 21. The first and perhaps simplest option would be that, for the 70 years Jeremiah stated that the people would be exiled to Babylon, the land would be spared tillage on each weekly Sabbath and during each of the 10 sabbatical years that were allotted to occur in that 70-year period. This idea includes the notion that the Israelites had not been entirely faithful to the Sabbaths which the Law of Moses required.

An alternative understanding likewise includes the notion that the Israelites had not faithfully kept the sabbatical requirements. However, it also includes the specification that the 70 years of desolation were 70 consecutive sabbatical years

that the Israelites had previously neglected. In his study, Warner adopts this interpretation and explains that in a 49-year period there were 7 sabbatical years. This was followed by a jubilee year (every 50th year). So, in a 50-year period there were 7 sabbatical years. Therefore, in order for the Israelites to neglect 70 sabbatical years, it would have taken 500 years.

In his current study, Warner argues that this kind of 500-year period of sabbatical neglect is what 2 Chronicles 36:21 indicates God had in mind when he exiled Israel from the land for 70 years. Warner places the conclusion of these 500 years after the Babylonian exile so that in his model there is a 430-year period from Solomon's 23rd year to the destruction of the Temple followed by a period of 70 years in exile in Babylon.

Second, we have independent confirmation from the last words of 2 Chronicles. Here the writer explained why God chose 70 years for the length of the desolation of Jerusalem. God commanded a "Sabbatical" for the Land every 7th year. Over a 49 year period, there were 7 Sabbatical years, during which Israel was forbidden from farming the land. However, after 7 Sabbatical years, there was an intercalated "Jubilee year," making a total of 50 years, a Jubilee cycle, which contained 7 Sabbatical years. **Since the Babylonian captivity was said to be 70 consecutive Sabbatical years, it represents a total period of 500 years (during which there should have been 70 Sabbatical years observed). In other words, since Israel failed to keep the Sabbatical years, God accumulated them and assigned them back to back (70 consecutive Sabbatical years). The Sabbatical years were all forcibly kept by driving them from the land for the last 70 years of that 500 year period. When counting backward the 500 years from the end of the captivity, we again arrive at God's warning to Solomon.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

In his audio recording of this portion of his chronology study, Warner points to Leviticus 25 and 26 in reference of 2 Chronicles 36:21.

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. 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.**

While discussing what would happen if the people of Israel didn't faithfully adhere to the commands of God's covenant, Leviticus mentions the desolation of the land and the exile of the people. This passage twice mentions the idea

captured in 2 Chronicles 36:21 of the land enjoying her Sabbaths while it was desolate of its people.

Leviticus 26:31 And I will make your cities waste, and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours. **32 And I will bring the land into desolation:** and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it. **33 And I will scatter you among the heathen,** and will draw out a sword after you: **and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste.** **34 Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye be in your enemies' land; even then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths.** **35 As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest; because it did not rest in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it...**⁴³ **The land also shall be left of them, and shall enjoy her sabbaths, while she lieth desolate without them:** and they shall accept of the punishment of their iniquity: because, even because they despised my judgments, and because their soul abhorred my statutes.

Furthermore, the text of Leviticus 25 ties the sabbatical requirements to Israel's entrance into the Promised Land and includes the statements that the land itself belong to God and the people of Israel were sojourners in the land.

Leviticus 25:23 The land shall not be sold for ever: **for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners** with me.

In his chronology study, Warner takes these passages to necessitate that the 70 years of Babylonian exile were comprised of 70 sabbatical years that had been neglected over the preceding period of Israelite history. It is certainly true that Leviticus 25, 26, and 2 Chronicles inform us that God required Israel to keep sabbatical years while they lived in the land. But these are certainly not the only commandments God was requiring them to keep while they were in the land. The surrounding passages of Leviticus lay out a host of other commandments and statutes. Furthermore, Leviticus 25 includes commandments not just for sabbatical years, but also for the weekly Sabbath day as well. So, when Leviticus 26 and 2 Chronicles 36:21 speak of the land enjoying its Sabbaths it is not clear whether this refers solely to sabbatical years or to all kinds of Sabbaths including weekly Sabbaths and festival Sabbaths. Moreover, Leviticus 23:4-44 not only command the Israelites to keep the various annual feasts, each of which had its own special Sabbath days (days of rest), but verses 1-3 command the Israelites to keep the fundamental, weekly Sabbath itself. Consequently, leading up to chapter 26 we have three whole chapters describing various kinds of Sabbaths including the weekly Sabbath, the annual festival Sabbaths, and the sabbatical years. Consequently, Leviticus 26 must be taken to include all the Sabbaths, not just the sabbatical year. Moreover, the language of Leviticus 26 specifies that this warning of expulsion was conditional not just upon Sabbath commands but all of the various commands that God had given to Israel. We see this plainly in chapter 26:1-3 and also in verse 14 which is where we find the beginning of the list of offenses for which God would expel the Israelites and give rest to the land in verse 31 and onward.

Leviticus 26:1 Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up *any* image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it: for I *am* the LORD your God. 2 **Ye shall keep my sabbaths**, and **reverence my sanctuary**: I *am* the LORD...14 **But if ye will not** hearken unto me, and will not **do all these commandments**; 15 **And if ye shall despise my statutes**, or if your soul abhor **my judgments**, so that ye will **not do all my commandments**, *but* that ye **break my covenant**...

Therefore, 2 Chronicles 36:21's reference to Leviticus 26:34, 35, and 43 would certainly indicate that sabbatical year neglect was part of what brought God to exile his people from the land. But, the prophetic books as well as Leviticus and the books of Kings and Chronicles inform us that sabbatical neglect was not the only commandment that the people of Israel and Judah violated which brought the judgment of God upon them. In short, the sabbatical years the only issue God was concerned about in the period of the kings which led to the Babylonian exile and the destruction of the Temple. There is no exegetical necessity then to conclude that the 70 years were determined solely on the basis of 70 neglected sabbatical years from a preceding period of time.

There are two additional items worth considering about the line of argument that Warner offers in his current study regarding 2 Chronicles 36:21. For reference, here again is Warner's articulation of his support.

Second, we have independent confirmation from the last words of 2 Chronicles. Here the writer explained why God chose 70 years for the length of the desolation of Jerusalem. God commanded a "Sabbatical" for the Land every 7th year. Over a 49 year period, there were 7 Sabbatical years, during which Israel was forbidden from farming the land. However, after 7 Sabbatical years, there was an intercalated "Jubilee year," making a total of 50 years, a Jubilee cycle, which contained 7 Sabbatical years. **Since the Babylonian captivity was said to be 70 consecutive Sabbatical years, it represents a total period of 500 years (during which there should have been 70 Sabbatical years observed). In other words, since Israel failed to keep the Sabbatical years, God accumulated them and assigned them back to back (70 consecutive Sabbatical years). The Sabbatical years were all forcibly kept by driving them from the land for the last 70 years of that 500 year period. When counting backward the 500 years from the end of the captivity, we again arrive at God's warning to Solomon.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, God's Threat to Solomon to the Decree of Cyrus, www.120jubilees.org

A few points are worth noting here. We should consider Warner's assertion that 2 Chronicles and its reference to the sabbatical years confirm his method for counting and calculating the total amount of time for the reigns of the kings. And we should also critically analyze his interpretation of 2 Chronicles and the implications that can be derived from the sabbatical years.

First, as we have seen, Warner utilizes option three for calculating the total time of the reigns of the kings. This option states that the biblical authors did not count

transitional years when one king was replaced by another. Consequently, Warner's method argues that a correct chronology requires adding one additional year to the total for every transitional year that occurred during the reigns of the kings. And, as described here by Warner, the cornerstone of this particular proof is the fact that the 70 years of exile "represents a total period of 500 years (during which there should have been 70 Sabbatical years observed)." But most importantly, notice the last sentence of the quote in which Warner explains that we must "count backward the 500 years from the end of the captivity." The key phrase here is "the end of the captivity," not the beginning of the captivity. Since the 500 years ends when the captivity ends, this means that the 70 years of exile are part of the 500 years. Moreover, this means that at the start of the exile, we would count back only 430 years.

Here the question is whether option three is the only method that produces a measurable total of 430 years starting from a discernible and relevant historical event. By Warner's methodology, these 430 years begin with God's visitation of Solomon when the Temple was completed in the 23rd year of Solomon's reign. Warner then adds 17 years to the end of Solomon's reign and then adds the 393 years of kings that are accounted for in Kings and Chronicles. The total is only 410 years, 20 years short of the 430 years needed. In Warner's view, this confirms that the biblical authors did not include transitional years in their accounting and that 20 transitional years have to be added back into the total count.

In contrast to option three, option two assumes that the biblical authors didn't leave out any years during this period but simply assigned transitional years to either the preceding or succeeding king. If the 430 years begins with God's visitation in Solomon's 23rd year, option two would be 20 years short of the necessary total of 430 years Warner states need to have occurred prior to the Temple's destruction. However, as we have seen, God also visits Solomon with a very similar message 20 years earlier in the 4th year of his reign (when Solomon had reigned for only 3 full calendar years) when Temple construction was just beginning. Consequently, even if we accept Warner's division of the 500 years into 430 years followed by 70 years of exile, there is nothing in the text of 2 Chronicles 36 that would determine whether the 430 years should start with the visitation in Solomon's 4th year or the visitation in Solomon's 23rd year. Consequently, since 2 Chronicles does nothing to rule out the notion that the biblical authors accounted for every year adequately including the transitional years, this passage does nothing to substantiate the theory that 20 missing years need to be added to the counts given in the bible.

Second, we can analyze Warner's specific interpretation of 2 Chronicles. It should be noted that a biblical timetable (which Warner himself employs) would only allow for the Israelites to have neglected 430 years worth of sabbatical years before they were exiled. Warner's argument here explicitly explains the length of the exile by saying, "since Israel failed to keep the sabbatical years, God accumulated them and assigned them back to back (70 consecutive sabbatical years)." Notice that the logical backbone of this assertion is the idea that the specific amount of "70 consecutive Sabbatical years" corresponds to 70 sabbatical

years that “Israel failed to keep.” While there are 70 sabbatical years in a 500-year period, in Warner’s model the Temple is destroyed with 70 years left in the 500-year period. Therefore, the period of disobedience for which Israel was being punished, therefore, would necessarily end at 430 years, not the 500 necessary to produce 70 sabbatical years. Furthermore, the entire point of Leviticus 26 and 2 Chronicles 36 is that the Sabbaths are kept during this 70 years. Consequently, because the period of disobedience ends at 430 years and because the Sabbaths are kept during the final 70 years, we simply do not have 500 years of failure regarding the Sabbaths. We have only 430 years of failure regarding the Sabbaths followed by 70 years in which the Sabbaths are allowed to occur in spite of the Israelites. This means that in this model the people of Israel could only have neglected a total of 60 sabbatical years during the 430-year period from the time of Solomon’s 23rd year to the destruction of the Temple. In other words, Warner’s assertion that the number of years of exile corresponds to the number of neglected sabbatical years can only necessitate 60 years of exile. And yet the exile is 70 years, not 60. If God was exiling the people for 70 years to make up for 70 missed sabbatical years, then the exile took place too soon. God should have waited another 70 years to allow Israel to accumulate another 10 years of sabbatical neglect.

Third, another issue is raised by Warner’s assertion that the 70-year exile and the 500 years of neglected Sabbaths ended at the same time. Warner identifies the 70 years of exile as a consequence, which results from behavior that occurred during 500 years. And God views the Sabbaths as occurring (or being kept) during the 70 years of exile. These two factors lead to a problem. Because the exile is a consequence and because the exile ends the neglect of Sabbaths, the natural expectation is that the exile should follow chronologically after the period of Sabbath negligence. It should not be included as part of the period of neglect as Warner’s model inherently does. Consequently, what is needed is a way to overturn this logical, biblical expectation as well as explain why the exile was 70 rather than 60 years long. It would seem that Warner’s solution to this dilemma is to assert that God desired the entire period, including the exile, to total 500 years and that God wanted to ensure that this 500 years contained the required 70 sabbatical years. Consequently, Warner marks this 500-year period as starting in the 23rd year of Solomon’s reign and when there was only 70 years remaining in that 500-year period, God exiled his people in order to allow the land to enjoy the 70 sabbatical years consecutively. This seems to be the model Warner advocates in his current study. However, there are some potential problems with this alternative explanation as well.

To be sure, biblical data informs us that there were 500 years between the Exodus from Egypt and the 23rd year of Solomon’s reign. 1 Kings 6:1 tells us that from the Exodus to Solomon’s fourth year was 480 years. If we add another 20 years to this point we arrive in Solomon’s 23rd year which would be 500 years after the Exodus. However, the Israelites did not enter into Canaan Land until 40 years after the Exodus. Furthermore, in a previous section of this study we learned that the conquest and division of the land wasn’t accomplished until at least 5 years or perhaps as much as 25 years after Israel’s travels in the wilderness had ended. In

his studies, Warner calculates the conquest and division of the land as a period of 10 years. In particular, notice the specific sentence in which Warner identifies the completion of the land allotment and the dismissal of Israel's armies as "the point when the Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles begin – the first year all Israel farmed their land."

In Joshua 22, after all the lands were secured from Israel's enemies, and all twelve tribes had received their allotted land inheritance, Joshua finally dismissed all the tribal armies to go home to their inheritance and farm their own land. This is the point when the Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles begin – the first year all Israel farmed their land. Just how many years in total did it take to conquer the land, divide the inheritance to all 12 tribes, and dismiss the armies? Joshua does not tell us. We know it was more than 6.5 years, since that was how long it took before Joshua began to divide the southern portion alone. **It is no stretch to assume that it took a total of 10 years before all of the tribes received their allotted land inheritance, and Joshua dismissed the armies to go home to their inheritance...**As we saw in the previous chapter, it was exactly 400 years from Isaac's birth until the exodus. **It was 40 years until Joshua and all Israel entered the Promised Land. That leaves 10 more years according to Paul's reckoning until all the land was divided, and the Israelites all went home to farm their land. Thus, we have proof that it was 50 years from the year of the exodus (the 50th Jubilee) until Israel began to farm their allotted land inheritance.** 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.** – Tim Warner, Jubilee Calendar, Exodus to God's Promise and Threat to Solomon, www.120jubilees.org

Since there are 500 years from the Exodus to the 23rd year of Solomon's reign, it is clear then that from the time the Israelites entered Canaan Land until Solomon's 23rd year was only 460 years (500 years minus the 40 years in the wilderness). And the amount of time from the Israelite conquest and division of the land to Solomon's 23rd year was (using Warner's calculations) 450 years (500 years minus 40 years in the wilderness minus another 10 years for the conquest and allotment).

Furthermore, as stated by both Leviticus 25:1-10 and Warner (in the final sentence of the quote above), sabbatical years weren't kept until the Israelites inherited the land.

Leviticus 25:1 And the LORD spake unto Moses in mount Sinai, saying, 2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the LORD. 3 Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof; 4 But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the LORD: thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard. 5 That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou

shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed: for it is a year of rest unto the land. 6 And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger that sojourneth with thee, 7 And for thy cattle, and for the beast that are in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be meat. 8 **And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years.** 9 **Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubile to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land.** 10 And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family.

At this point, it is important to restate the components of Warner's interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36 so that we can assess all the premises upon which its potential validity depends. In summary, Warner is asserting not only that the period from Solomon's 23rd year to the end of the exile totals 500 years, but also that 2 Chronicles 36:21 declares there will be a period of 70 consecutive sabbatical years for the specific purpose of ensuring that the required number of 70 sabbatical years would be kept for this 500-year period.

This interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36:21 inherently relies on three essential premises. It requires that God measured Israelite time in the land of Canaan in relation to particular 500-year segments with pre-set beginning and ending points (each with precisely 10 Jubilee cycles). It requires that God demanded and ensured that 70 sabbatical years were actually kept for each 500-year segment. And it requires that one of these 500-year segments began in the 23rd year of Solomon's reign. There are difficulties with these premises which make it hard to accept this conception of how the 500-year period and 70 requisite sabbatical years would work with the timeframe of the destruction of the Temple.

The fact that the Israelites didn't enter the land until 40 years after the Exodus and the fact that the Israelites didn't possess the land or begin keeping the sabbatical years until more than 40 years after the Exodus all undermine the idea that a 500-year period defined by 70 sabbatical years and Israelite possession of the land began at the Exodus. If it existed at all, such a 500-year period would have started in the 40-50 years after the Exodus when Israel possessed the land and first began to keep the sabbatical years.

Once we subtract the 40 years of wilderness travel and another 5-10 years for conquest and land allotment as Warner proposes, there are only 450 years (or so) between Israel's possession of Canaan land (when they first began to keep sabbatical years) and the 23rd year of Solomon's reign. If the first 500-year period of sabbatical cycles began 50 years after the Exodus then the next 500-year period would not start in Solomon's 23rd year. It would begin 50 years later, at some point during the reign of Solomon's great grandson, Asa. Consequently, the 500-year period of sabbatical neglect for which God destroyed the Temple and cast

Israel from the land would itself start 50 years later. This in turn would push the critical 430-year point back so that it, too, would no longer start in Solomon's 23rd year but instead 50 years later. Therefore, God should not have destroyed the Temple at the end of Zedekiah's 11th year. He should have waited another 50 years. Conversely, the period prior to the exile would only have 380-390 years (430 minus 40-50 years). Even if the 70 years in exile are added to the 380-390 years, as Warner does, there would still only be 450-460 total years and only 63-64 sabbatical years. It simply would not warrant 70 years of exile, only around 65. Needless to say, pushing back the start of the 500-year period by 40-50 years to account of the wilderness journey, conquest, and land allotment as the bible requires, seems to irrevocably prohibit Warner's calculated timetable. Simply put, adding 20 years (one year for each transitional year of the kings) is not enough. To even get his model to work, it seems Warner would have to add another 40-50 years beyond the numbers provided by the biblical authors in the account of the kings' reigns.

Furthermore, some of the kings of Judah were good kings. Solomon himself didn't turn away from God until the end of his life. So, it seems difficult to conclude that each and every sabbatical year was neglected from the 23rd year of Solomon until the 11th year of Zedekiah. It is perhaps even more difficult to conclude that Solomon began to completely neglect sabbatical cycles just 6 years after God's miraculous display at the Temple's dedication and God's visit to him in response to his dedicatory prayer. Additionally, we have no exegetical reason that would lead us to conclude that sabbatical years weren't being kept throughout most of Solomon's reign as well as during the reigns of all of Solomon's successors. After all, God approved of some of Solomon's successors for walking upright and keeping His commandments as David had done.

And there are other answers to the question regarding why the exile was designated to last 70 years. For instance, 70 years itself contains nearly 10 sabbatical cycles and, depending on the exact arrangement, the following 71st year could have been a sabbatical year when the Israelites would be freed from exile. And even if we assume that the 70 years of exile are meant to compensate or equate to neglected sabbatical years (as Warner insists 2 Chronicles suggests), it is perfectly plausible that the years in exile merely correspond to 70 years, rather than 500 years, of neglected sabbatical cycles. However, it is not necessary to prove this alternative because there may, in fact, not be any strict correspondence between the 70 years of exile and other periods of time or to Jubilee cycles in particular. 70 years may simply have fit within God's plans, sufficiently accomplishing his goal, and lining up with other historical events. Ultimately, the point is that explaining the 70 years of exile does not require lining it up in a particular way with a 500-year period. But without a particular relationship to the 500-year period, the 70 years of exile loses all possibility of substantiating Warner's adoption of option three for calculating the reigns of the kings of Judah.

All of these considerations have a crucial impact on the internal logic of Warner's model. In Warner's model, each of the 70 years of exile corresponds to one of 70

sabbatical years that were neglected over a 500-year period. Moreover, Warner places the 70 years in exile as the final 70 years finishing the 500-year period. Consequently, Warner in turn demands the addition of 20 years missing from the record of kings' reigns in order to obtain a total of 430 years from the 23rd year of Solomon's reign to the exile. But as we have seen, it is not exegetically possible (or even likely) to insist that all 70 sabbatical years in that 500-year period were neglected. And this means that contrary to Warner's argument, the 70-year exile is not "70 consecutive sabbatical years" which "Israel failed to keep" and which "God accumulated" and "assigned them back to back." And if the 70 years in exile are not equivalent to the 70 sabbatical years of a particular 500-year period, then we have even less reason to think that the 70 years in exile are meant as a collective sabbatical period to finish off a 500-year period. In fact, they would not relate so strictly to any 500-year period. They are simply 70 years for sins (10 sabbatical cycles) of punishment. In which case, the 70 years in exile would neither confirm any particular starting point for a 500-year period, nor would they necessitate any particular length of time from Solomon's 23rd year to the start of the exile. And ultimately, the 70-year exile cannot confirm option three or its corollary in which 20 unrecorded, transitional years must be added to the biblical count of the reigns of the kings.

These biblical considerations make it difficult to accept Warner's interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36:21 as confirmation of his calculation of the years of the kings of Judah. Instead, it seems simpler, more exegetically sound, and more logically consistent to conclude that 2 Chronicles 36:21 is only declaring that the land would enjoy the Sabbaths and sabbatical years that were allotted to occur in the 70 years of desolation that Jeremiah had predicted.

To be fair, the best reason to uphold the type of interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36 that Warner offers is that it would allow us to maintain a correspondence between the Temple's destruction and the exile on the one hand with Warner's proposed 120 jubilee-cycle model of history on the other. Since maintaining Warner's jubilee-correspondent chronology seems to provide the rationale for adopting Warner's interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36, 2 Chronicles 36 wouldn't qualify as independent confirmation of Warner's approach or his chronological model. Therefore, it seems as though we are still without compelling exegetical or logical grounds for inserting an additional 20 years into the amounts of time in the history of the kings of Judah as counted by the biblical authors.

7. Another potential exegetical difficulty with Warner's model comes from Ezekiel 40:1. In his previous chronology study, Warner argued that Ezekiel 40:1 identified the occurrence of a jubilee year 14 years after the Temple was destroyed, which he also notes is 25 years after the beginning of the exile.

In Ezek. 40:1, we observe that the 70 years of the Babylonian captivity began 25 years before Ezekiel saw his vision. – The Coming Millennial Sabbath – Part II, Tim Warner, Copyright © July, 2009, answersinrevelation.org

Beginning in Ezekiel 40:1, Ezekiel received his final vision. It was of Christ's coming Kingdom and Temple. **Ezekiel wrote that his vision occurred the 14th year from the destruction of the Temple.** Adding these 14 years to the year of the destruction of the Temple, 3405AM, places Ezekiel's final vision in the year 3419AM. **In the same verse, Ezekiel wrote that his vision occurred on the 10th day of the month, on "rosh hashana" (new year). The only time "rosh hashanna" falls on the 10th day of the month is the commencement of the Jubilee year.** 6 Ezekiel has therefore informed us that his final vision began on the first day of a Jubilee year. When we compare this to the chronology we have thus far constructed, we discover that the year 3419AM was indeed a Jubilee year, the 18th Jubilee counting from Joshua's entrance into the Promised Land. God told the Israelites to begin using the Sabbatical and Jubilee calendar from that date, (Lev. 25:1). This is important confirmation that we have not made any mistakes from the exodus until Ezekiel's vision. – The Coming Millennial Sabbath – Part II, Tim Warner, Copyright © July, 2009, answersinrevelation.org

As Warner notes above, God had commanded Israel to blow the trumpets in the first day of the seventh month, which was Rosh Hashanah. The Hebrew term "Rosh Hashanah" means "head of the year."

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

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

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

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

However, Leviticus 25 requires that in jubilee years, trumpets were to be blown on the tenth day of the month.

Leviticus 25:8 And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee

forty and nine years. 9 **Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubile to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month**, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land.

Ezekiel 40:1 refers to the tenth day of the month, and to “Rosh Hashanah.” The phrase translated in English as “the beginning of the year” is “rosh Hashanah” in the Hebrew text.

Ezekiel 40:1 In the five and twentieth year of our captivity, **in the beginning (07218) of the year (08141), in the tenth day of the month**, in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten, in the selfsame day the hand of the LORD was upon me, and brought me thither.

07218 ro'sh

from an unused root apparently meaning to shake; n m; {See TWOT on 2097}
AV-**head 349**, chief 91, top 73, beginning 14, company 12, captain 10, sum 9,
first 6, principal 5, chapters 4, rulers 2, misc 23; 598

1) head, top, summit, upper part, chief, total, sum, height, front, beginning

1a) head (of man, animals)

1b) top, tip (of mountain)

1c) height (of stars)

1d) chief, head (of man, city, nation, place, family, priest)

1e) head, front, beginning

1f) chief, choicest, best

1g) head, division, company, band

1h) sum

08141 shaneh (in pl. only), shaw-neh' or (fem.) **shanah** shaw-naw'

from 08138; n f; {See TWOT on 2419 @@ "2419a"}

AV-**year 797**, not translated 55, yearly 3, yearly + 08141 2, year + 01121 1, live + 02416 1, old + 02416 + 03117 1, misc 4; 875

1) **year**

1a) as division of time

1b) as measure of time

1c) as indication of age

1d) a lifetime (of years of life)

As cited above, in his previous chronology study, Warner therefore argued that a jubilee year occurred 14 years after the destruction of the Temple and 25 years after the beginning of the exile based on Ezekiel 40:1's reference to Rosh Hashanah and the tenth day of the month which seems to coincide with Leviticus 25's description of jubilee practices. As we discussed in our previous chronology study, Warner was not alone, other scholars have likewise interpreted Ezekiel 40:1 as a reference to a jubilee year on these same grounds.

Rosh Hashanah – In the earliest times the Hebrew year began in autumn with the opening of the economic year...It is likely that the new year was celebrated from ancient times in some special way. The earliest reference to such a custom is,

probably, in **the account of the vision of Ezekiel (Ezek 40:1). This took place at the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month (Tishri). On the same day the beginning of the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed by the blowing of trumpets (Lev 25:9)...** – wikipedia.org

Sabbatical Year And Jubilee: Talmudic and Samaritan Calculation of Jubilees – The first cycle commenced after the conquest of the land and its distribution among the tribes, which, occupied fourteen years, and **the last jubilee occurred on the "tenth day of the month [Tishri], in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten" (Ezek. xl. 1), which was the New-Year's Day of the jubilee** ('Ab. Zarah 9b; 'Ar. 11b-12b). - www.jewishencyclopedia.com

If Ezekiel 40:1 does indicate the occurrence of a jubilee 14 years after the Temple was destroyed, this would constitute a contradiction with Warner's current chronology. As we explained in our discussion of Jeremiah 34, Warner currently concludes that the entire 70-year Babylonian exile took place after the Temple's destruction. Likewise, he concludes that the end of the Babylonian exile occurred in a jubilee year. Therefore, since jubilee years can only occur every 50 years, it would be impossible for the year 14 years after the Temple's destruction to be a jubilee year.

In our previous chronology study, we stated that "it seems reasonable to conclude that Ezekiel 40:1 is reporting that the fourteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple was, in fact, a Jubilee year." But we also allowed for the equally plausible alternative possibility that Ezekiel 40:1 was not a reference to a jubilee year.

"We must also consider that Ezekiel's identification of the first ten days of the year as the 'head of the year,' or Rosh Hashanah, may not indicate a Jubilee year specifically. Rather than specifying that this was a special year, **Ezekiel may only be noting that the ancient Jews considered the first 10 days of the year to be the "beginning of the year."** – Addendum 2 (Timeline of Biblical World History), biblestudying.net, 2010

It is also possible that Ezekiel might only be referring to the occurrence of a sabbatical year at this time. After all sabbatical years and jubilee years were connected by the same concept and operated on the same calendar system. Leviticus 25:9-10 points out that jubilee years began in Tishri. And, as Warner points out, sabbatical years also began in Tishri.

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

Whatever we decide about how Ezekiel 40:1 should be interpreted regarding jubilee years, our interpretation should not be dictated by the desire to either support or avoid a conflict with our chronological model. If it seems that Ezekiel 40:1 does necessitate the occurrence of a jubilee year 14 years after the Temple

was destroyed as Warner previously advocated then this conviction should not be cast aside to accommodate a hypothetical chronological model. This issue concerning Ezekiel 40 will also become relevant under Point Number 9 below.