

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ESTABLISHING THE CORRECT FOUNDATION	1
A. BASIC CONSIDERATIONS.....	1
B. TWO DISTINCT WORLD VIEWS.....	1
1. Man Centered World View	1
2. God Centered World View	2
3. The Author’s World View	3
4. Summary Of World Views	4
C. THE EFFECT ON BIBLE CHRONOLOGY	4
1. The Assyrian School.....	5
2. The Biblicist School	5
D. METHODOLOGY	5
E. ARCHBISHOP JAMES USSHER	6
F. THE TRIDENT	7
G. HISTORY.....	8
H. THE TEXT.....	9
1. The Samaritan Pentateuch	9
2. The Septuagint.....	10
a. Discordant Ages of the Patriarchs in the LXX.....	11
b. Discordant Lengths of Kings’ Reigns in the LXX.....	12
c. Irrefutable Internal Evidence	13
d. Final Considerations	14
3. The Faithfulness of the Hebrew Text	16
CHART ONE.....	21
A. STANDARD OR AN ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY	21
B. THE SKELETAL OUTLINE	23
C. DATE OF THE CREATION.....	26
D. THE SECOND CAINAN	29
1. Solutions of Compromise	31
2. The Biblicist Solution to Cainan II.....	32
E. GENEALOGICAL GAPS.....	36
1. Matthew 1:8.....	37
2. Matthew 1:17.....	39
3. The 14 Generations from David to the Carrying Away to Babylon: Matt. 1:17.....	41
CHART TWO	47

CHART THREE	49
A. THE 430-YEAR SOJOURN	49
B. EARLY OR LATE EXODUS	49
C. THE LENGTH OF THE SOJOURN IN EGYPT.....	53
D. HARMONIZING AND RESOLVING EXODUS 12:40.....	55
E. 430 OR 400 YEARS OF AFFLICTION?.....	57
F. THE PHARAOH(S) OF THE BOOK OF EXODUS	60
G. CHART 3A.....	61
H. CHART 3B.....	61
I. CHARTS 3C AND 3D.....	62
J. CHARTS 3E AND 3F	62
K. JACOB’S “KINDRED”	67
 CHART FOUR	 71
A. BIBLICAL JUDGES DESCRIBED AND DEFINED	71
1. THE SPAN OF THE JUDGES — 480 OR 450 YEARS	72
2. THE SKELETAL OUTLINE	76
3. THE FORTY-YEAR PHILISTINE DOMINION	78
a. Micah’s “Priest” and the Tribe of Dan.....	79
b. The Levite’s Concubine – Benjamin Decimated	80
c. Eli and His “Judgeship”	81
d. Contrasting Samson and Samuel	82
e. Establishing Samson’s Judgeship	82
f. Establishing Eli’s Death Year	84
g. Philistine Dominion Thesis Confirmation	85
B. JEPHTHAH’S 300-YEAR DECLARATION.....	85
C. THE JOSHUA-JUDGES CHASM.....	87
D. JOSHUA’S AGE.....	88
E. DAVID’S AGE AT HIS SLAYING OF GOLIATH	94
1. DAVID’S MINIMAL AGE.....	94
2. DAVID’S MAXIMUM AGE	95
F. JONATHAN’S AND DAVID’S AGE DISPARITY	97
G. DAVID’S CHRONOLOGY.....	99
H. “FORTY YEARS” AFTER WHAT?.....	101
I. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	102

CHART ONE

A. STANDARD OR AN ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY

As previously stated, the purpose of this endeavor is to construct a “standard” chronology for the span covered within the Old Testament. Specifically, the *terminus a quo* is the creation and the *terminus ad quem* is the crucifixion and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

It will be noted that the goal is that of a “standard” chronology, not an “absolute” chronology. As Scripture normally records only entire years for a given event and not the days and months, summing the years may yield an inaccurate total because the partial years were not included. After twelve years of examining numerous arguments, date placements, regnal data, ancient inscriptions, royal annals, eclipse calculations, etc., this researcher has concluded that any such assignment is not realistic of any chronology of prolonged duration.¹ Even the serious notion of an absolute chronology stretches credulity and borders on the ludicrous. The critical secular dates at the few points of synchronization have simply never been established.

For example, the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar in which the City of Jerusalem fell in conjunction with the burning of the temple has received three “absolute” dates, 588, 587 and 586 BC by various scholars of notable merit. The same may be said for the year in which Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne of Babylon, the year of Christ’s birth, the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, and the year of the Crucifixion. It must be remembered that chronology is a branch of historical science; hence, it is constantly subject to revision.

¹ One merely has to observe the numerous times qualifying words such as “if,” “probably,” “perhaps,” “it would seem,” “suggesting,” “we believe,” “presumably,” “it is possible,” etc. in any standard work such as Jack Finegan’s, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*, (Princeton: 1964) to prove to oneself the limitations regarding the accuracy of Chronology studies. This is all the more so when different calendars, regnal years, and methods of reckoning regnal year must be considered.

Each expert presents a most authoritative case for his position yet not without some assumptions, however valid they may be deemed, hence some conjecture is always present. The same is true concerning a great many of the historical dates regarding the Empires of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Syria, etc. which are germane to such a study. The most convincing is usually the one last examined by the reader. The probability of determining each of these with flawless precision borders on the impossible.

Nonetheless, it is believed that the effort herein presented is as accurate as may be attained, apart from Divine revelation, from the available data and is more than sufficient for the study of the kingdoms whose existence falls within the history of that contained in Scripture. The overall skeletal outline as presented is believed to be within three years of absolute although the dates of individual events and persons located within the outline during the latter period of the judges may be of greater error. This will be clarified in the detailed explanation of chart 4.

The final product of this dissertation is a series of chronological charts displaying the dated major events in the Old Testament which can be tested and checked by the user. This is significant because most previous works are either on a scale so minute that they must be accepted or rejected as a whole, or else they are so encumbered with extraneous data relating to other nations with whom the Hebrews came in contact such as Babylon, Egypt, Assyria, etc., as to be hopelessly bewildering to the everyday reader.

The accompanying charts portray that which the Holy Scriptures themselves state. For example, when it is written that a certain king began to reign in a specific year of the rule of another king and that he reigned for so many years, the data is accepted and charted down accordingly. It cannot be overemphasized that the charts themselves are the very heart of the dissertation. That they exist, without the context of a single Scripture having been violated, is proof of our aforementioned proposal (page iv).

Doubtless, the author will seem outrageously naive to most, for the chronology presented

herewith is so out of step with modern thinking. However it should be remembered that many brilliant scholars of the past accepted without hesitation the concept of creation as being only about 6,000 years ago. To name but a few who held to this “romantic” view includes not only Ussher, but his contemporary William Shakespeare (1564–1616) – himself a biblical scholar. Another was Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727),¹ the undisputed greatest scientist and mathematician yet to live. He was also an outstanding biblical chronologist.

Indeed unlike nearly all today who fancy themselves scientists, Newton and many of his day who cleaved to the scriptural account of creation and the Deluge were scientists in the true sense. Being well grounded in many different disciplines of scientific investigation and study, they were able to discern when a theory or hypothesis in one field violated well known well established laws and principles in that of another.

Conversely, most moderns specialize to the point that they have no broad scientific base upon which to stand. The result is that while theorizing in their field (e.g., geology, biology) they are oblivious to the fact they are moving against the laws of physics, chemistry and statistics. In so doing they venture farther and further from reality and fact, all the time deluded that such flights of imagination are science.

Newton defended the chronology of Ussher against those who tried to push back the date of creation and wrote powerful refutations on atheism while defending the literal six day Bible creation account. Moreover, he believed that the worldwide flood of Noah’s day accounted for most of the geologic phenomena

¹ Sir Isaac Newton is the discoverer of the law of universal gravitation, the formulation of the three laws of motion, the binomial theorem, the calculus (a basic tool in the more exact fields of science) and anticipated the great law of the conservation of energy. As an astronomer, Newton constructed the first reflecting telescope. He held the chair of Mathematics at Cambridge for 33 years, represented the university in Parliament and for 24 years was president of the Royal Society (a group of scientists whose names read like “Who’s Who”). In 1705 he was knighted and upon his demise in his eighty-fifth year, buried in Westminster Abbey. Newton made a hobby of chronology, becoming its avid student during the last 30 years of his life.

observed in his day. Newton authored two volumes addressing biblical chronology: *The Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel*, and the great work, *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*, published posthumously in 1728. In the latter, Newton decimated and overthrew the current dates of Greek, Latin and Egyptian chronology demonstrating the impossibility of using any of their chronologies as a stable foundation which could be used as a standard.

The actual fact is that neither geology, paleontology, nor any evolutionist can extract precise dating for the age of the earth and the antiquity of man. As creation scientists have shown that all radiometric dating, including radiocarbon, is inaccurate, historical records are still the only reliable method of obtaining these dates.² It cannot be overemphasized that all the actual historical records agree in substance with the so-called “short chronology” as found in the Bible. Significantly longer chronologies, which are required to support the modern dogma of evolution, are all based on uniformitarian extrapolation and other assumptions associated with particular present physical processes.

As can be demonstrated, all such calculations are founded upon unproven, untestable, and often illogical and unreasonable assumptions;³ thus they can never be accurate or reliable in obtaining actual historical dates. We proclaim and shall show that the Word of the Living God is the most accurate and trustworthy source. Hence the weight of the scientific data, when properly understood, is firmly in support of a recent creation and the chronology of history which is in accord with the biblical record. Comprehending this, we unashamedly stand beside the promises of God to preserve His Word as inerrant as He originally gave it and beside such men of God from the past whose faith stands forth unto this day.

² See Harold S. Slusher, *Critique of Radiometric Dating*, *op. cit.*, p. 1–43; Henry M. Morris, *The Scientific Case for creation*, *op. cit.*, p. 43–64; Gerald E. Aardsma, *Radiocarbon and the Genesis Flood*, *op. cit.*, p. 1–22; and Thomas G. Barnes, *Origin and Destiny of the Earth’s Magnetic Field*, (San Diego, CA: Master Books, 1973), p. 1–64.

³ *Ibid.*

B. THE SKELETAL OUTLINE

Chart 1 is simple, direct and straightforward. The major problem here lies in the fact that it is at this point that a principal date must be determined, one which will affect all anterior values. The date is that of the fall of the Kingdom of Judah with the subsequent burning of the temple, destruction of the city of Jerusalem along with its walls and the accompanying deportation (the third) of most of its citizens to Babylon. The Scriptures date this as occurring in the 19th year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar (cp. Jer. 52:12–14; 32:1; and see page 125).

This is critical from a chronological perspective as it represents one of only three places where firm dated secular historical events overlap the Scriptures, thus forming a connecting bridge between the two. The others are the fourth year of Jehoiakim with Nebuchadnezzar's first which was also the year of the great battle of Carchemish (Jer. 25:1; 46:2), and the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar with the 30th year of our Lord Jesus, the Christ (Luke 3:1,23). Moreover, it is only at these infrequent bridges that Bible chronology may be assigned and fixed as to a "BC" designation (this study uses Gregorian, not astral or Julian dates, see page 287). All other biblical dates are so assigned by numbering backward and forward from these three anchor points.¹ Thus, if we err at these contact points the mistake will be uniformly disseminated throughout the chronology.

The date of the fall of Jerusalem has been taken as 586 BC (see appendix N, page 309). About 80 percent of the previous works concur. The years 588 and 587 also receive able support by careful men. For example Ussher, who held to the 588 BC date,² was later upheld by Henry Browne.³ They have recently been joined in

that decision by Eugene W. Faulstich,⁴ whereas Henry Fynes Clinton championed 587 BC.⁵ Clinton's conclusions were later vigorously upheld by Sir Robert Anderson, who was for many years head of the criminal investigation division of Scotland Yard.⁶

Much later William F. Albright⁷ joined Clinton and Anderson in upholding 587 as the year of Jerusalem's destruction at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar. More recently, this date has received even wider credence and acceptance within academic circles due to the fact that Donald J. Wiseman, formerly of the British Museum and later professor of Assyriology at the University of London, published in its favor.⁸ biblically the latter date has much in its favor and if it were known to be the true date, this writer would neither find it offensive nor an incompatible adjustment with the aforementioned guidelines in establishing a "standard" chronology.

As can readily be seen from the chart, once the BC date of the fall in the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar's rule has been established, the other major Bible occurrences are "fixed" by measuring from 586 BC. The span from that year to a given biblical event is determined exclusively by using data gleaned directly from the Scriptures themselves, adding them to this 586 BC base until we arrive at a date for the creation.

The first decisive Scripture is Ezekiel 4:4–5 where the Word of God indicates that the period of time from the division of the monarchy to the final fall of Judah to Babylon is a span of 390 years. Thus, beginning at 586 we number back 390 years arriving at 975 BC (inclusive numbering hence minus one) to arrive at the

¹ A fourth is the year Evil Merodach began to reign with the 37th year of Jeconiah's captivity. A "recently" reported lunar eclipse and c.30 astral observations in the 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar helps solidify this bridge, but more effort is required than for the other three.

² James Ussher, *Annals of the World*, revised by Larry & Marion Pierce, (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2003), p. 104–107 (1658 ed., p. 91).

³ Henry Browne, *Ordo Saeclorum*, (London: John Parker Pub., 1844), p. 185, 230.

⁴ Faulstich, *History, Harmony and the Hebrew Kings*, *op. cit.*, p. 77, 218–220.

⁵ Henry Fynes Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. I, (Oxford, England: 1834), appendix, p. 319.

⁶ Sir Robert Anderson, *The Coming Prince*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1882), appendix I, p. 230–237.

⁷ William F. Albright, "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 100 (1945), p. 16–22.

⁸ D.J. Wiseman, *Nebuchadrezzar And Babylon*, (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 37.

date of the death of Solomon whereupon the Kingdom divided.

$$586 + 390 = 976 - 1 = 975 \text{ BC (inclusive)}$$

This Ezekiel passage is most significant for it takes the date of the division of the kingdom out of the hands and subjective devising of man, chronologist and archaeologist alike, and sets a fixed God given mathematical value of 390 years for the interval. This is confirmed by the lengths of the reigns of the kings of Judah from Rehoboam's 1st year to Zedekiah's 11th. However the justification for this interpretation and its application shall await our discussion of the fifth chart. As it will be seen at that time, this is the basic concept behind the laying out of chart 5 although the time span is extended to the days of Alexander the Great for clarity and completeness.

From 975 BC, one merely continues back to Adam. The 40-year dominion of Solomon is added to this 975 taking us back to 1015 BC, the year David died and Solomon began his sole reign. To this established date three years must be subtracted in order to arrive at the inception of the temple construction, Solomon's having begun the work but three years one month and two days from his coronation (1 Kings 6:1; 2 Chron. 3:1-2). As will be documented later, Solomon's coronation as sole rex would have taken place in the month Abib of the year 1015 BC (Nisan, not Tishri as Edwin R. Thiele maintains; cp. 1 Kings 6:37-38), hence the first months of his fourth year would fall in the year 1012, not 1011. Before continuing, the reader should prove this by taking a few moments and sketching this for himself.

$$975 + 40 = 1015 \text{ BC} - 3 = 1012 \text{ BC}$$

From the commencement of the temple back to the Exodus spans 480 years (1 Kings 6:1). Note that only 479 is actually added, as the work began very early in the 480th year as Ussher also detected:¹

When the Israelites are said to go out of Egypt the fifteenth day of the first moneth (Num. 33:3): and Solomon to begin to build the temple, in the 480 year after their departure (1 Kings 6:1), on the second day of the second

month (2 Chron. 3:2), the moneths and dayes which bound each termination of that Period, shew, that 11 moneths and 14 dayes are to be taken away; and not that the whole 480, but only 479 years, and sixteen dayes are to be taken for the space of that Period.

This places the year of the Exodus under Moses' leadership at 1491 BC.

$$1012 + 479 = 1491 \text{ BC}$$

Many theories regarding this "480"-year passage have been proposed. For now, it is merely being set forth demonstrating the method and relative ease with which one may move back through time to the creation as depicted on the first chart. An appropriate defense is given in the discussion of the fourth chart where it more properly belongs. The resolving of this problem and the disposition of this number is most critical to any biblical chronology.

Having established 1491 as the year of Exodus, a period of 430 years representing the time from that point unto the covenant which God made with Abraham when he entered the land of Canaan must be added. This takes us to 1921 BC, the year Abraham's father, Terah, died and he departed from Haran, entering into the land of promise.

$$1491 + 430 = 1921 \text{ BC}$$

By comparing Genesis 12:4; Exodus 12:40; and Galatians 3:17, the much debated 430-year epoch can be properly understood. Never is it said in these Scripture references that the Jews dwelt in or were slaves in Egypt for 430 years. Rather, they teach that the duration of their sojourn from the time Abraham (Abram) entered the promised land until the giving of the Law three months after the Exodus was that of 430 years.

That is, Exodus 12:40 does not say that the children of Israel sojourned 430 years in Egypt. It does say that the sojourn of that particular branch of Abraham's lineage as traced through Isaac and Jacob, with which we are specifically concerned, was the group which eventually went down to Egypt.

In other words, it is a statement of identification as to which of Abraham's lineage's the narrative is dealing as Abraham had numerous other lineages, i.e., that of

¹ Ussher, *Annals, op. cit.*, "The Epistle to the Reader," p. 8 (1658 ed., p. iii).

Ishmael and also many offspring from his marriage to Keturah (Genesis 25). The verse is telling us which children of Abraham are being focused upon, not how long they were in Egypt. That the lineage of Isaac was the branch selected by God is indisputable for “in Isaac shall thy seed be called” (Genesis 21:12c, cp. 17:19,21 and Hebrews 11:17–18). All this will be enlarged upon when the third chart is explored; for now only enough is being given to establish the general method and logic in the outline exhibited on the first chart.

To the year 1921 BC we must add the number of years from the Flood to the covenant with Abraham in order to derive the year of the Deluge. A misjudgment is often made at this point leading many investigators into a sixty-year error. Although chart 1 directs the reader to the sixth chart for the derivation of this span, an explanation is deemed appropriate at this point in order to establish the correctness of the logic and methods employed in the preparation of the skeletal outline found on the first chart.

Numerous authorities determine this span as being 367 years instead of 427 because they either fail to notice or accept the data given in Genesis 11 and 12 as being genuine. That is, many authorities have been speared by the trident, consequently they have erroneously concluded that the Scriptures contain errors.

Others fall into this error due to the fact that Genesis 11:26 says that Terah was 70 years old when he began to beget sons. The verse places Abraham (Abram) first in the list of Terah’s three sons, hence they assume without further consideration Abraham to be the firstborn. They then total the life spans of the patriarchs in Genesis 11:10-25 obtaining 222 years, add to that 70 for Terah’s age when he supposedly fathered Abraham and 75 for Abraham’s age when he left Haran and entered Canaan (Gen. 12:4) deriving the sum of 367 years.

The problem with this calculation is that it is based upon a faulty presumption. Albeit Abraham’s name is given first, he was not the firstborn son. Logic and proper scientific bearing demand that before coming to final conclusions, one first obtains and considers all data pertinent to a problem. Comparing Genesis 11:32 with 12:4, it may be seen that Abraham was 75 when Terah died at age 205.

From this, the fact is firmly established that Terah was 130 years old ($205 - 75 = 130$) when Abraham was born. This means that although Terah was 70 when he had his first son, that son could not have been Abraham; it had to have been either Nahor or Haran.

Moreover, that was one of the main reasons why God had to remove Abraham from Ur. As long as he remained there, he would never become the head of the family clan for, by the law of primogeniture, the firstborn son would have so been. Why was Abraham listed first? Because he was the son who received the blessing and the birthright. This is most important to perceive and a biblical precedence had already been given.

When speaking of Noah’s sons Shem, Ham and Japheth, Shem’s name is always mentioned first because he received the birthright and the blessing (Gen. 9:26; Luke 3:36), hence we find the Messiah coming through his lineage. However, Genesis 9:24-25 speaks of Ham as being the youngest son, 10:21 unmistakably says Japheth was the elder, leaving Shem as the middle son. Likewise Isaac is placed before Ishmael in 1 Chron. 1:28 although Isaac was not the older but the younger of the two. The 427 years is thus obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} & 222 \text{ Total of patriarchs' life spans in Gen. 11:10-25} \\ & + 130 \text{ Add Terah's age of 130 when Abram was born} \\ & + 75 \text{ Abraham's age when he left Haran (Gen. 12:4)} \\ & = 427 \text{ years} \end{aligned}$$

At the inception of this research, it was not known by the author that the time from the Flood to the beginning of Abraham’s sojourn was such a point of contention. Years after having independently solved the puzzle, it was learned that Ussher was the first to make the correction of Terah’s age from 70 years to 130 at the birth of Abraham (*Annals*, p. 4), again justifying our admiration for his insight and careful attention.

To obtain the year of the Flood, take the 1921 BC date derived previously as the year of Terah’s death when Abraham departed from Haran, entering into the land of promise and beginning the sojourn, and add the preceding 427 years.

$$1921 + 427 = 2348 \text{ BC (year of the Flood)}$$

Among all who use the Masoretic Text as the basis and foundation for their chronology, there is no dispute over the length of time traversed from the Flood back to the creation. As shown on the extreme left side of Chart 6, by summing the life spans of the patriarchs listed in the fifth chapter of Genesis, 1656 years are determined as the intervening period. Add this to the previously derived 2348 BC year of the Flood thereby securing the year of creation as 4004 BC.

$$2348 + 1656 = 4004 \text{ BC}$$

C. DATE OF THE CREATION

The date of creation as taken from the Scriptures has been calculated by many scholars over the centuries resulting in a significant divergence of solutions. As is true for nearly each of the natural major time segments into which biblical chronology has been divided (i.e. the 430-year sojourn, the 480 years from Exodus to the commencement of the temple, etc.), the answers fall into two general categories, that of the “long chronology” or the “short chronology.”

CHRONOLOGIST	BC YEAR
1. J. Africanus	5501
2. G. Syncellus	5492
3. J. Jackson	5426
4. W. Hales	5411
5. Eusebius	5199
6. M. Scotus	4192
7. L. Condomanus	4141
8. T. Lydiat	4103
9. M. Maestlinus	4079
10. J. Ricciolus	4062
11. J. Salianus	4053
12. H. Spondanus	4051
13. M. Anstey	4042
14. W. Lange	4041
15. E. Reinholt	4021
16. J. Cappellus	4005
17. J. Ussher	4004
18. E. Greswell	4004
19. F. Jones	4004
20. E. Faulstich	4001
21. D. Petavius	3983
22. F. Klassen	3975
23. Becke	3974
24. Krentzeim	3971
25. W. Dolen	3971
26. E. Reusnerus	3970

27. J. Claverius	3968
28. C. Longomontanus	3966
29. P. Melancthon	3964
30. J. Haynlinus	3963
31. A. Salmeron	3958
32. J. Scaliger	3949
33. M. Beroaldus	3927
34. A. Helwigius	3836

The preceding table¹ portrays the calculated interval from the creation to the birth of Christ Jesus and depicts an objective sampling of chronologers over the past several hundred years:

As a matter of curiosity and completeness, we add the Indian chronology at 6,174 years for the interval in question (as computed by Gentil), the Babylonian at 6,158 years (computed by Bailly), the Chinese at 6,157 years (Bailly), the Septuagint at 5,508 years (by Abulfaragus) while most of the Jewish writers bring it down to 4,000 and even 3,760.

The scatter effect may seem strange and unaccountable to many, but by now most probably already begin to see some of the rationale leading up to the unevenness in the results.

Julius Africanus, Georgius Syncellus, John Jackson and Dr. William Hales are representative of those who used the Septuagint for the patriarchal generations and other “Long” interval determinations (as that with the Exodus, see discussion on chart 3).

The “short chronology” is the result of relying upon the Hebrew; the disagreements are the result of differing opinions and interpretations by the individual workers within the Masoretic Text and of some coming to the task with various doctrinal presuppositions to maintain.

Pierre Simon LaPlace (1749-1827), the famous French mathematician and astronomer, found Ussher’s 4004 BC (23 October, 6:00 P.M. Julian) creation data² as being remarkable for it

¹ Charles Roger Dundee, *A Collation of The Sacred Scriptures* (1847), p. 20.

² Ussher, *Annals*, *op. cit.*, p. 17 (1658 ed., p. 1). Also see C. O. Dunbar, *Historical Geology*, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1953), p. 21. where, curiously, Dunbar wrongly states Ussher’s date as 9:00 A.M., October 26.