

ARTICLE IV.

A NEWLY DISCOVERED KEY TO BIBLICAL
CHRONOLOGY.BY J. SCHWARTZ, LIBRARIAN OF THE APPRENTICES' LIBRARY, NEW YORK
CITY.

SECOND PAPER.

1. IN the January number of the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* an attempt was made to show that the chronology of the Bible, from Solomon to Jehoiakim, agrees exactly with the Assyrian Eponym Canon, and with Ptolemy's Canon, if we assume that in the royal line of Judah, with one exception, the heir to the throne was chosen from the children born when the preceding king was twenty-one years old. The present paper will begin by showing that the harmony between the two chronologies—Assyrian and biblical—can be proved without reference to the theory advanced in the first paper. References to that paper will be made thus: "Key," with the number of the section added.

2. The Bible synchronizes the accession of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, with the fourth year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah ("Key" § 4). According to Ptolemy's Canon the first *official* year of Nebuchadnezzar was in B. C. 604, which proves that his *accession* was in B. C. 605 ("Key" § 15). The Bible places the accession of Jotham, king of Judah, 150 years before this date, that is in B. C. 755 ("Key" § 11), the details being as follows:—

Jotham.....	16 years.	755 B. C.
Ahaz, alone.....	14 "	739 "
Ahaz and Hezekiah associated.....	2 "	725 "
Hezekiah alone.....	27 "	723 "
Manasseh.....	55 "	696 "
Amon.....	2 "	641 "

Josiah.....	31	“	639	B. C.
Jehoiakim.....	3	“	608	“
Accession of Nebuchadnezzar.....			605	“

The capture of Samaria, and end of the kingdom of Israel, is placed in the sixth year of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 10), therefore in B. C. 720.

3. If we examine the details of this table, and compare it with other statements of Scripture, it will be seen that Jotham reigned only fifteen years full, and not sixteen, as his first year is the second of Pekah (2 Kings xv. 32), and his successor Ahaz begins in the seventeenth year of the same Pekah (2 Kings xvi. 1). There is no evidence to substantiate the two years' associated reign of Ahaz and Hezekiah, and we must therefore allow sixteen years full for Ahaz. These corrections make a difference of one year in the total. As the twenty-nine years of Hezekiah and the thirty-one years of Josiah are confirmed by other statements of Scripture (§ 5), we must deduct one year from the fifty-five of Manasseh in order to preserve the total of 150 years. The reigns from Jotham should have been given as follows: Jotham 15 years + Ahaz 16 years + Hezekiah 29 years + Manasseh 54 years + Amon 2 years + Josiah 31 years + Jehoiakim 3 years = 150 years.

4. Although the Bible clearly places the capture of Samaria in B. C. 720, it is certain, by comparing the information furnished by the cuneiform inscriptions and Ptolemy's Canon, that it must be placed two years earlier, in B. C. 722. As has been shown ("Key" § 15) the years assigned to the kings of Israel must be reduced by one, in every case. Hence the nine years of Hoshea, the last king of Israel, and the twenty years of his predecessor Pekah are, from an Israelitish standpoint, only 19 + 8. As the Bible and the cuneiform inscriptions agree that Hoshea immediately succeeded Pekah, and that there was no interregnum between the two reigns, as has been assumed by many chronologists, it follows that the accession of Pekah cannot be placed higher than B. C. (722 + 19 + 8 =) 749. Now the Bible says that

Jotham did not begin to reign until the second year of Pekah, therefore the line of Judah, which places him in B. C. 755, (§ 2) has an error or excess of *seven* years. That there is no mistake about the second of Pekah being the first year of Jotham is shown by the sixteenth and last year of Jotham being synchronized with the seventeenth of the same Pekah (§ 3). Consequently one of the successors of Jotham has seven years too much.

5. Of the seven kings of Judah, from Jotham to Jehoiakim inclusive, the reigns of Amon, with two years, and Jehoiakim, with three years, are, of course, out of the question. Jotham's fifteen years are confirmed by the second and seventeenth of Pekah. Ahaz has sixteen, which cannot be further reduced, as the age of his son Hezekiah, at his accession (*viz.*, 25 years, for which we read 15) will make Ahaz twenty-one years older than his son, which agrees with the average found for nearly all the kings of Judah ("Key" §§ 9, 11). The twenty-nine years of Hezekiah are placed beyond dispute by the prophecy of Isaiah concerning that king's sickness (§ 6), and the thirty-one years of Josiah are confirmed by Jeremiah (*chap.* xxv. 2, 3), a cotemporary, who counts twenty-three years from the thirteenth of Josiah to the fourth of Jehoiakim. It is therefore certain that the seven superfluous years must be deducted from the fifty-four of Manasseh, who consequently reigned only (54—7) 47 years. The table in § 2 must be corrected as follows:—

Jotham.....	15 years.	748 B. C.
Ahaz.....	16 "	733 "
Hezekiah.....	29 "	717 "
Manasseh.....	47 "	688 "
Amon.....	2 "	641 "
Josiah.....	31 "	639 "
Jehoiakim.....	3 "	608 "
Accession of Nebuchadnezzar.....		605 "

6. In confirmation of this restoration we have the synchronism of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah with the first official year of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, which is thus ved:—

(1) The Bible says (2 Kings xviii. 13) that Sennacherib's first invasion of Judea took place in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, which must have been in B. C. 704 if his first year was B. C. 717. Now it is clear that Sennacherib's invasion cannot be placed earlier than the first year of his reign, which the Eponym Canon places in B. C. 704.

(2) Nor could it have taken place later than B. C. 704, because the embassy of Merodach Baladan (2 Kings xx. 12) congratulating Hezekiah on his recovery from sickness, must be placed in the same year, since Isaiah (2 Kings xx. 6) predicted that Hezekiah (who reigned 29 years) would survive his illness fifteen years. 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 began to reign in B. C. 704, the embassy of Merodach Baladan and the fourteenth year of Hezekiah are indisputably fastened to B. C. 704.¹

(3) If Isaiah xxxvii. 30 indicates, as several eminent writers hold, that the fourteenth year of Hezekiah was a sabbatical year and the fifteenth year was a jubilee year, it will agree with our chronology, for B. C. 458 was a jubilee year ("Key" § 16), therefore B. C. 703 was one, since the interval between two jubilee years was forty-nine years, and B. C. 704 must have been a sabbatical year.

7. According to the annals of Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, he was warring against a king of Judah named Azariah, between B. C. 743-740. As we cannot assume that the Assyrians were ignorant of the names of the foreign kings with whom they came in contact, it follows that the king of Judah reigning between B. C. 743-740 was identical with Azariah. Now we have just shown that

¹The identification of the Merodach Baladan of the Bible with the Merodach Baladan of Ptolemy's Canon and the cuneiform inscriptions, who reigned from B. C. 721 to 709 (Mardokempad in Ptolemy), is inadmissible because the earlier Merodach Baladan was a son of *Yakin*, according to the cuneiform inscriptions, whereas the Merodach Baladan of the Bible was a son of *Baladan* (see 2 Kings xx. 12). The first Merodach was probably the father of the second.

Jotham was king from B. C. 748 to 733, hence he was the "Azariah" of the cuneiform inscriptions. An examination of Scripture confirms this identification:—

(1) The name Azariah was quite common to the tribe of Levi, but very uncommon in the line of Judah. Its presence can be accounted for only on the supposition of intermarriages between the two tribes. By putting together various indications of Scripture it is quite certain that "Jerusha, the daughter of Zadok," the mother of Jotham (2 Kings xv. 33), was the sister of Azariah, the high priest, who cast out Uzziah, father of Jotham, from the temple (2 Chron. xxvi. 20). Azariah was therefore the brother-in-law of Uzziah, and the uncle of Jotham, and we can now understand how the name Azariah got into the royal line of Judah—Jotham was named Azariah after his uncle.

(2) We know that Jotham was associated as joint king while his father was a leper (see 2 Kings xv. 5), and as the son has two names, it is probable that Azariah was the one used while he was thus associated, and that he changed this to the throne name Jotham when he reigned alone. Hence the fifty-two years (2 Kings xv. 2) assigned to the king who is confusedly called alternately Azariah (2 Kings xv. 1, 6, 7, 8, 17, 23, 27), and Uzziah (2 Kings xv. 13, 30, 32, 34) must represent the *combined* reigns of the two kings, Uzziah-Azariah. As Azariah (or Jotham) has been shown (§§2, 5) to have reigned fifteen years, from B. C. 748 to 733, it follows that Uzziah reigned, altogether, (52—15) thirty-seven years, beginning with B. C. (748+37) 785.

(3) It has been shown, in the former paper ("Key" §18) that Uzziah and Jeroboam II. began to reign in the same year, viz., the fifteenth of Amaziah, king of Judah. Now, inasmuch as Uzziah reigned, altogether, thirty-seven years, and Pekah, king of Israel, began to reign in his *last* year (since Jotham, the son of Uzziah, began to reign in the *second* year of Pekah), it follows that Jeroboam II. could not have reigned more than thirty-six years. According to the correct chronology (§4) Pekah's accession was in B. C. 749;

but if we take the biblical date of the capture of Samaria, viz., B. C. 720, the first of Pekah must be depressed to B. C. 747, and the death of Jeroboam II. to B. C. 748. That this was, in fact, the view of the compiler of the book of Kings is shown by his placing the death of Jeroboam II. in the thirty-eighth of Uzziah-Azariah (2 Kings xv. 8), which was, in fact, (785—37) B. C. 748, as just assumed. It is clear, therefore, that, under the influence of the false date, B. C. 720, for the capture of Samaria, all the dates for the kings of Israel, up to Jeroboam II. at least, were depressed by two years each. As Jeroboam II. reigned only thirty-six years, as just shown, there can be no doubt that, in the view of the compiler of the present text of 2 Kings xv., the accession of Jeroboam II. was placed in B. C. 783. This being the case, a hitherto mysterious date is at once explained, and proves, beyond a doubt, that our identification of Azariah with Jotham is correct. In 2 Kings xv. 1, the accession of "Azariah, King of Judah," is placed in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II. If Uzziah and Jeroboam II. began to reign in the *same year* (see "Key" §18), and Azariah was only another name for Uzziah, as has been generally assumed, then Uzziah could not have begun to reign twenty-seven years later, but if our theory is right this date is exactly correct. For, if we take the thirty-five years now reckoned from 1 Jotham to 6 Hezekiah, and add them to the correct date of the capture of Samaria, viz., B. C. 722, or, if we take the years of the kings, without regard to the synchronisms, viz., 16 Jotham + 16 Ahaz + 5 Hezekiah, and add them to the *biblical* date of the capture of Samaria, viz., B. C. 720, in either case we come to B. C. 757 for the accession of Jotham. Any one who adopted either of these modes of arriving at the accession of Jotham, in place of accepting the date (B. C. 755) based on the synchronisms between the two kingdoms (Israel and Judah), and compared it with the biblical date for the accession of Jeroboam II., viz., B. C. 783, would necessarily place the accession of Azariah-Jotham in the twenty-seventh year of the Israelitish king.

(4) If Azariah was the same king as Jotham, then the date B. C. 755 (§2) or B. C. 757 (see preceding paragraph) can be accounted for as representing the time of Azariah's joint or associated reign. The mistake of the writer of 2 Kings was in confounding the date of Jotham's associated reign in B. C. 755 with the date of his sole reign in B. C. 748. As he allowed only fifteen years to his whole reign, in place of twenty-two (B. C. 755—733), he was of course compelled to add seven years below, to Manasseh, as has just been shown.

(5) If Azariah-Jotham began to reign in B. C. 757 or 755, and Jeroboam II. did not die until B. C. 749, then the two kings were cotemporaries for six or eight years. That they were, in fact, reigning at the same time is expressly stated in the Bible (1 Chronicles v. 17). It is only on the theory that the fifty-two years of 2 Kings xv. 1 represent the *joint* reigns of Uzziah-Azariah that this synchronism can be made out. If the ordinary view—that Uzziah reigned fifty-two years alone—is correct, such a synchronism would be clearly impossible.

8. If Jeroboam II. died in B. C. 750, then the reign of Menahem, who followed Jeroboam II., after the two short reigns of Zechariah and Shallum (see 2 Kings xv. 8-22), must have been cotemporary with Pekah, who began in B. C. 749, that is, the ten years of Menahem extend from B. C. 749 to B. C. 739, exactly where the Assyrian inscriptions require his reign to be placed, for they make him a vassal of Tiglath Pileser II., king of Assyria, who did not begin to reign until B. C. 744. That there were rival candidates or pretenders to the throne of Israel during the reign of Menahem is shown by the statement (in 2 Kings xv. 19) that he paid a thousand talents of silver to the Assyrian king to "*confirm* the kingdom in his hand."

9. The accession of Uzziah in Judah, and Jeroboam II. in Israel, must be placed in B. C. 785, in the fifteenth year of Amaziah, king of Judah. We have the following statements respecting the chronology, from the time of the divided kingdom, down to this date:—

Jeroboam I., king of Israel, reigns 21 Tisri years (1 Kings xiv. 20).

Asa, king of Judah, begins to reign in the 20th of Jeroboam, for 41 years (1 Kings xv. 9).

Death of Ahab, king of Israel, and accession of Ahaziah, his son, is placed in the 17th year of Jehoshaphat, successor of Asa (1 Kings xxii. 51).

Jehoram, successor of Ahaziah, begins his 11 years' reign (2 Kings iii. 1) in the eighteenth of Jehoshaphat, which is also the 2d year of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat (as regent). See 2 Kings i. 17.

Ahaziah, successor of Jehoram, king of Judah, begins in the 11th year of Jehoram, king of Israel, and reigns one year (2 Kings ix. 29).

Athaliah usurps the throne of Judah for six years on the death of Ahaziah (2 Kings xi. 1-3).

Conspiracy against her in the 7th of Jehu—the slayer of Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah—the “beginning” (see “Key” § 15) of Joash. His first official year is the 8th of Jehu. (See the table in “Key” § 21.)

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

Amaziah, king of Judah, in the 2d year of Jehoash (2 Kings xiv. 1).

These statements give us the following chronology, which agrees exactly with the scheme evolved by means of the theory discussed in the first paper (see the table in “Key” § 21):—

Jeroboam I., king of Israel.....	929	B.C.
Rehoboam, king of Judah.....	928	“
Asa, king of Judah.....	910	“
Jehoshaphat, king of Judah.....	869	“
Jehoshaphat accompanies Ahab to Ramoth-Gilead, where Ahab is killed. Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, made regent. Ahaziah succeeds Ahab.....	853	“
Jehoram succeeds Ahaziah in Israel in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat and the second year of Jehoram of Judah (as regent).....	852	“
Ahaziah, king of Judah.....	842	“

Ahaziah and Jehoram killed by Jehu. Athaliah usurps the throne of Judah for six years.....	842 B. C.
Death of Athaliah. Joash, king of Judah.....	836 "
Jehoash, king of Israel.....	800 "
Amaziah, king of Judah.....	799 "
Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam II., king of Israel.....	785 "

10. A comparison between this table and the biblical dates established by the cuneiform inscriptions ("Key" §3) shows an exact agreement between the two. For the battle of Karkhar, in which Ahab, king of Israel, took part, as the ally of Ben-hadad, king of Syria, the Assyrian records place in B. C. 854, which is the year before the death of the Israelitish king. Jehu's payment of tribute to Salmanassar II. of Assyria is dated B. C. 841, which is his 2d year in the preceding table. The synchronisms of Menahem with Tiglath Pileser, Azariah of Judah with the same king, and the fourteenth of Hezekiah with Sennacherib, have been considered in previous sections.²

11. If Rehoboam began in B. C. 928, then Solomon, who reigned 40 years (1 Kings xi. 42), must have commenced to reign in B. C. 968, and his fourth year should be in B. C. 965. There are, however, two reasons which prove that he did not commence to date his regnal years until the death of his father David, which we place in B. C. 962, because:—

(1) The LXX., the Samaritan, and the Hebrew, all agree in placing the Exodus from Egypt at the beginning of a cycle of

²Mr. Badger's attempt to harmonize the Assyrian Eponym Canon with the biblical chronology (in the *Old Testament Student*, Vol. v. no. 10), which was not seen until this paragraph was written, is based on the assumption that the fifty-two years of Uzziah (whom he considers to be the same king as Azariah), and the forty-one years of Jeroboam II. of Israel, represent not their *regns*, but the duration of their *lives*. He admits that "this use of numerals is without a parallel probably in the Bible," and it is extremely improbable on other grounds, if for no other reason, than that it requires an interregnum, between Jeroboam II. and his son Zechariah, of eight years, for which there is no evidence whatever. Mr. Badger's theory—even assuming it to be correct—leaves most of the difficulties unexplained. Only the dates B. C. 854 for Ahab, and B. C. 841 for Jehu, are made out. The synchronisms of Azariah and Menahem with Tiglath Pileser, and the 14th year of Hezekiah with Sennacherib, are irreconcilable with Mr. Badger's chronology.

490 years ("Key" § 16). As such a cycle began in B. C. 458 ("Key" § 16), the two previous ones began in B. C. 1438, and B. C. 948, respectively. The book of Kings says the fourth year of Solomon was the 480th from the Exodus (1 Kings vi. 1), therefore the fourth of Solomon was B. C. (1438—479) 959.

(2) The Tyrian annals, as quoted by Josephus, place an interval of 155 years 8 months, or, in round numbers, 156 years, between the accession of King Hiram and the building of Carthage. The twelfth year of Hiram of Tyre is synchronized with the fourth of Solomon: hence, from the building of the temple to the building of Carthage the Tyrian chronicles reckoned (156—11) 145 years. As the best ancient authorities are agreed that the building of Carthage must be placed in B. C. 814, it follows, that the fourth of Solomon was in B. C. (814 + 145 =) 959. (See "Key" § 24.)

12. If we take the 3921 years of the LXX. version, before the Exodus ("Key" § 16), as correct, we get the following scheme:—

Creation.....	5359	B. C.
Deluge.....	3098-7	"
Dispersion of nations (531 after the Deluge).....	2566	"
Birth of Terah, father of Abram.....	2098	"
Birth of Abram (205—75 =) 130th of Terah.....	1967	"
The promise in the 99th year of Abraham.....	1868	"
Isaac born (Abraham 100 years old).....	1867	"
Jacob born (Isaac 60 years old).....	1807	"
Entrance into Egypt in Jacob's 130th year.....	1678	"
Exodus from Egypt.....	1438	"

The date 1438 B. C. for the Exodus depends, of course, on the assumption, that the 480 years of 1 Kings vi. 1 are genuine. It has been held by some writers, with whose schemes this number did not agree, that it is a corrupt addition foisted into the text, shortly before the time of Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, about A. D. 325, who, it is claimed, is the first Christian writer that accepts it.* This

*See Russell's *Connection of Sacred and Profane Chronology* (Wheeler's edition), Vol. i. pp. 79-81.

supposition is incorrect. The number 480 years, between the Exodus and the building of Solomon's temple, was known, and accepted as reliable, long before Eusebius, as can be easily proved.

(1) Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about A. D. 192, or over one hundred years before Eusebius, among a mass of undigested extracts from chronologists, before his time (contained in Book i. chap. xxi. of his "Stromata"), gives the following fragment:⁴ "From the birth of Moses till the Captivity, 972 years.....From the reign of David till the Captivity, 452 years 6 months." This would leave from the birth of Moses to the reign of David (972—452 years 6 months=) 519 years 6 months. For some peculiar reason, not yet satisfactorily explained, the early Christian chronologists placed the building of the temple in the *second*, in place of the biblical *fourth*, year of Solomon. Assuming that the writer from whom Clement makes this extract adopted this practice, we would have, counting forty years for David and one year for Solomon, (519 + 40 + 1=) 560 years from the birth of Moses to the building of Solomon's temple. As Moses was eighty years, at the time of the Exodus (Ex. vii. 7), there are (560—80) 480 years left between the Exodus and the building of the temple.

(2) Castor of Rhodes, according to Eusebius, brought down his Chronicles to B. C. 56. His work has been lost, but there are extracts from it preserved in Eusebius, Syncellus, and in an anonymous Latin writer, first published by Scaliger.⁵ He is generally called "Auctor Barbarus." His work seems to be an undigested medley of extracts from Africanus, Eusebius, and Castor of Rhodes, and perhaps a few unknown writers. Whatever, therefore, we know, from other sources, cannot be ascribed to Africanus, we may fairly credit to Castor, especially if it agree with

⁴Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. iv. p. 432.

⁵Thesaurus Temporum, 1658, pp. 58-85. Schoene's edition of Eusebius's *Chronicorum*, Vol. i., Appendix, pp. 177-239, contains a corrected edition of these important extracts.

what we know of his scheme of chronology. One of these extracts,⁶ relating to the Median empire, says that this kingdom lasted 269 years to the [end of the] fifty-fourth Olympiad, beginning fifty-three years before the first Olympiad, which was the fifteenth year of Uzziah, king of Judah. The Median empire began with the overthrow of Sardanapalus, king of Assyria, from whose last year to the beginning of the Assyrian empire under Ninus, Castor counts 1261 years.⁷ Therefore, Castor placed Ninus, first king of Assyria, in B. C. $(776 + 53 + 1261 =)$ 2090. Both Eusebius and Syncellus make the forty-third year of Ninus to synchronize with the birth of Abram, and as they have made some remarkable and violent alterations in Assyrian chronology to produce this synchronism, it is probable that it was derived from some earlier writer. As both of these writers' lists of Assyrian kings were derived from Castor, it is fair to assume that he was the original authority for the synchronism, especially as Africanus, the only other chronologist of note before Eusebius, cannot be the source from whence it was derived, inasmuch as he placed the beginning of the Assyrian empire⁸ 200 years before the beginning of the kingdom of Argos. If B. C. 2090 was the first of Ninus, then Castor must have placed the birth of Abram in B. C. 2048. All the earlier chronologists are agreed in counting 505 years from the birth of Abraham to the Exodus, so that

⁶Schœne, pp. 220-221.

⁷After Sardanapalus, Castor has a Ninus II., with 19 years, making the total duration 1280 years.

⁸Syncellus, *Chronographia*, ed. Dindorf, p. 236. The Exodus was placed by Africanus in B. C. 1797, in the 55th year of Phoroneus, the second king of Argos. As Inachus, the first king of Argos, has 56 years in Syncellus (p. 236), this would place the beginning of the kingdom of Argos in B. C. 1907, and the Assyrian empire in B. C. $(1907 + 199)$ 2106, which is the thirty-sixth year of the patriarch Jacob in the scheme of Africanus. Counting down, from this date, 1261 years to Sardanapalus, we reach B. C. 845. Africanus placed the first Olympiad in B. C. 778, so that he would seem to have placed the end of the Assyrian empire 67 years before the first Olympiad. In Schœne, p. 214, the Assyrian list of the "Auctor Barbarus" does, in fact, end at that date. This extract is therefore from Africanus.

Castor's date for that event was probably (2048—505) B. C. 1543. Uzziah he placed, as we have seen, fifteen years before the end of the Assyrian empire, which he dates 53 years before the first Olympiad, that is, in B. C. (776 + 53 + 15 =) 844. From the second of Solomon to Uzziah the present book of Kings gives (40 — 1 =) 39 + 95 (from Rehoboam to Athaliah) + 6 Athaliah + 40 Joash + 29 Amaziah = 209 years. But Theophilus, Clemens, Africanus, and therefore probably Castor also, give thirty-nine years to Amaziah. We have, consequently, 219 years from the building of the temple to the reign of Uzziah, which would place the building of the temple in (844 + 219 =) 1063, leaving an interval of (1543—1063) 480 years between it and the Exodus.

13. There is, moreover, internal evidence that the 480 years are authentic. In Judges x. 7, 8 it is distinctly stated that the Ammonite and Philistine oppressions began in the same year, and in Judges xi. 26, Jephthah counts, in round numbers, 300 years from the last year of the wandering in the desert to the Ammonite oppression. If the whole period from the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon was 480 years, it must be thus divided:—

1. Wandering in the desert.....	39	years.
2. To the Ammonite and Philistine oppressions.....	300 + x	“
3. From double oppression to the fourth year of Solomon...141 — x	“	“
Total.....	480	“

As Jephthah speaks in round numbers, we may be sure that the second period is more than 300 and less than 350 years.

The Philistine oppression continued down to the judgeship of Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 5—14). Its duration was 40 years 7 months (see Judges xiii. 1, and compare 1 Sam. iv. 18; vi. 1; vii. 2), which is thus proved: The judgeship of Eli was twenty years (so the LXX. in 1 Sam. iv. 18—the Hebrew has 40 years), the ark was in the country of the Philistines, from the death of Eli, seven months (1 Sam. vi. 1), and its abode in Kiriath-jearim until the judgeship of Samuel was 20 years

(1 Sam. vii. 2) and 20 y. + 7 m. + 20 y. = 40 years 7 months. The forty years of Judges xiii. 1 are a round number. According to St. Paul (Acts xiii. 20, 21), Samuel and Saul ruled together forty years. David was king for 40 years 6 months (2 Sam. v. 5), and the 480 years expire in the fourth year of Solomon. This gives us, for period 3, 40 y. 7 m. + 40 y. + 40 y. 6 m. + 4 y. = 125 y. The composition of the 480 years was, therefore, as follows:—

1. Wandering in the desert.....	40 years.
2. From Joshua to double oppression of Ammonites and Philistines.....	315 “
3. From Philistine oppression to 4 Solomon.....	125 “
	Total.....480

14. According to Josephus,⁹ Saul reigned twenty years, which would allow the same number of years for Samuel's judgeship, if St. Paul's forty years (Acts xiii. 20, 21) for Samuel and Saul are correct. But Josephus¹⁰ has only twelve years for Samuel, or eight years less than the truth. If we examine the chronology of Eastern Canaan during period 3, we shall see at once where Josephus got his twelve years. The Ammonite oppression lasted eighteen years (Judges x. 8), after which, according to Judges xii. 7, 14, the following judges ruled: Jephthah 6 years + Ibzan 7 years + Elon 10 years + Abdon 8 years. The sum total, from the Ammonite invasion, is 49 years. Down to Saul's first year the chronology of Western Canaan has (40 y. 7 m. + 20 y.) 61 years, so that these forty-nine years expire in the eighth of Samuel's judgeship, leaving twelve years for Samuel's rule over the whole land. It is only on the supposition that the period from the double oppression to Saul was sixty-one years, and that Jephthah began to judge in Eastern Canaan in the nineteenth year of the Philistine oppression over the west, that we can thus satisfactorily explain Josephus's number.

15. From the death of Moses the book of Judges gives

⁹Antiquities of the Jews, Book vi. chap. xiv. § 9.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, Chap. xiii. § 5.

us the following sums down to the double oppression: Joshua x years + Oppression under Cushan Rishathaim 8 years + Judgeship of Othniel 40 years + Oppression under Eglon 18 years + Judgeship of Ehud 80 years + Oppression under Jabin 20 years + Judgeship of Deborah and Barak 40 years + Midianite oppression 7 years + Judgeship of Gideon 40 years + Abimelech 3 years + Judgeship of Tola 23 years + Judgeship of Jair 22 years. This gives us a total of 301 + x years. As the total duration of period 2 is 315 years (§ 13) the "x" of Joshua is fourteen years, and the chronology of the 480 years is as follows:—

Wandering in the desert, under Moses, 40 years.....	1438	B. C.
Joshua, judge 14 years	1398	"
Servitude under Cushan Rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, 8 years.....	1384	"
Othniel, judge. Rest for 40 years.....	1376	"
Servitude under Eglon, king of Moab, 18 years.....	1336	"
Ehud judge. Rest for 80 years	1318	"
Servitude under Jabin, king of Canaan, 20 years.....	1238	"
Deborah and Barak judges. Rest for 40 years	1218	"
Servitude under Midian for 7 years.....	1178	"
Gideon judges 40 years.....	1171	"
Abimelech 3 years.....	1131	"
Tola judges 23 years.....	1128	"
Jair judges 22 years.....	1105	"
Ammonite oppression in the East for 18 years.....	1083	"
Philistine oppression in the West for 40 years 7 months.....	1083	"
Eli judges Western Canaan, 20 years.....	1083	"
End of Ammonite oppression. Jephthah judges 6 years.....	1065	"
Death of Eli and capture of the ark which remains among the Philistines 7 months.....	1063	"
Ark taken to Kiriath-jearim where it remains 20 years. Samson judges 20 years ¹¹	1062	"
Ibzan judges in Eastern Canaan 7 years.....	1059	"
Elon judges in Eastern Canaan 10 years.....	1052	"
End of the Philistine oppression. Samuel judges in Western Canaan and Abdon in Eastern Canaan 8 years.....	1042	"
Samuel judges the whole land 12 years.....	1034	"
Saul first king of Israel 20 years.....	1022	"
David king of Israel 40 years 6 months.....	1002	"

¹¹He was born about the beginning of the Philistine oppression (see Judges xiii. 1-5), therefore he could not have been judge until about B. C. 1062, when he was about twenty years of age.

Solomon associated for 6 years (See "Key" § 23).....	968	"
Death of David. Solomon reigns alone 34 years.....	962	"
4th year of Solomon.....	959	"

16. From the division of the land under Joshua, which took place in the seventh year after the death of Moses¹² to the end of the judgeship of Samuel are (1398 — 1022)376 — 7 = 369 years, which seems to contradict St. Paul (Acts xiii. 19, 20), who appears to reckon for this interval 450 years. But the best critics are now agreed that instead of *beginning* at the division of the land under Joshua, these 450 years end at that point. The revised English version, based on the most ancient manuscripts, supported by the Vulgate, so reads. And if we assume that St. Paul, like his cotemporary, St. Stephen (Acts vii. 6), had in mind the 400 years of oppression in Egypt (compare Acts xiii. 17), and made that his starting-point, the 450 years—a round number—are easily explained, for the 400 years of oppression + 40 years wandering in the desert + 7 years to the division of the land under Joshua make 447 years.

17. The genealogies of the Bible, when properly explained, confirm our chronological system in the most remarkable manner. It will have been noticed, by any one who has given even the slightest attention to the subject, that these lists are constructed in symmetrical groups in which the number "seven" plays an important part. Names are dropped to secure a fixed number of generations,¹³

¹²Caleb, son of Jephunneh, was one of the spies sent by Moses to Canaan, in the second year of the wandering (Num. x. 11; compare xiii. 1-6). He was then 40 years old (Josh. xiv. 7). At the time of the division of the land he was 85 years old (Josh. xiv. 10). As the wandering in the desert, under Moses, lasted 40 years, this gives us (2+85-40) 7 years from the death of Moses to the division of the land.

¹³Compare the genealogy from David to Jehoiachin, in Matthew i. 6-11 with 1 Chron. iii. 1-16. Ezra (chap. vii. 1-6) makes himself the 17th in descent from Aaron, who is placed 23 generations before the Captivity in 1 Chron. vi. 3-15. From Zadok, the cotemporary of David, to the Captivity, the 6th chapter of 1 Chronicles has 13 generations, whereas the royal line of Judah, for the same period, has 19 generations in 1 Chron. iii. Com-

and where a genealogy is handed down in two forms, the second table, while giving the same number of generations, selects, in some cases, different names.¹⁴ These peculiarities occur so frequently as to preclude the idea of accident. The symmetrical and artificial arrangement of the genealogies was evidently designed for a particular purpose. What this purpose was it will now be our business to examine. The first book of Chronicles is the principal store-house of these family registers, and if we confine our attention to the genealogical tables of Jacob and his twelve sons (chap. ii.–ix.), we find that they are of very unequal length, and end at different periods. Some do not go further than the time of the Exodus, as for example the line of Ephraim (c. vii. 20–27), while others, the line of David, for instance (c. iii.), extend to the time of Ezra. An investigation in detail shows that all the lists end at one or the other of the following points: (1) The entry into Egypt in 1678 B. C. seems to be the starting-point (Gen. xlv. 1–27). As Joseph was thirty-nine years old at that time (compare Gen. xli. 46, 47 and xlv. 11), Judah, his brother, was probably not much more than forty-five. As he had a grown-up son, Shelah (Gen. xxxviii. 14), when his two sons Pharez and Terah (ver. 29, 30) were born, these two children must have been mere infants in 1678 B. C., yet the table (in Gen. xlv. 13) gives two sons (Hezron and Hamul) of Pharez, who could not have been born until about 1636 B. C., as a generation, before the time of Solomon, was considered as being equal to 42 years, as we shall show in succeeding sections (§§ 19, 22, 23). Benjamin, who was but a child at the time of the going down to Egypt (Gen. xliii. 8; xlv. 20–22) has ten sons in the table of 1678 B. C. (Gen. xlv. 21). It is clear that this list was taken from a later genealogical table made about 1636 B. C.

pare also St. Matthew's genealogy of Christ, from Salathiel to Joseph (i. 12–16), which has 13 generations with the same genealogy in St. Luke (iii. 24–27), which has 21 generations.

¹⁴Compare the two genealogies of Ahimoth in 1 Chron. vi. 22–26 and ver. 35–39, of Asaph in ver. 20–22 with ver. 39–44, and of Heman in ver. 26–29 with ver. 33–35.

(2) The second "numbering" appears to have been taken in the second year of the wandering in the desert (Num. i. 1), that is in B. C. 1437. The numbering in the last year of the wandering, in Num. xxvi., would, of course, include those born about the time of the Exodus. As the entrance into Egypt was in B. C. 1678, and Jacob's sons were then about forty-five years old, we have, from their birth to the fortieth year of the wandering ($1678 + 45$) $1723 - 1398 = 325$ years, or nearly eight generations at forty-two years each. Therefore the genealogy of Asher (1 Chron. vii. 30-40), which goes down to the eighth generation, ends at the second numbering in the desert. Manasseh's genealogy (vii. 14-19), and that of Ephraim (vii. 20-29), end at the Exodus.

(3) In 1 Chron. iv. there are a number of detached genealogies of the line of Judah which appear to go down to the third generation after the Exodus, for Othniel, who married the daughter of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, in the time of Joshua, was then about forty years old, as his father-in-law was then eighty-five, which would place Othniel's birth about the time of the Exodus. In verse 14 of 1 Chron. iv., the genealogy goes down to his grandson Ophrah. Shobal (ver. 4) was one of the "sons" of Caleb, and the "father," that is first settler, of Kiriath-jearim; therefore he was born about the same time as Othniel. His genealogy goes down to the fourth generation (iv. 1, 2): 1. Shobal, 2. Reaiah, 3. Jahath, 4. Ahumai. The remaining genealogies in this chapter, although somewhat confused and incomplete, appear to end about the third or fourth generation from the Exodus. Counting a generation as equal to forty-two years, the register from which these lists were extracted must have been made about (42×2) 84 years after the Exodus, that is B. C. $(1438 - 84) = 1354$.

(4) The next registration was made in the reign of David (1 Chron. xxi. 1, 2). David was born B. C. 1032 (as he was thirty years old at his accession in B. C. 1002) and the "numbering" in his reign must have ended with the generation born about his own time.

(5) From Zabad, the great-grandson of Ahlai, one of the captains of David, to Elishama, with whom the line of Jerahmeel ends (1 Chron. ii. 37, 42) there are eleven generations. The royal line of Judah, in the eleventh generation from David, has Jotham. Meribaal (or Mephibosheth) the son of Jonathan, was five years old, at the time of David's accession (2 Sam. iv. 4). He was therefore a cotemporary of David. Down to Azrikam, the end of the line of Benjamin (1 Chron. ix. 40-44) the descendants of Meribaal number eleven generations. This table, therefore, likewise ends in the time of Jotham. That a genealogical register was taken in his reign is expressly stated in 1 Chron. v. 17.

(6) The last registration of genealogies was made in the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. The line of David ends there, for the Hattush, grandson of Shecaniah, of 1 Chron. iii. 22, is evidently the same as the "Hattush of the sons of Shecaniah," whose son, Daniel, was one of those who "went up from Babylon" with Ezra in B. C. 458 (Ezra viii. 1-3).

We have then six registers which appear to have been made about the following periods: (1) B. C. 1638; (2) B. C. 1438; (3) B. C. 1354; (4) B. C. 1032; (5) B. C. 757-748; (6) B. C. 458. Now if we bear in mind that a generation, before the time of David, was counted as forty-two years, the intervals between these various genealogical registers are all seven generations apart from some fixed chronological epoch. Seven generations are 294 years, and adding 294 years to B. C. 458 we come to B. C. 752, in the reign of Jotham (the 5th registration). Add 294 years to B. C. 752, and we come to B. C. 1046, or just before the birth of David (4th registration). Add 294 years to B. C. 1046 and we come to B. C. 1340—that is (1438—1340) 98 years after the Exodus, or in the third generation after that date, at which point the third registration must be placed as we have shown above. If we go up 294 years higher we come to (1340 + 294) B. C. 1634, when the first registration of the sons and grandsons of Jacob must have been made. If we place the birth of the sons of Jacob about forty-five or fifty years before B. C. 1678, or in

B. c. 1728, then 294 years down from that point will bring us to B. c. 1434, or about the time of the second registration under Moses.

18. As 294 years are equal to seven generations of forty-two years each, or six jubilee periods, and as each of the dates of the preceding six genealogical registrations, at one of which all the lists in the Bible end, are jubilee periods, it is a fair assumption that the genealogies were arranged in multiples of seven, and that they were connected with jubilee periods as convenient mnemonic points of departure; and that they are, in fact, chronological in their intention. A consideration of the genealogy of Christ, in the Gospel of St. Matthew (chap. i.), confirms this view and throws additional light on the structure and purposes of these tables. The genealogy in question consists of, nominally, forty-two generations, from Abraham to Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, divided into three divisions of fourteen generations each. However, when we come to examine the table in detail it appears that there are, in reality, only forty generations, for David and Jehoiachin do double duty: the first is the last of the first division and first of the second division, and Jehoiachin is the last generation of the second division and the first generation of the third division. Now it is certainly remarkable that in our restoration of biblical chronology there are (1967—4) 1963 years, or only three years more than forty jubilee periods, from the birth of Abraham to the birth of Christ, allowing exactly a jubilee for each generation.

19. One of the cardinal divisions of St. Matthew's genealogy begins with the birth of Jehoiachin, which, as has been shown, ("Key" § 14) must be placed in B. c. 605—a jubilee period. From Jehoiachin to Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, there are, in this genealogy, fourteen generations. As these tables are all connected with jubilee periods we will take the one immediately preceding the birth of Christ, viz., B. c. 17, as the probable terminus of the scheme, and if we deduct it from 605 we get 588 years, or twelve jubilee peri-

ods, which gives forty-two years for each of the fourteen generations.

If we assume the same number of years for each generation in the second division of fourteen generations, we get (605 + 588) 1193 B. C. for the birth of David, which is (1193—1032) 161 years too high, if we count from the real date of David's birth, or (1193—1046) 147 years too high if we count from the nearest jubilee period to his birth. If, however, we count down from 1046 B. C. the 588 years end at 458 B. C.—the beginning of a 490 years' cycle—and it is clear, if the fourteen generations are to be preserved, as a mnemonic division, that St. Matthew, in order to give a symmetrical division of three periods of fourteen generations each, has placed his third division (605—458) 147 years too high. These 147 years are equal to three and one-half generations of forty-two years each, and as the beginning of the scheme places Abraham (1193+588) in B. C. 1781 or (1928—1781) 147 years too low, if we count from the first jubilee period in the life of Abraham, it is probable that the original table had $(42+3\frac{1}{2})$ 45½ generations,¹⁵ at 42 years each, which must be thus divided:—

(1) 21 generations from Abraham to David =	382	years	1928 B. C.
(2) 14 generations from David to the time of Ezra	588	“	1046 “
(3) 10½ generations from the time of Ezra to B. C. 17..	441	“	458 “
Total.....	1911		“

As we have shown in our former article (“Key” § 9) from Solomon the average generation was twenty-one years. This would give us, for the third division, just twenty-one generations at twenty-one years each.¹⁵ As David is the last of the generations of forty-two years, he must be counted as equivalent to two generations of twenty-one years each, and as Jehoiachin is counted twice in St. Matthew's original scheme, we would have, down to B. C. 605, another period

¹⁵St. Luke has 21 generations from Salathiel to Joseph (iii. 24-27) in place of the 13 of St. Matthew.

of 441 years, or 21 generations of 21 years each,¹⁶ leaving, between B. C. 605 and B. C. 458, 7 generations of 21 years each. This would give us the following, as the final original form of the table :—

1.	21 generations from Abraham to David inclusive at 42 years each=.....	882 years	1928 B. C.
2.	21 generations from David to Jehoiachin at 21 years each=.....	441	" 1046 "
3.	7 generations from Jehoiachin to the time of Ezra at 21 years each=.....	147	" 605 "
4.	21 generations from the time of Ezra to Joseph, at 21 years each=.....	441	" 458 "
Total.....		1911	"

20. The present scheme of St. Matthew has fourteen generations from Abraham to David, but, as we have just seen, the original scheme had twenty-one, so that seven generations have been omitted. As Salmon the son of Nahason appears to have been one of the original settlers in Canaan (1 Chron. ii. 51), he was probably born about the time of the Exodus, in B. C. 1438. The nearest jubilee period before the entrance into Egypt in B. C. 1678, was in B. C. 1732, at which date we may, approximately, place the birth of Judah. From 1732 to 1438 are 294 years, which requires just seven generations at forty-two years each. St. Matthew has only six, viz., Judah, Pharez, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, and Nahason, so that one of the missing or suppressed seven generations belongs before the Exodus, and the other six belong to the period between the Exodus and David. As St. Matthew has, for this interval, only five generations, viz., Salmon, Booz, Obed, Jesse, and David, the original list must have had (5+6) 11 to David, or 12 to Solomon inclusive. Now twelve generations, at forty-two years each, are 504 years, which will extend, in our chronology, from B. C. 1438, to

¹⁶These 21 generations are (counting David as two) as follows: 1. David, 2. Solomon, 3. Rehoboam, 4. Abia, 5. Asa, 6. Jehoshaphat, 7. Jehoram, 8. Ahaziah, 9. Joash, 10. Amaziah, 11. Uzziah, 12. Jotham, 13. Ahaz, 14. Hezekiah, 15. Manasseh, 16. *His Son* (see "Key" § 10), 17. Amon, 18. Josiah, 19. Jehoiakim, 20. Jehoiachin.

B. C. 934, or six years before the death of Solomon, showing a perfect harmony with and confirmation of the 480 years.

21. An examination of the genealogies, from the going down to Egypt to the time of King David, remarkably confirms the foregoing view of the purpose and structure of these tables. If we take only those registers that appear to be reasonably complete, we shall find that they all agree in giving exactly fourteen generations for this interval: (1) The genealogy of Zadok, the high priest in the reign of David, (1 Chron. vi. 1-8) has: 1. Levi, 2. Kohath, 3. Amram, 4. Aaron, 5. Eleazar, 6. Phinehas, 7. Abishua, 8. Bukki, 9. Uzzi, 10. Zerachiah, 11. Meraioth, 12. Amariah, 13. Ahitub, 14. Zadok, (2) The genealogy of Ethan the Levite (1 Chron. vi. 44-47) has: 1. Levi, 2. Merari, 3. Mushi, 4. Mahli, 5. Shamer, 6. Bani, 7. Amzi, 8. Hilkiath, 9. Amaziah, 10. Hashabiah, 11. Mal-luch, 12. Abdi, 13. Kishi, 14. Ethan. (3) The genealogy of Asaph the Levite (1 Chron. vi. 16-21, 39-44) has: 1. Levi, 2. Gershom, 3. Jahath, 4. Zimmah,¹⁷ 5. Ethan, 6. Adaiah, 7. Zerah, 8. Ethni, 9. Malchiah, 10. Baaseiah, 11. Michael, 12. Shimea, 13. Berechiah, 14. Asaph. (4) The genealogy of Heman the Levite (1 Chron. vi. 16-28, compare verses 33-35) has:¹⁸ 1. Levi, 2. Kohath, 3. Amminadab, 4. Korah, 5. Assir, 6. Elkanah (same as the Elkanah of verse 26), 7. Zophai, 8. Nahath, 9. Eliab, 10. Jeroham, 11. Elkanah, 12. Samuel, 13. Joel, 14. Heman. (5) The genealogy of Mahath or Ahimoth the Levite (1 Chron. vi. 16-25, compare verses 35-38) has: 1. Levi, 2. Kohath, 3. Amminadab, 4. Korah, 5. Assir, 6. Ebiasaph, 7. Assir, 8. Tahath, 9. Uriel, 10. Uzziath, 11. Shaul, 12. Elkanah, 13. Amasai, 14. Ahimoth. (6) The genealogy of Zabab, "the son of Ahlai," one of the "valiant

¹⁷Verse 43 has a Shimei as father of Zimmah, but by comparing the parallel list in ver. 16-21 it will be seen that he is an interpolation. This is also the opinion of Lord Hervey, *Genealogies of our Lord*, p. 211, note.

¹⁸In the present text of the first book of Chronicles this genealogy is mixed up with that of Ahimoth or Mahath, but Lord Arthur Hervey, in his *Genealogies of our Lord* (pp. 214-218, note), has successfully disentangled the two lines.

men of David" (1 Chron. xi. 41), of the line of Jerahmeel (1 Chron. ii. 3-5, 9, 25-37) has: 1. Judah, 2. Pharez, 3. Hezron, 4. Jerahmeel, 5. Onam, 6. Shammai, 7. Nabad, 8. Appaim, 9. Ishi, 10. Sheshan, 11. Ahlai, 12. Attai, 13. Nathan, 14. Zabad. (7) The genealogy of Simeon (1 Chron. iv. 24-37) has: 1. Simeon, 2. Shaul, 3. Shallum, 4. Mibsam, 5. Mishma, 6. Hamuel, 7. Zacchur, 8. Shimei, 9. Shemaiah (verse 37), 10. Shimri, 11. Jedaiah, 12. Allon, 13. Shiphi, 14. Ziza. (8) The genealogy of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh. There is much confusion as to the identity of the various Calebs mentioned in the first book of Chronicles, but as Caleb, son of Jephunneh, had a daughter named Achsah (Josh. xv. 16) the Caleb of 1 Chron. ii. 49, who likewise has a daughter Achsah, must be the same person. We know from Scripture that Caleb, son of Jephunneh, was a prince of the house of Judah. The father of Achsah of the book of Chronicles is called the son of Hur, in ii. 50, which may be reconciled with the statement that he was the son of Jephunneh, by assuming that he married a daughter of Hur, and was, therefore, reckoned as his son.¹⁹ This will give us the following genealogy (1 Chron. ii. 1-5, 18-19, 42-46): 1. Judah, 2. Pharez, 3. Hezron, 4. Caleb, 5. Hur, 6. Caleb, "the son of Jephunneh," 7. Mesha, 8. Ziph, 9. Maresha, 10. Hebron, 11. Rekem, 12. Shammal, 13. Maon, 14. Bethzur.

Now if we count from the approximate date of the birth of the sons of Jacob, viz., 1732 B. C., to the jubilee period just before the birth of David, viz., 1046 B. C., we have just 686 years, or fourteen jubilee periods, that is, in all of these eight genealogies a generation was counted as being equal to a jubilee period. This is further confirmed by analyzing these lists into their two principal divisions (1) from 1732 to the Exodus, and (2) from the Exodus to the birth of David. From 1732 to 1438 are 294 years, which will require six generations of forty-nine years each down to the

¹⁹Similar cases occur elsewhere, thus Salmon is the son of Caleb in one place and the son of Nahason in another, and Salathiel is the son of Zorobabel in St. Matthew and of Neri in St. Luke.

Exodus, and eight generations of forty-nine years from the Exodus to the time of David. That this division is recognized in Scripture is clear: (1) Caleb, son of Jephunneh, was eighty-five years old at the time of Joshua's conquest of Canaan (Josh. xiv. 10), he therefore belongs to the generation preceding the Exodus: he is the sixth in descent from Judah. (2) Salmon, the son of Nahason, was the "father" (that is, first settler) of Bethlehem (1 Chron. ii. 51), he was therefore born about the time of the Exodus: he is seventh in descent from Judah. (3) The genealogy of Samuel (1 Sam. i. 1) goes back to Zophai, probably the first settler of Ramathaim-Zophim, hence born about the time of the Exodus: he is the seventh in descent from Levi. (4) The daughters of Zelophehad (Num. xxvii. 1) were probably born at or after the time of the Exodus, as we first hear of them in the fortieth year of the wandering in the desert. This is proved by their genealogy: they are seventh in descent from Joseph, viz.: 1. Joseph, 2. Manasseh, 3. Machir, 4. Gilead, 5. Hephher, 6. Zelophehad. (5) The genealogy of Saul (1 Sam. ix. 1) goes back to a certain Benjamin, who, in analogy with the genealogy of Samuel in the same book, was probably the first settler in Canaan. Down to Jonathan, the son of Saul, we have the following series: 1. Benjamin, 2. Aphiah, 3. Bechorath, 4. Zeror, 5. Abiel, 6. Kish, 7. Saul, 8. Jonathan. As Jonathan at his death left a son five years old, he was probably about the same age as David. Hence these eight generations agree exactly with the number required from the Exodus to David.

22. Eight generations (or jubilee periods), from the Exodus in B. C. 1438 to David, would give us, to B. C. 948, ten generations. We have shown that St. Matthew's authority must have had twelve generations at forty-two years each for the same period. There are sufficient traces remaining to show that while the arrangement by jubilees was the general mnemonic disposition of the genealogies, the actual number of generations was counted at forty-two years each. (1) Several of the genealogies, just considered, appear in

two versions, in which, while the number of generations remain the same, the names do not always agree. It has been held that these variations represent the same persons mentioned in the other list under a different name. We prefer to assume that they are separate generations purposely suppressed to bring out the reckoning by jubilees. The following lists have the lacking two generations: (a) The genealogy of Mahath has, in the second list, for Nos. 9, 10, Zephaniah and Azariah. (b) Asaph's second list has for Nos. 5 and 8 the variations Joah and Jeaterai. (c) Saul's genealogy offers the following omissions: Matri (1 Sam. x. 21) and Jehiel (1 Chron. ix. 35).

(2) The genealogy of Gad (1 Chron. v. 11-15; compare verse 10) goes down to the days of Saul. The first of the line, Guni, "chief of the house of their fathers" (verse 15), cannot be identified with any of the sons or descendants of Gad in Num. xxvi. 15. He is, therefore, probably the first settler of that family in Canaan, and born about the time of the Exodus. The full number of generations, to Saul inclusive, at forty-two years each, would be ten. This genealogy has the same number: 1. Guni, 2. Abdiel, 3. Buzahi, 4. Jahdo, 5. Jehishai, 6. Michael, 7. Gilead, 8. Jaroah, 9. Huri, 10. Abihail. The children of No. 10 (verse 13) give us an eleventh generation cotemporary with David.

23. The additional generation required before the Exodus (§ 20) is proved (1) by the variation Izhar for Amminadab, in the genealogy of Levi. (2) The line of Asher, as has already been shown (§ 17) goes down to the second numbering of Moses. The eight generations are (1 Chron. vii. 30-39) as follows: 1. Asher, 2. Beriah, 3. Heber, 4. Hotham or Helem (comp. verses 32 and 35), 5. Zophah, 6. Ithran or Jether, 7. Ulla, 8. Arah. (3) Joshua's genealogy (1. Chron. vii. 20-27) is obscure. If we may assume that the Laadan of verse 26 is the same as the Eleadah of verse 20, then we should have just seven generations to the Exodus: 1. Joseph, 2. Ephraim, 3. Eleadah or Laadan, 4. Ammihud, 5. Elishama, 6. Nun, 7. Joshua. As Joshua

was 110 years old when he died (Josh. xxiv. 29.) and as his judgeship lasted fourteen years, that is (40+14) 54 years after the Exodus, he was (110—54) 56 years old in 1438 B. C., and therefore belongs to the generation preceding the Exodus.

24. The testimony of the genealogies might be extended much further if necessary, as only a few nuggets from this unexplored mine have been produced. Sufficient evidence has been given, it is hoped, to show conclusively that no curtailment of the 480 years between the Exodus and the building of the temple can be admitted, and it therefore necessarily follows that the Exodus from Egypt cannot be placed lower than B. C. 1438. If we have succeeded in establishing this point it will follow, as a matter of course, that Menephtah, the son of Rameses the Great, is not the Pharaoh of the Exodus, since no Egyptologist, except Lauth,²⁰ places his reign as high as B. C. 1438. The association of Menephtah with the Hebrew Exodus has almost reached the dignity of an article of faith in the present Egyptologist's creed, and it will probably be regarded as a kind of heresy for any one to question the synchronism. Almost every late work on Egypt seems to accept it as a matter of course. Yet when we come to analyze the arguments on which it is based, as first set forth in Lepsius's *Chronologie der Ägypter*,²¹ as has been ably done by Lieblein (*Ägyptische Chronologie*, pp. 42-44) and Nash,²² it will be seen at once that they rest on a very unsubstantial basis. We do not propose here to examine either the arguments for or against this opinion. If it can be shown that Menephtah was not the Pharaoh who was reigning in B. C. 1438, then it will need no further argument to show that his reputed connection with the Exodus must be given up. It will, accordingly, be our business in the next paper to go into a searching examination of

²⁰He identifies him with the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and ends his reign in B. C. 1491 (see *Ägypten's Vorzeit*, p. 332).

²¹Pp. 314-404, translated into English in pp. 359-498 of Horner's translation of Lepsius's Letters from Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Peninsula of Sinai.

²²See also chap. v. of Nash's Pharaoh of the Exodus.

Egyptian chronology, in which we hope to establish, by incontrovertible astronomical evidence, that our restoration, based entirely on internal evidence furnished by the Egyptian dynastic lists themselves, when compared with our system of biblical chronology, agrees with it at every point where the two chronologies come in contact. A most remarkable series of synchronisms between Egyptian and biblical history will be evolved by merely comparing the two chronologies together, which will prove, to demonstration, that both schemes tell exactly the same story. In the course of the investigation it will be shown that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was reigning in B. C. 1438, and that Egyptian tradition, confirmed by astronomy, places the Exodus exactly in that year.