and Friday. Thus, he postpones his Thursday, April 22, 34 A.D. date to Friday, April 23rd for the 14th of Nisan to avoid having a new moon on Friday, April 9th. Such rules, however, were imposed ca. A.D. 359, and were not used on the first century. See Zeitlin, Solomon, for a refutation of the postponement theory (255.153).

16.   Rules for Regnal Years

Rules For Counting Regnal Years, Oppressions, Judgeships, and Era's, and age based periods, anniversary calculations, and periods of divine judgments, and years.

Default Rule: no year is counted twice except in the case of kings (see rules for kings).

YEARS:
1. Until the commencement of counting sabbatical cycles (1592 B.C.) all years are from one vernal equinox to the next vernal equinox, or from Nisan 1 to the last day of Adar.
2. All years from 1592 B.C. onward begin on Tishri 1 with the sabbatical cycle.

ERAS:
1. Year 1 of an Era is synchronous with the event that defines the era.
2. The last year of an era does not include the terminating event.
3. If there is no terminating event, but a date in an established era is referred to then the date of the reference is synchronous with the date of the era referred.

430.   1 = Year Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees.
430 = last year in Egypt, not including year of Exodus
400   1 = Year of Isaacs birth.
400 = last year in Egypt, not including year of Exodus
300   1 = Year Heshbon conquered by Israel

300 = last year before Ammonite re-conquest in 1st year of Jair.
390   1 = Division of the Kingdom, 1st year of Judah's Kingdom.
390 = 5th year of exiled King Jehoiachin.

KINGS:
Rule #1: The kings of Judah did not count a year twice at the end of a reign, unless a co-regency is proven.
Rule #2: Otherwise (as in the case of Israel), the first year of rule is the first regnal year of the reign, unless a co-regency is proven.
Rule #3: If a co-regency is proven, then the years count from the first year of the co-regency unless proved otherwise (i.e. accession years don't make sense with co-regencies.)

17.   Sabbath Years in Maccabees

The passage supposed to indicate a sabbatical year in 1 Macc. 6:49, 53 speaks of a post sabbatical year just before the spring harvest when food supplies would be at their lowest level. The Greek text of 1 Macc. 6:49 reads, "ὅτι σάββατον ἦν" and translates, "because a sabbatical had been" (cf. John 9:18, "that he had been blind" (KJV, same syntax). Since the book was first in Hebrew, the key word would have been "hyh" which refers to past events. In similar manner the text in 1 Macc. 6:53 reads in Greek, "διὰ τὸ ἕβδομον ἔτος εἶναί" and translates, "because of the seventh year happening"; the present in the infinitive verb is probably merely citing the cause w/o indication of time, and says the sabbatical year happens, but not when. We may supposed that from cause to effect, the food supplies did not run low for this reason until spring of the 8th year, because it is at that point that food supplies reach their minimum.

So, the year A.S. 150 (1 Macc. 6:20) in the fall-313 Seleucid Era (Turquoise, T3-3977) was the same as A.S. 149 (2 Macc. 13:1) in the spring-312 Seleucid Era (brown, T1-3977): A.S. 150 = A.S. 149 = Tisrhi 1, 164 B.C. to Adar 29, 163 B.C. = the fall and winter after the sabbatic year when supplies were the lowest.

I am not using the Seleucid era here to justify the sabbatical year dating. That, I have already accomplished on biblical grounds. This is just to explain the historical reference. The attempt to justify Zuckermann's sabbatical dating using the Maccabean evidence is a *ménage à trois* between the assumed sabbatical year, the assumed Seleucid era, and the books of Maccabees.[2] The spring-311 A.S., spring-312 A.S, and fall-312 A.S. are used in conjunction with Zuckermann's theory (a.k.a. Maimonides) and Maccabees to show a consistent concordance. The apparent agreement is purely circular. The choice of Seleucid eras to apply to Maccabees was motivated by the assumed sabbatical cycle. We could just as well use the fall-313 A.S. as I have it above. The Seleucid era cannot resolve the ambiguity. Maccabees cannot resolve the ambiguity. The only way to resolve the ambiguity is to know the correct sabbatical year beforehand on the basis of the Scripture. The problem is that no researchers have been able, or are willing to start with the Bible to solve the problem. They begin with, or make the bulk of their argument from secular sources.

It is possible that many expected 164/163 to be a year of Jubilee. If Ezra was mistakenly put in the reign of Artaxerxes I, then the 458/57 B.C. date to the 164/63 B.C. date counts exactly 7 Jubilees. If one starts in 597, then approximately 430 years (390 + 40) bring us to this date. One can also count back 49 years from 458. In addition, this Jubilee agrees with the timing of the Book of Jubilees, in which the Exodus was in the year of Jubilee. Also the date of the return from Babylon 528, minus 364 years is 164 B.C. This is a special number in the Jubilees Book, because the year was 364 days, the shortfall being made up by adding a week every seven years, and an extra week in the year of Jubilee.

And for the record, I am leaving my former explanation, since it might still turn out to have merit:

At least one sect of Jews may have differed, at that time, as to the timing of the sabbatical and Jubilee years, showing that non-biblical evidence may not indicate the true cycle. The Qumran sect, otherwise identified as Essenes or Zelot-Sadducees used a completely different calendar based on the book of Jubilees. The book of Jubilees dates the revelation at Sinai in the year of Jubilee (The New Bible Dictionary, 2nd ed. Inter-varsity Press; 1962, pg. 626, "Jubilees, Book of"). This starting point for the cycle is different from the biblical one, which has Joshua reading the Law (8:30ff; Deut. 31:10) in the first year of the cycle after the destruction of Ai. In fact, if you work the Jubilees cycle forward by 50 years from the

---

[2] A la Donald Blosser (251.20) and Solomon Zeitlin (254.124).