

Then there are the scholarly chronologies, which were sidelined a century ago by biblical revisionists. However, not one of them comes close to providing a complete series of charts that covers the whole.³¹ They are very outdated, and there is much astronomical, archaeological, and historical research to be considered without having to revise or doubt the biblical chronology. This chronology answers the need for a complete, accurate, and thorough in-depth presentation.

This chronology is the most readable also. Other chronologies use line sketches filled in with numbers. For the common person, they are unreadable, and for the scholar considerable effort has to be applied to understand them. Trying to work out the consequences of other's assumptions beyond the boundaries of a limited chart is a headache inducing exercise that often exposes a glaring inconsistency that the author nowhere addresses!

This chronology is the only one *bar none* that quotes in full every relevant chronological text next to its point in the timeline and connects the text to the grid with an arrow. It is the only chronology in print to list every year of every king, and to color code or shade every era and reign for good contrast.

Twenty-seven years went into harmonizing this chronology with all the biblical data, using computerized spreadsheets to try numerous different hypothesis and theories until the right ones were discovered or confirmed.

Chronological theories are like weather. A butterfly that flaps its wings in Beijing causes a hurricane in the Caribbean; A small mistake can have enormous consequences. Yet, when all the data are aligned correctly, the cloudy focus suddenly becomes clear, and the image sharp.

The authors of the bible were concerned about history as much as religion, and because they never sacrificed historical accuracy for religious reasons, it stands to reason that its chronology can be consistently and completely explained.



³¹ *The Romance of Bible Chronology* (Martin Anstey 252.6) comes the closest, but his theory of the Persian Period was incorrect.