

The Bar-Kokhba Revolt – Part 2 – The Shemitah Year Change & Resolving Daniel's Timeline

 sightedmoon.com/the-false-teaching-of-daniels-seventy-weeks-by-rabbi-jose-and-other-christian-teachers/

By Joseph F. Dumond

January 13, 2012

News Letter 5847-043

(Previous Newsletter Title: The False teaching of Daniels Seventy Weeks by Rabbi Jose and other Christian Teachers)

19th day of the 10th month 5847 years after the creation of Adam
The 10th Month in the Second year of the third Sabbatical Cycle
The Third Sabbatical Cycle of the 119th Jubilee Cycle
The Sabbatical Cycle of Earthquakes Famines, and Pestilences

January 14, 2012

Shabbat Shalom Brethren,

Last week we shared with you the history of events around the Bar Kokhba Revolt. We wanted you to understand the events of the time and how Judah wanted Simon to be the Messiah. Mostly at the prompting of Rabbi Akiva.

This week I want to share more information about this time and how it was twisted to suit the political aims of the leading Rabbis of that time.

The following is taken from:

<http://www.yahweh.org/publications/sjc/sj27Chap.pdf>

of Qedesh La Yahweh Press.

<http://www.yahweh.org/yahweh2.html>

Rabbi Yose Seder Olam

There has been a failure to recognize the motive of the rabbis who originated the chronology system upon which popular rabbinical chronology is built. These rabbis were supporters of Bar Kochba, a man who claimed to be the promised messiah and who had a large following among the masses. Bar Kochba's supporters read into the Second Revolt a fulfillment of the prophecy in Daniel, 9:24-27, which states that the messiah would come AFTER 483 weeks (incorrectly interpreted to mean 483 years), i.e. in the 484th year of the building of the second Temple. In their calculations, the destruction of Jerusalem (70CE) took place in the 421st year of this era.

Since the 421st year of this period equals 70 CE, the rabbis began this era in 351 BCE (see chart B). In reality, this construction is impossible. The era starts when the command went forth to build the second Temple; yet the first stages of the second Temple were already completed in the sixth year of King Darius of Persia (515 BCE). Therefore, the early construction of the second Temple was actually completed some 164 years before the rabbis calculated that the work to build it had started. Neither can the rabbinical understanding be a reference to a later building phase, for the second Temple was not enlarged until the eighteenth year of King Herod (20/19 BCE)

The clear intent of the contrived chronology from the period is to prove that Bar Kochba was the promised messiah. The 484th year of this era, the year in which the messiah was to appear, becomes 133/134 CE. This date, therefore, proves that the Second Revolt would have actually begun in 133 CE not 132 CE (133 CE being the year in which the messiah's appearance was expected). Other contemporary rabbis and later rabbis dismissed the Bar Kochba messianic attachment to the chronology but inaccurately continued use of it as if it was a factual framework for the past.

The claim of three and one-half years for the length of the revolt – as found in some variant tests of the Seder Olam Rabbah and a couple of Talmudic writings – is, in fact, of much later origin than either the earliest copies of Seder Olam or Eusebius. The figure of three and one-half years is actually derived from still another attempt to read into the Second Revolt some of the prophecy of Daniel, 9:24-27; i.e. the statement that in the “middle of the week” (interpreted to mean three and one-half years) the evil one shall “cause the sacrifices and offering to cease.” As a result, these writings superimposed their own chronological interpretation on that event.

The Bar Kochba Chronology

Let us first examine in more depth the origin of the Bar Kochba Chronology. A major error of the advocates of system “B”, “C”, and “D” has been their failure to take into account the source of the chronology used by the authors of the Seder Olam and other Talmudic works. This chronology originated from the supporters of Bar Kochba who read into the Bar Kochba revolt the prophecy of Daniel, 9;24-27, which foretold of the appearance of the messiah.

First, it can be no mere coincidence that the year 133 CE, year 16 of Hadrian, is the 484th year of the era of building the second Temple – the year 351 BCE being the date determined by the rabbis as the time when the building of the second Temple began.

Why did these rabbis calculate a date so far from the truth (i.e. over 164 years) if it had not arisen for some religious and political purpose?

The very fact that the chronology agreed upon by the rabbis from the time of Rabbi Jose (about 160 CE) was based upon the prophecy of Daniel, 9:24-27 – and then finding that his chronology fulfills the messianic expectation at the time of Bar Kochba's insurrection – clearly indicates its original source and intent. In fact, Rabbi Jose, who wrote the Seder Olam (the text upon which Talmudic chronology is built) only about 25 years after the end of that revolt, also

lived at the time of the Second Revolt. Nevertheless, he was not the originator of the chronology but only its transmitter.

Rabbi Yahanan, who lived in the next century after Jose, and the Babylonian Talmudic works Yebamot (82b) and Niddah (46b) report that Rabbi Jose “taught” Seder Olam. Rabbi Jose (Yose) is himself cited nine times in the Seder Olam, while other Rabbis, all of them Tannaim, appear altogether ten times. Milikowsky concludes from this evidence.

“With SO (Seder Olam), there is good reason to believe that R. Yose’s central role was that of a transmitter who edited (revised?) and added his own comments to the text. Only in this way can we explain the statements attributed to R. Yose in SO; a later editor when re-editing the chronography of R. Yose transmitted added R. Yose’s name to those comments which the latter had added (in the first person?) to the text. Not only does this solve our problem, i.e. how is it possible for R. Yose to be cited in SO if it is his work, but it is also the only ways to explain why R. Yose is cited in SO almost as much as all other Sages together: since he transmitted SO, his notes and comments were more numerous than the statements of their Sages which were attached to the text.

It is clear from this evidence that Rabbi Jose transmitted a chronology that had been in vogue during the Bar Kochba period only 30 years before. It was a chronology that he “taught” not originated. The political and messianic attachments made during the Bar Kochba revolt were dropped but the scheme of things was continued as if this chronology represented the true chronology of the ancient Jewish people.

Bar Kochba represented himself as the messiah. His appearance in Jewish history at the precise time that the Jewish chronology of the rabbis would indicate the appearance of the messiah cannot be a mere coincidence. His official title was (Nasia or Nasi),” denoting chief, prince, or king. The name Kochba, meaning “star” was a reference to the messianic prophecy in Number, 24:17. Rabbi Akiba specifically calls him the “King Messiah.” Bar Kochba is often considered one of the “gibborim” or “mighty warriors” of Jewish history in later Talmudic works. He is described as catching stones flung from Roman catapults and hurling them back with deadly results. According to this legend, it was for that reason that Rabbi Akiba declared him to be the messiah.

The majority of coins from the first year of the revolt bear Bar Kochba’s name and his title “Nasia of Israel.” These coins clearly reflect the messianic aspirations of Bar Kochba. The “star which appears above the Temple façade on the obverse of most tetradrachms of the second and third years [of the revolt-coins] again alludes to the messianic aspirations of Ben Kosiba [Bar Kochba].” This star is still held up among the Jews today as the star of David.

The belief that Bar Kochba was the messiah and that he fulfilled the requirements of Daniel, 9:24-27 (rabbinical interpretation) necessitates that his appearance after 483 years must occur on a Sabbath year, i.e. in the 484th year. Wacholder, in his study on Chronomessianism, for example, presents an outline of the ancient evidence proving that “at one time” there existed among the Jews a “widespread belief, that the inevitable coming of the messiah would take

place during the season when Israel celebrated the sabbatical year.” And indeed, this circumstance is exactly what the records from the Bar Kochba period indicate.

The rental contracts found at Murabba’at were written towards the end of the month of Shebat (the eleventh month of the Jewish year) of the second year of the redemption. They reveal that the eve of a Sabbath year was to follow after five coming, complete harvest years. Therefore, the first year of the revolt (133/134 CE, Nisan reckoning) was in fact a Sabbath year!

Just as important to our study is another overlooked fact. Based upon the date for Hezekiah’s sixteenth year, the second year of the Bar Kochba revolt (134/135 CE, Nisan reckoning) was a Jubilee year (Chart B). What better time for someone claiming to be the messiah to exert his claim? Even though during this period the rabbis claimed that the Jubilee was abolished by “rabbinic” – though definitely not by “scriptural” – ordinances, the Jubilee was still calculated and its prophetic connection with the messiah clearly understood.

This detail also explains why no rental contracts were found that showed a harvest during the first and second years of the Second Revolt. The 12 contracts under discussion for this period merely point to the fact that in the coming five years there would be five harvests before the next Sabbath year.

These facts demonstrate that these 12 contracts, written on the twentieth day of Shebat (Jan/Feb), must be understood to mean that the five producing years referred to would actually commence with the first of Nisan, which was only 40 days away. These five years were to end on the eve of the next Sabbath year.

Finally, we must account for the fact that Bar Kochba seized Jerusalem and other Roman outposts during his first year, even though this year was undoubtedly a Sabbath year and despite the fact that military expeditions were forbidden under Jewish law in that season. Again, we must return to the fact the Bar Kochba’s followers saw Bar Kochba as the messiah. The messiah was to war against the enemies of Israel. In the eyes of the rabbis, when the messiah came to war for the freedom of Israel, it was expected that he would do so during a Sabbath year. Therefore, normally forbidden aggressive military activity during a Sabbath year was under this exceptional circumstance permissible.

The Three and One-Half Years

Next, let us examine the evidence used to support a three and one-half year period for the war. To begin with, the figure (three years and one half)” found in some of the variant texts of the Seder Olam Rabbah instead of (two years and one half),” as footnoted in Neubauer’s translation, does not change the beginning year for the revolt, as the advocates of systems “B”, “C”, and “D” would have us believe.

Even in the variant texts referred to by Neubauer we still find 80 years from the conflict of Asvarus to the conflict of Vespasian; 52 years more to the conflict of Quietus; and 16 years more to the war of Bar Kochba. These figures bring us to the spring 133 CE as the outbreak of the war. The ending figure, on the other hand, is changed to the middle of the year 136 CE, not 135 CE!

When the chronologists supporting systems “B”, “C”, and “D” use the three and one half years from some of the variant texts of the Seder Olam Rabbah, they misuse it by subtracting that number from the confirmed date for the fall of Beth Thera in late summer of 135 CE. If this figure is correct and original, as claimed, then they should appropriately begin counting from the sixteenth year after the conflict with Quietus as directed in the text.

Neubauer’s edition of the Seder Olam and his citations of variant texts, found in his Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, are cited by Schurer and others as proof of a three and one half year war. Yet this text is described by Milikowsky’s more recent edition of that work as falling short because of its “selectivity in citing variants, the insufficient care in copying editions and manuscripts, and the method used in the text and apparatus.” These details, he continues “preclude it’s being considered an adequate utilization of the materials he had available. Additionally, there are many manuscripts of SO [Seder Olam] to which he had no access, and others to which he had only limited access.”

Milikowsky’s editions of the Seder Olam, which far better utilizes all the variants, declares that two and one half years for the Second Revolt is the true and earliest figure supplied by the best texts. More important, even Neubauer’s edition leaves the figure of two and one half years in his main text, showing that he too found this number to be from the earliest and best manuscripts to which he was familiar.

In the Talmudic texts entitled Lamentations Rabbah, “three and one half years” is given for the siege of Beth Thera by Hadrian. What usually goes unnoticed is the fact that three and one half years is also given in his text for the length of the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian. But Vespasian did not besiege Jerusalem for three and a half years. His son Titus did not begin laying siege against Jerusalem until the spring of 70 CE, and the war was over in Elul (Gorpiaeus; Aug/Sept) of that same year.

Neither can the three and one half years represent the duration of the entire war, since the First Revolt began in the spring of 66 CE and lasted until late summer of 70 CE, a span of four and one half years. Three and one half years can only work as an approximate time for the period of Vespasian’s and his son Titus’ involvement in the entire Judaeen war, which for them actually got under way in May of 67 CE.

Jerome (early fifth century CE) gives the view of some of the Jewish scholars in his day that the last septennium of Daniel, 9:27, is to be divided between the siege of Vespasian and the siege of Hadrian. That is, three and one half years are to be allotted to each event. It is clear from Jerome that the underlying idea of some of the Jews in the Talmudic period was to apply the calculations of the end time prophecy of Daniel to the two destructions of Jerusalem, which occurred during the First and Second Revolts.

The figure of three and one half years, therefore, is a chromatographical interpretation. One can no more trust this calculation for the length of the Bar Kochba revolt until the fall of Beth Thera than he can for the supposed length of the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian given in the same text. The rabbis may well have included the year before the formal declaration of war

by all of Judaea as part of their calculation (i.e. the time when Bar Kochba had established his own power but prior to the major outbreak of hostilities in 133 CE). Then again, it may have arisen as pure speculation in an attempt to read prophecy into that important defeat in Jewish history.

It is also certain, by the fact that some of the variations of the Seder Olam Rabbah substituted three and one half years for two and one half years, that the rabbinic interpretation (of three and one half years) was used to replace the original calculation. At the same time, when faced with the credibility of the figure of three and one half years from the Palestinian Talmud (Taanim, 68d) and the Lamentations Rabbah, even Schurer was forced to admit that “these sources are not of great weight.” Yet after making this admission he then concludes: “... it is in fact correct that the war lasted about three and a half years (the late sources confuse the durations of the war with that of the siege of Bether).”

The truth of the matter is that Schurer and those following systems “B”, “C”, and “D” have only “assumed” that the duration of the war for all Judaea until the collapse of Beth Thera was three and one half years. This assumption is necessary only because it is required if their respective calculations are to be upheld.

Conclusion

It is necessary for the proponents of systems “B”, “C”, and “D”, in order to accommodate their arrangements of the Sabbath cycle, to overlook the strong evidence for a two and one half year conflict for all Judaea during the Second Revolt. For their systems to work, they required that the war for all Judaea begin one year earlier than stated by Eusebius and the best editions of the Seder Olam. In an effort to find support for this view, they are forced to fall back on a late Talmudic interpretation, which tries to frame both the First and Second Revolt in such a way as to fulfill a prophecy found in Daniel, 9:24-27. System “A”, on the other hand, relies on the best and most reliable of the ancient source. These sources prove that the Second Revolt lasted only two and one half years for all of Judaea, from the spring of 133 until Ab (July/Aug) of 135 CE.

Here is one of the leading Christian teachers, John McArthur who is using the exact same teaching that Rabbi Yose used about the 483 years. Listen to his teaching on this 70 Weeks. You need to understand the Christian viewpoint and then the Rabbinic view.

<http://www.gty.org/resources/sermons/27-25/Israels-Future-Part-2>

see if you can pick out how they arrive at the 70 X 7. Do you also see how they arrived at 490 years? To miss 70 Sabbaths is not 490 years. It is 398 years not 490 because you have to also count the Jubilee years and the Sabbatical ones.

Also note how he now goes to a 360 day year for his prophecy. But this is not kosher as we have explained in Ezekiel’s 30 days. https://sightedmoon.com/sightedmoon_2015/?page_id=140

Keep in mind the year Yeshua died was 31 A.D. due to the New Moon being sighted. Then note the gymnastics he has to go through to make this work. All Christians take flying leaps of faith here. It just does not work. Study this out and know why it does not work. You need to be able to explain to those deceived by people like John McArthur why they are deceived. This is why it is so important to understand the false teaching put forward as truth by the Rabbis from the time of the Bar Kochba revolt and the same false teachings are then reworked by Christians and it is still a false teaching.

The 70 Weeks of Daniel is not about the coming of the Messiah in 31 CE.

It is about the coming of the Messiah in our time in this the last Jubilee cycle.

It is a huge prophecy for us today. Those who will witness the utter destruction that is about to arrive in the middle of the Week; The Middle of the Shabua, when Israel, not the Messiah, but Israel, The USA and UK and her commonwealth countries will be cut off and destroyed. This time is just 8 years from 2012. This is a huge understanding to grasp a hold of.