

5. *If the 50th Year Represents Eternity, Should We Also Understand it As Being the First Year?*

In chapter two of Part I, and then again in chapter four of Part II, I referenced a remark that Glenn had once made in which he expressed agreement with our personal view that the Jubilee Year represents a glimpse of eternity. Briefly, I'll explain it this way. In examining the Sabbatical cycle, we see a "week" of seven years culminating in a Sabbatical year. Seven, as commonly understood, is regarded as a "perfect number," so the Sabbatical year represents a "perfect year." If we multiply that "seven" times seven (seven perfect cycles), we arrive at the 49th year ... the final "perfect Sabbath year" of the entire cycle. If those seven perfect cycles represent the 7,000 years that precede what we understand as "eternity," then it only makes sense that "Year 50," which falls outside the seven cycles, represents "eternity," which falls outside the 7,000 years.

Back in chapter two of Part I, I mentioned that it doesn't make sense to regard the Jubilee Year as representing eternity if that symbol of "eternity" is actually a part of an ongoing, continuously-repeating process. In Glenn's case, he believes that the Jubilee Year is not only the representation of eternity, but to him it is *also* the beginning of another cycle that will bring him to "eternity" again ... and again and again ... a continuously-repeating process. Glenn is left with no choice but to regard the Jubilee Year as being a part of an ongoing, continuously-repeating process because that 50th year also represents the 1st year of *another* cycle that will eventually bring him to the next "Year 50."

Many believers would agree that "eternity" falls *outside* the continuously-repeating cycle of time, so if we can agree on this understanding, then it makes more sense to believe that when the Jubilee Year arrives, the previous cycle (the Sabbatical cycle) has ended and a new "era" has begun. The Jubilee Year is *outside* the boundaries of an otherwise continuously-repeating cycle, *not part of it!* This parallel fits the pattern much more securely than the one proposed by Glenn, who wants to incorporate the Jubilee Year (eternity) with the next cycle (time). For Glenn, there are no actual interruptions, and in fact, his "eternity" *coincides* with "time," since year 50 is *also* year one of the next cycle. Not only is such an understanding missing from Scripture, but it just doesn't fit the pattern.

On his web site's "Answers to Objections" page, Glenn offers his "answer" to the above commentary and explains why, in his estimation, his view makes more sense:

QUESTION: Why did Yahweh specify the 50th year as a Jubilee year?

ANSWER: Because He is using the 50th year to represent eternity.

QUESTION: If the 50th year represents eternity, how can it also be the first year of the next cycle? It seems to be an interruption of the "continuously repeating" pattern of Sabbatical years, such that it should stand alone outside of the Sabbatical cycle. To follow up on that thought, it would seem you would have to do the same thing regarding the weekly cycle and the Sabbatical year cycle, such that year seven should also be year one of the next weekly cycle. How do you answer this?

ANSWER: The best way to explain this would be to consider the musical scale. In music, we have an octave consisting of eight notes, and the eighth note is also the first note of the next octave. So in the process of demonstrating this scale, we say **DO-RE-ME-FA-SO-LA-TI-DO**. When we do this it is commonly taught that we are to hold the last note longer. Is this possibly a **representation of eternity?** There are different scales, but the pattern is similar to the one above--the last note representing the same as the first note. Please notice that the first and last note in the musical scale are the same exact notes. There are seven unique whole notes in the scale, and the eighth note is the same as the first--only an octave higher. Please see this excellent article by Greg Killian regarding The Significance of The Number Seven.

So, to answer the follow up question, it is not the seventh day (nor the Sabbatical year) which represents eternity (and supposedly equal to the first day). No, it is the eighth day which is also equal to the first day, and likewise the eighth year is also equal to the first year of the next Sabbatical cycle--as can be plainly seen when reading the text of Leviticus 25:21, where it actually calls it the "eighth year." Therefore, it is not so difficult after all to understand how the 50th year could also be a representation of eternity--as confirmed through our basic understanding of music.

Please notice how this thought that eight is equal to one (and represents eternity) is also plainly shown in chapter 33 of the book of Enoch:

And I appointed the eighth day also, that the eighth day should be the first-created after my work, and that the first seven revolve in the form of the seventh thousand, and that at the beginning of the eighth thousand there should be a time of not-counting, endless, with neither years nor months nor weeks nor days nor hours.

The Apostle Peter confirms this thought as he repeats the same basic claim:

But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.
(2 Peter 3:8)

Thus, the "continuously-repeating" pattern of Sabbatical years **is not** interrupted by the picture or symbol of eternity, but instead it is intermeshed within the cycles of time, just as the musical scale is intermeshed within it's own cycles--cycles which also give us a representation of eternity.¹

In response to Glenn's "answer," I would like to start with his musical scale analogy. He compares his "Year 50 = Year 1" belief to the fact that the eighth musical note also represents the first note of the next octave (i.e., $8 = 1$). On the surface, Glenn's analogy seems to make perfect sense. Like all superficial answers, however, it proves nothing and calls to mind the Henry Louis Mencken quote that I cited back in Part I, chapter 12 (in response to Glenn's "amazing mathematical alignments"): "There is always an easy solution to every human problem: neat, plausible, and wrong."

¹ This quote was copied and pasted from W. Glenn Moore's "Answers to Objections" page on his web site. The entire set of questions and answers may be read by accessing the following URL:
http://www.itsaboutthattime.net/answer_objections.htm.

I'm certainly no musician, but it doesn't take a musician to know that just because the eighth musical note is *also* the first note, this doesn't mean the Jubilee Year is *also* year #1 of the next Jubilee count! Analogies are just that ... analogies. Glenn's analogy reminds me of how Magonus Sucatus Patricius (a.k.a. St. Patrick) used a shamrock to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity. He succeeded in persuading the king of Tara's wife of the Trinity Doctrine by explaining that, although the shamrock has three leaves, yet it is *one plant*, symbolizing that the three "persons" of the "Holy Trinity" are One in essence. Just because it may seem neat and even plausible that a single plant with three leaves demonstrates that there is a "trinity," this does not mean that Yahweh, Yeshua and the spirit of Yahweh are "One in essence." In the same way, just because the eighth musical note represents the first note of the next octave does not mean that the Jubilee Year (year 50) is also the first year of the next Jubilee cycle.

Glenn also refers his readers to what he considers an excellent article entitled "The Significance of The Number Seven." Since the author of this article references lots of neat things about the number seven, including the eight musical notes (with the 8th one being the same as the 1st), it appears that Glenn appreciates *all* of the author's "neat examples" of "The Magnificent Sevens!" Number 22 on the author's list is, "We wind the Tefillin straps around the arm 7 times." In view of the fact that Glenn authored a study entitled "Are Believers Commanded to Wear Tefillin as Taught by Rabbinic Judaism?" in which he strongly discourages embracing this Jewish tradition, I am left to wonder if, during Glenn's search for analogies, he failed to consider the fact that "neat examples" do not validate a doctrine. Otherwise, we may have just found a justification for wearing the Tefillin!

On a more serious note (pardon the pun), even Glenn's use of *The Book of Enoch* proves nothing. According to the *Book of Enoch*, Yahweh appointed the "eighth day," that the eighth day should be the first-created after His work. In other words, the eighth day is equivalent to the first day. My response: Okay, and this proves *what*, Glenn? If someone wishes to refer to the first day of the week as "the eighth day," that is fine by us. No harm is done, presuming no one is confused by the "8 = 1" rule! Certainly, the weekly cycle isn't affected by alluding to the first day of the week as "the eighth day," and there will always be six days of work between Sabbath days, except where Yahweh specifies otherwise.

Can the same be said for the "Year 50 = Year 1" rule promoted by Glenn? No, it cannot. With the "Year 50 = Year 1" rule, the first Sabbatical cycle of the Jubilee cycle is *always* impacted. Instead of six years of sowing and reaping, five are required. This is a major deviation from the Scriptural instruction to sow and reap for six years, and I am persuaded that it is a significant-enough departure from that instruction that Yahweh would have specified such an exception.

As I bring this section to a close, let's consider the following: With the weekly cycle, we have a seven-day week. The following day, the *eighth day*, is not a part of the previous week, even though someone who doesn't know any better might think otherwise. Thus, the *eighth day* is "day 1" of the following week.

The same goes for the Sabbatical cycle, which is likewise a "cycle of seven," only it is a cycle of seven *years*. We know that the seventh year represents a Sabbatical year. The following year, the *eighth year*, is not a part of the previous Sabbatical cycle, even though someone who doesn't know any better might think otherwise. Thus, the *eighth year* is "year 1" of the following Sabbatical cycle.

This brings us to the Jubilee Year. It is the 50th Year. If we follow through with the previously-listed examples, we might say, “The 51st year,” with the full knowledge that the 51st year is not a part of the previous Jubilee cycle, even though someone who doesn’t know any better might think otherwise. Thus, the 51st year is “year 1” of the following Jubilee cycle. Nowhere in Scripture do we read that “Year 50” is also “Year 1,” and Glenn’s attempt to validate such an understanding is not only unscriptural, but unsound.

Finally, we are not certain why anyone would want to use 2 Peter 3:8 to validate their opinion regarding to the length the Jubilee cycle one way or the other, but apparently Glenn feels differently:

The Apostle Peter confirms this thought as he repeats the same basic claim:

But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. (2 Peter 3:8)

June and I agree with everything this verse says, but we do not agree with Glenn’s interpretation of it. With Yahweh, one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years is as one day. This is why we understand that six thousand years are given to man, but the 7th one-thousand-year period will be ruled by Yahweh through His Son Yeshua the Messiah. After that last millennium, eternity begins. Eternity is not co-mingled with time, as represented by Glenn’s model. Thus, we maintain that the seven consecutive Sabbatical cycles are brought to a close by a Jubilee Year, which we believe symbolizes eternity. Once that Jubilee Year is over, the following year begins a new Jubilee cycle. It is not a “combo year” intermeshed with the first year of the next cycle, as proposed by Glenn, which would require violating the “six years of sowing and reaping” law to fulfill.