

Is the Jubilee Cycle 49 or 50 Years?

By the fall of 2009, the length of our study had become so enormous that the average reader wouldn't dare tackle reading "the whole thing" in one sitting, and many Bible students wouldn't even know where to start. The obvious answer would be to start at the beginning, but who wants to do that – knowing that they've got 300+ pages to go? Many folks will simply skip to the conclusion, but that summary won't really *prove* anything. Thus, to avoid having to immerse themselves in a study that primarily consists of a debate between Larry Acheson and Glenn Moore, a disagreement in which many folks will not be interested, many students will look elsewhere for answers.

I certainly understand an individual's decision to skip past our full-length study in search of something that's considerably more brief and concise. In fact, only a few short years ago, this topic was of virtually no interest whatsoever to either June or me, which in turn means that we would not have taken an interest in reading our own study! Nevertheless, we have had a few individuals express an interest in our view pertaining to the length of the Jubilee cycle, and we know that others may also have questions. We therefore offer our study ... our perspective ... to anyone interested.

In this age of "information overload," many folks are looking for straight answers in abbreviated form. Obviously, our full-length study will not qualify! With this understanding in mind, June and I have decided to offer a rebuttal to what is currently Glenn's shortest treatise on the Jubilee cycle. In his essay, Glenn offers a summary of the twelve points that he feels best validates his position. I will briefly respond to each point while simultaneously directing you to a portion of our full-length study where our perspective is covered in greater detail. I have put Glenn's comments in a blue font so as to better distinguish his comments from ours.

Is the Jubilee Cycle 49 or 50 Years?

There has historically been much confusion regarding the Jubilee Cycles over whether they are 49 year or 50 year cycles. Here is a summary of twelve major points which show conclusively that the cycles are actually 49 years in length:

Have Sabbatical Cycles Remained Unchanged Since the Beginning of Creation?

Here is Glenn's 1st "major point":

1) In Exodus 20 the Sabbath is commanded in honor of the fact that Yahweh created the earth in six days and rested on the seventh day. Leviticus 25 is a direct parallel, as it also indicates that the land is to have a Sabbath rest after six years of work, which also ties it in directly with the first week of creation. Since the weekly cycle has remained unchanged from the beginning of creation, we can only conclude (based upon these clear facts) that the Sabbatical cycles have also remained unchanged from the time of creation. If this is so, then you cannot have a 50 year Jubilee cycle--for that would interfere with the continuously repeating 7 year cycles.

We fully address this argument in Part II, chapter four of our study ([Does a 50-Year Jubilee Cycle Interfere with Continuously-Repeating Sabbatical Cycles?](#)). Perhaps the briefest, yet concise way to answer Glenn's first point is to mention the discussions that June and I have had with lunar sabbatarians. Lunar sabbatarians believe that the cycle of the weekly Sabbath has a monthly interruption. As such, with

each new moon, the cycle resets itself so as to cause weekly Sabbaths to occur on the 8th, 15th, 22nd and 29th days of the month. One of the primary arguments I presented to lunar sabbatarians was the fact that I would have *no problem* with interrupting the weekly cycle ... ***IF*** Yahweh instructed me to do so. Instead, I see what I believe is a clear directive to “work six days, then rest the seventh” until Yahweh says to stop doing so.

In the case of the *Sabbatical cycle*, we are persuaded that Yahweh tells us to ***stop*** reckoning that cycle at the end of the seventh “week of years.” The final year of those “seven weeks of years” is year #49. ***Then***, according to Leviticus 25:10, we are to hallow the *fiftieth year*. This constitutes a “double Sabbatical year,” after which the *next* Jubilee cycle begins. In other words, at the end of “Year 50,” the following year is “Year 1” of the next Jubilee cycle. Thus, from our perspective Yahweh essentially tells us to “**STOP**” counting Sabbatical cycles after seven have come and gone. Again, we offer more details in chapter four of Part II of our full-length study.

Does the Seventy Week Prophecy of Daniel 9 Mean Jubilee Cycles Consist of 49 Years?

Here is Glenn’s 2nd “major point”:

2) In the book of Daniel, chapter 9, the 70 week prophecy gives solid evidence of being connected with the Jubilees. It even mentions a period of "seven weeks" in the prophecy itself, a clear and direct connection between the 70 week prophecy and the Jubilee commandment of Leviticus 25. Since that prophecy is in harmony with 49 year cycles instead of 50 year cycles ($70 \times 7 = 490$, not 500), it is another strong piece of evidence to support 49 year Jubilee cycles.

In Part I, chapter seven, we address the above commentary in detail (see “[The Prophecy of Daniel 9](#).”) In fact, Glenn’s interpretation of this prophecy eventually served to undermine his credibility, as exemplified by his challenge for me to produce a table containing exactly 70 Sabbatical/Jubilee years within a period of only 430 years (using 50 year cycles in place of 49 year cycles). Glenn stated, “*If he can do this (following the exact pattern given in Scripture), then I will heartily embrace the 50 year cycles and abandon the 49 year cycles.*” Well, I produced the table, but Glenn opted to break his promise to “heartily embrace the 50-year cycles.”

As with *all* Scripture, we all need to be very careful not to read too much into the text that contains the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27. If you read that prophecy, you will notice that the word “Jubilee” does not appear *anywhere*, yet Glenn insists that this prophecy “proves” a 49-year Jubilee cycle! The above prophecy is commonly referred to as “the seventy weeks’ prophecy.” It is *not* known as “the Jubilee prophecy.” Not only does the word “Jubilee” *not* appear in Daniel chapter 9, but neither is there a mention of 50 years. For that matter, neither is there a mention of 49 years. Thus, the only way an individual could *possibly* read this prophecy and conclude that it’s a “Jubilee prophecy” is if that individual reads it with the *preconceived notion* that the Jubilee cycle consists of 49 years and reasons that since $70 \times 7 = 490$, which is the same as 49×10 , then this *must* be a prophecy comprising ten “Jubilee cycles” of forty-nine years. This is precisely the approach used by Glenn Moore in his interpretation of the prophecy. However, as a reminder, the prophecy of Daniel 9 does *not* mention “Ten Jubilees.” Men may *interpret* this prophecy as “of necessity” including a reference to ten Jubilee cycles, but in the final

analysis, an interpretation is *all* they can produce, and an interpretation does not validate a position. This having been said, I find it *amazing* that Glenn cites this prophecy as being “The Most Crucial Key to Determine Jubilee Years.”¹

The fact that “seventy weeks” of years is equivalent to 490 years, which amounts to ten 49-year periods, does not mean that a Jubilee cycle must consist of 49 years. Thus, Glenn’s remark that (70 X 7 = 490, not 500) amounts to nothing more than an attempt to infuse his interpretation into the text. I could just as easily make a similar remark about the Millennium by stating, “20 x 50 = 1,000, not 980.” Such a statement, in and of itself, would not validate the position that the Jubilee cycle consists of a fifty-year period.

Since the Plural of “Sabbath” Indicates More than One Week, Sabbatical Cycles Must Consist of “Consecutive Multiple Periods” of Seven Years Each

Here is Glenn’s 3rd “major point”:

3) When we examine more closely the Hebrew word for “Sabbath” (shab-bawth'), it appears to also be closely related to the Hebrew word for “week”, and in the Greek *shabbaton* is translated as both “week” and “sabbath.” The Hebrew word for week is shaw-boo'-ah and it literally means something that is “sevened”. The word can mean both “seven” and “week” and can even be used to mean “weeks of years.” In Scripture we have a week (shaw-boo'-ah) and the plural form of that word (shaw-boo-oth). So let us consider the fact that a “week” is a period of something (like a day) which has been “sevened” (or multiplied by seven). A week is therefore a period of seven days. The plural form of that word (shaw-boo-oth) means “weeks” and indicates more than one week, or **consecutive multiple periods** of seven days. Conclusion: The very word itself to describe a Sabbatical year gives evidence that it must be the last day of **consecutive multiple periods** of seven days each.

First, I think Glenn *meant* to write “**consecutive multiple periods** of seven **YEARS** each” instead of “seven *days*.”

Secondly, I believe our answer to Glenn’s “point #1” could suffice to answer *this* point as well! Unless I’ve forgotten, I don’t believe we address the above point in our study, and for an excellent reason: Quite frankly, this is a case of an individual “*proving too much*” and hence, proving nothing at all. Has anyone ever denied the fact that a “week of years” (i.e., *seven years*) is “sevened” during the process of completing the Jubilee cycle? I know *we* certainly haven’t! That’s why we believe we are to count *seven sabbaths of years*, which brings us to that all-important 49th year. If Yahweh had nothing further to say in this matter, we would understand that the next year would be the beginning year of *another* reckoning “seven sabbaths of years” (although we would certainly wonder why He didn’t just tell us to observe a continuing, unending pattern of “Sabbaths of years” at the end of each six years).

¹ Cf., Glenn’s study entitled “The Most Crucial Key to Determine Jubilee Years,” which may be read by accessing the following URL:
http://www.itsaboutthattime.net/most_crucial_key.htm.

However, Yahweh *does* have something further to say: “And ye shall hallow the *fiftieth year* and proclaim liberty though the land unto all the inhabitants thereof” (Lev. 25:10). As we believe is plainly brought out in the text, the fiftieth year breaks up the “sevening” process that Glenn so adamantly maintains as validating his position.

Sabbatical Cycles Have Been Tracked From 332 BCE to 139 CE?

Here is Glenn's 4th “major point”:

4) Historically, Sabbatical cycles have been tracked all the way from 332 BCE to 139 CE. Evidence for this can be found toward the end of my *Jubilee Calendar*, in the tab called *Sabbatical Year Documentation*. It is also found in my upcoming book, *Discovering the Jewish Messiah*. These cycles clearly follow repeating 7 year cycles, which would prove that the Jubilees would also have to follow 49 year cycles as well. Please note [documentation and charts](#) clearly showing how this is true.

I am surprised that Glenn still offers this “point” as evidence validating his position. In Part I, chapter 8 (“[Historical Evidence for Jubilee Years](#)”), we addressed Glenn's claim pertaining to his claim that 332 BCE was a Sabbatical year. He bases this year on an account mentioned by Josephus pertaining to when Alexander the Great asked the Jews what favor he might grant them.² The high priest asked Alexander to grant the Jews an exemption from paying tribute during the seventh year. As we know from the historical record, Alexander granted this wish. Glenn concludes, “If indeed Alexander ‘granted all they desired’ immediately, then both conditions were met. By implication, then, it was a Sabbatical year already.”

Frankly, Glenn's conclusion is more wishful thinking than reasonable conclusion. The high priest requested an exemption from tribute “on the seventh year.” Josephus did not add anything to the effect of, “For that year was indeed the seventh year” or “that year was indeed the Sabbatical year.” Glenn is left to *presume* that it was, and then, equipped with his presumption, expect his readers to believe that he has furnished us with evidence of a Sabbatical year. Truly, if the year 332/331 BCE was a Sabbatical year, I would have expected Josephus to have added such an important detail to his report. The fact that he did not leaves me with the impression that Josephus understood that the seventh year had not yet arrived, and the high priest's request was in anticipation of an upcoming Sabbatical year. The two key words in the above quote, then, are the words “If” and “immediately.” Certainly, “IF” the Jews' wish was granted for that “IMMEDIATE” year, it was a Sabbatical year, but to presume it was -- with no additional information to go on -- is no more than wishful thinking.

When Glenn read the above explanation, he complained that we had picked on “what could be the ‘weakest’ historical date for a Sabbatical year,” even though, to that point, it was the *only* historical date on which he expounded.

In our very next chapter (Part I, ch. 8 “[Putting Glenn Moore's Alleged Sabbatical Year of 68/69 to the Test](#)”), we demonstrated that Glenn's decision to label the year 68/69 CE as a “known Sabbatical year”

² Cf., *Antiquities of the Jews*, by Josephus, Book 11, Chapter 8, Section 4-5.

was quite premature. He based his claim on the findings of the late chronologist Benedict Zuckermann, who in turn based his decision on the mistaken notion that the temple was destroyed during a year *following* a Sabbatical year was based on his mistranslating the Hebrew phrase *ve motsae* as “after” instead of the correct translation of “*during*.” Even Glenn’s fellow “49-year Jubilee cycle” proponents agree that *ve motsae* does not mean what Glenn *wants* it to mean.

Of course, with whichever year we conclude was the Sabbatical year at or near the time when the temple was destroyed, we are left to *presume* that Judaism was correctly reckoning Sabbatical years at that time. June and I personally remain opposed to relying on man’s attempts to date ancient historical events in order to validate one’s understanding with regard to when a Sabbatical year or Jubilee year was observed.

Later in our study (Part II, ch. 12, “*Benedict Zuckermann Disagreed With Glenn Moore’s Dating of Maccabees Sabbatical Year*,” we demonstrate that Benedict Zuckermann *disagreed* with at least *one* of Glenn’s “confirmed” Sabbatical years. Glenn maintains that 164/163 BCE was a Sabbatical year, but that’s not what Zuckermann came up with! Zuckermann came up with 163/162 BCE. Not only that, but Zuckermann, who himself wasn’t certain of the date he came up with, commented that the text of I Maccabees “would seem to date the siege one year later.” If his hunch was correct, this would put the siege *two years* after Glenn’s proposed date (162/161 BCE). As we can see, the dating process isn’t nearly as easy (or accurate) as Glenn tries to make it out to be.

Was Judaism of Messiah’s Day Practicing Continuously-Repeating Sabbatical Cycles?

Here is Glenn’s 5th “major point”:

5) Judaism is foundational to an understanding of Torah. As such, the practices of Judaism (at the time of the Messiah) must be considered central to a better understanding of Torah. When the Messiah came about 2000 years ago, he did not introduce sweeping changes in the Jewish faith. Instead, the Messiah only corrected the people and their leaders concerning the finer points of the law. As such, it is only reasonable to conclude that He would have been in agreement with them concerning the timing of the weekly Sabbaths as well as the Sabbatical years, since He never once hinted that a change was needed in those areas. We know for a certainty that the Jews at the time of Messiah were keeping Sabbatical cycles based upon repeating seven year cycles, therefore (since he did not speak out against it) the Messiah would have been in agreement with them. Such would also be an implied agreement with the repeating 49 year cycles, since these cycles, along with the 7 year cycles, were also continuously repeating.

Okay, I believe Glenn here exhibits a form of what is know as “The Obvious Fallacy.” He insists that Judaism of Messiah’s day was observing “repeating seven year cycles,” and perhaps he feels that underlining “for a certainty” makes his case all the more convincing; however, this is a case of making a premature “obvious” generalization without citing any evidence to support his case. Since Glenn appears unable to offer any logical reasons supportive of his premise, I suppose the best he can do is underline the phrase “*for a certainty*.” What Glenn leaves out of his commentary is the fact that first-century Jew Philo

described the Jubilee cycle as a “period of fifty years.”³ We address Philo’s comments pertaining to the Jubilee cycle in Part I, ch. 2 (“*The Testimony of Philo*”). At one time, Glenn was very supportive of Philo being representative of first-century Judaism, but he “changed his tune” when he learned that Philo supported the fifty-year Jubilee cycle. When Philo’s writings served to validate Glenn’s position regarding the wearing of *Tefillin*, he wrote, “He was a knowledgeable person, he upheld obedience to Torah, and would therefore be a general representative of Jews living at that time.” We address Glenn’s treatment of Philo’s writings in Part II, ch. 11 (“*Selective Scholarship and Glenn’s Use of Philo’s Writings*”). Suffice it to say that Philo’s popularity with Glenn dropped a few notches when he learned how Philo reckoned the Jubilee cycle. With regard to any other historical evidence validating how Judaism was measuring Sabbatical cycles during the days that Yeshua the Messiah walked with humanity, I don’t remember Glenn producing anything worthy of note.

Does The Book of Jubilees Validate a Forty-Nine Year Jubilee Cycle?

Here is Glenn’s 6th “major point”:

6) *The Book of Jubilees* written by a Jew (likely from the priestly class) in the 2nd century BCE, demonstrates that Jubilee cycles were historically understood by normative Judaism to be 49 year, not 50 year, cycles. This book was published 2 centuries before the Messiah, and was very popular among many Jews.

Well, let’s see: We *do* agree that the author of *The Book of Jubilees* upheld the 49-year Jubilee cycle. However, does this prove that normative Judaism recognized 49-year Jubilee cycles? Glenn says it does. But wait a minute – Glenn is also on record as stating that *Philo* was a knowledgeable person who upheld obedience to Torah, and would therefore be a general representative of Jews living at that time. As we just read, Philo recognized a *fifty-year* Jubilee cycle. Something to bear in mind: The author of *The Book of Jubilees* is widely recognized as having been a member of the Jewish sect known as the *Essenes*. Philo, although he was an Alexandrian Jew who did not belong to any Jewish sect, ascribed to most, if not all, tenets of the *Pharisees*, including the way he counted to Pentecost. The *Essenes* observed Pentecost in the middle of the third month, whereas normative Judaism of Philo’s day observed it during the first week of the third month.

In Part II, ch. 11 (“*Selective Scholarship and Glenn’s Use of The Book of Jubilees*”), we address the fact that Glenn flaunts *The Book of Jubilees* when it suits his purpose, but when it *doesn’t*, he keeps his differences “under wraps.” For example, Glenn doesn’t advertise the fact that *The Book of Jubilees*’ chronology is anywhere from 75 to 138 years off from the timeline he offers his reading audience! Glenn also withholds from his readers the fact that *The Book of Jubilees* presents a Jubilee Year entrance into the Promised Land, whereas Glenn believes the Israelites crossed the Jordan six months before a Sabbatical year began. This discrepancy is critical because, as we all know, upon entering the Land, the Israelites were instructed that the land was to “keep a Sabbath unto Yahweh” (Lev. 25:2), followed by *six years of sowing and reaping* (Lev. 25:3). However, if it was a Jubilee Year when they entered the Land, according to Glenn’s model, there can only be *five* years of sowing and reaping!

³ From *The Works of Philo*, “Special Laws, II,” by Philo of Alexandria, ch. XXII, sec. 114.

But wait, there's more! In Part III, ch. 7 ("[*Does the Book of Jubilees Offer Evidence of a Fall or Spring Flood?*](#)"), we demonstrate that *The Book of Jubilees* author recognized an original spring-to-spring calendar, as opposed to Glenn's direct statement that the original calendar was fall-to-fall.

In view of all the above, it's time to ask Glenn the obvious question that remains unanswered: *If you are so certain of how authoritative The Book of Jubilees is when it comes to the length of the Jubilee cycle, why do you reject its authority with regard to the chronological timeline, the timing of the Israelites' entrance into the Promised Land and the beginning month of Yahweh's original calendar?*

Do the Dead Sea Scrolls Validate a Forty-Nine Year Jubilee Cycle?

Here is Glenn's 7th "major point":

7) The Dead Sea Scrolls and several other related documents also shed great light on the significance of a Jubilee cycle and how it was to be counted. For example, [*The Melchizedek Scroll*](#) plainly indicates that the 70 weeks of Daniel prophecy (Daniel 9) were to be understood as 10 Jubilee cycles of 49 years each. All of these ancient documents can be dated to the 2nd and 3rd Centuries BCE. (*Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Craig Evans and Peter Flint (eds). Eerdmans:1997.) [Collins, p. 83.]

The best way to respond to the above commentary is to ask a simple question: *Who authored The Melchizedek Scroll, as well numerous other Dead Sea Scrolls?* We address that question in Part II, ch. 14 ("[*Do the Dead Sea Scrolls Prove the Length of the Jubilee Cycle?*](#)"), but if you want a brief summary, I will spoil the ending by stating that scholars agree that texts such as *The Book of Jubilees*, *The Book of Enoch*, and *The Melchizedek Scroll* are all products of the same Qumran community, otherwise known as the *Essenes*. Since these documents were all produced by the same sect, it hardly comes as any surprise that each one of them supports the 49-year Jubilee cycle. Using those ancient documents to validate the historical observance of 49-year Jubilee cycles would be akin to using writings such as *The Book of Mormon*, *Pearl of Great Price* and *Doctrine and Covenants* to demonstrate that "nominal Christianity" believes an angel named Moroni appeared to Joseph Smith and directed him to unearth (and later translate into English) gold plates that present the ancient historical record of the American continents. All three of the aforementioned books are products of Mormon authors, including founder and "prophet" Joseph Smith, so it would come as no surprise that each of those three writings corroborates the writings of the other two. In the same way, if members of the same Jewish sect authored *The Book of Jubilees*, *The Melchizedek Scroll* and *The Book of Noah*, should it come as any surprise that each writing supports the 49-year Jubilee cycle?

Do Historical Alignments Based Upon 49-Year Cycles Confirm a 49-Year Jubilee Cycle?

Here is Glenn's 8th "major point":

8) The evidence as presented in my book *The Jubilee Code* indicates that there are several major historical alignments between the Jubilee cycles and the chronology of Genesis. Since these alignments are based upon 49 year cycles, this would clearly rule out cycles of 50 years. It is true, we might assign one or two of these alignments to coincidence, but after finding seven or more alignments it becomes clear that it is not just a coincidence.

It took us a while to address the above "point," primarily because a neat historical record of fantastic alignments occurring at 49-year intervals *does not* validate a 49-year Jubilee cycle. Over the years, we have read all kinds of "neat" accounts of strange events that appeared too bizarre to have been considered "mere coincidence." A simple example of this involves the company where I work. Occasionally, several employees show up at work wearing apparel of the same color. Knowing that this seems too strange to be a coincidence, it is common for an employee who is wearing a different colored item to joke, "Well, I guess I didn't get the memo!" On a higher level, we have heard stories that make us wonder, "*Was that a coincidence ... or did the Almighty intervene?*" For example, we were once acquainted with a chain smoker who, in spite of numerous attempts to "kick the habit," just couldn't do it. Suddenly, one day, for no apparent reason, he lost the desire to smoke. A few days later, he received a letter from his aunt who had written to say that she was praying to the Almighty for help in causing her nephew to give up smoking. Of course, we would all like to give credit to the Almighty for his sudden, unexplained desire to quit smoking, but can we *prove* it? No, we cannot. The internet is full of stories relating of "bizarre coincidences," but this doesn't mean Yahweh orchestrated any of them.⁴

In spite of our delayed attempt to give serious attention to Glenn's "amazing historical alignments," we eventually decided to look a little more closely into Glenn's claim, especially to see if there are any "amazing alignments" based upon *fifty-year* cycles. To our own "amazement," we found one right away. In Part I, chapter 12 ("*Can We Produce an "Amazing Mathematical Alignment" Chart With 50-Year Cycles*"), we produce a chart demonstrating that there were precisely 21 *fifty-year Jubilee cycles* between the birth of Noah and the birth of Jacob. Shall we expect Glenn to reply, "My alignments are better than *your* alignments?"

Are Jubilee Cycles Patterned After the Count to Pentecost?

We now arrive at Glenn's 9th "major point":

9) The Jubilee cycles of 49 years with a special 50th year added are paralleled by the Pentecost cycle of 49 days with a special added 50th day of Pentecost. Since the Pentecost cycle does not alter the typical weekly cycle on the day of Pentecost, neither does the Jubilee cycle change the timing of the Sabbatical cycles on the year of Jubilee.

⁴ Here is a site that I found while doing a quick check to validate my comment:
<http://listverse.com/2007/11/12/top-15-amazing-coincidences/>.

The reasoning employed by Glenn with the above summary is essentially the same style that he used above in point #5. With point #5, Glenn expressed his (faulty) conclusion that “[for a certainty](#)” the Jews at the time of Messiah were keeping Sabbatical cycles based upon repeating seven year cycles. He then offered nothing to prove his case, and we are still waiting (over a year from our first inquiry) for Glenn to produce his “solid evidence.” Now, with his “Jubilee cycle to Pentecost” parallel, Glenn again exhibits the same form of the technique known as the “The Obvious Fallacy.” According to Glenn, since both counts end at *fifty*, this must (“*obviously*”) mean the same rule applies to both, even though Scripture addresses no such comparison between how the two are reckoned.

Nevertheless, since Glenn insists on drawing a parallel between the Jubilee cycle and the count to Pentecost, I find it interesting that scholars do not necessarily share Glenn’s “obvious” analogy view in quite the same way he does. In Part I, ch. 5 (“[Mistaken Associations](#)”), we produce a quote from author Henry Browne. In his book *Ordo Sæclorum: A Treatise on the Chronology of the Holy Scriptures*, Browne observes the similarity between the Jubilee cycle and the count to Pentecost, but *unlike Glenn*, he approaches the similarity from the perspective of the actual formula being used in arriving at the respective day or year, *not* whether or not the weekly cycle is affected. He wrote, “[The numerical definition of the jubilee is plain: it is the 50th or 7 x 7 + 1st year, just as the day of Pentecost is the 7 x 7 + 1st day from the 2nd day of unleavened bread.](#)” If we *must* draw any analogies between the Jubilee cycle and the count to Pentecost, Henry Browne’s analogy is sufficient enough for us.

Glenn’s primary concern involves altering the Sabbatical cycle at the end of fifty years. He seems unable to accept any possibility that Yahweh could ever sanction the interruption of a Sabbatical cycle, since there is no such parallel associated with the cycle of the weekly Sabbath. However, as we addressed in our above response to point #1, the final year of the mandated counting of “seven weeks of years” is year #49. *Then*, according to Leviticus 25:10, we are to hallow the *fiftieth year*. This constitutes a “double Sabbatical year,” after which the *next* Jubilee cycle begins. In other words, at the end of “Year 50,” the following year is “Year 1” of the next Jubilee cycle. Thus, from our perspective Yahweh essentially tells us to “**STOP**” counting Sabbatical cycles after seven have come and gone.

Not only are we concerned regarding Glenn’s unscriptural attempt to draw an “obvious” parallel between the Jubilee count and the count to Pentecost, but it appears that he is confused about when Pentecost occurs. Pentecost is also known as the *Feast of Weeks*, or *Shavuot* in Hebrew. The fifty-day count to this feast begins during the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which begins during the middle portion of the first month of the Scriptural calendar (Abib 15 – 21). If we proceed from any day following the middle of the first month and count fifty days, we *must* end that count during the third month of the year. However, Glenn writes that the “Feast of Weeks” is not confined to a *day*, but is rather a seven-week festival in and of itself, and that it does not cover the time of the third month. In an apparent attempt to demonstrate that he no longer employs *selective scholarship* with regard to his treatment of *The Book of Jubilees*, Glenn expresses the view that its author appears to bring confusion to the Pentecost issue by presenting the view that the feast of weeks takes place in the 3rd month, instead of the 1st and 2nd months, which Glenn feels are supported by Scripture. See Part II, ch. 11 ([The Book of Jubilees and The Feast of Weeks](#)) for Glenn’s unique interpretation of the count to *Shavuot*.

Finally, for those who, like Glenn, insist that there *must* be a seamless transition from one Jubilee cycle to the next (without disrupting the Sabbatical cycle in the process), we invite you to read Part I, ch.

2 (“[Only Five Years of Reaping and Sowing Between the Jubilee and the Next Sabbatical Year?](#)”). The bottom line: Since Scripture offers neither instructions nor “approved examples” pertaining to an “obvious parallel” between the Jubilee cycle and the count to Pentecost, we maintain that we should be extra careful before declaring a *perceived* parallel to validate our case.

Rabbinic Opinion is Conflicting, So This Validates the 49-Year Jubilee Cycle?

Here is Glenn’s 10th “major point”:

10) Rabbinic opinion is conflicting, sometimes supporting 50 year cycles and sometimes supporting 49 year cycles. However, the Rabbinic *practice* (over a period of several centuries) has consistently demonstrated their belief in 49 year cycles. When we actually follow one of the main formulas from the Talmud used to determine Sabbatical years (as given near the end of my [Jubilee Calendar](#), in the tab called *Talmudic Sabbatical Yr. Formula*), we find that it is in complete harmony with the Sabbatical years given in my Jubilee Calendar. Since such evidence upholds repeating cycles of 7 years, it would also uphold repeating cycles of 49 years. We also have [evidence of several Sabbatical years](#) which line up with both this Talmudic formula (dating from the start of the Seleucid Era) and the *Jubilee Calendar*.

This is essentially a case of *déjà vu*, since Glenn essentially covered this same topic up in point #4, where he claims to have accurately tracked Sabbatical cycles from 332 BCE to 139 CE. As we demonstrated in our response, Glenn is “off track” with his Sabbatical year determination methodology, and even those who share Glenn’s belief pertaining to a 49-year Jubilee cycle concede that Benedict Zuckermann mistranslated a key Hebrew word that he used in determining a Sabbatical year.

In Point #10, Glenn adds the Talmudic formula as a clinching factor supporting his view. Before we read that Talmudic formula, there is something very significant that we should bear in mind: According to *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (compiled by Jews who are familiar with the Talmud), prior to the Babylonian exile, Judaism “intercalated” the fiftieth year. This means they factored in a separate “Year 50” (and didn’t share “Year 50” with “Year 1” of the next cycle). Here is what we read in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* article “Sabbatical Year and Jubilee”:

The opinion of the Geonim and of later authorities generally prevails, that the jubilee, when in force during the period of the First Temple, was intercalated, but that in the time of the Second Temple, when the jubilee was observed only “nominally,” it coincided with the seventh Sabbatical year. In post-exilic times the jubilee was entirely ignored, though the strict observance of the shemittah was steadily insisted upon.⁵

⁵ From JewishEncyclopedia.com, article “Sabbatical Year and Jubilee,” Copyright 2002 . All rights reserved. The article may be read in its entirety by accessing the following URL: [.http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=18&letter=S](http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=18&letter=S)

Of a truth, the above information completely invalidates any of Glenn Moore's assertions that *post-exilic* Judaism recognized a 49-year Jubilee cycle. They had ceased being observed *and tracked* by the time of the Babylonian exile.

With the above information in mind, here is the quote of the "Talmudic formula" for determining Sabbatical years, as found on Glenn's Jubilee calendar spreadsheet: "He who would determine what relation a year holds to the Sabbatical cycle, should ask the public notary which year is current. Let him then deduct two from the existing date or add five unto it; let the hundreds be omitted and two be added to the remainder for each of the omitted hundreds. Let the result be divided by seven, and the remainder of this division will give the place of the year within the series of the Sabbatical cycle." (*the Talmudic book Abodah Sarah, 9b*)

What Glenn fails to take into consideration in presenting us with the above formula is the fact that it was *never designed* to play a role in the determination of Jubilee years. By the time the above formula was devised, the observance of the Jubilee cycle had long since passed, and Judaism was only engaged in determining "the strict observance of the shemittah." Glenn thus succeeds in proving nothing with his 10th "major point."

Can 70 "Land-Rest" Years Be Found Within a 430-Year Period (Using 50-Year Cycles)?

Here is Glenn's 11th "major point":

11) The 70 week prophecy of Daniel 9 not only gives us 490 years (10 - 49 year Jubilee cycles), but such years are clearly based upon the 70 year desolation predicted by Jeremiah (which is itself based upon the Jubilee cycles). We know this by comparing that prophecy with the statements made in 2 Chronicles 36 and the prophecy of Ezekiel 4:4-6. In Ezekiel 4 a period of 390 + 40 days (a day representing a year) are given. Since the sum total of 390 + 40 = 430 (based on Ezekiel 4), and the 430 years are connected with the 70 years of desolation predicted by Jeremiah, it follows that the 70 Sabbatical years which were not kept would be found within the 430 years. Using 49 year cycles, 70 land-rest years **can indeed** be found within 430 years--whether starting the count from the year of Jubilee or from the Sabbatical before a year of Jubilee.

Here's another "major point" that I am surprised to find as remaining on Glenn's list. Does he not remember his "rash vow" in which he challenged me to come up with a table which will produce exactly 70 Sabbatical/Jubilee years within a period of only 430 years (using 50 year cycles in place of 49 year cycles)? In fact, Glenn added, "If he can do this (following the exact pattern given in Scripture), then I will heartily embrace the 50 year cycles and abandon the 49 year cycles." Well, I produced the table, Glenn admitted that I did so, but then he reneged on honoring his vow. We address this matter in Part I, ch. 7 ("*Glenn Moore's Response to Our Interpretation of Daniel 9... And His Rash Vow*"), as well as in Part IV of this study.

Once we produced the table that Glenn required, he countered with a statement to the effect of, “Well, I can produce more configurations than *you* can!” I’m *still* not sure if he was attempting to dodge the issue at hand or not with that comment. He also pointed out, for whatever it’s worth, that if we were to start our configuration just one year later, it won’t work. Of course, his original pledge didn’t require us to come up with *multiple tables* containing exactly 70 Sabbatical/Jubilee years within a period of only 430 years (using 50 year cycles in place of 49 year cycles), nor did he specify a certain year when we should start our configuration. Rather, he challenged me to come up with “*a table*” fulfilling the above requirement. We produced “*a table*,” and quite frankly, *one functioning possible scenario* is all Yahweh needs! Such being the case, why does Glenn continue to count his argument among his other “points”?

Finally, I believe it should be noted that, with the above commentary, Glenn exhibits something known as *eisegesis*,⁶ a term referring to the interpretation of a text (or texts) by reading into it one’s own ideas. Nowhere do we read in Scripture that anyone ever understood the seventy years of captivity as representing seventy ignored “land rests,” yet Glenn insists that unless we understand and accept his combined interpretation of Daniel 9:24-27, Ezekiel 4:4-6, 2 Chronicles 36:19-21 and Jeremiah 25:1; 11-12, we are poor students of the Word (at best) and hopelessly *lost* at worst.⁷ In fact, while discussing these prophecies with Glenn back in 2008, I brought up the fact that it is *amazing* that he knows all these things about prophecy that were apparently “hidden” from the writers of the New Testament. He remarked, “[I may understand some things about prophecy that the New Testament authors didn’t.](#)” We address my reaction to Glenn’s remark elsewhere in this study, including Part IV, ch. 4 (“[Arrogance, Violent Opposition and ‘Killing the Messenger.’](#)”)

***Since the Sabbatical Cycle is “Repeating,” This Proves That
the Jubilee Cycle is Also “Repeating”***

This brings us to Glenn’s 12th and final “major point”:

12) One more very important point needs to be established. Having determined that the Sabbatical cycles are repeating, and that Daniel 9 establishes that fact, it is also important to tie together Daniel 9 with the Jubilee cycles. All of these prophecies (2 Chronicles 36, Ezekiel 4, and Daniel 9) are based upon the Jubilee cycles at their very foundation. Therefore, because of this, and because the language of the Jubilees is used in Daniel 9 itself (i.e., “seven weeks”) we can also be certain that the 490 years are in direct alignment with the Jubilee cycles--such that we can know for a certainty that 457 BCE (the year Ezra came to Jerusalem, and the year the 70 weeks begins) ***is indeed a year of Jubilee.***]

⁶ *Eisegesis* is defined as “the interpretation of a text (*as of the Bible*) by reading into it one's own ideas.” “Eisegesis,” [Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/eisegesis), 2009. Merriam-Webster Online. <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/eisegesis>>.

⁷ I’m not saying that Glenn is condemning anyone, but at the same time, he is on record as stating that his message is a “message of salvation,” and since his belief pertaining to the combined interpretation of these four texts certainly separates *his* “message” from *other* “messages,” I recognize the *possibility* that, according to Glenn, our very salvation may hinge on accepting and *acting* on his interpretation.

Based upon the evidence as presented here, the Sabbatical cycles are clearly understood to be continually repeating cycles of 7 year periods. If the Sabbatical cycles are continuous, this is conclusive evidence that the 49 year Jubilee cycles are also continuous.

I'm not quite sure where to even *begin* with my answer to this "point"! These are *supposed* to be "twelve major points which show conclusively that the cycles are actually 49 years in length," but with this "point," Glenn explains that he has already *pre-established* that the Sabbatical cycles are repeating, which would of necessity *also* validate his contention that the Jubilee cycle consists of 49 years!

In other words, I would say to Glenn, "If you've already *proven* that the Sabbatical cycles are continuously-repeating (without any interruptions whatsoever), then you don't even *need* Point #12!"

However, as we have methodically demonstrated by addressing each of Glenn's points, he has *by no means* demonstrated that the ordained Sabbatical cycles are "repeating," which, in turn, automatically invalidates Point #12. Moreover, as I have previously explained, Glenn's use of such texts as Daniel 9:24-27, Ezekiel 4:4-6, 2 Chronicles 36:19-21 and Jeremiah 25:1; 11-12 involves interpreting them a certain way ... *Glenn's way*. For the record, I do not share Glenn's interpretation of these texts, and not just because of the fact that the word "Jubilee" doesn't appear in any of those books. Quite frankly, Glenn believes the understanding of those books had been sealed from all men – including the writers of the New Testament – until he came along to unveil their *true meaning*. We address Glenn's treatment of these four texts in such places as Part I, ch. 7 ("The Prophecy of Daniel 9") and Part II, ch. 4 ("Does a 50-Year Jubilee Cycle Interfere with Continuously-Repeating Sabbatical Cycles?").

By the way, Glenn's use of "the Sabbatical cycles are clearly understood to be continually repeating cycles" is yet another example of his tendency towards employing "The Obvious Fallacy." As we have presented in this review of his twelve "major points," the likes of Philo certainly disagreed with Glenn's "obvious" understanding. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, as noted elsewhere in our study, expresses the understanding that "the majority of rabbis" *also* disagreed with Glenn's view.