

ARTICLE III.

A NEWLY DISCOVERED KEY TO BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY.

BY J. SCHWARTZ, LIBRARIAN OF THE APPRENTICES' LIBRARY, NEW YORK CITY.

I. AMONG the few chronological documents that have been handed down to us from antiquity, Ptolemy's Canon is unquestionably the most valuable. It gives an unbroken series of kings of Babylon, Persia, Egypt (and the emperors of Rome from Augustus to Antoninus), from the accession of Nabonassar, in B. C. 747, to A. D. 160.¹ The absolute historical accuracy of these tables is guaranteed by a series of eclipses, recorded in Ptolemy's *Almagest*, which gives the year and day of each reign in which they occurred. Ptolemy's statements have been verified by modern astronomers. The recently discovered Egibi contract-tables reckon eighty-three years from the accession of Nebuchadnezzar (B. C. 604) to the first of Darius Hystaspes (B. C. 521) in exact agreement with the Canon, and thus effectually dispose of Bosanquet's theory of chronology, in which Nebuchadnezzar's first year is depressed to B. C. 578. The scheme of Franke Parker, proposing to advance all the reigns of the Persian and Babylonian kings before Artaxerxes II. by at least twenty-one years, has been considered and confuted by Dr. Hincks.² With the exception of these two theories, no other attack, of any importance, has ever been made on the accuracy of Ptolemy's Canon.

¹ See Cory's *Ancient Fragments*, Lond., 1832.

² *Journal of Sacred Literature* (fourth series), Vol. iv., Jan., 1864; see also Vol. vii., April, 1865, pp. 213-217, and Vol. viii., Oct., 1865, pp. 186-190.

2. Scarcely second in value is the famous Assyrian Eponym Canon, which gives an unbroken series of the officers after whom each year was named for about two hundred and sixty-five years, and also notes the accession of each successive Assyrian king during that time. Down to the assassination of Sargon, the capturer of Samaria and destroyer of the kingdom of Israel, the Eponym Canon counts two hundred and seven years. Now we know from the annals of this king that he reigned seventeen years, and that his first year synchronized with the accession of Merodach Baladan, king of Babylon, which is astronomically fixed to B. C. 721 by Ptolemy's Canon. Hence the Eponym Canon begins B. C. 911.

3. The annals of the Assyrian kings were dated according to the Eponym, or officer, for the year in which the event recorded occurred. We are therefore able to fix, with mathematical certainty, the date of any event in Assyrian history, for which the Eponym is mentioned, from B. C. 911 to 646. Among the most important events thus dated are those which have a bearing on biblical chronology. The following selection is sufficient for our purpose:—

Battle of Karkhar in which Ben-hadad, king of Syria, and his confederates, among whom is <i>Ahab, king of Israel</i> , are defeated by Salmanassar II., king of Assyria.....	854 B. C.
Jehu, king of Israel, pays tribute to the same Salmanassar.....	841 "
Menahem, king of Israel, pays tribute to Tiglath Pileser II. between.....	743-740 "
Azariah, king of Judah, wars against the same Tiglath Pileser between.....	743-740 "
Jehoahaz [Ahaz of the Bible], king of Judah, pays tribute to Tiglath	732 "
Rezon, king of Syria, slain.....	732 "
Pekah, king of Israel, slain and succeeded by Hosea.....	731-730 "
Salmanassar IV., king of Assyria.....	726 "
Capture of Samaria by Sargon, king of Assyria, in the "beginning" of his reign.....	722 "
Sennacherib, son of Sargon, ascends the throne.....	705 "
First year of Sennacherib.....	704 "
Sennacherib invades Judea, in reign of Hezekiah, and besieges Jerusalem.....	701 "

4. The Bible offers, apparently, only three methods of ascertaining its chronology for the period covered by these

events. There is, first, the plan of adding up the regnal years assigned to the kings of Judah. These may be naturally divided into three periods, as follows, in which the names of the kings are omitted as unnecessary for our purpose:—

1. From Rehoboam to the death of Ahaziah (with $17 + 3 + 41 + 25 + 8 + 1 =$).....	95 years
2. From the usurpation of Athaliah to the 6th of Hezekiah, and capture of Samaria (with $6 + 40 + 29 + 52 + 16 + 16 + 5 =$)	164 "
3. From the 6th of Hezekiah to the 4th of Jehoiakim (with $29 - 5 - 24 + 55 + 2 + 31 + 3 =$).....	115 "
Total.....	374 "

The fourth year of Jehoiakim synchronizes (according to Jer. xxv. 1) with the first of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. According to Ptolemy's Canon his first official year was B. C. 604, which proves that his accession was in B. C. 605 (see § 15). Hence the leading dates are:—

Accession of Rehoboam.....	979 B. C.
Usurpation of Athaliah.....	884 "
Capture of Samaria.....	720 "

According to this scheme, which is essentially the same as that of Archbishop Ussher, printed in the King James' version of the Bible, the death of Ahab (which 1 Kings xxii. 51 places in the seventeenth of Jehoshaphat) fell in B. C. 902, or forty-eight years before the Assyrian date of the Battle of Karkhar. The accession of Jehu is 884 B. C., or forty-three years too high. If Azariah is the same king as Uzziah, he dies in B. C. 757, or at least fourteen years before the Assyrian date of his war with Tiglath Pileser II. As Menahem, king of Israel, dies in the forty-ninth of Uzziah (2 Kings xv. 23), or B. C. 761, his date is at least eighteen years higher than the cuneiform inscriptions require. The capture of Samaria, on the other hand, is placed two years too low. The invasion of Sennacherib is placed by the Bible in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, therefore in B. C. 712, which seems to be about eleven years too high. If the Assyrian dates are correct, it is clear that a biblical chronology founded on the above scheme is utterly unreconcilable with it.

5. The second method is to accept the regnal years of the kings of Israel as the basis. These are, according to the Bible, as follows:—

(1) From Jeroboam I. to the death of Joram, son of Ahab, (with $22 + 2 + 24 + 2 + 12 + 22 + 2 + 12 =$)	98 years
(2) From accession of Jehu to capture of Samaria (with $28 + 17 + 16 + 41 + 1 + 10 + 2 + 20 + 8 =$).....	143 "
Total	241 "

Accepting 720 B. C. as the biblical date of the capture of Samaria, as shown in § 4, we get the following dates:—

Jeroboam, king of Israel.....	961 B. C.
Ahab succeeded by Ahaziah.....	877 "
Jehu usurps the throne.....	863 "
Menahem king for 10 years.....	760-750 "
Accession of Pekah, king of Israel, and death of Azariah, king of Judah.....	748 "

Comparing these dates with the Assyrian records, we find that Ahab is twenty-three years too high, Jehu twenty-two, Menahem at least seven, and Azariah at least five years too high. While the discrepancy between the biblical and the cuneiform dates is somewhat reduced, yet not a single date agrees. It is clear we cannot reconcile the two chronologies by this system.

6. There remains, then, only the third method which, instead of taking each kingdom by itself, accepts the *synchronisms* between the reigns of each, as recorded in the Bible. The following are the most important:—

Asa, king of Judah, begins to reign in the 20th of Jeroboam, first king of Israel (1 Kings xv. 9).

Ahab, king of Israel, in 38th of Asa (1 Kings xvi. 29).

Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, in 4th of Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 41).

Joram, king of Israel, in 18th of Jehoshaphat, reigns 12 years (2 Kings iii. 1).

Jehu succeeds Joram as king of Israel (2 Kings ix. 6; compare verse 24).

Joash, king of Judah, in 7th of Jehu (2 Kings xii. 1).

Jehoahaz, king of Israel, in 37th of Joash (2 Kings xiii. 10).

Amaziah, King of Judah, in 2d of Jehoahaz (2 Kings xiv. 1).

Jeroboam II., king of Israel, in 15th of Amaziah, reigns 41 years (2 Kings xiv. 23).

Uzziah or Azariah, son of Amaziah, king of Judah in 27th of Jeroboam II., reigns 52 years (2 Kings xv. 1).

Zechariah succeeds Jeroboam II. in 38th of Uzziah (2 Kings xv. 8).

Pekah, king of Israel, in 52d of Uzziah (2 Kings xv. 27).

Jotham succeeds Uzziah in 2d of Pekah (2 Kings xv. 32).

Hoshea succeeds Pekah in 20th of Jotham (2 Kings xv. 30).

Capture of Samaria in 9th of Hoshea (2 King xviii. 10).

Taking 720 B. C. as the date for the last event (§ 4), the foregoing statements produce the following results:—

Jeroboam in Israel, Rehoboam in Judah.....	937 B. C.
Asa, king of Judah,.....	918 “
Ahab, king of Israel,.....	881 “
Ahaziah succeeds Ahab.....	862 “
Joram succeeds Ahaziah.....	861 “
Jehu, king of Israel,.....	849 “
Joash, king of Judah,.....	843 “
Jehoahaz, king of Israel,.....	807 “
Amaziah, king of Judah, 29 years.....	806 “
Jeroboam II. associated with his father Jehoahaz 11 years.....	803 “
Uzziah associated with his father Amaziah for 22 years.....	799 “
Jeroboam II. alone 30 years.....	792 “
Uzziah alone (27th of Jeroboam II.) 30 years.....	777 “
Zechariah succeeds Jeroboam II. in 38th of Uzziah.....	762 “
Menahem succeeds Zechariah and Shallum.....	761 “
Pekaiiah, son of Menahem, king of Israel (50th of Uzziah).....	750 “
Pekah, king of Israel,.....	748 “
Jotham, king of Judah,.....	747 “
Ahaz, king of Judah, in 17th of Pekah.....	732 “
Hoshea, king of Israel,.....	728 “
Capture of Samaria.....	720 “

Comparing this scheme (which is substantially the same as that evolved by Samuel Sharpe in his “Chronology of the Bible”) with the Assyrian dates, we find the following differences:—

	Synchronistic Method.	Assyrian Records.	Difference.
Ahab dies.....	862 B. C.	854 B. C. (earliest)	8 years too high.
Jehu king.....	849 "	841 " "	8 " " "
Menahem dies... .	750 "	743-740 " "	10-7 " " "
Azariah dies.....	747 "	743-740 " "	7-4 " " "
Ahaz king.....	732 "	732 " "	
Hoshea king.....	728 "	730 " "	2 years too low.
Capture of Samaria	720 "	722 " "	2 " " "

It will be seen, that, of the three methods, the last approaches nearest to the Assyrian records. As Ahab and Jehu are only eight years above the right dates, Brandes,³ whose scheme agrees, with a few exceptions, with that of Ernest de Bunsen,⁴ proposes to bring the synchronistic method into harmony with the true chronology by simply lowering all the dates down to Jotham by eight years, and by making Jotham's first eight years synchronize with the last eight of Uzziah his father, while he was a leper. The death of Menahem and Azariah are thus brought just within the time required by the Assyrian records.

There are, however, some serious objections against admitting this scheme, even as thus modified, as representing the correct view of the Bible as to its own chronology.

(1) In the first place, the accession of Pekah, according to the Bible (2 Kings xv. 27) fell in the fifty-second and last year of Uzziah, which is confirmed by the synchronism 1 Jotham=2 Pekah (2 Kings xv. 32). Jotham reigns sixteen years (current) and the accession of his son is placed in the seventeenth year of Pekah (2 Kings xvi. 1). Hence the death of Uzziah and accession of Jotham took place in the sixteenth year before the accession of Ahaz; that is (732 + 16) 748-747, and not in 741, as this revised scheme requires.

(2) If Uzziah dies in B. C. 748, then all the preceding reigns must be left as in our table, if the synchronisms, *on which the scheme is founded*, are correct.

³ Abhandlungen, Part ii., 1874.

⁴ Biblische Gleichzeitigkeiten, 1875.

(3) The scheme requires Jeroboam II. to reign eleven years with his father Jehoahaz, and Uzziah twenty-two years with his father Amaziah. For the former supposition there is not the shadow of an evidence. So far as Uzziah is concerned, it is quite clear that the revolution which placed him on the throne, and compelled his father to flee to Lachish, could not have happened before the fifteenth year of Amaziah (compare 2 Kings xiv. 17-21).

(4) The harmony between the biblical dates and the Assyrian synchronisms, as brought out by Brandes and de Bunsen, is destroyed if we substitute the correct date of the capture of Samaria, viz., 722 B. C., in place of the biblical date 720 B. C., because each of the dates preceding that event in our table (§ 6) will have to be raised two years.

7. It is therefore evident that none of the preceding three systems agree with the Assyrian records. Consequently either none of these methods is correct, or else the Assyrian records are wrong. Or, one of the three methods is correct and the Eponym Canon, on which all the Assyrian dates are founded, is not continuous.

As the line of Judah shows a difference of more than forty years between its dates for Ahab and Jehu and those based on the Canon, Professor Oppert⁶ seeks to harmonize the two schemes by assuming a gap of forty-seven years, just before the accession of Tiglath Pileser II., which all Assyriologists (Oppert included) agree to place in B. C. 744. This break in the Canon is required, Professor Oppert thinks, to make room for Phul, the Assyrian king mentioned in the Bible (2 Kings xv. 19) as taking tribute from Menahem. But the Assyrian records know nothing of a King Phul, and the acts ascribed to him by the Bible are attributed to Tiglath Pileser II., who is, accordingly, assumed to be the same as the biblical Phul by nearly all Assyriologists. As Menahem dies in B. C. 751, according to Oppert, he could not have paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser II., who did not begin to reign until 744. Nor could Azariah, dying in 749, war with the same Tiglath Pile-

⁶ *La Chronologie Biblique*, 1868, and *Salomon et ses successeurs*.

ser in 743-740. Oppert is therefore obliged to *invent* a second Menahem, unknown to the Bible, whom he thrusts into the middle of Pekah's reign. "Azariah of Judah," whom the cuneiform inscriptions represent as warring against Tiglath Pileser,⁶ is *assumed* to be the "son of Tabël" whom Pekah and Rezon tried to place on the throne of Judah in place of Ahaz (Isa. vii. 6).

The wildness of these hypotheses, and their utter want of evidence, are sufficient proofs of the desperate straits to which Professor Oppert was reduced to save the credit of a supposed correct system of biblical chronology. Fortunately, it is unnecessary to go into an elaborate refutation of the absurdities involved in his system, as evidence has been discovered, since that system was published, which establishes, beyond the possibility of a doubt, the continuity of the Eponym Canon, and, per consequence, the absolute accuracy of the dates based upon it.

(1) The Canon records an eclipse in the twentieth year preceding the accession of Tiglath Pileser II. If the Canon was continuous, the eclipse must have occurred in B. C. 763. The astronomer royal, Professor Airy, has carefully calculated this eclipse, and has found that it took place in the exact year mentioned.⁷

(2) An inscription of the twelfth year of Sennacherib (B. C. 693) places the Eponymy of Mannukiassur one hundred and one years before that date, that is in B. C. 794. On turning to the Eponym Canon, we find Mannukiassur given as the officer for that year.⁸

It is therefore certain that the supposed gap of forty-seven years does not exist, and that the dates founded on the Eponym Canon are as absolutely certain as is 1776 for the Declaration of Independence, or 1861 for the Civil War. It is, therefore, equally certain that the Bible chronology of this period, as heretofore understood, is wrong.

⁶ Smith, *Assyr. Epon. Canon*, pp. 117, 118.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 83.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

8. Floigl⁹ accepts the Assyrian dates as correct, and assumes that the biblical chronology has been corrupted by adding twenty years to Uzziah, and ten years each to his successors, Jotham and Ahaz. He supposes these reigns were originally 32+6+6 in place of the present 52+16+16. In the Kingdom of Israel he thinks the reigns of Jeroboam II. and Pekah have been similarly corrupted by the addition of ten years to each, and that the original figures were 31 and 10 in place of the present 41 and 20. By assuming, further, that the biblical years are lunar, he is able to establish a harmony between nearly all the Assyrian dates and the Bible, except the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, which he makes 714 B. C. in place of 701 B. C.

As an argument in favor of his restoration of biblical chronology, Floigl seeks to establish the novel hypothesis that there was an interval of twenty-two years between each generation among the earlier kings of Judah, and one of sixteen years among the later kings. For argument's sake let us assume that this theory is correct, as it conclusively disproves his corrections. For if Uzziah was sixteen years old at his accession (2 Kings xv. 2) and reigned thirty-two years, as Floigl supposes, he must have been forty-eight years old at his death. His son Jotham should have been, according to the theory, (48-16) thirty-two years old at his accession. But the Bible says (2 Kings xv. 33) he was twenty-five. Further, if Jotham was twenty-five years old at his accession, and reigned only six years, he must have been thirty-one years old when his son Ahaz was twenty (2 Kings xvi. 1), which would make him only eleven years old at his son's birth, in place of the sixteen or twenty-two required by Floigl's hypothesis. Lastly, if Ahaz reigned only six years he was twenty-six when his son Hezekiah was twenty-five (2 Kings xviii. 2), who was therefore born when his father was one year old! Even if we assume, with Floigl, that Hezekiah was Ahaz's *brother* (which is contrary to 1 Chronicles and St. Matthew) it will not mend matters much as it would place Heze-

⁹ *Chronologie der Bibel, etc., 1880.*

kiah's birth in the twelfth year of Jotham's life. Floigl's corrections are therefore impossible, even according to his own theory, and the true system of Bible chronology still remains to be discovered.

9. The kings of Judah succeed each other in an apparently unbroken series, from father to son, from Rehoboam to Jehoiachin (1 Chron. iii. 10-16). In every case, excepting that of Abia and his son Asa, the age at which each king ascended the throne is recorded. Now it is evident that if there *was* a fixed interval of years between each generation, as Floigl supposes, and we succeed in discovering what it was, we shall have an infallible key to the chronology of the Bible for a period beginning with Solomon and extending to the accession of Nebuchadnezzar = fourth year of Jehoiakim. For it is clear that, if the ages assigned to the several kings of Judah at their accession are correctly preserved, all we need to do to ascertain the date of any king's reign is to merely subtract his age at accession from the date of his birth.

It is evident that some peculiar principle regulated the choice of a successor in the line of Judah; for, in at least three cases, the heir to the throne was not, as might naturally be expected, the first-born: (1) Solomon was the *fourth* son of David born in Jerusalem, in addition to which there were *six* still older sons born in Hebron (1 Chron. iii. 1-5); (2) Abijah was the *fourth* son of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 18-22); (3) Ahaziah is expressly stated to have been the *youngest* son of Joram (2 Chron. xxii. 1). What, then, was the principle regulating the choice of a successor? An examination of the reigns from Rehoboam to Amaziah will give the answer.

(1) According to the Bible, the first three kings of Judah reigned as follows: Rehoboam seventeen years, Abijah three years, Asa forty-one years, or apparently sixty-one years if all the years are to be considered as full. But (according to 2 Chron. xiii. 1) Abijah succeeded Rehoboam in the eighteenth year of Jeroboam, and (according to 1 Kings xv. 9) Asa, his son, became king in the twentieth year of Jeroboam, so that Abijah reigned only two years full. Asa was afflicted with

a dangerous disease in the thirty-ninth year of his reign, which finally resulted in his death (2 Chron. xvi. 12-14). It is therefore extremely probable that he was incapacitated from performing his duties as king during his last illness, and that his son Jehoshaphat was associated with him from his thirty-ninth year. Hence the interval from I Rehoboam to I Jehoshaphat was $(17 + 2 + 38 =)$ 57 years. According to 2 Chron. xii. 13, Rehoboam was forty-one years old at his accession, and, according to 2 Chron. xx. 31, Jehoshaphat was thirty-five years old when he ascended the throne. From the birth of Rehoboam to the birth of Jehoshaphat there were, therefore, $(57 + 41 - 35 =)$ 63 years. As there are three generations (Rehoboam, Abia, Asa) the allowance for each one is twenty-one years.

(2) According to 2 Kings iii. 1, Jehoram, the son of Ahab, became king of Israel in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat, and, according to 2 Kings viii. 16, Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, succeeded his father in the fifth year of Jehoram, king of Israel, and reigned eight years, being followed by his son Ahaziah, aged twenty-two years (ver. 24). Consequently, from the accession of Jehoshaphat to the accession of Ahaziah there were $(17 + 4 + 8)$ 29 years. There are, therefore, for the two generations, Jehoshaphat and Joram, $(29 - 22 + 35 =)$ 42 years, or twenty-one years each.

(3) Athaliah probably usurped the throne during the one year assigned to Ahaziah, consequently her six years' usurpation (2 Kings xi. 3) end in what would have been equivalent to the $(22 + 6)$ 28th of Ahaziah's age. As Joash, his son, was seven years old when he began to reign (ver. 21), he must have been born when his father was twenty-one years old.

(4) Joash is said to have reigned forty years in Judah, beginning in the seventh year of Jehu (2 Kings xii. 1). As we shall prove in the course of this paper (§ 15) the years assigned to the kings of Israel must be reduced by one year in every case, hence the 28 and 17 of Jehu and his son Jehoahaz are, from an Israelitish stand-point, 27 and 16. As these

forty-three years end in the thirty-seventh year of Joash (2 Kings xiii. 10) they must have begun ($43 - 36 =$) 7 years before the seventh year of his age, when he commenced to date his accession. It is therefore probable that the conspiracy against Athaliah began in the seventh year of Jehu, when Joash was six years old. He was therefore ($6 + 40$) 46 years old at his death, when his son Amaziah was twenty-five years of age (2 Kings xiv. 2), who was therefore born when his father was twenty-one years old.

It seems to be clearly established, by the foregoing facts, that, from the birth of Rehoboam to the birth of Amaziah, there was an interval of exactly twenty-one years between each generation. Hence we conclude that, during this period at least, the heir to the throne was selected from the children born when the king was twenty-one.

10. From Solomon to Amaziah, inclusive, are nine generations. From Uzziah his son to Jehoiachin there appear to be nine also (viz., Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon, Josiah, Jehoiakim, and Jehoiachin) consequently Jehoiachin is the eighteenth from Solomon. According to 1 Chron. iii. 17, Assir was Jehoiachin's son, and Salathiel was his grandson, so that the latter appears to be the twentieth generation from Solomon. But if we turn to the genealogy of Christ in the Gospel according to St. Luke (iv. 27-31) we find twenty-one generations from Nathan, the brother of Solomon, to this same Salathiel. Therefore, one generation appears to be omitted in the royal genealogy as given in 1 Chron. iii. 10-16. According to the Bible (Zeph. i. 1), the prophet Zephaniah, who was a cotemporary of King Josiah, was the fourth in descent from a person named Hezekiah, who, if not the king of that name, was probably contemporaneous with him. The line of Judah makes Josiah only third in descent from Hezekiah, so that the missing generation must be sought for between Hezekiah and Josiah. Manasseh, son of Hezekiah, begins, at the age of twelve years, a reign of fifty-five years, (2 Chron. xxxiii. 1) and is succeeded by his *son* Amon, aged twenty-two years, (ver. 21), so that

Amon would seem to have been born when his father was forty-five years old, which is more than double the average found for *all* the kings from Rehoboam to Amaziah. It is certain that the missing generation belongs here, and that Amon was the *grandson* of Manasseh, whose fifty-five years sufficiently account for the death of Amon's father.

We have, therefore, a series of eighteen generations from Solomon to Jehoiakim, inclusive. If the same interval of twenty-one years between each generation can be established for the last nine generations, as has already been proved to be the case for the first nine, it would follow that from the birth of Solomon to the birth of Jehoiakim there were $(17 \times 21 =)$ 357 years. The fixed starting-point of biblical chronology is the fourth year of Jehoiakim = 605 B. C., and accession of Nebuchadnezzar. Therefore the accession of Jehoiakim is clearly 608 B. C. According to 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5, Jehoiakim was twenty-five years old at his accession. Hence he would appear to have been born in B. C. 633. Taking this as a basis, the 357 years begin in 990 B. C., and the seventeen predecessors of Jehoiakim were born in years B. C. as follows:—

1. Solomon.....	990 B. C.
2. Rehoboam.....	969 “
3. ABIJAH	948 “
4. Asa.....	927 “
5. Jehoshaphat.....	906 “
6. Jehoram.....	885 “
7. Ahaziah.....	864 “
8. Joash.....	843 “
9. Amaziah.....	822 “
10. Uzziah.....	801 “
11. Jotham.....	780 “
12. Ahaz.....	759 “
13. Hezekiah.....	738 “
14. Manasseh.....	717 “
15. <i>His son</i>	696 “
16. Amon.....	675 “
17. Josiah.....	654 “

11. The present text of the Bible gives (both in 2 Kings as well as in 2 Chronicles) the following series of

kings and years from Jotham to 4 Jehoiakim; viz., Jotham 16 + Ahaz 16 + Hezekiah 29 + Manasseh 55 + Amon 2 + Josiah 31 + Jehoiakim 3. But (according to 2 Kings xvii.) Hoshea's accession as king of Israel was in the 12th of Ahaz, and, (according to 2 Kings xviii. 10) 6 Hezekiah=9 Hoshea, so that only fourteen years are left for the sole reign of Ahaz. Hence the following table will represent the chronology of this period, according to the present text:—

Jotham.....	16 years	755 B. C.
Ahaz, alone.....	14 "	} 16 years739 "
Hezekiah, associated.....	2 "	725 "
Hezekiah, alone.....	29 { 27 "	723 "
Manasseh.....	55 "	696 "
Amon.....	2 "	641 "
Josiah.....	31 "	639 "
Jehoiakim.....	3 "	608 "
Accession of Nebuchadnezzar.....		605 "

Jotham's age at his accession was twenty-five (2 Kings xv. 33), and as he reigned sixteen years, and was followed by his son, aged twenty years (2 Kings xvi. 2), Ahaz was born, as our theory requires, when his father was twenty-one years old. But if Ahaz was twenty years old when he began his sixteen years' reign, he could not have had a son aged twenty-five (2 Kings xviii. 2) to succeed him, as the present text seems to say, for in that case Hezekiah must have been born when his father was eleven years old! It is clear that we should read (36-21=) 15 in place of 25. Further, if Hezekiah was fifteen years old at his accession, and reigned twenty-seven years alone, his son Manasseh should have been (42-21) 21 years old in place of the 12 of Scripture (2 Kings xxi. 1) if our theory is correct. It is, however, probable that the *tens* have changed places, in the ages assigned to the father and son, and that we should read 15 and 22 in place of 25 and 12. With these two corrections of obvious copyist's errors, let us compare the preceding chronology with our birth-table. This gives:—

Birth B. C.	King.	Age at Accession.	Reigned B. C.
780.....	Jotham.....	25.....	755
759.....	Ahaz.....	20.....	739
738.....	Hezekiah.....	15.....	723
717.....	Manasseh.....	22.....	695
675.....	Amon.....	22.....	653
654.....	Josiah.....	8.....	646
633.....	Jehoiakim.....	25.....	608

According to this table, Hezekiah reigned (723-695) 28 years alone and not 27, and Amon would appear to have (653-646) 7 years in place of the 2 of Scripture (2 Kings xxi. 19). It is therefore probable that Amon, who was Manasseh's grandson, as we have shown, was associated with his grandfather when he was twenty-two years old, because his son Josiah was then one year old (and the succession, therefore, reasonably assured) and that the reign of Manasseh, according to the birth-table, was (695-646=) 49-2=47 years. If Hezekiah reigned alone twenty-eight years, then Manasseh's 55 years in System 1 must be corrected to 54 and the two systems stand as follows:—

	First System.		Second System.
Jotham.....	16 years		16 years.
Ahaz.....	16 "		16 "
Hezekiah.....	28 "		28 "
Manasseh.....	54 "	- 7 =	47 "
Amon.....	2 "		2 "
Josiah.....	31 "	+ 7 =	38 "
Jehoiakim.....	3 "		3 "
	<hr/>		<hr/>
Total.....	150 "		150 "

It will be seen that both systems produce exactly the same result, except that the 7 years' excess in the reign of Manasseh in System 1 are added to the 31 of Josiah in System 2.

12. Now it is certain that Josiah reigned only thirty-one years and not thirty-eight, for Jeremiah (c. xxv. 2, 3), a contemporary, gives the fourth year of Jehoiakim as the twenty-third year from the thirteenth year of Josiah (and $12+23-4=31$). If Josiah reigned thirty-one years, then his accession is rightly placed in B. C. 639, according to System 1. As he

was eight years old at his accession (2 Kings xxii. 1), it follows that he was born in B. C. 647, and not in 654, as the birth-table requires, *consequently every one of the dates in that table from Jotham to Josiah must be lowered seven years, as follows:—*

Birth B. C.	King.	Age at Accession.	Reigned B. C.
773.....	Jotham	25.....	748
752.....	Ahaz	20.....	732
731.....	Hezekiah.....	15.....	716
710.....	Manasseh.....	22.....	688
668.....	Amon.....	22.....	646
647.....	Josiah.....	8.....	639

That this restoration is historically correct is evident from the following facts, which prove, *from the Bible itself*, that Jotham's accession was 748, and not 755, B. C.:—

(1) Hoshea, king of Israel, begins his nine years in (722+8) 730 B. C. His predecessor, Pekah, reigns nineteen Tisri years: he began, therefore, in B. C. 749. Jotham ascends the throne in his second year (2 Kings xv. 33), therefore in B. C. 748.

(2) Unless we lower the date of Jotham's accession to 748, and of Pekah to 749, there will be a gap or interregnum of seven years, between the end of the reign of Pekah, according to System 1, (viz., 756—19=) 737 B. C. and the accession of Hoshea in B. C. 730, which is contrary to Scripture and the cuneiform inscriptions, both of which make Hoshea the immediate successor of Pekah.

(3) According to the false chronology, Pekah begins in 756 B. C. His 17th year = 1 Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 1) and 12 Ahaz is 1 Hoshea (2 Kings xvii. 1), whose accession is therefore (16+11) 27 years after 756, or 729 B. C. In 2 Kings xv. 30 his first year is synchronized with the twentieth year of Jotham, consequently 1 Jotham is 748 B. C.

If Jotham's accession is 748, then Manasseh reigned, as in System 2, 47 years, and not 54.

13. If Hezekiah began his sole reign of twenty-eight years in 716, then his twenty-nine years' reign must be dated from B. C. 717. Consequently his fourteenth year was B. C. 704.

That it cannot be placed earlier than that date is clear from the fact that Sennacherib's invasion (which the Bible places in the fourteenth year) could not have been made before he became king in B. C. 704, according to the Eponym Canon. Nor can it be placed any later on account of the embassy from Merodach Baladan, congratulating Hezekiah on his recovery from his dangerous illness. That this embassy took place in the same fourteenth year is evident from 2 Kings xx. 6, in which the prophet Isaiah predicts that Hezekiah (who reigned twenty-nine years) would survive his illness fifteen years. Now, according to Berosus and the cuneiform inscriptions, Merodach Baladan usurped the throne of Babylon, *for six months* in the first year of Sennacherib. As Sennacherib's first year is placed in B. C. 704 by the Eponym Canon, the embassy of Merodach Baladan and the fourteenth year of Hezekiah are indisputably fixed to that year.

According to the Assyrian inscriptions, the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib would seem to be placed in B. C. 701, or three years later than the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. But if we carefully examine the biblical account it is clear that this event occurred at a later date than the payment of tribute (2 Kings xviii. 24). There could have been no motive or pretext for besieging Jerusalem after Hezekiah had acknowledged himself as a vassal of the king of Assyria. It would seem, however (ver. 19-21, 24), that, after the departure of Sennacherib, Hezekiah rebelled and entered into negotiations with the king of Egypt to assist him, whereupon Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem to compel Hezekiah to submission. It is quite clear that at least a year or two must have elapsed between the payment of tribute in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah and his subsequent rebellion and the consequent siege of Jerusalem. Instead of contradicting our date for the fourteenth year the Assyrian record confirms and supplements it.

If Hezekiah began to reign in B. C. 717, then he could not have been king at the time of the capture of Samaria (which is astronomically fixed to B. C. 722) as the synchronisms in 2 Kings xviii. 9, 10 would seem to indicate. Fortunately the

Bible itself shows, in the most positive manner, that the capture of Samaria and the captivity of the ten tribes occurred some years before the accession of Hezekiah.

According to 2 Chron. xxx., the *first year* of Hezekiah was distinguished by a great religious reformation to which *all* Israel, "from Beersheba to Dan" (ver. 5) was invited. It is difficult to see how the messengers of Hezekiah could have ventured to travel "throughout all Israel" (ver. 6) if a hostile king, Hoshea, was then reigning. But verses 6-9 show that only a remnant of the people then remained in the land, and that the mass of the population had been carried into captivity by the kings of Assyria, as is narrated more in detail in 2 Kings xvii.

It has been held by several eminent chronologists and commentators that Isa. xxvii. 30 indicates that the fourteenth year of Hezekiah was a sabbatical year and the fifteenth a year of jubilee. As will be shown in § 16, the year 458 B. C. was a jubilee year. As the interval between two jubilee years was forty-nine years, it follows that 703 B. C. was such a year, and consequently 704 B. C. was a sabbatical year. Now these years are respectively the fourteenth and the fifteenth of Hezekiah in our system.

14. It seems certain, therefore, that all the birth-dates from Jotham to Josiah must be lowered seven years. But if Josiah was born in 647 B. C., as we have shown, then the birth-dates of his two successors must have been $(647 - 21 =)$ 626 for Jehoiakim, and $(626 - 21 =)$ 605 for Jehoiachin. That the later date is right is shown by 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, where Jehoiachin is said to have been *eight years old* at his accession. As Jehoiachin began in 608 B. C., and reigned eleven years, his successor must be assigned to 597 B. C., and $597 + 8$ is 605. It is true that there is a various reading of *eighteen years* (2 Kings xxiv. 8); but, as that would make his father only eleven years old at his son's birth, it may be safely rejected as corrupt. Moreover, 605 B. C. is conclusively proved to be correct by St. Matthew (i. 11), who says that Jehoiachin was born "about the time they were

carried away to Babylon." The captivity here referred to can be only that of B. C. 605, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, which ended in the third year of Cyrus (B. C. 536), after a duration of seventy years.

If Jehoiakim was born B. C. 626, then he could not have been twenty-five years old at his accession, as the present text of the Bible says (2 Kings xxiii. 36), for 608 B. C. was only eighteen years after his birth. Hence it is clear that for some reason seven years have been added to his age, thereby causing all the reigns, up to Jotham at least, to be placed seven years too high. What this reason was we shall presently show, but before examining this point it is necessary to explain the form of regnal year underlying the chronology of Judah and Israel.

15. It appears, from various parts of Scripture, that the Jews had two forms of year: one ecclesiastical, beginning with Nisan, and the other civil, beginning in Tisri, six months later. That the former was adopted by the kings of Judah as their official year is evident from 1 Kings vi. 1, where Zif, the month following Nisan, is given as the *second* month of Solomon's fourth year. According to the cuneiform inscriptions, the Assyrian kings always counted their first regnal year as beginning with the first Nisan after their accession. The time preceding Nisan was reckoned as the completion of the last regnal year of their predecessor and as "the beginning" of their own reign. Hence all the regnal years of an Assyrian king were counted as full from Nisan to Nisan. This practice seems to have obtained in Judah, also, for the first act of Hezekiah is dated in the "first month" (Nisan) of his first year (2 Chron. xxix. 3).

The kings of Israel, on the other hand, seem to have taken the civil year, beginning with Tisri (the seventh month of the ecclesiastical year), as the basis of their official year. Hence an Israelitish official year would fall in two Nisan years, and consequently, *from a Judah standpoint*, a king of Israel who reigned one year would be credited with two, meaning, merely, that his reign fell in two Nisan years. It is only on

this hypothesis that we can explain the discrepancy between the years assigned to the kings of Israel, from Nadab to Omri, as compared with the regnal years of Asa, king of Judah, in which they are said to have begun. For according to

1 Kings xv. 25,	Nadab reigns	2 years	beginning	in	2d	of	Asa.
" xv. 33,	Baasha	" 24	"	"	" 3d	"	"
" xvi. 8,	Elah	" 2	"	"	" 26th	"	"
" xvi. 15,	Zimri	" 7	days	"	" 27th	"	"
" xvi. 15, 16,	Omri	" 12	years	"	" 27th	"	"
" xvi. 29,	Ahab his son	begins		"	" 38th	"	"

The regnal years add up 40; but, according to the synchronisms, there are from the second to the thirty-eighth of Asa only thirty-six years, showing a difference of exactly one year in each reign (excepting, of course, Zimri), and thus conclusively confirming our theory. Hence it follows that one year must always be subtracted from the number assigned to the Kings of Israel if we wish to reduce them to Tisri years.

16. It appears from Scripture that the Jews made use of at least two cyclical periods, viz., the sabbatical year, which occurred every seventh year, and the year of jubilee, which fell on every fiftieth year, consequently immediately after a sabbatical year. The interval between two jubilee periods was therefore forty-nine years. In addition to these two cycles it appears to us that a third must be added, made up of ten jubilee periods. The only example remaining of its use is the famous seventy weeks' prophecy of Daniel (c. ix. 24-27), but that it was in existence from a remote period is evident from a consideration of the Bible chronology from the Creation to the Exodus. In each of the three versions of the Bible—the Hebrew, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan—the figures reported are a multiple of 490.

(1) The Hebrew version gives

From Adam to birth of Shem.....	1556	years.
From birth of Shem to birth of Abram.....	390	"
From birth of Abram to promise.....	75	"
From promise to Exodus.....	430	"
Total.....	2451	"

And $2451 - 1 = 490 \times 5$.

(2) The Septuagint chronology, if we date the promise in the ninety-ninth year of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 15-24), and place his birth in the 130th of Terah (compare Acts vii. 4 and Gen. xi. 22, with Gen. xii. 4), gives the following result:—

From Adam to birth of Shem.....	2162 years.
From birth of Shem to birth of Terah.....	1100 “
From birth of Terah to birth of Abraham (205-75)...	130 “
From birth of Abraham to promise.....	99 “
From promise to Exodus.....	430 “
Total.....	3921

And $3921-1 = 490 \times 8$.

(3) The Samaritan version, if we assume that it originally had Cainan and placed Abraham's birth in 130th year of Terah, gives:

From Adam to Deluge.....	1307 years.
From Deluge to birth of Abraham.....	1130 “
From birth of Abraham to promise.....	74 “
From promise to Exodus.....	430 “
Total.....	2941 “

And $2941-1 = 490 \times 6$.

It is therefore clear that all three versions placed the Exodus at the beginning of a cyclical period of 490 years. If, therefore, we can ascertain the date of the beginning of Daniel's period of seventy weeks, we need only to count upward to locate the beginning of each preceding cycle of 490 years, one of which must coincide with the date of the Exodus.

According to Daniel's famous prophecy, the beginning of the seventy weeks was to be marked by the going forth of the commandment to rebuild the temple and city of Jerusalem, and its end would be signaled by the death of Messiah (or Christ) "in the midst" of the last week. Three years and a half, therefore, after the death of Christ would be the *terminus ad quem*. It is generally conceded that the crucifixion must be placed in A. D. 29. Hence the end of the 490 years' cycle is A. D. 32, and consequently its beginning is B. C. 458. According to Ptolemy's Canon, 458 B. C.

was the seventh of Artaxerxes I., king of Persia, and on turning to Ezra (c. vii.) we find, in that precise year, an official proclamation from that king authorizing the temple to be restored, as the prophecy requires.

17. If 458 B. C. was the beginning of a 490 year cycle then the one preceding it must have commenced in B. C. 948. This coincides, in our birth-table (§ 10) with the birth of Abia. We have shown (§ 14) that Jehoiachin was born B. C. 605. If we assume the same average of twenty-one years to a generation for his descendants, as has been shown to hold good for his predecessors, we shall get the following result (see I Chron. iii. 17-22):—

Jehoiachin.....	born 605 B. C.
Assir.....	" 584 "
Salathiel.....	" 563 "
Zorobabel.....	" 542 "
Hananiah.....	" 521 "
Shecaniah.....	" 500 "
Hattush.....	" 479 "
His son.....	" 458 "

According to this scheme, the beginning of each of the cycles 948 and 458 coincided with the birth of one of the royal line of Judah. But it is only by adopting the reading 25 for Jehoiakim (§ 10), in place of the true reading 18, that this result is attained, with our present birth-table, and it now seems to be clear that the 18 was changed to 25 to produce this synchronism. We have shown that the seven years added to Jehoiakim are historically impossible, hence each of the birth-dates of the kings preceding Jotham must be lowered seven years, thus destroying the synchronism between the birth of Abia and the beginning of the cycle of 948 B. C., or else, as 21 goes into 490 twenty-three times, *with a remainder of seven years*, that one of the ancestors of Jotham must have selected his heir from among the children born in his twenty-eighth year instead of the customary twenty-first.

18. We have already shown from Scripture itself (§ 9) that from the birth of Rehoboam to the birth of Amaziah there

was no break in the rule of twenty-one years between each generation, and the same result has been proved below from the birth of Jotham to that of Jehoiachin (§ 12-14). If the seven years lacking to complete the 490 years were added anywhere, it must have been to either Amaziah or Uzziah, the only two generations remaining.

In 2 Kings xv. 1 we read that Uzziah reigned fifty-two years, and that Pekah, king of Israel, began to reign in his fifty-second and last year (ver. 27). This is confirmed by ver. 32, in which the *first* of Jotham, successor of Uzziah, is placed in the *second* of Pekah. Hence, fifty-two years preceding the second of Pekah must coincide with the accession of Uzziah. The reigns of the kings of Israel contemporary with Uzziah are given in 2 Kings xv., and if we correct an obvious error of one year which has dropped out from the reign of Menahem, (he begins in the thirty-ninth year of Uzziah and his successor in the fiftieth, therefore he reigned eleven years) and reduce the years to Tisri years (see § 15), we shall find that the fifty-second year before Jotham's accession coincides with the accession of Jeroboam II. For

Jeroboam II. reigned.....	40	Tisri	years.
Zechariah reigned 6 months (included in last of Jeroboam II.).			
Shallum reigned one month (included in first of Menahem)...			
Menahem reigned.....	10	"	"
Pekajah reigned.....	1	"	"
Pekah reigned.....	1	"	"
	—		
Total.....	52	"	"

It therefore follows that Jeroboam II. and Uzziah began to reign in the same year. Now the first of Jeroboam II. was the fifteenth of Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 23), consequently Uzziah must have reigned fifteen years during the lifetime of his father, as Amaziah is expressly said to have lived fifteen years after the fifteenth year of his reign (compare 2 Kings xiv. 17 and ver. 23). If Uzziah reigned fifty-two years, then his sole reign would seem to amount to thirty-seven years.

19. Amaziah was twenty-five years old at his father's death in his fortieth year as king (compare 2 Kings xii. 1 and xiv.

2), but he *began* to reign in the thirty eighth of Joash (compare 2 Kings xiii. 10 and xiv. 1), hence he was twenty-three years old in the first year of his twenty-nine years' reign. If he was twenty-three in his first year, he must have been (23 + 14) 37 in his fifteenth year, and therefore twenty-one years older than his son Uzziah, who was sixteen years old when he began to reign (2 Kings xvi. 2). The seven years to be added belong, therefore, to Uzziah, whose twenty-eighth year must coincide with the birth of Jotham. As Jotham was twenty-five years old at his accession (2 Kings xv. 33), his father was then (28 + 25) 53, and, as he began to reign when sixteen years old, his entire reign was (53—16) 37 years, and not 52. Consequently the fifteen years during which he reigned in his father's lifetime are already included in these thirty-seven. It follows, therefore, that there is an apparent surplus of fifteen years in the reigns assigned to the kings of Israel during this period, or else, that one or more kings reigned contemporaneously for fifteen years.

20. On examining the synchronisms assigned to the kings of Israel, we find that Jeroboam II. could not have reigned forty years. If his first year coincided, as we have shown (§ 18), with the first of Uzziah, then his successor Zechariah should be placed in the fortieth of the same Uzziah; but according to 2 Kings xv. 8, he is placed in his thirty-eighth. Even this synchronism must be raised two years, as it is based on the erroneous date 720 B. C. for the capture of Samaria (§ 4). If we raise this date to B. C. 722, as the Assyrian records require (§ 3), it will have the effect of advancing, by two years, the date of accession of each of the predecessors of Hoshea. Hence the accession of Zechariah (and death of Jeroboam II.) must be placed in the thirty-sixth of Uzziah. As the accession of Jotham was in the second of Pekah, and Uzziah reigned only thirty-seven years, it follows that his thirty-seventh and last year synchronized with the first of Pekah, and also with the accession of Shallum and Menahem, who immediately follow Zechariah, who was slain in Uzziah's thirty-sixth year. Consequently Pekah's first eleven years

synchronize with the ten of Menahem and the one year of his son Pekaiah. That there was a rival candidate to the throne, during the usurpation of Menahem, is sufficiently clear from 2 Kings xv. 16 (compare ver. 19), as has already been pointed out by Brandes.¹⁰ The reigns in both kingdoms, as corrected, stand therefore as follows from the simultaneous accession of Uzziah and Jeroboam II.:—

Uzziah, aged 16 years, is made king in place of his father Amaziah, who flees to Lachish and lives there 15 years.....	785 B. C.
Jeroboam II., king of Israel, reigns 36 years.....	785 "
Amaziah, king of Judah, dies after a reign of 29 years.....	770 "
Jeroboam II. dies and is succeeded by his son Zechariah for 6 months.....	750 "
Shallum slays Zechariah and reigns one month.....	749 "
Menahem slays Shallum and reigns 10 years.....	749 "
Pekah, rival king, reigns 19 years.....	749 "
Uzziah dies, after a reign of 37 years, and is succeeded by his son Jotham, who reigns 15 years <i>full</i> , beginning in 2d of Pekah..	748 "
Tiglath Pileser II. (or Phul) invades Israel and <i>confirms</i> the kingdom to Menahem (2 Kings xv. 19).....	743 "
Pekaiah succeeds Menahem, and reigns 1 year.....	739 "
Pekah slays Pekaiah and reigns alone 8 years.....	738 "
Ahaz succeeds his father Jotham in the 17th of Pekah (2 Kings xvi. 1) and counts this year as his "beginning" (2 15).....	733 "
Ahaz's <i>first</i> year, when he was 20 years old (2 Kings xvi. 2).....	732 "
Hoshea slays Pekah in the 12th of Ahaz (2 Kings xvii. 1), his "beginning".....	731 "
Hoshea's first year.....	730 "
Capture of Samaria in the 9th year of Hoshea.....	722 "

21. If Uzziah reigned thirty-seven years, as seems to be clear from the foregoing examination, he must have been born in (785 + 16) 801 B. C., or in the precise year indicated in our birth-table (§ 10). Consequently that part of the table preceding Uzziah needs no correction, and it will be more convenient to begin our restoration of the remainder of the chronology of the kings from the commencement of the series instead of working upward.

The first natural division of the reigns extends from the accession of Rehoboam to the death of Ahaziah, which coin-

¹⁰ *Abhandlungen*, Part ii, pp. 104, 105.

cides with the simultaneous accession of Jehu, the usurpation of Athaliah, and the death of Joram, king of Israel. According to the birth-table, combined with the notices of age at accession, the chronology of the kingdom of Judah for this period is as follows:—

Birth B. C.	Name.	Age at Accession.	Date of Accession B. C.
969.....	Rehoboam	41.....	928
948.....	Abia.....		
927.....	Asa.....		
906.....	Jehoshaphat.....	35.....	871
885.....	Joram.....	32.....	853
864.....	Ahaziah.....	22.....	842

Solomon died some time after Nisan B. C. 929, probably before Tisri, as Jeroboam I. dated his first year six months earlier than Rehoboam (see § 15). His eighteenth year is synchronized with the first of Abia (1 Kings xv. 1), that is B. C. 912, hence Rehoboam did not reign seventeen years full, but only current. As Abia's third year and Asa's accession are both placed in the twentieth of Jeroboam (1 Kings xv. 9) the three years of Abia are also incomplete. As Nadab succeeds his father, Jeroboam I., in the *second* of Asa (1 Kings xv. 25), it is clear that Asa dated his first year from the twenty-first of Jeroboam I., consequently (929—19) 910 was, technically, only his "beginning," and his forty-one years end in (910—41) 869. Jehoshaphat, who begins in B. C. 871, was therefore associated with him for *two* years.

We have already shown that the reigns from Nadab, son of Jeroboam I., to the accession of Ahab, in the thirty-eighth of Asa (B. C. 872) amount to thirty-six years, but as Jehoshaphat's accession was in the thirty-ninth of Asa and in the *fourth* of Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 41), it follows that Ahab's first year was in the thirty-sixth of Asa; hence he also must have been associated with his father Omri for two years, and the "thirty-eighth year" must mean the first year of his *sole* reign. This hypothesis is shown to be correct by simply counting down the years assigned to Ahab and his two sons, for

Ahab reigned 21 Tisri years, beginning in 36th of Asa (909—35)=874 B. C.	
Ahaziah, his son, reigned one Tisri year	853 B. C.
Jehoram, his brother, reigned 11 Tisri years	852 B. C.
Jehu	841 B. C.

This chronology is confirmed by the synchronism 17 Jehoshaphat=1 Ahaziah (1 Kings xxii. 51), and 18 Jehoshaphat=1 Jehoram (2 Kings iii. 1). For as Jehoshaphat's *sole* reign begins 869 B. C., his seventeenth year was 853 B. C., and his eighteenth 852 B. C. It is true we might count these years from his *associated* reign in B. C. 871, in which case the accessions of Ahab and his two sons would have to be advanced two years each. The former view is, however, shown to be correct by 2 Kings i. 11, in which the accession of Jehoram, king of Israel, (and consequently the eighteenth of Jehoshaphat) is made synchronous with the *second* year of Joram, king of Judah, (as regent). According to our birth-table, Joram was king (regent) in B. C. 853; consequently his second year was B. C. 852.

If Joram of Israel began in 852 B. C., then the beginning of Joram of Judah's eight years (2 Kings viii. 17,) in B. C. (842+8) 850 was in his *third* year, and not in his fifth (2 Kings viii. 16). The error is probably due to counting Joram of Israel's accession, in eighteenth of Jehoshaphat, from B. C. 871 in place of 869. Moreover, as Joram of Israel's eleventh year is concurrent with Ahaziah's accession in B. C. 842, (2 Kings ix. 29), Joram of Judah cannot be placed later than (8+1) 9 years before the death of Joram of Israel, hence in his third year. Adding nine years to Jehoram's fifth would make his reign thirteen years, which contradicts 1 Kings iii. 1.

The death of Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah must be placed early in B. C. 842. We have elsewhere shown (§9) that Jehu's "beginning" must be dated in the preceding year B. C. 843, when he was anointed as king. Consequently his twenty-seven years end in the twenty-first of Joash, and not in the twenty-third, as stated in 2 Kings xiii. 1. The latter date was arrived at by counting Jehu's twenty-seven years as beginning from the end of the eleven years of Joram

in B. C. 841. That the twenty-first of Joash is right is shown by his thirty-seventh being made equal to the first of Jehoash, grandson of Jehu, consequently, the sixteen Tisri years of his father, Jehoahaz, must begin in the (37—16) 21st. This erroneous reading of the twenty-third, in place of the twenty-first, if carried out consistently, will depress each of the succeeding reigns by two years in the kingdom of Israel. This explains why Jeroboam's death is placed in the thirty-eighth of Uzziah, instead of the thirty-sixth, and why the capture of Samaria is depressed by two years to 720 B. C., instead of 722 B. C., the correct date.

The chronology of the two kingdoms from Rehoboam and Jeroboam I. to Uzziah and Jeroboam II. is therefore as follows :

B. C.	JUDAH.	ISRAEL.
929		Jeroboam reigns 21 years.
928	Rehoboam reigns 17 years.	
922	Abia reigns 3 years.	18—
910	3 Abia, Asa's "beginning," reigns 41 years.	20—
909	Asa's first year.	21—
908	2—	Nadab reigns 1 year.
907	3—	Baasha reigns 23 years.
884	26—	Elah reigns 1 year.
883	27—	Omri reigns 11 years.
874	36—	Ahab associated, reigns 21 years.
872	38—	Ahab alone.
871	Asa diseased in his feet : Jehoshaphat associated, reigns 25 years.	4—
869	Jehoshaphat alone	6—
853	17 Joram, his son, regent, while his father accompanies Ahab to Ramoth Gilead.	Ahab dies, Abaziah reigns 1 year.
852	18 (2 Jehoram as regent)	Joram reigns 11 years.
850	Joram associated, reigns 8 years.	3—
847	Jehoshaphat dies.	5—
846	Joram alone.	6—
843		10— Jehu anointed king, reigns 27 years.
842	Abaziah reigns one year.	11 Joram and Abaziah slain.
842	Athaliah usurps the throne 6 years.	
837	Conspiracy against Athaliah, "Beginning" of Joash's 40 years.	7 Jehu.
836	Joash's first year.	8—
816	21—	Jehoahaz reigns 16 years.
800	37—	Jehoash reigns 15 years.
799	38 Amaziah associated, reigns 29 years.	2—
797	Amaziah alone.	4—
785	15 Conspiracy against Amaziah.	Jeroboam II. reigns 36 years.
	Uzziah his son, made king, aged 16 years.	

22. In the fifteenth chapter of Second Kings the king to whom fifty-two years are assigned is sometimes called Uzziah, and sometimes Azariah. It has been generally assumed that both names refer to the same king, but as we have shown that Uzziah could not have reigned more than thirty-seven years, the fifty-two which *seem* to be assigned to him can only designate the joint reign of Uzziah-Azariah. We know from 2 Kings xv. 5, that Jotham reigned during the life of his father while he was a leper, and it is therefore probable that Azariah designates the reign of Jotham while thus associated, which name he afterwards changed to Jotham when he reigned alone. If Uzziah-Azariah's fifty-two years represent the two reigns Uzziah-Jotham, and Uzziah's reign is thirty-seven, there must remain fifteen for Jotham; and we have just shown (§ 20) that Jotham's reign was, in fact, just fifteen years from B. C. 748 to 733.

By comparing various indications of Scripture, it is quite certain that "Jerusha, the daughter of Zadok" (the high priest) the mother of Jotham (2 Kings xv. 33), was the sister of the high priest Azariah (2 Chron. xxvi. 20). That the king and his brother-in-law should both have the same name is somewhat remarkable, but when it is seen that Azariah, the high priest, was the uncle of Jotham, it is natural enough to assume that Jotham was named after him.

That Azariah was only another name for Jotham is rendered certain by the hitherto enigmatical reading (in 2 Kings xv. 1) where the accession of *Azariah*, king of Judah, is placed in the twenty-seventh of Jeroboam II. The false chronology of the Bible places the accession of Jeroboam in 783, consequently the twenty-seventh year is 757 B. C. Jotham's reign is lowered to B. C. 755 (§ 11), by cutting off two years from Ahaz, which he is erroneously credited with as joint ruler with his son Hezekiah. Restoring these, we get 757 B. C. for Jotham's accession. It is therefore clear that the pseudo-biblical chronology confounded the *regency* of Jotham in B. C. 757 with his *accession* in B. C. 748. Azariah of Judah is therefore shown to have reigned B. C. 748-733, or

exactly where the Assyrian records require him to be placed.

If Azariah-Jotham commenced his associated reign in 757 B. C., he must have been contemporaneous with Jeroboam II., for (757-749) 8 years. According to 1 Chron. v. 17, Jeroboam and Jotham were, in fact, both reigning at the same time, as here assumed. If Uzziah reigned fifty-two years and Jeroboam died in his thirty-eighth year, such a synchronism, would be impossible.

23. If Rehoboam began in 928 B. C., and Solomon reigned forty years (1 Kings xi. 42), his first year was B. C. 968. Hence his fourth, in which the building of the temple was begun (1 Kings vi. 1), should be B. C. 965. According to the Bible, this was the four hundred and eightieth year after the Exodus, which therefore should be placed in B. C. 1444. But, according to § 16, it is clear that the Exodus coincided with the beginning of a 490 year period. As 948 B. C. is the first year of such a cycle, the one immediately preceding must be dated B. C. 1438. Hence Solomon's fourth year was B. C. 959, and his forty years must include six years during which he was associated with his father David.

An extended study of various indications of Scripture has convinced the writer that the same system of a fixed number of years between each generation obtained in the period before Solomon as well as after that reign, with this difference, however: the interval was forty-two years in place of twenty-one. The proof cannot be given here, as it would require too much space, but assuming the theory to be established, it would remarkably confirm the assumption that Solomon reigned six years with his father. For, if Solomon was born when his father was forty-two years old, he must have been twenty-eight at David's death, who lived (30 + 40) 70 years. As Solomon's son Rehoboam was forty-one at his accession, his father was (41 + 21) 62, and therefore reigned, from the death of David, (62 - 28) 34 years, and, (as the Bible says he reigned forty years,) consequently the remaining six years he was associated with his father, as just shown. As these

six years will bring us to Solomon's (28 — 6) 22d year, when his son Rehoboam was one year old, it accounts for his being then named as the successor of David. The reason is the same that moved Manasseh to associate his grandson Amon, when he was twenty-two years old, (§ 11) viz., because the existence of a child one year old, in both instances, would afford a reasonable assurance that the succession would be continued in the same line. That Solomon was associated for some time with his father is evident from 1 Chron. xxix. 22, which says: "And they made Solomon, the son of David, king *the second time.*"

24. In the foregoing restoration of biblical chronology no use has been made of the numerous synchronisms with Phœnician, Egyptian, and other chronologies that are mentioned in Scripture. We have relied entirely on internal evidence alone, and have shown that the Bible, rightly understood and freed from one or two corrupt readings, is in exact agreement and harmonizes, date for date, with the Eponym and Ptolemy's Canon.

It is not our purpose in this paper to show the remarkable confirmation the scheme here evolved from the Bible receives from Egyptian and other chronologies, and from other data furnished by the Bible, and we will conclude by giving only one specimen of such confirmation, reserving for a future paper the consideration of Egyptian and early Oriental chronology and their bearing on the biblical chronology before Solomon.

According to Josephus¹¹ who professes to quote from the Tyrian annals, there were 155 years 8 months from the accession of Hiram, king of Tyre, to the building of Carthage. The twelfth of Hiram was, according to the Tyrian records, the fourth of Solomon, hence from the building of the temple to the building of Carthage were (155 y. 8 m. =) 156 — 11 = 145 years. The building of Carthage, according to the unanimous testimony of Timæus, Cicero, Aristotle and Velleius

Contra Apion, i. 17, 18 and Antiq. 8, 3, 1.

was in B. C. 814.¹² If so, then the twelfth of Hiram and building of the temple at Jerusalem, in the fourth of Solomon, was, according to the Tyrian annals, in (814+145) 959 B. C. *in exact agreement with our restoration of biblical chronology.*

¹²See Unger, Chronol. des Manetho, pp. 213-215.