
1. Preliminary Considerations

Most scholars explain Dan 1:1 as a derivation of 2 Kgs 24:1 and 2 Chr 36:6-7. A possible motivation behind this dating may have


been the desire to provide the seventy years of exile (Jer 25:11) with an exact terminus a quo. Similarly, Otto Płöger believes that Dan 1:1 and the other dates in Daniel are stereotyped phrases.

Various proposals have been made to emend the text in order to derive a more historical sense out of the passage. Lacocque suggests that Jehoiachin be substituted for Jehoiakim, thus dating the incident to 594. A. Malamat emends the text from šlwš “third (year),” to šš “sixth (year),” and thus places the incident in the winter of 603 (second year of Nebuchadnezzar). G. Ricciotti, following Josephus, emends the numeral to šmnḥ “eighth (year).” As attractive as these emendations may be, however, there is no external evidence to justify changing the text.

Several commentators take the third year of Jehoiakim as being the last of the three years of servitude to Babylon mentioned in 2 Kgs 24:1. This solution is unlikely, for the text of Daniel states that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem “in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim” (bšn̂ šlwš lmlkt), not “in the third year of the servitude of Jehoiakim” (bšn̂ šlwš lḥwḏh)—as one might expect if the statement in Dan 1:1 were derived from 2 Kgs 24:1.

Various attempts have been made to relate the text as it stands to what is known about the period. H. C. Leupold, who inac-

p. 17; A. A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Cambridge, Eng., 1892), pp. 57-58; Collins, p. 45; Hartman and Di Lella, pp. 128-129; Gilles Gaide, Le Livre de Daniel (Tours, 1969), p. 29; Hammer, p. 18; Jeffery, pp. 361-362; Montgomery, pp. 72-73, 113-114; Porteous, p. 25; Russell, p. 229, n. 1. Lacocque suggests that the author of Daniel also may have combined Jer 25:1, 11 with 2 Chr 36:6 (pp. 25-26).


6Lacocque, pp. 7 (n. 29), 24. Cf. Gaide, p. 29.


accurately dated the battle of Carchemish to 604, placed the siege mentioned in Daniel at a time preceding that battle, holding that there was no strong garrison at Carchemish in 605 to hinder a siege of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{10} C. F. Keil translated \textsuperscript{b'}\textsuperscript{(Dan 1:1)} to mean "to set out"\textsuperscript{11} and interpreted the verse as conveying that Nebuchadnezzar set out in Jehoiakim's third year but did not besiege the city until the latter's fourth year (Jer 25:1).\textsuperscript{12} Dan 1:1 seems to suggest, however, that it all happened at once.\textsuperscript{13}

The purpose of this article is to reexamine Dan 1:1-2 exegetically and historically and to propose a solution as to how the chronological data of this passage might conform to the history of the times during which it was purported to have been written. It is my contention that the passage may be adequately related to the campaign of Nebuchadnezzar in Palestine, which took place from the summer of 605 through the late winter of 604, and to the notices in 2 Kgs 24:1 and 2 Chr 36:6-7. The article begins by tracing the history of the Neo-Babylonian Empire from the end of the reign of Nabopolassar to the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar.

2. \textit{An Historical Introduction to the Relationship between Jehoiakim and Babylon}

In the third month of 607 (4 May-2 June)\textsuperscript{14} both Nabopolassar and Crown Prince Nebuchadnezzar campaigned in a mountainous region not identifiable from the text.\textsuperscript{15} Nabopolassar, however, returned to Babylon the next month, whereas Nebuchadnezzar stayed on until sometime during the sixth month (1 Aug.-30 Aug.).\textsuperscript{16} A month or two later (29 Sept.-28 Oct.) Nabopolassar set


\textsuperscript{11}Some passages cited by Keil in defense of this meaning are Gen 45:17; Exod 6:11; 7:26; 9:1; 10:1; Num 32:6; 1 Sam 20:19; 2 Kgs 5:5; Jonah 1:3 (\textit{Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel}, trans M. G. Easton [Grand Rapids, MI, 1959], p. 62).

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 63.

\textsuperscript{13}E. J. Young, \textit{The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary} (Grand Rapids, MI, 1949), pp. 268-269.

\textsuperscript{14}All dates have been taken from the tables in Richard A. Parker and Waldo H. Dubberstein, \textit{Babylonian Chronology: 626 B.C.-A.D. 75} (Providence, RI, 1956).


\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., lines 8, 12, p. 97.
out with his army for Kimuḫu, a strategic city south of Carchemish, and was able to capture it near the end of 607 (27 Nov.-26 Dec.), also leaving a garrison there before going home in early 606 (25 Jan.-23 Feb.).

In the spring or early summer of the same year, the Egyptians laid siege to Kimuḫu for four months and eventually recaptured it. When Nabopolassar heard of this, he returned to Syria and there made the city of Quramatu his base of operations against the cities of Shunaditu, Elammu, and Daḫammu before returning home in the early part of 605 (15 Jan.-12 Feb.). The Egyptians, however, besieged the Babylonian garrison left at Quramatu shortly thereafter and forced the Babylonians to withdraw from the city. In response, Nabopolassar dispatched Nebuchadnezzar to Carchemish shortly after the beginning of his own twenty-first year of reign, which began on 12 April.

In contrast to the previous Babylonian encounters with the Egyptians, Nebuchadnezzar defeated them soundly at Carchemish and subsequently routed the remnant which had fled southward to the province of Ḫamath. At this time the Babylonian forces conquered Ḫamath, but they apparently also continued moving southward within Ḫattu (i.e., Syria-Palestine), as evidenced by the fact that later (when he returned from Babylon after the death
of his father) Nebuchadnezzar returned not to Hamath, but to Hattu (even though the Chronicles mention only the conquest of Hamath and not the conquest of Hattu). Upon learning of Nabolassar’s death (15 August 605), Nebuchadnezzar hastened back to Babylon and ascended the throne on 7 September.26

3. Babylon and Jehoiakim (605-598)

The Beginning of Jehoiakim’s Three-year Submission to Babylon (605-604)

Nebuchadnezzar’s probable movement to Hattu can be connected with Dan 1:1, which states: “In the third year of Jehoiakim king of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon27 came to Jerusalem and besieged it” (b’... yrwšlm wyṣr ḫyḥ).28 The text indicates that an actual siege took place, since each time ṣwr is used with the preposition ‘l29 it means “shut in, besiege.”30

28In Antiquities 10.87 Josephus skips from this point to the fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar, thus omitting four years of his reign. This may suggest that his statement that “the king of Babylon passed over Euphrates and took all Syria, as far as Pelusium, excepting Judea,” may be summarizing the years between the fall of Carchemish up to the fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar. If so, it has nothing really specific to say about the period following the fall of Carchemish.
29Deut 20:12; 2 Sam 11:1; 20:15; 1 Kgs 15:27; 16:17; 20:1; 2 Kgs 6:24, 25; 16:5; 17:5; 18:9; 24:11; Isa 29:3; Jer 21:4, 9; 32:2; 37:5; 39:1; Ezek 4:3; Dan 1:1; Cant 8:9.

D. J. Wiseman’s suggestion that the verb ṣwr “can denote action preliminary to, but not necessarily an actual siege” (Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon [Oxford, 1985], p. 23) is not convincing from the usage of the verb and in light of the fact that spoils were taken from the temple. Earlier he had suggested that ṣwr was a bi-form of šrr (“Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel,” in Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel [London, 1965], p. 18, n. 57). While it is true that ṣwr is a bi-form of the hiphil preterite of šrr, “cause distress (to)” (Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, eds., Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros [Leiden/Grand Rapids, 1958], s.v. I רצא, p. 818), it is unlikely that wyṣr in Dan 1:1 is from the root šrr, because the hiphil of šrr is never followed by the ‘l preposition. The preposition ‘l, however, is common in conjunction with ṣwr.
If the third year of Jehoiakim fell between 19 September 606 and 6 October 605, then the latter part of the third year would have fallen into the period after 12 April, after which time Nebuchadnezzar had been dispatched to Syria. This would have left a sufficient amount of time between the conquest of Hamath and his return to Babylon for him to begin a siege of Jerusalem.

Two passages must be connected with the siege of Jerusalem mentioned in Dan 1:1: (1) 2 Kgs 24:1, which states that Nebuchadnezzar "came up" (‘lh) in the reign of Jehoiakim, and (2) 2 Chr 36:6, which claims that Nebuchadnezzar "came up against him [Jehoiakim]" (‘lyw ‘lh). While ‘lh does not necessarily include a siege, it does not exclude it either.32

After Nabopolassar’s death on 15 August 605,33 Nebuchadnezzar was forced to return to Babylon and to leave the siege of Jerusalem in the hands of his subordinates. He arrived by the first day of the following month (7 Sept.) to claim the throne.34 By leaving his army in Palestine and returning with only a small escort,35 Nebuchadnezzar was able to cross the desert in only twenty-three days. After he secured the throne, Nebuchadnezzar immediately returned to Palestine where he rejoined his army and completed “mopping-up” operations.36

Thus the result of the siege was that “the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his [Nebuchadnezzar’s] hand” [wyttm ḫny bydw] (Dan 1:2)—a depiction of the surrender of Jehoiakim to the Babylonians.37 A similar meaning is conveyed in 2 Kgs 24:1ab:


32 Note the usage of ‘lh in 1 Kgs 14:25 and 2 Kgs 18:25 (cf. vs. 17).


34 Ibid., obv. 10-11, pp. 99-100.

35 Berossus; quoted in Josephus, Against Apion 1. 137.


37 Note the similar phrase in Lam 5:6; cf. also Deut 20:13; Jer 21:7, 10; 32:3, 4.
“Jehoiakim became his [Nebuchadnezzar’s] servant for three years.” This latter passage refers to Jehoiakim’s position as a vassal,\textsuperscript{38} which involved his paying of tribute three times.

We find in 2 Chr 36:6 that Nebuchadnezzar “bound him [Jehoiakim] with bronze to take him to Babylon.” This situation is analogous to that of Manasseh, who also was bound and taken to Babylon (2 Chr 33:11),\textsuperscript{39} and perhaps also to the circumstances of Zedekiah, who went to Babylon in his fourth year (Jer 51:59). Using Manasseh as an example, we see two reasons why Jehoiakim may have been taken to Babylon. First, he may have been brought to represent Judah at the confirmation of a vassal treaty\textsuperscript{40} or to swear a new oath of loyalty.\textsuperscript{41} Second, he may have been accused of being in a rebellion. Manasseh, for example, is thought by some to have been implicated in the rebellion of Shamash-shum-ukin.\textsuperscript{42} Leupold believes that 2 Chr 36:6 describes an incident that took place in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar, during which he took 3023 Jews into exile (Jer 52:28).\textsuperscript{43} But the exile of Jer 52:28 must refer to a time after the death of Jehoiakim (9 Dec. 598), because Nebuchadnezzar started out for Ḥattu in the month of Kislev of his seventh year (18 Dec. 598-15 Jan. 597).\textsuperscript{44}

Nebuchadnezzar took Jehoiakim, “along with some of the vessels of the house of God, and he brought them [\textit{w}̄\textit{b}̄\textit{y}̄\textit{m}] to the land of Shinar, to the house of his god,\textsuperscript{45} and he brought the vessels

\textsuperscript{38}For the usage of הָדָע (“servant”) as a term of vassalage, see J. C. Greenfield, “Some Aspects of Treaty Terminology,” in \textit{Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Papers} (Jerusalem, 1967), 1:117-118. For examples, see 2 Kgs 16:7 and 1 Sam 27:12.

\textsuperscript{39}Some believe that this was a legend that grew out of Manasseh’s journey to Nineveh during the reign of Esarhaddon (e.g., W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, \textit{A History of Israel}, vol. 1, \textit{From the Exodus to the Fall of Jerusalem}, by T. H. Robinson [Oxford, 1932], pp. 400-401). There is nothing, however, to contradict the possibility that it actually took place.


\textsuperscript{43}Leupold, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{44}Grayson, “Chronicle 5,” rev. 11, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{45}Hartman and Di Lella (p. 127) and Montgomery (p. 116) omit the four words after “Shinar” because they consider them to be a dittography. They thus read: “He
into the treasury of his god” (Dan 1:2; cf. 2 Chr 36:7). The antecedent of the suffix on wyby’ım must be both Jehoiakim and the temple vessels, otherwise the latter part of the verse becomes redundant. If our interpretation is correct, then both Jehoiakim and the vessels were taken to a temple of Marduk in Babylon. That would not be unusual, since booty was often deposited in temples, which also served as depositories for treaties and other documents.

The text of Dan 1:1-2 does not specify the time of Jerusalem’s capitulation to Nebuchadnezzar, only that the siege began in the third year of Jehoiakim. But one would expect that it was short, since the penalty was not harsh. This interpretation might account for the fact that it is not mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicles.

During the eleventh month (2 Feb.-2 Mar. 604), Nebuchadnezzar took the spoils back to Babylon. That was most likely the time when Jehoiakim, Daniel, and others were taken to Babylon (2 Chr 36:6-7). Jehoiakim, however, returned to Jerusalem to

carried them into the land of Shinar, (and) he brought (them) into the treasure house of his god.”

Montgomery objects to the suffix referring to both the king and the vessels, because he believes it was improbable that the captives were taken to the temple (p. 116). Charles also holds that it must refer to the vessels alone, because the captives have not yet been mentioned (p. 7). Lacocque, in order to avoid the nonhistorical exile of Jehoiakim, states that it must refer to the vessels alone (p. 21). Keil also believes that it only refers to the vessels (p. 72). He claims that the application to Jehoiakim is excluded by the connection of wyby’ım with byt-’hwyw (”house of his god”). Jeffery, however, states that it refers to the prisoners, since the disposition of the vessels is subsequently explained (p. 363).

Saadia Gaon interprets the word hîlhyym as a reference to the judges (cited in Lacocque, p. 21). Some, based on the usage in Hos 8:1 and 9:15 (cf. LXX Dan 1:2), have taken “house of his god” to be the land of Babylon. But Keil disputes that interpretation (p. 72).

Temples had treasuries. Cf. 1 Kgs 7:51; bît nišîrti in Mesopotamian temples (CAD 11, pt. 2:279).


This is supported by the Chronicles. They state that after Nebuchadnezzar returned to Palestine following his succession, “he took the vast booty of Ḫattu to Babylon” (ibid.). Berossus’ statement (Josephus, Against Apion 1.137) concerning Israelite exiles taken to Babylon at the time of Nabopolassar’s death does not refer to this deportation, but rather to a deportation of the prisoners taken from the Egyptian forces defeated at Carchemish and Ḫamath. This Egyptian force no doubt consisted of Egyptian vassals, among which was Israel.
continue reigning as a (hopefully) loyal vassal of Nebuchadnezzar. This he succeeded to do for three years.

D. J. A. Clines has several objections to a siege of Jerusalem in the midsummer of 605 and to the veracity of Dan 1:1.51 First, he believes that there was not sufficient time for the Babylonians to march from Hamath to Jerusalem and to begin a siege between May-June and 15 August—the time at which Nebuchadnezzar had to return to Babylon.52 However, even at a slow rate of march, the Babylonians could have arrived at Jerusalem in less than a month.53

Second, Clines claims that a siege and deportation of Daniel in the third year of Jehoiakim (Dan 1) are not consistent with Dan 2:1, which implies that Daniel had already completed his three-year term of instruction in the Babylonian court in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar (cf. 1:18-21).54 That difficulty, Clines holds, is especially weighty if the three years of instruction were three full years.55 Daniel was taken to Babylon and began his instruction in the spring of 604. The second year of Nebuchadnezzar, according to the Book of Daniel, was Tishri of 604 to Tishri of 603. Thus the episode in Dan 2 took place after Daniel had finished only about one-half to one and one-half years of his training.

It should be noted, however, that Dan 2 does not necessarily follow Dan 1 chronologically.56 In addition, the text of Dan 2 suggests that he was not finished with his training. After all, Daniel was evidently not among those who were unable to interpret

---

51Three of his objections presuppose a Tishri new year and a nonaccession year for the Book of Jeremiah (objections [i], [iii], and [iv], Clines, pp. 23-25). Since we see an accession-year system and a Nisan new year in the book of Jeremiah, these three objections do not apply to the present study. Cf. n. 31 above.

52Ibid., p. 24.

53Compare the rates cited by Clines, p. 34.

54Ibid., pp. 25, 28.

55Ibid., p. 28. Some commentators hold that the three years of Dan 1:5 were not three full years (e.g., Driver, p. 17; Young, pp. 55-56). They would say that Daniel was trained during the latter part of Nebuchadnezzar’s accession year, all of his first year, and part of his second year. That then would harmonize Dan 1:5 and 2:1. The fact that the three years were a specific period of time set up for education would suggest, however, that the years were three whole years, not a part of three. There is also some evidence that in the Persian period the length of training was indeed three full years (Montgomery, p. 122).

56In fact, Daniel is not arranged chronologically, but symmetrically (cf. A. Lenglet, “La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7” Bib 53 [1972]: 169-190).
the dream (vv. 2-11; cf. v. 27), nor had he even been informed of the matter (v. 15). Thus it is entirely possible that Dan 2 records an incident that took place after the story in Dan 1:8-17, but before the end of the three-year period.

In the meantime, Nebuchadnezzar conducted campaigns in Palestine during the years of 604-600. In the third month of 604 (30 May-28 June), Nebuchadnezzar went back to Palestine to collect tribute.\(^{57}\) After capturing and plundering the city of Ashkelon, he returned to Babylon in the eleventh month (23 Jan.-20 Feb. 603).\(^{58}\) This same basic pattern was repeated in his second (603-602)\(^{59}\) and third years (602-601).\(^{60}\) At an unspecified time in his fourth year (30 Mar. 601-18 Mar. 600), Nebuchadnezzar returned to Palestine.\(^{61}\) It was during this campaign (in late 601) that Babylon and Egypt fought to a standstill, and Nebuchadnezzar withdrew to Babylon with no tribute.\(^{62}\) It was also during this campaign that Jehoiakim of Judah, who had paid tribute for the past three years, rebelled against the Babylonians. This understanding fits 2 Kgs 24:1, which states: “In his [Jehoiakim’s] days Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up, and Jehohiakim became his servant for three years; but then he turned and rebelled against him.”

The Time of Jehoiakim’s Submission to and Rebellion against Babylon

The beginning of the three-year period of Jehoiakim’s submission is not stated, and various starting points have been proposed. Some start the three years in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar after his defeat of Ashkelon in December 604\(^{63}\) (cf. Jer 36:9), after

\(^{57}\)Grayson, “Chronicle 5,” obv. 15-17, p. 100.

\(^{58}\)Ibid., obv. 18-20, p. 100.

\(^{59}\)Ibid., obv. 21-23, p. 100. Wiseman has recently argued that the lacuna describes a siege of Tyre (Nebuchadrezzar, pp. 24-29). For a survey of the views, see Malamat, “The Twilight of Judah,” p. 131, n. 18.


\(^{61}\)Ibid., rev. 5, p. 101.

\(^{62}\)Ibid., rev. 6-7, p. 101.

which there was purportedly a siege of Jerusalem. The end of the three years would therefore be in Kislev 601, probably after Nebuchadnezzar fought against the Egyptians. The problem with this view is that there is no specific evidence for a siege of Jerusalem during the first year of Nebuchadnezzar.

Second, some hold that Jehoiakim became a vassal in late 603 in connection with a campaign of Nebuchadnezzar in his second year. Jehoiakim then rebelled in 601/600 after the unsuccessful battle against the Egyptians. But it is not known what should be supplied in the lacuna of the Babylonian Chronicle which discusses the campaign of Nebuchadnezzar in Palestine late in his second year.

Third, the three years are said to have started in 601. Then Jehoiakim paid tribute in 600, 599, and 598, at the end of which time he rebelled, and Nebuchadnezzar subsequently marched against Judah. The problem with this view is that one would expect the


vassals to withhold tribute following Nebuchadnezzar’s unsuccessful battle against Egypt rather than to submit faithfully to him. On the other hand, if the vassals in Ḫattu were paying their tribute, it might explain why Nebuchadnezzar did not campaign there during his fifth and sixth years and most of his seventh year.

Fourth, Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem between the campaign in Hamath and his return to Babylon in August of 605. That was followed by Jehoiakim’s three years of servitude.67 (A similar view sees the siege of Jerusalem after Nebuchadnezzar’s return to Jerusalem from Babylon instead of before his return to claim the throne.)68

A fifth view, the one which appears to integrate all of the data most successfully, is that Jehoiakim’s three years of vassalage began after his brief deportation to Babylon in the late winter of 604 (Dan 1:1-3; 2 Chr 36:6-7).69 If Jehoiakim was not subservient to Nebuchadnezzar in the latter part of his third year (summer of 605) and was subsequently taken to Babylon at the beginning of his fourth, then the three-year period of vassalage must have started from the imposition of tribute70 which followed that brief deportation to Babylon in the winter of 604. That particular tribute was collected in the campaign of 604, which began in the third month (30 May-28 June).71 Tribute was subsequently collected in the spring of 60372 and in the year 602-601.73 In summary, Jehoiakim submitted to Nebuchadnezzar as a vassal by paying tribute in 604, 603, and 602 (the first through the third years of Nebuchadnezzar), but in 601 he rebelled by failing to pay tribute.

The impetus behind Jehoiakim’s rebellion was probably his renewal of ties with his original overlord, Necho of Egypt, who had made him king (2 Kgs 23:34-35). Jehoiakim’s ability to extradite gives evidence that he was at one time a vassal of Egypt (cf.

70Grayson, “Chronicle 5,” obv. 13, p. 100.
71Ibid., obv. 15-16, p. 100.
72Ibid., obv. 21-23, p. 100.
73Ibid., rev. 2-4, p. 101.
Jer 26:22-23). Necho also imposed a very modest amount of tribute. Jehoiakim was a part of the pro-Egyptian party in Jerusalem and probably hoped that Necho would help him against the Babylonians. This renewed alliance would explain Nebuchadnezzar's march to Egypt in 601.

Aware of the alliance between Jehoiakim and Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar marched for Egypt in the tenth month of 601 (21 Nov.-19 Dec.). When Necho heard of Nebuchadnezzar's action, he mustered his army and marched out to meet him. Both armies suffered heavy losses, and Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon with no tribute. The subsequent effect on both armies was significant: Nebuchadnezzar did not campaign the following year, and the Egyptians never regained any semblance of the control that they once exercised over Syria-Palestine.

The Events Following Jehoiakim's Rebellion

Having stayed at home to refit his horses and chariots in the year following his failure against the Egyptians, in the ninth month of 599 (29 Nov.-27 Dec.) Nebuchadnezzar marched to Ḫattu, which became his base of operations. From there he dispatched his army for a desert campaign against the Arabs and (secondarily)

---

74Extradition was a standard clause in vassal treaties (cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, [ed. and trans.], “St III,” lines 4-7, in The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire [Rome, 1967], pp. 96-97).
76Most explain the impetus behind the revolt as the defeat of Nebuchadnezzar instead of a coalition between the Egyptians and Jehoiakim (e.g., Freedman, p. 55, n. 17; Malamat, “The Twilight of Judah,” p. 132, n. 20). The idea of a renewed alliance between Jehoiakim and Necho, however, would explain why Nebuchadnezzar undertook a campaign against the Egyptians at this time.
79Ibid., rev. 8, p. 101.
82Ibid., rev. 9, p. 101.
against the outlying regions of Judah.\textsuperscript{84} After obtaining much booty, the army returned to Babylon three months later (25 Feb.-26 Mar. 598).\textsuperscript{85} Jehoiakim died on 9 December 598\textsuperscript{86} and was succeeded by Jehoiachin.\textsuperscript{87}

4. Conclusion

This article has elaborated on (1) a possible link between the siege of Jerusalem in Dan 1:1 and the subjugation of Jehoiakim in 2 Kgs 24:1, and (2) the connection between the deportation of Jehoiakim in Dan 1:2 and the deportation in 2 Chr 36:6-7. It was concluded that Nebuchadnezzar began a siege of Jerusalem (which was completed at an unspecified time) in the midsummer of his accession year (605). In the eleventh month of Nebuchadnezzar’s accession year (Feb.-Mar. 604), Jehoiakim, Daniel, and others were taken to Babylon. Following three years of servitude (604-602), Jehoiakim rebelled against the Babylonians in Nebuchadnezzar’s fourth year (601-600), prior to his battle against the Egyptians in November-December of 601.

\textsuperscript{84} Kgs 24:2; cf. Jer 35:11; also perhaps the Ramath-Negeb ostracon from Arad (Yohanan Aharoni, “Three Hebrew Ostraca from Arad,” BASOR 197 [1970]: 16-28). This passage refers to “bands” (\textit{gdwdy}) of Chaldeans. The term \textit{gdwd}, when used in the plural, refers to a division or portion of an army (2 Sam 4:2; 2 Kgs 5:2; 6:23; 13:20, 21; 2 Chr 26:11). Therefore, this passage refers to raids, and not a major thrust by the entire Babylonian army.


\textsuperscript{86} Kgs 24:7; Jer 22:19; 36:30. For the chronology of Jehoiakim’s death, see Green, “Fate of Jehoiakim,” pp. 107-108.

\textsuperscript{87}According to Josephus, \textit{Jewish Antiquities} 10. 96-97, Nebuchadnezzar besieged the city and killed Jehoiakim. But since nothing is mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicles concerning Nebuchadnezzar’s presence in Palestine during the latter part of 598, we must conclude that Josephus has confused his sources. For details, see E. J. Smit, “Josephus and the Final History of the Kingdom of Judah,” in \textit{Studies in the Chronicler}, Ou-testamentiese Werkegemeenskap in Suid-Afrika, no. 19, pp. 53-56.