

Chronologies

Leslie McFall

In a recent copy of *TJ* 15(1): 62-68, 2001, Larry Pierce accused me of:-

1. Contorting the obvious meaning of the Bible (p. 66a)
2. Handling the Biblical text in an arbitrary manner (p. 67a), and
3. That I have 'too low a view of inspiration' (p. 68a).

Could I place on record what he should have gleaned from reading my four published articles on the subject of Biblical chronology, that the driving force behind all my research is to restore faith in the *Word of God* as a means of restoring faith in the *God of the Word*. If we cannot trust the *whole* Bible and every single word of it implicitly then we are no better off than the majority of Biblical scholars.

While Thiele did not go the whole way in trusting every Hebrew numeral (and I pointed this out in my article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148:4, 42-44, 1991), the fact that he accepted 95% of the numbers as having been faithfully transmitted meant that he was right 95% of the time. I had the task of trusting in the 5% he had rejected, and in doing so, and in using the key discoveries he had inductively arrived at, I was able to make full use of every Hebrew figure. I did not have to change or ignore a single Hebrew numeral to arrive at the perfect harmony that I did.

In Larry Pierce's 'longer chronology',¹ he acknowledges (and I quote him): 'We have not knowingly omitted any passages ... that contain chronological information ... Only twice does there appear to be a scribal error in transmission and even these do not affect the king list chronology' (p. 1a). Could I say that in working out my own chronology of the Hebrew kings I did not find a single instance of a scribal error?

May I, for the record, put Thiele's contribution in perspective by quoting from one of my articles:²

'Thiele has done more to re-establish trust in the accuracy of the numbers in Kings and Chronicles than any scholar before him. He has whittled down the number of alleged corruptions to only the chronological data relating to Hezekiah and Jehoiachin. This was quite an achievement. If, however, a closer examination of these data ... leads to the discovery of coregencies for them, then the last remaining evidence for corrupt numbers in Kings and Chronicles is gone' (pp. 57-58).

This I was able to achieve and I am convinced that the dates Thiele and I have worked out directly from the Hebrew texts will stand the test of time. Conservative-evangelical scholars are now in the period of fine-tuning the Thiele/McFall dates to a year either side of our dates, none of which contradict the latest studies in Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian chronologies, which Pierce's do.

Fabricated 'facts' in Pierce's 'Ussher's time line of the divided kingdom'

On p. 1b (bottom line) he writes: 'According to the Talmuds and the Mishnah ... the viceroy always counted his first year as king when he became viceroy, not the sole king'. On p. 8b (top) this is repeated. Nowhere in these Jewish works will you find such a statement.

In any case, there are three kings of Judah who had a period as coregent/viceroy but the years of their reigns do not include their coregency period: they are Ahaz, Hezekiah and Jehoiachin. The same applies to Jehoash of the Northern Kingdom (see my article in *Themelios* 17:6-11, 1991). For a detailed study of Hezekiah's coregency see my article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 146:393-404, 1989 and also *AUSS* 30: 35-58, 1992. All these articles are based on the Hebrew text without changing or ignoring a single numeral.

Pierce mentions the year of Jubilee in Hezekiah's reign as a known, fixed date. There is no synchronism with a Jubilee year anywhere in the Bible that would enable us to plot them. What little evidence there is in Jewish literature is confused and ambiguous.

We are told that Jeroboam was crowned on the 23rd of Sivan (p. 4a middle). This is nowhere stated in the Bible.

We are informed that the 10th Jubilee occurred in Asa's 2nd or 3rd year (p. 4a line 6 from bottom). This is nowhere stated in the Bible.

We are told that the total length of the divided Kingdom was 390 years. This is nowhere stated in the Bible, nor can it be inferred because Ezekiel was in the 337th year from the Division when he was given his prophecy.

On p. 8b (middle) we are told, 'There was an interregnum of about 12 years before Zachariah came to the throne'. But in 2 Kings 15:8 we are told that Jeroboam died in the 38th year of Uzziah and Zechariah came to the throne *the same year*. Pierce flatly contradicts this stating that 'Jeroboam died in the 26th year of Uzziah', and that there was a gap of 12 years in which no king reigned! Who are we to believe, Scripture or Pierce?

Another interregnum of 9 years is said to have occurred following the death of Pekah, but the Biblical synchronisms with Ahaz shows that there was no gap between the death of Pekah and the reign of Hoshea (2 Kings 15:30). Who are we to believe, Scripture or Pierce?

List of blunders in Pierce's chronology

He has confused the kings under paragraph headed 'Jehoram'. For 'Azariah' read 'Ahaziah'; also: for 'Amaziah' read 'Ahaziah' (p. 3a). Similarly on p. 5b (middle), 'In the 17th year of Jehoshaphat, Amaziah ...'. For 'Amaziah' repeatedly read: 'Ahaziah' in the whole section following. Amaziah was a Judean king! The confusion is repeated 10 lines from the bottom and on p. 6a (20 lines from bottom).

Amaziah is said to begin his reign 'in the 47th year from

the start of Jeroboam's reign' (p. 7b, 16 lines from bottom). Wrong king, probably 'Jehu's reign' is meant.

For 'Nebuchadnezzar attacked Jerusalem ... in the third year of Jehoichin's reign' (p. 11a, middle), read, 'Jehoiakim's reign'. He has confused the father and son here.

Scribal errors in the Bible

Pierce states that the Bible is in error over the age of Ahaz when he fathered Hezekiah (p. 10a, line 110), and in error over the age of Jehoiachin when he became king (p. 12a, top).

Larry Pierce's 'longer chronology' has more in common with the longer LXX chronology (which also invents interregna) and with Faulstich's than with the inspired Hebrew chronology which has no *interregna* and no errors.

For one to set himself up as the leading authority on Biblical chronology by speaking evil against those who showed greater respect for God's Word than he has shown, does not deserve our respect. It does him no credit to denigrate men like Thiele who showed a greater respect for the Word of God than he has shown in his work which ignores discoveries made since Ussher's day. I would strongly advise all those interested in Biblical chronology to compare the scheme set out in my article, 'A Translation Guide to the Chronological Data in Kings and Chronicles', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148:3–45, 1991, with that by Larry Pierce before committing themselves on this subject.

References

1. Pierce's longer chronology can be found at: <www.answersin genesis.org/Home/Area/Magazines/tj/TJ_v15n1.asp>.
2. Some missing coregencies in Thiele's chronology, *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, vol. 30, pp. 35–58, 1992.

Larry Pierce replies

I would like to thank Dr Leslie McFall for taking the time to go through the divided kingdom article in detail, and for the Scriptural objections he has raised to what I wrote. Space will only permit me to reply to one of his items dealing with 2 Kings 15:8. This should be sufficient to show the bankruptcy of the chronology based on Assyrian conjectures.

The 390-year period for the Divided Kingdom

If the Bible told us the *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* of the 390-year period of Israel, it would help us understand what this period referred to. In Ezekiel 4:4, 5 the phrase 'iniquity of the house of Israel' is mentioned twice.

We must determine either the starting or ending point of this period to know for certain what historical period this refers to. Ezekiel tells us expressly in the prophecy concerning Edom or Mount Seir when the period ended.

In Ezekiel 35:5 we are told 'their [Israel's] iniquity had an end' and this was in the 'time of their calamity'. According to Psalm 137:7 this refers to the time when the Edomites were cheering on the destruction of Jerusalem. In Obadiah 1:9–14 the event is elaborated on in more detail. In Obadiah 1:13 it is expressly called 'the day of their (Israel's) calamity' which was the time when 'their iniquity had an end' according to Ezekiel 35:5. This ties the *terminus ad quem* to the fall of Jerusalem in 588 BC according to the Biblical chronology and from this we deduce the 390-year period refers to the time of the divided kingdom and the *terminus a quo* was in 975 BC. We are indebted to Dr Floyd Jones for this insightful information. If one checks the old commentaries like John Calvin's, we find this was not a new concept, but the studied conclusion of most Jewish rabbis with which many of the Reformers concurred. The fact now establishes an independent check on any reconstruction of length of the divided kingdom. The Assyrian reconstruction of the divided kingdom fails miserably—Ussher's does not!

McFall noted two scriptures that he claims would invalidate the concept of interregnums in the Northern Kingdom. We will deal with the concept of interregnums first.

Interregnum phobia

The concept of interregnums in Biblical history seems strange at first to those who are not aware of the history for that period. The fact that the Bible does not directly mention them should not be a concern if the information can be logically deduced from the Biblical data. The Bible does not explicitly mention viceroy relationships or the Trinity either, but these can all be logically deduced from the Scriptures and few Christians doubt these. If the logical reasoning is valid, these deduced propositions are just as scriptural as those stated explicitly. Here is a trivial example to illustrate the point. Nowhere does the Bible say Absalom was the son of a king of Israel. This fact can be deduced from the Bible because we know that Absalom was the son of David and David was a king of Israel. Therefore, applying logic, Absalom was the son of a king of Israel.

The concept of interregnums is not new and was common in this period of history among foreign nations. Therefore, we should not be surprised, given the political turmoil in the Northern Kingdom, to find one or more interregnums during the death-throes of that kingdom. The Southern Kingdom was much more stable during this time and we should not expect to find interregnums there.

From history, we know of at least four interregnums in foreign countries.

1. In 704 BC, after Arkeanos, there was no king in Babylon

for two years.¹

2. In 688 BC, there was no king in Babylon for eight years.¹
3. In 687 BC, civil disorder increased in Egypt, because there was no king for two years.²
4. In 637 BC, there was a one year interregnum in Babylon.³

All serious students of history know about these interregnums. We are not surprised that those advocating the use of the conjectured Assyrian Chronology to amend the Bible, conveniently forget about them and recoil in horror at such a concept, for they know that if the concept is allowed it is fatal to their schemes of interpretation. Neither Thiele nor McFall breathe a word about this, and, indeed, it is one of the best-kept secrets of the Assyrian Academy. Indeed Galil goes so far as to state in his basic assumptions (without proof) there were no interregnums in the Biblical chronology!³ This begs the question—‘How does he know?’

Therefore, the problem is not with the concept of interregnums, but with trying to reconcile the alleged reconstructions of Assyrian history with the Biblical chronology. In order to do so, it just so happens that two interregnums in the Northern Kingdom must be eliminated. This raises two questions:

1. Can this be done without compromising the Biblical chronology? We have shown that this is impossible but will go over the same ground in more simple terms so readers will be able to clearly see the problem.
2. How do we know the reconstruction of the Assyrian Chronology is accurate?

2 Kings 15:8

This verse says that:

‘In the thirty and eighth year of Azariah [Uzziah] king of Judah did Zachariah the son of Jeroboam reign over Israel in Samaria six months.’

McFall says that Jeroboam II died in the 38th year of Uzziah before Zachariah came to the throne. Although the actual verse mentions nothing of this (however, it may be inferred from 2 Kings 14:29), lets grant this conjecture and see if it is logically consistent with the statements of Scripture. If McFall can prove his claim correct from the Bible, then the first interregnum is a fiction of Ussher. If he cannot, then the whole Assyrian based reconstruction of the Biblical chronology is incorrect and comes tumbling down like a house of cards.

Required to Prove

There was no interregnum after the death of Jeroboam II and his son Zachariah reigned immediately after his father.

Proof

‘And Jeroboam slept with his fathers, even with the kings of Israel; and Zachariah his son reigned in his stead’ (2 Kings 14:28).

‘In the thirty and eighth year of Azariah king of Judah did Zachariah the son of Jeroboam reign over Israel in Samaria six months’ (2 Kings 25:8).

(Before we proceed, we should note that the phrase ‘reigned in his stead’ does not necessarily mean the son directly reigned after his father. If there are no other time statements relating to the transition, this may be a safe assumption to make. You can assume that if you are making a list of kings, the son ruled after his father in that order. This exact same Hebrew phrase occurs in 1 Kings 22:50 and even McFall admits that if you were to assume that Jehoram started to reign after the death of Jehoshaphat you would be incorrect. How do you know? There are other time statements that define the time when Jehoram began to reign. These must be used to qualify and interpret this verse.)

In the case before us, there indeed are other Scriptures containing time statements to consider and we cannot take 2 Kings 14:28, 15:8 in isolation:

‘In the twenty and seventh year of Jeroboam king of Israel began Azariah (Uzziah) son of Amaziah king of Judah to reign’ (2 Kings 15:1).

Therefore according to McFall, Uzziah must have been viceroy for 24 years because he was made sole king in the 27th year of Jeroboam and Jeroboam died in the 38th year of Uzziah when his son Zachariah ruled.

But the next verse states:

‘Sixteen years old was he [Uzziah] when he began to reign, and he reigned two and fifty years in Jerusalem’ (2 Kings 15:2).

We have arrived at a contradiction for it is impossible to do anything eight years before you are born (24 - 16 = 8 years)! To avoid this problem McFall says this refers to the first time Uzziah was made viceroy and the verses should now be read as follows:

‘In the twenty and seventh year of Jeroboam king of Israel began Azariah son of Amaziah king of Judah to reign *as sole king*. Sixteen years old was he when he began to reign *as a viceroy twenty-four years earlier*.’

The emphasized text in italics is McFall’s amendment interpretation to the text. This is a neat dodge and no proof is given. McFall is forced to put forth this interpretation because of his premise that there are no interregnums. The problem now gets worse for look at these verses:

‘Now they made a conspiracy against him [Amaziah] in Jerusalem: and he fled to Lachish; but they sent after him to Lachish, and slew him there.

‘And they brought him on horses: and he was buried at Jerusalem with his fathers in the city of

David.

‘And all the people of Judah took Azariah [Uzziah], which was sixteen years old, and made him king instead of his father Amaziah’ (2 Kings 14: 19–21; with a parallel passage in 2 Chronicles 25: 27–26:1).

Ask a child what these verses mean and he will tell you without exception that the people killed Amaziah and made Uzziah king when he was 16 years old. Here we have a second contradiction!

McFall is aware of this and digs himself in still deeper and says the verses must be read as follows:

‘And all the people of Judah took Azariah [Uzziah], which was sixteen years old, and made him king instead of his father Amaziah’ (2 Kings 14: 21).

‘Now [twenty-four years later] they made a conspiracy against him [Amaziah] in Jerusalem: and he fled to Lachish; but they sent after him to Lachish, and slew him there.

And they brought him on horses: and he was buried at Jerusalem with his fathers in the city of David’ (2 Kings 14:20–21).

‘Then all the people of Judah took Uzziah, who [was] sixteen years old, and made him king in the room of his father Amaziah’ (2 Chronicles 26:1).

‘Now after the time [twenty-four years later] Amaziah did turn away from following the LORD they made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem; and he fled to Lachish: but they sent to Lachish after him, and slew him there.

And they brought him upon horses, and buried him with his fathers in the city of Judah’ (2 Chronicles 25:27–28).

The king, not the people, appointed his viceroy. Israel was not a democracy, at least not when there was a living king as there would have been in this case if McFall’s conjecture is correct. The emphasized text is McFall’s amendment to the text. McFall forces an unnatural order on the historical narrative by claiming that verse 21 should really come before verse 19 in the Second Kings passage, and likewise a similar transposition in the passage cited from Second Chronicles as you can see in our reproduction. (This violates accepted rules of Hebrew grammar.) This begs the question, if the writer of Kings got the verses in the wrong order, why did not the later writer of the Chronicles fix it up? The only rationale for McFall’s amendment is trying to eliminate this interregnum. It seems the Holy Spirit has gone to great pains to make such an amendment by McFall untenable.

No proof is given for this amendment either, except for McFall’s commitment to Assyrian Chronology. Stating something is so does not prove it so. Likewise it is a *no-no* to use your conclusion as part of your proof. This informal logical fallacy has a cute Latin name *Petitio Principii* and is known in English as *begging the question*. The only way

you can prove there was no interregnum after the death of Jeroboam II is if you assume there are no interregnums and then read the scripture in that light. McFall’s rationale for this assumption is his commitment to Assyrian chronology which forces him to delete 40 or so years from the divided kingdom. If you honestly start from the Word of God and that alone, you will never arrive at a chronology remotely resembling what McFall promotes. The very fact that the best theologians down through the millennia never dreamed of this gloss McFall and Thiele force on these scriptures, should make one very wary of their novel theories.

Review of pivotal dates in Assyrian chronology

Fall of Samaria 723 BC and the Assyrian Eponym List

Lets look at a section of the Assyrian Eponym List so you can see for yourself how flimsy the evidence is for Assyrian history.

Thiele firmly declares that Samaria fell in 723 BC and adjusts the Biblical chronology two years to shift the Biblically deduced date of 721 BC to 723. (If the integrity of the scriptures was not at stake this is no big deal!) This he claims is supported by the Eponym List and publishes a copy of the list in Appendix F of his work *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*.⁴ Lets take a look at what was actually published. Jones has provided this information and I can do no better than quote him directly.⁵

‘Unfortunately, the register is badly mutilated for the years 725–720, nonetheless Luckenbill has restored them to read:⁶

However, the fact is the eye/mind cannot properly appreciate the full significance of the fragmented nature of the above even with the brackets and parenthesis present. The true extent of the mutilation can be seen below. Bear in mind that this is how the register actually appears, only without the years being listed.

This then is the *only* Assyrian evidence which is uncontested. The rationale for using it to establish the date for the fall of Samaria is:

1. The Biblical account states that the seige of Samaria lasted *three* years.
2. The Eponym List has the word ‘against’ *three* years in succession (725–723) with the name of enemy location completely missed, and
3. The coincidence of both ‘three’s’ was deemed by Luckenbill (Olmstead also) as the ‘restoration’ as shown in the first listing and subsequent ‘fixing’ of the date of the fall of Samaria as being 723 BC.⁷

This ends the quote from Jones.

As one can see the 723 BC date for the fall of Samaria rests firmly on scholarly conjecture and interpolation. There are better foundations to build a history on! There

is absolutely no evidence from the actual Eponym List to contradict the established date of 721 BC or any other date you wish for the fall of Samaria *because* the translated list, when the scholarly interpolations are deleted, *never mentions Samaria!*

Even worse for Luckenbill is a later independent translation of the Eponym List done in 1994, which has even less data and none of Luckenbill's interpolations. Consider this and note the text in [] is conjectured:

I have marked the name changes with an '*'. Note the major change in the name for the entry for 722 BC. Luckenbill did not even mark the interpolated text correctly! What this does establish is that Luckenbill has a very vivid imagination and any translation he does should be carefully checked for accuracy to make sure nothing is read into the translations.

Jehu and the Black Obelisk in 841 BC

Thiele accepts as an established fact that Jehu paid tribute to Shalmaneser in 841 BC. As we pointed out in the article, there is *no evidence* that the obelisk was actually depicting the Israelite monarch Jehu. So much for this date!

Are you surprised that the translation *scholars* use to justify this was done by Luckenbill? The only rationale for even thinking it was Jehu is the alleged presence of Ahab at the battle of Qarqar in 853 BC. Even that rests on much conjecture! Jones pointed out that the image of the individual in the picture shows him with a rounded beard, something the Jewish law had forbidden. This casts further doubt that this was really Jehu.

Ahab and the battle of Qarqar in 853 BC

This is the most critical date, for if it can be established beyond a shadow of a doubt then there are serious problems with the Hebrew Bible text we have. Again we can do no better than quote Jones on this matter:

'Simply stated, the problem begins with the fact that the "Monolith Inscription" documents that in the sixth year of his reign, Shalmaneser II (III), son of Ashur-nasir-pal (II), fought against a twelve king alliance at the battle of Qarqar (Karkar) during the eponymous year of Daian-Assur. The inscription states that one of the kings against whom King Shalmaneser II (III) engaged was a certain "A-ha-ab-bu Sir-i-la-a-a".'

Before we continue with Jones's quote note that Luckenbill translates this as *Ahab of Samaria*, and notes that he had 2,000 chariots and 10,000 men. Now the Hebrew and Assyrian language are quite closely related. In their consonantal form (as we would expect to see on inscriptions) we would expect the same names to share at least the same consonants. *In both of these cases they differ from the Hebrew consonantal form!* Hence it would

be reasonable to conclude that we are not talking about the same person as Ahab in the Bible. This is especially true when we look at the history of Ahab. His kingdom had a forty-two month drought. Today, much shorter droughts in Africa virtually eliminated the livestock including horses, and no doubt this was true in Ahab's case too. In spite of this are we to believe that Ahab had more chariots than even Solomon who only had 1,400? About seventy years earlier Israel could field an army of 800,000 men, where as now Ahab is hard pressed to get even one percent of this total. Yet we are to believe he had more chariots than Solomon! Where did all the horses come from to pull these? Also, when Ahab was attacked a few years before his death, he could only muster a force of 7,000 men. The ratio of chariots to men does not correspond to actual battles, for the number of chariots is much too high for the fighting force or the number for the men is low by at least an order of magnitude or more. Something is very wrong here.

Jones⁷ notes further:

'Most Assyriologists understand "A-ha-ab-bu Sir-i-la-a-a" to be Ahab, the Israelite. This may be true, but there are problems associated with this identification. First, the identification may be incorrect. "A-ha-ab-bu Sir-i-la-a-a" may be some other historically obscure ruler, perhaps of something no more than a city-state anywhere along the nearly three hundred mile seacoast area of the fertile crescent. Some researchers go so far as to accuse Shalmaneser II (III) of taking credit for this and other events which actually belonged to his father, Ashur-nasir-pal (II). Among them, Faulstich addresses several perceived inconsistencies or contradictions regarding military expeditions and warns:

Some of the claims of Shalmaneser are preposterous, and it would be ill-advised to reconstruct the Hebrew chronology to satisfy his inaccurate boasting.⁸

After advancing examples, he concludes:

'... that the inconsistencies in Shalmaneser's annals would make it impossible to accurately date the battle of Qarqar.'⁹

Whereas we do not concur with or endorse all of Faulstich's determinations, we cite him to expose the uncertain nature of much of the oft-cited Assyrian assertions. Nor is Faulstich alone. Daniel David Luckenbill cautions in his comments prior to Shalmaneser's royal annals that:

'It is possible that the first of these, which contained a full account of the events of the year of accession, belongs to a much earlier period.'¹⁰

Thus says Jones. Space does not permit us to deal with the second verse mentioned by McFall. See Jones's work for a full treatment of that point.

Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles

These two cycles run like a checksum through Biblical history. When one accurately reconstructs Biblical history, he should expect the cycles to agree with secular history, for Josephus records a Sabbatical year in 163 BC and 37 BC. This agrees with the start of the first Sabbatical year as deduced from the Bible by Ussher of 1445 BC and the resulting cycles. If you start to delete years (unless they are a multiple of 7 for the Sabbatic cycle) from the Divided Kingdom, you can no longer make the Sabbatic cycle agree with the observations of Josephus. Ussher noted some very interesting Jubilee years in history:

- a) When Solomon finished the temple in the eighth month (about November) of 1005 BC, he waited until the seventh month (about October) of the following year to dedicate this multi-billion dollar building—the seventh month of 1004 BC was the start of a Jubilee.
- b) The seventh month of the same year of Hezekiah's deliverance from the Assyrians in 710 BC was the start of a Jubilee.
- c) The Jubilee year in 563/562 BC marked the year when Nebuchadnezzar was freed from his insanity and Jeconiah was freed from his imprisonment.
- d) The last Jubilee in Biblical history heralded the start of the ministry of John the Baptist in the fall of AD 26.

The last three relationships are lost if one follows the Assyrian Academy's reconstruction of Biblical history. Space does not permit me to go into greater detail on this, except to note that not one of the conjectured reconstructions of the Divided Kingdom by the Assyrian Academy agrees with the Sabbatic cycles, and they do not even mention the subject! Ussher's reconstruction agrees perfectly.

Conclusion

Enough has been said to show the following:

- a) Interregnums were relatively common during this period of history, and to arbitrarily exclude them based on preconceived notions is unjustified.
- b) In dealing with the first interregnum in Israel, we have shown that you cannot eliminate them without severely undermining the obvious meaning of the text in at least five places!
- c) The Assyrian data used to eliminate the interregnums in Israel is in itself highly suspect.
- d) Except for mainly obscure spelling mistakes, none of the critics (in addition to McFall, but not mentioned here) of my article on the Divided Kingdom have been able to point to an error that required one date to be changed. This in itself undermines their position.

This is a whole new area for creationists to explore and reclaim back from the secular *scholars*. Floyd Nolen Jones's ground-breaking work, *Chronology of the Old Testament*, has opened the way for further research. Jones's work contains a much fuller treatment of the points raised

in these letters plus many other issues dealing with Biblical history. The soon planned republication, an updated version of Ussher's *Annals of the World*, will make an excellent companion volume to Jones's research.

References

1. Ptolemy, *Canon of Kings*.
2. *Diodorus Siculus*, Book 1, Chapter 66, page 227, Loeb Classical Library, 1933.
3. Galil, G., *The Chronology of the Kings of Israel and Judah*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, p. 120, 1996.
4. Thiele, E.R., *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, University of Chicago Press, 3rd printing, 1983.
5. Jones, F.N., *Chronology of the Old Testament*, KingWord Press, The Woodlands, Texas, p. 190, 1999.
6. Luckenbill, D.D., *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, Vol. II, Greenwood Press, New York, p. 437, 1968.
7. Jones, Ref. 5, pp. 159, 160.
8. Faulstich, E.W., *History, Harmony & the Hebrew Kings*, Chronology Books, Spencer, Iowa, p. 144; See pp. 143–157 where he details his thesis, 1986.
9. Luckenbill, D.D. (Ed.), *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, Vol. I, sec. 626, p. 157, University of Chicago Press, 1926.
10. Luckenbill, Ref. 9, Vol. I, sec. 626, p. 232.