"self-same" day when Abraham left Ur in Exodus 12:41. This can only be because Abraham left Ur in the spring, which was the best time for travel, especially in the last two centuries of the ice age, when seasonal variance in the fertile crescent would have been more extreme than today. Likewise, Isaac was to be born "at this time next year," referring to the fact that it would be in the new year, just 400 years before the Exodus. Indeed, the only proper place to place a year shift, and to do so without changing the definition of the year, is upon the entry into the land of Israel when the sabbatical cycle observance began.

28. The weaning of Isaac

The view of M. Anstey, D. Cooper, and F.N. Jones that Isaac did not become the official seed until age 5, when they say he was weaned, is speculation. They did this because Abraham had been in Canaan only 25 years, and wished to make it 30 so that the 430 years would begin when Abraham entered Canaan. However, the 430 sojourn did not begin when Abraham entered Canaan. It began when he left Ur with Terah, as the Scripture says (cf. Acts 7:3-4). Their adjustment had the additional effect of throwing the sabbatical periods out of synchronization with creation and the years of plenty and famine. The 430 years merely tells us when the sojourn began by figuring back from the Exodus. The 430 years is not the link that secures the overall chronology. The chronology of Anstey, Cooper, and Jones, therefore, is relative speculation at best, since it is preposterous to know the precise date, or date of weaning tradition in the ancient near east during the time of Abraham. In fact, Leah must have weaned her children sooner than five years since she had seven children in less than 14 years. In addition, bearing many children was so important that a five year tradition is pure nonsense. There were not enough people who would wait this long between bearing children to justify such a tradition. Evidently, according to Anstey, the weaning tradition was good for Isaac, but not good enough for his grandson, Reuben. Finally, supposing that Isaac was weaned at age 5, then Ishmael would be age 19, which is too old for him to be a "boy" crying under a bush while his mother Hagar thinks she is going to watch him die. Probably Sarah nursed Isaac for around a year and kicked the slave woman out when Ishmael was 14 or 15. The chronology itself is secured by measuring 400 years from the birth of the "seed" Isaac to the Exodus. There were 425 years back to when Abraham left Haran, but 430 years back to when he left Ur.

This chronology agrees with *Seder Olam* which also starts the 400 years with the birth of Isaac. F.N. Jones argues that Galatians 3:15-17 proves that the 430 years began with the entry into Canaan. However, Paul connects the covenant with the promise, which was referred to in Genesis 12:1, "Now the Lord had said unto Abram …." The text in the KJV is appropriately translated "had said" because Genesis 11:31 says that they set out from "Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan". It would not be parsimonious to think that Abraham had already been on the way to Canaan when God called him. Indeed, God called Abraham in the land of Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Haran (Acts 7:1-4).

29. New Moon and the Arc of Vision

Floyd Jones, *The Chronology of the Old Testament*, c. 1993-2004, 16th Edition; Master Books. Jones proposes that the crucifixion was on Thursday, April 6th, A.D. 30. (Julian Calendar) pg. 273-275, Appendix B. This chronology is impossible because Nisan 1 fell on Sabbath, March 25, A.D. 30, and Nisan 14 was Friday, April 7th just as Fotheringham calculated. On the evening of March 23rd, A.D. 30, the Arc of Vision was 7.48 degrees, and Arc of Light 9.14 degrees. The Arc (of Vision) Needed is then 10.65 degrees. Since 7.48 < 10.65 visibility is impossible (see #1), well on the impossible to see side of the lunar date line.

#1. 5. The formulae relating the 'arc of vision' and the 'arc of light' are

(1) Arc needed (AN) = -1/4*AL + 12.75 when AL>=7 or AL < 11
(2) AN = -1/3*AL + 12.66 when AL>=11 or AL < 20
(3) AN = -1/2*AL + 17.00 when AL>=20 or AL < 22
(4) AN = -2/3*AL + 20.66 when AL>=22 or AL < 25
(5) AN = always engough when AL>=25
(7) AL < 7 ==> never visible

#2. AL = √[(ALT MOON – ALT SUN)^2 + (AZM MOON – AZM SUN)^2]. ALT = altitude; AZM = azimuth.

#3 Arc needed (AN) is compared to the actual AV (arc of vision). AV = |ALT MOON – ALT SUN|

30. Rabbinic Opinions on the Sabbath Year

"In what year was the second Beis ha'Mikdash destroyed? The **TUR** (CM 67) writes that according to the calculation of **RASHI** in our Sugya, the year 5087 (1327 C.E.)[3] was a Shemitah year. Extrapolating backwards, this would mean that the Beis ha'Mikdash was destroyed in the year 3828 (68 C.E.), and the preceding year was Shemitah. This is consistent with the dating of the Churban given in our Sugya"

"Not everyone agrees with this, though. The Tur writes that according to the **RI** (see **TOSFOS** here), Shemitah occurred in the year 5088 (1328 C.E.)[4]. According to this date, the Churban occurred in the year 3829 (69 C.E.), and the previous year (3828) was Shemitah."

"The **RAMBAM** (Hilchos Shemitah 10:6) cites a broadly accepted tradition of the Ge'onim, according to which the year 4935 (1175 C.E.) was a Shemitah year. This would mean that the year 5089 (1329 C.E.)[5] was a Shemitah year. Extrapolating backwards, this would mean that the Beis ha'Mikdash was destroyed in the year 3830 (70 C.E.), and the preceding year was Shemitah. This is consistent with our current system of counting the Shemitah cycle (the last Shemitah year was 5761, or 2001 C.E.)." [http: // dafyomi. shemayisrael.co.il/ azarah/ insites/ az-dt-09.htm].

31. Caligula's Statue

The sabbatical year is also confirmed by the fact that the Zuckermann cycle has now been invalidated. It involves the famous incident of the statue of Gaius Caligula Caesar,

[3] 1337, which is incorrect stood in the original document; all the Jewish World era dates are correct.
[4] 1338, which is incorrect stood in the original document.
[5] 1339, which is incorrect stood in the original document.