

when he was writing his history. The consular dates, therefore have a later application to the history. Josephus' knowledge of the Jewish history was superior, but not the Roman history. On the other hand, Dio Cassius had the superior grasp of Roman history since he had direct access to the records of the Republic Period, and was far more concerned with it. Ockham's razor says we should side with Dio. How may we explain Josephus' mistake then?

If Josephus was drawing on memory, then we must dismiss him offhand, but if he was drawing on Greek sources, then this suggests dependence on the Seleucid era. If it wasn't the Seleucid era, then we must again dismiss him because all other sources are a black hole. We may best suppose that Josephus had Greek documents drawn on a local Jewish source using a non-accession Seleucid era (say spring-312). Josephus then mistook this as an official Seleucid era (spring-311) which he matched with the consular dates resulting in a one year discrepancy. Here is how it could happen:

e.g. Greek source, conquest = **A.S. 275 (spr-312)**
 = **A.S. 275 (spr-311)** = Arippa et Gallus = **B.C. 37**.

Having unwittingly converted the Greek source to consuls for B.C. 37, he then discarded it, and used the derived consular dates.³⁰⁷ This prevented him or anyone else from

³⁰⁷ These sort of miscalculations come about when an author tries to figure a date anachronistically that is not in the original source. I have found such errors in Wacholder's paper. He reasons "Hurban year 364 = sabbath cycle year 1, and that because $364 \div 7$ comes out evenly with no remainder that Hurban year 1 = sabbath cycle year 1 also" (254.136, page 183, paraphrase). This singular conversion error completely destroys Wacholder's entire sabbath cycle system. The proper calculation: If 364 modulus 7 = 0, then we find that year 1 modulus 7 = 1. And since $0 \neq 1$, year 1 and year 364 are not the same year of the cycle. A small example. $7 \% 7 = 0$, and $1 \% 7 = 1$, since $0 \neq 1$, year 7 and year 1 are not the same year of the cycle.

Finegan, by a similar alchemy seeks to prove that "A.M. 3828 = A.S. 381 or A.D. 69/70 or year 1 of the era of destruction" (252.38, §209, or mine). He uses the synchronization from Avodah Zara that A.M. 4231 - 3 = year 400 of the era of destruction (§205). He tries to work his proof backward from the conclusion:

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1). 3828 = year of destruction | conclusion |
| 2). 3828 + 400 = year of destruction + 400; | add 400 |
| 3). 4228 = year of destruction + 400; | simplify |
| 4). 4231 - 3 = year 400 DE | Given |
| 5). 4228 = 400 DE | simplify |
| 6). 4428 - 400 = 400 - 400 DE | subtract 400 |
| 7). 3828 = 0 DE | simplify |
| 8) 3828 = year of destruction (assume 0 DE = year of destruction) | |
| 9) 3828 = 1 DE (assumed in §209). | |

Finegan's calculations assume that 0 DE = year of destruction, which is the same as non-inclusive counting. He then contradicts himself by stating his conclusion in §209 as 3828 = 1 DE.

Solomon Zeitlin is also capable of miscalculation, "This error was due to the fact that I ..." (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, "A note on the Sabbatical cycles" pg. 238 -239, New Ser., Vol. 35, No. 2; Oct. 1944). The only way for a non mathematician to detect such errors is by charting out every year graphically,

Modern scholars may catch the errors, but what about ancient ones? What is amazing is not that the ancient secular sources are subject to such corruptions, but that the Bible is free from them!

Edgar Frank's (252.44) fuzzy math is no less astonishing. On page 163 he tries to prove that A.D. 1944/1945 (A.M. 5705) is a sabbatical year. He bungles the first step by equating 5705 to Hurban year 1875. A quick check [A.D. 1944/1945 → 1875 DE: 1944/1945-

easily checking the sabbatical synchronism or even noticing the problem until after he had published because consular dates do not lend themselves to ready checking. But it was too late.³⁰⁸

Alternatively, it has been suggested that "according to M.T. Varro the term of the Roman consuls at this time began in March".³⁰⁹ This does not absolve Josephus though, because it only means that Claudius and Norbanus would stay in office until March **37 B.C.** Josephus assures us that the city fell in the 3rd month (Josephus Ant. 252.68 14.16.4 [487]), which was Sivan, which was well after March. Therefore it was Sivan of **38 B.C.**, and Claudius and Norbanus would have entered office in March of **38 B.C.** according to the Varro source.

Alternatively, it has been suggested that Josephus dated his consular year from the fall.³¹⁰ This however does not absolve his misdating either, because the proper fall-epoch match³¹¹ for Agrippa and Gallus would be fall 38 B.C. to fall 37 B.C., which cannot take us back to the summer of 38 B.C. (a.k.a. Claudius and Norbanus).

Alternatively, some have tried to date the season of the year by the "fast" Josephus mentions (ibid.). Due to the multitude of Jewish "fasts" this is the most hazardous course, two coming to mind, the 9th of Av, and the 10th of Tishri.³¹²

Alternatively, it has been suggested that the 3rd month is Olympian year or the 3rd month of the siege. But this is nothing but an arbitrary grasping at the last straw by those who cannot explain the situation any other way.

The strongest evidence on the other hand is Josephus' assurance that the siege began when "the rigor of winter was over" (Ant. 14.15.14 [465]). This observation is not subject to either numerical miscalculation nor to debates over what type of year is being used.³¹³ The biblical sabbatical year (Tishri 39 B.C. to Tishri 38 B.C.), and Josephus' knowledge of it, places the city's fall in the summer of B.C. 38. Dio Cassius' consular dates confirm this, and Josephus' consular dates added later are simply miscomputed by any treacherous conversion of secular dates one might want to dream up.

→
 1874 → 1875-1874: A.D. 70/71 → 1 DE]. But A.D. 70/71 → 1 DE ≠ 69/70 → 1 DE which he already stated was "The Correct Solution" in his Schedule "C" chart on page 155. His solution was correct. Why didn't he use it? [69/70 → 1 DE: 69/70 + 1875 → 1 DE + 1875: 1944/1945 → 1876 DE]. Now we apply the Avodah Zarah 9b rule (see footnote 290): $[(1876+1) \% 7] = 1$. Therefore, 1944/1945 is the first year of the cycle just as we have it in the charts. "KJV Hosea 5:10 The princes of Judah were like them that **remove the bound: therefore** I will pour out my wrath upon them like water."

³⁰⁸ It may be said that Josephus must have engaged in some calculations, but without a continuous set of year by year and season by season charts, there are always two ways to compute years. Josephus did not do this (it was not possible in his day), just like many other modern chronologists do not bother, because it is too much work. Only after trying it does one realize how easy it is to error by one year. Whiston (252.68, pg. 396-396 footnote a) tries to assure us that Moses Chorenensis secures the chronology. How? By saying Tigranes reigned two years after Herod was made king at Rome. Which of six methods of reckoning regnal years are used? Such "proofs" are useless beyond belief, and this is clearly known to anyone who has charted regnal years.

³⁰⁹ Tedesche 254.124, Pg. 255, note 52.

³¹⁰ See Tedesche 254.124, pg. 255, note 53.

³¹¹ This is unlike a Tishri/Nisan conversion which can go either way.

³¹² Ever since the burning of the city on the 9th - 10th Av in 587 B.C. it has been customary to assign this date to every fall of Jerusalem out of excessive traditional love for this date.

³¹³ See Schürer 254.114, vol. 1, division 1, page 397-399, note 11.