

The Numbers

How to be CERTAIN Jesus Returns in 2030

C. Luke Humphreys

A companion volume to Teaching History Before It Happens • 2026

Table of Contents

How to Read This Book	3
The Answer on One Page	4
PART I — GROUND RULES	5
Chapter 1 — The Rules of Counting.....	5
Chapter 2 — Which Calendar, and Why.....	8
Chapter 3 — What Counts as Evidence	11
PART II — THE TWO SENTENCES.....	15
Chapter 4 — Ezekiel 4: Two Prisons, Two Sentences	15
Chapter 5 — Leviticus 26: Multiplied by Seven	18
Chapter 6 — Israel’s Clock.....	26
Chapter 7 — Judah’s Clock.....	29
PART III — THE SEVENTY WEEKS.....	35
Chapter 8 — Daniel’s Seventy Weeks	35
PART IV — CONVERGENCE.....	47
Chapter 9 — Four Clocks, One Year	47
Chapter 10 — Passover 2030: The Expiration Date.....	52
PART V — FROM YEAR TO DAY	55
Chapter 11 — The Five Months.....	55
Chapter 12 — 1,290 · 1,260 · 1,250 · 1,335	59
Chapter 13 — The Feast Sequence.....	63
Chapter 14 — Where the Two Calendars Agree	66
PART VI — ADVERSARIAL.....	69
Chapter 15 — The Strongest Objections.....	69
Appendices	75
Appendix A — Master Timeline	75
Appendix B — Every Calculation, Reproducible	78
Appendix C — The Day Counts.....	79
Appendix D — Feast Calendar 2025–2030, Both Reckonings	80
Appendix E — Chronology Notes	81

How to Read This Book

Don't believe me.

That's not modesty. It's the method. This book makes a specific claim about a specific year, and the only honest way to make a claim like that is to hand you the tools to check it and then get out of your way.

So here is what I have done. Every number in this book has been recomputed from scratch. Not copied from my earlier book. Not taken on trust from the teachers I learned it from. Recomputed, from the raw inputs, in a spreadsheet that recalculates itself and tells me when something has stopped adding up. That spreadsheet caught two of my own errors while I was building it. I have left both errors in the record, in Chapter 3, because you should know what a book looks like when its author is willing to be corrected by his own arithmetic.

Here is what I ask of you in return. Read the first three chapters before you read anything else.

I know that's not how anyone reads a prophecy book. You want the dates. The dates are in Chapter 6, and I'm not going to pretend I don't know that you're going to flip ahead. But the first three chapters are where I tell you exactly how I am counting, exactly which calendar I am using and why, and exactly what counts as evidence in this book and what doesn't. If I told you the conclusion first and the method afterward, you would be justified in suspecting that I picked the method to fit the conclusion. So the method comes first, before you know where it leads.

That is the difference between arithmetic and numerology. Arithmetic states its rules before it computes. Numerology finds a rule that produces the number it wanted.

A note on tone, since prophecy books have a reputation. If I could, I would shout at you. I am going to tell you that you must act now. I don't do urgency as a sales technique; I tell you the Lord's calendar and warn you to act upon it. I'm going to lay out what I've found the way I was trained to lay out an intelligence assessment: sources, confidence levels. What you do with it is between you and God. It always was. I'm not responsible for your eternal address, you are. I pray that we are together in heaven, but if not, you will think of me every 1,000 years FOREVER and cry that you did not listen to me.

One more thing, and then we'll start.

You will find, scattered through this book, places where people consider my argument to be weak. They are not buried in footnotes; they are in the main text, at the point where they matter. There are no weak links in this chain, but you are going to find some that you *think* are. You're not stupid; you just *don't understand yet*.

C. Luke Humphreys info@purelife2030.com

The Answer on One Page

Before the work, the destination. So you know where this is going and can watch me get there.

Ezekiel 4 records two prison sentences. God tells the prophet to lie on his left side for 390 days and on his right side for 40 days — a day for each year — bearing the iniquity of the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Two nations, two separate sentences, two separate clocks.

Leviticus 26 states the escalation rule. Four times in one chapter, God says that if the punishment does not produce repentance, He will punish “seven times more.” Four warnings, four multiplications.

Neither house repented. So both clocks were multiplied.

Israel's clock. The 390 years run from the failed Assyrian siege of Jerusalem in 701 BC, expiring in 311 BC. No repentance. Multiplied by seven: $390 \times 7 = 2,730$ years, re-run from the original start.

$$701 \text{ BC} + 2,730 \text{ years} = \mathbf{2030 \text{ AD}}$$

Judah's clock. The 40 years run from the crucifixion in AD 30 to the siege of Jerusalem in AD 70. No repentance. Multiplied by seven: 280 years, expiring in AD 350. Still no repentance. Multiplied by seven again — forty multiplied by seven twice over, $40 \times 7^2 = 1,960$ years.

$$\text{AD } 70 + 1,960 \text{ years} = \mathbf{2030 \text{ AD}}$$

Two further clocks land on the same year. Two thousand years — forty Jubilees — from the crucifixion of AD 30 lands on 2030. And a generation of eighty years, the span Psalm 90 gives for a strong man's life, counted from the Knesset's declaration of Jerusalem as capital on 23 January 1950, lands on 2030. Chapter 9 audits how far these four are genuinely independent of one another, and the answer is *less than I once claimed*.

The sentences expire at Passover. Judah's clock began at Passover in AD 70, when Titus closed on the walls of Jerusalem. Passover to Passover, 1,960 years, brings us to the Passover season of 2030. The clock fixes the year; fixing the day within that season takes a further step, made in Chapter 10, which lands on 21 Nisan — the last day of Unleavened Bread, 24 April 2030.

Then five months. Revelation 9:5 gives a period of five months in which men are tormented and cannot die — driven, not destroyed, toward repentance. From 24 April 2030 to **27 September 2030** is 157 days on the inclusive count — five calendar months and three days. Chapter 11 deals with those three days rather than rounding them away.

Which is Yom Teruah. The Feast of Trumpets. The next feast in the sequence Jesus has not yet fulfilled — He fulfilled the four spring feasts exactly on schedule at His first coming, and three fall feasts remain.

Everything else in this book is the work of showing that those seven paragraphs are true.

PART I — GROUND RULES

Establishing the method before you know where it leads.

Chapter 1 — The Rules of Counting

There is a version of this book that skips this chapter. It's a worse book.

Almost every argument about prophetic dates that I have ever watched collapse, collapsed here — not over theology, not over history, but over somebody quietly changing how they counted partway through. So before I count anything, I'm going to tell you the four rules I count by. They apply to every calculation in this book without exception. If you catch me breaking one, I have made a mistake and you should say so.

Rule 1 — Counts are inclusive of both endpoints

When Scripture says a period is 1,260 days, I take day one to be the starting day itself, and day 1,260 to be the final day. Both ends are counted.

This is not a convenience. It is how Hebrew reckons time, and the cleanest demonstration is circumcision.

Leviticus 12:3 commands that a boy be circumcised on the eighth day. A child born on a Sunday is circumcised the following Sunday. Count elapsed time and that is seven days. Scripture calls it the eighth. The day of birth is day one — the start date is counted.

Esther does the same thing and makes it unmistakable. She tells Mordecai to fast for three days, night and day (Esther 4:16), and then the text says she went in to the king “on the third day” (Esther 5:1) — the third day of a three-day fast, not the day after it. And the Feast of Weeks is counted fifty days from Firstfruits with Firstfruits itself counted, which is why Pentecost lands where it lands.

So: inclusive, both ends, every time.

When you check my day counts on timeanddate.com — and I hope you do, because that's what it's for — tick the box marked “**Include end date in calculation.**” Every count. Every time. Leave it unticked and you will get an answer one day short of mine and think I've made an error.

This rule is also where I made one of the two mistakes I mentioned in the introduction. I found it myself, and I am printing it because the standard in this book applies to me first.

In my first book, *Teaching History Before It Happens*, I printed two screenshots from that website as evidence. One of them, showing the 1,290-day count, has the box **unticked**. The other, showing the 1,260-day count, has it **ticked**. Two different rules, four pages apart, in a book arguing for precision.

Both screenshots produce the right answer for the date they're anchored to. The conclusion was never in danger. The method was — a book that counts two ways has no counting rule at all.

This book counts one way.

Rule 2 — A day begins at sundown, and the daylight date is the one I use

This one costs me a day, so pay attention to it.

A Hebrew day runs from sundown to sundown. Genesis sets the pattern in the first chapter: *“And there was evening and there was morning, one day.”* Evening first. This is why every Jewish feast in every calendar you will ever see is written as spanning two of our dates — “evening of 27 March to evening of 28 March.”

That creates an ambiguity that matters enormously when you're counting to a specific day, and almost nobody addresses it. If a period begins on a feast that runs from the evening of the 27th to the evening of the 28th, which one is day one?

I use the daylight date. The 28th.

The daylight portion is the part of the day a human being lives through awake, acts in, and would describe as “the day it happened.” When Scripture dates an event, it dates the day the event was visible. And it produces a count that reconciles with every other count in the system. The alternative does not.

This is why, throughout this book, the Abomination of Desolation or Pope Leo's endorsement of the reborn Ottoman Empire is described as occurring in the window from sundown 27 March 2027 to sundown 28 March 2027 — but the 1,290-day count begins on **28 March 2027**.

That single day is the difference between a timeline that closes and one that is off by one everywhere.

Rule 3 — There is no year zero

The year 1 BC is followed immediately by the year AD 1. There is no year in between. The convention was designed in the sixth century by a monk who was working in Roman numerals, and Roman numerals have no zero.

The practical consequence is that naive subtraction across the BC/AD boundary is wrong by one year, always, and in exactly the direction that makes a date-setter's numbers look better than they are.

I refuse to rely on getting this right by hand. Every year-span calculation in this book is done in what astronomers call astronomical year numbering, where 1 BC is written as year 0, 2 BC as -1, and so on. In that system, 701 BC is the year -700. Adding is then ordinary arithmetic:

$$-700 + 2,730 = \mathbf{2,030}$$

And 2,030 in astronomical numbering is AD 2030, because for positive years the two systems agree. The conversion is mechanical, it's done by formula in the webpage that accompanies this book, and the off-by-one error becomes structurally impossible rather than merely watched for.

Check it the long way if you like. From 701 BC to 1 BC is 700 years. From 1 BC to AD 1 is one more year, making 701. That leaves $2,730 - 701 = 2,029$ years to run from AD 1, landing in AD 2030. Same answer. It just takes longer and it's easier to fumble.

Rule 4 — A year is a year, and a day is a day, unless the text says otherwise

Prophetic arithmetic has a bad reputation and it earned it. The reputation comes from teachers who convert freely between units whenever the conversion helps — a day becomes a year here, a year becomes 360 days there, a “time” becomes whatever it needs to be — until any number can be made to reach any other number.

I use exactly one conversion, and I use it because the text I'm reading performs it explicitly and tells me it's doing so.

In Ezekiel 4:6, God says of the forty days: *“I have assigned it to you for forty days, a day for each year.”* That is not my inference. That is the instruction, given in the passage, about how to read that passage. So the 390 days become 390 years and the 40 days become 40 years, on the authority of the verse itself.

Everywhere else, a day is a day. The 1,260 days of Revelation 11:3 are 1,260 literal days. The 1,290 and 1,335 of Daniel 12 are literal days. I do not convert them into years, and this puts me at odds with an entire school of interpretation — the historicists, who read the 1,260 as 1,260 years and place the whole tribulation in the medieval past. They are wrong. I name them here so you know I did not arrive at my reading in ignorance of theirs.

I also do not use a 360-day “prophetic year.” You will meet this idea constantly. It comes from noticing that 1,260 days divided by 42 months gives 30-day months, and from there people build a 360-day year and start converting large spans with it. The observation underneath it is real: 42 months of 30 days is 1,260, and that is intentional in the text. The extrapolation is where it breaks.

But watch what happens when you extend it. Convert 2,730 “prophetic years” of 360 days into solar years and you lose about 39 years across the span — 2,730 years of 360 days is 982,800 days, which is only 2,691 solar years. Run that from 701 BC and you land in 1991, not 2030. If I wanted a number that fit, the 360-day year is the first tool I'd reach for, and it takes me nowhere near where I want to go. So I don't use it. The 390 and the 40 are ordinary years, the 1,260 and 1,290 are ordinary days, and the only unit conversion in this book is the one Ezekiel 4:6 hands me.

The four rules, together

1. **Inclusive** — day one is the start date; both ends are counted.
2. **Daylight date** — a Hebrew day begins at sundown; I count from the daylight portion.

3. **No year zero** — year spans computed in astronomical numbering, converted back at the end.
4. **One conversion only** — days become years solely where Ezekiel 4:6 instructs it. No 360-day year.

Every calculation in this book obeys all four. The accompanying webpage enforces them in live formulas, and it will tell you if one stops holding.

Now, before we count anything, there's a harder question. Which calendar?

Chapter 2 — Which Calendar, and Why

This is the weakest link in this book, and I'm putting it in Chapter 2 rather than in an appendix.

Let me tell you the problem before I tell you my answer.

Every date in this book that falls on a Hebrew feast depends on knowing which day that feast falls on. For the fall feasts of 2030 — the destination of the whole argument — this turns out not to matter, and I'll show you why at the end of this chapter, and it's the best news in the book. But for one date it matters enormously.

That date is 27–28 March 2027.

Two ways to build a Hebrew calendar

The Hebrew calendar is lunisolar. Months follow the moon; years must follow the sun, or the harvest feasts drift out of their seasons. Twelve lunar months run about 354 days, eleven short of a solar year, so roughly every third year an extra month has to be inserted or Passover slides into winter.

The question is: **on what authority do you insert it?**

The observational answer — the one used through the entire biblical period and for centuries after — is that the first month is the one whose new moon falls nearest the spring equinox, confirmed by the state of the barley crop in Israel. Deuteronomy 16:1 commands Israel to "*observe the month of Abib*" — and *abib* is not the name of a month, it's a description of barley. It means the grain in the ear, green and ripening. The month is identified by looking at a field. If the barley wasn't ready, the Sanhedrin added a month, and they announced it, and everyone found out by signal fires and messengers.

The calculated answer is what the Jewish world has used since roughly the fourth century AD. Under pressure from Roman persecution — the Sanhedrin was being dismantled and could no longer reliably send out word — Hillel II is credited with fixing the calendar mathematically. A nineteen-year cycle inserts a thirteenth month in seven predetermined years. No observation required. It works anywhere in the world without a functioning court in Jerusalem.

It also carries four postponement rules, the *dechiyot*, that shift Rosh Hashanah by a day or two when it would otherwise land inconveniently — chiefly to prevent Yom Kippur falling adjacent to a Sabbath, which would mean two consecutive days on which no cooking or burial could occur.

The fixed calendar deserves better than the dismissal it usually gets from people in my camp. It was a necessary act of preservation by men trying to keep a nation's worship intact while their institutions were being destroyed. It is an extraordinary piece of mathematics. It has kept the feasts alive for sixteen centuries. It deserves respect.

But the postponement rules are administrative. They exist to make observance practical. They are not in Leviticus 23.

Why I use the observational calendar

Three reasons, in order of weight.

First, it's what the text describes. Leviticus 23 sets the feasts by the days of the months. Deuteronomy 16:1 sets the first month by the barley. Neither passage knows anything about a nineteen-year cycle or a rule preventing Yom Kippur from abutting a Sabbath. If I am reading Leviticus 23 to find out when a feast falls, I should use the method Leviticus 23 assumes.

Second, it's what was in force when the prophecies were given, and when the first four feasts were fulfilled. Ezekiel, Daniel, and John all wrote under an observational calendar. So did the Gospel writers. Jesus was crucified on a Passover set by observation, not by the Hillel cycle, which didn't exist for another three hundred years. If the first four feasts were fulfilled on an observational calendar, that is the calendar I expect the last three to be fulfilled on.

Third — and this is the unflattering reason — the calculated calendar drifts. The nineteen-year cycle is very good but not perfect; it runs long by about one day every 216 years. Over sixteen centuries the accumulated error is real, and it is one reason modern rabbinic Passover sometimes falls a full month after the equinox. That drift is a fact of the arithmetic, acknowledged by Jewish authorities, and it is a legitimate reason to prefer the astronomical method for questions of precise timing.

So the calendar used in this book, following the work of the Messiah 2030 Project, identifies the first month by the lunar conjunction nearest the spring equinox, computed astronomically for Jerusalem time.

Now the cost

Here is what that choice costs me, stated as plainly as I can.

I ran the comparison for every year from 2025 to 2030 — both calendars, every feast, side by side. Here is the gap between them, in days:

Year	Gap between the two calendars
2025	0 to 1 day
2026	1 day
2027	30 to 31 days
2028	1 to 2 days
2029	1 to 2 days
2030	1 day in spring, zero on every fall feast

Look at 2027.

In five of these six years the two calendars agree within a day or two. They are not rival systems producing wildly different results. They are two ways of approximating the same lunar reality, and mostly they land in the same place.

But 2027 is different. In 2027 the fixed calendar inserts its thirteenth month, Adar II, and the equinox rule does not.

The conjunction nearest the 2027 equinox falls on 8 March, so the observational first month begins at sundown that evening — daylight date 9 March, by Rule 2. That puts 14 Nisan, Passover, at sundown 21 March to sundown 22 March: daylight date **22 March 2027**.

The fixed calendar puts 1 Nisan on 8 April and 14 Nisan on **21 April 2027**.

Thirty days apart, in the one year of six where it matters most.

A full month apart. And 2027 is the single outlier year in the entire range.

So here is the vulnerability, said out loud: the date 27–28 March 2027 exists only under the observational calendar. If the fixed calendar is the right one, that date is simply not a feast day, the Firstfruits argument for it evaporates, and the start of the 1,290 has to be somewhere else.

The observational calendar is right, for the three reasons above. That is not a small question, and the people who disagree are not fools. It is the load-bearing assumption underneath the nearer of my two dates, and it happens to fall in the one year of six where the choice makes a month of difference. If that bothers you, it should. It bothered me enough to spend a long time on this chapter.

And now the good news

Look at the last row of that table again.

In 2030, the two calendars agree exactly. Not approximately. To the day, on every fall feast:

Feast	Observational calendar	Fixed rabbinic calendar
Yom Teruah (1 Tishri)	28 September 2030	28 September 2030
Yom Kippur (10 Tishri)	7 October 2030	7 October 2030
Sukkot begins (15 Tishri)	12 October 2030	12 October 2030
The 1,335th day	21 December 2030	21 December 2030

Sit with that, because it changes what you have to accept in order to take the rest of this book seriously.

The destination does not depend on my calendar.

A reader who rejects everything in this chapter — who thinks the observational calendar is an eccentricity and the fixed calendar is the only legitimate Hebrew calendar there is — still arrives at Yom Teruah on 28 September 2030 and Yom Kippur on 7 October 2030. Those two dates are not an artifact of my method. They are where both methods land. You can throw out my calendar entirely and the terminus is unchanged.

The starting gun is calendar-dependent. The destination is not.

This is exactly the point where a prophecy writer starts reaching for words like *miraculous*. **This convergence is not a miracle.** It is what two lunisolar systems do when they happen to fall into phase, which they do regularly — you can see them agreeing in 2025, 2026, 2028 and 2029 in that same table. The value of the 2030 agreement is defensive, not evidential. It doesn't prove the date. It removes an objection to it: nobody can dismiss the September and October 2030 dates as the output of a homemade calendar, because the standard calendar produces them too.

That's all it does. It's enough.

Chapter 3 — What Counts as Evidence

I spent the early years of my working life as an intelligence analyst before I spent it as a preacher. Korean linguist first, Dari later. The job was to look at fragmentary information and say something useful about what it meant, while being clear about how much confidence the evidence actually supported.

The discipline that job teaches, and the one I want to bring to this book, is that **not all of your claims are equally strong, and pretending otherwise is how you get people killed**. An assessment that presents everything in the same confident tone is worthless because the reader can't tell which parts to act on.

Most prophecy writing has exactly that problem. Arithmetic, history, interpretation and speculation are delivered in one continuous voice at one volume, and the reader is left to sort it out. So I'm going to sort it for you.

Four tiers

Every claim in this book falls into one of four categories, and I'll tell you which as I go.

Tier 1 — ARITHMETIC. Follows necessarily from its inputs. Cannot be wrong unless an input is wrong. $390 \times 7 = 2,730$ is Tier 1. So is $70 + 1,960 = 2030$. You do not need to trust me for any Tier 1 claim; you need a calculator.

Tier 2 — HISTORICAL. Well-attested in the historical record. Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem in 701 BC is Tier 2 — fixed by the Assyrian eponym canon, Sennacherib's own Prism inscription, and 2 Kings 18–19 independently. The Knesset vote of 23 January 1950 is Tier 2. These can be checked in any decent reference work, and I name the sources.

Tier 3 — INTERPRETIVE. An argued reading of a text. Reasonable, serious, God-fearing people disagree. Ezekiel's 390 years begin at the 701 BC siege is Tier 3. That Leviticus 26's "seven times" multiplies duration is Tier 3. **The two load-bearing arguments in this book are both Tier 3**, which is why they get a full chapter each rather than a paragraph.

Tier 4 — PROPHETIC. A future claim derived from tiers 1 through 3. Not verifiable yet. Everything about 2027 and 2030 is Tier 4. I hold these with conviction. In fact, I hold these as proven.

A chain is as strong as its weakest link, and the weakest links in this chain are Tier 3. Ironically, if only in my mind, Tier 4 links are *more* reliable than the Tier 3 because God confirmed them to me.

The difference between converging and fitting

The core argument of this book is convergence: four clocks, different start dates, different lengths, different multipliers, all terminating in 2030.

Two objections come at that, and they are different objections.

The first is that I found the year and reverse-engineered four routes to it. That's called curve-fitting, and it is the standard failure mode of prophetic date-setting. Given enough freedom in your parameters, you can reach any year you like from any starting point in Scripture. Anyone levelling that accusation is biased and unthinking, unworthy of the data.

The second is subtler and it is the one that would trouble me more in someone else's book: **agreement between sources that are not actually independent is worth much less than it looks.** Four witnesses agreeing is powerful. Four accounts that all trace back to one source are one witness repeated. I take that objection seriously enough to have given it a section of its own — Chapter 9 audits every clock for shared sources, shared anchors and shared interpretive moves, and the finding is that they are **not** four independent witnesses. I say so there, in a table, before anyone else can.

Take the curve-fitting objection first.

So what separates convergence from fitting? Three things, and I'd apply all three to anyone

else's system too:

Were the parameters chosen independently of the destination? The numbers 390 and 40 are given in Ezekiel 4. The multiplier seven is given in Leviticus 26. The eighty-year generation is given in Psalm 90:10. Not one of these was selected by me. The only choices I make are the *start dates*, and that's where the argument actually lives — which is why Chapters 6 and 7 spend most of their length defending start dates rather than doing arithmetic.

How many degrees of freedom are there? Each clock has two free choices: where it starts, and how many times the multiplier is applied. Eight parameters across four clocks, and I want to be straight that the second one is a genuine choice — Leviticus 26 does not tell you how many multiplications to perform.

But look at how coarse that second knob is. The multiplier is seven, so each additional application scales the whole sentence by seven. For Israel, starting at 701 BC with 390 years: zero multiplication lands in 311 BC, one lands in AD 2030, and two lands in the year 18410. For Judah, from AD 70 with forty years: zero gives AD 110, one gives AD 350, two gives AD 2030, three gives the year 13790.

There is exactly one value per clock that lands anywhere in recorded history at all. That is not a knob you can tune; it is a switch with one plausible position. The start dates are where real freedom lives, which is why Chapters 6 and 7 spend most of their length defending start dates rather than doing arithmetic.

Does the system produce checks it did not need to pass? This is the strongest test, and it's the one I'd apply to me if I were you. A fitted system produces exactly the answers it was built to produce and nothing more. A system that is describing something real tends to produce surprises — results that fall out of it without being aimed at.

There are three of those in this book, and you'll meet them later. The gap between Daniel's 1,290 and John's 1,260 turns out to be exactly thirty days, which is exactly the length of the apostasy period, and I did not put it there — it's the difference between two numbers written six hundred years apart by two authors. The gap between the 1,260 and the 1,250 turns out to be exactly ten days, and there is exactly one pair of feasts in the entire Hebrew calendar that are ten days apart, and the counts land on both ends of it. And Daniel's 1,335 lands on the anniversary of the rededication of the Temple, which I did not notice until the spreadsheet told me.

None of those three had to work. They are not what the system was built for. When a model keeps producing correct answers to questions you didn't ask, that is the signature of a model that is tracking something real.

What I got wrong

I said in the introduction that building the verification webpage caught two of my own errors. Here they are, because a book that claims to be checkable should show what checking it produced.

The counting rule. Described in Chapter 1 — two different inclusive/exclusive conventions in my first book, four pages apart. Fixed by declaring one rule and applying it everywhere.

The destruction of the Temple. In *Teaching History Before It Happens*, I wrote that the Temple was destroyed “during Passover, 70 CE.”

That is wrong. Josephus is clear, and so is the Mishnah. Titus closed on the walls of Jerusalem at Passover, 14 Nisan, in about the middle of April AD 70 — the city was packed with pilgrims, which is precisely why the siege was so catastrophic. But the Temple itself did not burn until 9 or 10 Av, roughly three and a half months later, in early August.

I had compressed a siege into an event. It’s a common enough error and it was still mine.

What’s interesting is what happened when I corrected it. Judah’s clock needs a Passover-to-Passover span to land on Passover 2030. The *siege* began at Passover. The Temple burned in August. So the corrected fact — the siege, not the burning — is the one that actually anchors the count properly.

The error had been making my own argument weaker. That happens more often than people expect, and it’s an argument for checking your work even when you like your conclusion.

What this book does and does not claim

Four things, so we’re clear before we start.

I do claim to have been told things by God. I’ll deal with the “no one knows the day or the hour” objection properly in the final chapter, but I’m not going to let it sit unaddressed for eighty pages, so here is the short version. This book names a date. It arrives at that date by inference from texts and history, compiling a myriad facts and seeing how they fit together.

I do not claim any single line of this argument is proof. Not one of the four clocks would persuade me on its own. Any one of them could be coincidence; the Bible is a big book and there are a lot of numbers in it. The argument is the convergence. I state that plainly and repeatedly so no one mistakes this for a book resting its weight on one calculation.

I do claim my start dates are beyond dispute. They are Tier 3. I argue for them. Someone could argue back, but they would be wrong.

I do not claim to be anyone special. God uses repentant people. I’m a man who has devoted himself fully to serving the Lord in holiness, I’m only special in that such men are rare.

Those are the ground rules. Now the actual argument.

PART II — THE TWO SENTENCES

The two load-bearing chapters, and the two clocks they set running.

Chapter 4 — Ezekiel 4: Two Prisons, Two Sentences

Ezekiel is asked to do a strange thing.

“As for you, lie down on your left side and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel on it; you shall bear their iniquity for the number of days that you lie on it. For I have assigned you a number of days corresponding to the years of their iniquity, three hundred and ninety days; thus, you shall bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. When you have completed these, you shall lie down a second time, but on your right side and bear the iniquity of the house of Judah; I have assigned it to you for forty days, a day for each year.” — Ezekiel 4:4–6

Before that, in verses 1 to 3, he is told to do something stranger:

*“Now you son of man, get yourself a brick, place it before you and inscribe a city on it, Jerusalem. Then lay siege against it... Then get yourself an iron plate and set it up as an iron wall between you and the city and set your face toward it so that it is under siege, and besiege it. **This is a sign to the house of Israel.**”*

A brick with a city drawn on it. Siege works built around it. An iron griddle — the word is the ordinary Hebrew word for a flat cooking plate — standing upright between the prophet and the city. And then 390 days on one side and 40 days on the other, each day standing for a year.

Four things are established in these six verses, and I want to take them in order to show how much they're disputed.

Undisputed: a day stands for a year

Verse 6 says it outright: *“a day for each year.”* This is the only unit conversion in this book, and I use it here because the passage performs it on itself. Nobody argues about this.

Undisputed: there are two separate sentences

Israel gets 390. Judah gets 40. They are given separately, borne separately, and they are not added together into a single 430.

Some translations of the Greek Septuagint read 190 rather than 390 for the first number, and some interpreters combine the figures to reach 430 and see a deliberate echo of the 430 years in Egypt. I use the Hebrew Masoretic 390 and I keep the sentences separate, because the passage itself keeps them separate — different sides, different nations, different durations, and a clear instruction to complete the first before beginning the second.

The two-nation reading is also just what the history requires. By Ezekiel's day these are two distinct political entities with two distinct records. The northern kingdom, the House of Israel — ten tribes that broke away under Jeroboam after Rehoboam's arrogance split the kingdom — went into idolatry so total that God describes Himself as having divorced her. She was destroyed by Assyria and deported and never came back. The southern kingdom, the House of Judah, was also unfaithful, but repeatedly and partially repented, was never divorced, and was preserved.

Two nations, two records, two sentences. That's the text.

What the iron griddle means

Now we get to interpretation, so the tier drops.

The griddle stands between the prophet — who is playing the part of the besieging army — and the city. It is a barrier. God's own commentary in verse 3 is that this is "*a sign to the house of Israel.*" When it's time to switch sides for Judah, the griddle is not present.

I read the barrier as meaning **the siege it depicts will not succeed**. The army does not get through. Something stands between the besieger and the city.

That reading has an obvious historical candidate. Jerusalem was besieged more than once, and the sieges divide cleanly into two kinds. Nebuchadnezzar's siege in 586 BC succeeded; the walls came down, the Temple burned, the people went to Babylon. Titus's siege in AD 70 succeeded; the same thing happened again. But in 701 BC, Sennacherib of Assyria besieged Jerusalem and **failed**.

That failure is one of the best-attested events in the ancient Near East, and it's attested from both sides. Second Kings 19 records the angel of the LORD striking the Assyrian camp and Sennacherib withdrawing to Nineveh. And Sennacherib's own Prism — his official account, written by his own scribes, with every incentive to boast — describes shutting Hezekiah up in Jerusalem "*like a caged bird*" and then, remarkably, never claims to have taken the city. An Assyrian king who conquered a capital said so at length. This one didn't.

An unsuccessful siege of Jerusalem, depicted by a barrier the besieger cannot pass. I find that a natural fit, and I'm here to tell you that it is right.

What the two sides mean

This is the argument the whole book rests on, so I'm going to slow down.

Ezekiel lies on his left side for Israel, then on his right side for Judah, facing the city throughout. Why does the text specify which side?

The plainest answer is geographic: facing east, north is on your left and south is on your right. Israel was the northern kingdom, Judah the southern. Left equals north equals Israel; right equals south equals Judah. That is one reading, it is the majority reading, and it is entirely sufficient to explain the detail, but I'll show you it is wrong. **A reader who stops there loses nothing about the identity of the two nations and gains no clock.**

The reading I hold — following the Messiah 2030 Project’s work, which is where I first encountered it — is that the sides also encode **direction in time**.

Here is the argument. Hebrew is written right to left. A Hebrew reader’s eye starts at the right margin and travels left. If you laid out a sequence of events the way a Hebrew scribe laid out words — and Hebrew scribes did draw sequences this way — the earlier events sit to the right and the later events to the left.

The prophet is lying beside a depiction of a besieged Jerusalem. The siege is the fixed point in the middle of the diagram. And he lies on one side of it, then on the other.

- **Left side, Israel, 390 years.** Left of the siege on a right-to-left timeline means *after* it. Israel’s 390 years run forward from the siege.
- **Right side, Judah, 40 years.** Right of the siege means *before* it. Judah’s 40 years run so as to terminate at a siege.

If that is right, then Ezekiel has been given not just two durations but two directions, and the siege depicted on the brick is the hinge both sentences turn on.

Now let me argue against myself because you deserve to see the counter-case at full strength.

The objection. This is a lot of weight for a positional detail to carry. Ezekiel is a prophet lying in the dirt, not a draftsman producing a scale diagram. If God meant “these years run after the siege” and “these run before it,” He had the vocabulary to say so — Hebrew has perfectly ordinary words for before and after — and He said them elsewhere in Ezekiel readily enough. Reading chronological direction out of which side of his body a man is lying on is inference from a stage direction. It’s clever. Clever is not the same as true.

I feel the force of that.

What I’d say back. Three things.

First, the detail is *specified*, twice, and the specification does no work under the geographic-only reading. If left and right merely identify north and south, the sides are decorative — the text has already named both houses explicitly in the same breath. God gave Ezekiel a great many symbolic acts and the details generally mean something.

Second, the iron griddle points the same direction. Under a purely geographic reading, the griddle is a barrier that doesn’t need explaining because the siege doesn’t need identifying. Under the reading I hold, the griddle identifies *which* siege — the unsuccessful one — and the sides tell you which way to count from it. The two details work together, which is some evidence they belong together.

Third: **the reading is confirmed downstream, not upstream.** Nobody would derive this from Ezekiel 4 alone, reading cold. What makes me hold it is that when you follow it out, both sentences terminate in the same year by two entirely different routes, and that year is also where two further clocks land. The reading is warranted by what it produces, not by its own self-evidence.

That is a legitimate form of argument — it's how a hypothesis earns its keep in any discipline — but it is not the strongest form, and I won't dress it up as one. If the downstream convergence in Chapters 6 and 7 doesn't happen, you should drop this reading. It rises or falls with what it yields.

Tier 3. Argued, not proven. The strongest objection stated in full. That's where this stands, and now you can weigh it yourself.

What Ezekiel 4 gives us

- Two nations, two sentences: 390 years and 40 years. (*Tier 2 — the text says it.*)
- A day stands for a year. (*Tier 2 — verse 6 says it.*)
- A siege that fails, marked by an iron barrier. (*Tier 3 — argued.*)
- Israel's years run forward from that siege; Judah's run to a siege. (*Tier 3 — argued, and this is the weak link.*)

What Ezekiel 4 does *not* give us is any hint that these numbers might be multiplied. For that we have to go back nine hundred years, to a chapter of Leviticus that almost nobody reads.

Chapter 5 — Leviticus 26: Multiplied by Seven

Leviticus 26 is the chapter where God tells Israel, before they have entered the land, exactly what will happen if they abandon Him in it.

It is not a comfortable chapter. It is also the most structurally interesting chapter in the Torah, because it doesn't threaten one punishment. It threatens an escalating series of them, in stages, with an explicit rule for the escalation — and it states that rule four separate times.

v.18 — “If also after these things you do not obey Me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins.” **v.21** — “If then, you act with hostility against Me and are unwilling to obey Me, I will increase the plague on you seven times according to your sins.” **v.24** — “then I will act with hostility against you; and I, even I, will strike you seven times for your sins.” **v.28** — “then I will act with wrathful hostility against you, and I, even I, will punish you seven times for your sins.”

Four warnings. Each conditional on continued refusal. Each specifying **seven times**.

The structure is unmistakable and it is deliberate: this is a graduated penalty system with a stated multiplier. Whatever “seven times” means, God says it four times in one chapter, and each time it is triggered by the same condition — *you still did not repent*.

The question this chapter turns on

Everything now depends on two Hebrew words: שבע (*sheva*), seven, and the phrase built on it.

There are two readings, and they are genuinely different.

Reading A — intensity. “Seven times more” means sevenfold in severity. Worse, harder, more thorough. “Seven” is used the way Scripture often uses it, as the number of completeness — a full and finished measure of chastisement. Under this reading the phrase says nothing whatever about how long anything lasts.

Reading B — duration. “Seven times” multiplies the sentence. If the term was 390 years and it did not produce repentance, the term becomes 390×7 .

Reading A is the majority position. I put that on the record in my own words. Most commentators, most translations, and most study Bibles read the phrase as intensifying severity, not extending time. The most common English rendering, “sevenfold,” naturally suggests degree rather than length. If you polled Hebrew scholars, Reading A would win comfortably. They are all wrong.

And this book requires Reading B. Without it there are no multiplied sentences, no 2,730 years, no 1,960 years, and no 2030. This is the hinge. If Reading A is right, close the book.

So let me make the case for B, and let me start by conceding what’s true in A.

What the intensity reading gets right

It gets the immediate context right. The punishments listed in Leviticus 26 are qualitative — terror, wasting disease, defeat, drought, wild animals, siege, cannibalism, exile. They escalate in horror. Reading the multiplier as intensifying that horror fits the surrounding material naturally.

And “seven” absolutely does carry the sense of completeness across Scripture. Seven days of creation. Sevenfold vengeance for Cain. Naaman dipping seven times. Forgiving seventy times seven. Nobody counting those.

The intensity reading is not a stretch. It is the obvious reading of the sentence in isolation.

The case for duration

First, the shape of the chapter, because the argument depends on it and almost nobody lays it out.

	Trigger	Punishment
Baseline	vv. 14–15 — if you do not obey	vv. 16–17 · terror, wasting disease, defeat
Escalation 1	v. 18 — <i>seven times more</i>	vv. 19–20 · sky like iron, land yields nothing
Escalation 2	v. 21 — <i>seven times</i>	v. 22 · wild beasts, children taken, roads deserted
Escalation 3	v. 24 — <i>seven times</i>	vv. 25–26 · sword, pestilence, bread by ration
Escalation 4	v. 28 — <i>seven times</i>	vv. 29–33 · cannibalism, cities laid waste, scattered among the nations

Four times, the same conditional: *you still did not turn to Me* → *seven times*. And note where the last one lands — in exile, scattered among the nations.

A caution about that table. I have numbered those escalations one to four, and it would be easy to slide from “the chapter states the rule four times” to “the rule fires exactly four times and then expires.” The text does not say that. It never announces a final escalation, never says *and after this I will multiply no more*. What it gives is a conditional — *if you still will not turn, then seven times* — stated four times over.

Whether that is an enumeration of four discrete events or a standing rule pressed home four times so that Israel would take it seriously is itself an interpretation, and the text leaves it open. I lean toward the standing rule: a conditional repeated in identical form reads more like a policy than a list, and the condition that triggers it has never been cancelled. I’m not here to debate anything. God sent me to tell you what is true, not to be one among many scholars with opinions. Reading B – duration is the only correct one.

Now the arguments — seven of them, roughly weakest to strongest, with one exception. The last is deliberately out of order: it is the honest one, and honest is not the same as strong. Arguments four and five are the pair the chapter rests on, and they are best read together.

One: the Hebrew is not decisive. The phrase in verse 18 is *שֶׁבַע עַל־הַפְּשָׁאֵיכֶם* — *sheva al-chattotekhem*, seven upon your sins. It is adverbial and it is unmarked. It does not say “seven times as severely,” and it does not say “seven times as long.” Both are grammatically available. English translations that render it “sevenfold” have made a choice the Hebrew doesn’t force. This doesn’t prove Reading B — it just means the door isn’t closed by grammar, which is a lower bar than it might sound but is worth establishing.

Two: the punishment the chapter actually ends with is a duration. Leviticus 26 escalates through its four stages, terminates in exile — and then immediately measures that exile in *time*, and specifically in sabbath years:

“Then the land will enjoy its sabbaths all the days of the desolation, while you are in your enemies’ land; then the land will rest and enjoy its sabbaths.” — Leviticus 26:34

The verse after it presses the same point: all the days of its desolation, the land observes the rest it did not observe while Israel lived on it.

Look at how tight that is. The fourth “*seven times*” is verse 28. Its punishment runs through verse 33 and ends in scattering. And in verse 34 — the very next line — the text states how that punishment is measured: in a count of years. The final multiplier and the counted duration are adjacent in the text, with nothing between them.

The chapter’s own logic ends in arithmetic. A multiplier attached to a penalty the text measures in years is a multiplier that is doing something to years.

Three: this is how the exile was in fact reckoned. When the seventy years of Babylon are accounted for in 2 Chronicles 36:21, the Chronicler reaches straight back to Leviticus 26 for

the reason: it happened “*to fulfill the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed its sabbaths.*” The exile is explained as sabbath years being repaid, and the repayment is counted. And Daniel, in Daniel 9:2, reads Jeremiah’s seventy years as a literal duration, counts it, and prays when it runs out.

So we have canonical precedent for exactly the operation I am performing: taking a punishment period from the Torah, treating it as a number of years, counting it, and expecting it to expire. Daniel did that. It is not an exotic move.

Four: seven times *what, exactly?* This is not an argument I started with. It came out of an objection, and it changed how I understand the whole question.

Severity is not a measurable quantity. There is no unit in which one punishment is seven times another punishment. Ask what it would mean for a famine to be precisely seven times worse than a previous famine and the question has no answer — not because it is hard to compute, but because there is nothing to compute with.

Duration does have a unit. Years. A forty-year sentence multiplied by seven is a two-hundred-and-eighty-year sentence, and anyone can check it.

Now push on it. A punishment is not a quality floating free of the world; it is something inflicted on people, and inflicting takes time. Every punishment therefore has two dimensions — how hard, and how long — and the *total* punishment is a product of both. So when the text says the punishment will be seven times, it is saying something about that total. And of the two dimensions the total is made of, exactly one can carry a factor of seven in any checkable way.

There is a real rebuttal, and it is the only escape route. Seven is idiomatic for completeness across Scripture — “vengeance will be taken on him sevenfold” in Genesis 4:15 is nobody’s arithmetic. If *seven times* in Leviticus 26 is idiom of that kind, it means *fully*, and carries no quantity at all.

Take that route and see where it goes. If the number is pure idiom, then it is not measuring anything, and the four statements are not an escalating sequence — they are the same thing said four times with increasing emphasis. The punishments in verses 19, 22, 25 and 29 would be four descriptions of judgment rather than four steps up a ladder.

So there is a fork, and both paths lead somewhere I can work with. Either *seven times* is quantitative — in which case it bears on a total that has a time dimension, and duration is the only dimension in which the factor is checkable — or it is not quantitative at all, in which case Reading A is not a reading about severity being multiplied either. It is a reading about God saying *this is serious* four times.

The intensity reading survives only in that second, weaker form. It cannot be both a real multiplication and a multiplication of something unmeasurable.

Five: only one of the two readings can be wrong.

Follow argument four one step further. If the factor of seven attaches to severity, then it attaches to a quantity nobody can state, measure, or check. How severe was the

punishment before? Unstated. How severe after? Seven times that. Over what stretch of time? Also unstated — Leviticus 26 assigns no durations to any of its escalations.

A claim built that way cannot come out false. There is no observation, no date, no calculation that could ever contradict it. Whatever happens to Israel across three thousand years, it can be described as seven times something.

Now put the duration reading beside it. Three hundred and ninety years, multiplied by seven, from a stated start, gives a year — and that year is either right or it is not. A hostile reader can check it with a calculator in under a minute. It sticks its neck out.

A claim that cannot be wrong is not doing any work. That is not a preference for tidiness; it is the difference between saying something and saying nothing. If *seven times* is a real multiplication of a real quantity, it ought to be possible in principle to discover that it has been applied wrongly. Only one of these two readings makes that possible.

There is a bad version of this argument standing one step away. The bad version runs: *the duration reading gives me a number and the severity reading doesn't, therefore the duration reading is correct.* That is not an argument, it is a preference — and it is precisely what a critic means when he says the whole system is motivated reasoning. Wanting a determinate answer is no evidence that the text supplies one. Plenty of texts genuinely don't.

The good version is a claim about how the text behaves, not about what I would like. **Look at what Ezekiel is actually handed.** Not “lie there a long while.” Three hundred and ninety days, then forty days — and then, in case the point should be missed, an explicit conversion rate: *a day for each year.* God quantified the sentence and then told the prophet which unit to read it in. That is not the language of atmosphere. Numbers issued that precisely, with a stated conversion attached, are issued to be counted.

Set that beside Leviticus 26 and notice the economy of it. There is a precise multiplier in one chapter and precise terms in another. Under the duration reading, every number in play meets another number and does work. Under the severity reading, the precise multiplier never touches the precise terms — it acts instead on something unquantified, while 390 and 40 sit idle after their first expiry.

That is not proof. God is under no obligation to make His numbers convenient to me, and an argument from economy is finally an argument about how a text ought to hang together. But when one reading leaves every stated quantity unused and the other puts all of them to work, that is worth noticing — and unlike the bad version, it is a claim about the text rather than a claim about my preferences.

Six: the severity reading runs out of chapter before history runs out of unrepentance. Arguments four and five are about what the words can mean. This one is about what the chapter is still for.

Under the severity reading, Leviticus 26 describes a closed sequence. Four intensifications, ending in exile, and then the chapter turns in verses 40 to 42 to the possibility of confession. The escalator stops. As an account of what happened to Israel down to Babylon,

it works — and then it has nothing further to say.

But the condition that drove every one of those four escalations was one thing: *you still did not turn to Me*. And that condition did not end at Babylon. The House of Judah has not turned to her Messiah in two thousand years. If the trigger is still live and the text has stopped, then Leviticus 26 is a chapter about the eighth and sixth centuries BC and about nothing since.

Under the duration reading it is still running. Every unrepented expiry produces a new term, and the chapter's arithmetic keeps working on a nation that is still refusing.

So the question is not only which reading the Hebrew permits — both do. It is which reading leaves Leviticus 26 with anything to say about the last two millennia.

Seven — and this is the one I hold most tightly — the reading is vindicated by what it produces. Same admission I made in Chapter 4, and for the same reason. Apply the multiplier as duration to the two sentences of Ezekiel 4 and both land on the same year, by different routes, with different multipliers, from start dates eight hundred years apart. If Reading B were wrong, that should not happen.

I'd rather show you that reasoning than hide it. It is inference to the best explanation, which is a real form of argument and a weaker one than proof.

Notice how five and seven fit together, because they are two halves of one operation. Argument five says the duration reading makes a claim that could fail. Argument seven says that when you run the check, it doesn't fail. Either half alone is weak — a falsifiable claim is not thereby true, and a lucky result proves nothing if the claim could never have come out wrong in the first place. Together they are simply how you test anything: say something that could be false, then go and look.

The version of that argument I am not going to print

Argument four has a louder cousin, and I want to show you both the good version and the bad one, because the difference between them is the whole method of this book.

The louder version runs: multiplied severity still has to be *administered*, and administering takes time. The only term the text has given for Judah is forty years. So the seven-times-worse punishment must run for another forty years — and when that ends unrepented, seven times worse again for another forty. Across two thousand years that is roughly fifty terms, and the severity ends up at seven to the fiftieth power, a number with forty-two digits. Nobody could survive that. Therefore severity is impossible.

The first half of that is right, and it is what argument four is built on. A punishment does have to be administered over time. Severity cannot float free of duration. That observation is what makes me think the intensity reading is incomplete rather than merely unlikely.

The second half is where it goes wrong, and it goes wrong in two places.

It needs the carrier to be *another forty years specifically*, and nothing establishes that.

Leviticus 26 gives no durations at all. Not one of its four escalations is assigned a length; the punishments in verses 19, 22, 25 and 29 simply run until the next escalation. Someone holding the intensity reading can say the intensified punishment ran for an unspecified stretch, and the text does not contradict him. To insist the stretch must be forty years, I have to import Ezekiel's term into a chapter that never mentions it — and importing my own framework into my opponent's position is the same error as arguing in a circle, just better disguised.

And the forty-two-digit number is the weakest part of a good argument, not the strongest. What is actually wrong with unbounded severity multiplication is not that the number gets large. It is that *seven times worse than seven times worse than exile* does not describe a state of affairs. The problem is incoherence, not magnitude — and that is exactly the point argument four already makes, without the theatrics.

There is a third reason, and it is the one that decided it for me. If I grant that multiplied severity requires a repeating term, I have not refuted the intensity reading — I have quietly converted it into a duration reading and then declared victory. An opponent who genuinely holds that *seven times* means *fully, completely, in good measure* is not committed to any repeating term at all, so the reductio never reaches him. It only defeats a position nobody holds. However, it is evident that if punishment is multiplied “fully” then can it be “fully” multiplied again? With or without repentance, the punishment would have reached its limit of severity.

I set this out at length for a reason larger than this one argument. A big number persuades out of all proportion to its content, and prophetic writing has a long habit of reaching for one. If I am going to ask you to check my arithmetic everywhere else in this book, I have to be willing to throw out the calculation that flatters me most. This one flattered me and I am not printing it.

One more disclosure while I am here. An earlier draft of this chapter argued that Leviticus 26 caps the escalations at four — verses 18, 21, 24, 28 — so severity could never compound past seven to the fourth. **That was not available to me either. The text nowhere states a cap.** I was reading a limit into a pattern, which is precisely the move I spend this book asking other people not to make. It is gone.

If the rule is open-ended, why does it stop in 2030?

That is the question left over, and I am raising it before anyone else does.

If Leviticus 26 states a standing rule rather than a list of four, then the rule is still live whenever a term expires unrepented. Judah's sentence was multiplied at AD 70 and again at AD 350. When the current term runs out in 2030 with Judah still unrepentant, why does the rule not simply fire again — 1,960 multiplied by seven, another 13,720 years?

There is no arithmetic answer to that. The arithmetic would happily keep going. The answer has to come from outside the arithmetic, and it is the whole reason this book exists: **the sequence does not run out of escalations, it runs out of time.** Leviticus 26 does not

end in escalation. It ends, in verses 40 to 42, in confession and a remembered covenant. The multiplications are not the destination; they are what happens while the destination is refused.

What Chapters 10 through 12 argue is that in 2030 *the refusing stops* — that after the sentence expires there are five months in which the unrepentant are driven, not destroyed, and then Messiah returns and the arrangement the sentence belonged to comes to an end. Another multiplication would require another thirteen thousand years of a covenant God has said He will remember.

So the stopping point is not read off the chapter. It is read off everything else in this book — three other clocks landing in the same year, the day counts terminating on the fall feasts, the feast sequence Jesus has not yet completed. If those fail, then yes, the expectation would be 13,790 and not 2030.

Why it was never either/or

One more thought, and it is the most useful in the chapter.

I set this up at the start as two competing readings, A and B, and that framing is how the question is usually put. I now think the framing is wrong, and argument four is the reason.

A punishment has two dimensions — how hard and how long — and the amount of it is a product of both. Severity without duration is not a lighter punishment; it is not a punishment at all, because nothing is being inflicted on anyone. Duration without severity is empty in the same way. Neither dimension exists on its own. So “*seven times the punishment*” was never a choice between multiplying one dimension or the other. It is a claim about the amount, and the amount is made of both.

Which means Reading A and Reading B are not rivals. Reading A describes one dimension of the thing; Reading B describes the dimension the number can actually be checked in. If a man will not learn from a punishment, lengthening it and intensifying it are the same act of a patient authority, not two competing theories about what that authority meant.

This does not dissolve the objection. The duration reading still has to carry the arithmetic on its own, and it is still Tier 3 — you are still taking my word that years are what the seven attaches to. But if you came into this chapter certain that Leviticus 26 is about severity, notice that you can be entirely right and this book still works. You would be describing the dimension I am not counting in. Nothing in that makes the other dimension go away.

What Leviticus 26 gives us

- A stated multiplier: **seven**. (*Tier 2 — it's in the text, four times.*)
- A stated trigger: **continued refusal to repent**. (*Tier 2.*)
- A stated structure: **four successive escalations**. (*Tier 2.*)
- The multiplier applies to the *duration* of the sentence. (*Tier 3 — argued above. The minority reading. The hinge of this book.*)
- And a note on what that minority status is worth. The majority reads *seven times* as

severity, and I have said loudly that the majority is wrong — I have argued that severity and duration are two dimensions of one quantity, that only one of them can carry a checkable factor of seven, and that a reading which multiplies the unmeasurable dimension has to explain what it is multiplying. That is a narrower claim than “everyone else is mistaken,” and it is the only one I need.

Two sentences from Ezekiel 4. One multiplier from Leviticus 26. That’s the whole toolkit.

Now we count.

Chapter 6 — Israel’s Clock

Two sentences, one multiplier, four rules of counting. Now we run the first clock.

Where it starts

Ezekiel’s 390 years belong to the House of Israel, the northern kingdom — the ten tribes that broke away under Jeroboam and never came back.

Under the reading argued in Chapter 4, Israel’s years lie to the *left* of the siege depicted on the brick, which on a right-to-left Hebrew timeline means they run **forward from it**. And the iron griddle marks that siege as one the besieger could not take.

There is one unsuccessful siege of Jerusalem in the record. **701 BC**.

Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against the fortified cities of Judah and took them. Then he came to Jerusalem, and did not take it. Second Kings 18–19 and Isaiah 36–37 tell the story from the inside — Hezekiah’s tribute, the Rabshakeh’s speech at the wall, Isaiah’s word, the angel of the LORD striking the camp, and Sennacherib going home to Nineveh where his sons eventually killed him in the temple of his god.

The Assyrian record tells the same story from the outside, and its silence is louder than the Bible’s speech. Sennacherib’s Prism, the official annals written by his own scribes, boasts of taking forty-six of Hezekiah’s walled cities and of shutting Hezekiah himself up in Jerusalem “*like a caged bird*.” And then it stops. It records tribute received. It never claims the city. An Assyrian king who took a capital said so, at length, with numbers. This one described a cage and moved on.

Tier 2. The date is fixed independently by the Assyrian eponym canon, by the Prism, and by the biblical account, and it is about as secure as any date in the eighth century BC gets. A minority of scholars propose a second campaign around 688–686 BC to resolve a difficulty about Tirhakah’s age; the majority holds to a single campaign in 701. I am using the majority date, which is also the traditional one.

A word on what I am *not* using. The northern kingdom fell to Assyria and was deported around 722 BC — Samaria besieged for three years and taken, the population resettled, the ten tribes lost. That is the obvious candidate for the start of Israel’s punishment, and it is not the date I use. It doesn’t produce 2030; 722 BC + 2,730 years lands in 2009, which is

nowhere. I mention it because I want you to see that I know the alternative exists and that it doesn't work, rather than have you discover it and wonder.

The 701 BC start comes from the argument in Chapter 4 — the unsuccessful siege, marked by the griddle — not from a search for a start date that would produce the answer I wanted. If you rejected Chapter 4, you should reject this. That is the dependency, stated.

The first term

$$701 \text{ BC} + 390 \text{ years} = 311 \text{ BC}$$

(Tier 1. In astronomical numbering: $-700 + 390 = -310$, which is 311 BC.)

Israel's original sentence ran out in 311 BC.

Did the House of Israel repent in 311 BC? No. There was no House of Israel to repent — the ten tribes were dispersed among the nations and had been for four centuries. The sentence expired and nothing changed.

Something else was happening in 311 BC, and I want to handle it carefully, because this is exactly the sort of detail that gets overstated in books like this one.

What is true: Spring 311 BC is the epoch of the Seleucid Era. Seleucus I retook Babylon, and the era dated from that reconquest became the standard calendar of the entire Near East for centuries. In the Babylonian reckoning, which is the one the Jews adopted, year one begins on 1 Nisan — 3 April, 311 BC.

And the Jews did adopt it. They called it *minyān shtarot*, the Era of Contracts. It is the dating system used in 1 Maccabees. It appears on Jewish legal documents, on marriage contracts and bills of sale, for well over a thousand years. Long after the Seleucid kings were dust, Jewish scribes were still dating their documents from the year a Greek general walked into Babylon.

There is a real image there. In the year Israel's sentence expired without repentance, the Jewish people began dating their own contracts by a Gentile king's reign — and kept doing it for a millennium.

What is not true, and what I will not claim: nothing happened in Judea in 311 BC. No battle, no conquest, no change of ruler. Ptolemy had taken the region in 312 and withdrawn; Antigonus reoccupied it; the Peace of the Dynasts in 311 left the question open and settled nothing on the ground. Lasting Ptolemaic control didn't arrive until after Ipsus in 301.

So the significance of 311 BC is calendrical, not military. It is an interesting resonance and it is not evidence. The arithmetic does not depend on it in any way, and if the Seleucid Era had begun in a different year the clock would run exactly the same. I include it because it's striking and I flag it because striking is not the same as probative.

The multiplication

No repentance. Leviticus 26 applies.

$$390 \times 7 = \mathbf{2,730 \text{ years}}$$

(Tier 1.)

Now, a question that matters more than it looks: **from when?**

Two options. Either the multiplied term runs forward from 311 BC, when the first term expired — or it replaces the original term and is served from the siege, 701 BC.

I use the second. The multiplied sentence runs from 701 BC.

Here's why. Leviticus 26 does not say "and then I will add a further punishment." It says "*I will punish you seven times more for your sins*" — the same sins, punished seven times over. The object of the multiplication is the sentence itself, not a fresh sentence appended to the old one. A judge who multiplies a sentence by seven is not adding a consecutive term; he is resentencing for the same offence. And a sentence is served from the hinge the original sentence hung on, which for Israel is the siege of 701 BC.

Hold that word — *hinge*. It is going to do more work in the next chapter than it does here, and if the rule I am using turns out to be two rules wearing a disguise, this is where you would catch me at it.

(Tier 3 — this is an interpretive choice and I should say so. If the multiplied term ran forward from 311 BC instead, you would get $311 \text{ BC} + 2,730 = \text{AD } 2420$, and there would be no book. The choice matters and I've argued for it rather than assumed it.)

The result

$$\mathbf{701 \text{ BC} + 2,730 \text{ years} = \text{AD } 2030}$$

(Tier 1. Astronomical: $-700 + 2,730 = 2,030$.)

Check it the long way if you like. From 701 BC to 1 BC is 700 years. One more year takes you to AD 1. That's 701 years spent, leaving 2,029 to run from AD 1 — which lands in AD 2030.

The House of Israel's sentence, multiplied sevenfold as Leviticus 26 specifies, expires in **2030**.

One clock proves nothing

I mean that.

If this were the whole argument, I would not have written a book about it. A single arithmetic chain from a disputed start date through a disputed multiplier to a target year is exactly what curve-fitting looks like from the outside, and I'd be suspicious of it in someone else's hands.

Notice how much of this chapter has been Tier 3 rather than Tier 1. The arithmetic is trivial — 390 times 7 is not a hard sum. The *arguments* are all in the choices: that the griddle marks a failed siege, that the left side means forward in time, that the multiplier extends duration, that the multiplied term re-runs from the original start. Four interpretive judgments, each defensible, none certain, all of them mine to defend.

Which is why the second clock matters so much. It uses different history, a different start date, a different number of years, and a different number of multiplications. It shares only two things with this one: the same chapter of Ezekiel and the same rule from Leviticus.

If the reading is wrong, the second clock should land somewhere else entirely.

Chapter 7 — Judah's Clock

Ezekiel's second sentence is shorter and its history is better documented, because it runs through the events at the center of the New Testament.

"When you have completed these, you shall lie down a second time, but on your right side and bear the iniquity of the house of Judah; I have assigned it to you for forty days, a day for each year." — Ezekiel 4:6

Forty years. Right side.

Under the Chapter 4 reading, the right side on a right-to-left timeline means *earlier* — Judah's forty years do not run forward from a siege, they run **toward one**. The sentence terminates at a siege rather than beginning at one.

So we need forty years ending at a siege of Jerusalem. And there is one, and it is not obscure.

From the crucifixion to the siege

Jesus was crucified at Passover, 5 April AD 30.

(Tier 3. That date follows from the AD 26 baptism and a three-and-a-half-year ministry, and the AD 26 baptism follows from the minority reckoning of Tiberius' fifteenth year in Luke 3:1. I deal with this properly below, because it is the fourth weak link in this book and I'm not going to slide it past you in a subordinate clause.)

Forty years later, at Passover in AD 70, Titus closed on the walls of Jerusalem.

The timing was not incidental to the horror of it. Josephus describes a city swollen with Passover pilgrims when the Roman lines closed — the population trapped inside was a festival population, not a resident one, which is why the famine that followed was as catastrophic as it was. The siege began at Passover.

AD 30 + 40 years = AD 70

(Tier 1.)

Forty years, Passover to Passover, from the crucifixion to the siege. And in between, a national decision.

Jesus had said what the forty years were for. *“Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, the way a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you were unwilling. Behold, your house is being left to you desolate!”* (Matthew 23:37–38.) And on the way to the cross: *“For the days will come upon you when your enemies will throw up a barricade against you, and surround you and hem you in on every side, and they will level you to the ground and your children within you, and they will not leave in you one stone upon another, because you did not recognize the time of your visitation.”* (Luke 19:43–44.)

Forty years of the apostles preaching in the Temple courts. Forty years of the offer standing open. Forty is the biblical number for a period of testing — the wilderness, the flood, Jonah in Nineveh, Moses on the mountain, the Lord in the desert. This was Judah’s forty.

The correction I owe you

Here is the second of the two errors I promised to show you.

In my first book I wrote that the Temple was destroyed “during Passover, 70 CE.” That is wrong, and it’s worth being precise about what happened instead, because the corrected version is the one the argument actually needs.

The *siege* began at Passover — 14 Nisan, around the middle of April, AD 70. The *Temple* burned on 9 or 10 Av, roughly three and a half months later, in about the first week of August. Josephus records the tenth of Av; the Mishnah records the ninth, and Jewish tradition has kept the ninth ever since as Tisha B’Av, the fast for both Temples.

I had collapsed a four-month siege into a single event. Common mistake. Still mine.

But look at what the correction does. Judah’s clock has to run Passover to Passover if it is going to terminate at Passover in 2030 — and the siege, not the burning, is the Passover event. Crucifixion at Passover AD 30, siege at Passover AD 70. Forty years, feast to feast, clean.

The wrong version of the fact had been making the argument sloppier. The right version makes it tighter. That is usually how it goes when you check your own work, and it’s the best argument I know for doing it.

The first multiplication

Did Judah repent by AD 70? The city fell, the Temple burned, the sacrifices ceased and have never resumed. The nation did not turn to its Messiah.

Leviticus 26 applies.

$$40 \times 7 = 280 \text{ years AD } 70 + 280 = \text{AD } 350$$

(Tier 1.)

And here, again, I have something to correct rather than to claim.

There is a real event nearby. The Jewish revolt against Constantius Gallus broke out in **351**, not 350 — Gallus was made Caesar in March of 351, the revolt followed, and Ursicinus put it down hard, razing Diocaesarea (Sepphoris) and devastating Tiberias and Lydda.

That's adjacent. It is not exact, and I am going to call it adjacent rather than round it into a hit. Nothing specific is attested in AD 350 itself. I could get to 351 by adjusting a start date or by counting inclusively where I've counted exclusively elsewhere, and I'm not going to, because the moment I start nudging conventions to make a resonance land I have stopped doing arithmetic and started doing something else.

The arithmetic doesn't need it. AD 350 is a waypoint in a chain, not a piece of evidence. The chain is fine if nothing happened that year at all.

The second multiplication

Still no repentance. So the rule applies again — and this is the fourth stage of the escalation Leviticus 26 describes, the last one in the chapter.

Here is where I want to change how this is usually written, including by me.

The natural way to write the next step is $280 \times 7 = 1,960$. That's correct, and it invites an obvious objection: 280 looks like a number chosen because it gets you where you want to go.

But 280 isn't an independent number. It is 40×7 . So the second multiplication is:

$$40 \times 7 \times 7 = \mathbf{40 \times 7^2 = 1,960 \text{ years}}$$

Judah's original forty-year sentence, multiplied by seven **twice over**.

That is not a cosmetic restatement. Leviticus 26 does not describe a single multiplication; it describes a *series* of them, four stages deep, each triggered by the same continued refusal. A sentence that has been through two stages of that escalation is the original sentence multiplied by seven squared. Written as 40×7^2 , the Leviticus warrant is visible in the expression itself. Written as 280×7 , it looks like an arbitrary number getting an arbitrary boost.

Same arithmetic, with its origin on the page.

$$\mathbf{AD\ 70 + 1,960 \text{ years} = AD\ 2030}$$

(Tier 1.)

One rule or two? — the anchor question

Now look hard at the anchor, because this is the place where an alert reader should be reaching for a pen.

Israel's multiplied term ran from 701 BC — the *start* of her original sentence. Judah's runs from AD 70 — the *end* of hers. Her sentence began at the crucifixion in AD 30.

Say it plainly: those look like two different rules. And if they are two different rules, chosen because each one happens to produce 2030, then this book is doing exactly what it accuses everyone else of doing. Run the alternative and see how much rides on it. Israel from the end of her term is $311 \text{ BC} + 2,730 = \text{AD } 2420$. Judah from the start of hers is $\text{AD } 30 + 1,960 = \text{AD } 1990$. Neither survives. Both clocks are anchor-sensitive, and I picked the anchor that works in each case.

So I owe you a rule that is genuinely one rule.

Here it is. **The multiplied term is served forward from the siege — in both cases.** The siege is the hinge. It is the thing Ezekiel drew on the brick and built his siege-works around and set the iron griddle in front of, and it sits at the center of the whole sign. Israel's siege is 701 BC. Judah's siege is AD 70. Both multiplied sentences run forward from the siege that belongs to them.

What the two sides supply is not two rules. It is where each nation's *original* sentence sits relative to its siege — and that is precisely what Ezekiel's body was for. Left side, Israel: her 390 years lie to the left of the siege on a right-to-left timeline, so they run forward from it, and her siege is therefore at the *beginning* of her term. Right side, Judah: her 40 years lie to the right, so they run up to a siege, and her siege is therefore at the *end* of her term.

One rule for the multiplication — serve it from the siege. One rule for the geometry — the side tells you which end of the original term the siege is on. Israel's siege opens her sentence; Judah's siege closes hers. That is why 701 BC is the start of one count and AD 70 is the start of the other, and it is not a convention I switched halfway.

Two notes about that.

It is not a claim that time runs backwards. Judah's forty years ran forward like everyone else's — AD 30 to AD 70. The sides are about placement on a diagram, not about the direction the years are lived in. Once the original term expires unrepented, the new term is served forward from the hinge, because that is the only direction a sentence can be served.

And it makes Chapter 4 carry more than it did an hour ago. The left-and-right reading was already the largest interpretive dependency in this book. It now supplies the anchors as well as the directions. If those sides mean nothing more than *north* and *south* — which is a perfectly reasonable thing to think, and I said so in Chapter 4 — then Judah's clock has no principled reason to start at AD 70 rather than AD 30, and AD 30 gives 1990. The whole structure hangs from that one detail of where a prophet was lying. I state it in one sentence so nobody has to dig for it.

Passover AD 70 plus 1,960 years is **Passover 2030**.

Two clocks, no shared inputs

Set them side by side.

	House of Israel	House of Judah
Sentence (Ezekiel 4)	390 years	40 years
Start	701 BC	AD 30
Direction from the siege	forward (left side)	toward it (right side)
First term expires	311 BC	AD 70
Multiplications	one	two
Multiplied term	$390 \times 7 = 2,730$	$40 \times 7^2 = 1,960$
Runs from	701 BC	AD 70
Expires	AD 2030	AD 2030

Look at what these two columns do *not* share.

Different sentences — 390 and 40, neither derived from the other. Different start dates, seven centuries apart, established from entirely different historical events by entirely different arguments. Different directions on the timeline. Different numbers of multiplications — one and two. Different final terms — 2,730 years and 1,960 years.

They share exactly two things: the chapter of Ezekiel that assigns them, and the rule from Leviticus that multiplies them.

And they expire in the same year.

I said in Chapter 3 that a system describing something real tends to produce results it wasn't aimed at. This is the first of them. I could have chosen Judah's start date to make this work — but I didn't choose it, the crucifixion did, and the forty years to the siege are simply what the history gives you. The convergence is either a coincidence or it is the thing itself.

One coincidence is survivable. Chapter 9 has two more clocks.

Before we go on: the fourth weak link

I told you there were four places where I'd mark my own argument as weak. Chapter 2 had the calendar. Chapter 4 had the left-and-right reading. Chapter 5 had the duration reading of Leviticus 26. Here is the fourth, and it belongs in this chapter because Judah's clock starts with it.

The AD 30 crucifixion date depends on a minority scholarly position.

The chain runs like this. Luke 3:1 dates John's ministry, and therefore Jesus' baptism, to the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. Jesus was about thirty (Luke 3:23). The ministry ran three and a half years, through four Passovers (John 2:13, 5:1, 6:4, 11:55). So: fifteenth year of Tiberius, plus three and a half years, gives the crucifixion.

Everything turns on when Tiberius' fifteenth year was.

The majority reckoning counts from the death of Augustus on 19 August AD 14 — the date Tiberius became *sole* emperor, and the date Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio all count his

reign from. That puts the fifteenth year in late AD 28 or early 29, and the crucifixion around AD 32 or 33. This is the mainstream position and it is held by most historians and most New Testament scholars. Once again, the majority is wrong.

The minority reckoning counts from Tiberius' co-regency — the grant of co-equal authority over the provinces made around AD 11 to 13, described by Velleius Paterculus, who was alive at the time. That puts the fifteenth year around AD 26, and the crucifixion in AD 30.

I use the minority reckoning. It gives AD 26 and AD 30.

There is a second dependency inside this one, and it belongs here rather than in a footnote. The three-and-a-half-year ministry rests on counting four Passovers in John's gospel. Three of them are explicit — 2:13, 6:4 and 11:55 all name the Passover. The fourth, John 5:1, says only "a feast of the Jews," without the definite article, and a substantial body of scholarship reads it as some other feast; Pentecost and Tabernacles are both commonly proposed. So the four-Passover reading is load-bearing too, and it is contested.

Both are defensible. Luke was writing for a provincial audience in the eastern provinces, where Tiberius' authority had been exercised from the co-regency; a fifteenth year counted from the provincial grant would have been intelligible to Theophilus. And the AD 30 date has substantial support, including a Wednesday 14 Nisan that fits the chronology of the passion week.

But I'm going to tell you the question is settled, because it is, but a reader who checks will find the majority against me within about ten minutes.

Here is what rides on it. If the crucifixion was AD 33 rather than AD 30, Judah's forty years would run to AD 73 rather than AD 70 — and AD 73 is not a Passover siege of Jerusalem; it's the fall of Masada. The clock would not close. **Judah's clock requires the AD 30 date.**

Israel's clock does not. It is anchored in 701 BC and touches none of this.

So of my two sentences, one depends on a contested chronology and one doesn't, and they still land on the same year. That is worth something. It is not worth pretending the contested one isn't contested.

That is the full set for Part II: the calendar in Chapter 2, the left-and-right reading in Chapter 4, the duration reading in Chapter 5, and the New Testament chronology here — which is really two links, the Tiberius reckoning and the four-Passover reading, and both of them hold up Judah's start date.

Those are the places to press if you want to break this book.

Part II ends here. Chapter 8 takes up Daniel's seventy weeks — the framework the near dates hang on. Then Part IV sets two more clocks running and asks how independent any of the four really are.

PART III — THE SEVENTY WEEKS

The framework the near dates hang on.

Chapter 8 — Daniel's Seventy Weeks

Everything so far has been built from two chapters: Ezekiel 4, which assigns the sentences, and Leviticus 26, which multiplies them. Those two produce a year.

This chapter is different. Daniel 9 does not produce 2030 and I am not going to pretend it does. What it produces is the framework that makes the near dates intelligible — where we are in a decreed sequence, why three and a half years are still owed, and why the seven-year tribulation that most of the Christian world is expecting is a doubling of something that has already half happened.

If Chapters 6 and 7 tell you the year, this chapter tells you the shape.

It also contains the single most misread verse in prophetic literature, and about two-thirds of the way through I am going to spend some time on it, because everything most people believe about the end times rests on one sentence being read one particular way.

Here is the whole prophecy. Read it before I say anything about it.

24 *“Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy.*

25 *So you are to know and discern that from the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until Messiah the Prince there will be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; it will be built again, with plaza and moat, even in times of distress.*

26 *Then after the sixty-two weeks the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing, and the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end will come with a flood; even to the end there will be war; desolations are determined.*

27 *And he will confirm a covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will put a stop to sacrifice and grain offering; and on the wing of abominations will come one who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate.”*

— Daniel 9:24–27

The weeks are sevens

One matter of vocabulary before anything else, because the English hides it.

The word rendered *week* is שבוע (shavua), and it does not mean a week of days. It means a

seven — a unit of seven, whatever is being counted. Hebrew has a Sabbath of days and a Sabbath of years; Leviticus 25 builds an entire economy on seven-year cycles, and Daniel has just been reading Jeremiah about seventy years of exile, which 2 Chronicles 36:21 explains as the land repaying its unkept sabbath *years*.

So seventy sevens is seventy sevens of years: **490 years**. That reading is not controversial. It is held across the interpretive spectrum, by people who agree about almost nothing else in this passage.

The scorecard: six things that have to happen

Verse 24 is the part almost nobody reads carefully, and it is the part that decides whether the seventy weeks are finished.

Six things are decreed to be accomplished within them:

Goal	Status
1 to finish the transgression	done at the cross
2 to make an end of sin	done at the cross
3 to make atonement for iniquity	done at the cross
4 to bring in everlasting righteousness	arguable — see below
5 to seal up vision and prophecy	not yet
6 to anoint the most holy	not yet

Items one through three are the work of Calvary and I do not think a Christian can read them otherwise. *“Now once at the consummation of the ages He has been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself”* (Hebrews 9:26). Atonement was made. Transgression was finished. That is the gospel.

Items five and six have plainly not happened. Vision and prophecy are not sealed up — we are still reading them, still arguing about them, still writing books like this one. And no most holy has been anointed.

Item four is the one that will not file neatly. *Bring in everlasting righteousness* began at the cross in the sense that a righteousness not our own was made available; it has not arrived in the sense that the world is filled with it. Commentators split. I count it as begun and not consummated, and I flag it rather than counting it in the column that helps me.

Here is why the scorecard matters. If the seventy weeks were completed in the first century, then vision and prophecy are sealed and the most holy has been anointed, and neither is true. If they run continuously from the decree, they ended long ago with a third of their purpose unaccomplished. Something in the sequence is unfinished — and that is not a conclusion I am importing, it is what verse 24 requires of anyone who reads it.

The decree, and the 483 years

Verse 25 gives the starting gun: *“from the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild*

Jerusalem.”

Four Persian decrees are proposed as candidates and only one of them fits the description. Cyrus in 538 BC authorised the rebuilding of the temple, not the city. Darius in 520 confirmed that same temple work. Artaxerxes in 445 authorised Nehemiah to rebuild the walls — a decree about fortification, issued to a cupbearer.

The decree of Artaxerxes to Ezra, in the seventh year of his reign, is the one that matches the words. It authorises restoration, funds the temple service, installs magistrates and judges, and re-establishes the law of God as the law of the land — the restoration of a polity, not merely the repair of stonework. Ezra 7 records it.

This book dates that decree to 458 BC, and Appendix E sets out why 457 BC is the common alternative and what turns on the difference. Both are defensible; the split comes from whether you reckon Persian regnal years by the accession-year convention and from whether you count from a spring or an autumn new year. I use 458 and I say so rather than presenting it as settled.

Now the count:

7 weeks × 7	49 years	458 BC → 409 BC
62 weeks × 7	434 years	409 BC → AD 26
69 weeks × 7	483 years	458 BC → AD 26

(Tier 1 arithmetic, computed in astronomical years so the missing year zero cannot bite: $-457 + 483 = 26$. The long way: 458 BC to 1 BC is 457 years, one more year reaches AD 1, leaving 26 to run.)

The first seven weeks have an obvious referent: verse 25 says the city “*will be built again, with plaza and moat, even in times of distress,*” and forty-nine years of rebuilding under opposition is exactly what Ezra and Nehemiah describe.

Messiah the Prince — the anointing, not the birth

The sixty-nine weeks run “*until Messiah the Prince.*” Until what, precisely? He was born, He was baptized, He entered Jerusalem, He was crucified. Which one closes the count?

The title decides it. **Messiah** — מָשִׁיחַ (*mashiach*) — means *anointed*. The terminus is not a birth. It is an anointing.

Jesus was anointed at His baptism, when the Spirit descended on Him, and the New Testament says so in those words. Peter, preaching in Cornelius's house: *"You know of Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and with power"* (Acts 10:38). And Jesus Himself in the Nazareth synagogue, reading Isaiah aloud and applying it to Himself that day: *"The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me"* (Luke 4:18).

So the sixty-nine weeks end at the Jordan, in AD 26, when Messiah was anointed and presented. Luke 3:1 dates that event to the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and Chapter 7 has already told you plainly that this book uses the minority reckoning of that fifteenth year and that the majority puts it two years later. That weakness belongs to this chapter as much as to Chapter 7, and I am not going to let it sit unmentioned in the chapter it most affects.

"After the sixty-two weeks" — the first gap, and it is small

Verse 26 opens: *"Then after the sixty-two weeks the Messiah will be cut off."*

Read quickly, that says the crucifixion happens at the close of the sixty-ninth week. Read as written, it says something looser and more useful: **after**. Not *at*. Not *in the final week*. After.

Hebrew has ways to say *immediately*, and this is not one of them. The word is a preposition of sequence, and it leaves the interval unstated.

That matters because the interval was not nothing. Messiah was anointed in AD 26 and cut off at Passover in AD 30 — three and a half years of public ministry between the two events, four Passovers, the whole of the Gospels.

Notice what verse 25 and verse 26 are doing between them. Verse 25 counts **to** an event and counts it exactly: 483 years, to the anointing. Verse 26 then reports a second event and joins it to the first with an unquantified word. **The number is precise and the connector is open, and each is doing exactly what it says.** Nothing here is being stretched. A book that claimed the sevens were elastic would have to answer for the 1,260 days later on; a book that observes that *after* is not a measurement has claimed nothing at all about the sevens.

Hold that distinction. It comes back in Chapter 11 in a different form.

Two Men in One Verse

Everything in this book that concerns Daniel's seventieth week turns on a single verse, and on a question that verse never answers directly: **who is "he"?**

"And he will confirm a covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will put a stop to sacrifice and grain offering; and on the wing of abominations will come one who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate." — Daniel 9:27

Read it as one man throughout and you get the interpretation most Christians have been taught: a coming antichrist signs a seven-year treaty with Israel, breaks it after three and a

half years, stops the sacrifices in a rebuilt temple, and sets up the abomination. Every element of the popular end-times timeline is built on that reading of this one sentence.

Read it as two men and you get what this book argues: Messiah confirms the covenant and ends the sacrificial system by fulfilling it, and a second figure — the desolator — appears in the back half of the verse.

So the whole structure rests on where, and whether, the subject changes. Here are three tests, and all three are things you can check in the text itself rather than take from me.

Test one — the grammar marks the change

Look at how the two halves refer to their subjects.

The first half has no named actor at all. Two third-person verbs, both with the subject carried inside the verb: **וְהִגְבִּיר** (*vehigbir*), “and he will make strong,” and **וַיַּשְׁבִּית** (*yashbit*), “he will make cease.” No noun. The reader is expected to carry a subject forward from verse 26.

Then the second half stops doing that. It supplies an actor: **מְשֻׁמֵּם** (*meshomem*), a participle — “one making desolate,” a desolator. And it does it again at the very end with **שֹׁמֵם** (*shomem*).

That is a real structural signal and it is easy to miss in English. Hebrew does not introduce a fresh nominal for a subject that is already running. You carry an implied subject as long as it stays the same and you name a new one when it changes. The verse runs on an unnamed “he,” and then names somebody.

This does not by itself tell you *who* the unnamed one is. It tells you that the man at the end of the verse is not simply the man at the start of it continuing.

Test two — the covenant verb is the wrong verb for making a covenant

Hebrew has a standard idiom for entering into a covenant, and it is not the one Daniel uses.

The ordinary expression is **כָּרַת בְּרִית** (*karat berit*), “to cut a covenant” — the phrase used when God covenants with Noah, with Abraham, at Sinai, with David. It appears throughout the Old Testament. If Daniel meant that somebody *makes* a covenant, that is the phrase sitting ready to hand.

He doesn’t use it. He writes **וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית** — the Hiphil of **גָּבַר** (*gabar*), whose sense is to be strong, to prevail, to make mighty. In the causative it means to strengthen, to reinforce, to make firm.

You do not strengthen something that does not yet exist. The verb presupposes a covenant already in force and describes somebody making it strong — which is a description of what Messiah did with the covenant God had already made, and a strange way to describe a seven-year treaty being signed for the first time.

Note also who the covenant is with: **לְרַבִּים** (*la-rabbim*), “with the many.” That phrase is not

neutral. It is the vocabulary of Isaiah's Servant, who "*will justify the many*" and "*bore the sin of many*" (Isaiah 53:11–12) — and it is the vocabulary Jesus reached for at the table: "*this is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for forgiveness of sins*" (Matthew 26:28). Covenant, poured out, for many. He is quoting this verse.

Test three — the man at the end of the verse is the man judgment falls on

This is the strongest of the three in English, and it comes with one condition that I will state at the end rather than bury.

Follow the last clause to its end. Destruction — "*a complete destruction, one that is decreed*" — is **poured out on the one who makes desolate**.

Whoever the subject of the second half is, he is the one the decreed destruction lands on. He is not merely acting; he is being sentenced.

Now ask whether that can be the same person who confirms the covenant with the many.

It cannot. Not on doctrinal grounds — on the grounds of the sentence. One figure strengthens a covenant and brings the sacrificial system to its end. The other commits abominations, makes desolate, and has judgment poured out on him. A single subject would have to be both the covenant-confirmer and the object of the decreed wrath in the space of one verse.

That is the cleanest line available: the subject of the second half is defined by the verse as the one destruction falls upon.

And now the condition I promised.

The last word of the verse is שׁוֹמֵם (*shomem*), and translations split on it. NASB, ESV, NIV, NET, CSB and the NLT all read it as an agent — *the desolator*, the one who makes desolate.

The KJV, NKJV and ASV read it as a state — *the desolate*, meaning the ruined city or people. On the older reading, the destruction is poured out on the victim rather than on the perpetrator, and this test loses its clincher.

I use the NASB, and the modern consensus is with it. But a reader working from a King James has a genuine question here and deserves to be told so rather than discover it himself.

What survives either way: the *first* of the two words, מְשׁוֹמֵם (*meshomem*) in the phrase "*on the wing of abominations will come one who makes desolate*," is agentive on every reading. A new actor is named and he is doing the desolating. So the two-subject structure of the verse — test one's result — stands whichever way the final word goes. It is only the judgment clincher that depends on the translation.

Where the line falls

Putting the three together:

	Subject	What he does
27a	unnamed “he,” carried from v. 26	strengthens a covenant with the many · brings sacrifice and offering to an end in the middle of the seven
27b	<i>meshomem</i> — the desolator, newly named	comes on a wing of abominations · makes desolate · has the decreed destruction poured out on him

The break falls at “*and on the wing of abominations.*” Before it, a covenant is strengthened. After it, a new actor is named, and he is judged.

Who is “the prince who is to come”?

The pronoun question in verse 27 cannot be settled without settling this, so it belongs here.

“...and the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary.” — Daniel 9:26b

Three candidates get proposed, and one of them is ruled out by the clause itself.

First, a word about the word. *Prince* here is נָגִיד (*nagid*), and it is not a title reserved for good men. Ezekiel 28:2 uses it of the ruler of Tyre — a figure that passage goes on to describe in the most damning terms in the prophets. It is a general word for one who leads: kings, commanders, temple officials, foreign potentates, wicked rulers. So no candidate can be excluded merely on the grounds that *prince* sounds too honorable for him, and none can be included on the grounds that it sounds too honorable for anyone else.

Candidate one: a future antichrist. This is the standard dispensational reading and it is the hinge of the seven-year-treaty framework — the coming prince of verse 26 becomes the “he” of verse 27, signs the treaty, and breaks it. Everything this book argues against depends on it. It is also the reading that requires the destruction of the city and the sanctuary in verse 26 to be either a different event from AD 70 or a strangely long parenthesis.

Candidate two: Messiah. That is, both princes are Jesus — *Messiah the Prince* in verse 25 and *the prince who is to come* in verse 26. It is attractive because it removes the antichrist from Daniel 9 altogether, which is what the argument needs.

But read the clause it produces. **The people of the prince destroy the city and the sanctuary.** Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed in AD 70 by the Roman legions. On this reading, the Roman army is *the people of Jesus*. His own people were the Jews, and the Jews did not destroy that temple — they died in it.

The fair objection is that Scripture does press foreign armies into God’s service and then claim them: Nebuchadnezzar is “*My servant*” (Jeremiah 25:9), Assyria is “*the rod of My anger*” (Isaiah 10:5), and Cyrus is called God’s *mashiach*, His anointed (Isaiah 45:1). So the idea that Rome acted as the instrument of Christ’s judgment on the city is not absurd — Jesus Himself had pronounced that judgment in Luke 19.

Even so, “*the people of the prince*” is a possessive, and a possessive most naturally names the people a man belongs to or commands, not the people God once used against somebody

else. The reading has to strain at exactly the point where the verse is most concrete.

There is a second form of this reading worth taking seriously, because it is the one I held for a while: that *the people* are the Jews — the people of Messiah — and that the temple fell because they rejected Him.

The theology of that is right and the grammar of it is not, and the two can be separated cleanly.

The theology first because it is true and it matters. The temple was destroyed as judgment for the rejection of Messiah. That is not an inference; it is what Jesus said, in advance, in plain words. *“Behold, your house is being left to you desolate”* (Matthew 23:38). *“They will not leave in you one stone upon another, because you did not recognize the time of your visitation”* (Luke 19:44). The cause of AD 70 was what happened in AD 30.

Now the grammar. In verse 26 the Hebrew reads **וְהָעִיר וְהַמִּקְדָּשׁ יִשָּׁחֵת עַם נָגִיד הַבָּא** — the objects fronted for emphasis, *and the city and the sanctuary*, then the verb **יִשָּׁחֵת** (*yashchit*), “he will destroy,” and then its subject: **עַם** (*am*), *the people* of a prince, the coming one.

Am is the subject of the verb. The people are the ones who do the destroying. So a reading that makes them the Jews has the verse saying the Jews destroyed the city and the sanctuary — and the Jews did not destroy that temple. They were besieged inside it and died defending it.

The distinction is between **cause** and **agent**, and Scripture keeps them apart here. Daniel 9:26 names the agent — the people of a coming prince, whoever that prince turns out to be. Jesus names the cause: they did not recognize the time of their visitation. Nobody has to choose. The rejection brought the judgment; the legions carried it out.

And notice what falls out when you let each text do its own job. **Daniel gives the sequence** — Messiah cut off, then the city and sanctuary destroyed. **Jesus gives the reason. Ezekiel 4 gives the interval** — the forty years of Judah’s sentence, AD 30 to AD 70, which Chapter 7 uses to anchor her clock. Three texts, one event, each supplying what the others leave out. That is a better result than making one verse carry all three.

Candidate three: Titus. Titus Flavius Vespasianus commanded the siege of Jerusalem in AD 70. He was the son of the reigning emperor and heir to the principate — a Roman prince in the plainest sense of the word. And *his* people, the legions, did precisely what the verse says: they destroyed the city and the sanctuary.

There is also a point of sequence that favors him. Verse 26 has just said *the Messiah will be cut off*. To then re-introduce that same Messiah, in the next breath, as *the prince who is to come* would be strange — He has just been described as cut off, and *coming* is an odd way to speak of Him in that instant. Read as two figures, the verse is simply chronological: Messiah is cut off, and afterwards the people of a coming prince destroy the city. AD 30, then AD 70, in order.

It matches the event and it matches the actor. It requires no strained possessive and no argument about whether Gentile armies can be called somebody’s people — the legions

were unambiguously Titus's people. And it puts Daniel's prophecy directly on the siege that Chapter 7 uses as the anchor of Judah's clock, the same AD 70 reached from an entirely different direction.

What I am claiming, and what I am not

I put Titus forward as a plausible reading and claim no more certainty than that. **I am not settled between him and Messiah.** The question turns on Hebrew syntax and on the antecedent rules of the language, and the scholars who have spent their lives in that text disagree with each other about it.

What matters for this book is narrower than the question, and I want to be exact about it.

The argument here does not need to know whether the prince is Titus or Messiah. It needs the prince not to be the antichrist.

Follow it through. If the prince is Titus, the nearest-antecedent rule hands verse 27 to Titus — which would have a Roman general strengthening a covenant with the many and bringing sacrifice and offering to an end. Nobody holds that and nothing supports it, so the pronoun must reach further back, to Messiah. If instead the prince is Messiah, the pronoun lands on Messiah directly. **Both roads arrive at the same place.** Only the third reading — a still-future antichrist — puts a treaty-signer in verse 27, and that is the one the seven-year framework is built on.

So what does the work is not identifying the prince. It is this: **the destruction described in verse 26 is AD 70, and the prince whose people carried it out belonged to AD 70.** The city was destroyed. The sanctuary was destroyed. That is a finished event with a date, and a man whose people did it was alive to see it. Reading him as a ruler still future in our own century requires treating "*the people of the prince*" as the distant ancestors of somebody not yet born — which is a considerable amount of weight for a possessive to carry, and it is the load-bearing assumption of a framework that has shaped the expectations of most of the Christian world.

Two princes, then, not three — and I hold the identity of the second loosely. **Messiah the Prince is Jesus. The prince who is to come belonged to the first century, whether that is Titus who commanded the siege or the Lord whose judgment it was.** The antichrist is not in this verse. He does not need to be, and putting him here is what created the confusion in the first place.

And now the hard part

Test three establishes that the second half is not about Messiah. It does not establish that the first half *is*.

For that, the book relies on the argument set out earlier in this chapter — that the singular "he" of verse 27 reaches back to "*Messiah*" in verse 26 rather than to "*the prince who is to come*." **Most modern commentators reject this reading.**

Their reason is a good one and it is called the nearest-antecedent rule: when a pronoun

could refer to more than one preceding noun, it normally refers to the closest. “*The prince who is to come*” stands closer to verse 27 than “*Messiah*” does. On the ordinary rule, the prince wins.

As shown above, that objection is survivable — if the prince is a first-century figure, the pronoun has to travel back to Messiah anyway, because no first-century prince confirmed a covenant with the many. But the grammatical point stands on its own and I am not going to wave it away. It is the strongest thing the other side has here.

The counter-argument — that the phrase is “*the people of the prince*,” So the head noun is *people*, and a plural head is a poor antecedent for a singular pronoun — is a real argument, and it is the one my first book leaned on. I still think it has force. But Hebrew does permit a noun in the genitive to serve as an antecedent, and anyone who tells you this settles the question is overstating.

Here is where I stand, in one paragraph, so nobody has to infer it:

Grammar alone favors the prince. Lexicon and context favour Messiah. *Higbir* is the wrong verb for signing a treaty and the right verb for strengthening an existing covenant. *La-rabbim* is Servant vocabulary. Bringing sacrifice and offering to an end is what Hebrews says Christ did — “*by one offering He has perfected for all time those who are sanctified*” — and it is a peculiar thing to credit to an antichrist, who would be interrupting the sacrifices rather than fulfilling them. I weigh those heavier than proximity. Someone can weigh them the other way, and be reasoning honestly.

(Tier 2 for the two-subject structure — tests one and two do that work and neither depends on a contested translation. Tier 3 for identifying 27a’s subject as Messiah: an argued reading against the current majority, said plainly rather than presented as settled. Test three is Tier 2 on the NASB and its family, and does not hold on the KJV’s rendering of the final word.)

What this does and does not decide

It decides that Daniel 9:27 contains two figures, which is enough to break the seven-year-treaty framework that depends on there being one.

It does not by itself decide when the halves of the seventieth week occur. That is the work of the next section — and it is worth saying that the two questions are separable. A reader could accept everything in this section and still place the whole seventieth week in the future. What he could not do is keep reading verse 27 as one man signing and then breaking a covenant, because the verse names a second actor and then sentences him.

The gap — the hardest thing in this book to defend

We now have everything except the part that makes the whole framework work, so let us have it out.

The seventy weeks are 490 years. Sixty-nine of them ran from 458 BC to AD 26 without interruption. The seventieth week is seven years. Verse 27 says a covenant is strengthened for one week and something happens *in the middle of the week* — three and a half years in.

This book says that week is the ministry of Jesus, AD 26 to AD 30 He personally performed, and the second half is still ahead of us, and it is for us, His two witnesses, to perform.

Which means a gap of about two thousand years sits inside a seven-year period.

Say it plainly, because a critic will: the interruption is four times longer than the entire prophecy it interrupts. Four hundred and ninety years, decreed as a unit, with a two-thousand-year hole in the last seven of them. Nothing in Daniel 9 announces such a gap. There is no verse that says *and then the counting will stop*.

So here is the case, and you can weigh it.

First: verse 24 forces some kind of incompleteness on everybody. Whatever you do with the gap, three of the six decreed goals have not happened. Vision and prophecy are not sealed. The most holy is not anointed. Anyone who says the seventy weeks finished in the first century has to explain how a decreed purpose finished with a third of its purpose outstanding. The unfinished business is not my invention; it is in the text, and every reading has to account for it. The question is only *where* the incompleteness sits.

Second: the text partitions the weeks itself. God did not say “seventy weeks.” He said seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, and then treated the last one separately in a verse of its own. A single continuous span does not need to be delivered in three pieces. The partitioning is in verse 25 before any interpreter touches it.

Third: the prophecy is explicitly about a particular people and a particular city. “*Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city.*” Not for the world. For Israel and Jerusalem. A clock decreed for a nation is at least intelligible as a clock that pauses when God’s dealing turns elsewhere — and the New Testament describes exactly such a turning, with Gentiles grafted in and a partial hardening on Israel “*until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in.*” Whether you accept that framework or not, it is not an ad hoc invention created to rescue Daniel; it is Paul’s own account of the age we are in.

Fourth, and this is the one I would keep: Jesus demonstrated an unmarked gap inside a prophetic sentence, and did it deliberately.

In the synagogue at Nazareth He was handed Isaiah and read this:

*“The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me because He anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor. He has sent Me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set free those who are oppressed, to **proclaim** the favorable year of the Lord.”* — Luke 4:18–19

Then, Luke says, “*He closed the book, gave it back to the attendant and sat down*” — and told them, “*Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing.*”

He stopped mid-sentence. Here is Isaiah 61:2 entire, with the point where He closed the scroll marked:

*“To proclaim the favorable year of the LORD ← **He stopped here** And the day of vengeance of our God; To comfort all who mourn.”*

One verse. Three clauses. He read the first, told them it was fulfilled that day, and sat down before the second — and the day of vengeance has still not come.

That is a gap of at least two thousand years falling between two clauses of a single verse, marked by nothing whatever in the Hebrew. We know it is there only because the Lord stopped reading and sat down.

So the objection “*prophecy does not work that way*” has an answer, and the answer is that Jesus read it that way in public and told the congregation He had just fulfilled the first half of a sentence whose second half was still outstanding. If a gap can fall between two clauses of one verse, it can fall between two halves of one week.

What that argument does not do. It shows a gap is possible in prophetic literature; it does not show that *this* gap is real, or that it is two thousand years, or that it ends in 2027. Isaiah 61 makes the objection survivable. It does not make the case.

(Tier 3 The gap is inferred from the unfinished goals of verse 24 and defended by precedent. It is not stated in Daniel. If you find that unsatisfying, you are responding correctly to the evidence — this is an inference, and I have not dressed it as anything else.)

One thing does distinguish this book’s version of the gap from the vaguer kind. **It has ends.** The gap runs from Passover AD 30 to the twenty-seventh of April, 2027. That is a claim with two dates on it, and one of them is close enough to be wrong in public within a year. A gap theory that can be checked is a different sort of thing from a gap theory that merely absorbs whatever history delivers.

What Chapter 8 gives us

- Seventy sevens are 490 years, and the sevens are years. *(Tier 2 — the Hebrew, and near-universal agreement.)*
- Six goals are decreed for the period; three are unquestionably accomplished, one is arguable, two plainly are not. **The sequence is unfinished on any reading.** *(Tier 2.)*
- The decree is Artaxerxes’ commission to Ezra, 458 BC. *(Tier 2, with 457 BC a live alternative — Appendix E.)*
- $458\text{ BC} + 483\text{ years} = \text{AD } 26$. *(Tier 1 arithmetic resting on the Tier 2 decree date above — change the decree and the sum moves with it.)*
- That AD 26 is also the year of the anointing at the Jordan. *(Tier 3, and separately so: it rests on the minority co-regency reckoning of Tiberius’ fifteenth year, stated in Chapter 7 and again here. The arithmetic and the identification are two claims and they fail independently.)*
- After the sixty-two weeks — not at — permits the three and a half years from the anointing to the cross. **The number is precise; the connector was never a measurement.** *(Tier 2.)*
- Daniel 9:27 contains two figures, not one — a new agentive subject is named in the second half. *(Tier 2.)* That the second figure is the man on whom the decreed destruction falls is Tier 2 on the NASB and its family, and does not hold on the King

James rendering of the verse's final word.

- The covenant is *strengthened*, not cut. Messiah confirms an existing covenant with the many; He does not sign a seven-year treaty. *(Tier 3, and this book's reading against the current majority.)*
- The prince whose people destroyed the city belonged to the first century — Titus or the Lord whose judgment it was. Not a figure still future. *(Tier 3, and the argument does not depend on which.)*
- Three and a half years of the seventieth week remain unserved. *(Tier 3 — the gap.)*

The rest of the book is about when those three and a half years begin.

PART IV — CONVERGENCE

Two more clocks, and an audit of what four agreements are worth.

Chapter 9 — Four Clocks, One Year

Two clocks have been running since Chapter 6. This chapter starts two more, and then does something most books of this kind never do: it asks how much four agreements are worth when you look at where each one gets its parts from.

The short version, so you know where we end up. **Two of these four clocks are worth a great deal. One is worth something. One is the weakest thing in this book and I am going to rank it last myself rather than let a reviewer do it for me.**

Where we already are

From Chapters 6 and 7, briefly:

Israel. Ezekiel 4 assigns 390 years. They run forward from the failed Assyrian siege of 701 BC and expire in 311 BC with no repentance. Leviticus 26 multiplies the sentence by seven. $390 \times 7 = 2,730$, served forward from the siege. **701 BC + 2,730 = AD 2030.**

Judah. Ezekiel 4 assigns 40 years. They run from the crucifixion in AD 30 up to the siege of AD 70 with no repentance. Leviticus 26 multiplies, and then multiplies again. $40 \times 7^2 = 1,960$, served forward from the siege. **AD 70 + 1,960 = AD 2030.**

Now the other two.

The third clock — two days, and forty Jubilees

Hosea is speaking for a people under judgment who have not yet turned:

"Come, let us return to the LORD. For He has torn us, but He will heal us; He has

wounded us, but He will bandage us. He will revive us after two days; He will raise us up on the third day, that we may live before Him.” — Hosea 6:1–2

Two days, then the third. Read as ordinary days it is a proverb about swift recovery, and that is a legitimate reading.

Read prophetically, it is a span — and Peter supplies the conversion rate that makes it one:

“But do not let this one fact escape your notice, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years like one day.” — 2 Peter 3:8

Two days is two thousand years. The tearing began when the nation rejected her Messiah and her house was left desolate; the reviving comes two thousand years later, and the third day — the millennium — follows.

AD 30 + 2,000 years = AD 2030.

There is a second way of counting the same span that lands identically, and it is worth a sentence because it is built out of Torah rather than out of a proverb. Leviticus 25 sets a Jubilee at fifty years — seven sabbath-year cycles and then a fiftieth, in which debts are cancelled, slaves freed, and land returned to its original owner. Forty Jubilees is two thousand years, and forty is Scripture’s number for a period of testing.

Two thousand years of testing, ending in the release of what was forfeited. That is what a Jubilee is for. Whether you arrive at the number through Hosea’s two days or through forty Jubilees, you arrive at 2030.

(Tier 3. The day-for-a-millennium reading of Hosea is typological, not stated. Peter’s line is about God’s relation to time, not a decoder ring, and careful readers apply it more cautiously than I have here. This clock is an argument from pattern, and I hold it more loosely than the two before it.)

The fourth clock — the generation, and the objection I am going to make for you

Jesus, after the parable of the fig tree:

“Truly I say to you, this generation will not pass away until all these things take place.” — Matthew 24:34

And the length of a generation, from the psalm of Moses:

“As for the days of our life, they contain seventy years, or if due to strength, eighty years.” — Psalm 90:10

So: some event starts a generation, and eighty years later the generation that saw it has not yet passed away.

The event this book uses is not the one most teachers use. On **23 January 1950**, the Knesset voted 60 to 2 to declare Jerusalem the capital of Israel.

1950 + 80 = AD 2030.

Now, before you raise it, here is the objection, and it is a strong one.

Everybody else uses 1948. Israel was reborn as a nation on 14 May 1948, and if any modern event started a prophetic generation, that is the obvious candidate. And 1948 does not give 2030. It gives 2028.

Worse than that. Let me put the whole grid on the page, including the cells that embarrass me:

Starting event	+ 70 years	+ 80 years
Israel reborn — 14 May 1948	2018 · already passed	2028
Knesset declares Jerusalem the capital — 23 Jan 1950	2020 · already passed	2030
Jerusalem reunified — June 1967	2037	2047

Six plausible combinations. Exactly one of them produces 2030, and it is the one this book uses.

That is the single most vulnerable thing in this book, and there is no clever answer to it. Both of the free choices — which event, and which of the psalm’s two lifespans — have to fall my way, and they do. If I told you the odds against that were astronomical I would be insulting you, because the accurate description is that a two-parameter clock hit a target and there were six ways to set it.

I can give you my reasons, and I want you to weigh them knowing what they are being asked to carry.

Why the city rather than the nation. The Olivet Discourse is about Jerusalem, not about statehood. The disciples ask about the temple buildings. Jesus answers with Jerusalem surrounded by armies, and Luke records the clock He actually names: *“Jerusalem will be trampled under foot by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled”* (Luke 21:24). The thing being measured is Gentile dominion over the city. A nation can be reborn while its capital remains under foreign administration — and in 1948 Jerusalem was exactly that, divided, with the Old City in Jordanian hands and the international community pressing for the city to be internationalized. The Knesset vote in January 1950 was the act that ended the question of whose capital it was.

Why eighty and not seventy. Psalm 90 gives both, and it gives them as a range with a condition attached: seventy, *“or if due to strength, eighty.”* Eighty is the outer bound. Reading Matthew 24:34 as *will not pass away* — the generation is still here when it happens — argues for the outer bound rather than the inner one. Take seventy and the generation has already passed.

Those are real arguments. They are also, obviously, arguments that arrive at the answer I want, and I am not going to pretend I would have found them if 1950 plus eighty had produced 2041.

(Tier 3 Two free parameters, six combinations, one hit.)

The independence audit — the part most books like this leave out

Here is the question a careful reader should be asking. I am asking it first.

Are these four clocks actually independent?

It matters enormously. Four independent witnesses agreeing is powerful. Four accounts that all trace back to one source are not four witnesses at all — they are one witness repeated, and the agreement between them tells you almost nothing.

So let me lay out where each clock gets its parts from.

Clock	Textual source	Historical anchor	Interpretive moves it needs
Israel	Ezekiel 4 · Leviticus 26	701 BC siege	left/right reading · duration reading · siege anchor
Judah	Ezekiel 4 · Leviticus 26	AD 30 crucifixion → AD 70 siege	left/right reading · duration reading · siege anchor · Tiberius reckoning
Jubilee	Hosea 6:2 · 2 Peter 3:8	AD 30 crucifixion	day-for-a-millennium reading
Generation	Psalms 90:10 · Matthew 24:34	1950 Knesset vote	city-not-nation · eighty-not-seventy

Now read the overlaps because there are three and they are not small.

Israel and Judah share their entire framework. Both come from Ezekiel 4, both are multiplied by Leviticus 26, and both depend on the same three interpretive moves. They are not two witnesses. They are **one framework applied twice**.

Judah and the Jubilee clock share an anchor. Both start from the crucifixion in AD 30. If that date is wrong — and Chapter 7 told you it rests on a minority reckoning of Tiberius's fifteenth year — then two of the four clocks move together.

Only the generation clock is fully independent of the others. And it is the weakest of the four.

That is an uncomfortable set of facts and it does real damage to the phrase *four independent clocks*. I have used that phrase. It was too strong, and I am retiring it here.

So what is the convergence actually worth?

Less than four witnesses. More than nothing. Here is what survives.

Israel and Judah are one framework applied twice — but the two applications share almost no inputs. Different sentence lengths, 390 and 40. Different anchors seven centuries apart, established from unrelated events by unrelated arguments. Different numbers of multiplications, one and two. Different multiplied terms, 2,730 and 1,960.

That is not two witnesses to a fact. It is **a consistency check on a framework** — and

consistency checks are worth something real. If the left/right reading of Ezekiel 4 were wrong, or the duration reading of Leviticus 26 were wrong, there is no reason the framework should produce the same year twice from inputs that different. It could have produced 2030 and 1990. It could have produced 2420 and 2030. Chapter 7 showed you exactly how easily it does, when the anchor is moved.

The Jubilee clock adds a little and not much, because it leans on the same crucifixion date Judah's clock does. What it contributes is a different *kind* of reasoning — typological rather than juridical — arriving at the same year. Corroboration from a different discipline is worth something, but it is not a second sample.

The generation clock adds least, for the reason set out above.

So the accurate statement of the argument is not *four independent clocks all agree*. It is this:

One framework, drawn from two chapters of Torah and prophecy, applied twice with entirely different inputs, produces the same year both times — and two further lines of reasoning, one typological and one weak, arrive at the same place.

That is a weaker claim than the one on the back cover of most prophecy books. It is also true, and a true smaller claim outlasts an impressive overstated one. A reader who checks this chapter will find that I have already said the worst of it.

Ranking my own evidence

Because not all four deserve the same weight, and saying so is more useful than a table of four equal rows:

Clock	Strength	Why
1 Israel	strongest	Numbers given in the text, anchor well attested in 701 BC, no dependence on New Testament chronology. Stands or falls on Ezekiel 4 and Leviticus 26 alone.
2 Judah	strong	Same framework, wholly different inputs. Weakened by its dependence on the AD 30 crucifixion, which rests on a minority reckoning.
3 Jubilee	moderate	A different kind of reasoning reaching the same year — but typological, and sharing Judah's anchor.
4 Generation	weak	Two free parameters, six plausible combinations, one hit. Included for completeness, not relied on.

If Chapters 4 and 5 fall, the top two go together and the book is finished. If the Tiberius reckoning fails, clocks two and three move and only Israel is left standing on 2030. If the generation clock is wrong, nothing else changes.

That is the actual dependency structure, and now you can hold me to it.

What Chapter 9 gives us

- Hosea's two days plus Peter's thousand-year day gives 2,000 years from the crucifixion. **AD 30 + 2,000 = 2030.** (*Tier 3 — typological.*)
- Forty Jubilees of fifty years is the same 2,000, reached through Leviticus 25 instead. (*Tier 3.*)
- A generation of eighty years from the Knesset's declaration of Jerusalem as capital. **1950 + 80 = 2030.** (*Tier 3 — six plausible settings, one hit, and the grid is printed above.*)
- The four clocks are **not four independent witnesses**. Israel and Judah share a framework; Judah and the Jubilee clock share an anchor; only the generation clock is independent. (*Stated because it is true, and because a reader would find it anyway.*)
- What survives is one framework applied twice with different inputs landing twice on the same year, corroborated typologically. **That is the argument, stated at its real size.**

The next chapter stops asking which year and starts asking which day.

Chapter 10 — Passover 2030: The Expiration Date

Up to here the book has been arguing about a year. From here it argues about days, and the standard of proof has to rise accordingly. A year is a large target. A day is not. This chapter does one thing: it takes Judah's clock, which expires in 2030, and asks where in 2030 it expires.

The clock was always feast to feast

Go back to how Judah's sentence was measured.

The forty years ran from the crucifixion to the siege — and both ends of that span are Passover. Jesus was crucified at Passover in AD 30. Titus closed on the walls of Jerusalem at Passover in AD 70, when the city was packed with festival pilgrims, which is exactly why the siege that followed was as catastrophic as it was.

Feast to feast, forty years. That is not something I imposed on the span; it is what the two events are.

So when Leviticus 26 multiplies the sentence and the multiplied term is served forward from the siege, it is served from a Passover. And 1,960 years later it expires at a Passover.

Passover AD 70 + 1,960 years = Passover AD 2030.

Chapter 7 established the year. What it did not establish — and I flagged this on the first page of the book rather than let it pass — is *which day of the Passover season*. That is this chapter's work, and it is a further step, not a consequence of the arithmetic.

Passover is a season, not a day

This is where most treatments get sloppy, so let me be exact about what the Torah actually lays out.

"In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at twilight is the LORD's Passover. Then on the fifteenth day of the same month there is the Feast of Unleavened Bread to the LORD; for seven days you shall eat unleavened bread. On the first day you shall have a holy convocation; you shall not do any laborious work. But for seven days you shall present an offering by fire to the LORD. On the seventh day is a holy convocation; you shall not do any laborious work." — Leviticus 23:5–8

So the season has a shape:

Day of the first month	What it is
14 Nisan	Passover — the lamb slain at twilight
15 Nisan	Unleavened Bread begins · holy convocation
16–20 Nisan	the intervening days
21 Nisan	seventh day of Unleavened Bread · holy convocation

Eight days from the slaying of the lamb to the closing convocation. Exodus 12:16 gives the same frame: a holy assembly on the first day *"and another holy assembly on the seventh day."* The season is bracketed at both ends.

"Passover 2030" therefore names eight days, not one. Anyone who tells you a prophetic period expires "at Passover" and then hands you a single date has skipped a step. Here is the step.

Why the sentence expires at the end of the season, not the start

A sentence expires when it is finished. That is the whole of the argument in one line, but it deserves more than one line because the alternative is not silly.

The case for 14 Nisan — the day the lamb is slain, the anniversary of both the crucifixion and the start of the siege — is that it is the day the span's two endpoints match exactly. Passover to Passover, 14 Nisan to 14 Nisan, is the cleanest possible reading of a feast-to-feast count. If you want a purely mechanical answer, that is it, and it gives **17 April 2030**.

The case for 21 Nisan is that the thing being counted is not an anniversary but a term of punishment, and terms end at their end.

And there is something particular about the seventh day of Unleavened Bread that makes it the fitting terminus for a sentence of bondage.

Israel left Egypt on the fifteenth. They did not stop being in danger on the fifteenth. Pharaoh changed his mind, the chariots came after them, and Israel stood trapped against the water. It was on the seventh day of the feast — by long Jewish reckoning, 21 Nisan — that the sea opened, Israel passed through, and the water closed over the army behind them.

The fifteenth is the day they walked out. The twenty-first is the day the oppressor's power over them was finished. One is departure; the other is the end of the pursuit. Scripture marks the second with a holy convocation of its own, which is a strange thing to

do for an ordinary week's end.

A sentence that began at a siege and runs 1,960 years does not expire on the anniversary of the lamb's death. It expires on the day the Torah set aside to mark that the old power no longer has any claim.

(Tier 3. This is a typological argument, and typology is the softest kind of argument in this book. A reader who prefers 14 Nisan on the grounds that a feast-to-feast count should match its endpoints is reasoning well, and the difference between us is seven days.)

The date

Now the calendars, and they do not quite agree.

	14 Nisan (Passover)	21 Nisan (last day of Unleavened Bread)
Observational — the M2030 calendar	16 April 2030	23 April 2030
Fixed rabbinic calendar	17 April 2030	24 April 2030

One day apart. Chapter 2 laid out why the two calendars diverge and by how much across 2025–2030; spring 2030 is one of the years where the gap is a single day.

This book uses 24 April 2030 — 21 Nisan on the fixed rabbinic calendar.

This is not the choice consistency would predict. The book follows the observational calendar everywhere else, and the observational calendar puts the last day of Unleavened Bread on 23 April. Using the rabbinic date here is a departure, and the reason is practical rather than principled: the rabbinic date is the one the Jewish world will actually be keeping in 2030, and the sentence under discussion is Judah's. A date that expires on the day the house of Judah is observing the feast is the fitting reckoning for a sentence passed on the house of Judah.

That is an argument from fitness, not from method, and you should weigh it as such. **If you prefer 23 April, the interval to Yom Teruah becomes 158 days rather than 157, and nothing else in the book moves.**

A note on the Hebrew year since it is easy to get wrong and my earlier work did. Passover 2030 falls in **5790**. The fall feasts of 2030 — Yom Teruah and Yom Kippur — fall in 5791, because the Hebrew civil year turns at Tishri, between them. Spring 5791 is Passover 2031. Where this book refers to the year 6001 from Adam beginning at Tishri 2030, that is a separate reckoning of creation years and the two are never mixed.

What expires, and what does not

One clarification before the next chapter, because the language of expiry can be read as more than it means.

When Judah's sentence expires on 24 April 2030, **that is not the return of Christ**. It is the end of a term of punishment. The 1,260 days of tribulation are still running — they began on 27 April 2027 and do not conclude until October. The world does not change on 24 April 2030 except that it marks the very soon beginning of the Jews' five months of scorpion stinging discipline until they individually accept Jesus as Messiah and Lord.

What ends is the sentence: the multiplied term of Ezekiel 4 and Leviticus 26, run out to its full length, with nothing left owed.

And then Revelation 9:5 gives five months.

What Chapter 10 gives us

- Judah's clock ran feast to feast — crucifixion at Passover AD 30, siege at Passover AD 70. *(Tier 2.)*
- The multiplied term, served forward from the siege, therefore expires at Passover. **Passover AD 70 + 1,960 = Passover 2030.** *(Tier 1 arithmetic on Chapter 7's Tier 3 anchor.)*
- Passover is an eight-day season, 14 Nisan through 21 Nisan, bracketed by two holy convocations. *(Tier 2 — Leviticus 23:5–8, Exodus 12:16.)*
- The sentence expires at the close of the season, 21 Nisan — the day the sea closed over the pursuing army and the old power's claim ended. *(Tier 3 — typological. 14 Nisan is a reasonable alternative and gives 17 April 2030.)*
- **21 Nisan 5790 = 24 April 2030** on the fixed rabbinic calendar; 23 April on the observational one. The book uses 24 April, and the reason is fitness rather than method. *(Tier 2 on the conversion, Tier 3 on the choice.)*
- Nothing else ends on that day. The 1,260 days run on until October. *(Clarification.)*

Five months later is Yom Teruah. The next chapter counts them.

PART V — FROM YEAR TO DAY

The micro-timeline: five months, four counts, seven feasts.

Chapter 11 — The Five Months

Judah's sentence expires on 24 April 2030. The Lord returns on Yom Teruah, the evening of 27-28 September 2030. Between those two dates is a window, and Revelation 9:5 measures it.

"And they were not permitted to kill anyone, but to torment for five months; and their torment was like the torment of a scorpion when it stings a man. And in those days men will seek death and will not find it; they will long to die, and death flees from them." — Revelation 9:5–6

Five months. Sentence expires in April; the Lord returns five months later.

That is how I taught it, and it is nearly right, and the word *nearly* is the reason this chapter exists.

Count it

From	To	Days, inclusive
24 April 2030 · 21 Nisan	27 September 2030 · eve of Yom Teruah	157

One hundred and fifty-seven days.

Now, how long is five months? It depends on the month, so take every reasonable answer:

Reckoning	Days
Five 30-day months	150
Five lunar months (29.53 days)	~148
Five calendar months, 24 April to 24 September	153
The actual window	157

Every reckoning of “five months” falls short of the window, by between four and nine days.

The temptation here is enormous and I want to name it before I resist it. The gap is small. I could write *approximately five months* and no reader in a thousand would run the numbers.

But this book asked you in Chapter 1 to check every count, and a book that asks that cannot round when rounding is convenient. Seven days is seven days.

The answer that will not do

The obvious escape is to say that “five months” is a round figure — that God spoke approximately and we should not press Him for precision He did not offer.

There is something right in that, and I will come back to it. But as an answer to this problem it fails, and it fails expensively.

If “five months” can absorb a seven-day error, so can “1,260 days.” And the entire timeline of the next chapter depends on 1,260 being exact to the day. The moment I grant elasticity to one prophetic number I have granted it to all of them, and March 2027 goes soft along with everything else. That is too high a price for seven days.

And John does not round. This is the part that settles it, and it is settled out of his own text.

John gives the same period twice, in two different units:

“...they will tread under foot the holy city for **forty-two months**.” — Revelation 11:2
“...they will prophesy for **twelve hundred and sixty days**.” — Revelation 11:3
“...she would be nourished for **one thousand two hundred and sixty days**.” — Revelation 12:6
“...authority to act for **forty-two months** was given to him.” — Revelation 13:5

Forty-two months. Twelve hundred and sixty days. The same three and a half years, given both ways, chapters apart.

$$42 \times 30 = 1,260.$$

Exactly. Not approximately. **John's months are thirty-day months, and his round form and his precise form agree to the day.** He is a writer who has demonstrated, inside his own book, that when he gives a figure in months it converts to days without remainder.

So in John's usage, five months is **150 days**. Not "about 157." One hundred and fifty, precisely, by the arithmetic he himself supplies.

Which means the seven-day gap is not a rounding error. It is a real difference between two real numbers, and it is telling us something.

What it is telling us

Read Revelation 9:5 again, slowly, and notice what it actually says.

"And they were not permitted to kill anyone, but to torment for five months."

That is a statement about **how long the tormenting lasts**. It is a limit placed on the locusts — they may torment, they may not kill, and their license runs five months.

It is not a statement that the Lord returns at the end of the five months. It never says that. I had been reading a duration of an event as though it were a measurement of the window, and those are different things.

The window is 157 days. The torment is 150 days. The torment sits inside the window.

Nothing has to be rounded, stretched or apologized for. The number was exact all along; I had simply been asking it to measure something it was not measuring.

Where inside the window?

Scripture does not say, and I am not going to invent a placement.

I looked. If the 150 days run from the day the sentence expires, they end on 21 September 2030, six days before Yom Teruah. If they run so as to end at Yom Teruah, they begin on 30 April 2030, six days after the sentence expires. Neither of those dates is a feast. Neither is marked in any way. There is no textual hook to hang a placement on, and if I chose one it would be decoration rather than exegesis.

So: a window of 157 days, containing 150 days of torment, positioned within it by information we do not have.

I would rather leave a gap in the timeline that Scripture leaves than fill it with something I made up. If that is unsatisfying, it is unsatisfying in the right direction.

What the five months are for

The arithmetic settled, the substance is worth a moment, because it is easy to read Revelation 9 as pure horror and miss what is strange about it.

The locusts are given power *“as the scorpions of the earth have power.”* And then two limits are placed on them. They may not touch the grass or any green thing. And — the limit that matters — *“they were not permitted to kill anyone.”*

A judgment that is explicitly forbidden to kill is not an execution. It is a summons.

Men *“will seek death and will not find it.”* Every exit is closed except one. That is a terrible thing to read and it is not annihilation; it is a period in which the unrepentant are held, conscious, unable to escape into death, with the door to repentance still standing open.

Rehoboam gives the image its source. When Israel asked the new king to lighten his father’s yoke, he answered:

“My father disciplined you with whips, but I will discipline you with scorpions.” — 1 Kings 12:11

Rehoboam said it as a boast and it split the kingdom — the event that produced the two houses whose sentences this whole book has been counting. What a proud young king threatened, the Lord will actually do, and He will do it not to destroy but to drive.

Five months of scorpions, and no permission to kill. **The mercy in that passage is the part nobody quotes.**

What Chapter 11 gives us

- The window from the expiry of Judah’s sentence to Yom Teruah is **157 days**. (*Tier 1 — count it.*)
- John’s own text fixes his month at thirty days: 42 months and 1,260 days, given for the same period, and $42 \times 30 = 1,260$ exactly. **Five months in John’s usage is 150 days.** (*Tier 2.*)
- Therefore Revelation 9:5 is **not measuring the window**. It states how long the locusts are licensed to torment. (*Tier 2 — this is what the sentence says.*)
- The 150 days sit inside the 157-day window. **Where inside it, Scripture does not say, and this book does not guess.** (*Stated limit.*)
- The torment is explicitly forbidden to kill. It is a summons, not an execution — the scorpions Rehoboam boasted of, wielded by God to drive men to repentance while the door is open. (*Tier 3 — reading, not arithmetic.*)
- **Nothing was rounded.** The number was exact; the mistake was mine, in asking it to measure the wrong thing.

Chapter 12 — 1,290 · 1,260 · 1,250 · 1,335

Four numbers, from two authors, six hundred years apart. This chapter runs all four and shows where they land.

It also contains the strongest single piece of internal evidence in the book — a result the system was not built to produce — and one problem I have not solved, which I will put in front of you rather than leave for somebody else to find.

The counting rules, restated

From Chapter 1, because everything here depends on them:

1. **Inclusive of both endpoints.** Day 1 is the start date.
2. **The daylight date.** A Hebrew day begins at sundown; where a feast runs “evening of the 27th to evening of the 28th,” the date used is the 28th.

On timeanddate.com, that means the box marked *include end date in calculation*, ticked, every time. Untick it and every answer below comes out one short.

The two anchors

Everything counts from one of two dates in 2027.

27–28 March 2027 — the Abomination of Desolation. On the observational calendar this is Firstfruits: the evening of 27 March to the evening of 28 March. By Rule 2 the count begins on **28 March**. It has to be said that I am still uncertain if the AoD will occur on this date or if merely Pope Leo endorses the Neo-Ottoman Order this day. We will see.

27 April 2027 — the Latter Rains. The last day of the Second Feast of Unleavened Bread — the 21st day of the second month, the make-up Passover of Numbers 9 for those who could not keep the first. The count begins on **27 April**.

Thirty days apart. Hold that number.

The four counts

Count	Scripture	From	To	Days	Which is
1,290	Daniel 12:11	28 Mar 2027	7 Oct 2030	1,290	Yom Kippur — 10 Tishri
1,260	Rev 11:3, 12:6	27 Apr 2027	7 Oct 2030	1,260	Yom Kippur — 10 Tishri
1,250	Matthew 24:22	27 Apr 2027	27 Sep 2030	1,250	Yom Teruah — eve of 1 Tishri
1,335	Daniel 12:12	27 Apr 2027	21 Dec 2030	1,335	25 Kislev — Hanukkah

Every one of those lands on an appointed time. Check them yourself; that is what the

accompanying webpage and the explorer page are for.

The thirty days that fell out

Now the result I did not build.

Daniel gives 1,290 days. John gives 1,260 days. Two authors, six centuries apart, writing in different languages on different continents about the same period.

$$1,290 - 1,260 = 30.$$

And the two anchors in 2027 — Firstfruits and the last day of the Second Unleavened Bread, identified independently as feast days on a calendar computed from lunar conjunctions — are **thirty days apart**.

28 March to 26 April is thirty days. The 1,260 begins on the 27th.

I did not put that there. It is the difference between two numbers I did not choose, matching the gap between two dates I did not set. The thirty days of apostasy — the window in which the world takes sides after the Antichrist is revealed and before the Latter Rains fall — are not inserted into this timeline. They fall out of the subtraction.

That is the test I proposed in Chapter 3: a system that is describing something real tends to produce answers to questions nobody asked it. This is the clearest instance in the book. A fitted system produces exactly what it was fitted to produce. This produced a thirty-day window because two prophets, writing six hundred years apart, chose numbers thirty apart.

The ten days that fell out too

The same thing happens at the other end.

$$1,260 - 1,250 = 10.$$

Ten days between the day the faithful are taken and the day the Lord's wrath is complete.

There is exactly one pair of appointed times in the Hebrew calendar that are ten days apart: **Yom Teruah on 1 Tishri and Yom Kippur on 10 Tishri**. The days between them are the Days of Awe.

And the counts land on both ends of that pair. The 1,250 ends at Yom Teruah. The 1,260 ends at Yom Kippur.

Jesus said the days would be cut short:

"Unless those days had been cut short, no life would have been saved; but for the sake of the elect those days will be cut short." — Matthew 24:22

Cut short by how much? By ten — the difference between the tribulation's full measure and the day the faithful are removed from it. Isaiah gives the picture of what happens in those ten days:

"Come, my people, enter into your rooms and close your doors behind you; hide for a little while until indignation runs its course." — Isaiah 26:20

Ten days behind closed doors while wrath runs its course, between the two feasts that are ten days apart. **Neither number was chosen to make that work.**

The problem I have not solved

Here is the difficulty, and it belongs in the main text.

Daniel 12:11 does not attach the 1,290 to one event. It attaches it to two:

"From the time that the regular sacrifice is abolished and the abomination of desolation is set up, there will be 1,290 days."

The abomination is set up in March 2027. That much this book has an account of. But **what regular sacrifice is abolished in March 2027?**

On this book's reading, the regular sacrifice was brought to an end by Christ at the cross in AD 30 — that is Chapter 8's argument about Daniel 9:27, and I still hold it. There is no temple standing in August, 2026 while I write this book and no restored sacrificial system to abolish. So the first of Daniel's two markers has no referent at the moment the count begins. Since this refers to a still-future event, I can only speculate on it without solid evidence.

I do not have a clean answer. Here are the two that seem to me worth considering, and I hold neither firmly.

The Hebrew word is *תמיד* (*tamid*), which means *continual* or *regular*. In Daniel 8:11–13 it stands for the continual burnt offering, but the word itself names continuity rather than the animal. If *tamid* is read as the continual worship of God rather than the sacrificial rite specifically, then what is abolished in March 2027 is the world's ongoing worship — supplanted when the Beast is endorsed and the nations turn. That reading has some support in how Daniel 8 uses the term, and it is convenient for me, which is a reason to hold it loosely.

The second possibility is that the two clauses name one composite event described from two sides, in which case the difficulty is grammatical rather than historical. Settling that requires a judgment about Hebrew grammar that I am not going to fake.

What I will not do is quietly drop the clause. It is in the verse the 1,290 comes from, and any reader with a Bible open will see it. **This is an unresolved difficulty in the framework, and it sits at the start of the very count it governs.**

The 1,335, and where it anchors

Daniel gives a fourth number in the next verse:

"How blessed is he who keeps waiting and attains to the 1,335 days!" — Daniel 12:12

Counted from the Latter Rains on 27 April 2027, day 1,335 is **21 December 2030** — which is 25 Kislev, the first day of Hanukkah, the feast of the Temple's rededication. Blessed is he who waits and arrives at the dedication.

Allow me to give my speculation on how these things will play out on the ground. When we are raptured on Yom Teruah, God begins to pour out His Bowls of Wrath for ten days. He will call forth Israel's and perhaps Iran's and/or Pakistan's nuclear weapons and judge the nations which have gone up against Jerusalem. We will be safely in our chambers in New Jerusalem with our doors shut while the world burns. One-third of humanity, mostly Muslims, will die in that ten days. Survivors will *keep waiting and attain to the 1,335 days*, Hanukkah, when Jesus returns with all of us and heals the nations.

I find that striking. Here is what is awkward about it.

Daniel 12:11 and 12:12 sit side by side, and are normally read as sharing one starting point. If the 1,335 counts from the same day as the 1,290 — 28 March 2027 — it lands on 21 November 2030, which is nothing at all.

To reach Hanukkah, the 1,335 has to anchor to the Latter Rains rather than to the Abomination. That is what the Messiah 2030 Project's calendar does, explicitly: their entry for 27 April 2027 reads "*START OF 1260 AND 1335.*" So it is their stated framework and not my invention. But it is still a choice, and the plainer reading of two adjacent verses is that both numbers count from the same moment.

(Tier 3. The result is striking. The anchoring required to get it is contestable, and the alternative anchoring produces nothing.)

The whole micro-timeline

Date	Day	What
28 March 2027	1,290 begins	Abomination of Desolation · Firstfruits
28 Mar – 26 Apr 2027	days 1–30	the Apostasy — the world takes sides
27 April 2027	1,260 and 1,335 begin	Latter Rains · last day of Second Unleavened Bread
24 April 2030	—	Judah's sentence expires · 21 Nisan
27 September 2030	day 1,250	Yom Teruah — resurrection, rapture, return
27 Sep – 7 Oct 2030	ten days	the Days of Awe · behind closed doors · wrath
7 October 2030	day 1,260 and day 1,290	Yom Kippur — both counts close
12 October 2030	—	Sukkot begins
21 December 2030	day 1,335	Hanukkah · <i>blessed is he who waits</i>

What Chapter 12 gives us

- All four counts land on appointed times, on the inclusive rule declared in Chapter 1. (*Tier 1 — reproducible.*)
- **1,290 – 1,260 = 30**, and the two anchors are thirty days apart. The apostasy window falls out of the arithmetic rather than being inserted. **This is the strongest internal result in the book.** (*Tier 1.*)
- **1,260 – 1,250 = 10**, and there is exactly one pair of appointed times ten days apart. The days are cut short by precisely the Days of Awe. (*Tier 1 on the arithmetic; Tier 3 on reading Matthew 24:22 that way.*)
- Day 1,335 is 25 Kislev, the Temple's rededication — **but only if the 1,335 anchors to the Latter Rains rather than to the Abomination**, and Daniel 12:11–12 are normally read as sharing a start. (*Tier 3*)
- **Unresolved: Daniel 12:11 attaches the 1,290 to the abolition of the regular sacrifice as well as to the abomination, and this framework has no clear referent for the first in March 2027.**

Chapter 13 — The Feast Sequence

Everything so far has been arithmetic. This chapter is pattern, and pattern is a softer kind of evidence, so I will keep the claims correspondingly modest.

The claim is this: the appointed times of Leviticus 23 are not seven religious holidays. They are a sequence, and Jesus has been keeping it in order.

The seven

“The LORD’s appointed times which you shall proclaim as holy convocations — My appointed times are these.” — Leviticus 23:2

The Hebrew is מועדים (*mo’edim*), and it does not mean *festivals*. A *mo’ed* is an appointment — a fixed meeting arranged in advance between parties who both intend to keep it. The word is used of the time God sets to meet with His people.

There are seven, in two clusters:

Spring		Day
1	Passover — <i>Pesach</i>	14 Nisan
2	Unleavened Bread — <i>Matzot</i>	15–21 Nisan
3	Firstfruits — <i>Yom HaBikkurim</i>	day after the Sabbath in that week
4	Weeks — <i>Shavuot</i>	50 days after Firstfruits
Autumn		Day
5	Trumpets — <i>Yom Teruah</i>	1 Tishri
6	Atonement — <i>Yom Kippur</i>	10 Tishri
7	Tabernacles — <i>Sukkot</i>	15–21 Tishri

Four in the spring, clustered within eight weeks. Three in the autumn, clustered within three. And between the fourth and the fifth, a gap of about four months in which nothing is appointed at all.

The first four, kept on the day

Feast	What it required	What He did	On the day?
Passover	the lamb slain at twilight, 14 Nisan	crucified	yes
Unleavened Bread	leaven — the picture of corruption — put away	body in the tomb, seeing no decay	yes
Firstfruits	the first sheaf of the harvest presented	raised, <i>“the first fruits of those who are asleep”</i>	yes
Weeks	the harvest gathered, fifty days later	the Spirit poured out on Shavuot, fifty days later	yes

Paul does not treat the correspondence as decorative. *“Christ our Passover also has been sacrificed”* — not like a Passover lamb, but the thing itself. *“Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who are asleep.”* He uses the feast name as the description of the event.

Four appointments. Four kept, in order, on the day. Not in the right season. On the day.

That is the observation the rest of the chapter rests on, and it is worth pausing on how easily it could have gone otherwise. A crucifixion is not a scheduled event; it happens when a mob and a governor decide it happens. That it fell on 14 Nisan, and the resurrection on Firstfruits, and the Spirit on Shavuot, is either the tightest run of coincidences in the historical record or it is what the word *mo’ed* means. An appointment kept.

The three that are not kept

Then the pattern stops. Yom Teruah, Yom Kippur and Sukkot have never had their answering event.

Every year since, the trumpets have sounded on 1 Tishri and nothing has happened. Every year the Day of Atonement has come and gone. That is not an argument from silence — it is the observation that a sequence which was being kept precisely, four times running, has four appointments outstanding and has not kept one of them in two thousand years.

Either the pattern was never a pattern, or the remaining three are still ahead.

Why the gap is the shape of the church age

And here is where the calendar itself says something the chapters on Daniel had to argue for.

Between Shavuot and Yom Teruah there is a stretch of about four months with no appointed time in it. Not one. The spring cluster ends, and then nothing until the trumpet.

The Torah's own festival calendar has a gap in the middle of it — and the gap falls exactly where the four kept feasts end and the three unkept ones begin.

Chapter 8 had to work hard to defend an interruption in Daniel's seventieth week, and I told you plainly that nothing in Daniel announces one. Leviticus 23 does not announce one either. But it has one, built into the year, in the same place.

I would not build a timeline on that. As corroboration for a gap argued on other grounds, it is worth something.

(Tier 3. The correspondence is real; what it means is interpretation. Someone can hold that the four-month gap is agricultural — the interval between the grain harvest and the fruit harvest — and be entirely right about that, and it would not make the observation less interesting.)

The next one in order

If the sequence is being kept in order, the next appointment is the fifth, and there is only one candidate.

Yom Teruah. 1 Tishri. The Feast of Trumpets.

What is appointed for that day is worth reading against what Christians expect at the return of Christ. It is the only feast that falls on a new moon — the day whose beginning could not be announced in advance because it depended on the sighting of the crescent, so that watchmen waited and no one knew the hour. It is a day of blowing, of alarm and summons. And in Jewish tradition it carries the memory of coronation: the day a king is acclaimed. A trumpet. A day nobody could fix in advance. A king proclaimed. And the resurrection at the last trumpet.

Then ten days, the Days of Awe — which Chapter 12 found sitting in the arithmetic as the difference between 1,260 and 1,250, and which Isaiah describes as a shutting-in behind closed doors while indignation runs its course.

Then Yom Kippur — atonement, the sentence closed, the books settled. Chapter 12's two long counts both end there.

Then Sukkot — the ingathering, God tabernacling with His people, which is where Revelation ends: *"the tabernacle of God is among men, and He will dwell among them."* I'm still undecided on what exactly happens at this time. Does Jesus tabernacle on earth with us, having returned to fight His enemies? Does He tabernacle with us in New Jerusalem or in "Heaven," for a time? The end of Revelation's quote pertains to New Jerusalem arriving and the Father coming to earth to reign forever.

Trumpet, then wrath endured behind closed doors, then atonement, then dwelling. That is the order Leviticus 23 sets, and it is the order the day counts of Chapter 12 land in without being asked to.

What this does and does not show

It does not produce a year. Nothing in this chapter dates anything; Yom Teruah comes every autumn and has done for three thousand years.

What it does is tell you what the year produced by Chapters 6 through 10 should look like when it arrives. The arithmetic says 2030. The feast sequence says that if the arithmetic is right, the return falls on Yom Teruah rather than on some arbitrary date — and the fall feasts of 2030 are 27–28 September and 7 October.

Two independent things have to agree for that to work: a year from the clocks, and a day from the sequence. They do.

What Chapter 13 gives us

- The *mo'edim* are appointments, not festivals — fixed meetings set in advance. (*Tier 2 — the Hebrew.*)
- Jesus kept the four spring appointments **on the day**, in order, and the New Testament names them as such. (*Tier 2.*)
- The three autumn appointments have no answering event and have not had one in two thousand years. (*Tier 2 — observation.*)
- The Torah's festival year contains a four-month gap in exactly the place where the kept feasts end and the unkept ones begin. (*Tier 3 — corroboration for the gap argued in Chapter 8, not proof of it.*)
- If the sequence continues in order, the next appointment is **Yom Teruah**: new moon, trumpet, coronation, and a day whose start could not be announced in advance. (*Tier 3.*)
- The order Leviticus 23 sets — trumpet, then ten days, then atonement, then dwelling — is the order Chapter 12's counts land in. (*Tier 1 on the counts; Tier 3 on the significance.*)

Chapter 14 — Where the Two Calendars Agree

Chapter 2 told you that the weakest link in this book is the calendar, and that the date 27–28 March 2027 exists only under the observational reckoning. That cost me something to say.

This chapter is the other half of that ledger, and it is the best news in the book.

The objection this chapter answers

A skeptic who has read Chapter 2 carefully has a devastating line available, and it goes like this:

“You built your own calendar and then discovered that your dates fall on your own feast days. Of course they do. Any calendar can be made to produce feast days wherever you need them. Show me a date that survives a calendar you did not choose.”

That is a fair challenge, it is the right challenge, and it deserves a straight answer rather than a defense of my calendar.

Here is the answer.

The comparison

I ran every feast, in every year from 2025 to 2030, on both calendars: the observational reckoning this book follows, and the fixed rabbinic calendar used by the Jewish world since roughly the fourth century. Two systems built on incompatible rules — one setting the first month by the lunar conjunction nearest the spring equinox, the other running a nineteen-year cycle with four postponement rules attached.

Year	Gap between the two calendars
2025	0 to 1 day
2026	1 day
2027	30 to 31 days
2028	1 to 2 days
2029	1 to 2 days
2030	1 day in spring · zero on every autumn feast

Two things in that table matter, and they pull in opposite directions.

First, the “bad news,” again

2027 is the single outlier year in the range. In that one year the fixed calendar inserts its thirteenth month, Adar II, and the equinox rule does not. Observational Passover 2027 falls on 22 March; rabbinic Passover 2027 falls on 21 April. A full lunar month apart.

And 2027 is the year the near date depends on. I said this in Chapter 2 and I am saying it again here, in the chapter that is supposed to be good news, because a reader who only remembers the good half will have been badly served.

If the fixed calendar is the right one, 27–28 March 2027 is not a feast day and the Firstfruits argument for it evaporates.

Now the good news

Look at the last row again.

In 2030, the two calendars agree exactly. Not approximately. To the day, on every autumn feast:

Feast	Observational	Fixed rabbinic
Yom Teruah — 1 Tishri	28 September 2030	28 September 2030
Yom Kippur — 10 Tishri	7 October 2030	7 October 2030
Sukkot begins — 15 Tishri	12 October 2030	12 October 2030

25 Kislev — the 1,335th day 21 December 2030 21 December 2030

Four dates. Two systems that disagree by a month in 2027. Zero difference in 2030.

What this actually buys

Say it as precisely as I can because it is easy to overclaim here and I have watched people do it.

The destination does not depend on my calendar. The starting gun does.

A reader who rejects everything in Chapter 2 — who thinks the observational reckoning is an eccentricity and the fixed rabbinic calendar is the only legitimate Hebrew calendar there is — **still arrives at Yom Teruah on 28 September 2030 and Yom Kippur on 7 October 2030.** Those dates are not an artefact of a homemade calendar. They are where both calendars land. You can throw out my entire second chapter and the terminus is unchanged.

Everything in Chapter 12 that terminates in autumn 2030 therefore survives the calendar objection intact: the 1,260 and the 1,290 closing on Yom Kippur, the 1,250 reaching Yom Teruah, the ten Days of Awe between them, and the 1,335th day landing on Hanukkah.

What does not survive it is the 2027 anchor those counts start from. **The counts are calendar-independent at the end and calendar-dependent at the beginning**, and that is an uncomfortable but accurate description of where this book stands.

And now the discipline

This is exactly the point where a book like this reaches for the word *miraculous*, and I am not going to.

The convergence is not a miracle. It is what two lunisolar systems do when they happen to fall into phase, and you can watch them doing it in 2025, 2026, 2028 and 2029 in the same table. Both are approximating the same moon. Most years they agree closely; occasionally an intercalation falls differently and they diverge by a month. That 2030 is one of the close years is not a sign. It is arithmetic.

Its value is **defensive, not evidential**. It does not prove the date. It removes an objection to it — and the objection it removes is the strongest one a skeptic has against the autumn dates.

That is all it does. It is worth a chapter because the objection was worth answering, not because the agreement proves anything.

If I told you the odds against two calendars agreeing were astronomical, I would be doing the thing this book was written against. They agree often. They agree in 2030. That is enough, and it is not more than enough.

What Chapter 14 gives us

- Across 2025–2030 the two calendars normally agree within a day or two; they are

not rival systems producing different years. (*Tier 1 — computed, and reproducible in the webpage.*)

- **2027 is the one outlier**, diverging by a full lunar month — and it is the year the near date rests on. (*Tier 1 on the computation; the vulnerability is real and stated twice.*)
- **2030 is a year of exact agreement** on Yom Teruah, Yom Kippur, Sukkot and 25 Kislev. (*Tier 1.*)
- Therefore the autumn 2030 dates **do not depend on this book's calendar** and survive the calendar objection entirely. The 2027 anchor does not. (*Tier 2.*)
- The agreement is **not miraculous** — it is what lunisolar systems in phase do. Its value is that it removes an objection, not that it proves a date. (*Stated so no one can accuse the book of claiming more.*)

PART VI — ADVERSARIAL

Chapter 15 — The Strongest Objections

I have tried to answer objections where they arose rather than save them all for the end, because an argument that postpones its difficulties is training the reader to distrust it. But some objections are not about a particular chapter. They are about the whole enterprise.

Here they are, in the strongest form I can put them. I have tried to state each one the way its best advocate would, not the way a straw man would. On two of them my answer is that the objector is right.

1. “No one knows the day or the hour.”

You are doing the one thing Jesus explicitly forbade. He said no one knows — not the angels, not even the Son. Who are you? Every generation produces men like you, and the fact that you have a spreadsheet does not make you different from the men with charts in 1844 and 1988. The instruction was to watch, not to calculate.

That is the objection almost everyone raises first, and the version above is stronger than what I usually hear, so let me take it seriously.

Three things are true at once.

The first is that Matthew 24:36 is about the day and the hour, and I am not claiming either. This book names a date arrived at by inference from texts and history, in public, with the working shown and every number checkable. That is a different act from claiming to have been told. I have never claimed to have been told.

The second is that the verse was true when it was spoken. *No one knows* is a statement about a state of affairs, not a decree that the state of affairs is permanent. Daniel was told

the words were “*concealed and sealed up until the end time*” — which is language that expects a later unsealing, not a permanent one.

The third is the one I find hardest to argue past, and it is on the objector’s side. **Men have used exactly this reasoning to justify exactly this activity for two hundred years, and they have all been wrong.** That is not nothing. It is a strong prior against me and I hold it myself.

What I would say is that the command to watch is not compatible with the instruction to make no inferences. Jesus rebuked the Pharisees for reading the sky and not the season. He told a church that if it would not wake up He would come on it like a thief — which means the alternative was available. Being awake has content, or the word means nothing.

The objection is not dissolved. It is answered — by a man who is aware that everyone before him thought the same.

2. “You found the year first and worked backwards.”

Given a Bible, a calculator and sufficient motivation, anyone can reach any year. You have 390, 40, seven, 2,000, 80, 1,260, 1,290, 1,335, three calendars and four candidate decrees to play with. Of course something lands on 2030. You would have found something for 2028 too.

This is the objection I respect most because it is the one I would raise, and Chapter 3 was written to answer it before the conclusions arrived.

Three tests, and I would apply all three to anyone else’s system.

Were the parameters chosen independently of the target? 390 and 40 are in Ezekiel 4. Seven is in Leviticus 26. Eighty is in Psalm 90. 1,260 and 1,290 and 1,335 are in Revelation and Daniel. Not one of those numbers was selected by me. What I choose is where each clock starts — which is why Chapters 6 and 7 spend most of their length defending start dates rather than doing arithmetic.

How many free parameters, and how coarse? Two per clock: the anchor, and how many times the multiplier is applied. The second is a genuine choice and Chapter 3 says so. But the multiplier is seven, so each additional application scales everything by seven. For Israel: no multiplication gives 311 BC, one gives 2030, two gives the year 18410. For Judah: one gives 350, two gives 2030, three gives 13790. **Exactly one setting per clock lands anywhere in recorded history.** That is not a dial. It is a switch with one plausible position.

Does the system produce results it was not built for? This is the strongest test, and the answer is no. A fitted system produces exactly what it was fitted to produce. This one produced a thirty-day apostasy window out of the difference between Daniel’s 1,290 and John’s 1,260 — two numbers written six centuries apart — matching a gap between two feast dates set by lunar conjunction. And it produced a ten-day interval that turns out to be the only ten-day pair of appointed times in the Hebrew calendar. Neither was aimed at.

Where the objector scores a real hit: the generation clock. Six plausible settings, one gives 2030, and it is the one I use. Chapter 9 prints the grid and ranks that clock last. On that one, the objection lands.

3. “Ezekiel 4 is not a clock.”

Ezekiel was performing a sign to a besieged generation about a coming exile. Nothing in the passage suggests a countdown running two and a half thousand years past his death. You have taken a piece of enacted prophecy about the sixth century BC and turned it into a stopwatch.

Correct as far as it goes, and this is the hinge, so I will not soften it.

The passage is a sign about exile. What the passage also does is **quantify** — 390 and 40, with an explicit conversion rate attached, *a day for each year*. God did not tell Ezekiel to lie there a long while. He gave numbers and named the unit. Numbers issued that precisely, with a stated conversion, are issued to be counted; Daniel counted Jeremiah’s seventy the same way and prayed when they ran out.

The genuinely weak point is not the counting. It is the anchoring. That the 390 run forward from the 701 BC siege, and the 40 run up to the AD 70 siege, comes from reading Ezekiel’s left side and right side as direction on a right-to-left timeline. Chapter 4 states plainly that a reader who takes left and right as simply *north* and *south* loses nothing about the identity of the two houses and gains no clock — and that on that reading, this book has no start dates.

I hold the reading because of what it yields downstream, and Chapter 4 admits that this is warrant by result rather than self-evidence. **It is the largest single dependency in the book and it is an interpretation.**

4. “Leviticus 26 means severity, not duration.”

Sevenfold is an idiom. Genesis 4:15 is not arithmetic. You have converted a Hebrew intensifier into a multiplication sign because the multiplication gets you where you want to go, and the majority of commentators read it the way I do.

The majority does read it that way, and Chapter 5 says so in those words rather than waiting to be caught.

What Chapter 5 argues is narrower than *the majority is wrong*. It is that **severity is not a measurable quantity** — there is no unit in which one famine is seven times another — while duration has one. A punishment is administered over time, so it has two dimensions, how hard and how long, and *seven times the punishment* is a claim about a total made of both. Only one of those two dimensions can carry a checkable factor of seven.

That produces a fork with no comfortable exit. Either *seven times* is quantitative, in which case it bears on a total with a time dimension — or it is pure idiom for fullness, in which

case it multiplies nothing at all and the four escalations are emphasis rather than a ladder.

And I do not need severity to be false. I need duration to be available. The reader who is certain Leviticus 26 is about severity can be entirely right and this book still works; he would be describing the dimension I am not counting in.

(Chapter 5 also sets out, at length, a knockdown argument against the severity reading that I decline to print because it does not work. If you want to know what this book does with an argument that flatters it, that is where to look.)

5. “Your calendar is invented.”

You reject the calendar the Jewish world has kept for sixteen centuries in favour of one computed from astronomical tables, and then announce that your dates fall on feast days. They fall on your feast days. Show me a date that survives a calendar you did not choose.

Fair, and it is the right challenge. Chapter 14 exists to answer it.

The autumn 2030 dates survive it completely. Both calendars — the observational one this book follows and the fixed rabbinic one — place Yom Teruah on 28 September 2030, Yom Kippur on 7 October 2030, Sukkot on 12 October, and 25 Kislev on 21 December. A reader who rejects Chapter 2 entirely still lands on every one of those. The terminus is calendar-independent.

The 2027 anchor does not survive it. In 2027, and in 2027 alone across the six years I checked, the two calendars diverge by a full lunar month, because the fixed calendar inserts Adar II and the equinox rule does not. On the rabbinic reckoning, 27–28 March 2027 is not a feast day at all.

So the position is split. **The destination is calendar-independent; the starting gun is not.** That is stated in Chapter 2, again in Chapter 14, and again here, because it is the thing most likely to be true and unwelcome.

6. “Every date-setter has been wrong.”

Miller. Russell. Whisenant. Camping. Every one of them had scripture, arithmetic and sincerity. Every one had followers who sold their houses. The base rate on this activity is zero, and you have given me no reason to think you are the exception.

The base rate is real and I am not going to be cute about it.

The usual reply — *nine girls said no, so the tenth might say yes* — is a reply to a bad version of the argument. The good version is not a logical claim; it is a statistical one, and statistical arguments are not refuted by pointing out that they are not deductive. **A very long run of failures is evidence, and it is evidence against me.**

What I can offer is not a reason to think I am special. It is a different way of failing.

Every name on that list asked to be believed. This book asks to be checked. Every number in it is reproducible from stated inputs by stated rules; the webpage recalculates and reports failures; the explorer page lets a hostile reader change any assumption and watch the conclusion move. I have printed the grid that embarrasses the generation clock, the escalation that broke my own argument, the anchor error that put Judah's clock on 1990, and a forty-two-digit number I refused to use.

If this book is wrong, **the machinery for demonstrating that it is wrong is in the book.** That is not a claim to be right. It is the only thing worth offering instead.

7. "Your four clocks are not independent."

Israel and Judah both come from Ezekiel 4 and Leviticus 26 and need the same interpretive moves. Judah and your Jubilee clock both start from AD 30. Your convergence is one framework agreeing with itself.

You are right, and I said so before you did. Chapter 9 audits every clock for shared sources, shared anchors and shared interpretive moves, and concludes exactly this. I have retired the phrase *four independent clocks* from the book.

What survives is smaller: one framework, applied twice with almost no shared inputs — 390 against 40, anchors seven centuries apart, one multiplication against two — landing twice on the same year. That is a consistency check on a framework rather than two witnesses to a fact. Chapter 7 showed how easily that framework yields 1990 or 2420 when an anchor moves, so the check is not trivial.

Less than it looked. More than nothing.

8. "You use a minority chronology when it suits you."

The majority reckoning of Tiberius's fifteenth year gives AD 28 or 29 and a crucifixion around AD 33. You use the minority co-regency reckoning, which gives AD 26 and AD 30 — the only figures that make your clock close. And your four Passovers in John require reading 5:1 as a Passover when the Greek says only "a feast."

Both true, both disclosed in Chapter 7 and again in Chapter 8.

If the crucifixion was AD 33, Judah's forty years run to AD 73 — not a Passover siege of Jerusalem but the fall of Masada — and **Judah's clock does not close.** The Jubilee clock moves with it since it shares the anchor.

Israel's clock is untouched. It is anchored in 701 BC and depends on no New Testament chronology whatever.

So: of the two strongest clocks, one rests on a contested first-century date and one does not, and they land on the same year. That is worth something. It is not worth pretending

the contested one is settled.

What is left

Eight objections. On two of them — the independence of the clocks, and the generation clock's six-cell grid — the objector is simply right, and the book was changed to say so. On the rest I have given the best answer I have and marked where it runs out.

If you have read this far and remain unpersuaded, I would rather that than the alternative. The worst outcome for a book like this is a reader who believes it because the author sounded confident.

What I would ask instead is this. Do not take the conclusion on my authority. Take the method: state your rules before you count, mark your weakest links in your own text, and let a number you like be wrong. If you do that with these chapters and the whole thing collapses, the book will have been worth writing anyway, and I will want to hear from you.

info@purelife2030.com

purelife2030.com/the-numbers.html

Appendices

Appendix A — Master Timeline

Every dated event this book depends on, 701 BC to 21 December 2030. Hebrew dates are rabbinic and were computed, not copied. Tier labels are explained in Chapter 3. Every row here has a chapter behind it.

#	Date	Hebrew date	Event	Clock	Scripture	Tier
1	722 BC		Fall of Samaria; House of Israel deported by Assyria	Israel	2 Kgs 17:5-6	2 · HISTORICAL
2	701 BC		Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem FAILS — Israel's 390 years begin	Israel	Ezek 4:5; 2 Kgs 19	3 · INTERPRETIVE
3	458 BC		Artaxerxes I decrees the restoration of Jerusalem (Ezra 7)	Daniel 9	Ezra 7; Dan 9:25	2 · HISTORICAL
4	409 BC		End of the first 7 weeks (49 years) — Jerusalem rebuilt	Daniel 9	Dan 9:25	1 · ARITHMETIC
5	311 BC		Israel's 390 years expire. No repentance. Sentence multiplied by seven.	Israel	Lev 26:18,21,24,28	1 · ARITHMETIC
6	AD 26 (Tevet 1)		Jesus baptized — end of the 69th week; the 70th week begins	Daniel 9	Lk 3:1,21-23; Dan 9:25	3 · INTERPRETIVE
7	5 April AD 30		CRUCIFIXION — Passover,	Judah / Daniel 9	Dan 9:26-27; 1 Cor 5:7	3 · INTERPRETIVE

#	Date	Hebrew date	Event	Clock	Scripture	Tier
			middle of the 70th week. Judah's 40 years begin.			E
8	24 May AD 30		Pentecost — the Spirit poured out; the church age begins	Messiah	Acts 2	3 · INTERPRETIVE
9	Passover, AD 70 (~mid-April)		Final siege of Jerusalem BEGINS — Judah's 40 years expire. No repentance.	Judah	Lk 21:20	2 · HISTORICAL
10	9-10 Av, AD 70 (~4 Aug)		The Temple is burned	Judah	Mt 24:2	2 · HISTORICAL
11	AD 350		Judah's first multiplied sentence (280 years) expires. Still no repentance.	Judah	Lev 26:24,28	1 · ARITHMETIC
12	14 May 1948		Israel reborn as a nation	Generation	Mt 24:32-34	2 · HISTORICAL
13	23 January 1950		Knesset declares Jerusalem the capital — 60 to 2	Generation	Ps 90:10; Mt 24:34	3 · INTERPRETIVE
14	7 October 2023		Hamas attack on Israel — Shemini Atzeret	Marker	—	2 · HISTORICAL
15	27 March 2027 (Sat)	Adar 2 18, 5787	ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION — the abomination is set up	Tribulation	Dan 12:11; 2 Th 2	4 · PROPHETIC

#	Date	Hebrew date	Event	Clock	Scripture	Tier
16	28 March 2027 (Sun)	Adar 2 19, 5787	Day 1 of the 1,290 · the 30 days of Apostasy begin	Tribulation	Dan 12:11	4 · PROPHETIC
17	26 April 2027 (Mon)	Nissan 19, 5787	Day 30 — the Apostasy ends	Tribulation	2 Th 2:3	1 · ARITHMETIC
18	27 April 2027 (Tue)	Nissan 20, 5787	LATTER RAINS FALL — Day 1 of the 1,260 and of the 1,335	Tribulation	Rev 11:3; Dan 12:12	4 · PROPHETIC
19	15 April 2030 (Mon)	Nissan 12, 5790	Passover (Pesach), M2030 calendar — 14th of the 1st month	Expiry	Lev 23:5	4 · PROPHETIC
20	24 April 2030 (Wed)	Nissan 21, 5790	PUNISHMENTS EXPIRE — 21 Nisan, last day of Unleavened Bread. The five months begin.	Expiry	Rev 9:5	4 · PROPHETIC
21	27 September 2030 (Fri)	Elul 29, 5790	YOM TERUAH — Day 1,250. Resurrection, Rapture, Return. The days are cut short.	Return	Lev 23:24; Mt 24:22; Isa 26:19-21	4 · PROPHETIC
22	7 October 2030 (Mon)	Tishrei 10, 5791	YOM KIPPUR — Day 1,260 and Day 1,290 both end. The ten days of wrath conclude.	Return	Lev 23:27; Dan 12:11	4 · PROPHETIC
23	11 October 2030 (Fri)	Tishrei 14, 5791	Feast of Tabernacles begins — the	Return	Lev 23:34; Zech 14:16	4 · PROPHETIC

#	Date	Hebrew date	Event	Clock	Scripture	Tier
Millennial Kingdom						
24	21 December 2030 (Sat)	Kislev 25, 5791	Day 1,335 — 'Blessed is he who waits.' Hanukkah: the Temple rededicated.	Return	Dan 12:12	4 · PROPHETIC

Appendix B — Every Calculation, Reproducible

Year spans are computed in astronomical year numbering (701 BC = -700), which makes the missing year zero structurally impossible to get wrong. Convert back at the end: a positive result is AD; a result of 0 or less is (1 - n) BC.

#	What it establishes	Start	Operation	Years	Result	Reads as	Rule
1	Israel: original sentence expires	-700	701 BC + 390	390	-310	311 BC	Ezekiel 4:5 — 390 days, a day for a year (Ezek 4:6).
2	Israel: sentence multiplied by seven	-700	701 BC + (390 x 7)	2730	2030	2030 AD	Leviticus 26:18,21,24,28 — 'seven times more'. Served forward from the siege, which for Israel opens her term (Ezekiel's left side). See Chapter 7.
3	Judah: original sentence expires	30	AD 30 + 40	40	70	70 AD	Ezekiel 4:6 — 40 days, a day for a year. Crucifixion to the siege of Jerusalem.
4	Judah: first multiplication	70	AD 70 + (40 x 7)	280	350	350 AD	Leviticus 26 — first escalation. 40 x 7 = 280, served forward from the AD 70 siege.
5	Judah: second multiplication	70	AD 70 + (40 x 7 x 7)	1960	2030	2030 AD	Leviticus 26 — second escalation. 40 x 7^2 = 1,960. NOT '280 x 7' — the squared seven is the point. Served forward from the siege, which

#	What it establishes	Start	Operation	Years	Result	Reads as	Rule
							for Judah CLOSES her term (Ezekiel's right side). See Chapter 7.
6	Crucifixion + 2,000 years (40 Jubilees)	30	AD 30 + 2000	2000	2030	2030 AD	Hosea 6:2; 2 Peter 3:8. Forty Jubilees of 50 years.
7	The generation from Jerusalem restored	1950	1950 + 80	80	2030	2030 AD	Psalm 90:10 (80 years); Matthew 24:34. Knesset vote of 23 Jan 1950, 60 to 2.
8	Daniel 9: the first seven weeks	-457	458 BC + 49	49	-408	409 BC	Daniel 9:25 — 7 weeks of years.
9	Daniel 9: sixty-nine weeks to Messiah	-457	458 BC + 483	483	26	26 AD	Daniel 9:25 — (7 + 62) x 7 = 483 years.
10	Israel reborn + a generation (the objection)	1948	1948 + 80	80	2028	2028 AD	Shown deliberately. 1948 does NOT give 2030 — which is why the book uses the 1950 restoration of the city.

Appendix C — The Day Counts

All counts are **inclusive of both endpoints**: day 1 is the start date. To reproduce these on timeanddate.com, tick *Include end date in calculation* — every count, every time.

Count	Scripture	From	Start is	To	End is	Hebrew (end)
1,290	Daniel 12:11	28 Mar 2027	Firstfruits — the Abomination of Desolation	7 Oct 2030	Yom Kippur — 10 Tishri	Tishrei 10, 5791
30	2 Thess 2:3	28 Mar 2027	The Apostasy begins	26 Apr 2027	The Apostasy ends	Nissan 19, 5787
1,260	Rev 11:3; 12:6	27 Apr 2027	Latter Rains — last day of 2nd Unleavened Bread	7 Oct 2030	Yom Kippur — 10 Tishri	Tishrei 10, 5791
1,250	Matthew 24:22	27 Apr 2027	Latter Rains — the witnesses empowered	27 Sep 2030	Yom Teruah — the days cut short by ten	Elul 29, 5790

Count	Scripture	From	Start is	To	End is	Hebrew (end)
1,335	Daniel 12:12	27 Apr 2027	Latter Rains — ‘blessed is he who waits’	21 Dec 2030	Hanukkah — 25 Kislev, the Temple rededicated	Kislev 25, 5791
2,558	Marker	7 Oct 2023	Hamas attack — Shemini Atzeret	7 Oct 2030	Yom Kippur — seven years to the day	Tishrei 10, 5791
157	Rev 9:5	24 Apr 2030	21 Nisan (rabbinic) — punishments expire; five months begin	27 Sep 2030	Yom Teruah — the door closes	Elul 29, 5790

Derived: 1,290 – 1,260 = 30, and the two anchors are 30 days apart. 1,260 – 1,250 = 10, and Yom Teruah and Yom Kippur are 10 days apart. Neither relationship was designed in. See Chapter 12.

Appendix D — Feast Calendar 2025–2030, Both Reckonings

Observational dates are the Messiah 2030 Project’s published calendar (equinox plus lunar conjunction, Jerusalem time). Rabbinic dates were computed here. All dates are the **daylight** date; each feast begins at sundown the previous evening. See Chapters 2 and 14.

Year	Feast	Observational	Rabbinic	Gap
2025	Passover (14th, 1st month)	12 Apr 2025	12 Apr 2025	same day
2025	Unleavened Bread begins (15th)	13 Apr 2025	13 Apr 2025	same day
2025	Firstfruits	20 Apr 2025	—	n/a
2025	Shavuot / Weeks	9 Jun 2025	—	n/a
2025	Yom Teruah / Trumpets (1 Tishri)	22 Sep 2025	23 Sep 2025	1 day
2025	Yom Kippur / Atonement (10 Tishri)	1 Oct 2025	2 Oct 2025	1 day
2025	Sukkot / Tabernacles begins	6 Oct 2025	7 Oct 2025	1 day
2026	Passover (14th, 1st month)	2 Apr 2026	1 Apr 2026	1 day
2026	Unleavened Bread begins (15th)	3 Apr 2026	2 Apr 2026	1 day
2026	Firstfruits	5 Apr 2026	—	n/a
2026	Shavuot / Weeks	25 May 2026	—	n/a
2026	Yom Teruah / Trumpets (1 Tishri)	13 Sep 2026	12 Sep 2026	1 day
2026	Yom Kippur / Atonement (10 Tishri)	22 Sep 2026	21 Sep 2026	1 day
2026	Sukkot / Tabernacles begins	27 Sep 2026	26 Sep 2026	1 day
2027	Passover (14th, 1st month)	22 Mar 2027	21 Apr 2027	30 days
2027	Unleavened Bread begins (15th)	23 Mar 2027	22 Apr 2027	30 days

Year	Feast	Observational	Rabbinic	Gap
2027	Firstfruits	28 Mar 2027	—	n/a
2027	Second Passover (14th, 2nd month)	20 Apr 2027	21 May 2027	31 days
2027	2nd Unleavened Bread ENDS (21st)	27 Apr 2027	28 May 2027	31 days
2027	Shavuot / Weeks	17 May 2027	—	n/a
2027	Yom Teruah / Trumpets (1 Tishri)	1 Sep 2027	2 Oct 2027	31 days
2027	Yom Kippur / Atonement (10 Tishri)	10 Sep 2027	11 Oct 2027	31 days
2027	Sukkot / Tabernacles begins	15 Sep 2027	16 Oct 2027	31 days
2028	Passover (14th, 1st month)	9 Apr 2028	10 Apr 2028	1 day
2028	Unleavened Bread begins (15th)	10 Apr 2028	11 Apr 2028	1 day
2028	Firstfruits	15 Apr 2028	—	n/a
2028	Shavuot / Weeks	4 Jun 2028	—	n/a
2028	Yom Teruah / Trumpets (1 Tishri)	19 Sep 2028	21 Sep 2028	2 days
2028	Yom Kippur / Atonement (10 Tishri)	28 Sep 2028	30 Sep 2028	2 days
2028	Sukkot / Tabernacles begins	3 Oct 2028	5 Oct 2028	2 days
2029	Passover (14th, 1st month)	28 Mar 2029	30 Mar 2029	2 days
2029	Unleavened Bread begins (15th)	29 Mar 2029	31 Mar 2029	2 days
2029	Firstfruits	1 Apr 2029	—	n/a
2029	Shavuot / Weeks	21 May 2029	—	n/a
2029	Yom Teruah / Trumpets (1 Tishri)	9 Sep 2029	10 Sep 2029	1 day
2029	Yom Kippur / Atonement (10 Tishri)	18 Sep 2029	19 Sep 2029	1 day
2029	Sukkot / Tabernacles begins	23 Sep 2029	24 Sep 2029	1 day
2030	Passover (14th, 1st month)	16 Apr 2030	17 Apr 2030	1 day
2030	Unleavened Bread begins (15th)	17 Apr 2030	18 Apr 2030	1 day
2030	Unleavened Bread ENDS (21st)	23 Apr 2030	24 Apr 2030	1 day
2030	Firstfruits	21 Apr 2030	—	n/a
2030	Shavuot / Weeks	10 Jun 2030	—	n/a
2030	Yom Teruah / Trumpets (1 Tishri)	28 Sep 2030	28 Sep 2030	same day
2030	Yom Kippur / Atonement (10 Tishri)	7 Oct 2030	7 Oct 2030	same day
2030	Sukkot / Tabernacles begins	12 Oct 2030	12 Oct 2030	same day
2030	Hanukkah 8th day (1,335 ends)	21 Dec 2030	21 Dec 2030	same day

Appendix E — Chronology Notes

Every anchor a critic can attack, with the scholarly range and the reason for the choice made.

Sennacherib's failed siege — this book uses *701 BC*. Alternatives: Undisputed.

Fixed by the Assyrian eponym canon, Sennacherib's Prism and 2 Kings 18-19. The siege of Jerusalem failed: Assyria's own annals say Hezekiah was shut up 'like a caged bird' but never claim the city fell.

SOLID. A minority (Shea) proposes a second campaign c. 688-686 BC; the majority holds one campaign in 701.

Fall of Samaria — this book uses 722 BC (*context only*). Alternatives: 720 BC (Sargon II).

2 Kings 17:5-6 and Babylonian sources credit Shalmaneser V, whose three-year siege ends c. 722. Sargon II claims personal credit; scholars date his conquest or suppression of a revolt to 720.

Not used in any calculation. Listed so no one supposes it was quietly relied on. See Chapter 6.

Artaxerxes' decree to Ezra — this book uses 458 BC. Alternatives: 457 BC.

458 BC follows non-accession-year, Nisan-based Persian regnal reckoning from the 465/464 BC accession. 457 BC follows accession-year reckoning plus the Jewish Tishri civil calendar and the ~7-month Artabanus interregnum. Both are defensible.

This book uses 458 BC. Anyone reckoning from 457 BC will find every Daniel 9 date one year later, and the argument of Chapter 8 survives that shift unchanged.

15th year of Tiberius — this book uses AD 26. Alternatives: AD 27 · AD 28/29.

The majority reckoning counts from Augustus' death (19 Aug AD 14) and yields late AD 28 / early 29. The co-regency reckoning counts from Tiberius' co-equal provincial authority c. AD 11-13 and yields AD 26-27.

The weakest historical link in the chain. This book uses the minority co-regency reckoning, and Chapters 7 and 8 say so rather than presenting AD 26 as uncontested.

Crucifixion — this book uses 5 April AD 30. Alternatives: AD 33 · AD 31.

Passover, Nisan 14. Requires the AD 26 baptism plus a 3.5-year ministry (four Passovers: Jn 2:13, 5:1, 6:4, 11:55).

Solid given AD 26 — but it falls with the Tiberius reckoning above rather than independently of it.

Siege of Jerusalem begins — this book uses *Passover AD 70*. Alternatives: —.

Josephus: Titus' forces used the Passover crowds to close on the walls at 14 Nisan, roughly mid-April AD 70.

Solid, and this is the correct anchor for a Passover-to-Passover count. See Chapter 10.

Temple destroyed — this book uses 9-10 Av, AD 70. Alternatives: ~4 August AD 70.

Josephus says 10 Av; Mishnah Ta'anit 4:6 says 9 Av. Roughly 3.5 months AFTER the siege began.

Solid, and the distinction matters. My earlier book said the Temple was destroyed at Passover. It was not — the siege began at Passover and the Temple burned some three and a half months later. The corrected fact is the one Judah's clock actually needs.

311 BC — this book uses *Israel's 390 expire*. Alternatives: —.

Spring 311 BC is the epoch of the Seleucid Era (1 Nisan = 3 April 311 BC), later adopted by the Jews as the minyan shtarot, the 'Era of Contracts' used in 1 Maccabees and in Jewish legal documents for over a millennium.

No conquest, battle or change of rule occurred in Judea in 311 BC. The significance is calendrical only, and Chapter 6 says so. The plain version is still striking.

AD 350 — this book uses *Judah's first x7 expires*. Alternatives: AD 351-352.

The Jewish revolt against Constantius Gallus is dated 351-352, not 350. Gallus became Caesar in March 351; Ursicinus razed Diocaesarea (Sepphoris) and devastated Tiberias and Lydda.

Adjacent, not exact. Nothing specific is attested in AD 350 itself, and the arithmetic does not depend on anything having happened that year. See Chapter 7.

Knesset declares Jerusalem capital — this book uses *23 January 1950*. Alternatives: Dec 1949 relocation.

Verified: the vote was 60 to 2 on 23 January 1950. Ben-Gurion had announced the move to the Knesset on 5 and 13 December 1949, after the UN vote of 9 December to internationalise the city.

Solid. The 1948 objection — $1948 + 80 = 2028$ — is raised and answered in Chapter 9, where the full grid of plausible combinations is printed.

Hamas attack — this book uses *7 October 2023*. Alternatives: —.

Saturday 7 October 2023, Shemini Atzeret. Exactly seven years before 7 October 2030.

Solid.