

FAITH AND THOUGHT

*A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation of the
Christian Revelation and modern research.*

1972

Vol. 99

Number 2

DAVID D. BRODEUR

Israel and the Sovereignty of Jerusalem

The Victoria Institute does not often discuss prophecy. The year – day theory, so ingeniously elaborated by Dr. Gratton Guinness and others a generation or so ago, is rarely remembered today. Many though not all of the predicted dates have come and gone uneventfully. Now Dr. Brodeur comes up with the startling theory that we modern Christians have failed to see the significance of an event of vast importance. He sees the 'six-day war' as the end of the 'times of the Gentiles' and argues that it happened exactly at the time appointed.

The capture of Jerusalem on June 7, 1967, marked the beginning of a new era in the fortunes of the State of Israel. Jews and gentiles of as many hues as Joseph's coat discerned quite readily the Messianic implications of the unprecedented six days of victory: June 5-10, 1967. The victories included the Jewish capture of the Old City of Jerusalem, the remaining alienated lands west of the Jordan, the Sinai peninsula in its entirety and the Golan Hills of Syria. This swiftest and most far reaching series of conquests in three milleniums of Jewish occupance of ancient Hatti-land (Philistia-Canaan) almost instantly extended Israel's borders to a closer approximation of the spheres of influence of the Davidic–Solomonic kingdom than any subsequent Jewish colony, commonwealth or kingdom achieved, including that of Alexander Jannaeus.

Each of Israel's latter day victories, beginning with the Independence War of 1948-9, has been more far reaching than the previous. While the early years of this century-old

return were marked by severe hardships, an inexorable kind of progress is summed up in the recitation of its notable dates recording land grants, proclamations, settlements and military actions: 1869-70, 1878, 1882, 1897, 1909, 1917. 1948-9, 1956, 1967.¹

Twentieth century Israel appears certainly to be the unfolding of Ezekiel's prophecy, the resurrection of the Valley of the Dry Bones (Ezek. 37: 1-15). What had been undone by 'God's servant' Nebuchadrezzar is being restored before the eyes of the world. Yet history can no more repeat itself than time can run backwards. Israel's unique history can only be explained intelligently in the light of Biblical prophecy. History has even now established that a large part of Biblical prophecy has been fulfilled in what has happened to Israel, the land and people.

The Roots of Zion's Alienation

The electrifying events of 1967 appeared in history like some creation week consummation, with all the blessings of Lev. 26: 8-9 which exults: 'Five of you shall chase a hundred, and a hundred of you shall chase ten thousand . . . I will confirm my covenant with you'. But the restoration only invites us to ponder the Diaspora and to search for its significance.

Study of the long history of non-Jewish occupations of Eretz Yisrael invites a pause at 609 B.C., when the land came under an Egyptian hegemony following the death of Josiah, in battle, at Megiddo. Hardly four years later, Egypt experienced an enormous defeat at Carchemish and as a result the Holy Land fell under the Babylonian hegemony. Careful examination of Old Testament prophecies justifies a distinction between certain compromises in the Jewish sovereignty prior to Josiah (the last righteous king that Jewry had), that could be rectified by prayer and repentance before Yahweh, and the compromises effected by Nebuchadrezzar between 605 and 588 B.C. that drew forth no national repentance from the rump kingdom of the Jews or from its leaders.

The national sins of the southern monarchy had in fact been steadily accumulating ever since Rehoboam took office as its first sovereign. On one side hung infidelity to the Torah, and in particular to the Holiness Code (Lev. 26). On the other side, the backsliding of Jerusalem strained the precarious, off-setting balance in the scales of divine justice. Then in time the delicate balance was destroyed under the long reign of the immoral Manasseh.² So much so in fact that by the end of the seventh century before Christ the nation was ripe for judgment, for despite the belated purges of Josiah, the sins of Jerusalem — sun worship, promiscuity, child sacrifice and even murder of Yahweh's prophets and the substitution of false prophets — continued as before (Ezek: 8: 9; 22: 1-12). Even though the predicament of King Hezekiah in Jerusalem before the menace of Sennacherib was resolved by the King's prayerful petition to Yahweh, who answered with marvelous deliverance, the apostacy and hardness of heart of Judah's last three sovereigns is illustrated by the rebellion of Zedekiah who adamantly and repeatedly refused to heed the prophet Jeremiah. Zedekiah's resistance led directly to the destruction of the monarchy, the temple, and the Holy City.

Yahweh thus spoke: 'Judah also will I banish from my presence . . . as I banished Israel; and I will cast off this city of Jerusalem which I once chose' (II Kings 23: 27). It began, this well measured end of Judah, in the year 605, 'In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, king of Israel (that is in the year of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon)' (Jer. 25: 1). In that year, 605, Yahweh said to his prophet:

If each of you will turn from his wicked ways and evil courses . . . then you shall live forever on the soil which the Lord gave you and to your forefathers . . . But you did not listen to me . . . Therefore . . . I will send *my servant Nebuchadrezzar* king of Babylon. I will bring him against this land and all its inhabitants and all these nations round it. (Jer. 25: 5-9).

Retribution indeed swiftly followed upon the oracle. Nebuchadrezzar came to Jerusalem in 605, during the late spring or early summer, and took the temple vessels and several of

the princes as hostages, among them the prophet Daniel (Dan 1: 1). At least two times more Nebuchadrezzar visited Jerusalem, early in 597 and at the beginning of 588. Each visit proved to be more destructive than the last. As a result of his final siege Jerusalem was left a heap of ruins, the productive capacity of the land devastated, the people taken into captivity except for a few tillers and overseers.

Simulacrums of Sovereignty

That Jewish sovereignty was not restored to the Jews by Yahweh after Babylon's fall, in 539, shortly after which the seventy years captivity prophesied by Jeremiah ended, is Scripturally confirmed:

Those who escaped the sword he took captive to Babylon and they became slaves to him and his sons *until the sovereignty passed to the Persians*, while the land of Israel ran the full term of its sabbaths. All the time that it lay desolate it kept the sabbath rest, to complete the seventy years in fulfilment of the word of the Lord by the prophet Jeremiah. (II Chron. 36: 20-21).

This passage makes clear that while a seventy year period of land rest was paid in full, the control of the land and its inhabitants by aliens continued. Apparently Yahweh wanted to test His People further in order to win their hearts as well as their lips. The political conditions of the Judaic remnant that returned from Babylon is succinctly stated by Abba Hillel Silver who writes: 'During the Persian period, Judah continued as a semiautonomous province within a Persian satrapy and covered a very small area'.³ This is hardly a definition of independence, sovereignty or self-determination.

Similarly, it can hardly be said that the Maccabean times were times of a national Jewish sovereignty over Eretz Yisrael, from 'Dan to Beersheba'. The Hashmonian successions reached their territorial apogee under the despot Alexander Janneus (Heb: *Jannai*) between 103 and 76 B.C.⁴ Yet Janneus apparently did not succeed in wresting Ascalon and its hinterland from its Ptolemaic overseers. Neither in fact did he

conquer any of the coast above Carmel, much of north-western Galilee remaining beyond his control. The short lived state bequeathed by Janneus was but a substantial fragment of Israel of Genesis promise and not to be compared with the the sovereignty of Israel since 1967. In utter contrast to former restorations of Jerusalem to Jewish participation or control (Cyrus, Judas Maccabeus, Edmund Allenby) the restoration of 1967 was effected solely by a Jewish action undiluted by foreign ally and unfettered by alien hegemony.

Therefore, it becomes painfully obvious that an *absence* of sovereign self determination in political life was the constant condition of the Jew in Eretz Yisrael from the first visit of Nebuchadrezzar, in 605 B.C., even to the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 A.D. This tormented fettering of Jewish life in the Holy Land was the great, negative common denominator of the Jewish political and civil existence for no less a period than two and one half milleniums.

The Period of Alienation Foretold

One wonders if there can be found in Scripture, so voluminous with prophecies fulfilled and yet to be fulfilled, any positive or precise description of such an immense period of discontinuous Jewish occupations in Jerusalem and in the Holy Land? Leviticus, chapter 26, presents both outline and description of the peculiar period and even gives a logical key to the very length of the period. Chapter 26 is of course the great peroration to the Holiness Code – a series of solemn promises and equally solemn warnings. In this peroration peace and abundance are forecast as the fruits of obedience to Yahweh's commandments; while wars, desolations, famines, terrors, and *exiles* are to be the harvest of continuous disobedience. A sample:

I will bring war in vengeance upon you, vengeance irrevocable under covenant; you shall be herded into your cities, I will send pestilence among you, and you shall be given over to the enemy. (Lev. 26: 25-26).

This harsh description of all that actually befell the Jewish colonies and commonwealths from Darius Hytaspes down to the second Roman dispersal is prefaced by a passage which contains a number. This number, or cypher, is repeated no fewer than four times and in a context that exhibits little variation. A sample:

If after all this you have not learnt discipline but still defy me,
I in turn will defy you and scourge you *seven times*⁵ for your
sins. (Lev. 26: 23-25).

Precise details of the future degradation of the dual monarchies and post-monarchical existence in the Holy Land was revealed to Moses. The following passage (which no authority can prove is of post-exilic origin) foretells the nature of Jewish religion and existence for nearly the next two and one half milleniums after the fall of Babylon:

Instead of meat you shall eat your sons and daughters. I will
destroy your hill-shrines and demolish your incense-alters. I
will pile your rotting carcasses on the rotting logs that were
your idols, and I will spurn you. I will make your cities
desolate and destroy your sanctuaries; the soothing odor of
your offerings I will not accept. I will destroy your land, and
the enemies who occupy it shall be appalled. I will scatter you
among the heathens, and I will pursue you with the naked sword.
(Lev. 26: 29-34).

During the siege of Samaria in the time of Elisha, Jewish children were eaten by their starving parents (II Kings 6: 28-29). A generation later, Hezekiah became the first Judean King to destroy at least some of the *Bamot*, the idolatrous high places. Evidence that he did not destroy all of them is found in II Kings 23: 8-20.

With the scourge of Nebuchadrezzer, Yahweh's chosen instrument, all the judgments of Leviticus 26 began to come to fulfillment, and none of the blessings. The hill shrines and incense alters were rooted out of Jewish consciousness forever. 'Tender hearted women . . . boiled their own children; their children became their food in the day of my people's wounding' (Lam. 4: 10-11). Leviticus 26: 33 noted that the

enemies who occupy the land will be 'appalled' by the destruction. Lamentations confirms that Jerusalem's fall was 'beyond belief' (Lam. 1: 9).

Keil and Delitzsh termed this the 'fourth and severest stage' of the aggravated divine judgments. While these two great commentators thought that the series of judgments was not to be understood 'historically', they also saw that 'these divine threats embrace the whole of Israel's future (and) . . . correspond in every case to the amount of the sin, and only burst in upon the incorrigible race in all the intensity foretold, when ungodliness gained the upper hand'.⁶ They noted that the eating of offspring occurred again in the Roman war of extermination under Titus.⁷ They might have mentioned also that the abominable practice was predicted by Ezekiel about the 30th year of the prophet's captivity (Ezek. 5: 10).

It has been recognized that in pre-exilic times the religious unity of the Hebrews was essentially tribal and familial - not individual. A concept of salvation and after-life did not become firmly rooted in Jewish life until sometime after the return from Babylon. For centuries Yahweh was constrained to speak to His people in terms that they could readily understand - peaceful occupation of the land when they obeyed; terrors, wars and famines when they disobeyed. The sermon of Leviticus 26 speaks therefore of a national punishment, one of the land and the people. Yahweh still remained true to the covenant He made with Abraham and which He renewed with Isaac and Jacob. He would eventually assure Israel through His prophet: 'but I will not make an end of you, though I will punish you as you deserve, I will not sweep you clean away' (Jer. 46: 28).

The above passage reads in both the King James and JPSA translation: 'but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure'.

Up to now, most commentators on Leviticus 26, including Kiel and Delitzsch, have failed to appreciate that Israel's days could be controlled by Yahweh in a manner consistent with *sheva* (seven) or the seventh day rest.

There is simply no valid justification to interpret parts of the Scripture allegorically or metaphorically and other portions literally. Yahweh is more than capable of combining both the literal and the abstract in a single verse or number in a single parable or prophecy. The Scriptures, including the words and parables of Jesus, abound with such examples of dual meanings and fulfillments.

New Testament Confirms the Old

After somewhat more than six centuries of vassalage to various powers, Israel witnessed the advent of Jesus Christ who spoke unflinchingly of terrible times that were yet before the Jews. He said:

But when you see Jerusalem encircled by enemies, then you may be sure that her destruction is near. Then those who are in Judea must take to the hills; those who are in the city must leave it, and those who are in the country must not enter; because this is the time of retribution, when all that stands written is to be fulfilled. Alas for women who are with child in those days, or have children at the breast! For there will be great distress in the land and a terrible judgment upon this people. *They will fall as the sword's point; they will be carried into all countries; and Jerusalem will be trampled down by foreigners until their day has run its course.* (Luk 21: 20-24).

This notable passage is part of a longer oration which concludes with descriptions of signs in the heavens denoting the approach of the last days before the Messiah's coming. As with much of prophecy, several time-frames are apparent. The first portion speaks of the destructions and deportations of Titus which came about forty years after the words were uttered. A somewhat longer time-frame alludes to the actions of Hadrian's legions in 134-35. These events brought further destruction to Jerusalem and ended with massive deportations and the rooting out of the words Jerusalem and Judea from the lexicon of the Roman occupants.

Just as unmistakably, the prophecy refers to yet unfulfilled events in Israel, events which many exegetes feel will culminate in Dan. 9: 27, Zech. 12: 14 and Revelation 16: 16, the Battle of Armageddon.

In Jerusalem's 'trampling down' indeed began with the final siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar in early 588 B.C. there must be some Biblical evidence to bring forth support for a conclusion that *seven times* of trampling down by foreigners terminated in June, 1967. Before this can be determined it is worthwhile to examine, very briefly, the evidence of how the siege of 588 began. The major but not exclusive source of this period is the Book of Jeremiah.

The Beginning of the Alienation

The first visit of Nebuchadrezzar to Jerusalem in 605 did not overturn the Judean monarchy. But the Judean king, Jehoiakim, was nonetheless forced to pay tribute to Babylon. Toward the end of 598, Nebuchadrezzar again advanced upon the land, possibly delayed by battle reverses with Egypt. He captured Jerusalem on March 15-16, 597, waiting until the New Year (April 13) to install a new king, Mattaniah, renamed Zedekiah.⁸

Nebuchadrezzar surely mocked the Judean monarchy with the capture and banishment of Jehoiachin (Jehoiakim having been killed and thrown outside the city gates by a panic faction at the end of 598). The exile of the foremost citizens the nobles and leaders left a party firmly in control that was favourable to Egyptian intervention against Babylon. Informed of revolt, Nebuchadrezzar entered upon the land once again, in late 589, but this time with a more deadly purpose than upon any previous visit. He apparently came to destroy the kingdom and to banish its people. So drastic a punishment was justified in the Babylonian's eyes because Zedekiah had willfully broken his solemn oath of allegiance to Nebuchadrezzar (Ezek. 17: 13, 18).

Josephus tells us:

After maintaining his alliance with the Babylonians for eight years, Sacchias broke his treaty with them and went over to the Egyptians, hoping to overthrow the other side. And, when the Babylonian king heard of this, he marched against him and, after ravaging his country and taking his fortresses, he came up against the city of Jerusalem itself to besiege it. But when the Egyptian king heard of the plight of his ally Sacchias, he raised a large force and came to Judea to end the siege. Thereupon the Babylonian king left Jerusalem, and went to meet the Egyptians and encountering them in battle, defeated and put them to flight and drove them out of the whole of Syria.⁹

Josephus then tells us that the king of Babylon marched a 'second time' against Jerusalem and 'encamped before it, besieged it with the utmost energy for eighteen months'.¹⁰

This reference to a second time can only refer to the resumption of the interrupted siege, because Josephus has described two earlier sieges already, the first in Jehoiakim's reign (605) and the second in Jehoiakin's reign (597).

In attempting to equate the instant of Nebuchadrezzar's return to resume the interrupted siege with the chronology given in the correlative passages of II Kings 25: 1, Jer. 39: 4 and 52: 4, Josephus is plainly in error. The clear inference of these three passages is that Nebuchadrezzar arrived *initially* in the ninth year, tenth month, and tenth day of that month of Zedekiah's reign: that is, between January 5 and January 15, 588 B.C.¹¹

Many scholars think that the Pharaoh caused the siege to be interrupted just after this date and not before.¹² In any case Ezekiel is most emphatic when he writes: 'These were the words of the Lord, spoken to me on the tenth day of the tenth month in the ninth year: Man, write down a name for this day, *this very day*; this is the day the king of Babylon invested Jerusalem' (Ezek. 24:1).

The largely non-dated later oracles of Jeremiah (chaps. 21, 33-34, 37-38) reflect a non-sequential chronology that makes it impossible to determine the exact time beyond which Yahweh can no longer offer to Jerusalem and Judah opportunity for divine deliverance. Chapter 34 offers the possibility

that the oracle of doom without options or qualifications was uttered (vs. 2-3) ' . . . when Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon (is) . . . fighting against Jerusalem and *all* her towns' (vs. 1-2), that is, very early in the siege which began January 15, 588.

In any event, chapter 34 clearly states that the oracle was conveyed to Zedekiah while the Jewish fortresses of Lachish and Azekah still held out (vs. 6-7). Unqualified doom is conveyed in even stronger terms (vs. 17-22) while Nebuchadrezzar has lifted the siege in order to meet the Egyptians (vs. 21).

It is still not known for certain how long it took Nebuchadrezzar to vanquish Judah's ally led by Pharaoh Hophra. Some scholars think that the Ezekiel oracles (chaps. 29-31), which are fixed to that prophet's captivity date (March 16, 597), suggest that the intervention of the Pharaoh spanned most of the winter and spring of 587. This may be so, but there are difficulties which have not been convincingly answered.

Turning to Jeremiah chapter 37 we find the lifting to the siege referred to several times (vs. 5, 7-9, 11) and learn that Jeremiah is first imprisoned just after Nebuchadrezzar has gone away. After many days in prison (vs. 16-17) he is interviewed by Zedekiah and boldly tells the king what is about to happen. In chapter 34, which refers to the same period while the siege is lifted, we find Jeremiah transmitting a doom oracle from a Yahweh angered by the revocation of a proclamation that Zedekiah had recently made freeing the Hebrew slaves of Hebrew freeman residing in the besieged Holy City (Jer. 34: 8-22).

Still later when Jeremiah is confined to the court of the guardhouse (following his rescue from the mirey well) he is again interviewed by the king. Surprisingly, the prophet delivers an oracle promising deliverance of the city conditioned upon immediate surrender of Zedekiah (Jer. 38: 17-18). The oracle demonstrates Yahweh's eternal willingness to renew opportunities for repentance by fallen man, but Zedekiah buries it under false pride (vs. 19).

In ignorance of the exact date when this oracle was delivered, we can but speculate as to whether it was delivered

before or after the resumption of the siege. History only records that the reappearance of Nebuchadrezzar before the walls of Jerusalem finally sealed the fate of the Judean monarchy and led to the destruction of the Temple and the Holy City.

A Cypherment of Leviticus 26

Convinced that the Six Day War of June, 1967, had achieved for Israel and Jerusalem a status that the Holy City had not enjoyed since the last days of the Judean monarchy, the writer investigated the cryptograms of the Old and New Testament. He concluded Leviticus 26 embodies a comprehensive description of the peculiar nature of Jewish occupancy of the Holy Land during the Diaspora, the first seventy years captivity (Jer. 25: 11; 29; 10) of which was the prologue of a much longer period.

Leviticus 26: 25 speaks of a period of 'seven times' of judgment. Numbers 14: 34, Ezekiel 4: 6-7, Daniel 8: 26, and Revelation 11: 1-3, taken together, justify the conclusion that one prime key to prophetic time-measurement is the substitution of *shanah* (year) for *yom*, *yamin* (day, days). This is made particularly clear by Numbers 14. While a considerable body of literature has arisen in England over the past few centuries in support of an interpretation that one 'time' (*paam*) is 360 years, as inferred by Revelation 11: 1-3, nothing in Revelation's Judgment on Jerusalem (which bears a tone so strikingly similar to the Judgment of Ezekiel 4: 1-7) excludes the application of a prophetic 'time' to a *solar year in which each day is a year*. There is ample room for both interpretations.

Consistent with the Mosaic law and ritual. Leviticus 26: 25 indeed was prophesying of a great Levitical Week of Years; that is, a year of days of years. This great *sheva*, or seven, day-years is no less a period than 2556.6954 years (365.2422×7).

When this cypher of Leviticus 26 is applied to the end-date: June 6-7, 1967, the date arrived at is March 7, 588 B.C. This is derived, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 2556.695 \\
 - 1966.433 \text{ (A.D.)} \\
 \hline
 590.262 \text{ (B.C.)}
 \end{array}$$

Unadjusted for the Christian calendar error, the date is March 7, 589. However, one year must be omitted from the span of years to compensate for the 'O' B.C. - A.D. fiction.¹³

The adjusted date now reads: March 7, 588 B.C., a possible beginning date of the *resumption* of the final siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar. The resumption of the final siege of Jerusalem may have marked the point beyond which it became impossible for Yahweh, in His integrity, to allow Jerusalem to remain in the possession of His people. Zedekiah's belated attempt to escape at the end of the siege, his capture and blinding of Nebuchadrezzar, reflects the great severity of the divine judgment upon Jerusalem.

When the divine sentence of a forfeited independence had been completely served, June 6-7, 1967, appeared witnessing the termination of Yahweh's *seven times* of indignation against Jerusalem. The comprehensive events embraced by June 5-10 translate into the fuller restoration of Yahweh's sovereignty over the Holy City and much of the remainder of the Promised Land to His people Israel.

The Historic Islamic Claim to the Temple Mount

Pathos and irony abounded in the words of King Hussein when the proud Jordanian monarch told an American audience in Washington D.C., some two years after Israel's capture of Old Jerusalem ' . . . any plan for withdrawal must include our greatest city - *our spiritual capital*, the holy city of Jerusalem. To us - Christian and Moslem alike - Jerusalem is as sacred as it is to the Jews. And we cannot envisage any settlement that does not include the return of the Arab part of the city of Jerusalem to us *with all our holy places*'.¹⁴

The pathos in the plea of Hussein was that he brought the loss of Jerusalem upon his country by his own decision. The irony was in fact that the holy places of which he spoke inspired Muhammad and his successors precisely because

they were, in the first place, Abrahamic and Israelitic holy places.

Even a superficial examination of the Koran (Quran) reveals it to be unabashedly based upon the Hebrew Old Testament. A closer examination of the holy book of Islam shows it to be a fairly skillfully disguised diatribe against Judaism and the most fundamental tenet of Christianity. Throughout the Koran Hebrews and Christians are referred to as the 'People of the Book'. One reference reads:

It was He (Muhammad) that drove the unbelievers among the People of the Book out of their dwellings into the first exile.¹⁵

This reference is an allusion to the Prophet's expedition against the Jews of al-Nadhir of Arabia whom he reduced and drove out in 626. Further on, we read:

He brought down from their strongholds those who had supported them from among the People of the Book and cast terror into their hearts, some that you slew and others you took captive.¹⁶

This passage is believed to refer to the Jewish tribe of Banu Qurayza which Muhammad raided, beheading 800 of their males (one abjured his religion to be saved). The incident took place in 627. In 629 the Jews of Khaybar were decimated by the Prophet and in 630 he took Mecca from his fellow Arabs. As Guillaume notes, by denying the divinity of Christ, Muhammad brought peace to the Arabian peninsula which had been repeatedly torn by the dissention of Christological disputes. 'But the price was the unconditional surrender of the essence of Christianity'.¹⁷

The Koran reflects constant attempts to cast doubts on the teachings of Christ and Judaism. One example:

Believers, take neither Jews nor Christians for your friends. They are friends with one another. Whoever of you seeks their friendship shall become one of their number. Allah does not guide the wrongdoers.¹⁸

Throughout the Koran Muhammad presumes to judge the Jews. He states:

Those of the Israelites who disbelieved were cursed by David and Jesus, the son of Mary: they cursed them because they rebelled and committed evil and never restrained one another from wrongdoing. Evil were their deeds.¹⁹

Islam has been both a religious and political persecutor of the Jews since the Hegira. When Muhammad died, in 632 A.D., he was preparing for an invasion of Palestine to drive the Byzantines from the Holy Land. His first successor, (*Khalifa*) was Abu Bakr, who died in 634. Already, by that year, Arab bands were raiding and terrorizing the unfortified towns and hinterlands of Palestine. The chronicles of that year show that the Christian ethnarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius, was not able to make his annual pilgrimage to Bethlehem on Christmas Day because of the Arab-Islamic menace.

After the Byzantine debacle on the Yarmuk, in late August, 636, the followers of Islam, now under *Khalifa* Omar, chased the survivors up to Jerusalem, laying siege to the Holy City. Sophronius is reputed to have expired, of heartbreak, soon after giving the city in formal surrender to Omar, early in 639.²⁰

Omar instituted a policy of tolerance to the Jews, but this was short lived. In 681, *Khalifa* Yazid imposed a head tax on the Samaritan Jews who chose not to vacate Palestine. A permanent Islamic insult to the Temple Area crystallized (688-92) with the completion of the still extant monumental ciborium, the so-called 'Dome of the Rock', whose interior inscription candidly reveals its purpose: a politico-religious symbol of the 'final victory of Islam over the People of the Book.'²¹

The builder of the Dome of the Rock was Abd al-Malik, fifth *Khalifa* of the Umayyad family of Muhammad's Meccan tribe of the Quraysh. Abd al-Malik had the splendid octagonal monument inscribed with three basic themes: (1) that God is without heirs - a deliberate denial of Christ's claim of Sonship, (2) that Muhammad was God's greatest apostle - an attempt to usurp Christ's power and authority, and (3) that the mission of Islam is to convert the infidel, both Jew and gentile. This also constitutes a usurpation of Christ's command: 'Go ye out into all the world . . .'

The Dome's carefully contrived symbolism in all strives to preempt not only the spiritual and historical claims of Christians but also those of the Jews. Erected over the rock on Mount Moriah from which by tradition Abraham was caught up into heaven, the Dome intended to convey more graphically the Koran's assertion that Abraham was not a Jew (which ethnically is true enough) but rather a devout Moslem! Islam, by this bold stroke, attempted to nullify Israel's lineal and spiritual descent from the one with whom God made His first personal Covenant.

The long Islamic sovereignty over the Dome of the Rock, broken for certain brief periods by other equally oppressive gentile conquests, was eclipsed during the fighting of June 6-7, 1967, exactly 1278.34 solar years from February 1-2, 689 A.D., which falls into the Islamic year (a.H. 69) that many scholars, including Aanavi of the Metropolitan Museum of New York, believe to be the year during which the foundation stones of the Dome were laid down.

The Book of Revelation, chapter eleven, speaks of a long persecution of the Jew. The prophecy is couched in a symbolic language similar to that of Ezekiel's received judgment upon Jerusalem (Ezek. 4: 1-8). The writer of Revelation is thus commanded:

Now go and measure the temple of God, the altar, and the number of the worshippers. But have nothing to do with the *outer court of the temple*; do not measure that; for it has been given over to the gentiles, and they will trample the Holy City underfoot for forty-two months. Rev. 11: 1-3.

When the principle of Ezekiel, chapter four, and Numbers, chapter fourteen (a day for a year and a year for a day), is applied to this '42 months' of Revelation, it is discovered that each month is worth 30.44 solar years (one solar month is 30.44 days). Forty-two of these solar 'months' is exactly 1278.34 solar years, which in turn corresponds to the second half of the great *seven times* punishment period - 2556.6954 years.

Jerusalem's Density

The foregoing demonstration that the long absence of Israelitic sovereignty over Jerusalem is measurable and explicable by the arithmetic function of seven (and its half) vindicates metric prophecies of both the Old and New Testament and confirms the integrity of the Scriptures and their ancient moral teaching.

We are not Scripturally informed why Yahweh chose *seven* to consummate His creation; we are not informed why He chose *seven* to govern the period of prescribed ritual cleansings under the Mosaic law; or why, again, He chose *seven* as the number whereby He disciplined His people for two and one half milleniums.

Two years after the first Aliyah to Palestine, seven thousand Jews from Russia, Dr. H. Grattan Guinness (d. 1910) published his finding that levitical and prophetic times form a 'continuous septenary series'. He pointed out that the Mosaic Jubilee (Lev. 25: 8-12) ritual was a 'week of weeks of years'; that the 'seventy years' (Jer. 25: 11-12) prophesied for Judah's captivity was a 'week of decades'; and that the 'seventy weeks' of Daniel 9, a portion of which is yet unfulfilled, is a 'week of weeks of decades' (that is, 490 years).²² All these *weeks* or *sevens* amply demonstrate Yahweh's utter consistency in building upon the Creation Week and His Commandment that the Israelities rest upon the seventh day (Exod. 20: 8). As stated in the foregoing, the 'seven times' of Leviticus 26 is *seven times a year of days of years* or, as Guinness expressed it, a 'week of years of years'. As stated earlier, the justification for assuming a year for a day of Israelitic transgression is found in Numbers 14: 34 and Ezekiel 4: 1-3.

Just as the universal theory of gravitation measures only the amount of change in the motions of heavenly bodies but is not able to explain what causes that motion, similarly we are able to measure the time span of a Biblical prophecy, set in motion two and one half milleniums ago, come to a rest at Jerusalem, the City of God, the spiritual capital of the world. At this fact we can only stand in awe and with Sir Isaac Newton exclaim, 'to us it is enough'.

Yosef Tekoah, Isreal's Ambassador to the United Nations, was indeed right when in 1967 he referred to the June event as a ' . . . great hour of biblical prophetic consummation'.^{2 3}

The Scriptures do not speak of another alienation of Jerusalem from the Jews before Messiah's return. They do warn most emphatically that the Holy City will be invaded and ravished during the Armageddon (Zech. 12, 14; Rev. 16: 16). It appears therefore quite certain that Isreal will cling tenaciously to her beloved Jerusalem, as indeed the nation has shown every intention of doing since 1967.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. 1869-70 – purchase of land by the Alliance Israélite Universelle near Jaffa for the agricultural school Mikve Israel (Mique Yisrael); 1878 – founding of the first pioneering village, Petach Tikva; 1882 – first *aliyah*: Rishon le-Zion, Nes Ziona, Zichron Ya'akov and Rosh Pina founded; 1897 – First Zionist Congress – World Zionist Organization founded; 1919 – Tel-Aviv, first Jewish city, founded; 1917 – Balfour Declaration and the British capture of Jerusalem, ending a 400 year Ottoman domination; 1948-9 – Jewish War of Independence; 1956 – Israel's Bar-Mitzvah in Sinai; 1967 – Israel's capture of Old Jerusalem and extension of other borders.
2. Cf. Jeremiah 15: 3. Abba Hillel Silver categorizes the immoral practices of Manasseh whose deplorable dual distinction lay in being the most wicked king of Judah and in reigning the longest of any: "(1) He rebuilt the high places and erected altars for Baal and made an asherah. He worshipped all the hosts of heaven and built altars to them, even in the House of YHVH, and he placed a graven image of the asherah there. (2) He burnt his son as an offering. (3) He practised soothsaying and augury and dealt with mediums and wizards. (4) He shed much innocent blood. These were the abominations, the evil he did which provoked YHVH to anger (II Kings 21)". (Silver, Abba H., *Moses and the Original Torah*, MacMillan, New York, 1961. p. 40-41.
3. Silver, Abba H., *Moses and the Original Torah*, p. 102.

4. Some historians and not a few evangelicals still persist in pointing to the period of the Maccabees and Hashmonians as times of a bona fide Jewish national sovereignty. During these times there existed for short periods only a kind of *pseudo-sovereignty* that was in effect a *deferred sovereignty* of the Seleucids. During the long Persian domination of Palestine (539-332) the Jews were a satrapy (Neh. 9: 36-7). Jewish effected liberations were an erratic see-saw phenomenon and were never complete in their sovereignty. For example, Judas's dramatic entry into Jerusalem in 164 was made under the eyes of a manned Syrian fortress. While Simon was freed of paying tribute to Demetrius II Nicator in 142, he was really an unmolested ethnarch dubiously named by the Jews. His son John, known as Hyrcanus, succeeded a murdered father by popular support before Antioch could react. In time, Hyrcanus was subjected to tribute by Syria and he had to give up both cities and fortifications. Moreover, in 129 B.C. he had to have the confirmation of the Roman Senate. (Such a state of affairs as this is somewhat comparable to an Israel seeking U.N. approval for its assumption over Jerusalem in 1967 – something a fully sovereign nation like Israel has not done and is unlikely to do). The last of the strong Hashmonian rulers was Jannai (Janneaus Alexander, 103-76). Posing as a devout Sadducee, Jannai was a lusty, bellicose wretch who in a lifetime of military wanderings destroyed without mercy certain Nabatean and Greek cities. Twice in his checkered career he acquired nearly all of *Eretz Yisrael* and even a good part of what is today the western portion of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Yet no evidence exists that he held Askelon, though Gaza fell to him. Jannai in fact suffered almost as many notable defeats as victories. Only the fratricidal struggles of the Seleucids permitted him to carry on and the terrible factions among the Jews. In 88 B.C., he was soundly defeated by the Syrian, Demetrius III Eukairos, at Shechem. Demetrius had been invited into the country by Jannai's embittered rivals, the Pharisees. The same year, another Seleucid king, Antiochus XII of Damascus, decided to subdue the Nabateans and ran his army right through the Jannai defence line, which hinged on Joppa, and defeated Jannai east of Lydda. Resilient Jannai recovered yet again and a few years before his death extended his rule to its farthest limits. *However, the settlements he made in defeat are ample evidence of the true nature of his sovereignty.* He was murderous to his own people and his court was modelled after Hellenistic regimes.

Following his death, induced in 76 by alcohol, Antipater in about 70 began scheming for Judea, currying favor with Rome. When Pompey's aide appeared in Jerusalem in 66, Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II dropped their power struggle, so much did they dread Daniel's fourth empire and its illustrious general. Pompey annexed Syria-Palestine to the Roman Empire in 64 B.C. Antipater's infamous son, Herod the Great (34-4 B.C.), acquired the power by deceit and never earned the trust of the Jewish people, despite his temple rebuilding and great public works. Now from the death of Herod, until the destruction of Jerusalem, in 70 A.D., the Roman domination grew oppressive in direct proportion to Jewish revolt and resistance. (See Williams, Albert N. *The Holy City*, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1954, p. 197-206; *Daniel to Paul* edit. by G. Cornfield, et al) The MacMillian Company, 1962, p. 57-66).

5. Major English renderings of the ancient texts appear to be about evenly divided between calling *sheva* "sevenfold" and "seven times". The choice of "seven times" as the intent of Yahweh here hinges partly on the evidence that is afforded by the feminine *sheva* which presupposes the feminine *pa'an*, although the latter word is absent from the earliest known texts. The reconstructed phrase would properly read: *sheva pe'amin*. The scholastic battle over this raises the more fundamental question of the literal versus the allegorical or spiritualized interpretation of Biblical texts. The writer feels that there is room for both views
See: Herschel, Abraham Joshua, *Israel, An Echo of Eternity*, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1967, p. 139-145.
6. Kiel, C.F. and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol II, The Pentateuch*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, n.d., p. 473.
7. Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, v. 10. 3; Kiel and Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 475.
8. The Babylonian date is the second of Adar. For a discussion see: D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings 626-556 B.C. in the British Museum*, London, 1961, p. 33.
9. Josephus. Trans. by Ralph Marcus. VI (Jewish Antiquities. Books IX - XI.) Cambridge, 1966. p. 217.
10. Josephus, *op. cit.*, p. 218.
11. Thiele, E.R., *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (rev. ed.) Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1964. p. 165-166. This edition has revisions for the Nebuchadrezzar period based on a

- publication by the British Museum in 1956. While Thiele's derived date, Jan. 15, 588, must be very close to correct, II Chron. 36: 10 presents a problem. The Hebrew in Chron. may be translated as the 'turn of the year' or the 'spring of the year' as the stated start of Zedekiah's reign. Thiele cites also Ezek. 40: 1 to justify a Nisan 10 (April 22, 597) date for Zedekiah, rather than April 13th, the start of the New Year for Babylon in 597, when it is more likely that Zedekiah was named king by Nebuchadrezzar after swearing an oath of allegiance.
12. Accepting the Josephus theory, Smith cites Jer. 37: 5-11; 34: 21 and Ezek. 17: 15-20 (which describes Nebuchadrezzar's breaking off the siege long enough to turn back the Egyptian army) as indications that II Kings 25: 1 must refer to the date of Nebuchadrezzar's return to resume the siege. Smith admits that such evidence is 'extremely slight'. In fact, it is no evidence at all since the verses that Smith cites give no clues on the actual chronology of the event. (W. Smith in *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Westwood, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1967, p. 761).
 13. *The World Almanac Book of Facts 1971* (N.Y., Doubleday, 1970 p. 770) notes: 'The year 1 A.D. is the first year of the Christian era. Jan 1, 1 B.C. is just one year before Jan 1, 1 A.D. The elapsed number of years between a date B.C. and the same date A.D. is one less than the sum of the years. The Christian era was calculated by the monk Dionysius Exiguus in the 6th century after Christ. He placed Jesus' birth on Dec. 25 in the year 753 of Rome, and decided 754 should be the first year of the Christian era.' There is some reason to believe that Exiguus was ignorant of the Arabic concept of the mathematical zero, hardly known in Europe in his time. The world's major observatories have expressed preference for the one year subtraction theory over all other theories.
 14. Quoted from the *Washington Post* (Wash. D.C.) April 20; 1969.
 15. *The Koran*, trans. by N.J. Dawood. Penguin, Baltimore, 1966, p. 263.
 16. *The Koran*, Penguin, 1966, p. 286.
 17. Guillaume, Alfred. *Islam*. Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1954. p. 38.
 18. *The Koran*, Penguin, p. 382-3.
 19. *The Koran*, p. 385.

20. Caetani, Leone. *Cronografia Islamica*. Foglio 1 Paris, 1911, p. 182. Other sources have the death of Sophronius in March, 638 (Papenbroch, C.F. Caetani). One thing appears certain. The siege of 637 was for some time interrupted by plague (Caetani, *Annali Dell'Islam*, p. 923).
21. Grube, Ernst J. *The World of Islam*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967. p. 13. Also: Oleg-Grabar "The Umayyad Dome of the Rock" *In. Ars Orientalis*, Vol III, 1959, p 46: 53-54; 62. Falsely called the 'Mosque of Omar', the Dome of the Rock (Al-Qubbat as-Sakhrah) was erected by Caliph Abd-al-Malik (685-705) as a pilgrimage shrine for worshippers, when, according to at least one Arab historian, the local caliph at Mecca, Ibn al-Zubayr, began to exploit the pilgrims visiting the holy city of Islam. Thus for a time Jerusalem became a rival to Mecca and to the present day is regarded by Islam as its most sacred city after Mecca and Medina. The carefully contrived historic Islamic insult to Jewish holy places does not end with the Umayyad's placement of the Dome of the Rock. The Supreme Moslem Council (The Mehkema or Mahkama), or House of Judgment, still occupies a Saracenic building that sits upon the site of the ancient Sanhedrin, the Supreme Council of the Jews, destroyed by Titus. The Israeli authorities permit the Mehkema to continue to function just off the Temple platform in its medieval house between Wilson's Arch and the recently enlarged plaza before the Western Wall remnant. Effective Islamic (Jordanian) sovereignty over the Dome of the Rock and the Temple area ended with the Jewish victory of 1967. The Government of Israel immediately forced a reduction in the tariff imposed upon visitors to the sacred platform – the Haram esh Sharif – and also forced the Islamic religious authorities to accept a new opening to the platform between the Western Wall and the Al Asqa (Aska) Mosque, where no tariff can be collected of any visitor. (Beneath the foundations of the Asqa Mosque are believed to be the foundations of the palaces of the kings of Judah). The Moslem authorities since 1967 only regulate the visiting times to the Temple area and to their monuments there. Israel's effective sovereignty over this, and all other parts of Jerusalem, is complete.
22. Guinness, H. Grattan. *Creation Centred in Christ*, New York, A.C. Armstrong & Son, 1884. p. 270-279. (London ed 2 vol. 1896).

23. Tekoah, Yosef. *Barbed Wire shall not return to Jerusalem*. Israel Information Services, New York, 1967. p. 43.

All Scriptural quotations employed in this paper, except as otherwise noted, are from the 1970 Oxford Cambridge edition of the *New English Bible*.

Note. Dr. Brodeur studied international relations at Harvard (A.B. 1955) and in 1963 received a doctorate from Clark University in political geography. His address is Apt. 601, 55 West Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610, USA.

Discussion.

Mr. H.L. Ellison Writes:-

This fascinating study raises major theological and philosophical problems. It belongs to a type of study which was not uncommon in the late Victorian period. The example best known to the Christian student is probably Sir Robert Anderson's calculations on Daniel's Seventy Weeks (Dan. 9: 20-27). There are various reasons why it has largely fallen out of favour, but it is far from dead, as may be seen from C.G. Ozanne's recent volume *The First 7000 Years*. Dr. Brodeur's treatment avoids the weakness of many such studies in that he does not have to depart from accepted chronology or to ask for special measures of time. He does not, however, meet certain questions of principle.

There is, firstly, the assumption that God chooses to bind Himself by measures of time, which act deterministically on men. Undoubtedly the New Testament sees God's determinate council behind the rejection of Jesus the Messiah, but there is clearly also the sense of heart-break that Israel did not recognize its Lord. Then it does not allow for the New Testament certainty that the Second Coming could be just around the corner. If, in fact, as such calculations suggest, the Parousia could not take place before 1967 at the earliest, it is hard to exonerate the New Testament of *suggestio falsi*. Thirdly, there must always be an element of doubt about a theory which was clearly unknown to the apostles. This does not mean that the arguments should not be taken very seriously, but that we need to seek a synthesis between an apparently unanswerable mathematical argument and equally apparently valid theological arguments.

Editorial Note With the greatest respect, after correspondence with Dr. Brodeur and consultation with others including Professor D. J. Wiseman, we find it difficult to understand Dr. Brodeur's calculation. The unadjusted date 590.262 would correspond, we reckon, to about 26 Sept. BC 590. To allow for the fact that there is no year zero, we

subtract one year from the negative number giving a date around the end of September BC 591.

Wisely Dr. Brodeur makes no claim to exactitude: his discovery is no less remarkable if the seven times of the Gentiles started just before the beginning of Nebuchadrezzar's siege of Jerusalem, perhaps when he set out from Babylon finally resolved to make a full end of the city. There is obviously some ambiguity about the start of the period, but it is small – less than 0.1% of the total time involved.

Later note Dr. Brodeur now agrees with the amended date. He says that this corresponds with the giving of oracles to Ezekiel, Chs. 20-23, and that most of the blessings and curses of Leviticus 26 are in fact alluded to in Ezekiel.