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INTRODUCTION

In the Gospel According to John, festivals of the Jewish Calendar year are mentioned, which are not found in the synoptic gospels. This study of "THE FESTIVALS OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR YEAR IN RELATION TO THE STRUCTURE OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN" is undertaken to attempt to answer the following questions about these festivals:

(a) Does the sequence of festivals found in this Gospel represent a scheme which has influenced the structure of the Gospel of John?

(b) Has the symbolism and interpretation of the festivals by Judaism and the Christian church influenced the expression of thought in the Gospel of John?

It has been the method of this study first to determine what was the cycle of festivals in the Jewish calendar year in the first Christian century and what significance Jews and Christians attached to this cycle. The sequence of the festivals in the Gospel of John has then been compared with the cycle of the festivals in the calendar year, to determine what relationship exists between them. Each of the feasts which enters into the sequence of feasts in the Gospel of John has then been studied to determine what were the characteristics of its observances, and what was the significance of these observances in the
first Christian century to Jews and Christians. A study of the events and discourses of the Gospel of John, in those sections which appear to be associated with the festivals, has then been made in the light of the rites and significance of the festivals, to determine the extent to which the symbolism and interpretation of the festivals is related to the thought of the Gospel. The relationship of the cycle of the festivals to the sequence of festivals mentioned in the Gospel of John, and the relation of the rites of the particular feasts to the thought of the related sections of the Gospel have been considered to determine to what extent the scheme of the festivals forms a major theme of the Gospel.

It is the conclusion of this dissertation that the sections of the Gospel of John between the introduction and the Passion Story are arranged to follow the structure of one annual cycle of the Jewish feasts, plus one Passover which introduces the cycle; and that the rites and interpretations of the feasts have been used by the author of the Gospel of John, in his own independent manner, as a major theme through which his thought is expressed.
CHAPTER I

THE CYCLE OF FESTIVALS OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR YEAR

The general form of the cycle of festivals of the Jewish Calendar year is prescribed in the Old Testament, in the Pentateuch. Analysis of the Pentateuch shows that several different accounts of the festivals are given. While these differences throw great light upon the origins of the feasts, and the standards of post-exilic Judaism, they do not enter into the significance of the feasts in a time which would have an effect upon the composition of the Fourth Gospel. The Priestly code (P) of the Pentateuch became the determinative source for later Judaism\(^1\) respecting the cycle of feasts, and the section "set-feasts", Leviticus 23:4-36, gives the complete yearly cycle according to this source. The cycle of feasts in the above passage is the same as the listing in Numbers 28:16 - 29:12. The three main pilgrimage feasts are also set out in Deuteronomy 16:1-17 and in the JE source of Exodus 23:14-17 in agreement with the cycle in P. The Jahwist, J, in Exodus 34:21-23 names the three pilgrimage feasts, but in a less specific way than the Priestly source does.

\(^1\) Wellhausen, J., PROLEGOMENA TO THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL, p. 108.
The appointed feasts, according to the Priestly code, which have endured until the present time in Judaism are as follows:

A. The Sabbath or seventh day of each week. Leviticus 23:3 states that the seventh day of the week is to be a holy convocation, a time for abstinence from all laborious work. Consistent with Genesis 2:3, "So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it," Exodus 20:8 contains the rule, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." In this passage the observance of the day is the abstinence from all labor. In Exodus 31:16, the keeping of the sabbath is a sign of the covenant between the people and Jahweh. Again in the decalogue of Deuteronomy 5:12, the sabbath is to be kept by abstinence from all work, but in this passage as a remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt. Special sacrifices in addition to the continual burnt offering of Numbers 28:3, are prescribed for the sabbath in Numbers 23:9 and 10: "two male lambs a year old without blemish, and two tenths of an ephah of fine flour for a cereal offering, mixed with oil, and its drink offering."

B. The New Moon. That the new moon of each month was, at one time, celebrated as a religious festival in Israel, is seen in the prescription of Numbers 28:11 of special offerings, greater in number than those for the sabbath,
for the day of the new moon. Trumpets were to be blown over the burnt offerings at the beginning of the months, according to Numbers 10:10. The section "set feasts" in Leviticus 23 (v. 23) makes provision only for the new moon of the seventh month, Tishri, to which the name "Day of Blowing of Trumpets" was applied. This day was originally the New Year celebration, in the time when the calendar had the year end at the autumn equinox, observed about Tishri 10, but in the development of calendars in Israel, this observance moved to the first day of Tishri, on which it is still called "Rosh Ha-Shanah" - "New Year", although in later Judaism, the year was thought of as starting in the spring. The New Moon as a religious festival disappeared about the time of the exile, except for Rosh Ha-Shanah, although it was still retained as a chronological point for fixing the calendar. When the evidence of observers had been found in order by the Court, in the days of the Mishnah, the Court declared "It is hallowed" to proclaim the first day of the month. Special observances in the Temple followed. Philo lists the New Moon as one of the ten festivals of the Jews,

showing that in his time, it was still deserving of some special mention as a religious observance. It was not kept as a holy convocation, with stopping of all work.

C. The Three Pilgrimage Festivals. The pilgrimage festivals were those upon which all males were required to present themselves in the Temple, as prescribed in Exodus 23:14-17, and other parallel passages. They are three in number: the combined feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread, in the first month, from the fourteenth to the twenty-first days; the feast of Pentecost, fifty days after the day of the offering of the Sheaf during Unleavened Bread, on the sixth of the month of Sivan; and the feast of Tabernacles in the seventh month, for eight days, from Tishri fifteen to twenty-two.

D. The Day of Atonement. On the tenth day of the seventh month, Tishri, was a holy convocation with rites designed to make atonement for the sins of the people, after the prescription of Leviticus 23:27, and Numbers 29:7. This is not one of the feasts upon which the people must present themselves before the Lord in the Temple, and may be looked upon more as a fast than as a feast.

In later times, after the establishment of these feasts and celebrations on the basis of the Pentateuch, other celebrations were incorporated into the festival year of Judaism. The feast of Purim, celebrating the deliverance of the Jews from Haman on the fourteenth of Adar (or fifteenth for towns with walls dating to the time of Joshua) was instituted according to Esther 9:27. This institution took place in 114 B.C. or earlier.\(^7\) It was an established fact in Mishnaic times\(^8\) and at the time of the writing of II Maccabees 15:36,\(^9\) a feast was found on Adar 14.

In the month of Kislev, the ninth month, a feast was instituted as the celebration of the rededication of the Temple in the year 165 B.C., according to the account in I Maccabees 4:59. This feast is called Hanukkah, for dedication, or in Greek, Χανουκκα.\(^1\) It lasts for eight days, from the twenty-fifth of Kislev, to the second of Tebeth.

Before New Testament times, several other feasts were instituted,\(^10\) none of which gained principle places in the

---

8. Mishnah Rosh Ha-Shanah 1:3., ed. Danby, H., p. 188.
festival year. The feast of Nicanor on the thirteenth of Adar, in accordance with I Maccabees 7:49 was observed in the time of Josephus, and is listed in the Megillath Ta'anith. (The Megillath Ta'anith is dated before 200 A. D.) A festival developed around the offering of wood for the Temple, since the Priests and Levites brought their wood on the fifteenth day of Ab, and this gave something of a festive character to the day.

The calendar of the Jewish Festival year in the first Christian century, including the feasts prescribed in the Pentateuch, and including Purim and Hanukkah, but disregarding the later minor feasts would have the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Feast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>14 - 21</td>
<td>The Feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Feast of Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Day of Blowing of the Trumpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Day of Atonement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>15 - 22</td>
<td>The Feast of Tabernacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Feast of Hanukkah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Feast of Purim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Ibid., p. 278.
The dates shown above represent the ideal time for the celebrations. Due to difficulties in determining exactly the beginning of the new month in areas distant from Jerusalem in ancient times, the practice developed among Jews living away from Palestine, of celebrating two days at the beginning of each feast. The Day of Atonement was one exception to this.\(^{15}\) In order to allow for the celebration of the Passover for those who might be unclean, or who were traveling on the fifteenth of Nisan, a second Passover was observed exactly one month later, on the fifteenth of Iyar, for those who had missed the regular one.

The system of feasts based upon the legislation of the Pentateuch and subsequent developments in later biblical history, i.e. the deliverances associated with Esther and the Macabbees, presumes a relation with the Temple in Jerusalem, which shall be the center of the feasts and the convocation point for the pilgrims. Yet when many Jews were effectively separated from the center of their Temple worship by the Dispersion, and even after the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D., the form of the festival year of Judaism remained the same. The

\(^{15}\) Oesterly and Box, THE RELIGION AND WORSHIP OF THE SYNAGOGUE, p. 320.
continuance of the form of the festival year was brought about by several means developed by Jews to meet the problem of separation from the land of Palestine:

A. Many Jews from the Dispersion made pilgrimages to Jerusalem in order to participate in the festivals. According to Philo, "...many thousands of people from many thousands of towns made pilgrimages to the temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south." John 12:20 gives evidence of Greeks coming to the feast of Passover. That such pilgrimages should be on the occasion of the festivals is evidence of the continuity of the scheme of feasts in the Dispersion. According to Oesterley and Box, "One of the most noteworthy links that connect the modern Jews with their great historic past is their sacred year and calendar."17

B. The services of the synagogue gradually took over the thought and feeling of the Temple services, so much that even when the Temple was destroyed in 70 A.D. the event did not mark a serious crisis in the Jewish worship


in synagogues of the Dispersion. In the Mishnah, Taanith 4:1 the names of the services in the Temple, the Morning Prayer, the Additional Prayer, the Afternoon Prayer, and the Closing of the Gates are names for synagogue services which are patterned directly after the Temple services, the morning Daily Whole-Offering, the Additional Offerings, the afternoon Daily Whole-Offering, and the Neilah, closing ceremony of the Day of Atonement. Special services in the synagogue attempted as far as possible to carry out the worship associated with the Temple on the great feast days. The Shofar was sounded in the New Year and Day of Atonement services of the synagogue, as it had been in the Temple. At the services for the feast of Tabernacles, the procession around the reading desk was a rite transferred from the procession around the altar in the Temple. Before 70 A. D. the synagogue had risen to a position beside the Temple in the worship, such that it was considered to have a place of its own in the festival worship. On the seventh feast of Tabernacles, when it was prescribed that the Law should be read in the hearing of all the people, the Mishnah, Sotah 7:8 states that it was the minister of the synagogue who brought out the scroll, which

was passed to the chief of the synagogue, thence to the Prefect, to the High Priest and finally to the King. Such a position of honor for the synagogue along side the Temple, in this public observance for the nation, speaks of an acceptance of the synagogue as important in the cultus of Israel. The transfer of some of the festival rites from the Temple where the actual observance could be carried out, to the synagogue, where in some cases only the idea could be expressed without the actual observance, (i.e. the water libation of the feast of Tabernacles, a rite which sought rainfall, was represented by the reading of Psalm 65, "...Thou hast remembered the earth and watered her") resulted in a spiritualization of the earlier rites. In lands outside Palestine, where different climatic conditions prevail, the physical need for rainfall was not felt as of primary importance, and the earlier rain-producing rites became spiritualized to represent a petition for the resurrection of the dead. According to the Mishnah, in the eighteen benedictions, "the Power of Rain" is mentioned in the benediction "the resurrection of the dead". This tendency to spiritualize the

20. Riesenfeld, H., JESU TRANSFIGURE, p. 34.
observances of the Temple was in the first Christian century subject to the restraining influence of the tradition which held to the worth of the Temple worship even after the Temple was destroyed. The Mishnah stands as a testimony to the strength of the tradition of Temple observances even in the lands of the Dispersion, for when it was compiled about 160 A.D. about one-half of its material had no practical bearing. It concerned Temple practices which had long ceased, but these must still be held as a tradition for careful study by the leaders of Judaism.\textsuperscript{22} With the exception of those things which were impossible in the synagogue, such as sacrifice and very large congregations of the Israelites, the form of the festival calendar, and the observances connected with it would apply during the latter half of the first Christian century as well for Jews of the Dispersion as for those dwelling in Palestine.

The pilgrimage feasts were early connected with the agricultural year, Passover and Unleavened Bread occurring at "lambing" time and at the beginning of the new harvest period, Pentecost coming at the end of the grain harvest, and Tabernacles at the time of ingathering of the fruit,

\textsuperscript{22} Danby, H., \textit{THE MISHNAH}, intro. xvi.
oil and wine. As agricultural feasts, their date was determined primarily by agricultural considerations. Thus one of the considerations in deciding whether a month shall be intercalated at the end of the year, or the new moon after Adar shall begin Nisan, is the condition of the barley crop, which must be ripe enough for the offering of the Sheaf on Nisan 16. The spring and autumn equinoxes which were venerated in early agricultural communities, have apparently influenced the dating of the spring and fall feasts, although these considerations have passed out of importance in later development of the calendar. The agricultural cycle of the feasts was a connection which signified the thankfulness of the nation for the produce of the soil, which was given by God. The land, given to the people by their God, continued to be useful only so long as He gave fertility and good weather. The pilgrimage feasts were a consecration of the whole agricultural pursuit of the nation to their God.

In the legislation of the Pentateuch, a study of the sources reveals that by the time this section of the Old Testament was written in its present form, a movement was under way to give the festivals a historic meaning. The

dates for the feasts were set by the calendar instead of by the conditions of the crops: e.g. in Deuteronomy 16:13 the feast of Tabernacles is not prescribed for an exact date, but for the "ingathering from the threshing floor", while in the later form of Leviticus 23:33 the feast is dated to begin the fifteenth day of the seventh month. The feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread became the commemoration of Israel's deliverance from Egypt, the feast of Pentecost a memorial of the giving of the Law on Sinai, and the feast of Tabernacles a sign of Israel's wandering in the wilderness forty years.

Of the feasts originally set out in the Pentateuch, the New Year's feast (1 Tishri) and the Day of Atonement (10 Tishri) were later associated with historic events. In the readings from the Law prescribed for these days in the Mishnah, Megillah 3:5 and 624 for New Year, Leviticus 23:23 is read, placing the institution of the feast in connection with the deliverance from Egypt, and for the Day of Atonement, the reading from Leviticus 16 places that day in relation to the journey from Egypt. The other major feasts of the later Jewish calendar, Purim and Hanukkah, are associated with historic events. While Hanukkah was presumably founded as a commemoration of the rededication

of the Temple in 165 B.C., the reading on that day is Numbers 7:1-89, the dedication of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, associating the feast with that dedication. At Purim, they read the story of the Jews victory over Amalek, in Exodus 17:8-16, although the feast was instituted as a remembrance of the delivery of the Jews in the story of Esther. Yet one may see in the Purim reading, a tendency to associate all the feasts with the deliverance from Egypt.

The interpretation of the feasts as signs of past deliverances in the history of the nation may be seen as an evidence of the belief that all the affairs of the chosen nation were sacred and that all the course of Israel's history must be related to God's action. The remembrance of the past deliverances in the cycle of the feasts was not merely a historic recollection, but an attempt to consecrate the present and future course of the nation to the purposes of its God. From the beginning of the year to the end of it the cycle of the nation's history must be the cycle of the Lord's action on their behalf. Yet this cycle was not considered as a closed cycle of feasts, reverenced for its completeness. At the time of the introduction of the feast of Purim, there was no objection to the introduction of another
observance into the old cycle of feasts, as there would have been had the cycle itself been considered as complete. According to the Talmud, the objection which was raised to the introduction of the feast of Purim in Jerusalem was not an objection based on the unity of the festival cycle, but an unwillingness to incite the anger of the foreign nations.25

Within the old cycle of feasts from the Pentateuch one may discern a system which at one time may have existed, giving a sacred symbolism to the arrangement of the cycle itself. Some observance was held on the tenth day of Nisan, which is mentioned only as the day on which the Paschal victim was to be selected, and which was dropped as an observance in later Judaism. The spring festival of Passover and Unleavened Bread then occurs from the fifteenth to the twenty-first of Nisan. In the seventh month, Tishri, the Day of Atonement occurs on the tenth day, followed by the feast of Tabernacles on the fifteenth of the month, at one time for seven, later for eight days. A symmetry of the year may thus have existed with parallel observances grouped around the spring and fall equinoxes. The importance of this scheme apparently was lost when

the rearrangement of the calendar was made at some time in early history. In the cycle there yet remains the sacred number, seven, in prominence. That this number was of great importance to the Hebrews is demonstrated by the extent to which it entered into their calendar: the week was seven days, the seventh year was a sacred year, the seventh sacred year was the Jubilee year. In the festival cycle, the feasts of Unleavened Bread, Tabernacles and Hanukkah are originally seven days in length, Pentecost is seven weeks from Passover, and there is an accumulation of festival occasions in the seventh month, Tishri. Since seven was considered the perfectly complete divine number, as God showed in the creation in six days plus the sabbath, the appearance of the number seven in the festival cycle symbolizes the divine nature of the cycle. The number seven stands to witness that this cycle is no creation of incomplete and mortal man, but an act of the Lord.

Philo arranges the feasts into a group of ten, to which he imputes great significance, though the form of the cycle of festivals thus arranged has no significance. In his treatise on "The Ten Festivals", he ends his listing with

the statement, "The tenth is the feast of Tabernacles, which is the last of all the annual festivals, ending so as to make the perfect number ten." By extensive numerology in his treatise on "The Ten Commandments" Philo shows his reason for esteeming the number ten so highly. Even as the Decalogue must reflect the number ten, as it is perfect, uniquely formulated by God, so the festivals to form the perfect scheme must be ten in number. But in order to fill this number ten, Philo must include the festival which is "every day", an idea originated by Philo to complete his scheme. He also lists as festivals the sabbath, the New Moon, Passover, Unleavened Bread (as separate feasts), the offering of first fruits, Pentecost, the Sacred Moon (New Year), a fast of the tenth month and Tabernacles. Having thus arranged the festivals into a group of ten, Philo is content to consider this as sufficiently symbolic of the perfection of the scheme without further elaborating the order.

From the above discussion of the different changes in the festival order, and of different ways of considering


the total cycle, it can be concluded that the cycle of festivals of the Jewish calendar year did not of itself have one primary meaning. Some details of arrangement were symbolic, but the whole course of the festival year did not of itself convey unquestionably any unique idea. It can be said of most of the observances of Judaism in the first Christian century, that they were carried out primarily because they had been commanded. This was the principle upon which it was determined that all precepts of the Law were binding. In the Mishnah, Aboth 2:1 it is said, "And be heedful of a light precept as of a weighty one, for thou knowest not the recompense of reward for each precept;"*50 Since the Law included God's command to observe the feasts, that in itself is sufficient reason to follow the precept. Since this was the dominating reason behind the Temple cultus, and the following of the festival year, the inherent symbolism of the cycle would have little importance. The most that could be said for the meaning of the cycle as a whole is that it represented, in the light of the Lord's past deliverances of His people, the pattern of His mode of deliverance which must continue for the nation.

CHAPTER II

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

A. The Major Divisions of the Gospel

The division of the Fourth Gospel into three major sections, after C. H. Dodd is a normal division based upon the subject matter of the text. The first division, 1:1-51, includes the Prologue, 1:1-18, and the testimonies of John the Baptist, Andrew, Philip and Nathaniel that Jesus is the Messiah. These are arranged in the course of six days. Thus Jesus is introduced as the Word made flesh, "he who comes after" John, and the one called Messiah by those who were well known in the early Christian church.

At chapter 2:1 the main body of the narrative begins, with the telling of the "first of his signs" (John 2:11) which Jesus did. The "signs" (σημεία) here are significant actions through which Jesus confronts men by action as well as word. A sign is "something that actually happens, but carries a meaning deeper than the actual happening." For example, in John 12:12-19 Jesus enters Jerusalem, an actual occurrence, riding on a colt; but the

occurrence is actually meant to show the Messianic King coming to his own. These signs become points of departure for the discussions and discourses of this section of the Gospel, as the writer seeks by explanation to tell what was the meaning of the action. The following are signs of Jesus in this section of the Fourth Gospel:

- The Miracle at Cana 2:1
- The Cleansing of the Temple 2:14
- The Healing of the Official's Son 4:50
- The Healing of the Lame Man 5:8
- Feeding of the Five Thousand 6:11
- Walking on the Water 6:19
- Healing of the Man Born Blind 9:7
- Raising of Lazarus 11:44
- Entry into Jerusalem 12:14

After the Book of Signs, 2:1 - 12:50, the remaining material of the Gospel deals with the Passion Story. The action moves with one sweep from the supper in 13:2 through the trial, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. All these events occupy the last week of the ministry of Jesus. Even the addition of chapter 21 which seems to come after the natural ending of the Gospel at 20:31, is in subject matter related to the Passion Story. The whole Passion-Resurrection
narrative then forms the third section of the Gospel.

Since the first section of the Gospel is introductory, its events do not enter into the chronological scheme of the Gospel, except as the six days of John 1:24-51 are described as background for John 2:1. The chronology of the Fourth Gospel up to the beginning of Holy Week then, will be the chronology determined from the Book of Signs.

B. The Chronology of the Book of Signs in the

Traditional Order of the Text.

Although many rearrangements have been presented and defended, giving revised chronologies for the Fourth Gospel, it is first necessary for this study to determine the chronology of the Book of Signs from the text in its traditional order.

From the Book of Signs of the Fourth Gospel, the passage 7:53-8:12 is omitted, in keeping with the practically unanimous opinion of scholars. Evidence of the best manuscripts is against the inclusion of this passage: Χ BNTW and Θ omit it without comment, while the only uncial including it is Codex Bezae (D) which includes many exceptional readings. Other important manuscripts omit it, some with indication that the rejection is intentional. It is assigned to different places by several manuscripts,
e.g. following John 7:36 in the cursive 225, and following Luke 21:38 in $\phi$. Beyond the manuscript evidence, the passage does not appear to be well suited to the context of the seventh and eighth chapters of John were the retirement "to the Mount of Olives" appears as an intrusion into the presence of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles. Inclusion of the passage in connection with Luke 21:36-38 would be an example of a far more acceptable context for the passage. The vocabulary and style of the passage are too "conclusive against the Johannine authorship of this section". In view of this and other evidence cited by Bernard and others, this passage is omitted from consideration in this section of the Fourth Gospel.

A small chronological section is found in the Introductory section of the Fourth Gospel, beginning at 1:19. The testimony of John the Baptist, 1:19-28 occurring the first day, verses 29-34 tell of a second day, following $\gamma \pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \mu \rho \iota \omicron \nu$. The third day occupies verses 35-39, ending with the statement, "...and they stayed with him that day for it was the tenth hour." Bernard holds that


verses 41 and 42 concern events of the fourth day, since he considers τῇ the original reading in verse 41, instead of τῷ. The events of verse 41 and 42 can be considered as one day's activity even if the reading of Westcott and Hort, τῷ, is taken here.

The fifth day, after the first testimony of John the Baptist, is described then in verses 43-51. Of the sixth day, nothing is said, but beginning at 2:1, "On the third day," can be considered the seventh day, which Bernard sees as "the detailed report of a momentous week." Yet viewing these events recorded in the first chapter as being in the same category with the Miracle at Cana is to miss the dramatic emphasis which appears due the sign at the wedding. The testimonies of the first five days are connected with the simple expression of the passing of time, "the next day" or some similar expression. The events are described briefly and in general terms. The whole series comes to a climax at 1:51 with the declaration of Jesus, "Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." This prophetic utterance catches up the latent meanings of the testimonies of the disciples and of John

the Baptist. Now a new phrase, filled with symbolic meaning is used: "On the third day..." This expression was intimately connected with the Resurrection, as the use in verse 19 of the second chapter will indicate. Hoskyns⁶ finds this phrase to indicate the temporary condition, over against the permanency of "four days", and recalls that "in three days" is usually supposed to refer to the day of the Resurrection, or simply to mean "after a short time." If the expression, "on the third day" here has not only the obvious meaning, "after a short time," thus setting the events following off from the introductory testimonies, but also a connotation gained from its use in connection with the Resurrection, it then becomes truly an introduction to the sign which Jesus is to perform.⁷ This sign is in his act of changing the water in "six stone jars...standing there, for the Jewish rites of purification," into wine which the guests find to be the "good wine" of the feast (John 2:6-10). If this act be taken simply at its face value, it contributes little meaning to the Fourth Gospel. Jesus would be held up as a magician who amazed people. The act however is called, in the eleventh

---


verse, "the first of his signs". The heart of the deeper significance here, would be the jars of water, used for the Jewish rites of purification. These would be for use in removing ritual uncleanness from the hands, in accordance with the prescriptions codified in Mishnah tractate Yadaim, e.g. 1:1, "To render the hands clean, a quarter-log or more of water must be poured over the hands to suffice for one person, or even for two." These jars would represent the Jewish ritual system, with all its laws of uncleanness, and its purpose to purify through the Law of Moses. Yet though the need at the feast was for wine, the only thing available was the pale water, of use merely for the perfunctory washing of hands. Then by the creative act of Jesus, by a means mysterious to the recipients ("When the steward of the feast tasted the water now become wine, and did not know where it came from..." John 2:9), a new liveliness and vital sustaining power enters the religious system. The water is changed to not just wine, but "good wine" (2:10), by the act of the Son of God. The new religion, a transformation and fulfillment beyond the old, not only purifies, but goes on to give life, as the old could never fully do.

The sign is a preview of the relation of Jesus to the Law and the Jewish religion, to be seen again and again throughout the Fourth Gospel. Immediately following this sign, is the cleansing of the Temple, which will repeat the same theme: Jesus fulfills all that was the purpose of the old system, and goes far beyond to a new kind of religion and worship. Again in 4:2 in the discourse with the Samaritan woman, this message is made explicit, "But the hour is coming and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

The final sign of Jesus, his Resurrection, was the means by which he carried out the transformation and fulfillment of the old system of Judaism. The sign of Cana is a dramatic anticipation of this supreme act, and its meaning becomes clear only in the light of the Resurrection. Thus it is appropriate that this miniature view of what the summation of the Fourth Gospel is to be, should begin with the words "On the third day" which carried with them the echo of the Resurrection. This expression then, is to be taken not just as a chronological point in the first week described by the Evangelist, but as the announced beginning of the signs which, different from the introductory material, would show just what the coming of the Messiah meant. When this has been said, the purely chronological use of the expression is seen to be of secondary importance.
There is no reason to believe that it does not indicate the passage of two days' time, but this has not been the only factor determining the Evangelist's use of the expression.

Following the sign at Cana, a "few days" (2:12) passes at Capernaum. The first indication of any date to which any chronological scheme could be connected occurs at 2:13, "The Passover of the Jews was at hand..." About the fourteenth of Nisan Jesus goes up to the Temple at Jerusalem for this feast and there follows the cleansing of the Temple. The next event after the chronologically undesignated story of Nicodemus, is the trip to Judea of 3:22. This is said to have occurred when "John had not yet been put in prison". (3:24)

After an undetermined period of time, Jesus and the disciples leave Judea, passing through Samaria, on the way to Galilee (4:4) and on this trip is Jesus' conversation with the woman of Samaria. After the conversation, Jesus and the disciples stay for two days in Samaria (4:40). There is insufficient data in this incident as recorded, to suggest a precise dating of the event. At 4:35 Jesus is quoted as saying, "Do you not say, 'There are yet four months, then comes the harvest'? I tell you, lift up your eyes, and see how the fields are already white for harvest." This has been taken as an indication of the time of year.
by some, e.g. Farrer takes it as "hints of Pentecost" since the bringing of first-fruits of harvest could begin at Pentecost; Westcott discusses the possibility that the expression indicates a date in December, but cannot fit this date into the apparent duration of the trip.

Others, however, have seen that this passage probably has nothing to say about the date. Bernard assumes that "There are yet four months, then comes the harvest" is a "Greek rendering of an Aramaic agricultural proverb" and that the harvest is the spiritual harvest of the men who are coming out of the city, 4:30. Nothing can then be inferred as to the dating of the incident. Strack-Billerbeck also take verse 35 to contain a rural proverb, though admittedly without evidence. Barrett takes the meaning of the verse to be "On the common reckoning..., there is a four month interval... between sowing and harvest" taking it as a reference to common knowledge, and in such a way that no chronological data could be derived from it.

When the two days in Samaria have passed, Jesus and his disciples returned to Galilee, 4:43. At verse 45 it is told that the Galileans welcomed Jesus, "having seen all that he had done in Jerusalem at the feast,". This would suggest that the time elapsed between the Passover of 2:13 and the trip through Samaria to Galilee was but a short time. If several subsequent feasts, for example, had taken place since the Passover, the references to "the feast" in verse 45 would be ambiguous. The return to Galilee then would probably precede Pentecost.

At Capernaum in Galilee, the son of an official is healed, and this is called the "second sign" of Jesus done in Galilee, referring to the statement of 2:11 that the miracle at the wedding in Cana was the first of Jesus' signs.

Following the healing of the official's son, is the account of the journey of Jesus again to a feast in Jerusalem, but this feast is unnamed, 5:1. In connection with the visit to the feast, the healing of the cripple at the pool of Bethzatha occurs, 5:2-9, and there rises out of it a discussion with the Jews concerning healing on the Sabbath. The discourse rising out of this occupies the remainder of chapter 5. Since the feast is not named, one may possibly determine which feast was meant either by the order in which it follows in the cycle of feasts, or by the evidence
of themes which would indicate one of the feasts. From the order of events in the Fourth Gospel in its traditional order, no one of the feasts can be identified here. The only chronological point established thus far in the chronology of the Gospel is the Passover at 2:13. It would occur Nisan 14, in the spring. The next point which is identifiable by date is the second mention of the Passover, at 6:4, which must be the next spring. Since the events after the first Passover mentioned need to have taken only a few weeks, though they may have taken somewhat longer, any other feast of the calendar year could have been the occasion. It is probably one of the pilgrimage festivals, Pentecost, Tabernacles, or Passover, since it was on these occasions that all Jewish males were required by the Law to attend the Temple worship. Although this requirement must not have been followed strictly in the time of Jesus, but was the ideal of the Rabbinic teachers, there would be greater probability that a Galilean would attend one of the three pilgrimage feasts in Jerusalem, than that he would attend one of the lesser feasts and miss attendance at one of the three pilgrimage feasts. Of these pilgrimage feasts, it is possible that the unnamed feast is Pentecost, following by fifty days the Passover of 2:13. It is the argument of chapter VI of
this dissertation that the themes of the discourse in John 5:1-47 strongly suggest this feast. In the traditional order of the text, however, it would mean that between this feast and the following Passover which is immediately mentioned in 6:4, a period of ten months passes without mention.

In the traditional order of the text, the unnamed feast of John 5:1 could also be identified with the feast of Tabernacles, Tishri 15 - 22. If the alternate reading of the text in 5:1, ἡ ἑορτὴ were the original one, rather than ἑορτὴ without the article, the expression could mean specifically Tabernacles, which was called "the feast". Against this, however, is the strictly Johannine usage in John 6:4, speaking of the Passover as "the feast of the Jews". The manuscript evidence, too, is definitely against the reading with the article. There is no particular connection between the themes of the feast of Tabernacles and the discourses of chapter 5, nor does it seem
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that Tabernacles would be mentioned in this way, and later given much fuller treatment by the author in chapters 7 and 8. Yet it must be considered that in the traditional order of the text, the feast of Tabernacles is not absolutely ruled out, by the festival order.

Other possibilities for the identification of the feast may be found in New Year (Tishri 1), the Day of Atonement (Tishri 10), Purim (Adar 14 or 15), or the feast of Dedication (Kislev 25 for eight days). Austin Farrer argues that the feast must be New Year, Rosh Ha-Shanah, on the basis of its place in the cycle of feasts in John, and the themes of the discourse of John 5:1-47 which suggest that day. Since the argument from the themes of the discourse in John 5 will be discussed in chapter VI of this dissertation, only the conclusion will be referred to here. Although some association may be seen between themes of the discourse in John 5:1-47 and the New Year, this association is not strong enough to identify the feast with New Year, nor is it as strong as the association of the themes with the feast of Pentecost. The other argument, that the scheme of feasts in John requires that this feast be New Year, is based upon the particular scheme which Farrer finds in the Fourth Gospel.

He has concluded that the scheme of the Jewish feasts is the scheme of the Apocalypse of John, and that the same scheme is found in the Gospel of John. This is actually an argument from suggestion based upon identical authorship. Farrer holds that either the same author wrote both the Gospel and the Apocalypse, or that at least they came from the same school of thought. He takes the festival sequence in the Fourth Gospel to be: Passover (2:13), "hints of Pentecost" (4:27-38), New Year (5:1-47), Tabernacles (Ch. 7), Dedication (Ch. 10) and Passover again (Ch. 12ff). By "hints of Pentecost" Farrer must mean the references to harvest, which was a theme of the feast of Pentecost, in 4:35 "...see how the fields are already white for harvest." The disturbance of the scheme here set forth by Farrer, caused by the mention of the Passover at hand, in John 6:4, is eliminated by postulating a break of one year in the attendance of Jesus at the feasts in Jerusalem, beginning after New Year, Tishri 1, and ending just before Tabernacles, Tishri 15 the next year. The Passover mentioned in 6:4 is then celebrated by Jesus in Galilee, because the Jews intended to do him harm after the controversy which ends in 5:18, "This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him..."

After the interlude in Galilee, covered by chapter 6, it is suggested that Jesus again took up his attendance at the feasts exactly one year after he had ceased attendance, going to Tabernacles, chapter 7, Dedication, chapter 10, and the last Passover, chapter 12.

If the sequence of feasts proposed by Ferrer be taken as correct, the feast of John 5 must be New Year, since it must follow the mention of Pentecost, 4:35 and precede the beginning of the year from Tishri to Tishri when Jesus was supposed to have broken attendance at the Temple. The difficulty with this sequence of the feasts in John, is that Pentecost could hardly be dismissed with such a vague reference as that of the harvest theme in 4:35. While it is recognized that a one-day festival must not have drawn many pilgrims to Jerusalem in the first Christian century, this feast was still one of the original three main feasts. The discourse mentioning the harvest, in 4:27-38 could as well refer to the feast of Unleavened Bread, associated with the Passover, or refer to no feast at all, as to Pentecost. If no more of Pentecost is said than is found in this vague reference, then it must be said that there is a blank spot in the scheme at this point. If this be the case, then the argument for identifying the feast of 5:1 with the New Year, does not hold. It could as well be Pentecost.
There is no evidence to suggest that the feast of 5:1 should be identified with any of the other feasts; the Day of Atonement, Purim, or the feast of Dedication. The Day of Atonement had a very specific symbolism built around the entrance of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies, but nothing of this appears in connection with the feast which is not named. Since Purim was celebrated chiefly in the synagogue it would be unusual for Jesus to go up to Jerusalem specifically for that feast. Nor is there any reason to connect this feast with the feast of Dedication except that this is one of the many possibilities. It is improbable that the feast of Dedication would be meant anonymously in this case, and then named in 10:22. It must be concluded that in the traditional order of the text it is not possible to identify this feast from its place in the order of the festival cycle.

Following the unnamed feast of chapter 5, is a trip of Jesus "to the other side of the sea of Galilee," a very confusing description in the context of the traditional order of chapters in this gospel. The Passover is near, 6:4, and there follows the feeding of the five thousand, 6:5-14. That night is the time of the miracle of Jesus walking on the sea, 6:19. On the next day, at Capernaum, the people find Jesus, and there follows the discourse on the True Bread from Heaven, 6:25-71.

John 7:1 describes an undetermined period of time during which Jesus stayed in Galilee, for fear of the Jews. When the feast of Tabernacles, presumably six months after the Passover mentioned in chapter 6 comes, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem "about the middle of the feast" (John 7:14). This would be Tishri 18 or 19. The discourses from 7:16 through 8:59, excepting of course 7:53-8:12, all seem to belong to this visit to the Temple.

Immediately following Jesus' exit from the Temple is the sign performed for the man who was blind from his birth, 9:1-7. The discourse arising from the healing continues through John 10:21. At 10:22 it is the feast of Dedication, Hanukkah, for eight days following Kislev 25. On this occasion, a discourse of Jesus is recorded, which has close connections with the discourse of the preceding section, although the date is presumably two months later. The teaching of Jesus leads to an uprising against him, and he flees across the Jordan for an undetermined period of time. At some time unspecified, between Dedication and the Passover, Jesus goes across to Bethany to raise Lazarus from the dead, John 11:1-44. As a result, the Pharisees plot the death of Jesus, who again flees to Ephraim.
Beginning at 11:55 is the narrative of the last Passover. In John 12:1 it is said that Jesus went to Bethany, six days before the feast, or Nisan 8. On the next day, occurs the triumphal entry, 12:1-19, and a discourse following, verses 20 - 36. Jesus then hid himself, and there follows another discourse, 12:44-50, not related to any event, but summing up the teaching of the Book of Signs.

The chronology of the passion story appears quite plain, and it is Passover time. The trial of Jesus before Pilate is at about the sixth hour of the day of Preparation for the Passover, 19:14, or Nisan 14, and the Crucifixion soon thereafter. It was early that day when Jesus was led from the house of Caiaphas to the Praetorium, 18:28. The appearance before Caiaphas would then have occurred during the dark hours preceding that day, Nisan 14 by the Jewish reckoning of the day from sunset to sunset. The supper, John 13:2 - 17:26 would have taken place on the evening which began Nisan 14.

This description of the chronological relations in the Book of Signs, will serve to show how vague is the actual evidence for dating the events of the Fourth Gospel. Although many expressions for the passage of time are used, these relate events for a series of a few days only, and do not result in a continuous scheme of time throughout the Gospel. From the testimony of John the Baptist, 1:24, to
the Marriage at Cana, 2:1, six days apparently pass, but this block of time is not related in any way to the next event, the Passover, 2:13. The journey through Samaria, 4:1-42 occupies two days, 4:40, after which apparently, the healing of the official's son takes place in Galilee, but this is followed by an unknown period of time, a feast of unknown date, another unknown period, then the Passover, of which two days are described. The feast of Tabernacles dates the next event, for which the whole period of the feast is covered, from the first day, when the brothers go up, until the last day of the feast, 7:37. An undated discourse intervenes, before the feast of Dedication, which can be dated. The stay across the Jordan, the healing of Lazarus, and the stay in Ephraim are undated, before one arrives at the carefully dated six days before the final Passover. The feasts provide the only chronological data in the Gospel, and without the mention of them, we should have no notion from the Evangelist's work, of what sort of period was covered by the events he describes.

The sequence of the feasts mentioned in the Gospel of John, when the text is taken in its traditional order is as follows:
The Passover 2:13
"A Feast of the Jews" 5:1
The Passover 6:4
Tabernacles 7:2
Feast of Dedication 10:22
The Passover (in six days) 12:1

This sequence of feasts would occupy at least two years, comprising almost a complete cycle of the feasts from 6:4 to 12:1, with the addition of the part of another year's cycle from 2:13 to 5:1. This scheme of feasts, however, does not appear to have symbolic significance, as a cycle, since it includes two incomplete years. The sequence of feasts is changed if one takes into account possible relocations of parts of the text, especially of Chapter 5.

C. The Chronology of the Fourth Gospel in the
   Restored Order of the Text.

   It has long been felt that there are places in the Gospel of John where the narrative, or the argument have been interrupted, or where parts of the text seem to fit well in some other part of the book. It has therefore been suggested that certain relocations of passages be made,

to rectify what appear to be very early errors of arrange-
ment. Since there is no manuscript evidence for any of
the rearrangements suggested, it is held that these dis-
arrangements are more primitive than any manuscripts known.

Bernard lists seven cases which have been subject to rear-
angement: 20

(1) The transposition of chapters 5 and 6.
(2) Adding 7:15-24 to the end of chapter 5.
(3) Substituting 13:1-30, 15, 16, 13:31-38, 14,
   17 for the traditional 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
   order of chapters.
(4) Substituting 3:31-36, 3:5, 3:22-30, for the
   traditional order of chapter 3.
(5) Substituting 10:19-29, 10:1-18, 10:30ff, for
   the traditional order of chapter 10.
(6) Substituting 12:1-36a, 12:44-50, 12:36b-43
   for the traditional order of chapter 12.
(7) Substituting 18:1-13, 18:19-24, 18:14-18,
   18:25b-28 (eliminating 25a) for the tradi-
   tional order of chapter 18.

Of the above list of proposed changes in the order of the
Gospel, only (1), (2) and (5) will affect the sequence of
the feasts in John, or the material associated with the
feasts, and the others will not be within the scope of
this work.

20. Bernard, J. H., INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON
1. The Transposition of Chapters 5 and 6.

The event in John 4:46-54 is placed in Galilee, after Jesus' return from Samaria. Chapter 5 describes a visit to Jerusalem, with no return to Galilee mentioned. Chapter 6 begins with ΜΕΤΑ ΤΑΤΥΑ which presumes some continuity with what has gone before, and tells of Jesus' going "to the other side of the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of "Tiberias". Although this would be a natural description of a trip from one shore of the sea to the other, as ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΩΛΑΟΣΗΣ is used in 6:17, it would be a most awkward way to describe a journey from Jerusalem to a point across the sea from Capernaum. Further, John 6:2, "And a multitude followed him, because they saw the signs which he did on those who were diseased," suggests an antecedent event of healing, such as that found in 4:46-54. The healing event in 5:2-9 would hardly produce a multitude in Galilee, such as that suggested in 6:2. Again, in John 7:1 it is said, "After this Jesus went about in Galilee; he would not go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him." This would be natural if it followed the description of some controversy with the Jews in Judea, but in the traditional order it follows a controversy in Capernaum, which could hardly be taken as reason for Jesus to remain away from Judea. These difficulties are eliminated, if it be assumed that in some primitive accident, the whole of
chapter 5 was dislocated from immediately following chapter 6, to its present position in the text. If chapter 5 follows 6, the itinerary described would be natural: at 4:54 Jesus is in Capernaum, at 6:1 immediately following, he goes to "The other side of the sea of Galilee," and in 6:16-21 he returns to Capernaum. The multitude in 6:2 would be the result of the healing of the official's son, 4:46-54. Chapter 5, describing an event in Judea, which ends in a controversy which might make it unsafe for Jesus to remain in Judea, immediately precedes 7:1 which tells that Jesus would no longer go about Judea. Bernard, McGregor, Bultmann, and Streeter accept this transposition of chapters as restoring the probably original order.

There are, however, objections raised to such transposition of passages, when no manuscript evidence is to be found for them. Westcott holds that our knowledge of
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the details is too fragmentary to allow us to make rearrangements from the recorded order. He further argues that the abrupt change at 6:1, which was eliminated by the transposition, is in fact a characteristic of the author. This latter argument is repeated by Strachan, who also states that "This evangelist was not interested in itineraries." This latter point must certainly not be pushed too far, however, as it would lead to suspicion of the whole historical basis of the events recorded by the Evangelist. If the remarks of the author which give geographical information were included in such a way as to be vague references to a general area of the country, one might say that they are accidental remarks in which inconsistency would not be important. The remarks of the Evangelist, however, seem to try to convey precise geographical data. 4:46 is in Cana, 6:1 and 2 are in the hills across the sea of Galilee from Capernaum, 5:2 is at one certain pool in Jerusalem, and 10:23 is in a particular portico of the Temple. Since the Evangelist has gone to great pains to be very specific about the locality of these events, it does not seem likely that all relationships between these localities would be

unimportant to him. Wright, in a similar argument, states that "His mind did not work in any systematic manner."27 While this too seems to overstate the case, it must be recognized that this Evangelist was remarkably independent in his use of events from the common tradition, e.g., the placing of the cleansing of the Temple at the early part of Jesus' ministry, and was primarily given to making his theological point. Considerations of chronology or geography did not dominate his narrative, but were made subject to the theological argument of the Gospel. It is on this ground that C. H. Dodd28 objects to the proposed transposition of chapters 5 and 6. He considers that the argument of chapter 5, that "there is an unbroken identity of will and purpose, resting upon unqualified dependence of the Son on the Father" upon which Christ works the works of God, must precede the teaching of chapter 6, that Christ is Himself the Bread of Life. Were it not for the argument of chapter 5, Christ would in chapter 6 appear as a second independent source of life. Dodd therefore argues that although something is gained in the physical aspect


of the narrative by transposing the two chapters, the movement of thought is better with the traditional arrangement.

The strong arguments on both sides of the question of relocation of this passage of the Fourth Gospel indicate that it is a delicate question. When one takes into account the scheme of the feasts in this Gospel, however, it appears that there is somewhat more weight in favor of transposing chapters 5 and 6. In the previous chapter of this dissertation, it was shown that the unnamed feast of 5:1 could be almost any of the feasts of the year, Pentecost, New Year, Day of Atonement, Tabernacles, or Purim, if the traditional order of the text is used. If the relocation of chapter 5 after chapter 6 is allowed, the feast of 5:1 must follow the mention of the Passover in 6:4 and precede the feast of Tabernacles mentioned in 7:2. It could not be the New Year's feast, or the Day of Atonement, since these would be so closely followed by the feast of Tabernacles (fifteen days after the New Year, five days after Yom Kippur) that the shunning of Judea because of the danger from the Jews, mentioned in 7:1 would be meaningless. The feast must then be either the Passover which was mentioned in 6:4 as being "at hand" (*νυ δε εξής τὸ πάσχα*), or Pentecost which followed the Passover by fifty days. Contrary to Bernard, Bultmann, and
Streeter, it is not natural to identify the feast of 5:1 in the transposed order with the Passover mentioned in 6:4. The miracle of the feeding of the five-thousand is a sign which Jesus performs, the meaning of which is associated with the symbolism of the feast of Unleavened Bread which was part of the Passover celebration. The discourse in 6:26-58 on the theme, "I am the bread of Life" makes adequately clear that Jesus is in himself more than a fulfillment of that which was symbolized in the offering of the sheaf of new barley, on Nisan 16 in the course of the feast of Unleavened Bread. This sheaf is the new grain given by God, for which the Israelite must be grateful. So too the theme in the discourse is referred in 6:53 to the Passover meal, in which the Israelite eats the flesh of the lamb, as a symbol of deliverance. The words "...unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you have no life in you;" are scarcely understandable, unless they refer to the symbolism of the Passover meal. This association of ideas is clear if the meaning of 6:4, "Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews was at hand" is that right at this time, the Passover

sacrifices are being made at the Temple, but here with Jesus is the complete fulfillment of the feast. To say that this all takes place before the Passover, and that some time later, Jesus goes to the Passover described in 5:1-47 is essentially to ignore the association of the acts and discourses of chapter 6 with the Passover. Further, there is nothing in the following chapter 5 which suggests the Passover. It is therefore unlikely that the feast of 5:1 would be the Passover, and if this revised order of chapters be adopted, it must be Pentecost. This identification of the feast is satisfactory from the point of view of subject matter of chapter 5, since it is highly compatible with the themes of the feast of Pentecost (see chapter VI). The sequence of feasts resulting from this relocation of chapter 5 is:

The Passover - Cleansing of Temple 2:13
The Passover - Feeding of Five Thousand 6:4
Pentecost - (The Unnamed Feast) 5:1
Tabernacles 7:2
Dedication 10:22
The Final Passover 12-13
2. The Addition of 7:15-24 to Chapter 5.

The suggested addition of 7:15-24 to chapter 5 would change the context in which the words are spoken from the feast of Tabernacles to the feast of Pentecost. The change is suggested for these reasons: 30

(a) "The Jews marveled at it saying, "How is it that this man has learning, when he has never studied?", 7:15 does not follow well upon verse 14 which tells that Jesus taught in the Temple, but it does follow well the point reached in 5:47, "...how will you believe my words?". The surprise of the people that he is the teacher which the leaders are trying to kill follows better after verse 14, therefore removal of the passage is an improvement.

(b) "...Why do you seek to kill me?" 7:19, refers to the animosity of the Jews mentioned in 5:18. Following chapter 5, it is natural, while in chapter 7 it anticipates unfavorable reception at a time when the people are hearing him peacefully.

(c) The argument from the authority of Moses 7:19-24 is a continuation of the argument begun in 5:45, "...it is Moses who accuses you.", and actually completes the thought which was left incomplete in chapter 5. The meaning of Moses accusing the Jews is explained in 7:19, "Did

not Moses give you the Law? Yet none of you keeps the law." This passage is better associated with chapter 5 upon which it is apparently based.

(d) "...are you angry with me because on the sabbath I made a man's whole body well?" 7:23, refers to the healing of the man on the sabbath in 5:2-9, as there is no antecedent healing to which this might refer in chapters 6 or 7. If this reference is made to an event which occurred months before, it can hardly be recalled by the hearers, but if 7:23 is in the section added to chapter 5, it is in a reasonable position, spoken on the same occasion as the healing.

(e) The question of 7:19, "Did not Moses give you the Law?" is appropriate to the feast of Pentecost, which was at the time of Jesus, and the Apostolic age becoming the feast of the Giving of the Law on Sinai. (Chapter VI) This was not one of the themes of the feast of Tabernacles. This passage then would be more in keeping with the chapter associated with Pentecost, chapter 5.

Against this relocation it is argued that the difficulties raised above are not so great, that the passage has meaning in its traditional context, and that the chronological improvements resulting are made at the expense of the theological connections. 31 Strachan, while

arguing against all other relocations, allows this one. The change is adopted here, since it appears to improve both the chronology and the movement of thought through the sequence of the feasts.


It has been proposed to remove verses 1-18 from the beginning of chapter 10 and place them after verse 29, before verse 30. This is proposed for the following reasons:

(a) The discourse 10:1-18 appears to be delivered in vacuo, since it is only remotely connected with the preceding situation in chapter 9. The expression ἀμὴν ἀμὴν 10:1, is usually used in the course of a discussion, not at the beginning of a discourse on a new topic. At 10:19, however, it is found that the controversy of 9:41 is continuing. 10:1-18 appears as an intrusion in the line of this controversy. 10:19 does continue the narrative of 9:41.

(b) In 10:26 Jesus begins to speak about "my sheep" in a manner like that in 10:1-18, but this appears to be on a different occasion, following the description of 10:22,


"...and Jesus was walking in the Temple, in the portico of Solomon". The ideas in 10:26-29, however, are a prior part of the argument running through 10:1-18. If the change of location of 10:1-18 is made, the saying about sheep are all on the same occasion, and form a continuous argument. In 10:4 an eschatological reference may be detected, "When he has brought out all his own..." which echoes the thought of Numbers 27:17 where a man is appointed by God to "lead them out and bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord may not be as sheep which have no shepherd." The metaphor of Numbers 27:17 has become an allegory in John 10:4, of the final work of Jesus on behalf of his followers. This future reference is developed further in 10:16, "...so there shall be one flock, one shepherd." This idea of the final work of Christ for his sheep, is appropriate to the conversation recorded in 10:24, with its question about the eschatological aspect of Jesus' ministry. "How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell us plainly."

(c) Verse 30 of chapter 10 follows well upon verse 18, therefore no violence is done if the substitution is made.

For the above reasons, and because the whole of chapter 10 exhibits a unity which seems to associate it with the
feast mentioned in 10:22, whether 10:1-18 is relocated or not, this passage will be considered as part of the discourse on the occasion of the feast of Dedication.

In connection with the discussion of the relocation of passages in the Fourth Gospel, account must be taken of the fact that such rearrangements are on a very insecure foundation, if it cannot be shown how it was possible that a primitive error could have been made. It is precarious to propose rearrangement merely because the new order of the text appears to the contemporary reader to make more sense than the traditional order. It has been shown however, that it is by no means uncommon that misplacements are found in early documents of a non-biblical nature, and that the same may be a reasonable hypothesis in considering Biblical material. Bernard has followed this hypothesis in explaining how the dislocations of the Fourth Gospel may be accounted for by assuming the confusion of pages of an early codex. He finds a common denominator in length among five of the six sections considered, of 750 letters, which he computes to be the number of letters to a page of the primitive copy which was confused. Since


these sections would comprise one, two, four or five leaves almost exactly, it appears possible that the dislocations could have been due to misplacement of pages. The sixth section considered is held to occur at the end of one main section of the Gospel, which would mean that open space might be left for the remainder of the page. It is said by Hoare\textsuperscript{36} that in his solution, Bernard has neglected the necessity of the length of the sections between the dislocated sections also being a multiple of the number of letters on a page. Hoare suggests a very much more elaborate rearrangement of the Gospel on the basis of his arithmetic analysis. Other scholars\textsuperscript{37} have also proposed solutions based upon similar hypotheses. The details of these studies are beyond the scope of this work, but the reference is made to them as evidence that the possibility of explaining the dislocations by assuming the confusion of pages in a primitive codex is held to be likely by these scholars. The one relocation of sections, the transposition of chapters 5 and 6 of the Gospel, which affects the sequence of feasts, is more likely according to this hypothesis, than others involving the shifting of


pages to a different section of the Gospel. The arithmetic analysis of this relocation, too, is not subject to the criticism of Bernard's method by Hoare, since no pages would intervene in the primitive manuscript.

D. The Relation of the Jewish Festival Cycle to the Sequence of Feasts in the Fourth Gospel.

It was shown in section C above, that the sequence of feasts in the Fourth Gospel, if the order of chapters 5 and 6 are exchanged, is as follows:

- Passover - Cleansing of Temple 2:13
- Passover - Feeding of Five Thousand 6:4
- Pentecost - (The Unnamed Feast) 5:1
- Tabernacles 7:2
- Dedication 10:22
- The Final Passover 12-13

This sequence includes one complete cycle of feasts which were centered in the Temple, plus one introductory Passover, and the final Passover. Missing from the cycle, as shown in chapter I are Purim, which was observed primarily in the synagogue not in the Temple, New Year and the Day of Atonement, which were one day observances. On New Year, the additional observances in the Temple were not enough to bring large numbers of Israelites from outside the city of Jerusalem to the Temple. It was not a
pilgrimage feast. The Day of Atonement had its observance by the High Priest, who with great ceremony sprinkled the curtain of the Temple with the blood of the sacrifice, and also sprinkled the altar of incense. This was followed by the ceremony of the "scapegoat" which was sent out into the wilderness, presumably bearing the sins of the people, represented by a thread of crimson wool. 38 This feast, however, was not a pilgrimage feast, and cannot have brought many to Jerusalem for the rites. Some probably would come early for the feast of Tabernacles which followed the Day of Atonement by five days. 39 To those outside Jerusalem these observances early in Tishri did not carry with them the sense of an obligation to go to the Temple. The omission of these observances from the cycle of feasts used by the Evangelist would still not represent a great incompleteness in the cycle, since all the occasions when Israel must "appear before the Lord" are included.

The importance of the pilgrimage festivals to the Evangelist may be much greater than that which appears on the surface. C. H. Dodd 40 makes a suggestion which reflects accurately the sort of meaning which the Evangelist

is able to put into the ordinary acts of life, when he asks whether the expression, "he went up to Jerusalem" (2:13, 5:1, 7:10, 14) while it might have been used of any pilgrim to the city, may not have had for this Evangelist a suggestion of the "raising up" of the Son of Man. It is in the Resurrection that Jesus' time finally comes, anticipated in 2:4, "...My hour has not yet come." and in 7:6, "...My time has not yet come,..." It is on the occasions of the "going up" of Jesus to the pilgrimage festivals, that signs are given, telling the effect of the Resurrection on the Temple cultus. This connotation of \( \Delta \nu \beta \alpha \iota \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \) gives more reason to the importance of the pilgrimage festivals to the Evangelist, and affirms that primarily the cycle of festivals would be complete if the three historic pilgrimage festivals were included.

The feast of Dedication would probably be included in the scheme of festivals, since it was primarily associated with the Temple, and was being referred back to the dedication of the Tabernacle in the wilderness for its historic meaning. One of the readings in the Synagogue, for the feast of Dedication is Numbers 7, the story of the dedication of that Tabernacle.41 It would tend to take on some of the associations of the ancient feasts, though it was late in

---

origin. It was sometimes called "Booths of Kislev" - an indication of its association with the feast of Booths, or Tabernacles.42

The Evangelist in the Fourth Gospel has given the sense of a complete summation of the Temple worship, by the use of a cycle of the pilgrimage feasts plus the feast of Dedication, in their proper order for one calendar year (from John 6:4 to John 12:1). This cycle is inclusive enough to represent the complete Temple worship. It is introduced by one earlier Passover, which stands as the occasion upon which the Evangelist's conviction about Jesus' relation to the Temple worship is presented.43

E. Reading Sections of the Gospel of John Related to the Festivals of the Jewish Calendar Year.

A suggestion of some relationship between the structure of the Gospel of John and the festivals of the Jewish Year is found in an analysis of the ancient chapter divisions found in some manuscripts. Carrington44 has studied these divisions in the Gospel of Mark, using the notations found in Codex Vaticanus (B), and determining also what he


43. See chapter IV.

believes to be an older system of divisions from manuscript details. Differences between these older systems and that of B are minor. Carrington has suggested that these divisions represent the old division into lections for an annual cycle of readings, associated with the festival year, and representing a time when there was but one gospel used for liturgical reading in a particular church.

The question presents itself: What relation can be found between the ancient chapter divisions of the Vaticanus in the Gospel of John and the Jewish Festival Year? The chapters are designated in Nestle's text and are in agreement with the divisions of Codex Zacynthius. It is assumed that the reading sections of the Gospel would begin with the first section at the beginning of the liturgical year, and continue through the year, one section each week. This would take, in the Jewish calendar, fifty or fifty-four readings, depending upon whether a month was intercalated or not. The annual cycle of the Pentateuch was made up of fifty-four readings. If it be assumed that the basic number of readings for the course of the year is fifty readings, with special readings added when there is a month intercalated, the first fifty sections of the Gospel may be tested to determine if they present

45. Nestle, E., GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, Sixteenth Ed., p. 27.
any scheme associated with the liturgical year. In the practice of the synagogue, the first section of the Pentateuch was begun for the new year on the day after the eighth day of Tabernacles. If this assumption is followed, it is found that the sequence of readings in the first fifty of the eighty reading sections of John bear no clear relationship to the observances of the festival year. If it be assumed, however, that the liturgical year of the Christian church found its beginning and end in its primary festival, Easter, it would be logical to assume that the reading of the sections for the course of the year would begin just after the Easter season, bringing the end of the fifty sections about just before the next Easter, and allowing the remaining thirty reading sections of the Gospel to constitute readings for special use during Holy Week. The following diagram is drawn up on this basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Week in Year</th>
<th>Observance</th>
<th>Reading Section</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Passover 15</td>
<td>49--John 14:1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 Passover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6 Pentecost</td>
<td>7--Marriage at Cana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8--Cleansing of Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Week in Year</td>
<td>Observance</td>
<td>Reading Section</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>15---Unnamed feast, 5:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>16---Feeding of 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15 Tabernacles</td>
<td>25---&quot;On the last day of the feast&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshvan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25 Dedication</td>
<td>34---&quot;It was the feast of Dedication&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebeth</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shebat</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14 Purim</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain associations are found in the above scheme:

1. The reading of the twenty-fifth reading section, John 7:37-43, describing Jesus' actions on the last day of the feast of Tabernacles coincides with the observance of that feast in the Jewish festival calendar. Either when
the feast of Tabernacles was being observed in Jerusalem, or when a Christian counterpart of it was being observed in the church this reading was read.

2. The reading of the thirty-fourth reading section, John 10:22-42, the discourse of Jesus on the occasion of the feast of Dedication, comes at the time in the year when the feast was celebrated in the Temple and the Synagogue, or when the Christian counterpart of this festival was being observed.

3. Reading section 8, John 2:12-22, the narrative of the cleansing of the Temple very nearly coincides with the feast of Pentecost. Although the event is related to the feast of Passover, it has implications for all the feasts (see chapter IV), and some reason may be seen for its reading particularly on this day.

4. The break in the Gospel of John at reading section 43 forms the most appropriate point for ending the telling of the ministry of Jesus, and introducing the Passion Story. The words, John 13:31 at the beginning of this section, "Now is the Son of man glorified..." close one whole section of the story, and open the final one. This would have been read on the last week before the beginning of the Easter season with which the new liturgical year began. In all probability, the first two weeks of the
year shown on the above diagram would have been characterized by special readings, and all the reading sections from 49 on through the end of the Gospel would be special material for the Easter season.

The above associations which appear between the reading sections of the Gospel and the Jewish festival calendar are too well ordered, especially 1 and 2 above, to be mere chance. The scheme is obviously incomplete, since there is no association at all with the unnamed feast of section 15 and the feeding of the five thousand in section 16, which are prominent festival occasions. Yet it seems that one must draw at least the conclusion that the positions of the feast of Tabernacles and the feast of Dedication in the Gospel as it has come to us, were at a very early period directly related to the place of the feasts in the calendar year. The scheme upon which this is based presupposes a time when the church using the lectionary of John, used only this Gospel in its liturgical system, a time which Carrington places at the early part of the second century. 46 It is not possible to tell whether the association of the sections with the festival calendar has resulted from the calendar exerting an influence upon the original

writer of the Gospel such that he made the association, or from a later editor who arranged the sections in this manner. It is perhaps sufficient to say that the evidence of these relationships is evidence someone perceived that the festivals in this Gospel were a theme which spoke clearly of the transformation of the cultus of Judaism wrought by Jesus.
A. The Old Testament Prescription of the Passover

Although in the time of the New Testament, the feast of Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread were considered as one,¹ they were probably different in origin. Since they fall together on the calendar, Passover on Nisan 14 and the days of Unleavened Bread on Nisan 15-21, it was inevitable that they should merge into one feast. They are not distinguished in the festal calendar of Deuteronomy 16:1-8 which legislation is the nearest to the observance of the holiday in the days of the Temple.

Since the calendar of feasts in Leviticus 23 became the standard of observance in Judaism,² we first take note of its prescriptions for Passover and Unleavened Bread. Leviticus 23:5-8 prescribes the Passover for the fourteenth day of the first month (Nisan) in the evening. The feast of Unleavened Bread is to be observed on the fifteenth of the month, for seven days, with the following

¹. Mark 14:1, see too Mark 14:12 where the day on which the Passover victim is slain is called, the First Day of Unleavened Bread.

particulars: for seven days unleavened bread shall be eaten, on the first and seventh days are holy convocations, on which no laborious work is done, and on all seven days, offerings shall be presented by fire.

Leviticus 23:9-14 prescribes the rite of the wave offering of the first sheaf of the harvest, which has been interpreted as taking place during the feast of Unleavened Bread, on the sixteenth of Nisan. Along with the offering of the sheaf, a male lamb with its accompanying cereal and drink offering is to be made. None of the grain from the harvest is to be eaten until the sheaf has been offered.

Another section of P, the "Priestly code", which lists the offerings to be made on festival occasions, Numbers 28:16-25, repeats this information, and adds that on each of the seven days of the feast, two bulls, one ram, seven male lambs and a goat, together with their cereal offerings shall be offered in addition to the regular morning burnt offerings.

In another passage from the Priestly and JE sources, Exodus 12:1-13:10 it is possible to see clear demarcations between the tradition for the Passover and that for the feast of Unleavened Bread. Exodus 12:1-13 refers to the Passover. It prescribes that on the tenth day of the month, the lamb is selected, one for each household, or
one for two households if they are small families. The victim is to be a sheep or a goat, without blemish, male, a year old. On the fourteenth of the month, all the people are to kill their animals "in the evening", taking some of the blood and smearing it on the doorposts of the house in which the feast is to be eaten. The animal is to be roasted and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs that night. It is all to be eaten that night, and any remaining in the morning is to be burned. The feast is to be eaten in haste, sandals on, staff in hand, loins girded. All this is told in the context of the preparation for the Exodus from Egypt. The blood on the doorposts is to be a sign for the Lord to "pass over" that house with the destroying plague.

From JE, Exodus 12:21-27 retells this same observance, with some added details: the blood of the sacrifice is to be caught in a basin, and a piece of hyssop is to be used to sprinkle the doorposts; the rite is to be continued by subsequent generations; and directions are given for telling the meaning of the service, "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, for he passed over the houses of the people of Israel in Egypt, when he slew the Egyptians but spared our houses." (Ex. 12:27)
In Exodus 12:43-50, from P, additional legislation for the Passover is given: no foreigners, sojourners, or hired servants may take part, unless circumcised; none of the flesh of the animal shall be taken out of the house, and no bone of it shall be broken.

In the sequence of the same narrative of the Exodus from Egypt, Exodus 12:14-20, and 13:3-10 relate the observance of Unleavened Bread to the same historic deliverance. This passage makes some changes over what was said in Leviticus 23: the putting out of all leaven from the houses on Nisan 14 is prescribed, and it is required to keep all leaven out for the seven days of the feast. These seven days, however, are from the evening of Nisan 14 (the evening on which the fourteenth began) until the evening of Nisan 21. Unless this expression "the twenty-first day of the month at evening" means actually the evening with which Nisan 22 began, the feast has been shortened one day in this account, by counting Nisan 14 as one of the days of Unleavened Bread. The practice which prevailed in Judaism, however, counted Nisan 15 through 21 as the days of Unleavened Bread.

Exodus 13:3-10 repeats the prescription of eating unleavened bread for seven days, and gives an explanation of how the feast shall be interpreted to the children: 13:8-9, "And you shall tell your son on that day, 'It is because of what the Lord did for me when I came out of Egypt.' And it shall be to you as a sign on your hand, and as a memorial between your eyes, that the law of the Lord may be in your mouth; for with a strong hand the Lord has brought you out of Egypt."

It is in Deuteronomy 16:1-8 that the provisions for the celebration of the Passover and Unleavened Bread in the central Temple are given. The legislation of Exodus, Numbers, and Leviticus in which each slays his Passover victim at his home, and eats the meal at home would not fit the pattern of a centralized worship in the Temple. The rite of Passover is centralized, by the directions of Deuteronomy 16:5 and 6 in which it is stated that the Passover meal cannot be eaten in any of the towns, but "at the place which the Lord your God will choose, to make his name dwell in it,". The sacrifice is to be made there also. Where it was prescribed in Exodus 12:9 that the animal should not be boiled, this is the method of preparation prescribed in Deuteronomy 16:7. Here, as in Exodus 12:18, Nisan (Abib) 14 through 20
appear to be the seven days of unleavened bread, for Dueteronomy 16:8 says, "For six days you shall eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day there shall be a solemn assembly to the Lord your God." Added to the other legislation, too, is the requirement that all males shall appear before the Lord "at the place which he will choose" which was interpreted as the Temple, for Unleavened Bread, Pentecost, and Tabernacles.

While the origins of these feasts are beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is apparent that we have in Passover and Unleavened Bread, two separate feasts — one of a nomadic people, and one of an agricultural people. The Passover ritual, in which the central feature is the sacrifice and eating of an animal, would be characteristic of nomads with wandering herds. The feast of Unleavened Bread, with abstention from the eating of leavened bread, and the presentation of the first sheaf of the barley harvest, would be typical of an agricultural people and practically impossible for nomads. But by the time the Penteteuch had reached its present state of development, both feasts had been reinterpreted as the feasts of the great historic deliverance of the people by their God.
B. The Observance of the Passover and Unleavened Bread in the Temple

In the first century of the Christian era, the feast was observed in a manner which attempted to follow the prescriptions of Exodus 12:14-20, and Deuteronomy 16:1-8, with the preference given to the Exodus version in cases where different actions might be directed, e.g., the victim was roasted, following Exodus 12:8, rather than boiled according to Deuteronomy 16:7. Although the Israelite was directed to select the animal for the feast on the 10th day of Nisan, this was taken as applying only to the "Passover of Egypt", and not binding the later Hebrews who celebrated the "Passover of the generations".  

Preparation for the feast would begin on the night of the 14th of Nisan (the evening preceding the day Nisan 14) with a search, by lamp, through the house for any Hametz, or food which might contain grain, and which might ferment.  

This rite could, according to some of the Rabbis, be carried out up to the time of the destruction of the Hametz. This was to be done at mid-day of Nisan 14. In order to signal the time for the burning of Hametz, two loaves which had been disqualified from the

Thank Offering were placed on the roof of the portico of the Temple. When one was removed, the people must stop eating Hametz; when the second was removed, all Hametz must be burned. At a later date, since it was difficult to see the two loaves, two kine were set to plowing on a hillside. When one was removed, Hametz must not be eaten; when the second was removed, it must be burned.

Since Passover was one of the pilgrimage festivals, many visitors would be in Jerusalem for the feast. Josephus records a crowd of some three millions at the Passover under Cestius, about A. D. 65. This is computed from the number of sacrifices slain, counted to be 255,600. The practical problems of the accommodation of such a crowd would be enormous, for there would be over eighty thousand victims to be killed in each sacrificial ritual in the Temple. It is possible that there is exaggeration in Josephus' figure. The evidence of the Mishnah, Pesahim 5:7 is against Josephus, since it is said that there never were enough victims to slaughter in the third group to require the Levites to get very far in the Hallel.

7. Schauss, H., THE JEWISH FESTIVALS FROM THEIR BEGINNINGS TO OUR OWN DAY, p. 52.
case, it was considered a miracle that all the people found lodging at the Holy City when they came up for Passover, in Mishnaic times. The meal at Passover was not to be eaten in just the family group, but was to be eaten in groups of ten or over. The animal to be used for the Passover was usually a lamb, but may frequently have been a kid, without blemish, a male, not more than a year old. Gray, in the passage cited above, believes that in earlier practice, the victim may have been an older sheep, but Rabbinic interpretation of \[\text{\text{n\text{\text{j}}\text{\text{w}}} \text{\text{j}}}\] has been "less than one year old."

On the fourteenth of Nisan, at about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the afternoon sacrifice having been moved up an hour for the Passover sacrifice, the first of three groups to sacrifice entered the temple Court of the Priests, and the gates were closed. The trumpets blew T'kioh T'ruoh T'kioh, whereupon each owner slew his own beast. The priests stood in rows with bowls, one row silver, the next gold, in which the blood of the beasts was caught and passed to the end of the row at the base of the altar where it was thrown on the base. During this, the Levites sang the Hallel (Ps. 113-118). After killing

10. Gray, G. B., SACRIFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT; see also Mishnah Pesahim 8:2.
the beast it was hung on hooks, or staves to be flayed, and the sacrificial portions were removed, put on a tray, and burned at the altar by the priest. This done, the first group went out of the court, and the second group entered for the same rite. If it were a Sabbath, the worshipers remained in the Temple grounds until sunset, and then went out to eat their meal. The beasts sacrificed were taken to the place where cooking was to be done, placed on skewers of pomegranate wood, and roasted.

The Israelite was not to eat anything from the time of the evening offering until the Passover meal, which started at nightfall. By the time of the Mishnah, the meal had become a long ceremony, since the Mishnah offers decisions on cases in which the participants fell asleep during the meal. It was eaten in comfort and leisure, contrary to the Exodus legislation.

The meal began with the first cup of wine, diluted, and the benedictions, "Blessed Art Thou, O Lord our God, who has created the fruit of the vine," and the blessing over the day, which has been reconstructed in this fashion: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, who hast chosen us from among all people, and exalted us from among all languages, and sanctified us with Thy commandments! And Thou hast given us, O Lord our God, in love, the solemn days for

joy, and the festivals and appointed seasons for gladness; and this the day of the feast of unleavened bread, the season of our freedom, a holy convocation, the memorial of our departure from Egypt. For us hast Thou chosen; and us hast Thou sanctified from among all nations and Thy holy festivals with joy and with gladness hast Thou caused us to inherit. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who sanctifiest Israel and the appointed seasons! Blessed art Thou, O Lord, King of the Universe, who hast preserved us alive and sustained us and brought us to this season. Edersheim suspects that this is a reconstruction of a prayer that may have been used, but that it is not necessarily the exact words.

Some of the food was brought before the group at this point, and following the lead of the head of the group, they eat lettuce, dipped in a tart liquid, or in some cases, salt water. The sacrificial animal is then served, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs dipped in Haroseth (a mixture of nuts and fruit pounded together and mixed with vinegar). It was generally agreed in the time of the Mishnah, that the Haroseth was not an obligatory rite, since it was primarily to render the bitter


herbs palatable. Rabbi Eliezer Ben Zadok II, c. 140 A.D. held the Haroseth to be an obligation. Following the second cup of diluted wine, the son of the household (later interpreted as the youngest son) asks his father, "Why is this night different from other nights? For on other nights we eat seasoned food once, but this night twice; on other nights we eat leavened or unleavened bread, but this night all is unleavened; on other nights we eat flesh roast, stewed, or cooked, but this night all is roast." In answer to the questions, the father explains the rites, "He begins with the disgrace and ends with the glory, and he expounds from A wandering Aramean was my father... until he finishes the whole section." The section is Deuteronomy 26:5-11, which in its context in the Bible, refers to the ceremony of bringing first fruits to the temple, but which recounts briefly, the deliverance from Egypt. The father explains, too, the elements of the meal, which explanation must include the following: Passover, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs. The explanation is to be given with each regarding himself as having come out of Egypt. The explanation ends with, "Therefore are we bound to give thanks, to praise, to glorify, to honor,

to exalt, to extol, and to bless him who wrought all these wonders for our fathers and for us. He brought us out from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a festival day, and from darkness to great light, and from servitude to redemption; so let us say before him the Hallelujah. The group recites then Psalms 113 and 114, though they did not recite clear through the six Psalms which made up the Hallel. This is concluded with the benediction, "He that redeemed us and redeemed our fathers from Egypt and brought us to this night to eat therein unleavened bread and bitter herbs," to which some added, "Therefore, O Lord our God and the God of our fathers, bring us in peace to the other set-feasts and festivals which are coming to meet us, while we rejoice in the building up of thy city and are joyful in thy worship; and may we eat there of the sacrifices and of the Passover-offerings whose blood has reached with acceptance the wall of thy Altar, and let us praise thee for our redemption and for the ransoming of our soul. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who has redeemed Israel!" This additional section is attributed to Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, c. 120 A.D., and would be different in form from

that benediction used during the time when the Temple was standing. It is probable, however, that some benediction suitable to the times was used, similar to this.

After the first part of the Hallel, a third cup of diluted wine was served, after a Benediction had been said over it. The fourth cup of diluted wine followed, over which was said the rest of the Hallel, Psalms 115-118, and the benediction, "All thy works shall praise Thee, O Lord, our God. And Thy saints, the righteous, who do Thy good pleasure, and all Thy people, the house of Israel, with joyous song let them praise, and bless, and magnify, and glorify, and exalt, and reverence, and sanctify, and ascribe the kingdom to Thy name, O our King! For it is good to praise Thee, and pleasure to sing praises unto Thy name, for from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. The breath of all that lives shall praise Thy name, O Lord our God. And the spirit of all flesh shall continually glorify and exalt Thy memorial, O our King! For from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God, and besides Thee we have no King, Redeemer or Saviour." 19

This is a later reconstruction of the benediction, which must be similar to the one actually used in the first century of the Christian era.

The Passover rite ended with the "Benediction over Song" reconstructed above. The participants were reminded not to disperse for revelry, since the sacred feast must not degenerate into ordinary merry-making. Josephus tells that after the meal many went out to the Mount of the Temple, for the Levites opened the gates, and the people spent the rest of the night praying and singing hymns of praise. 20

The day following the eating of the Passover was a Holy Convocation, as the first day of Unleavened Bread, Nisan 15. On this day no laborious work was to be done. The extra sacrifices ordained for the days of Unleavened Bread were sacrificed in the Temple.

On the 16th day of Nisan, the ceremony of "the Sheaf" was observed, derived from the legislation in Leviticus 23:10ff. The barley for the offering was to be reaped near Jerusalem, unless the crops there were not yet ripe enough. It could be brought from a distance in that case. Messengers from the Temple went out to the field in the afternoon of the fifteenth of Nisan, and tied the required amount of grain into bundles. When the sun had set, a crowd gathered for the reaping. The reapers called

out questions defining the practice, to which the people shouted answers, each question repeated three times: "Is the sun set?" and they answered, "Yea"; "Is this a sickle?" and they answered, "Yea"; "Is this a basket?" and they answered, "Yea"; "Shall I reap?" and they answered, "Reap". If the day were a Sabbath, an additional question inquired, "On this Sabbath?", and they answered, "Yea".

When it had been reaped, the grain was put into the baskets, and taken to the Temple Court, where it was parched and processed until it made meal. Of this meal, a tenth of an Ephah of flour was taken to be mixed with oil and frankincense. When offered in the Temple, the Omer (meal offering from the sheaf) was waved on the east side of the altar, and "brought near" on the west side. A handful was then taken out and offered as burnt offering, and the priests retained the remaining portion. The offering of the Omer was the signal which told that the produce from the new crop could now be consumed. For those who were far off from Jerusalem, it was permitted to eat of the new crop from midday onward, since "they knew that the court would not be dilatory therewith (the offering)". This suggests that the Omer ceremony took place normally in the morning of Nisan 16.

The days of the feast of Unleavened Bread between the 16th of Nisan and the 21st were celebrated as "minor festival-days", on which major laborious work could not be done, but that work necessary to the festival, or to prevent damage if postponed until after the festival could be done. The last day of the seven, Nisan 21, was again a holy convocation, a full festival day, on which no work was done, although no special ritual features marked the day, except the offering of the extra burnt offerings in the Temple, prescribed for each of the days of Unleavened Bread.

C. The Observance of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread in the Synagogue.

The legislation concerning the feasts, and the practices surrounding the celebration, were predicated upon the expectation that all male Israelites would be able to attend the feasts in Jerusalem. With the dispersion of Jews all around the countries of Asia Minor, and with the growth of the synagogue, some celebration of the feast in the local synagogue was indicated for those who could not attend the feast in the Temple. While it was still the hope of the good Hebrew that he should at some time be able to return to his homeland, to observe one Passover at the Temple, it was possible to participate in a revised
celebration of the festival, even in a foreign land, through a synagogue service which recalled the rites at the Temple, and through the observance of the parts of the festival which normally were associated with the home. Certain changes in the observance of the festival were necessary as a result of the different conditions of the synagogue worship and that of the Temple.

At the Passover, while it was possible to observe the rite at home, the meal and its explanations, the absence from the Temple made the sacrifice of the animal impossible. The offering of sacrifices outside Jerusalem was not allowed by the authorities in Jerusalem. The meal was prepared without this rite, and after a service in the synagogue, the supper was observed as before.22 Since a whole animal need not be used in this case, it became a later custom to use only a shank of the lamb, rather than the whole animal.

When the feasts were observed in the synagogue, it became practical to read to the congregation the portions of the scriptures which applied to the feast. This reading from the scriptures did not have a prominent place in the Temple service, probably because only a few could hear at a time. On two occasions, however, portions of

the scriptures were prescribed for public reading in connection with the feasts; on the feast of Tabernacles each seven years, the King read Deuteronomy, or selections from it, to fulfill the obligation of Deuteronomy 31:10; and on the Day of Atonement, the High Priest read Numbers 29:7-11. The readings for the festival days, set out in Mishnah Megillah 3:4-6 are found in the context of directions concerning a synagogue, although they may reflect practice which came from the Temple. The readings are brief, and include the sections which prescribed the major observance of the feast. These readings would represent the special readings of the synagogue, breaking into the normal cycle of reading from the Law, which brought the details of the festival observance to mind for those who could not attend at the Temple. In later times, the reading for the first day of Passover became Exodus 12:21-51, Numbers 28:16-25, and the Haftarah reading, Joshua 3:5-41. Readings of similar length were prescribed for the other days of the festival. These are a development in the synagogue, which had to substitute reading for the action of the Temple, but it is doubtful if the present lectionary of the synagogue goes back to any time near the beginning


of the Christian Era. If such a lectionary were established as early as that, the Mishnah would bear evidence of it.

In the dispersion, the difference in calendars which the Jews had to take into account in determining their feast days, and the unsettled state of the calendar, with its intercalated days at different times, brought about the custom of the celebration of the feast for an extra day in places outside Jerusalem. The Passover feast then, extended to eight days in the dispersion. The cessation from work, however, was observed only on the first two and the last two of the eight days.25

The days of Unleavened Bread remained a part of the observance of the Passover season even for those separated from the Temple, but the offering of the Omer could not retain its significance away from the agricultural community. The reading of the section Leviticus 23:10,11 would serve to remind people of the custom, but it would not have the prominent place it maintained in the Temple.

In the synagogue then, the observance of the Passover and the Days of Unleavened Bread would carry much of the same significance as the observance in the Temple, except that somewhat less emphasis would be placed upon those rites practiced only in the Temple, particularly the sacrifice and the offering of the Omer.

D. The Significance of the Feast of Passover
and Unleavened Bread

Although in the time of the beginning of the Christian Era, the feasts of Passover and Unleavened Bread had merged into one feast, it is possible in the rites attaching to the composite feast to observe themes which are connected primarily with the Passover meal, themes which are connected primarily with the offering of the Omer, and the eating of unleavened bread, and a theme which accounts partially for the merging of the two feasts into one.

The Passover Meal. The essential rite which attached to the feast of Passover, was from the beginning, however that may be obscured by later interpretations, the meal eaten by a group together. As this meal appears in the accounts Exodus 12:1-13 and 21-27, and Deuteronomy 16:2-7, it bears some resemblance to the shepherd rites of the sacrifice of the firstlings, to which it may be related in origin. But for the significance of the meal to the Jewish people of the beginning of the Christian Era, this possible origin has no influence. As the Passover was celebrated in the last days of the Temple, according to the Mishnah, there were actually two aspects to the rite; the sacrifice of the victim, and the eating of the meal. A third aspect, the use of unleavened bread in the
meal, probably finds its origin in the agricultural rites of Unleavened Bread, and is found in the Passover meal because it migrated there as a result of the association of the two feasts together.

The sacrifice of the Passover victim was different from the sacrifices which were regularly made in the Temple each day. In this sacrifice, the individual Israelite took part as the slayer of the victim, not as a distant onlooker. Yet something of the sacrificial character of the regular temple sacrifices would attach to this sacrifice as well.

Behind the sacrifices in general, were the ideas of presentation of a gift to God, and of the establishing of a communion between the worshipper and God. Gray has demonstrated that in Hebrew thought as evidenced in the terminology of the sacrifices, in the kind and manner of the sacrifices offered to God, and in the criticism of the prophets against a shallow materialistic view of the sacrifices, the predominating thought of sacrifice was that of a gift presented to God. This thought can be illustrated by implication from some of the passages which sought to correct an erroneous idea of the sacrifices. Psalm 50:12-14 repudiates the idea of the sacrifices as

gifts of food for God to eat, and substitutes for gifts of food, the giving of thanks:

"If I were hungry, I would not tell you; for the world and all that is in it is mine.
Do I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?
Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and pay your vows to the Most High;"
The passages in the prophets, in which the sacrificial system is held up for criticism, Isaiah 1:10-17, Jeremiah 7:21f, Hosea 6:4-6, Amos 4:4 and 5:21f, Micah 6:6-8, protest against the assumption that the great and costly gifts will so impress the Lord, that nothing else is required. The argument of the prophets is essentially an argument in favor of gifts to God of justice, mercy, and ethical conduct. This is a substitution of one kind of gift for another, which does not call into question the presupposition that the idea of a gift is to be associated with the sacrifices which one makes to God. The gift of a different character, the self-sacrifice which is costly to the giver, though of questionable value to God, could lead to the idea of fasting as sacrifice.  

Although the ideas of expiation and propitiation were connected with some occasional sacrifices in Israel's system of religion, the predominating idea at the great festivals was the thought of gratitude, and joy in the bringing of gifts. Gray has shown, too, that it was in the first century that the idea of the sacrifices as material gifts for God reached its greatest vitality.

In the Passover sacrifice, however, the gift significance is minimized by the fact that the victim is not offered on the altar, but is retained, except for small portions, to be eaten by the group at the meal later. In addition to this, the gathering legalism of the first century would stress the carrying out of the rite, simply because it was commanded by God, e.g. Sirach 35:4 and 5, "Appear not with empty hands in the presence of the Lord, for all this (shall be done) because it is commanded."

The sacrifice of the Passover victim was necessary in part because some feature of the rites of the feast had to call attention to the blood ritual which was an integral part of the "Egyptian Passover", of the night before the Exodus. The blood ritual connected with the "Egyptian Passover", the smearing of blood of the victim on the doorposts, was taken in the time of Mishnah, as applying

only to the first Passover. When the sacrifices were centralized in Jerusalem, under the Deuteronomic legislation, it became impossible to carry out any such ritual. Yet because of the significance attaching to the blood of the Passover victim, something must be done with it. Beside this was the practical problem in the sacrifice of so many animals at once, of the disposition of the blood. This ritual, along with the offering of the fat parts and certain of the entrails, gave something of the appearance of an offering to God of the victim, which would yet be available for the meal following. There is no clear significance attached to the sacrifice of the Passover lamb, which would make this part of the observance of the festival a dominant part. It was probably looked upon generally as simply the approved manner for the preparation of the Passover victim.

The Passover meal itself was an event which was rich in significance, as a continuing sign of the covenant relationship between God and Israel in history, and of the consequent hope for future redemption. The groups in which the meal was eaten, originally the family, were in the time of the beginning of the Christian Era made-up groups which


must number over ten, but all of whom must be Israelites. No foreigners could participate in this rite (Exodus 12:43) since it was the sign of the particular covenant made with Israel.

The interpretation of the Passover rites in response to the question of the son of the household, or one of those present, brings for the reply from the leader of the group, "A wandering Aramean was my father,..." (Deut. 26:5ff). In this passage the story of the affliction of Israel in Egypt, and of God's redeeming them is told in the first person, so that each Israelite may consider himself as having been redeemed from Egypt. The significance attributed to the components of the meal, too, point to the Exodus from Egypt: the unleavened bread - because of the haste of the Israelites leaving Egypt; the bitter herbs - the bitterness of the Jewish lot there; the Haroseth - the mortar which the Israelites were forced to mix because they were slaves in Egypt. This event in which the Israelites were brought out from captivity and slavery, was the act of God which gave concrete evidence of His initiative in the making of the covenant with the nation. In Jeremiah 31:32 the making of this covenant is


32. Schauss, H., THE JEWISH FESTIVALS, p. 44; Rosenau, Wm., JEWISH CEREMONIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CUSTOMS, p. 119.
described in this way: "...not like the covenant which I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." Here the Exodus from Egypt is God's act in making the covenant. On Israel's part, the acceptance of the covenant relation is on Sinai, when the commandments are given. With the stress on the first person in the explanation of the rite, the significance becomes, "This redemption from bondage is your past experience with God, and your present relationship with Him." The significance of the four cups of wine at the meal, according to later interpretation, shows this same meaning. The cups correspond to the four expressions of redemption used in the Bible in Exodus 6:6-7, the story of Israel's liberation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{יְָהָנֵנָה} & \text{ I have brought forth,} \\
\text{יְָהָנָי} & \text{ I have redeemed,} \\
\text{יֹ֥תְנָנָי} & \text{ I have delivered, and} \\
\text{יְָהָנָי} & \text{ I have taken.}^{33}
\end{align*}
\]

From the past and present assurance of the Israelite's relation to God, must come the question about the future. In the Passover meal are significant acts which tell of the future hope of this covenant relationship. In the rite,

33. Rosenau, Wm., JEWISH CEREMONIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CUSTOMS, p. 119.
the Hallel is sung, Psalms 113-118. After a section on the establishment of the covenant relation in the Exodus, Ps. 114:1 and 2, "When Israel went forth from Egypt... Judah became his sanctuary, Israel his dominion." The Psalm ends on a note of firm assurance that the Lord is yet working in the world, verse 7, "Tremble, O earth, at the presence of the Lord." The Hallel ends with the Psalm of the continuance of the covenant love (דֹּנַי), Psalm 118. It is at verse 25 of this Psalm that the future hopes of salvation for Israel were expressed, "Save us (or Save now, אֶלַּי הַעֲשְׂרִיתָהּ) we beseech Thee, O Lord! O Lord! we beseech thee, give us success!" This passage was the center of great ceremony at the feast of Tabernacles, when the lulabs were waved at this particular verse, with great joy, as the expression of great hope at immediate deliverance. The verse is interpreted as the hope of future salvation in its use in the Mark 9:9 and John 12:13 in the story of the triumphal entry. In this use, the thought behind the cry is, in John 12:13; the hoped for king of Israel is here, ready to save the people from bondage. It is probable that this verse found such use in Christian thought because there already were eschatological associations with it. The waving of the lulab was associated, in later thought among the Jews, with the bringing of
the Messianic salvation. The application of the thoughts of the *Hallel* to the participants in the Passover meal, then, would lead to hope for the coming of redemption through the Messiah, or through God's intervention. As the Palestinian Jews of the first Christian century, would have eaten the meal in a context of political bondage, in which there was great desire for the end of the oppressive Roman rule among some parties, the immediate need for physical redemption in the form of political freedom, would be intense. This tended to emphasize the immediacy of their hope. The central thought of the feast, and of the meal, became that of deliverance of the nation soon. God would bring Israel out of bondage now, as He had in the time of Moses, and it was believed that this would come about on Passover eve.

The future hopes associated with the Passover meal are shown by another symbolic act which attached itself to the meal, but which is of later origin than the first Christian century. At the meal, an extra cup is filled with wine, but not used. The cup is set for Elijah, whose

---


hoped-for coming is to precede the coming of the Messiah. The "Elijah Cup" is based upon the remark at Malachi 4:5, "Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes.", and the consequent widespread expectation that Elijah must precede the Messiah. That this thought was commonly held in the first Christian century is shown by the questions put to John the Baptist in John 1:21, and 1:25 which presume that Elijah must precede the Christ. So also in the synoptic gospels, Mt. 11:14, 1:10, and Mark 6:15 and 9:12 take for granted the prevalence of the thought that Elijah would be an immediate forerunner of the Messiah. Although the custom is not known to have been practiced in the first Christian century, the belief which it was to express was current in that age.

2. Unleavened Bread and the Offering of the Sheaf:
The agricultural aspects of the observances at the spring festival form a pattern around the theme of the end of the previous year, with its old crops, and the coming of a new year by the agricultural reckoning. The first part of the observance of the whole holiday was the search for any leavened material, or hametz in the house. This

follows the rule of Exodus 12:16 and 12:19. In all the Old Testament prescriptions about the unleavened Bread, the rite is associated with the memorial of the day the Israelites were brought out of Egypt. But there is little actual connection between the search for hametz and the memorial.37 Originally this act, and the eating of unleavened bread, were connected with the end of the old season, the cleansing out of all that was left over, and the making of a new beginning with the new agricultural season. The process of fermentation was thought to be unholy, and therefore was forbidden during the holy period of the observance. Nothing of this significance, however, is left in the search for hametz in connection with the feast, by the time of the first Christian century. This is carried out because it is commanded. The benediction recited at the search for leaven shows that the command to obey is the primary motive of the rite: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, who has sanctified us by Thy commandments, and commanded us to remove the leaven."38

37. Schultz, H.; OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY, Vol. II, p. 366. Exodus 12:34 explains a connection with the Exodus, but one which does not fully cover the actual ceremony.

38. Edersheim, A., THE TEMPLE, p. 188.
The abstention from any leavened bread, like the search for hametz, was carried out primarily because it was commanded. In Philo, however, we have an interpretation of the meaning of the unleavened bread which, while probably not a current interpretation which prevailed in Judaism or early Christian circles, suggests lines of thought that were present in these circles in the first Christian century. He mentions the connection of the unleavened bread with the Exodus, and immediately passes on to interpret the observance at great length on a very different basis.\(^{39}\) As the spring season is the time when the corn (barley) is unripe, an imperfection of the fruit belonging to the future, the unleavened bread is also imperfect, but bearing a promise of the hope that nature is preparing her gifts. He also associates the spring festival with Creation, the time near which the first inhabitants of earth would have taken all the gifts of the universe in their unperverted state. Unleavened bread is, to Philo, food in its purest state. It is artistry which makes leavened bread palatable, but the gift of nature is the pure, unleavened bread. Thus the "old-time life" associated with the time of creation, is symbolized by the unleavened bread. The significance of the feast of

Unleavened Bread in this school of thought is the promise of food, and by extention, the promise of all things necessary for life, of which the dawn of the new season is the first suggestion.

The offering of the sheaf of new grain on the second day of Unleavened Bread, Nisan 16, is by its nature, an agricultural rite, not associated with the deliverance from Egypt. It has within it the symbolism of the first-fruits, offered regularly by individuals as a sign of their thanksgiving for the produce, and the symbolism of the removal of a taboo on the consumption of the new crops until an offering had been made to the Lord. It differed from the first-fruit offering, which was brought in the manner prescribed in Deuteronomy 26:1-11, in that it was a communal offering, and was efficacious for all Jews anywhere in the world. Why the offering of the sheaf should release the crop for consumption is lost in the origin of the rite, and the simple idea of "taboo" is not sufficient to explain it. It may be surmised that the new crop was considered not entirely the property of the Israelite who sowed and reaped, but the property also of God. Gaster expresses this thought in describing the relation of God

and man as not master and servant "but of mutually dependent partners in a joint enterprise of continuous creation." 42

This may be an overstatement of the case, but it does offer a possible reason for the offering of the sheaf and the release of the crops thereafter. For most of Judaism in the first Christian century, this observance was carried on because it was commanded, if the absence of good explanations for it is any indication. Philo, however, finds this presentation an event of great meaning. He devotes as much explanation to it as he does to all the rest of the spring festival. He emphasizes that the sheaf is offered on behalf of the whole world, as a means of supplication, with Israel performing the duty of priest for the world. 43 It is also a thanksgiving offering for the Jews' own land, since they have a land of their own, it is good soil and produces crops and animals, and it was a rich land when first taken by the Jews. It is a thanksgiving for the fertility and abundance which the nation and the whole human race desires to enjoy. 44 Since one must give thanks to a benefactor, it is necessary to offer

42. Gaster, T. H., FESTIVALS OF THE JEWISH YEAR, p. 60.
the sheaf before partaking of the food grown. This part of the feast is a world-wide agricultural thanksgiving, anticipating the later offerings of first-fruits of the various kinds of grain and produce. Josephus considers the offering of the sheaf, a thanksgiving for the harvest, which has not been eaten until then, "esteeming it right first to do homage to God, to whom they owe the abundance of these gifts..."45

3. The Time of the Year: It is perfectly understandable that the agricultural thanksgiving at the beginning of the first harvest of the year should take place in the spring, at about the spring equinox. This is the time when the promise of growth again becomes apparent in the world of nature. The springing to life of nature is commonly a theme of spring festivals, e.g. the Phrygian festival of spring, at which with mirth and revelry the god was awakened from his winter slumber.46 If the theme of the Passover feast, the redemption from bondage be considered, it is seen that this theme too, has much in common with the theme of nature, or the changes in the season. The section of the Mishnah giving the theme of the meal states


the theme in this way: "He brought us out from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a Festival-day, and from darkness to great light, and from servitude to redemption;"\textsuperscript{47} The expressions used in apposition to "from bondage to freedom" are expressions which well describe the spiritual rebirth which is symbolized by the spring season. Spring is the time when the darkness of winter is gone and the light of spring is appearing. This theme is so much a part of the Passover season, that in later times in the synagogue, the Song of Songs was interpolated into the regular devotions, largely because of the verse, "for lo, the winter is past," (Song of Songs 2:11) and because the Rabbis taught that this book speaks of the espousal of Israel "the beloved" and God, "the lover" which took place at the first Passover.\textsuperscript{48} Since the theme of the Passover meal is so readily compatible with the spring season, and the theme of Unleavened Bread is in a similar manner related to this time of year, it is difficult to conceive of these feasts coming at different times in the year. If in some earlier period, they were separated by some small period, it was inevitable that they should come together. They express the same theme in widely varying symbols.

\textsuperscript{47} Mishnah Pesahim 10:5, Danby, H., p. 151.

\textsuperscript{48} Rosenau, Wm., \textsc{Jewish Ceremonial Institutions and Customs}, p. 81.
The association of the Passover meal with the spring time of the year, suggests that the emphasis of the feast is not so much the remembering of the past for its own sake, but the recalling of that event which holds great hope for the future. For this reason it is the great feast of freedom, the time when God brings the new life in the natural world from the darkness of winter, and when He brings His people from the darkness of bondage to the light of freedom.

E. The Feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread in the Church of the New Testament.

The early church, stemming primarily from the synagogues, e.g. Acts 19:9, did not at first feature itself as distinct from the Jewish practices, but continued the Jewish worship with certain Christian insights. That the Gentile converts should wonder how much of the Jewish law was to be kept by them, and the instruction to continue some Jewish regulation in eating (Acts 15:22-29) should be given them, indicates the attitude of continuing a connection with the Jewish tradition. That the Easter festival in the later Christian Church grew out of the Passover celebration is obvious. At first the feast in the Christian Church was kept on the same date as the Passover, Nisan 14, whatever day of the week it might be. Roman
Christians, however, apparently reflecting the acceptance of the Sadducean method of determining the day for the offering of the Omer, kept the Easter feast from Friday to Sunday, to assure that the Resurrection Day always occurred on Sunday. The former group, called the "Quatrodecimans" traced their authority back to the Bishop Polycarp, who was said to have heard the Apostle John. It is from the Gospel of John that the importance of the relation of the time of the Resurrection to the offering of the Omer is presented, since the synoptic gospels do not place the Resurrection at the time of that offering but one day later.

The interpretation of the Passover in Christian terms was found to have produced two different ideas in the Church of the New Testament. The first of these ideas was that the Last Supper was a Passover meal in origin. Mark's Gospel is written with this identification apparently in mind. Mark 14:12 calls the day upon which the Last Supper was to be eaten, "...the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the Passover lamb." This is a possible description of the day, Nisan 14, which might be thought of as a day of Unleavened Bread, due to a complete merging of the Passover and Matzoth feasts.

The disciples, in this passage, are asking about the preparation of the Passover meal for that evening. In verse 17 the meal is begun, actually on Nisan 15 since the new day had started at sunset, several hours after the Paschal lambs had been slain. Late that night, Mark 14:53, they have arrested Jesus and all the priests are assembled (though the day must be a Holy Convocation when such an assembly would be forbidden). The time of the death of Jesus, Mark 15:34, would be at the ninth hour of Nisan 15, and the day is called "the day of Preparation, that is the day before the sabbath" which would make Nisan 16 the sabbath. The day of the Resurrection would be Nisan 17, the following day, or in Mark 16:2, "the first day of the week." By this chronology, which is common to the synoptic gospels, the point is made that the Last Supper was the Passover, but the account is not compatible with Jewish practice regarding Nisan 15. It practically obscures the possibility of regarding Jesus as "the Paschal lamb". In the Markan version, it seems that the writer has ignored the fact that Nisan 15 was a Holy Convocation, with the same rules concerning labor as the sabbath. V. Taylor considers the inconsistencies found in the account, and, while recognizing that exceptions could explain many of them, concludes that it is easier to assume that the Crucifixion did not occur on Nisan 15.50

The other idea of the early Church, different from that above, was that Jesus was the Paschal lamb, and that he died at the time when the victims were slain for the Passover. This identification is made by Paul, I Corinthians 5:7 "...For Christ our Paschal lamb has been sacrificed". In I Peter 1:19, the blood of Christ is said to be "... like that of a lamb without blemish or spot," a characteristic of the Paschal lamb, as well as of other sacrifices. It would be awkward to consider Jesus the Paschal lamb who had died just twenty-four hours after the time when the victims were sacrificed. With this idea was the thought that in the Resurrection, Jesus was the first-fruits, as the Omer was of the harvest. Paul so identifies Jesus in I Corinthians 15:20 and 23. This identification would be awkward, if the actual time of the Resurrection were just twenty-four hours after the usual time of offering of the Omer, as the synoptic chronology would have it. The importance of this association with the offering of the Omer is shown in the development of the controversy over the date of Easter, derived from the Judaistic controversy over the date of offering the Omer. In the Fourth Gospel, the chronology agrees with the latter idea, identifying Jesus with the Paschal lamb and the Omer, and making the Last Supper precede the regular time for the Passover meal, though in this Gospel it is very different in form from
the Last Supper of the synoptic tradition. The Lord's Supper, however, in John is not lost, since the teachings of John 6:1-65 associate it with the Passover.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{51} See chapter IV, section C.
THE TEACHING OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN
IN THE LIGHT OF THE PASSOVER

The feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread is mentioned in connection with three sections of the Fourth Gospel: 2:13-25, 6:4-71 and 11:55 - 20:18. These will be examined to determine to what extent the significance of the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread is an essential element in the acts and discourses recorded in each of the sections.

A. John 2:13-25: The cleansing of the Temple in the Fourth Gospel is told briefly, but in two parts: 2:13-16 the setting and the act of Jesus, and 2:17-22 a further conversation which makes clear the meaning of the previous action. Since it is Passover season, the Temple is full of those who provided the animals necessary for the purifications necessary for preparing for the Passover. "In the Temple..." (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) would indicate the Temple and the outer grounds, as opposed to ναὸς, the Inner Temple. Making a whip out of cords, Jesus drove out of the Temple area those who

sold animals, changed money and those who sold pigeons, with the words, "Take these things away; you shall not make my Father's house a house of trade." (\.\ä rape \δικον ταύτα ἐντεύθεν μη ποιεῖτε τὸν θ ν πατρός μου δικόν ἐμπροσθόν). This saying is similar to Zechariah 14:21, "there shall be no more tradesman (Συγκεκριμένης) in the house of the Lord". The words certainly do not represent a quotation of the Septuagint, as the word Συγκεκριμένης is rendered Χαιρικάιος in that version. The Evangelist is capable, however, of quoting with the Hebrew version against the Septuagint, as in John 19:37.2 The passage is not a quotation, but is probably suggested by Zechariah. Thus far the event could be interpreted as the same event in the synoptic gospels might. For example, Mark 11:15-17 tells almost the same story, except with the quotation, in the mouth of Jesus, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? But you have made it a den of robbers." The first part of the quotation is from Isaiah 56:7. The difference between the two quotations, that from Isaiah and that from Zechariah, is very small, and does not change the interpretation of the event. The protest of the act and the words is against the misuse of the Temple. Those who are trading in the Temple are to be

driven out because this was not a proper act in the Temple, which should be a place of prayer. Even though it be the Messiah coming to his Temple, he comes to correct the abuses, not to supersede the worship, in the synoptics. Here the Fourth Gospel contributes an explanation of the event which is missing in the synoptic gospels.

In verse 17, the Evangelist includes the reaction of the Disciples to the cleansing of the Temple. They associate the event with the quotation from Psalm 69:9, "For zeal of thy house has consumed me." The action of Jesus was certainly a zealous action with reference to the Lord's house, and on this basis the quotation may be seen to be appropriate to the description of the event. This would be using the quotation from the Old Testament in the manner commonly found in Rabbinic literature. The most vague similarity of ideas or words in a passage to the case at hand is sufficient to justify quotation, even though the scripture passage may have a very different meaning in its original context. For example, in the Mishnah, Shabbath 9:2, Isaiah 61:11, "For as the earth bringeth forth her bud and as the garden causes the seeds sown in it to spring forth," is quoted to justify by scripture, the sowing of many kinds of seeds in one garden bed. So too, the Gospel of Matthew makes such use of the Old Testament, e.g., 2:5. The Fourth
Evangelist, however, seldom uses Old Testament texts in this fashion. Psalm 69 figures prominently in the Old Testament testimonies to the fact that Jesus was the Christ. In John 15:25, "They hated me without cause," is a deliberate statement of the fulfillment of the passage in Psalm 69:4. At John 19:29 the bowlful of sour wine, or vinegar, ( ὀξος ) is associated with the description of Psalm 69:21, "they gave me vinegar to drink." In the mind of the Evangelist, this quotation from the Psalm which had such Messianic significance, must bear with it some of the connotations of the other parts of the Psalm. Appropriate to the occasion of the cleansing of the Temple would be Psalm 69:22, "Let their own table before them become a snare; let their sacrificial feasts be a trap." This questions not merely the abuse of the sacrificial system, but even the efficacy of the normal use of the system. The outcome of the discussion in John 2:17-22 affirms that this association would be in keeping with the argument of Jesus on this occasion. The theme of Psalm 69 is that of the righteous person, true to God, who is persecuted because of his loyalty to the Lord. It is particularly a theme of the Fourth Gospel, e.g., John 8:40, "...but now you seek to kill me, a man who has

told you the truth which I heard from God..." The quotation in John uses the future of the verb, "will consume me" according to most texts, although some show the aorist, "has consumed me." The Septuagint shows similar variants at this point, with the weight of manuscript evidence favoring the aorist. The future, however, is so much more in keeping with the Evangelist's meaning here that he may well have used freedom in quoting. The meaning of the passage would not be simply, "I have done this because I love the purity of the Temple," but, viewing the present act of cleansing as an example of what should finally occur in the Crucifixion and Resurrection, "I will be devoured because of my love of the purity of the Lord's worship." The cleansing of the Temple, with this quotation in comment upon it, cannot be taken as a reform of the Jewish sacrificial system, but must be seen as a sign, with a meaning beyond that of the historic event. The further discussion recorded in verses 18-22 brings out explicitly the meaning of the sign. "The Jews," not those driven out, but the representatives of the Temple and its worship, require of Jesus a sign, as his authority to act. The answer is, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." 4

The answer is ambiguous: both ἀνει and ἐγείρειν can be used of buildings as well as of human life. The Jews take the former sense, characterized by unbelief, as is their place in the Fourth Gospel. The Evangelist, however, comments, "But he spoke of the temple of his body," to give the interpretation of the enigmatic saying. The sense of the answer of Jesus then may be, "Destroy this body, and in three days I will arise," or by a mixture of the literal and figurative meanings, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise this body from the dead, i.e. to take its place." The "body of Christ" and the "Temple of God" certainly were already connected in Christian tradition. The former sense of the answer, "Destroy this body, and in three days I will raise it up," is the meaning to be emphasized here; that is, in Jesus' person is the answer to the query for a sign. Jesus himself is the Temple which the Jews will destroy, and he will as soon raise up the new. Now, in the destiny of Jesus, the eschatological consummation happens. The "sign" which

Jesus gives as the authority for his action in the Temple, is an appeal to the fact that in his person the final purpose of God in all the Temple worship, sacrifices and purifications is fulfilled. If the Jews understood his answer in verse 19 as he meant it, they would have the answer to their search for a sign. We have in the interpretation of the sign which Jesus gives, too, an explanation of what supersedes the Temple worship which Jesus is challenging. In the synoptic gospels it may be taken that he is reforming the practices of the Temple, to purify them. In the Fourth Gospel, we are left with the unmistakeable idea that the sacrifices, and the Temple system themselves are ended. The question must arise, with what is the old worship supplanted? The Old Testament prophets, telling of "that day" when all nations shall worship at Zion, speak of a purification of the Temple rites, and a spiritual apprehension of religion, "I will put my law within them, I will write it on their hearts," (Jeremiah 31:33). But this sign of the cleansing of the Temple goes beyond that. All that was symbolized by the Temple, all that the sacrificial system could do, was not now purified, but superseded, fulfilled beyond the prophet's descriptions, in the person of Jesus.
The cleansing of the Temple stands at the beginning of Passion week in the synoptic tradition, although it may have been received in the tradition unconnected to any chronological time in Jesus' life. The motive for which the Fourth Evangelist has placed it at the beginning of his Gospel, however, is abundantly clear from the above interpretation. It stands as the introduction to what Jesus will do in respect to the whole Jewish festival system. In the passages following this, where the other feasts are mentioned, more detailed accounts will be given of how Jesus supersedes the old religion. This first Passover stands outside the cycle of feasts found in the Fourth Gospel, for it is introductory to that complete cycle. The next festival reference will be to the Passover again at 6:4 in the revised order, the beginning of the annual cycle for which Jesus' relation to the cultus will be shown.

It must now be asked, what is the relationship of the Passover to the event which takes place in John 2:13-22? The cleansing of the Temple was apparently associated with the Passover feast in the tradition of the synoptic gospels, as in each the event takes place as the crowds are gathering for the last Passover of Jesus' ministry, Mark 11:15, Matt. 21:12-13, Luke 19:45-46. John associates
the event with a Passover which would be, in all probability, the feast two years before the final Passover. The setting at Passover time is essential to the event, no other occasion fitting it as well. The crowds at Passover, and the necessary temporary merchandising arrangements for providing what they needed, are the necessary situation into which the prophet speaks. The situation must be Passover, because at the time of Jesus no other feast so represented the whole religious system of the Israelites, and at the same time would be so associated with the sacrifice of Jesus in the mind of the Christian. While Tabernacles, the great fall festival, might provide a setting with great crowds in the Temple, the association with the "raising up" of the Christ would be more remote. The Passover season is part of the "sign" which lies below the surface in this historic event, and contributes to the interpretation of the event.

With respect to the feast of Passover itself, the cleansing of the Temple carries an implication, in that it presents a substitute for the sacrificial animals involved in that feast. In the first part of the act, Jesus drives out the animals, and those who were providing materials for the observances of the feast, but does not offer any suggestion of the elimination of the Temple itself.
In the conversation following the act, if the words, "Destroy this temple..." refer primarily to the body of Jesus, the actual elimination of the Temple is not meant. It is the replacement of the observance which takes place in the Temple which is signified. That which replaces the sacrifice of the feast is the person of Jesus. That he was the replacement for the sacrificial victim is the thought of Paul in I Corinthians 5:7, "...For Christ our Paschal Lamb has been sacrificed." The sign is that of the culmination of the Passover sacrifice, specifically, as well as of the end in general of the sacrificial system. In John 6:4ff the Evangelist takes up the fulfillment and replacement of the other elements in the Passover rites, but at this point he has been concerned with the sacrifice only. It may be concluded that in the event of the cleansing of the Temple, the Evangelist has not used the Passover merely as a means of dating the event in a chronological scheme, but that the feast has entered fully into the meaning of the event.

(B) John 6:1-71: The feeding of the five thousand, with the discourse upon the theme, "The Bread of Life" occupies the major part of chapter 6 of the Fourth Gospel, with only verses 16-25 as an interlude. It is apparent that the Fourth Evangelist is following either
the Gospel of Mark, or the tradition from which Mark took his material for this episode. Details of the event, according to Mark 6:30-7:23 are as follows:

(1) Jesus and the disciples are away from people in Galilee, when a great crowd gathers.

(2) There is no source of food near.

(3) The disciples are challenged to give the crowd food, which they cannot do.

(4) They estimate that two hundred denarii worth of bread is needed.

(5) Five loaves and two fish are available for food.

(6) After blessing the loaves and fishes, Jesus gives them to the disciples for distribution.

(7) All had sufficient to eat.

(8) Twelve baskets full of broken pieces were left.

(9) Five thousand partook.

Immediately following, in Mark, is the miraculous walking on the sea which adds the following sequence.

(10) The disciples leave by boat for the west side of the lake, and become distressed in a storm.

(11) Jesus comes to them in the boat, walking on the sea, and immediately their fear is ended.

(12) Crowds follow Jesus, after word of the miracles.
(13) Pharisees gather for a controversy over cleanness and uncleanness with respect to eating and to foods.

(14) Jesus teaches that defilement is not the result of receiving unclean things, such as foods, but of moral evil from within.

Not only does the general course of the feeding of the crowd, the journey across the lake, and the subsequent controversy in John follow the sequence of Mark's narrative as described above except for (2), but certain details mentioned identify the two stories as one event: two hundred denarii (\( \text{διακοσίων} \ \text{δηλερίων} \)) would be required, Mark 6:37 and John 6:7; five loaves of bread and two fish are available for food, Mark 6:38 and John 6:9; twelve baskets of pieces were left over, Mark 6:43 and John 6:13; there were five thousand in the crowd, Mark 6:44 and John 6:10; the people sit upon the grass, Mark 6:39 and John 6:10. The geographical setting of the events is generally the same in the two accounts, Mark placing the feeding near Bethsaida, the crossing of the sea to Gennesaret, and John placing the feeding "on the other side of the sea of Tiberias" and the crossing of the lake to Capernaum, which would be in the vicinity of Gennesaret, which was a locality, not a town. The two gospels, then, are telling of the same event.

The differences which are found in the Johannine narrative, compared to the synoptic narrative, of the
feeding of the five thousand, are notable. It is in these that the particular reference to the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread is of importance. Although from the reference to the "green grass" in Mark 6:39 one might conclude that this was the springtime of the year, there is no association of the event in Mark with the Passover. John 6:4 however states explicitly, "Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand". Hort questions the original presence of ὁ πρόσκευμα in this verse, on the basis of silence of the early Fathers with regard to it, but finds evidence only to list it as a suspected reading. There is no actual manuscript evidence to suspect it, however. On other grounds, the reading may be suspected, since it would be most unusual to find Jesus, his disciples, and a large crowd here on a Galilean hillside at the time of the Passover. Yet this may be exactly the point which the Evangelist is making here. In the old religious system, it was necessary at Passover to go to Jerusalem for the sacrifice and the meal. Now the presence which is necessary for the Passover, is not in the Temple and its cultus, but with the person of Jesus, wherever he may be. If the cleansing of the Temple at the previously


mentioned Passover be taken as a sign of the present fulfillment and replacement of the sacrificial system by the Son of Man, the setting of a subsequent Passover away from the Temple, but in company with Jesus would be logical. It is an application of the teaching in the discourse with the Samaritan woman, "Woman believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father...But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth..." (John 4:21,23). It will be shown that the action and discourse on the occasion, the feeding of the five thousand, are to be understood only in the light of the Passover feast. These things being true, it is most probable that the mention of the Passover in verse 4 is intentional, and part of the Johannine Evangelist's particular teaching with respect to the narrative.

In the Fourth Gospel, in comparison to Mark's version of the feeding of the five thousand, the initiative of Jesus is emphasized.10 In Mark 6:35 and 36 it is the presence of hunger, mentioned by the disciples that brings about the feeding; in John, the feeding of the multitude would appear to have been deliberately initiated by Jesus,

without mention of the pressure of hunger. In Mark, the disciples distribute the food; in John it is Jesus who directly distributes it in spite of the fact that this would be very impractical with a crowd of five thousand. Although the exact detail of the narrative in Mark is more reasonable, it is the Fourth Evangelist's purpose to emphasize the central teaching of the event, that the source of this food is Jesus, and that it is given on his initiative.

Another notable difference in detail in the Johannine account of the feeding, is the mention of "barley loaves" on this occasion. As a food, barley was regarded as inferior, but it is the grain used for the offering of the Omer and is particularly associated with the second day of Unleavened Bread. Another reason for the deliberate mention of the "barley loaf" might be an attempt to emphasize that this was very poor food, and therefore, when the people were satisfied with it, the miracle was all the more remarkable. The association of barley with the offering of the first-fruits at the feast, is much more in keeping with the Evangelist's way of giving the deeper meaning of a sign, and is to be preferred to the alternative explanation.

In the synoptic tradition, when Jesus was about to distribute the loaves and fish to the people, "He looked up to heaven and blessed, (εὐλογησεν)" Mark 6:41. In John, the expression εὐχαριστήσας is used here, a word which came to be a technical term for the Holy Communion. Although it may be an attempt to make explicit the association of the feeding of the multitude with the Christian counterpart of the Passover, this is probably pressing too far the difference between the words. Paul in I Corinthians 10:16 uses εὐλογεῖν of the cup of the Holy Communion. The different word here used by the Fourth Evangelist may be due to his freedom from the exact details of language, and from exact details of description in the sources available to him. We are confronted, however, again in verse 23 with an emphasis upon the fact that at this place "they ate bread after the Lord had given thanks." (ἔφαγον τὸν ὀρὸν εὐχαριστήσαντον τοῦ κυρίου) "Bread" here is singular, "the loaf", which would be a definite reference to the Holy Communion. The mention of giving thanks in this later reference to the feeding of the multitude is superfluous, unless it is a term associating the event with the sacrament. "...after the Lord had given thanks," is taken by many as

a later gloss. 13 Bernard gives the full argument for regarding the words as a later gloss: (1) the mention of Tiberias, which was founded in 22 A.D., (2) reference to the five loaves as τὸν ἄρων, which is specifically the Eucharistic usage, (3) "...after the Lord had given thanks" seems to be the main identifying fact of the occurrence, whereas "where he fed the multitudes" or some such expression would seem more appropriate, (4) εὐχαριστεῖν seems to have its later sacramental significance here, which the Evangelist has been trying to avoid, (5) "...after the Lord had given thanks" is omitted by D,69,a,e,Sinaitic Syriac, and Curetonian Syriac, and several Latin Vulgate texts avoid the words through a mistake, and (6) in Johannine narrative, "the Lord" is not used except after the resurrection; "Jesus" would be the Johannine expression. (1) and (2) above are not backed by any manuscript evidence, and are scarcely strong enough by themselves to argue for the elimination of the whole verse. Some word about the arrival of boats is essential to the narrative. (3), (4), (5) and (6) however have manuscript backing. If these words are eliminated, the main ground for contention that

Barrett, C. K., THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN, p. 237 (less positively)
the verse is a gloss disappears. The use of ῥῦ ἀορον in the part of the verse which would then remain constitutes a veiled suggestion of the Lord's Supper, yet not an obvious reference to the sacrament.

At the end of the story of the feeding of the five thousand, the Fourth Evangelist adds a note not found in the synoptic narrative: John 6:15, "Perceiving then that they were about to come and take him by force to make him king, Jesus withdrew again to the hills by himself." The feeding of the five thousand is a miracle, producing great wonder. The reaction of the crowd may easily be in terms of the kind of expectation current among the Jews: the King who was to come would end oppression and suffering. Since the miracle here was feeding, the response to a material miracle is to try to make Jesus a king in the material sense. The possibility of such action is seen in the rebellion of Bar Cochba. This understanding of the action is specifically countered by the withdrawal of Jesus. This incident makes an advance in the interpretation of the action, over that which might be applied to the incident in the synoptic gospels. The feeding of the multitude cannot be interpreted,


according to the Fourth Gospel, as a wonder of the commonly expected political kingdom of the Messiah. Such interpretation could be given to Mark's version. The reader of the Fourth Gospel is forced to seek in the action a deeper meaning.

The differences from the synoptic version noted in the Fourth Gospel may be summarized: The feeding of the five thousand is associated with the feast of Passover, and with the offering of the barley sheaf; Jesus takes the initiative and personally carries out the action; a suggestion of the Eucharist is added in verse 23; interpretation of the event as a wonder of the political kingdom of the Messiah is ruled out. As the Fourth Evangelist has set it out thus far, the event is a sign, directly associated with Jesus' action, and related to the Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread.

In John 6:16-24 the story of the crossing from near Tiberias to Capernaum is told without significant differences from the version of Mark. It is notable that John is closely agreeing with Mark's order in this section, but no significant advance in the argument is made. In the discourse which follows the crossing of the sea, John 6:25-40, the Fourth Evangelist departs from the form of the synoptic gospels, i.e. Mark 7:1-23, yet retains enough connection with the point at issue in the Markan
account to show that he is actually giving a commentary upon it. In Mark 7:1-23, Jesus engages in controversy with the Pharisees, over rules of uncleanness, following the tradition of the elders, and the source of that which defiles a man. The discourse is consciously separated, by a general statement about Jesus healing for an indefinite period, from the feeding of the multitude and the crossing of the sea. The argument of the discourse is: keeping the tradition of the elders is not essentially obeying God, it may even make void the word of God; it is not the external matters of ritual cleanness and uncleanness that cause real defilement, but those moral matters which come from the heart of man. The Pharisees take as a presupposition of their position, such a stand as is expressed in the Mishnah, Aboth 6:7, "Great is the Law, for it gives life to them that practice it, both in this world and in the world to come". The following of the Law would be, for them, the work of God. The answer of Jesus, Mark 7:14-23, makes the point that this following of the tradition as though it were the total summation of the work of God, concentrates upon those things which actually do not defile a man. It is those things which come from the heart that cause defilement. The parenthetic comment is made, that

by this, Jesus declared all foods clean. This argument against the Pharisees, does not explicitly attack their presupposition that "the Law gives life", but appears to give a different teaching from the tradition of the Elders, based upon the Law. In this passage, Jesus could be taken as just a teacher, among the Rabbis, giving his particular interpretation of the Law.

The discourse in John 6:25-40, although apparently concerned with a very different theme from that in Mark described above, yet is associated with it in these ways: the controversy is with "the Jews" (identified in verse 41) who represent the religious system of Judaism as in Mark "the Scribes and Pharisees" do; the discourse touches upon the eating of food; Jesus answers two presuppositions basic to the arguments of the Pharisees in Mark's discourse, i.e. the works of God are following the tradition of the Elders, and it is the Law that gives life. The Fourth Evangelist in his discourse appears to be following the Markan scheme here, enough to formulate as the primary theme of the discourse the thing which he believes should not remain unsaid in the Markan account. The discourse in John, however, is intimately related to the event on the previous day, the feeding of the five thousand. The narration of that event was left, as above, as a sign, intimately connected with the Passover and Unleavened Bread,
and having to do with Jesus' personal agency. The crowd
is following Jesus, but not because it has clearly appre-
hended the meaning of the "signs." The people labor
(John 6:27) for the food which does not satisfy. Even
in this context, the question of the people is abrupt,
"What must we do to be doing the work of God?" (John 6:28).
But the question is not unexpected, nor is it due to the
accidental association with the word ἐργάζεσθαι in
verse 27, if it be true that the Evangelist is commenting
upon the Markan passage, "Why do your disciples not live
according to the tradition of the elders...?" (Mark 7:5).
Laboring for the "food which perishes" (John 6:27) is not
a simple materialism, but the false religious teaching
of the Jews, aptly described in Mark 7:9-13. The bread
was five loaves - probably the five books of "the Law."
In place of their reliance on this system, the true work
is "to believe in him whom he (God) has sent". (John 6:28).
Here the Johannine argument makes a point explicit, which
was left unsaid in the Markan argument. When the crowd
begins to see the point of the discourse, it asks, "What
is your authority?". In answer to this, Jesus rephrases
his point: it is not your interpretation of the Law which
gives life to the world, but "the bread of God is that
which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world."
(John 6:33). He points to the meaning of the feeding of the five thousand, verses 35 - 40, as the answer to the request for a sign, after the reference to the previous feeding, in the words of the people, John 6:34, "Lord, give us this bread always". A second identification of the "food which perishes" is provided before this answer of Jesus, in verses 31 and 32, the discussion of the people's reliance upon the authority of Moses, since he was instrumental in giving the nation manna. The "manna in the wilderness" (verse 31) was sometimes thought of as the Lord's word. Philo, (Allegorical Interpretation III:169) describes the manna as "a word of God, continuous, resembling dew, embracing the soul, and leaving no portion without part in itself."\(^{17}\) In Nehemiah 9:20 manna is associated with the Lord's "spirit to instruct them", though not identified with it. The answer of Jesus, "It was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven." (John 6:32) presumes that the meaning of "manna" is "the Law" which Moses received at Sinai. This "Law" included not only the Pentateuch, but the tradition of the elders, and the interpretation of the Law.\(^{18}\) The discussion of the manna affirms that the point in controversy is the reliance of the people upon the Law and the tradition of the elders.

---


The gift of manna in the wilderness, Exodus 16:14, was not associated with the time of Passover, since it was generally believed that the event took place a month after the first Passover, Exodus 16:1. But it is apparent that this provision of food on the trip out of Egypt, must be called to mind when the story of the Exodus is told. Since the Exodus was the prime example of deliverance from which the feast of Passover took its meaning, it may be that the reference to the gift of manna in this discourse is related to the occasion - "the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand".

The explicit statement of the meaning of the feeding of the five thousand is presented in John 6:35-40, after the reference of the crowd back to the event of the feeding, verse 34. The sign is perceived in this, "I am the bread of life." The one who comes to Jesus will not hunger or thirst. This language suggests Isaiah 55:1, "Ho, everyone who thirsts, come to the waters, and he who has no money, come, buy and eat". Verse 27 suggested too the next verse of the same passage in Isaiah, "Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread." "The bread" which does satisfy, in Isaiah 55 is found in the passage, "Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near." (Is. 55:6). The discourse following, John 6:37-40 describes the meaning of coming to Jesus,
the Bread of Life: none will be cast out, none shall be lost at the last, and the one coming shall be raised up at the last day. In the feeding of the five thousand, "none was cast out", for they all ate their fill (6:12). "Nothing was lost" of all that was given, as none is to be lost of the body of Christ. They will be raised up at the last day, as Christ is raised up in the Resurrection. He is the bread which is, in this feeding, the barley loaf. On Nisan 16, the third day after the sacrifice of the Paschal victim, the barley Omer was "waved" in the Temple. This released the barley harvest from its restriction. In a similar way the "bread of Life", through his being raised up on the third day, Nisan 16, brings release to those who follow. He is the first-fruits of those whom the father has given him, "the first-fruits of those that slept" I Cor. 15:20.19 Thus it is seen that the discourse, verses 35-40, gains its meaning from its association with the Passover season and the offering of the Omer.

The revelation "I am the bread which came down from Heaven" (John 6:41) is again subject to a material interpretation by the Jews, who are here identified as a part of the people to whom the discourse is given. This cannot be true, since they know his parents. But this is

a result of their looking at the physical origin of Jesus. The real nature of Jesus is seen in the Resurrection at the last day (6:44), not in his physical origin. It is in seeing that the eschatological consummation is here present. "And they shall all be taught by God", verse 45, quotes from Isaiah 54:13. This is one of the conditions present in the final vindication of Israel by God, Isaiah 54:17. Summed up in the Evangelist's language, the same thing is said in verse 47, "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes has eternal life." This is expressed in terms of the "bread which comes down from heaven," verse 50.

A new turn is given to the discourse, John 6:51, in the expression "...the bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh." Added to this in the following part of the discourse is the explanation that one must "eat my flesh and drink my blood" in order to apprehend the bread from heaven. Here a definite break in the symbolism is made. Two new aspects of the background of the discourse now enter: the Passover sacrifice, and the Holy Communion. It was said that there was a suggestion of the Lord's Supper in the account of the feeding of the multitude. Now the mention of the flesh and blood of Jesus, turning the symbols directly to the elements of the Lord's Supper makes explicit the association of the discourse with that sacrament. The Christian reader could
scarcely fail to perceive a sacramental reference in the mention of "the Passover...at hand".20 This reference is now clarified. With this turn of symbolism, the sacrifice of the Paschal victim is drawn into the discourse. The eating of the flesh of the victim was a sacrament of the covenant people, looking toward final salvation. The cups of wine, the blood, in Christian tradition, were also a part of the Paschal meal. No part of the Paschal victim could be left until morning; no part of the bread given at the feeding of the multitude could be lost. Those who partook of the former rites, died (verse 58) but those who partake of the "bread of life" - the flesh and blood of Jesus, live forever.

The feeding of the multitude and the discourse which follows, set forth the teaching that, far beyond the cultus which concentrated upon sacrifice, offerings, the Law, and rules of clean and unclean, here is the One who is himself the Bread, the first-fruits which already had brought about release. He is himself the sacrifice, the consuming of which brought about the immediate promise of the eschatological event, eternal life. The promise of the Passover festival and the offering of the Omer are fulfilled, and exceeded beyond anything that had been expected.

To a certain point, the teaching of the Evangelist could be placed within the framework of Jewish eschatology, but at John 6:41ff, the teaching bursts the bonds of Jewish hopes, and becomes a proclamation greater than all the previous hopes. C. H. Dodd expresses it thus, "But if Christ is Himself the food and drink of eternal life, we are well beyond merely Messianic categories." 21

The final discourses of chapter 6 serve to emphasize but one point in the above analysis. They tell of the offense of the disciples at the teaching, (John 6:61). The offense is a result of their clear understanding that the sacrifice of Jesus is apparently assured in the foregoing section. Their reaction to this revelation is parallel to that of the disciples in the synoptic tradition, Mark 8:31 and 32, who began to rebuke Jesus upon learning that He expected to be killed. It is clear that here in John 6:61 and 66 the disciples understand the discourse to point to the death of Jesus. This affirms the association of the event and the discourse with the Passover season and its sacrifice.

C. John 11:55-20:18: In this large section of the Gospel, the discourses are not, as in 2:13f and 6:1-77, intimately connected to the symbolism of the Passover

feast. One consideration, however, associates this section with the scheme of festivals in the Gospel: the chronology of the events in the Passion Story, 11:55-20:18, exactly fits the detailed observance of the Passover feast in such a way as to demonstrate that Jesus died at the hour of the slaughter of the Paschal Lambs, and rose at the time of the offering of the Omer.

In John 11:55 and 12:1 Jesus is said to have come up to Bethany, near Jerusalem, six days before the feast. The supper, which in this gospel is not in the same form as the Last Supper of the synoptic tradition, John 13:1-17:26, takes place on the evening which begins Nisan 14, twenty-four hours before the regular eating of the Passover. In John 18:29, it is said that the Jews did not want to enter the Praetorium for the trial, since they did not want to be defiled and prevented from eating the Passover. This must then be Nisan 14, early in the morning. There would be no conflict with Jewish rules governing sabbaths or Holy Convocations on this date. In John 19:14 this day is identified as "the day of Preparation for the Passover" or Nisan 14. It is some time after the sixth hour of Nisan 14 that the Crucifixion takes place; the time when the Paschal victims were being slain. The reason for immediate removal of Jesus' body is in John logical, too,
since the day following, "that sabbath, was a high day (Holy Convocation)" , John 19:31. The "first day of the week," John 20:1, when the Resurrection is discovered, is in this account, Nisan 16 - the day of the offering of the Omer, the first-fruits which freed the harvest. The Johannine account of the Passion and the Resurrection in the light of the Jewish Paschal customs, is straightforward, the participants acting in accord with known Jewish practice.

Since the Johannine account of the Passion, eliminates the association of the supper on the night before the Crucifixion with the Paschal meal, it may appear that in emphasizing the place of Christ as the Paschal lamb, the meaning of the Lord's Supper is lost. In the light, however, of the interpretation of John 6:1-71 given above, it is seen that the deep meaning of the sacrament has been maintained by the Fourth Evangelist, in a different place. He has, in fact, by his consistent chronology of the last days of Jesus' life, and by his discourse in chapter 6, managed to retain both the ideas of the early church which appeared to be contradictory.

The discourses and narrative in John 11:55-20:18 are associated with the Passover feast in that they describe events in conformity with the chronology of the feast. For the most part, however, the content of the discourses
and descriptions does not find close association with the symbolism of the Passover. One exception to this is noted however: In John 19:33 it is said that the legs of Jesus were not broken, as were those of the other two who were crucified. This is undoubtedly a reference to the prohibition of breaking the bone of the Paschal lamb, and is a conscious identification of Jesus with the Paschal victim.

In conclusion of the study of the relation of the Passover to the Fourth Gospel it may be said:

1. That in the passages where the Passover is mentioned, 2:13f and 6:1-71, the symbols of the feast enter intimately into the significance of the passages,

2. That in each case Jesus is shown to be himself the fulfillment, and more than the fulfillment of the things symbolized in the Temple worship,

3. That the account of the Passion and Resurrection in the Fourth Gospel differs from the synoptic account in that it respects the Jewish customs of the Passover, and clearly identifies Jesus as the Paschal lamb, in his death, and the first-fruits in his rising on the third day.
CHAPTER V

THE FEAST OF PENTECOST

A. The Old Testament Legislation on Pentecost.

In the section of Leviticus called the "appointed feasts", at 23:15 - 21 the feast of Pentecost is prescribed. It is to be a feast of one day, a holy convocation, with cessation from all laborious work. It is to be held counting fifty days from the "morrow after the sabbath, from the day that you brought the sheaf of the wave offering" (Leviticus 23:15). From the fifty days mentioned here, the name "Pentecost" (πεντεκοστής) was used by Greek speaking Jews. The primary observance here is said to be the bringing of two loaves of fine flour, baked from the new grain. These loaves are to be "waved before the Lord."

In the JE source, Exodus 34:22, the feast is called by the common Hebrew name, Shabuot (שַׁבּוּא), and here it is simply said that it is one of the three pilgrimage festivals, the first fruits of the wheat harvest, (אַהֲרֹןָהָה).

In the P source, Numbers 28:26, this feast is called the "Day of First Fruits", (דָּבָרִים בְּאָרוֹן), and prescriptions for the sacrifices are almost the same as the P source in Leviticus. (In Leviticus, one bull and two rams are prescribed, in Numbers, two bulls and one ram).
Deuteronomy 16:9 - 12 gives the Deuteronomic legislation for the feast, which is to be dated seven weeks from the time when the sickle is first put to the standing grain, according to this source.

In the section of Ezekiel in which his ideal picture of the feasts is presented, 48:18 - 25, although the other pilgrimage feasts are mentioned, the feast of Pentecost is ignored. Whether this represents a protest of Ezekiel against the feast for some reason, or represents a situation in which the feast was thought to be of such little importance that it should not be included in his scheme is not clear. In any case, this feast appears to occupy a more humble position than the other pilgrimage feasts.

B. Observance of the feast of Pentecost in the Temple.

According to the Biblical codes, as interpreted by the major part of Judaism, the day upon which Pentecost was celebrated was the sixth day of the third month, Sivan. It was a one-day feast, which caused certain complications. In the Mishnah, Hagigah 2:4¹ the question of how to bring offerings, and carry out slaughtering if the eve of the sabbath or the sabbath interfere, is shown to have been a topic of debate and concern. In some cases it was necessary to extend the time of the feast of Pentecost, for purposes

of offerings, to prevent breaking the sabbath. After the exile, the feast was extended to a two day feast, in lands outside Palestine, since it was so difficult in the days when the calendar was not fixed, to determine the correct date of observance. The Mishnah, Rosh-ha-Shanah 2:1 - 4 describes the lighting of signal fires as a signal when the new moon had been proclaimed by the Sanhedrin, to help the Jews of Babylon to know the dates which determined the feasts. Yet this was not possible all over the Dispersion. To assure that the feast was celebrated on the proper day, two days were celebrated, one of which must be the proper one. The day for the celebration of Pentecost would depend upon the day when the new moon beginning the month of Nisan was observed, since that date determined the time of the Passover celebration, which in turn determined the day of the offering of the Sheaf, from which the fifty days until Pentecost were counted.

The Sadducees and others celebrated Pentecost on a date different from the one stated above, as a result of the ambiguity of Leviticus 23:15, "And you shall count from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that you brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven full weeks shall they be." The word "sabbath" in this passage has been taken by

the Rabbis to mean "day of rest" in the general sense, and not "the sabbath" of the week. "The morrow after the sabbath" is then taken to be the day after the first day of Unleavened Bread, which was a day of holy convocation or "day of rest", which would be Nisan 16. It was on this day that the offering of the sheaf was carried out. The sixteenth of Nisan would not always fall upon the same day of the week, nor would the feast of Pentecost therefore fall always on the same day of the week. According to the Sadducean interpretation, however, the counting should begin from the day after the sabbath occurring during the feast of Unleavened Bread. This would always place the offering of the sheaf on the first day of the week, and Pentecost on the first day of the week, though of variable date in the month.

Very little information is available to us concerning the rites carried on in the Temple on the feast of Pentecost, other than the Old Testament passages which contain the laws relating to the feast. That the rites of Pentecost were not considered to be of great importance, is evident from the Mishnah, which devotes separate tractates to the other pilgrimage festivals, i.e., Pesahim and Sukkah, but devotes none to Pentecost.

The rites known to have been carried out in the Temple on Pentecost were: the special sacrifices, seven lambs, one

bull, and two rams, with their cereal and drink offerings, as a burnt offering, and a goat as sin offering and two lambs as peace offering; and the offering of the loaves of the first fruits. These are as prescribed in Leviticus 23:15-20. The loaves were found by Philo⁵ and Josephus⁶ to be the noteworthy part of the ceremonies. These were to be from flour made from the harvest of the worshiper's own field, since the passage in Leviticus says, "from your dwellings" (23:17). The manner of offering these may have been in keeping with the description of a procession bringing first-fruits which is described in the Mishnah, Bikkurim 3:2-6:

"2. How do they take up the First-Fruits (to Jerusalem)? (The men of) the smaller towns that belonged to the Maamad gathered together in the town of the Maamad and spent the night in the open place of the town and came not into the houses; and early in the morning the officer (of the Maamad) said, 'Arise, ye, and let us go up to Zion, unto the Lord our God.'

3. They that were near (to Jerusalem) brought fresh figs and grapes, and they that were far off brought dried figs and raisins. Before them went the ox, having its horns overlaid with gold and a wreath of olive-leaves on its head. The flute was played before

⁵ THE SPECIAL LAWS, II:180-183, Loeb Classical Library VII:419.

them until they drew nigh to Jerusalem. When they had drawn nigh to Jerusalem they sent messengers before them and bedecked their First-Fruits. The rulers and the prefects and the treasurers of the Temple went forth to meet them. According to the honor due them that came in they used to go forth. And all the craftsmen in Jerusalem used to rise up before them, saying, 'Brethren of such-and-such a place, ye are welcome!'

4. The flute was played before them until they reached the Temple Mount. When they reached the Temple Mount even Agrippa the King would take his basket on his shoulder and enter in as far as the Temple Court. When they reached the Temple Court, the levites sang the song, *I will exalt thee, O Lord, for thou hast set me up and not made mine enemies to triumph over me.* (Psalm 30)

5. The pigeons that were hung upon the baskets were sacrificed as whole-offerings, and what the people bore in their hands they delivered to the priests.

6. While the basket was set on his shoulder, a man would recite the passage (Deuteronomy 26:3ff) from I profess this day unto the Lord thy God, until he reached the words *An Aramean ready to perish was my father.* When he reached the words *An Aramean...* he took down the basket from his shoulder and held it by the rim. And the priest put his hand beneath it and
waved it; and the man recited the words from An Aramean ready to perish... until he finished the passage. Then he left the basket by the side of the altar and bowed himself down and went his way."

This description is for the bringing of First-Fruits to the Temple which could be done at any time after Pentecost, according to the Mishnah, Bikkurim 1:3. It is taken by Goldin to be a description of the rites of Pentecost, but this is held to be erroneous by Schauss. There are two points which would be improbable of rites on the feast day: the bearing of baskets from the country to the Temple would not be proper on a feast day of holy convocation; and the mention of ripe grapes and raisins, designates a time late in the season, for grapes would not be ripe at Pentecost time. Something of the same mode of presenting the first fruits and the loaves of the wave offering, however, would probably have been followed in the Temple on Pentecost.

Psalm 30 which the Levites are said to have sung when the procession entered the Temple Court, is a song of thanks to the Lord for His favors, for establishing the faithful, and for turning "mourning into dancing". This would indicate the joyous nature of the procession. The passage recited by the one offering the first-fruits, Deuteronomy 26:3 - 11,

recounts the story of the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt, their persecution, their crying out to the Lord, His bringing them out to a land "flowing with milk and honey", and their pledge of the first-fruits of the land.

In addition to the service accompanying the bringing of first-fruits, those in attendance at the Temple would stand by for the sacrifices of the regular and additional offerings, and would attend four services each day for prayer and the recitation of passages of scripture.\(^\text{10}\) At Pentecost, one of the scripture passages associated with these services would be Deuteronomy 16:9-12, the legislation concerning Pentecost, which in the time of the Mishnah was read for Pentecost, Megillah 3:5.\(^\text{11}\)

Celebration of the feast of Pentecost described above, is confined to rites which symbolized the agricultural significance of the feast. This is the only significance attached to the feast by the legislation of the Old Testament. Although one may infer that the later significance of Pentecost as the celebration of the giving of the Law on Sinai would have found its way into the worship of the Temple, there is no evidence to show that this actually occurred. Since the Old Testament books did not in any way associate the feast with the Law, the Sadducees, who maintained primarily the authority of the Old Testament written tradition,

\(^\text{11}\) Ed. Danby, H., p. 205.
against the oral tradition supposedly originating also at Sinai, would have held against any incorporation of the oral tradition into the Temple cultus.

C. Observance of the Feast of Pentecost in the Synagogue.

In the worship of the synagogue later than the time of the Temple, it is found that the feast of Pentecost has been converted to an observance of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. This interpretation of the feast is justified on the authority of Exodus 19 and 20, in which it is determined that the giving of the Ten Commandments on Sinai occurred on Sivan 6 (or 7, according to some reckonings). "The third new moon" in Exodus 19:1 would be the first day of the month of Sivan in the Jewish calendar. Starting from this point, the days mentioned or assumed in the following verses could be made to place the giving of the Law on the sixth day of the month. This reckoning is found in the Talmud,¹² but not in the Mishnah. This evidence suggests that the computation was of a date later than the time of the writing of the New Testament.

In the Book of Jubilees, which dates from the second century B.C., the two-fold nature of the feast of Pentecost is noted. According to the retelling of the history of the Jewish nation in terms of the strict Pharisaic point of view, it is said that Moses received the Law on Sinai on Sivan 16, Jubilees 1:1; that Abram celebrated it in the

middle of the month, i.e., Sivan 15; Jubilees 15:1; and that Jacob celebrated it on Sivan 15, Jubilees 44:4 and 5. This date is a peculiarity of the Book of Jubilees. It was possible to interpret the term "morrow after the sabbath" in Leviticus 23:15 as the day following the seventh day of Unleavened Bread. Thus the fifty days until Pentecost would be counted from Nisan 22, and the date of Pentecost become Sivan 15. The feast of Pentecost attains importance in this book. It is said in Jubilees 6:18 and 19 that the feast was observed in heaven from the day of creation until the time of Noah, and during Noah's lifetime, on earth. Noah's sons did not observe it, until the days of Abraham, who observed it. Then it was observed by the Hebrews until the time of Moses, when it was forgotten until the day when it was renewed in connection with the giving of the Law on Sinai. It is said in Jubilees 6:18, "For this reason it is ordained and written on the heavenly tablets, that they should celebrate the feast of weeks in this month once a year, to renew the covenant every year." The feast of Pentecost is then, in this tradition, a feast of the covenant. The author of the book, while he speaks of the covenant made with Noah, and with Abraham, seems to mean primarily the giving and observing of the Law as the

covenant. In Jubilees 6:11 the sprinkling of blood is to be carried out because of the "words of the covenant which the Lord made with them forever." In this book, then, the feast of Pentecost is a renewal of the covenant, and associated with the giving of the Law on Sinai. While it cannot be said that this interpretation of the feast was a primary one in the first Christian century, the Book of Jubilees gives evidence that the idea of the association of Pentecost with the giving of the Law dates in part of Judaism from the second century B.C. Since an interpretation in its bold outline similar to that given in Jubilees, became dominant in the synagogue in the early Christian centuries, it may be inferred that the interpretation was present to some extent in Judaism of the first Christian century, and the Christian Church which sprang from it. Pharisaic thought, such as that epitomized in the Book of Jubilees, would have been influential in the synagogues where the Pharisees had their stronghold, rather than in the Temple.

In the synagogue, the traditional readings from the scripture on the observance of Pentecost reflect the two-fold character of the feast. The Mishnah, Megillah 3:5 gives as the reading for the day of Pentecost, "the section Seven Weeks", i.e., Deuteronomy 16:9-12. This passage gives the directions for the keeping of the feast of Weeks with a tribute for the Lord's blessing. This is to be done remembering that "you were a slave in Egypt."

The reason for thanksgiving is for God's historic redemption of His people, which was the action initiating the covenant. It is this means by which Israel was elected to be the peculiar people of God.

In addition to the reading prescribed in the Mishnah, the lectionary for later synagogue services, when the feast was celebrated for two days, includes Exodus 19:1-2-:23, Numbers 28:26-31, and Ezekiel 1:1-28 and 3:1-12 for the first day, and Deuteronomy 15:19-16:17, Numbers 28:26-31, and Habbakuk 3:1-19 for the second day. These passages, though not necessarily the same as those which were used in the time of the writing of the New Testament, represent a tradition which goes back to very early times.

Early associated with the feast of Pentecost in addition to the readings from the Law and the Prophets above, were the book of Ruth, and Psalm 68. The book of Ruth is read for the Afternoon Prayer prelude, and Psalm 68 as a special anthem for the festival.

D. The Significance of the Feast of Pentecost.

In the first Christian century, the feast of Pentecost appears to have been in a state of change. Appearing as an agricultural feast of the bringing of first fruits of the wheat harvest, it was becoming an observance of the giving
of the Law on Sinai. This change was made in each of the pilgrimage feasts. Passover and Unleavened Bread had already become connected to the flight from Egypt by the time of the editing of the Pentateuch in its present form, and Tabernacles had been associated with the wandering in the wilderness on the trip to Canaan. It was the final step in this process of giving historical association to the feasts when Pentecost became the feast of the giving of the Law on Sinai.20

The agricultural meaning of the feast was not so far removed from the later historical meaning as would appear. In the reading for the festival, Deuteronomy 15:19 - 16:17, as stated above, the bringing of the first-fruits of the harvest is to be done, because the worshiper (or his people) was saved from being a slave in Egypt. Since the redemption of the nation from bondage in Egypt was the act of God which initiated the covenant which has been promised, the offering of the first-fruits is seen to be a sign of gratitude for the covenant relationship. In the book of Ruth, the sympathetic telling of the pleasures of agrarian life, of the harvest and gleaning, in connection with the central character of the story, who in simple faith takes to herself the religion of the Law, expresses the twofold nature of the feast.21 Through the richness or the

21. Gaster, T., FESTIVALS OF THE JEWISH YEAR.
meagerness of the fruit of the trees, the world is judged at Pentecost, according to the Mishnah, Rosh ha-Shanah 1:2. This judgment, however, is not just a judgment of the people of the covenant, but of all the world.

Philo appears to know only the agricultural meaning of Pentecost, for in his description of the feast he mentions only the loaves which were offered as the first-fruits of the wheat harvest. These are offered because one who has received so much sustenance, should not taste his food until he has offered a sample to the One who has favored him. The loaves are of wheat, because this is the highest of grains in rank, and they are leavened, because leaven stands for food in its most perfect form, and leaven is a symbol of the joyful rising of the soul which occurs when one possesses such abundance as one does at harvest time. The loaves are two, according to Philo, because one refers to the past, in which abundance has been received, and one to the future when we have hope in the time in which we use the gifts of God.

The passages read in the synagogue on Pentecost, from Ezekiel 1:1-28 and 3:1-12, Habbakuk 3:1 - 19, and Exodus 19:1-20:23 are all centered in the giving of the Law. Ezekiel 1:1-28 is the vision of the prophet, which ends at verse 28 with a description of the likeness of the glory.

of the Lord, which was like "the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud on the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness around him." (Ezekiel 1:28) The symbol in this verse is the rainbow, which was taken in the Old Testament to be a sign of the covenant, as in Genesis 9:16. So too, the Law was a sign of the covenant between God and His people. Ezekiel 3:1 - 12 is the passage in which the prophet is directed to eat the scroll on which is the message of the Lord. The summary statement of the passage is in verse 10, "...all my words that I shall speak to you receive in your heart and hear with your ears." The prophet is symbolically receiving the Law as every Israelite should and stands as the exemplary Israelite in relation to the giving of the Law. The Prayer of Habbakuk, Habbakuk 3:1-19 is read because it is a description of the mighty acts of God on behalf of His people, particularly recalling the flashing of lightning and other phenomena surrounding the giving of the Law on Sinai, e.g. "His brightness was like the light, rays flashed from his hand..." (Habbakuk 3:4). It is a prayer that God will renew His work on behalf of His people, recalling the thought of the renewal of the covenant at Pentecost, as taught in the Book of Jubilees. Psalm 68 is appropriate to the feast, since it recalls the evidence in history for faith in God's salvation. Verses 5 and 6 echo the Exodus from Egypt; 7 through 12, the giving of the Law on Sinai, e.g. "you Sinai quaked at the
presence of God..." (Psalm 68:8). Verses 15 and 16 of Psalm 68 are a glorification of Sinai on which the Law was given. These evidences of God's acts on behalf of His people in the past are brought together in the plea that the Lord will again bring His people back (from the Exile) and again give them power and strength.

It is probable that the feast of Pentecost had very little importance as a pilgrimage feast in the first Christian century, and that there was very little to the agricultural observance of the feast outside the Temple, and Jerusalem. The feast first attained importance when it was interpreted as the feast of the giving of the Law, or of the renewal of the covenant.24 Even as the feast of the giving of the Law, Pentecost did not become elevated to anything like the stature of the other pilgrimage feasts. After the destruction of the Temple, there was discussion according to the Mishnah, Moed Katan 3:625 as to whether the day was a full holiday, or just a half-holiday (on which mourning was to be continued.) The possibility of this discussion displays the humble stature of the feast, in times very near the time of writing of the New Testament. When, in later times, a feast of the Rejoicing in the Law was observed, this did not fall on the day of Pentecost, but followed the closing of Tabernacles as the Simhat Torah.

on Tishri 23. Since the feast of Pentecost was so closely related to that of Unleavened Bread, it was sometimes considered not a separate feast, but a closing feast of Passover, or "Azereth shel Pesach" as found in the Talmud and Midrash.

It may be concluded, that in Judaism in the first Christian century, the feast of Pentecost had a double significance. It was the agricultural feast of the first-fruits, marking the time from which the first-fruits of the harvests could be brought to the Temple. The bringing of first-fruits was a sign of the reality of the covenant existing between the Lord and His people. It was later the feast of the giving of the Law on Sinai, through the prophet Moses, the observing of which demonstrated Israel's part in the covenant.

E. The Feast of Pentecost in the Church of the New Testament.

In the New Testament, the feast of Pentecost has a place of importance, as a result of the event recorded in Acts 2:1-42, the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church on that day. This day maintained significance in the Church such that in a later period, the day was one of the great Holy Days. The day of Pentecost was, in Tertulian's time, the terminus of the period during which baptism was performed.

In the tradition in which Luke and the Acts of the Apostles followed, Pentecost was primarily the time of the

baptism with tongues of fire (Acts 2:3) and the giving of the Holy Spirit after the promise of Luke 24:49. This giving of the Holy Spirit has been likened to the giving of the Torah to Israel on Sinai, with the many tongues represented being similar to the seventy languages in which the Law was said to have been given.\textsuperscript{29} As the Law was given to Israel to guide them, the Holy Spirit was given to the Church. This interpretation of the event in the second chapter of Acts, however, is external to the story as it is told, for Acts makes no reference to the Law, nor to the giving of it on Sinai. The choice of the passage from Joel 2:28-32 which is quoted by Peter in Acts 2:16-21 is notable in that it does not refer to the renewing of the power of Law, nor to its becoming an inward possession, such as is expressed in Jeremiah 31:33, "I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts;...". The possibility of such an association of the event on Pentecost is passed by, in Acts, and instead, the gift to the Church is the Spirit, by which they shall prophesy. This is perhaps a deliberate attempt to prevent the association of the Spirit in the Christian Church with the Torah in Judaism, which had its connotations of a minute codification of all that governed life. The Holy Spirit instead of being associated with

casuistry, is that power that shall cause a renewal of prophecy, the free expression of the Word of the Lord which the Torah could not permit. In Acts 2:1 - 42 the significance of Pentecost in relation to the event of the giving of the Holy Spirit, is in the thought of the feast as the closing event of the Passover season, rather than in the idea of the giving of the Law. This act on Pentecost completes that which was begun with the sacrifice of Jesus at Passover time.

The feast of Pentecost was apparently still an occasion on which Jewish Christians would make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the time of Paul's activity. In Acts 20:16 it is said that Paul hastened in his journey in order to be in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.

In these passages concerning the feast of Pentecost in the New Testament, it is clear that the rites and significance of the feast have exercised little influence upon the New Testament tradition, even though the day of Pentecost lived on as a Holy Day in the Christian Church. It is apparent, however, that in the Gospel of John, the feast exercised some influence. This is the problem of Chapter VI.
CHAPTER VI

THE FEAST OF PENTECOST AND JOHN 5:1 - 47, and 7:15 - 24

The events and discourses of John 5:1 - 47 take place, according to John 5:1, on the occasion of an unnamed feast of the Jews, for which Jesus went up to Jerusalem. It was concluded in Chapter II that in the traditional order of the text of John, this feast could be any one of several feasts of the Jewish Calendar year. It was further concluded, however, that in the revised sequence of feasts which results from the relocation of chapter 5, the case is very strong for identifying the feast with Pentecost. It is here our purpose to consider the subject matter of this section of the Fourth Gospel, to determine if the themes of the passage are compatible with the themes of Pentecost.

The question of other identification of the feast mentioned here, from the nature of the subject matter of this passage, is also taken up. It was also shown in Chapter II that the relocation of John 7:15 - 24 from its traditional location to follow John 5:47 appears to be justified. The revised order of the text is presumed in this study.

This passage is composed of two sections, the story of the healing of the man at the pool with the argument over healing on the sabbath which ensued from it, 5:1 - 18, and the discourse of Jesus on his relation to the Father,
which arises from the previous controversy with the Jews, 5:19 - 47 and 7:15 - 24.


Following immediately upon the explanatory passage, John 6:66 - 71 which describes the reaction of the people to Jesus' teaching on the occasion of the Passover, John 5:1 again places the scene at a feast for which Jesus went up to Jerusalem. The time which intervened at this point between this feast and the feast of Passover is not indicated in any way, unless the falling away of some of the disciples in John 6:66 - 71 is meant to describe a process which took place over a period of a month or more. The activity of Jesus on the occasion of this feast comprises an act of healing, and a controversy with the Jews as a result of the conditions of the healing. The meaning of the term "a feast of the Jews" or the variant, "the feast of the Jews" was discussed in Chapter II.

The setting of the healing is described in a manner which is difficult to identify with the present geography of Jerusalem. It is by the Sheep Gate (Nehemiah 3:1) or by the sheep pool, depending upon the decision between the variant readings in verse 2. The latter reading is favored by the ancient tradition, and may be taken as probably the better reading.¹ The name of the pool is variously given:

---

The reading "Bethesda" was in the Syriac Speaking church associated with the meaning "House of Mercy", which is considered a suitable place for the healing to take place. The other variants contribute little in the possible meaning of them, to be of importance to the story. "Bethzatha" and "Belzetha" are probably different spellings of the same name, and together would be strongly attested. "Bethsaida" may have entered as a variant as a result of the prominence of the name for the lakeside town mentioned in John 1:44.

The attestation of all the variants however, is strong enough to prevent exact identification of the site of the healing with any known spot. The pool is one having five porticoes, a detail entered to clearly define the location, or to convey some symbolic meaning. The man who is to be healed lay among many who were "invalids, blind, lame, paralyzed (John 5:3). He had been ill for thirty-eight years, an exact detail which either displays a remarkable eye for small details on the part of the Evangelist, or again the intention to convey a symbolic meaning. When

Jesus addresses the man, it is apparent that he desires very greatly to be healed, but is unable to immerse himself in the pool "when the water is troubled" (5:7), which is apparently the time when one would be healed. This refers undoubtedly to some legend concerning the healing of people through the agency of a spirit or angel which made its presence known in the waters by causing them to move. There is here a tacit acceptance of this legend by the Evangelist, even as he accepted the efficacy of the waters of Siloam to purify or heal in John 9:7, yet this acceptance is not basic to his line of thought which will soon replace the power of the pool with the personal agency of Jesus. The question of the real power of healing from the pool is then transcended in his argument. Jesus, upon hearing that this man desired to be healed but could not be, heals him with the words, "Rise, take up your pallet and walk."

The difficulty that arises over the healing, is over the command which Jesus gave the man, for it was the sabbath, on which it was not lawful to carry "aught from one domain to another." The Jews" appear as the accusers in the discussion which follows the healing, questioning the man who was healed. He has carried his pallet on the sabbath because the one healing him, told him to (5:11). The Jews want to know who this is who commands another to set aside the law of the sabbath. The man who was healed

---

does not know, but finds out later, when Jesus again approaches him to give him a final word, "See, you are well! Sin no more, that nothing worse befall you." (5:14) This is not a threat to the man, based upon the idea that sickness is a result of his sin, for the teaching of Jesus in Luke 13:1 - 5 is against this idea, and there is no reason to believe that in the Gospel of John this thought has been changed. In John 9:2, the Rabbis ask whose sin is responsible for the blindness of a man, to which Jesus answers, "It was not that this man sinned, or his parents..." This can be taken as evidence that in John as in Luke, sickness is not considered to be the result of sin. The words of Jesus to the man refer not to his getting sick if he sins, but to the result of the final judgment, which would be much "worse" than the sickness if he sins. In this word, the healing which Jesus has performed is given the character of a sign, which shows that as Jesus is the one upon whose authority the man is healed, so he is the one upon whose authority rests the way of success in the day of the final judgment. When the man knows who it is that healed him, the word is given to the Jews, who now persecute Jesus because he "did this on the sabbath." (5:16) The discussion makes it clear that it was not just the act of Jesus' healing the man on the sabbath that is the point of the controversy, but the fact that Jesus took the authority upon himself to tell another to carry his
pallet on the sabbath. Jesus' answer to the Jews as his reason for breaking the sabbath, is "My Father is working still, and I am working." (5:17). Instead of using any excuse which might be found in the tradition for breaking the sabbath, Jesus places plainly his relation to the Father as his authority for the act. There is no danger here of interpreting the controversy as a difference over the interpretation of the Law. It is clearly a controversy which results from the presupposition of the Jews that the Torah is established as the complete and binding will of God for man, and the different presupposition of Jesus in which his authority supersedes that of the Torah. The sabbath controversy now falls into the background, for the issue is clearly defined (5:18) by the Evangelist, as revolving around the point that Jesus made himself equal with God.

In the description of the situation in which Jesus healed the man in this section, the details of "five porticoes" and "ill for thirty-eight years" appear to be unnecessarily specific in a story which in other ways is vague, e.g. the man is not identified, no reaction from the other sick people is given. It appears likely then, that there is reason for the inclusion of these unnecessary details. Augustine saw in the five porticoes a symbol of the five books of the Pentateuch, "These five porches signified the law which bears the sick but does not heal
them, discovers them but does not cure them." It is commented by Barrett that this is not the meaning, for, "When John employs symbolism he does so less crudely." This is not, however, more crude than the symbolism of the "six stone jars...standing there, for the Jewish rites of purification..." (John 2:6) which must be a symbol of the Jewish ceremonial and purification system or there is no sense to the miracle of Cana at all. The five husbands of the woman of Samaria (John 4:16) are considered as possible symbols of the foreign gods of the Samaritans, which, if true, would be the same kind of symbolism as is suggested here. It may be taken as a possible interpretation, that the five porticoes are a reference to the five books of the Pentateuch, from which the water flowing was not completely effective for the healing of the sick, or those in need. When it is said that the man was sick for thirty-eight years, it recalls the same period of time mentioned in Deuteronomy 2:14, during which the Israelites were wandering from Kadesh-barnea to the brook Zered, when they were now pressing toward the promised land. This was the wandering in the wilderness after they had received the Law on Sinai. The time spent by the man waiting by the pool for thirty-eight years, may well represent the wandering

of Israel, in a spiritual sense, possessing the Law, but still unable to be saved by it. The presence of either of the symbols, the five-porticoes or the thirty-eight years, by itself would hardly be enough to assure that this is what the Evangelist meant, but the two together make a strong case. Since it is suggested by the revised order of the Gospel, that this feast which is unnamed, may be the feast of Pentecost, it is a confirmation of this identification to find in these symbols the theme of Pentecost. It was stated in Chapter V, that the theme of the giving of the Law on Sinai, through Moses, was becoming a theme of the feast of Pentecost in the first Christian century. If it be accepted that the five-porticoes and the thirty-eight years are references to Pentecost, and to its commemoration of Israel's receiving of the Law, then the healing performed by Jesus is seen as a sign of his superseding the Law of Moses, and his ability to do what the Law never could do. The theme of the controversy with the Jews, arising out of the healing, is right in line with the thought suggested in the sign, that Jesus is himself authority above that of the Law of Moses. The healing of the man at the pool in this section is thus seen to be not merely an occasion on which Jesus and the Jews entered into a controversy, but a sign displaying the true relationship of Jesus to the Law, and the true relationship of Jesus to the Father. It is a sign which is highly appropriate to the time of the feast of Pentecost.

Continuing the theme of the authority of the Son, the remainder of Chapter 5, (vvs. 19–47) is a long discourse by Jesus. It is apparently on the same occasion as the controversy with the Jews after the healing of the man at the pool. It was the complaint of the Jews that Jesus made himself equal with God, (5:18). This would appear to them to be the setting up of a second God beside the One whom they knew to be the unique God. Their standard of strict monotheism, "The Lord Our God, the Lord is One", (Deuteronomy 6:4, and a part of the Shema) must be maintained. The discourse following is a careful attempt to define the relation of the Father and the Son, such that their unity is made clear, and the danger of a break in monotheism is prevented.

The Son, Jesus tells them, can do nothing as an independent worker, but he is absolutely dependent upon what the Father is doing. It is the inherent nature of the Son to do what the Father is doing, "for whatever he does, that the Son does likewise." (5:19). In appealing thus to the origin of his works in the Father, Jesus is adopting the same argument used by Moses when he was faced with the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, Numbers 16:28, "And Moses said, 'Hereby you shall know that the Lord has sent me to do all these works, and that it has not been of my own accord.'"6 It may be the subsequent action in the story

---

of Moses in Numbers 16:31 - 35 that suggests the next turn of the argument in the words of Jesus. As a sign of Moses' authority, the Lord "creates something new" (Numbers 16:30) which swallows up the men. They go down to Sheol as a result of God's new action, and, in a sense, judged according to Moses' authority. Quite beyond this authority, the Father has given the Son power such that "the Son gives life to whom he will." (John 5:21). If it appeared that the power of judgment had been given to Moses, it is clear in John 5:22 that judgment is given to the Son. The saying in the Mishnah, Aboth 4:11, attributed to Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob, "He that performs one precept gets for himself one advocate; but he that commits one transgression gets for himself one accuser." may have behind it the thought of Moses standing in some sense as a judge or participant in judgment with God, over the transgressor. The relationship displayed by the power of the Son to enter into judgment, is clarified by the words of Jesus on judgment in John 8:16, "...for it is not I alone who judge, but I and he who sent me." The full power which is found in the Son, is made explicit in the passage 5:24 - 29, in relation to the final judgment. The power of the Son is such that the one who believes in him and the One sending him has passed the judgment and

received Life. The giving of Life is not just a passing healing of those who are sick, or those, like Lazarus raised from physical death, but the giving of Life in the final judgment. The refrain of 5:25, "...the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live" places the life-giving power of the Son, demonstrated in the historical events and signs, as actually the power over the final issue of history. Here present in Jesus is the heart and power of the final judgment. The picture of a double resurrection, 5:28 - 29 duplicates prevailing Jewish thought on the resurrection in the first Christian century, when it was thought that a resurrection of the righteous Israelites was to occur at the beginning of the Messianic age, and of all the rest for judgment at the close of that age. In John however, the distinction between the Israelite and non-Israelite is not made, nor was it always made in Rabbinic circles.

The discussion now turns to the question, "What testimony is there to this authority of Jesus?" The testimony of Jesus to himself is disqualified, 5:31, for in accordance with Jewish practice, the witness of one to himself is not to be believed, e. g. Mishnah, Ketuboth 2:7, "So too, if there were two men and one said, 'I am a priest', and the other said, 'I am a priest', they may not be believed; but when they testify thus of each other they are to be

believed." But there is another witness to Jesus, besides the witness of John, which was given early in the Gospel. The witness of John would be that from man, but the witness which Jesus has is not from man, but from "the works which the Father has given me to accomplish" (John 5:36). The works of Jesus which bear no particular authority to the non-believer, are signs of this authority, and of his relationship to the Father for those who perceive in them the deeper meaning. The primary argument of the Fourth Gospel for the authority of Jesus is the argument from his signs. Those who do not see the deeper meaning of the works of Jesus, fail to see because they do not have God's word abiding in them (5:38), or because they have rejected the primary authentication of Jesus' authority.

At verse 39, as a result of the mention of the word abiding in the hearers, the argument turns to the witness of the scriptures. "You search the scriptures..." is a description of the mode of study of the Torah enjoined by the Rabbis, as in the Jerusalem Talmud, Berakhoth 4d, "Thou knowest how to read, but not how to search." "Searching" was the minute study for deeper meaning of the Torah. It was pursued because the Jews believed that in the Torah they had the means of life, as in the Mishnah,

Aboth 2:7, "If a man has gained a good name he has gained (somewhat) for himself; if he has gained for himself words of the Law, he has gained for himself life in the world to come." Yet Jesus' argument is that if this were pursued in truth, the searcher would be led to Jesus himself. At 5:41, the reference to receiving glory from men, may mean the authority of the Rabbinic schools, which did not apparently approve Jesus. The opinions of these groups may well have been quoted against him. It was the assumption in the Rabbinic discussions, that the opinion of an individual could not be held in authority over the majority, as in the Mishnah, Eduyoth 1:5, "And why do they record the opinion of the individual against that of the majority, whereas the Halakah may be only according to the opinion of the majority?" The Jews, while refusing to hear the one who came in the name of the Father, would hear those who came in their own names, 5:43, or possibly in the name of other Rabbis. This is receiving glory from one another, not from God. The accuser against the Jews for this failure to see the Law in its proper light, is not Jesus, but Moses for it is Moses who becomes the accuser of the one transgressing the Law. Jesus then says, John 5:47, that since they do not even believe Moses, they must

13. See note 7 above.
certainly be unable to believe him of whom the Law speaks. The natural reaction to this placing of Jesus' words in the same class with Moses' is found in John 7:15, for the Jews said, "How is it that this man has learning when he has never studied?" The Jews are holding to the authority of the accepted schools of the scholars, while Jesus defines the source of his authority, "If any man's will is to do His will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God, or whether I am speaking on my own authority." (7:17).

The final argument of the section, follows from the idea that the Jews who claim to follow the Torah completely, are in the case in point, the curing of the man on the sabbath, inconsistent (7:19), "...yet none of you keeps the Law." The evidence is that the Jews allow circumcision on the sabbath, as in the Mishnah, Shabbath 19:2, "They may perform on the Sabbath all things that are needful for circumcision:..."14. Yet they object to the healing of a man on the sabbath. This would be inconsistent, although it has not been said explicitly that the Jews objected to the healing on the sabbath, but to the command for the man to carry his pallet on the sabbath, (5:10). This argument must have in the background the occurrence recorded in Mark 3:1 - 6, in which the objection of the Pharisees is to healing on the sabbath.

The summation of the argument in this section of the Gospel is that Jesus, like Moses, appeals to the works of God which he is doing for his authority. Yet Jesus is superior to Moses in his authority in judgment, and his ability to give life, even in the last judgment. Moses is not an authority beside Jesus, but the Law of Moses, rightly understood by the mind seeking to do the Father's will, testifies to the Son. This controversy over the relative authority of Jesus and Moses, would arise from the situation portrayed, especially if the thought of the authority of Moses were present in the minds of the hearers. This suggestion of Moses' authority is provided by the nature of the feast of Pentecost, as celebrated in the synagogue, as the feast of the Giving of the Law. The whole of John 5:1 - 47, and John 7:15 - 24 is seen to be related to the feast of Pentecost, and to be built upon the assumption that the unnamed feast of 5:1 is Pentecost.

C. Farrer's Identification of the Feast with New Year.

In Chapter II it was said that Farrer argues that the unnamed feast of John 5:1 is to be identified with the New Year feast on two counts: the sequence of feasts in John requires this identification, and the "themes of V strongly suggest" the New Year feast. The reasons for doubting

the former of these were presented in Chapter II. One is now in a position to consider the latter of these arguments. The themes which are taken to suggest New Year are: the two witnesses, the sabbath, the idea of general release, and judgment.

(1) Witnesses. Two witnesses are required to fix the appearance of the new moon, according to the Mishnah, Rosh ha-Shanah 2:6 and 1:7. The question of a father and son appearing as a pair of witnesses is raised in the latter reference. John 5:33 speaks of the witness of John the Baptist concerning Jesus, and John 5:36 and 37 speak of the witness of the Son's works and of the witness of the Father. Personal testimony to the light of the new era is taken to be a theme of the New Year, and the discussion of the witnesses would then be one of the themes of the New Year in John 5. This theme, however, is not solely connected to the New Year feast. In the days of the Temple, any new moon was important enough, that the sabbath might be broken by witnesses in order to report their sighting of the new moon. Even after the days of the Temple, the new moon of Nisan as well as that of Tishri had this importance. Even if the very vague connection between the witnesses of John 5:36-37, the Father and the

17. Ed. Danby, H. Rosh ha-Shanah 1:4, p. 188.
Son's works, and the father and son witnesses to the new moon in Rosh ha-Shanah 1:7 be taken as established, this would not necessarily indicate the New Year ceremony, but would indicate any month of the Jewish year. The discussion of the witnesses in John 5:30 - 41 is not in any substantial way parallel to that in the Mishnah. In John, the Son immediately disqualifies his witness, John 5:31, "If I bear witness to myself, my testimony is not true." This is to say there is no expectation that the Son's witness will be taken with any credibility by the hearers. The discussion in the Mishnah, Rosh ha-Shanah 1:7 assumes that the son may be considered a credible witness. In John 8:17 and 18, a discussion of witnesses is more nearly parallel to that of the Mishnah, but this is on the occasion of the feast of Tabernacles. The theme cannot be taken, therefore, to indicate unquestionably the feast of the New Year.

(2) The Sabbath. New Year's day was sabbatical and it introduced the seventh or sabbatical month, therefore Jesus begins to heal on the sabbath, John 5:9 - 20.

Here it is not necessary to assume a connection with the New Year ceremony from the event of healing on the sabbath. The explanatory note, John 5:9 says, "Now that day was the sabbath." This language could be used of any of the weekly days of rest, without referring to the day of the New Year.

which was like a sabbath, or to the first and seventh days of Passover, the first and eighth days of Tabernacles, or the day of Pentecost. The sabbatical character of the New Moon of the seventh month was not particularly associated with the sabbath of the week, thus the beginning of the practice of healing on the sabbath would not necessarily suggest the New Year. It would also be expected that if Jesus is actually beginning to heal on the sabbath as a sign of the coming of the new era, there would be some indication in the discourse on that occasion that the sabbath was an important aspect of the event. This is not the case however. The important aspect of the discourse is authority, not the sabbath.

(3) General release. Farrer connects the deliverance of the cripple by Jesus, John 5:2 - 9 with the expectation of deliverance to be proclaimed by the Jubilee trumpet, of which the New Year trumpet was a reminder. Many other elements of the cultus of Israel were as directly connected to the expectation of deliverance as was the trumpet of Jubilee. The Passover meal was eaten in expectation of deliverance, as evidenced by the "Elijah Cup", a place set at the meal in hopes that Elijah would come as the forerunner

of the Messiah. At Tabernacles, the processions around the altar were accompanied by the recitation of Psalm 118, with waving of the Lulab at verse 25, "We beseech thee, 0 Lord, save us now." This is clearly the hope of deliverance. It cannot be said that the hope of deliverance of the crippled man at Bethzatha, John 5:5, and his deliverance by Jesus, constitutes a theme which would suggest the New Year more strongly than the other feasts mentioned.

(4) Judgment. Farrer cites the association of the trumpet of judgment with the New Year, as a theme strongly suggested by the discourse on judgment, John 5:21 - 30. There is no question but that the New Year's feast was predominantly associated with judgment. The Mishnah tractate Rosh ha-Shanah states that although there are four times a year when the world is judged, it is only on New Year Day that "all that come into the world pass before him (the Lord) like legions of soldiers." It is judgment in this personal sense that is the theme of the discourse on judgment in John 5:28f. The eschatological reference, "...for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment." (John 5:28-29), echoes the thought of I Corinthians 15:52,

"...For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed." In this latter reference, the last resurrection, though judgment is not mentioned, is associated with the trumpet. So too, the trumpet was associated with the New Year feast, which was sometimes called "The Day of Trumpet Blowing" (Numbers 29:1), on which the trumpet was sounded at some time in the Temple liturgy. This theme of judgment, while not exclusively associated with the New Year, could suggest that feast. As this theme is found in the section of John under study, 5:1 - 47 and 7:15 - 24, it is not the major theme, but enters as a means of arguing the main theme. The main theme is the authority of Jesus, especially in comparison to the authority of Moses. The Son's place in judgment is described to show the height of his authority.

In addition to the themes suggested by Farrer for identifying the feast of 5:1 with New Year, a connection between the preaching of John the Baptist and the New Year has been argued by Levertoff. It is stated that the "Logia" incorporated by Matthew in his Gospel, is a source which would be called "Debarim" in Hebrew, the name for the book of Deuteronomy. This source would represent material included to show Jesus as the new redeemer of

24. Levertoff, P. P., Article SPECIAL INTRODUCTION in Gore, C., A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE, p. 129 N.T.
Israel in a fashion parallel to that told of Moses in Deuteronomy. This would suggest the association of the events of the Gospel of Matthew with the liturgical year of the Jews, and in particular, the association of John with the New Year's season. The Baptist's call to repentance and the quotation from Isaiah 40:3 in Matthew 3:2-3 are said to be "remarkably fitting" if placed in the frame of the season immediately before the New Year and the Day of Atonement. Levertoff sees the evidences which would connect this feast day, (New Year) with the preaching of John the Baptist as "small matters (which) suggest the probability that John began his ministry about this season.25 Since the witness of John the Baptist is included in the discourse at John 5:33 it may suggest an association between the discourse and the New Year's feast. In this case too, however, the theme is a subordinate one, which is hardly sufficient to support the identification of the feast in 5:1 with the New Year, against other evidence.

Upon examination, as shown above, the case for identifying the feast of John 5:1 with the New Year, is not very strong. Since there is no direct evidence for the identification of the feast with Pentecost, a choice must finally be made as to which evidence is the stronger. It is our conclusion that the evidence is greatly in favor of identifying this feast with Pentecost.

25. Levertoff, P. P., Ibid., p. 128 N.T.
D. Conclusions concerning the feast of Pentecost in John.

It was concluded above that the feast of John 5:1 is to be identified with the feast of Pentecost. In this section of the Gospel, the point is made that Jesus' authority actually supersedes the authority of Moses, which was a central theme of Pentecost in the synagogue. It is to be noted that all of the material in Chapter 5 and in Chapter 7:15 - 24 is closely associated with the feast. In the revised arrangement, immediately before this section is the material associated with Passover, and immediately following, the section on Tabernacles begins.

It may be suggested that the discourse on the occasion of this feast of Pentecost may have provided a motive for which the name of the feast was not given as the Gospel was written. It was suggested in section E, Chapter V, that the story of the day of Pentecost in Acts 2 was told in a way which avoided identifying the Holy Spirit of the Christian Church as a new Torah. If alongside this tradition in Acts there appeared the discourse of Jesus recorded in John on the occasion of a feast of Pentecost, making its main point the authority of Jesus as the new law-giver, the new christianity would be in danger of the development of another Torah, with its oral tradition, and its tradition of the elders. The failure to name this feast in John 5:1 then may have been a deliberate act of the
Evangelist, to prevent a move to force the interpretation of the Christian Pentecost back into the Judaistic mould.
CHAPTER VII

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES

A. The Old Testament Legislation Concerning Tabernacles.

The most complete of the Old Testament legislation concerning the observance of the feast of Tabernacles, and that which was determinative of Jewish practice in the first Christian century, is the account of P in Leviticus 23:33-36 and 23:39-43. Within the section "The appointed feasts..." which comes to some conclusion at verse 38, it is prescribed that on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, Tishri, and for seven days is the feast called נגכּ נַ (in the LXX, ἐσχή ἀκνή), the Feast of Booths or Tabernacles. The first and eighth days are to be Holy Convocations, with no laborious work, the mid-festival days characterized by offerings. A second account of the observance, more full than the first, follows the section "The appointed feasts..." in Leviticus 23:39-43. Repeating the above prescriptions of date and duration, this section adds that the feast shall be a time of great rejoicing, with "the fruit of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and boughs of leafy trees, and willows of the brook." (Leviticus 23:23:40). This prescription has resulted in the carrying of the Lulab throughout the feast. In this passage there is also added the specific ordinance of the
"booth" in which all native Israelites are to dwell for the seven days, because the nation dwelt in booths when they were brought out of Egypt.

In another Priestly passage, Numbers 29:12 - 39, the same date and duration are given, but the feast is called "a feast to the Lord" (ὁμοίως ἡμέρα, in LXX ἀφετήριον κυρίων), and no reference is made to the dwelling in booths or the rejoicing. The extra offerings for each day of the feast are listed. In these offerings is one of the notable themes of the feast: the bulls to be offered are thirteen the first day, twelve the second day, eleven the third day, ten the fourth day, nine the fifth day, eight the sixth day, seven the seventh day, and one the eighth day. The total number for the first seven days, in the diminishing scheme, is seventy. These are later considered to be representative of the seventy nations of the earth, the gentiles. The one bull on the eighth day, was thought of as the bull for Israel.

In the festival scheme of Exodus 23, there is but a passing reference to the feast of Tabernacles, called in Exodus 23:16, (י), ἡμεράς τοῦ Ἑβραϊκοῦ (in LXX ἀφετήριον οὐράνια) the feast of Ingathering. In the JE section, Exodus 34:22, the feast is mentioned in the same way.

1. See below, section D.
In Deuteronomy 16:13-15 the feast of Tabernacles is again described, with the same designation as used in Leviticus 23, but with slightly different observance. The feast is to be for but seven days, with the eighth ignored in this account. It is related to the harvest, rather than to a historical event: "... because the Lord your God will bless you in all your produce and in all the work of your hands, so that you will be altogether joyful." (Deuteronomy 16:15). In the summary of the pilgrimage feasts, Deuteronomy 16:16, the Septuagint uses the expression by which the feast is known in the New Testament, ἡ ἑορτή τῆς ὑπερηφάνειας.

In the legislation of Deuteronomy 31:10-13 it is commanded that at the feast of Booths every seven years, the set time of release, the Law was to be read to all the people. In later times this was taken to mean that parts of the Law should be read, these parts listed in the Mishnah, Sotah 7:8.² It was apparently on the feast of Tabernacles, "...at the feast which is in the seventh month." (2 Chronicles 5:3,) that Solomon dedicated the Temple built in his time. Again, according to Ezra 3:4, the returned exiles from Babylon kept the feast of Tabernacles before beginning the rebuilding of the Temple. Nehemiah 8:17 is somewhat at variance with this, in that it is said that upon the discovery of the book of the Law, the feast was kept for the first time since the days of Joshua. The meaning of the

passage in Nehemiah may be that the bringing to light of the book of the Law caused a revision of the feast such that it was kept in a manner different than that which had previously been followed.

The feast of Tabernacles figures in the prophecy of Zechariah, in his description of the "day of the Lord", after which the survivors will all go up to Jerusalem for the feast. Those nations which do not go up will be punished by a stopping of the rain upon them.

In the Old Testament legislation concerning the feast of Tabernacles, it is clear that there are actually two feasts of different character involved. The one is the agricultural feast of the end of harvest time, the other a historical commemoration of Israel's redemption. The latter of these was probably a reinterpretation of the former. The booths which very early were a characteristic feature of the observances, were in all probability the booths of the harvesters, in which the people had been dwelling all during the season of harvest. The joy which characterized this feast above all others, was the joy of the harvest according to Deuteronomy 16:15. These features represent an early harvest feast which was later given the meaning of a historical commemoration.

4. Moore, G. F., JUDAISM, p. 43 and 47, Vol. II.
only in the section added to the earlier legislation in Leviticus 23:43, that this later historical meaning is found in the prescriptions of the Law. The passages in Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy have only the features of the agricultural observance.

B. The Observance of the Feast of Tabernacles in the Temple in the First Christian Century.

In the first Christian century in the Temple, the observance of the feast of Tabernacles was governed primarily by the legislation of Leviticus, the twenty-third chapter, as this was determinative for Judaism. Beginning with the Holy Convocation of the fifteenth of the seventh month, Tishri, the feast lasted until the eighth day, the twenty-second of Tishri, upon which the second Holy Convocation was held. The eighth day, was in reality a feast by itself, following the last day of Tabernacles, the twenty-first of Tishri, but in spite of its independence, the Azereth (hover) or "Closing Feast" came to be considered the closing of Tabernacles, as well as the closing of the year.5

Characteristic of the seven days of the feast of Tabernacles proper, was the bearing of the festive bouquet, or Lulab. This bouquet was to be carried seven days if the first day of the feast was a sabbath; carried six days

when the sabbath fell on another of the feast days, since the bearing of it could override the sabbath rule against laborious work only for the first festival day. The Lulab was constituted in accord with Leviticus 23:40 according to the rabbinic interpretation of the terms: "The fruit of goodly trees" must mean the Ethrog (דָּרְקַיָּם) or citron, the "branches of palm trees" were just that, the "boughs of leafy trees" must be the myrtle tree branch, and "the willows of the brook", willow branches. The proper Lulab should consist of the following: 1 citron, 1 palm branch four handbreadths long, two willow branches three handbreadths long, and three myrtle branches three handbreadths long. The Mishnah however, quotes several Rabbis who held that but one willow and one myrtle branch were needed, and in another place it is said that a palm branch three handbreadths long is valid. Further rules of the Mishnah state that the Lulab must not be obtained by stealing, nor by borrowing, but it must be the Israelite's own.

The Lulab was to be taken in hand by the Israelite on the first festival day, with the benediction, "Blessed art Thou, Jahwe our God, King of the world, who sanctifies us by Thy commandment, and gave command to us concerning the carrying of the Lulab." The Lulab was carried to the Temple for the morning offering, and as the Levites, in

connection with the bringing of the offering sang the Hallel, the Israelite prepared himself quietly with the benediction, "Blessed art Thou, Jahwe our God, King of the world, for Thou hast preserved us in life, Thou hast stood for us, and hast allowed us to attain this time."9 As the Levites came to the words "Thank Jahwe!", Psalm 118:1 the worshipers commenced shaking the Lulab, and especially on the words, "O Jahwe, save now!" Psalm 118:25. The Mishnah records some of the varying opinions on how the shaking of the Lulab should be done, but the differences seem to be minor refinements.10 The name "Hosanna" was sometimes given to the Lulab because of its use in connection with the word "hosanna" in Psalm 118:25. The shaking of the Lulab was generally done once forward and back, once right and left, and once up and down, although differences of opinion developed about this as time went on.

Another observance of the feast of Tabernacles was the procession around the altar, performed each day which was not a sabbath, unless the seventh day was the sabbath, on which day the observance would override the rules of the sabbath. According to the Mishnah, Sukkah 4:3 - 7,11 the people went to a place below Jerusalem, called Motza, where they cut willow branches. These they brought and set

---

up at the sides of the altar so that the tops bent over the altar. The shofar blew a sustained, a quavering, and a sustained blast, whereupon the people went in procession around the altar repeating Psalm 118:25, "Save now, we beseech thee, O Lord! We beseech Thee, O Lord, send now prosperity." Upon departing the people said, "Homage to thee, O Altar! Homage to thee, O Altar!" On the seventh day they went seven times around the altar, and beat the ground with palm tufts at the sides of the altar. This seventh day of the feast was called by the names, "Day of Beating of Palmtufts", "Day of the Hosanna", or "Day of the Great Hosanna". When this was finished, the Lulabs were cast away and the citrons eaten.

It was from the dwelling in booths, as prescribed in Leviticus 23:42, that the name of the feast was derived. This observance was carried out for seven days, and applied not only to Jews in Jerusalem, but to those all over the world. The Sukkah or booth is a structure with at least three sides, roofed over more than half-way at the top, and between four and one-half feet and thirty feet high. Materials not susceptible to uncleanness, and that grow from the ground may be used as roofing for the Sukkah. These, and many refined details of the construction of the Sukkah are contained in chapters one and two of the Mishnah.

tractate Sukkah. Some said that one must take two meals each day for the seven days in the Sukkah, but others, that one must just eat there on the first festival night. The booth is to be considered the main abode during these seven days, however, while the house would be the chance abode.

On each of the seven days of the feast, after the morning daily whole offering, the water libation was performed in the Temple. The following procedure for this libation is found in the Mishnah, Sukkah 4:9 and 10. One of the priests filled a golden container at the spring of Siloam with three logs of water (about one and one-half pints), which he brought to the Water Gate. This gate was named for this rite. When he was about to enter, there were blown on the Shofar a sustained, a quavering, and a sustained blast, upon which the priest with the water went up the altar-ramp. There were two bowls which had pipes leading out, the bowl to the west for the water libation and the one to the east for the wine offering. As the priest was about to pour the water, the crowd shouted, "Lift up thine hand!" because one priest once poured the water at his feet in contempt for the rite. The water of this libation, and the wine of the offering, flowed to the base of the altar, where the discharge of the pipes could be seen.

There is no prescription for this rite in the Old Testament, and the custom is said to rest upon a Halakkah of Moses on Sinai.  

Bearing the name "Beth Ha-She'ubah", or "The Place of Water-Drawing, the joyful dancing and flute playing took place in the Court of the Women, beginning on the evening of the first festival day, and continuing on each of the five or six days that was not a sabbath. A special women's gallery had been constructed there. On the first evening, the illumination of the golden candlesticks occurred at this observance. Into the tops of the candlesticks were poured 120 Logs of oil each, into which the old drawers and girdles of the priests were dipped for wicks. When these were lighted, it is said that all Jerusalem felt the light.  

Here in the Court of the Women, "men of piety and good works" danced before the people. The musicians of the Levites with instruments stood on the fifteen steps leading from the court of the Israelites to the court of the Women, the steps corresponding to the Psalms' fifteen songs of ascents, Psalms 120-134. The rejoicing continued until, at day-break, (or the crowing of the cock) two priests standing at the upper gate blew a sustained, a quavering, and a sustained blast on their

trumpets. At the tenth step they blew again, and when they reached the court of the women again they blew. They went to the gate that leads to the east, and turning to the west they said, "Our fathers when they were in this place turned with their backs toward the Temple of the Lord and their faces toward the east, and they worshiped the sun toward the east; but as for us, our eyes are turned toward the Lord." (Ezekiel 8:16) After this rite the people retired to their dwellings. Since this dancing in the night occurred each evening that was not a sabbath, the illumination would have burned each night, although the Mishnah, Sukkah 5:2 mentions only the first day.

After the seven days of the feast were over, the booths were removed, the Lulabs were no longer carried, and the water libation ceased in the Temple. Yet the eighth day was a holy convocation, Tishri 22, which was the Azereth, or Closing Feast. The only special observance of the day was the one extra bull sacrificed with one ram, seven male lambs, and a goat. The day would be notable in the feast, for its lack of rites, following almost as a quiet pause the very full week of the feast. It had its independent character, in that the course of priests to serve this day were specially chosen by lot, and the day had its own Benediction and Temple Psalm. At the close of the day,

by custom, the people used to watch the smoke of the evening sacrifice: if it blows to the north, the poor are happy and the rich are sad, since this is an omen of a rainy year when foodstuffs will be less costly; if the smoke blows south, the poor are sad and the rich merchants are happy, since this means a dry year when food prices will be high; if the smoke blows to the east, it is a sign of good for all, while the smoke blowing west foretells a famine year.\footnote{Schauss, H., \textit{Ibid.}, p. 185-186; ref. Yoma 21b.}

C. The Observance of the Feast to Tabernacles in the Synagogue.

The feast of Tabernacles, by the nature of its major rites, is primarily a feast of the Temple. The water libations, and the special sacrifices could not be carried out in the synagogue. The \textit{Lulab} could be carried by the Israelite outside Jerusalem, but not with the same feeling and same festivity of waving, as in the Temple. The illumination and the rejoicing were directly related to the Temple. Some of the elements of the worship of the Temple on the feast of Tabernacles, however, were transferred to the synagogue. The booth could be constructed anywhere, and the obligation to dwell in it was considered to be binding upon all Israelites. The \textit{Lulab} could be carried in the
synagogue service, and this became the custom. The encircling of the altar in the Temple became a procession around the reading desk of the synagogue, although this did not override the sabbath rules, as was the case in the Temple.23 Readings of the Law concerning the feast replaced that part of the observance which was peculiar to the Temple. Besides the reading of Leviticus 22:26-23:44 and Numbers 29:12-16, the Haftarah lesson for the first day of Tabernacles became Zechariah 14:1-21, because of its reference to the feast. On the eighth day, the Haftarah was Ezekiel 38:18-39:16, the prophecy of Gog and the land of Magog.24 This reading was related to the belief that the Messiah's triumphant entry into his kingdom must follow the eighth day of Tabernacles.25 With the concentration upon the reading of the scriptures in the synagogue, rather than upon the Temple rites, the reading of the yearly cycle of the Law took on a great significance. The fifty-fourth section was read on Tishri 23, called "The Rejoicing in the Law", and the first section was read, beginning the new cycle and ending the old. The celebration of that day as a special day, however, is held by G. F. Moore to be a medieval custom, not traceable to the New Testament times.26

24. Dobsevage, I. G., Article HAFTARAH in the Jewish Encyclopedia.
25. Dembitz, L., JEWISH SERVICES FOR SYNAGOGUE AND HOME, p. 46.
D. The Significance of the Feast of Tabernacles.

The Lulab does not bear an obvious meaning, but is an ancient rite, the origin of which is lost. Probably the use of the Lulab was very early related to the petition for rain. In a discussion of when the mention of rain should be made in the benedictions, Rabbi Eliezer (c. 90 A.D.) appeals to the carrying of the Lulab from the first day of Tabernacles on, in defense of his point that the prayer should mention rain from the first day of Tabernacles. The Lulab is a sign that, as the four species of the Lulab cannot exist without water, neither can the world exist without rain.27 Very similar to the Lulab is the willow branch which is brought to the altar for the procession. As the willow grows in places where there is abundance of water, it comes to mean growth to the primitive man. Later, the willows were continued in the rite, but the power was thought to reside in the altar.28 Undoubtedly much of the very early symbolism attaching to the branches of willow and of the Lulab was lost by the time of the first Christian century, but the idea of rain associated with this rite was still present to a certain extent. The beating of the ground with palm branches on the last day of seven on which the procession was held, is another

derivation of rites for producing rain. A more sophisticated interpretation of the Lulab however, was made in Rabbinic schools, as another meaning must replace that which was being lost. Particularly in the synagogues of the Dispersion, where climatic conditions were different, a spiritualizing of the rites occurred. It was said that the three kinds of branch of the Lulab stood for the three Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; or that there were four species and four Patriarchs, adding Joseph to the list. Similar to this interpretation, was the thought of the Leviticus Rabbah 30, that the Lulab pictures Israel and the four kinds of Israelites; the citron, with its taste and aroma, is the Israelite with knowledge of the Law and who is a doer of good deeds; the palm (date), with its taste but no aroma, is the Israelite with knowledge of the Law, but who is not a doer of good deeds; the myrtle branch with its aroma but no taste, is the Israelite who does good deeds, but has no knowledge of the Law; and the willow without aroma or taste, is the Israelite who neither does good deeds nor has a knowledge of the Law. These all are bound together in one covenant, the one making propitiation for the other. 30

The Lulab was thought to be a symbol of God, by Akiba (c. 135 A.D.) according to Pesikta 184. The "fruit of goodly trees" speaks of the "goodness" or "honor" with which God is clothed, as in Psalm 104:1. The Palm branch is for the "righteous one" (God in this passage) who is like a Palm branch, Psalm 92:13. The myrtle stands for God, as in Zechariah 1:8, the one standing among the myrtle trees is taken to be God. The willow is associated with the work of God, in Psalm 68:5 by Akiba. His meaning is that when the Israelite takes the Lulab he is taking God.\(^31\)

The Lulab and Ethrog form a sign of thanksgiving, according to a passage of Leviticus Rabbah 30 (128a), with which the people of the "generation to come" of Psalm 102:19 give thanks because the race which was oppressed to death is glorified by God. Rabbi Mani (c. 370 A.D.) finds another symbol of thanksgiving in the Lulab and Ethrog in connection with Psalm 35:10, "All my bones shall say, 'O Lord, who is like thee...'" The spine of the Palm branch is the spine of the man, the myrtle is the eye, the willow is the mouth, and the Ethrog the heart. Thus the festal bouquet symbolizes the act of thanksgiving of the above Psalm.\(^32\)

---

The Lulab is taken in Leviticus Rabbah 30 (128a) also to be a sign of victory of the Israelites over the other nations of the world. It is said that when two people stand before the judge, we do not know who is the victor. But if one carries a festal bouquet in his hand, we know him to be the victor. So, on New Year's day all the people of the world accuse one another before God, and we know who is the victor, for Israel is seen carrying the festal bouquet fourteen days later at the feast of Tabernacles.33

The encircling of the altar has come from the same primitive idea as did the carrying of the festal bouquet, since the willow branches enter into the rite of the encirclement. If the willows and festal bouquets were primarily related to the petition for rain, the encircling of the altar may have the ancient meaning of the circle which foiled magical powers. This gave rise to the belief that a man could gain favor with God by encircling an object. The Haggadah of the Talmud tells of Honi, the Circle Drawer, who lived in Jerusalem at the time of the Hasmoneans, and gained his name by the habit of drawing a circle about himself, and telling God that he would not move from that circle until his prayer was answered.34

The encircling of the altar could then be seen as a means of adding force to the petition for rain. As a part of the trend to give all the feasts and rites historical meanings, the encircling of the altar later became a symbol of the seven-fold procession around the walls of Jericho, and the remembrance of a great historic redemption of Israel.  

The most characteristic rite of the feast of Tabernacles, from which the festival takes its common name, Tabernacles, Booths or Sukkoth, is the dwelling in a booth for the period of the first seven days of the feast. Explanations of this practice take many forms, and again there is no clear and obvious meaning which explains the rite. By those who consider the origin of the feast to be primarily an agricultural thanksgiving feast at harvest time, the booths are taken to be the dwellings in which the harvesters have lived all during the harvest season. After the primarily agricultural orientation of the civilization passed, this practice would not be followed. It is not at all clear in the argument that this origin accounts for the practice, why there should be a compulsion to continue to live in such shelters as a religious rite. It is suggested that the custom may be due to a taboo on the regular dwelling of the person at


new year time, which was very close to the time of the feast.37 The existence of a simple primitive taboo in early times is hardly sufficient to give continued meaning to a custom. Another explanation which places the symbolism of the booth in a position of secondary importance is the suggestion that it was originally a practical means of housing the many pilgrims who thronged to the holy city at festival time, given a religious meaning to assure its continuance.38 Whatever the reason for its origin, it is primarily our task here to determine what was the idea brought to mind of the Israelite of the first Christian century by the dwelling in booths.

The primary meaning of the booth in the works of the Rabbis, reflecting the thought of the learned leaders of Israel about the time of the writing of the Fourth Gospel, is that it represents the wonders of God, done for the Israelites while wandering in the wilderness after the Exodus from Egypt.39 This would recall not only the whole event, the bringing of Israel out of Egypt to the land which had been promised, with the many gifts of food and water, and the victories at the fall of Jericho and the like, but would recall specifically the cloud under which

37. Riesenfeld, H., JESU TRANSFIGURE, p. 148, quoting Wensink, ARAB NEW YEAR.
Israel dwelt, the cloud of the protection of God. The Targum of Onkelos on Leviticus 23:43 calls the dwelling a "tent of cloud" as quoted in Pesikta Rabbati 188b.\textsuperscript{40} The experience of wandering in the wilderness was associated with the thought of complete dependence upon God. It was to this ideal condition of the relation of the nation to God that the living in booths pointed the Israelite. The shelter provided by God gained a place in the eschatological thought of Israel as the condition which must result from salvation by the Lord. Psalm 27:5, "For he will hide me in his shelter (נַחֲלָת) in the day of trouble..." expresses the hope of immediate help, but bears with it the suggestion of the final protection of the righteous.

In the description of "that Day" in Isaiah 4, verses 5 and 6 use the motifs of the cloud in the wilderness and the booth: "Then the Lord will create over the whole site of Mount Zion and over her assemblies a cloud by day and smoke and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory there will be a canopy and a booth.\textsuperscript{41} It will be for a shade by day from the heat, and for a refuge and a shelter from the storm and rain." The booth is here related to the protective cloud of the Lord over the redeemed nation in the final day. The experience of the protection in the wilderness has become the ideal of the

\textsuperscript{40} Strack and Billerbeck, KOMMENTAR, Vol. II, p. 778.

\textsuperscript{41} Masoretic text would make the second sentence, "A booth will be for a shade by day from the heat etc." Kittel, R., BIBLIA HEBRAICA holds to revision as above.
future blessed time, and the booth has been the theme through which the thought is expressed. This future thought is expressed also in the words of Rabbi Levi (c. 300 A.D.) who tells that the reward for dwelling in the booth is defence for the heat of the coming days. 42

H. Riesenfeld in his study of the meaning of the booths in the feast of Tabernacles, associates the Sukkah (סוכה) with the Huppah (חuppah) of the near-Eastern nuptial rites. He argues that the feast of Tabernacles is a degeneration of the Autumn Feast of the New Year, which originally lasted for a week before the new year. This feast was originally centered around the rites of enthronement of the King which became a sort of sacred marriage of God and the people in later times. The Huppah was the bridegroom's chamber, and continued to have that symbolism after the sacred marriage passed into the background of thought. The Sukkah bore the symbolism of the autumn feast, and had different characteristics from the Huppah. The Sukkah was a democratized form of the tent of dwelling of God, a symbol of all Israelites dwelling in the tent, or the Temple, because their God did. In external form, the tent began to take on an appearance similar to the Huppah, and a reintegration of the nuptial dwelling and the booth of the feast

of Tabernacles took place to a certain extent. 43

Three interpretations of the meaning of the Sukkah are found by Riesenfeld in his study: it represents a dwelling of God, a dwelling of the just, or a dwelling of the Messiah. In Psalm 75:3 God is said to have established his Sukkah in Salem. This suggests the thought which must have been present in the mind of the pilgrim at Tabernacles, that God Himself observed the feast, in His Sukkah in the Holy City. 44 In Psalm 31:20 it is said of the Lord, "thou holdest them safe under thy shelter (Sukkah)".

The dwelling of God, in which there is protection, is His Sukkah. The Sukkah as a dwelling place of the just, particularly with respect to the times to come, is suggested by Isaiah 4:5 and 6, a Sukkah or pavilion over the assemblies of Mount Zion, in a description of the future days. Riesenfeld finds this same idea suggested in the fresco of the Synagogue of Doura, depicting the Israelites in what appear to be booths, recipients of the blessings of the days to come. 45 The Sukkah as a dwelling of the Messiah is found in the representation of Pesikta Rabbati XXXVII in which it is said that God prepares seven Huppoth (bride-groom's chambers) through which the Messiah is conducted by God, in the view of all the redeemed people. 46

45. Riesenfeld, H., JESU TRANSFIGURE, p. 195 and Fig. 4, PL II.
In Amos 9:11, "In that day I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen", the booth is a symbol of the Messiah's presence. In Isaiah 16:5, "Then a throne will be established in steadfast love, and on it will sit in faithfulness in the tent of David, one who judges and seeks justice and is swift to do righteousness", the judge of the final day is the one who is in the tent of David, which was a term practically synonymous with the Sukkah. Riesenfeld holds that this connection of thought between the booth of the feast of Tabernacles and the coming era of the Messiah must certainly have been made by those observing the feast.  

In the Talmud, the idea is developed that the booth is a symbol of the temporary quality of life, especially that of the Jew. They wander from place to place (particularly in the days of the Dispersion) living only in "temporary dwellings", which the Sukkah represents.  

Philo is near this view, when he suggests that the dwelling in tents (σκηναῖς) should serve as a reminder of old misfortunes in the midst of high prosperity, to make people maintain piety for fear of change to the old condition, and to induce thanksgiving in them for present blessings.  

The great variety of interpretations of the dwelling٤٧٤٨٤٩

---

47. Riesenfeld, H., JESU TRANSFIGURE, p. 205.
in booths at the feast, is evidence that there was not one prevailing, clear thought connected with it. It is evident that the early meaning could not have exercised great control of thought about the rite by the first Christian century, nor was the Biblical explanation that this recalled the wandering in the wilderness felt to be a sufficient explanation. It must have been true of this observance, as of other parts of the ritual, that it was not alone the known symbolism of the observance, but also the fact that this was something which had been commanded by God, whom to obey was joy in itself, which motivated the Jew to carry out the ritual.

The ceremony of the pouring of the water, each day at the feast was not found in the codified rules of the Pentateuch concerning this feast. Schauss is of the opinion that the rite became a part of Tabernacles after the victory of the Pharisees in the days of Queen Salome Alexandra. Yet it appears to be an early custom, which for some reason was not included in the legislation for the feast. In Zechariah 14:16f the feast of Booths is directly associated with the giving of rain, in that those nations which do not go up for the feast will be punished by a cessation of the rain. This association with the rainfall

was continued to later times, as in the Tosephta, Sukka 3:18 it is attributed to Rabbi Akiba, that "You pour water in the Feast of Tabernacles, as it is the season of rain pouring, with it the rainfall is blessed to you..."51 The reference in Zechariah 14:16f is an eschatological picture, following the descriptions of what will happen "on that day", the final time of judgment, and the blessed reign. The rain is then seen in the future picture, and bears with it not only the physical hope of plenty in the crops which will be produced by the rainfall, but the hope of well being in fulfillment of all that man needs. In Isaiah 55:10 the fall of the rain is a symbol of the word coming from God, which carries out his purpose on the earth.

In the Rabbinic writings, the water libation was associated too, with the passages, Zechariah 13:1, Ezekiel 47:1 - 12, and Isaiah 12:3.52 In Zechariah 13:1, another oracle of the final day, it is said that there shall be opened a fountain for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem for cleansing from sin and uncleanness. Here the water has a purely spiritual purpose, that of cleansing from sin, rather than a material purpose, and it looks to the future time of the redemption of Israel.

51. Strack and Billerbeck, KOMMENTAR, P. 804, section 0.
52. Strack and Billerbeck, KOMMENTAR, p. 805.
The picture in Ezekiel 47:1-12 could well be a transformation of the water libation to an eschatological plane, though Ezekiel may be prior to any observance of this rite in the Temple. The "water issuing from below the threshold of the Temple..." Ezekiel 47:1, would be similar to the water issuing from the spouts of the chalices, and running down the altar. But on the eschatological plane, since this vision of the stream from the Temple is part of the future ideal found in Ezekiel 40-48, the water issues in a growing stream from the Temple, and flows all through the land to the east of Jerusalem. It is water with cleansing powers, for "when it enters the stagnant waters of the sea, the water will become fresh..." (Ezekiel 47:8). The trees growing near the water gain from it healing properties in their leaves. The fruit is never wanting from the trees, nor do they ever wither. The water is part of a picture of complete redemption of nature, and of the ideal blessed state in life. It comes from the Temple, signifying the presence of Jahweh with his people, the cleansing stream.  

Of the passages above mentioned as connected with the water libation in Rabbinic literature, Isaiah 12:3 is said actually to have been used in the Temple at the time when the priest carrying the water from the pool enters the gate, although this may be a later explanation of the rite.  

The picture in this passage is of the day of redemption of Israel, when, as a result of the Messianic rule, "with joy you will draw water from the wells of salvation."

Whether the passage was associated in the first Christian century with the water libation or not, it expresses the thought of Israel in terms of the symbolism of water in relation to the purpose of God for His people. The water is the means of salvation in the future time of judgment, not just a means of living in the material sense. The "joy" in this passage was associated with the very joyous dancing which was nightly a part of the feast of Tabernacles. This dancing which was called "the joy of the Beth ha-Sho'ebah (the place of water drawing)" (Mishnah Sukkah 5:1) was said to exceed any other joy.\(^55\)

The origin of this rejoicing is obscure. It has been held to be a continuation of the dancing at the time when the fall harvest was in, and the new wine was made.\(^56\)

Riesenfeld believes that it is the remnant of the ceremony of the divine marriage from which the feast was derived.\(^57\)

Neither of these suggested origins appears to have given significance to rejoicing in the Temple, during the first Christian century. The thought of drawing water from the wells of salvation with joy was probably the chief thought.

---

57. Riesenfeld, H., JESU TRANSFIGURE, p. 158.
The interpretation of the "drawing" according to Joshua ben Levi (c. 240 A.D.) was that from the place of the dancing they draw prophetic inspiration, the holy spirit.58

That the motif of supplication for rain runs through the feast of Tabernacles is apparent. There was a connection in the thought of Israelites between the rain, and the resurrection of the dead. Genesis Rabbah 13:6, in telling how rain is greater as a miracle than the resurrection of the dead, says that rain is greater since it is for animals too, while the resurrection is just for men; rain is for all nations, but the resurrection just for Israelites; rain falls upon the righteous and wicked alike, while the resurrection is only for the righteous.59

The association of rain and the resurrection is made in the Eighteen Benedictions, in the second benediction.

Over the rejoicing in the Temple on the nights of the feast of Tabernacles burned the huge candelabra, sources of great light and a remarkable sight from anywhere in Jerusalem. This rite is not prescribed by the Pentateuch legislation for the feast, nor is an explanation associating it clearly with the feast to be found in the Mishnah. One may imagine that the light was first needed for illumination in the Temple to carry out the nightly dancing or observances,

and that it was so striking that it gained the aspect of a religious rite. On the other hand it may have been instituted with a clear symbolism, which has been lost to us in the literature. In any case, the bright light at night and the smoke from the flame by day could well be seen as a representation of the "pillar of cloud to lead them along the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light..." (Exodus 13:21) which was their protection in the wandering in the wilderness. In Isaiah 4:5 and 6 this is the symbolism; the cloud and smoke are a canopy and a Sukkah, in the future picture. The knowledge of this passage, and the association of it with the feast of Tabernacles must certainly have made the candelabra represent the "glory of the Lord" in protection over His people.

Readings in the Temple for the feast of Tabernacles were taken from the following Psalms: first day, 105; second day, 24; third day, 50:16ff; fourth day, 94:16-end; fifth day, 96:8; sixth day, 81:6 ff; seventh day, 82:5ff.60

In the reading for the second day, at Psalm 29:7 one finds a passage which may well have related to the flaming candelabra as a source of revelation of God, "The voice of the Lord flashes forth flames of fire." This Psalm recalls the voice of the Lord upon the waters, and the voice of the Lord in the wilderness, both of which were associated

with motifs of the feast of Tabernacles.

In the Psalm read for the first day of the feast, Psalm 105, one finds an interpretation of the theme of the wilderness wandering, recalled by the booths, which brings to mind the association of Abraham with the feast. Psalm 105:5, "Remember the wonderful works that he has done, his miracles, and the judgments he uttered, O offspring of Abraham his servant, sons of Jacob, his chosen ones," introduces a recitation of the means by which the Lord brought the nation up from a struggling beginning to a powerful people. This listing of the miracles is to demonstrate that the Lord is mindful of the covenant which he made with Abraham. The miracles recounted in the Psalm to demonstrate the remembrance of the promise to Abraham are closely associated with the rites of the feast: Psalm 105:39, "He spread a cloud for a covering, and fire to give light by night..." as the candelabra in the Temple; Psalm 105:41, "He opened the rock, and water gushed forth..." like the water libation; and Psalm 105:43 "So he led forth his people with joy..." the joy in the dancing at the place of the Water-Drawing. The interpretation of the feast which is found in this Psalm is sufficiently clear and unified to give continuity to the feast, which otherwise could easily appear as a week of very diverse events. If this Psalm were used in the Temple for a long period of time, it would serve to give a prominent interpretation to the
feast. The Psalm, however, is not found to be prominent in
the Rabbinic interpretation of the feast; they quote many
other passages in explaining the meaning of the rites.
It appears possible that the connection of this Psalm
with the feast was rather late, or that it did not express
the meaning of the feast for the prevailing parties of
Judaism. In another source, however, the feast of
Tabernacles is associated with the patriarch Abraham.
The Book of Jubilees, rewriting the history of the children
of Israel from the Pharasaic point of view, in the second
century B.C. tells that it was Abraham who instituted the
observance of the feast of Tabernacles, Jubilees 16:21,
"And he (Abraham) built booths for himself and for his
servants on this festival, and he was the first to
celebrate the feast of tabernacles on the earth."61 In
this account the feast is to be for seven days only, the
offerings prescribed are very different from those listed
in the book of Numbers, it is a sacrament of the
covenant people, since no uncircumcised person was with
him, and it is ordained forever to be celebrated by Israel.
The details of the later celebrations are different from
those actually followed by the people,"...for it is or-
dained forever regarding Israel that they should celebrate
it and dwell in booths, and set wreaths upon their heads,

61. Ed. Charles, R. H., APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF
and take leafy boughs, and willows from the brook." (Jubilees 16:30). The wreaths here are the feature which is not found in the actual observance of the feast, although they were a part of the celebration at weddings. 62 This nuptial rite appearing in the account of the feast of Tabernacles is another evidence of the probability that the feast resulted from an earlier observance of a sacred marriage in Israel, as demonstrated by Riesenfeld. There is, however, no evidence that the feasts ever were celebrated according to the unique ideas of the Book of Jubilees. Important for our study is the teaching in this passage that the feast is a sign of the covenant made with Abraham, the keeping of which is incumbent upon the seed of Abraham.

The last day of the seven days of the feast of Tabernacles proper, not counting the Closing Feast on the eighth day, was called by the name, "Hosh'ana Rabbah", or "Day of the Great Hosanna" because of the repetition of the refrain, "Hosh'ana", "Save Now!" on that day. 63 This suggests the manner in which the Messianic expectancy was building up in the course of the feast, for this passage from Psalm 118:25 was taken as signifying salvation through the Messiah. Yet it was on the eighth day of the feast, the Azereth, or Closing Feast that the particular expectation

was felt. The term "Closing Feast" was taken to refer not alone to the fact that the day closed the feast of Tabernacles, but to mean that it had a special character of its own. This eighth day was a day on which the dwelling in booths was ended, the water libation stopped, and the Lulab was no longer carried. The Haggada stresses that the Closing Feast is the observance in which Israel receives a wholly special favor from God. Rabbi Pinechas ben Chama (c. 360 A.D.) finds the meaning of this feast in the sacrifices which had been offered on the seven days of Tabernacles. The total number of bulls was seventy, which was taken to correspond to the seventy nations of the earth. On the eighth day, or the Closing Feast, but one bull is offered, for Israel alone. Since Israel has been faithfully offering for the gentile nations, even though they do not appreciate it, now comes the time when they receive their special reward, as the particular people of God. The supreme special reward which they could receive would be the Messianic salvation. Thus in the synagogue, there was read before this eighth day, from the prophecy of Ezekiel, the passage, about the wars of Gog and the land of Magog, chapter 39. These wars were expected to occur just before the Messiah's triumphant entry. Later, it was believed that the

Messiah would come on the ninth day after the beginning of Tabernacles, the day of rejoicing in the Law, the double of the eighth or closing day of Tabernacles. This Messianic expectancy, which gathered around the closing of the feast of Tabernacles conflicted to a certain extent with the similar expectation which had gathered around the Pass-over feast in the spring month of Nisan. In the Babylonian Talmud, Rosh Hashana 11a, opinions are divided whether the final redemption will take place in Nisan or in Tishri. The latter time seems to have been favored in the later synagogue, possibly as a result of the Christian emphasis that the event had occurred in the spring festival.

We conclude from this survey of the rites of the feast of Tabernacles and their significance, that the significance of the feast came from three different sources: the idea of the divine marriage, which must account for some of the rites and joy associated with the feast, the practice of rites designed to produce rainfall, and the need to interpret all the rites historically. The principle of the divine marriage, while it appears to have contributed much to the early formation of the rites, and to the expression of wild rejoicing in the feast, was apparently not consciously a part of the significance of the feast in the first Christian century. The rainfall rites appear to have maintained a consciousness of their origin in the feast. When these, in

the course of time, combined with the historical explanation of all the feasts, the joy of the marriage theme, and the hope of the rites for rainfall naturally became associated with the joy and hope of the future deliverance, the day of the Messiah. By their nature however, the hope and joy were related primarily to Israel, the theocratic nation, a somewhat nationalistic concept. It is seen in this reconstruction of the meaning of the feast that there is no one theme explaining all the rites. The feast was rather, a loosely related group of observances, not a single unified festival from beginning to end.

E. The Feast of Tabernacles in the Christian Church of the New Testament.

Considering that the feast of Tabernacles was at one time the most popular of all Jewish festivals, it had very little effect upon the thought of the Christian Church of the New Testament. No explicit reference to the feast is found in any of the books of the New Testament, outside the Fourth Gospel. Riesenfeld\(^6^6\) has proposed that the Transfiguration in the synoptic tradition is, in fact, a picture of the enthronement of the Messiah at the feast of Tabernacles, and that the feast therefore finds a place in the other gospels. The association which he shows through

\[^6^6\] Riesenfeld, H., JESU TRANSFIGURE, p. 280.
the motifs of the cloud, the booths, the transfigured appearance, and the theme of the Messiah who suffers, appears to draw upon themes associated with Tabernacles, but does not bring the actual rites of the feast into a place of importance. The story of the Transfiguration cannot have clearly meant this particular Jewish feast to its readers. The themes are drawn from the three autumn observances, which Riesenfeld holds were common in origin, but which were not at all together in the thought of Judaism.

It is the suggestion of Edersheim that the reason why the feast of Tabernacles found no place in the rites of the Christian Church is that it was thought to be a type or symbol which has not yet been fulfilled. Besides the reference to the festival explicitly in the Gospel of John, which will be taken up in detail in the next chapter, the Apocalypse of John uses the symbols of the feast in relation to the fulfillment which Christ accomplishes. The final vision, Apocalypse of John 21:1 - 22:5, uses the expressions, verse 3, "Behold, the dwelling (σκηνή) of God is with men...". That is to say, the Sukkah of God is among men, when the work of the Lamb, Christ, is accomplished. The figure in 21:6, "To the thirsty I will give water without price from the fountain of the water of life," may be related to the water of the libation on the occasion of the feast of

Tabernacles. In 21:23, "And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the lamb." The candelabra of the feast of Tabernacles were related to the glory of God which was a canopy and a Sukkah (Isaiah 4:6) over the people; here the lamb (Christ) has taken the place of the light of the feast. The river which flows from the throne of God, and which causes leaves with healing power to grow on the trees (22:2) is a duplication of the stream from the Temple in Ezekiel's vision, Ezekiel 47:1, which was associated with the feast of Tabernacles. Here in the Apocalypse, the stream flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Christ). The point of all this vision is that in Christ, the elements of the feast of Tabernacles are fulfilled. This vision was interpreted as something to occur in the future, by the Christian Church, and could not therefore be considered as having been fulfilled already by Christ. Since the references to this feast are found only in the Gospel of John and in the Apocalypse of John, it appears that the feast of Tabernacles was considered to have Christian implications only in the school of thought in which these works were first known. Although unity of authorship of the two works is not widely held, they do appear to have come from the same school of thought in the early church. But the feast did not win its way in the church, since it did not in records
which we have, find any place in the worship of the church.

Messianic expectation grew up in Judaism around both the feast of Tabernacles and the Passover. The synoptic gospels convey the thought that Jesus fulfilled the role of Messiah by the fulfillment of the Passover expectation. The Johannine school carries the thought further, in holding that Jesus not only fulfilled the Passover expectation, but all the expectation of the whole cycle of the Jewish feasts, and beyond. This advance of the Johannine school was not sufficiently accepted however, to cause a change in the feast observed by the church at Passover time. The Passover too, is given the supreme place in the Johannine account, and has a much clearer association with the ministry of Jesus than does Tabernacles.
CHAPTER VIII

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES AND JOHN 7:1 - 9:41

Chapters 7, 8 and 9 of the Gospel of John form a continuous narrative which is set in time by the mention of the feast of Tabernacles in 7:2, reference to the middle of the feast at 7:14, to the last day at 7:37, and the continuing of the same discourse in chapter 8 and its immediate sequel in chapter 9. Natural breaks in the subject matter will make it convenient to deal with these chapters in four sections: 7:1 - 36; 7:37 - 52; 8:12 - 59; and 9:1 - 41.


There is apparently a long pause in the narrative represented by the first verse of this section, telling that Jesus went about in Galilee. In the revised order of the Gospel, this statement covers the time from the feast of Pentecost early in the month of Sivan to the feast of Tabernacles, four months later. The same kind of break in the narrative will occur at 10:22 with the mention of the feast of Dedication two months after Tabernacles, when the last action of the previous section apparently took place in direct relation to the feast of Tabernacles.

At 7:2 the identification of the passage with the time of the feast of Tabernacles is made explicit. The following conversation and action demonstrate the manner of Jesus'
going up to the feast. In verse 3, in the words of Jesus' brothers, the worldly reason for his going to the feast is proposed, "For no man works in secret if he seeks to be known openly." This is reasoning based upon the unbelief (verse 5) of his brothers. The suggestion that he go to Jerusalem to make himself known is rejected by Jesus in words and in his action in sending his brothers on to the feast. The reason for the rejection of the suggestion that he go up to the feast to become known openly, is that his "time has not fully come" (verse 9), that is, it is not the world's consideration of publicity which must guide his action, but the destiny which is finally fulfilled in his "going up" as the Son of Man, when his time is fully come. The action of Jesus in going up to the feast after rejecting the idea of going for the worldly reason of making himself known, becomes a commentary upon the word \( \alpha \nu \gamma \beta \alpha \iota \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \) which is not only the word for going up to the feast, but is John's word for the ascent of the Son of Man to the Father, through death.¹ When Jesus does go up to the feast (verse 10) it is on his own initiative, as his final glorification must be, and as a sign of the relationship between himself and the true Temple cultus which shall be made clear when his time has come.

¹ Barrett, C. K., THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN, p. 258.
There is perhaps at this point, a distinction being made between the knowledge which his brothers had of what he *was* doing, and what, in view of his final fulfillment of his mission, he *was* actually doing when he went up to the feast. If such a distinction is being made it would echo the thought of the prologue, John 1:11, "He came to his own, and his own did not receive him". At the feast, his own brothers did not perceive his meaning. In John 7:11-13 the sharp question of just who Jesus is, and what is the truth of his teaching is found to be dividing the crowds.

It is said in John 7:14 that about the middle of the feast, Jesus went up to teach in the Temple. Verses 15-24 following this statement have been relocated to a position following 5:47 for reasons set forth in chapter II. The questions of 7:25 and 26 then immediately follow, defining the reaction of the crowd, "Can it be that the authorities know that this is the Christ?" and the basis upon which the crowd does not answer affirmatively, "Yet we know where this man comes from (as did his brothers in the introduction to this conversation); and when the Christ appears, no one will know where he comes from". Jesus answers, casting doubt upon their knowledge of his true origin, and appealing to his relation to the Father who sent him as his authentication. But those who do come to belief, verse 31, do so because they perceive the signs he has done. The point is, belief is not in seeing his earthly
origin, but in perceiving the signs which point to his uniqueness in relation to their worship and to the Father. In the following passage, related to a question of the Pharisees, the importance of the coming of his time, when finally he ascends, is brought into the dissertation, verse 33, "...I shall be with you a little longer, and then I go to him who sent me;" The answer of the intense question about Jesus' identity then is said to be bound up in perceiving his signs, and particularly in the sign of his final sacrifice and Resurrection. The intensity of the question here raised, is to be expected in relation to the feast of Tabernacles, when all the pilgrims were dwelling, as were Israelites everywhere, in the Sukkah, with its significance as the dwelling of the age to come, and of its relation to the Messiah. The question, "Is this the Messiah?" must become more timely as the last day of the feast approaches. It is in the next section, beginning at 7:37 that the last day of the feast comes.


It is said that "On the last day of the feast, the great day, Jesus stood up and proclaimed..." verse 37. The last day of the feast of Tabernacles would be the eighth day, or the "Closing Feast", the "last day of the feast" being a name sometimes used of this day. It is a question, however, if the eighth day could properly be
called "the great day". This name would be more readily applicable to the seventh day of the feast, which was the day of the seven processions around the altar, and the beating of the ground with palm tufts. Next to the name "Day of Beating of Palmtufts" for this seventh day, was the name "Day of the Great Hosanna."² It is possible that it was to this day that the Evangelist refers. In any case, it was on one of the days when the Messianic expectation ran high, that Jesus proclaimed his teaching, "If anyone thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the scripture says, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.'" (John 7:37, 38) This reference to the water, appears to bear a direct relation to the water libation which was characteristic of the feast (not of the eighth day however). The water for the libation was drawn from the pool of Siloam, which here is not mentioned, but which in John 9:7 is named, with an explanation that the name means "sent". This would suggest that as the water of the libation comes from the pool named "Sent", so the living waters are dependent upon "the one who is sent", that is, the Christ. In verse 39, the water is identified with the Spirit, "which those who believed in him were to receive". This giving of the Spirit is dependent upon the "one who is sent". The words which Jesus

uses on this occasion are from two passages of Isaiah, both of which are anticipatory of the future redemption of Israel. "If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink", 7:37, recalls the cry in Isaiah 55:1, "Ho everyone who thirsts, come to the waters..." This chapter of Isaiah moves on to exhort the hearer to seek the Lord through whom the future joy will come. In the verse immediately preceding the section on the last day of the feast, as a conclusion to the argument which defines the questions about Jesus which will be answered in 37ff, a thought from this same part of Isaiah is used. "You will seek me and you will not find me..." verse 36, is a clear suggestion of Isaiah 55:6, "Seek the Lord while he may be found...". As the seeking of the Lord is the answer to thirst, and results in the promise of the eternal covenant with its blessings, so when "you will seek me", says Jesus, thirst will be ended, by the living water of the Spirit, a blessing of the everlasting covenant. In John 7:38, "Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water" suggests Isaiah 44:3, "For I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon your descendants...". This is the means by which the Lord will do great things through his servant, Israel, and bring about their redemption from captivity, according to Isaiah 44. In John, this pouring of the water is dependent upon Jesus. The term, "living waters" probably comes from
Zechariah 14:8, "On that day living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem...", a description of one of the characteristics of the final day of judgment and salvation. The water libation of the feast is thus related to the redemption anticipated by the prophets, and is a sign of the place of Jesus as the Christ through whom this redemption is to be realized. He is himself the giver of water, of which the libation was but an obscure picture.

In John 7:40 - 52, the Evangelist returns to the question, or decision facing the crowd and the hearers, some saying "This is the Christ", others raising objections. Disbelief is based upon the arguments from the earthly and traditional marks of the Messiah, he must be from Judah (Bethlehem), and a descendent of David. But the Evangelist is making the point that these are not the means by which it is attested that Jesus is the Christ. In the passage 7:45 - 52, it is the Pharisees who raise their objections: none of the authorities believe him, and he is from Galilee. In contrast to these, the officers and the Pharisee Nicodemus, who are believers, testify that it is through hearing Jesus and learning what he does that belief comes. In verse 51, "...learning what he does" would not be merely observing the actions, but perceiving the signs of Jesus.
With the elimination of John 7:53 - 8:11, the discourses in 8:12ff can be associated with the same day of the feast of Tabernacles, the seventh day, as the previous section. There is no reason to postulate the passage of time between the discourses. On this occasion, Jesus uses a figure of speech which bears close relationship to the rites of the feast of Tabernacles. In 8:12 he declares, "I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life." The use of light as a symbol is common in the Old Testament: Psalm 27:1, "The Lord is my light...", Isaiah 9:2, "The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light...", Isaiah 42:6 "I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations." Here light refers respectively to "the Lord", the hope of the Messianic redemption, and Israel as the servant. John makes use of the same figure, in the prologue, where the Logos is, "The true light that enlightens every man..." (John 1:9). The use of the expression "light of the world" in this passage, however, would appear to come directly from the illuminations of the Temple each night during the feast, by the great candelabra. This is the last day of the feast; soon the light will no longer burn as a clear indication of God's light, the pillar of fire, through which his people are protected. But instead
of walking in darkness, the true "light of life", is before them, if they will see him as such. It is not now to the Temple that they must look for the light, but to the one standing before them. The Psalm which was used on the seventh day of Tabernacles, Psalm 82:5ff, says of the wicked, "They have neither knowledge nor understanding, they walk about in darkness...". It is just the answer to this darkness that Jesus states, "...he who follows me will not walk in darkness..." Jesus puts himself in place of the light of the Temple, and as more than the light of the Temple, for he is the one giving the "light of life", which does not go out.

Following the statement of Jesus as the light of the world, the action and the discourse leave the subject of light, and pass to the question raised by Jesus' proclamation, a formulation again of the problem of the decision between the earthly appearance of Jesus, and what he in reality is. The reason for the unbelief of the Pharisees, John 8:15 is that they "judge according to the flesh". But Jesus' proclamation is authenticated by two witnesses, himself and the One sending him. Here, in 8:16, the expression "I and he who sent me", (ἐγώ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με) is used. Dodd holds that this may be an association with the form which the priests used in the Temple, when in the reciting of Psalm 118:25 at the feast of Tabernacles,
they said Xωλα. instead of Ναλα. This is supposedly to disguise the pronunciation of the sacred name\(^3\) but it may have been an expression of the close identification of God and His people. The expression which Dodd believes may have been used in the Temple on this occasion, would in the mouth of Jesus with his stated dependence upon and unity with the Father, be equivalent to "I and he who sent me." The Name of God, which is the expression of His nature, is not merely "I Am" but that which bears witness to the relationship of the Father and the Son, "I and He who sent me."\(^4\) Rabbi Pincha ben Jair (c. 130-160 A.D.) is witness for the belief that while the Name of God is not truly know in this age, it will be known in the age to come.\(^5\) Thus when Jesus answers the request for the authentication of his proclama-

tion, "for it is not I alone that judge, but I and he who sent me" (John 8:16), the answer becomes a sign of the true nature of God, the true Name, and an evidence that here is revelation of the age to come.

After further controversy, in which the hearers demonstrate their unwillingness to understand Jesus' intimate relation to the Father, Jesus turns the controversy to his coming death, "I go away, and you will seek me and die in your sin;" (John 8:21). Here again it is possible

\(^5\) Dodd, C. H., Ibid., p. 93.
to see the influence of the Psalm for the seventh day of Tabernacles, 82:5 - 8, verse 6 and 7 of which read, "I say, 'You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like men, and fall like any prince." Here in the Psalm, this death which comes even to the sons of the Most High would be taken to be the fate even of the Israelite, since the passage is separated from the first verse which explains that this is a scene of God sitting in judgment upon the "spirits" (דונותא). This same passage, Psalm 82:6, is used in John 10:34, interpreted as applying to the Israelites. But as Jesus' argument develops in John 8:24, this death is to be avoided by those who believe, "...for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he." The unbelief of the hearers is again expressed with the question of 8:25, "They said to him, 'Who are you?'" This controversy is ended, when Jesus tells that they have not known what he would tell them from the beginning, and that when he has been "lifted up" (verse 28) referring to the Crucifixion, they will then realize that his authority is from the Father.

Another phase of the conversation begins at 8:31 continuing to the end of chapter 8, revolving around the idea of Abraham's children. It is begun at 8:32 and 33 with Jesus word, "... and the truth shall make you free", to which the hearers, Jews who had believed in Jesus, reply,
"We are descendants of Abraham, and have never been in bondage to anyone." Jesus challenges their claim to freedom, with the argument that as sinners, they are slaves to sin. At verse 35, he uses a figure of speech which could be related to the feast of Tabernacles, "The slave does not continue in the house forever; the son continues forever."

This is similar to the idea of the slave woman, Hagar, cast out of Abraham's house, according to Genesis 21:10, an idea repeated in Galatians 4:30 by Paul. As the Evangelist uses the idea however, it has been expanded to picture the eternal dwelling place of the son. This is a possible reference to the interpretation of the Sukkah, the dwelling of the age to come. As the description of the feast of Tabernacles was given in the Book of Jubilees 16:20ff, it is a feast in which just the true Israelite dwells in the booth. To the true sons of Abraham, the booth is a dwelling forever, of the world to come. John 8:37 makes explicit the distinction which Jesus is making about his hearers, who appear now not to be the believers referred to in verse 31, but unbelievers, for in verse 37 he says, "I know that you are descendants of Abraham...". Then in verse 39, he presumes that, though Abrahams descendants, they are not in fact Abraham's children. They must then be the children of the slave. In verses 39 through 47 it is made clear that the charge which Jesus is making is that these are not children of Abraham, but children of the devil.
The controversy is in verses 45 through 51, the argument over Jesus' authority, as to why he should be believed. In the course of this, at verse 51 Jesus says, "Truly, truly I say to you, if any one keeps my word, he will never see death." This is obviously a claim to higher authority than that claimed for Abraham, for his would-be children here, say, "Abraham died, as did the prophets... are you greater than our father Abraham who died?" (verse 53). Jesus argues in return, that certainly he is greater, for his glorification is really the "Glory of God". This is the נ日々 which was symbolized by the illumination of the Temple by night during the feast, and which was also one of the spiritual interpretations of the Sukkah, in which God is present with His people, dwelling with them for the feast. But this glorification of Jesus looks forward to the final glorification, which is introduced in this Gospel with the words, John 13:31, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and in him is God glorified." Thus Jesus is said to be, in himself, the true glory of God which was symbolized in the feast of Tabernacles, and which should be apparent finally. The controversy ends with each side of the question clearly defined, Jesus summing up his teaching to them, "Truly, truly I say to you, before Abraham was, I am." (John 8:58). The hearers, now positively hostile, try to stone him. The
argument of the passage from verse 31 through 58 has been, Jesus is superior to Abraham, therefore his authority is greater than that which comes from Abraham. This whole concern with Abraham is closely associated with the occasion, the feast of Tabernacles, which it was said in the Book of Jubilees 16:20ff, was first instituted by Abraham. It is, so to speak, based upon his authority. There is no evidence to show that this idea was generally accepted in Judaism, but the emphasis in the Book of Jubilees must mean that to some party of Pharisees, it was an important tradition. It seems clear that the reason for the particular choice of subject in the controversy recorded must rest upon some influence of this tradition, whether from Jubilees or some other source.


The miracle of Jesus which is the point of departure for the discourse in chapter 9 of the Fourth Gospel is apparently to be located chronologically directly following the exit of Jesus from the Temple, after the controversy associated with the feast of Tabernacles. It is a sign, an historical event with a meaning beyond the obvious, which is related to the saying of 8:12, "I am the light of the world", which is repeated in this episode at 9:5. But here, the action of Jesus tells the message, in that Jesus
is confronted with a man who was born blind. Making reference to his nature, as the light of the world, Jesus proceeds to cure the darkness of the blind man, by means of clay made from his spittle, (John 9:6). This demonstrates the personal importance of Jesus in the healing which is to take place. But the healing takes place only after the man washes in the pool of Siloam. The miracle is thus related to the water libation at the feast of Tabernacles, which came from the pool of Siloam. The miracle is also in this aspect a sign of Jesus' nature, in the interpretation of the name "Siloam" ( ΠΝ/{$\omicron$}{\omicron}$\omicron$ from ΠΣ/{$\omicron$}{\omicron}$\omicron$ , to send) which means "sent" (John 9:7). Behind the power of the waters of Siloam, is the "one who is sent", which all through the Gospel is Jesus. In this episode, an advance is made in the proclamation of Jesus as the light of the world, which as it was given before, could have an impersonal interpretation. Here the light of the world is the answer to personal darkness, giving light to the person, not just to the race, or to mankind in general. Even the Messianic passages dealing with the promised opening of the eyes of the blind, such as Isaiah 35:5, do not contemplate such clear personal relationship with the bringer of the Messianic salvation. In the ensuing controversy, since it is said that the healing took place on the sabbath, the Pharisees staunchly refuse to believe, or "to see", the miracle, and resort to the attempt to prove that the event
did not happen. In the course of the controversy, the Jews identify themselves as disciples of Moses, verse 28, who cannot see anything in the miracle, and as a result, cast the man who was healed of his blindness out of the synagogue. Thus far, the man had reached the point of confessing of Jesus, "He is a prophet", 9:17. In the concluding meeting with Jesus, he comes to believe that he is the Son of Man, the Lord, verses 37 and 38. The conclusion of the whole event is found in the statement of Jesus, 9:39, "For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see, may see, and that those who see may become blind.". The point of the miracle and of the controversy has been the spiritual blindness which Jesus takes away. The curing of the blindness has been a sign of Jesus as the light of the world, the cure for spiritual blindness, and the unbelief of the Pharisees has been a sign of their actual spiritual blindness.

E. Conclusions concerning the feast of Tabernacles.

It has been shown that from the beginning of chapter 7 to the end of chapter 9 of the Fourth Gospel, the material is related to the feast of Tabernacles, with most of it relating to the last day. Whether it seems chronologically to be possible that this much activity could be attached to one day or not, it is the meaning of the Evangelist that in subject matter, these events are related to the feast. Since
the material on Tabernacles began immediately following the end of the material on Pentecost, according to the relocated passages, and immediately following is the section dealing with the feast of Dedication, all the action and discussion of the Gospel in this period from Sivan 6 to Kislev 25, six and one-half months, refers to the brief period of the feast of Tabernacles.

The relation of the rites and symbols of the feast of Tabernacles to the Gospel of John is not so complete as was the case with the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread. This must be in part due to the fact that the rites of Tabernacles are so varied that it would scarcely be useful to deal with them all. It is remarkable, however, that the most characteristic observances of feast are almost ignored by the Fourth Evangelist. The Lulab is not mentioned at all, nor is the joyous dancing. The Sukkah, the very primary rite, finds only one very vague reference in the Gospel. The observances which are emphasized are the water libation and the illumination, neither of which is connected with the Biblical background of the feast. The theme of Abraham's instituting the feast, or of its referring to his wandering is, in our sources, such a minor theme that it can hardly be considered an outstanding characteristic of the feast.

The implications of the actions and discourses of Jesus on the feast of Tabernacles are, with respect to the water of salvation, that Jesus is himself the giver and
the source, and with respect to the light, the Jesus is himself the dispeller of darkness. He is thus placed in the position as the one superseding the observances. In a sense he more than fulfills both these rites, in that he gives a personal application of these Messianic hopes; the water he gives is the Spirit, a personal source of life, and the light he gives is the curing of personal darkness.

The selection of the water and light as the motifs which Jesus is portrayed as fulfilling, may well have been dictated by the fact that these are the rites particularly associated with the Temple and which could not be duplicated in the synagogue. If the Gospel represents a time when the Temple had been destroyed, the Evangelist might be arguing that Jesus has fulfilled that part of the rites which could not be transferred to the synagogue, while the Lulab and Sukkah would still be obviously continued in the synagogues. No mention at all, however, is made of the sacrifices which were numerous at the feast, though not entering prominently into the interpretation of it.

Over all the feast of Tabernacles stands the superiority of Jesus who is held in this section of the Gospel to be greater than the one who instituted the feast, Abraham.

As related in the preceding chapter, it was only in the Johannine school of thought that the feast of Tabernacles had any apparent meaning for the New Testament Church. Specific mention of the feast is made only in the Fourth
Gospel. Here, different from the interpretation of the Apocalypse of John 21, the feast is fulfilled in the glorification of Jesus which occurs at his death, and Resurrection. In the Apocalypse, as interpreted by the early church, this was yet to be.

There is no evidence of an observance of a Christian Tabernacles by the Christian Church, but the reading of John 8:12 - 20 at the time when Tabernacles was celebrated (see Chapter II), and the extent to which Jesus' mission is interpreted in terms of the rites of the feast, would be evidence that at least in the churches of the early Johannine school, the feast of Tabernacles was a living tradition.
CHAPTER IX

THE FEAST OF DEDICATION

A. The Biblical accounts of the feast of Dedication.

There is no account of the feast of Dedication in any of the canonical books of the Old Testament (according to the Hebrew Canon). The title to Psalm 30, "A Psalm of David. A Song at the dedication of the Temple" is probably intended to mean the dedication of the Temple of Solomon, whether this was the actual original use of the Psalm or not. It is in the apocryphal books of I and II Maccabees that one first meets the feast. Each book gives an account of the institution of the feast in the period of the Maccabean uprisings, c. 165 B.C.

One account of the institution of the feast of Dedication is found in I Maccabees 4:36 - 59. This book is a rather matter-of-fact telling of the history of the Maccabean party, written about the last quarter of the second century B.C.¹ According to this account, the feast was first instituted by the Maccabees upon their successful campaign against Jerusalem in 148th year of the Seleucids, or 165 B.C., three years after Antiochus Epiphanes had desecrated the altar. When the Jews finally

made their way to the Temple they found it desolate. While some of the soldiers were sent to keep the enemy occupied in the citadel, others began to carry out the work of cleansing the Temple. They carried out the stones of the "abomination of desolation" or small heathen altar, which had been set up in the 145th year (I Macc. 1:54) and disposed of them. The stones of the altar of burnt offering were taken down but disposition was not immediately made. A new altar was built, the holy place repaired, and the Temple refurnished. They procured new holy vessels, a new candlestick, and a new table, placing them in the Temple. The loaves of shew-bread were put on the table, and the veils put up. Then "early in the morning on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month, which is the month of Chislev, in the one hundred and forty-eighth year," (I Macc. 4:52) they instituted the offering of sacrifices, with songs, harps, lutes and cymbals. The celebration was occupied with burnt offerings, gladness, sacrifices of deliverance and praise. In consequence the festival is ordained for eight days every year for the Jews.2

In the book of II Maccabees we find too, an account of the institution of the feast of Dedication. II Maccabees was written in its final form probably before 50 B.C., as the condensation of a longer history written by Jason,

probably around 130 B.C. References in the introduction of the book suggest that one of the purposes of it was to give Egyptian Jews the reasons for celebrating the "Feast of Tabernacles in the month Chislev" (II Macc. 1:10). In the account, II Maccabees 10:1 - 8 the institution of the new feast is placed in connection with the retaking of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus. His followers pulled down the pagan altars in the market place, and built a new altar in the Temple. The new fire was struck with flint, according to this account, two years after the desecration of the altar. Charles takes this to be a mistake in the text, which should read three years. Incense, lamps, and the presentation of the shew-bread were part of the ceremony of rededication. The celebration took place for eight days, which is taken to be like the feast of Booths, "remembering how, not long before, during the feast of tabernacles they had been wandering like wild beasts in the mountains and caves." (II Macc. 10:6). The celebration included the bearing of wands, and hymns of praise. The account adds that the festival was decreed for "these ten days every year." (II Macc. 10:8). Why it should say ten days here, and eight days in verse 6 is not clear. The intent of the decree of the feast has been taken to mean eight days.

B. The feast of Dedication in the Temple.

Although the feast of Dedication was held in II Maccabees to be a "feast of Tabernacles in the month of Chislev", there were deep differences in the feasts as celebrated. The feast of Dedication stood in a different class from that of Tabernacles, since it could never gain the status of the great pilgrimage feasts of Judaism. Since the Pentateuch was silent about the feast, it must always remain in an inferior position. In the Temple, there would not be the same assembling of people from all parts of the country, and from other countries, as was the case on the pilgrimage feasts. The feast lasted for eight days, from the twenty-fifth of Kislev. The days, however, were not marked by abstention from laborious work, nor were there holy convocations at the beginning or end.\(^5\)

The Hallel (Psalms 113-118) was used in the Temple, as on the occasions of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. The worshipers carried branches for the feast of Dedication, according to II Maccabees 10:7, but it is not clear if this is the same rite as was observed on the feast of Tabernacles or not. Rankin\(^6\) holds that this may be the description of part of a much wider realm of religious practice, not having the same meaning as that of the Lulab at Tabernacles.

---

The primary observance of the feast of Dedication was the lighting of lamps in the homes, although this is not clearly referred to in the passages of I and II Maccabees. It is for this reason that Josephus, "Antiquities of the Jews" x:7:7 says that this feast is called the feast of "lights". One might expect that the association with Tabernacles, might emphasize the lighting of the great lamps in the Temple on this feast, but the illumination of this feast, was a home celebration. In the Talmud, which calls the feast the "feast of Illumination", the Shammaites who generally represent the older tradition, held that on the first night of Dedication, eight lamps should be displayed in the home, or outside the door, with the number reduced by one each night. On the other hand, the Hillelites lighted one lamp the first night, two the second, and so on, until on the eighth night, eight were lit. 8 These lights in early times were apparently set out in front of the houses, for in the Mishnah, Baba Kamma 6:6 9 the case is considered where the load on a camel is set afire by a Hanukkah lamp, in which case the owner of the lamp is not liable. The

7. Rankin, O. S., Ibid., p. 76-77.
placing of the lamp was considered a religious duty, and to be able to set fire to the load on the camel, it must be outside. The lamp is brought in, according to later decisions, when there is persecution only. Upon lighting the lamp, the person lighting it says the benedictions, "Praised be Thou, O Lord, our God, ruler of the world, who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments and bidden us kindle the Hanukkah lights." and "Praised be Thou, O Lord our God, Ruler of the world, who didst wondrous things for our fathers at this season in those days." After the lamps are lit and the benedictions said, Psalm 30 is repeated by all. Even a temporary guest in a house is supposed to light a lamp for himself in honor of the feast, though the original thought seems to have been, one lamp for a man and his household.

There were not, on the occasion of the feast of Dedication extra sacrifices like those ordained for the other festival occasions. In the regular Temple services during Dedication, Psalm 30 was sung, although in later times this Psalm was dropped from the celebration and only the Hallel was used.

C. The feast of Dedication in the Synagogue.

The feast of Dedication was marked in the synagogue by services which were very little different from those of other days. The Hallel was used in the service as on other festival days, and there was inserted in the "standing prayer" a prayer referring to the deliverance under the Maccabees. On the days of Dedication, a special reading of the Pentateuch was inserted in place of the regular reading, the special section being Numbers 7:1-89. This was divided into sections such that from 7:54 to the end of the passage was read on the eighth day. This section was later extended to include the first four verses of chapter 8.

D. The significance of the feast of Dedication.

From the suggestion of II Maccabees, that the feast of Dedication was celebrated like the feast of Tabernacles, to make up for the missing of Tabernacles while the people were confined to the mountains and caves, it might appear that the feast was actually another Tabernacles. The similar features are: eight days duration, the singing of the Hallel, the carrying of branches, and the illuminations. Rankin has shown, however, that the eight days could well be the actual time consumed in rededicating the altar, that the Hallel

15. Gaster, T., FESTIVALS OF THE JEWISH YEAR.
was sung at Passover and Pentecost as well as Tabernacles, that the carrying of branches could mean something quite different on this occasion, and that the illuminations on the feast of Dedication were at the home rather than at the Temple. Since these observances need not rest upon the similar observances of the feast of Tabernacles, and in some cases are quite different from them, the character of the feast of Dedication does not appear to be primarily that of Tabernacles.

Wellhausen saw in the feast of Dedication, originally, a festival of the winter solstice which was taken over into Jewish worship and given a new interpretation. It would be "a nature festival of the winter-solstice and had first found entrance to Jerusalem through the heathen, as a Dionysus celebration, and thereafter had not been abolished, but had been rendered harmless through interpretation."18 The lamp of the festival would then be derived from the torches which the worshipers carried in the Dionysian celebrations. The date of the feast of Dedication however, makes this exact identification unlikely. The 25th of Kislev, based upon the luni-solar year of the Jews, would not coincide with the winter solstice which was a point on the solar year. Rankin holds that the influence of the Dionysian celebrations upon the feast of

18. Quoted in Rankin, O. S., Ibid., p. 105.
Dedication was in requiring that something supplant the Greek religion, but that I and II Maccabees show the vitality of Judaism in supplanting it. Rankin derives the origin of the Hanukkah lamps from the street altars which were a part of the cults of Dionysus and Apollo. These had the characteristics found in the record of the celebration of the first feast of Dedication, fire, sacrifice and altars. Sacrifices were made on the street altars on the twenty-fifth of each month, on the king's birthday, giving a dynastic aspect to the rites. Altars could not remain in the homes of the orthodox Jews, but lamps at the doorway provided a substitute.

The lamps of Hanukkah, replacing the street altars, gained a new meaning to the Jews. Gratz held that the lamps were a symbol of the Law, which was the basis of the victory over Hellenic idolatry. The symbol is explained by reference to Proverbs 6:23, "For the commandment is a lamp, and the teaching a light..." Rankin finds that this meaning of the lamps is strengthened by the oracular nature of the cult of Apollo. Beyond this he holds that the lamps represented the sovereignty of God, and of His people in the new age. The lamp which burned in the sanctuary

had become a symbol of the spirit of the Lord which would dwell within the Messiah in the age to come. The lamps of Hanukkah by relation to the Temple lamps relit by the heroes of the Maccabean war, take on this meaning too.  

From the pagan festival which the feast of Dedication replaced, Rankin finds that the character of a feast of the new aion, or new age attached to the new feast. This associated well with the older hopes of the age to come, and the new age concept was interpreted in Jewish modes of expression. The significance of the feast of Dedication according to Rankin's development, is attached primarily to its origin. It is difficult to know to what extent this interpretation would have dominated thought about the feast in the first Christian Century. The immediate effect of the pagan rites would be gone, and the tendency would be to stress the historical aspects of the feast. These historical deeds of the Maccabees however, would still carry with them thoughts of the new age, and of the promised redemption of the Messianic age.

An interpretation of the feast of Dedication different from that of Rankin, is proposed by Gaster. He holds that the rites introduced in II Maccabees are actually a

22. Rankin, O.S., Ibid., p. 222.
satire of the Dionysian rites. He states that in many places the Dionysian rites were held only once every two years; that dressed in the skins of fawns and foxes the followers of Dionysus rushed madly to the mountains where torchlight revels were held. The torches were dipped in wine or water so that the spurt of flame represented the fiery character of the God. The satire of these rites by the Jews would be pointed: "In place of the filthy 'purifications' of the pagans, these devoted Jews cleansed and purified the House of God. In place of the orgiastic festal parade, they reverently circuited the altar. Instead of wreathed wands, they carried the lulab. Instead of frenzied shouts, they recited Psalms. And instead of waving torches, they relit the sacred candelabrum." 25 The two-year interval mentioned in II Maccabees 10:3, thought to be a mistake for the three year lapse in the sacrifices, would be a deliberate change in favor of the satire. The lighting of the fire with flint, the normal means of lighting fire, was in strict contrast to the waving of torches. It still seems to be in the background of this theory, that the feast of Dedication had to replace or controvert some Dionysian practices. By this theory, however, one would not expect that any of the original meaning of the pagan feast or rites would remain.

In the scripture passages which attached to the festival in times later than its origin, one finds some of the ideas which it was taken to signify. The earliest evidence of readings for Dedication is that of the Mishnah which tells that Numbers 7:1 - 89 was used. This is appropriate for the occasion in that it connects the event with the dedication of the Tabernacle in the days of Moses. This is in accord with the movement observed in connection with the other festivals, to give a historical basis in the early history of the people, to each feast. The reading gives a detailed account of the offerings for the dedication of the Tabernacle, after which the reference to lamps is found in the passage which must have been included with chapter 7, Numbers 8:1 - 4. This is the section describing the lamps, and telling that the seven lamps gave light before the lampstand. This passage however, does not interpret the meaning of the feast. On the second sabbath of the feast of Dedication, when that occurred, the reading was I Kings 7:1 - 51 which tells the details of the dedication of the Temple of Solomon.

Psalm 30 was early found to be appropriate to the feast of Dedication, since its title tells that it is for the dedication of the Temple. It is a Psalm which rejoices in the fact that the Lord has brought the singer up from Sheol. It is a Psalm speaking of gladness, for
mourning has been turned to dancing. That this is appropriate to the dedication of the altar, is not obvious, but it would find a suitable context in the situation of the Jews who first returned to the Temple after spending their days hunted like animals in the hills and caves. This is like the procession returning from Sheol, when the Jews return to their Temple.

The Haftarah reading for the feast of Dedication was Zechariah 2:10 - 4:7. This passage opens with a shout of triumph and hope of the new age, "Sing and rejoice, 0 daughter of Zion, for lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of you, says the Lord." (Zechariah 2:10.) In chapter 3 a vision follows, telling of the high priest Joshua, who is cleansed of his filthy garments by the Lord, and who receives power to rule the House of the Lord until the final day. In chapter 4, the vision of the seven lamps fed by the olive trees is given. The vision of the lamps indicates to Zerubbabel, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord of hosts." (Zechariah 4:6). The figure of the priest's garments being cleansed by the Lord, is indicative of the cleansing of the Temple and its utensils on a spiritual plane. It indicates a pointing in the direction of the Messianic age, in that the Messiah, "the Branch", is promised to Joshua. The lamps of the vision fed by the spirit of the

Lord, the inexhaustible supply, are the sovereign rule of God which will be the power behind Zerubbabel. If the reading had been continued through the end of the fourth chapter, the complete identification of the branches of the olive trees beside the golden pipes, which are the two annointed ones who stand by the Lord would have been made. (Zechariah 4:14). These "annointed ones" or "Messiahs" suggest the Messianic age. But the more general interpretation only is found in the passage as it was read at the feast, stopping at verse 7.

The significance of the lamps of the feast of Dedication is the subject of several traditions found in the rabbinic literature. In the Talmud, Sab. 21b, the story is told that when the Greeks entered the Temple, they defiled all the oil for the lamps. When the Jews returned, oil was needed to light the lamps, but only one container of oil could be found with the seal of the high priest on it. This was enough for one day's flame, but by a miracle, the oil lasted for eight days. Thus the lamp commemorates the miracle. 27 Another tradition is found in Megillath Ta'anith ix, which suggests that when the seven-branched candlestick was taken from the Temple, no replacement was found but seven spears of iron were found, to which lamps could be attached to substitute for the candlestick. 28

27. Rankin, O. S., Ibid., p. 77.
28. Rankin, O. S., Ibid., p. 79.
The significance of the feast of Dedication according to Josephus, is suggested by his statement in Antiquities of the Jews xii: 7: 7, "I suppose the reason was, because this liberty beyond our hopes appeared to us." It would appear that what Josephus means here, is the religious freedom of worship which the Jews enjoyed upon the Maccabean revolt. It is considered improbable that this is the full significance of the lamp, and that Josephus is possibly passing over the deeper hope of his people, for full Messianic freedom, as he often seemed to do, in order to appear friendly to Rome. This may well be understatement of the meaning attached to the lamps in Jewish circles of his time.

E. The feast of Dedication in the Church of the New Testament.

The mention in the tenth chapter of John, is the only mention of the feast of Dedication in the New Testament, nor is there suggestion of it without name. There is, of course, a notable similarity between the date of Dedication, Kislev 25, and the date of Christmas finally adopted by the Church as the birth date of Jesus. But it must be born in mind that Kislev 25 does not coincide with December 25, but would more nearly coincide with November 18, ten days after the beginning of winter.

31. Rankin, O. S., Ibid., p. 197.
The adoption of December 25 as Christmas did not occur until the fourth century A.D., and then its date was based upon calculations of Hippolytus, using a symbolic history of Jesus' life. While there was controversy over the date on which Christmas should be observed, drawing its reasons from the supposed birth date of the Sun god in different lands around the Mediterranean Sea, there appears to be no evidence that a date was sought which would produce a Christian counterpart of the feast of Dedication.

The Gospel of John appears to be unique in its mention of the feast of Dedication. The fact that according to the reading lection of the Gospel of John discussed in Chapter II, the mention of the feast would come at the time in the year when this feast was celebrated by the Jews, indicates that in the Johannine circles, Dedication was a living tradition. The significance of this feast in the Gospel of John is discussed in Chapter X.

CHAPTER X

THE FEAST OF DEDICATION AND JOHN 10:1 - 42

As discussed in Chapter II, the order of Chapter 10 of the Fourth Gospel is rearranged to place the developed discourse of Jesus on the theme of the relation of the sheep to the shepherd (John 10:1 - 18) after the apparently original mention of the figure of the shepherd in John 10:26 and 27. The order of the chapter as treated is: 10:19 - 21, 10:22 - 29, 10:1 - 18, and 10:30 - 42.


The relocation of verses 1 - 18 of the tenth chapter of the Gospel, places the short section 10:19 - 21 in direct connection with the story of the cure of the blind man which went before in John 9:1 - 41. This section then, represents a reaction to the act of the healing of the blind man, and the division of the crowd over it. The reference to this event, "Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?" (10:21) finds suitable context in this relocation, though it was quite out of place in the traditional order of the Gospel, where this reference followed by two and one-half months, the event to which it seems to refer.

The beginning of this episode which takes place upon the feast of Dedication, Kislev 25 – Tebeth 2, follows after the above interlude which concludes the narrative of the feast of Tabernacles, taking up the course of events after a period of two and one-half months, during which nothing is reported. There is no material in the Gospel at this point which is not connected with one of the feasts.

The mention of "the feast of Dedication" (τὰ ἐν χαίνια) in 10:22 is the first use of this particular name for the feast that we have in our sources, representing a translation of the Hebrew name of the feast, נְחָנָה. The word had been used in the Septuagint however, to translate the Hebrew נְחָנָה in such a passage as Nehemiah 12:27. There was no requirement that Jesus, or any other Israelite, appear at the Temple on this occasion since it was not one of the pilgrimage festivals. It is notable that the specific mention of Jesus "going up (ἐβασίλευσεν)" is not made here, although it may be presumed that he did not remain in the Temple all the time between Tabernacles and Dedication. The Evangelist has been careful to maintain the separation between the three great historic feasts, for which all Israel "went up" to the Lord, and this feast which was in a different class from the great pilgrimage feasts. In this case the picture of the appearance
of Jesus at the feast is not one of the revelation coming to all of Israel through his "going up", but that of the true leader leading a small and select band out to safety. In view of the association of the feast of Dedication with the story of Judas Maccabeus and the party of rebels whom he led, the picture of Jesus leading the small party of followers is in keeping with the significance of the feast, as suggested below.

It is mentioned that the episode at the feast of Dedication took place in winter, which is the season of the feast. This mention, however, probably is made as a suggestion that the climate of activity around the band of Jesus' followers was growing dark. Hoskyns suggests that this reference to winter may mean "the extreme tension of the situation. Jesus, the fulfilment of the hope of Judaism, stands in the most sacred place of the Jewish religion, compassed about by its leaders, who are intent on His destruction. It was indeed winter, as it was night when Judas left the company of Jesus in order to betray him."¹

The question of the Jews who gathered around Jesus, "How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell us plainly." (John 10:24) will appear abrupt

at this point in the narrative, until it is remembered that the feast of Dedication was the feast of the New Age, or in Hebrew terms, the feast of the Messianic age. This feast would be a most appropriate time for the question to come into the mind of the Evangelist, or the mind of the Jews celebrating the feast.2 The suspense which the Jews feel, expressed in their question, is perhaps not suspense because Jesus has failed to give them an answer to their queries, but the tension which is developing, according to the Evangelists' scheme, as the course of the year of feasts moves on. The suspense of the Jews is a sign of the importance of the progress of these feasts toward completion of their cycle, in the Evangelist's conception of Jesus' ministry.

The answer of Jesus to the question of the Jews refers to the means by which men are to come to belief in him. They are to see his works, and in them see the hand of "the One who sent him." In John 9:4, the introduction to the story of the healing of the blind man, the healing is said to be one of the works which Jesus must do, that he may be the light of the world. In John 8:39 - 40, the Jews do not believe Jesus because they are not true children of Abraham. Here in John 10:26 the reason is expressed in a different metaphor, "because you do not belong to my sheep." With this reference to the sheep, begins the long discourse on the sheep and the shepherd which includes 10:26 - 29,

and 1 - 18.

In the Old Testament, the figure of Israel as the flock of sheep, and God as the shepherd is repeated many times: Psalms 23, 74:1, 78:52,71, 79:13, 80:1, 95:7, 100:3; Isaiah 40:11, Jeremiah 23:1 - 4. The discourse here, however, while touching many of the general Old Testament ideas common to several of these passages, appears to be very closely associated with one, Ezekiel 34:1 - 31. An outline of the movement of thought in the passage in Ezekiel, set beside an outline of the discourse in John 10:26 - 29 and 10:1 - 18 will demonstrate this association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EZEKIEL 34:1 - 31</th>
<th>JOHN 10:26-29, 1 - 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1-6) The shepherds of Israel do not care for the sheep but allow them to be scattered.</td>
<td>&quot;The Jews&quot; do not believe for they do not belong to Jesus' sheep. (25-26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7-10) &quot;The word of the Lord to the shepherds...Behold, I am against the shepherds.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;My sheep hear my voice...&quot; (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11-16) God Himself will search for the sheep, rescue them.</td>
<td>&quot;My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all, and no one will be able to snatch them out of the Father's hand.&quot; (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He will bring them out from the peoples. He will feed them with good pasture.

"He calls his own sheep by name and leads them out". Through Jesus they find pasture. (3) (9)

(20-24) God will judge between the sheep. A shepherd, the servant David, will be set over the sheep.

"...if any one enters by me, he will be saved." "I am the good shepherd". (14) (9)

(25-31) God will make a covenant with his "sheep", and bring Messianic blessings.

There will finally be one flock and one shepherd, this through the sacrifice of Jesus. (16)
In the above scheme which demonstrates the close association of the ideas of Ezekiel 34:1 - 31 with those of John 10:26 - 29 and 1 - 18, it can be seen that while John has obviously used the picture of Ezekiel's parable as a basis for this teaching, he has adapted it to the particular situation which occurs at the feast of Dedication. Here Jesus is facing the leaders of Israel who styled themselves as shepherds of the flock, for this is the group represented by the Johannine term "the Jews". A peculiarly Johannine style of thought is found in 10:27, "...my sheep hear my voice." Those who believe Jesus or "hear his voice" are those who take him to be the one sent from God, whose relation to the Father, is one of revealing the truth about the Father. "Hearing" Jesus' voice in the fourth Gospel, is parallel to "the Word of the Lord" coming to the prophets, thence to the people, and their responding to it. Therefore, those who do not "hear" the voice of Jesus, are in fact rejecting the "word of the Lord" which comes to them. The Evangelist is saying then, that the word of Jesus is against the shepherds, even as Ezekiel said that the word of the Lord was against the shepherds.

John 10:29 states very carefully, that the Father has given the sheep to Jesus. This recalls the passage in Ezekiel, 34:11, in which the personal action of God is clearly emphasized, "Behold, I, I myself, will search
for my sheep and will seek them out." The sheep are given to Jesus, after the Father himself has sought them out. This is in keeping with the teaching elsewhere in the Gospel, that Jesus does the works of the Father because his authority is from the Father, (e.g. John 5:30, 7:16).

Having used the idea that the believers come to Jesus because the Father has sought them out, or given them to him, (10:29), it is now the task of the Evangelist to show the place of Jesus in this process. Expanding the parable of the sheep and the shepherd, in the words of Jesus in 10:1 - 5, the idea of the sheepfold is brought into the discourse. A gatekeeper guards the sheepfold, against the one who would enter by another way, the "thief and robber" (10:1). The shepherd is allowed to enter and leave by the door, leading his sheep in and out. Having led the sheep out, the shepherd goes before them, leading them, because they know his voice, (10:3 - 4). This figure is not understood by those listening, according to verse 6. To clarify the meaning of this, that they may understand it, the further discourse, 10:7 - 18 follows.

In John 10:7 and 8, the point of verses 1 - 5 is repeated: there are "thieves and robbers" who have come before, but the sheep do not follow them. The figure is changed now, and Jesus is the door of the sheepfold (10:9) through which the sheep enter and go out to find pasture. This finding of pasture is made equal to the thing that
Jesus is bringing his followers, "that they may have life, and have it abundantly" (10:10). The figure is now changed back to Jesus as the good shepherd who "lays down his life for his sheep" (10:11). It is here that the Evangelist begins to state clearly the meaning of the previous section, 10:1 - 5, which was not understood by the hearers. In the figure of Jesus leading his sheep, acting as the good shepherd, the event in the background is the sacrifice of Jesus, in order that he may be raised up. Jesus lays down his life, not only for these immediate hearers, but for all sheep, even those "not of this fold" (10:16). This is to the end that there "shall be one flock, one shepherd." (10:16). The point in the parallel passage in Ezekiel which corresponds to this is 34:23, "And I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them: he shall feed them and be their shepherd." In Ezekiel this setting up of the one shepherd over the sheep results in the blessed condition described in 34:25 - 31, a description of the condition of peace, plenty, security in the land, prosperity, the end of reproach among the nations, and a close association with God. This is the Messianic age. The condition with one flock and one shepherd in John 10:16 is an eschatological picture, accomplished through Jesus; particularly through his sacrifice and Resurrection. The Resurrection of Jesus is characterized as "leading" the people out of
death in Ephesians 4:8 where Paul uses the quotation from Psalm 68:18, "When he ascended on high he led a host of captives...". The voice of one who has experienced salvation like that referred to here, is found in Psalm 30:3 in which the rejoicing of the Psalmist is joy over his being led out of trouble, "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol". The trouble from which the Psalmist is saved had the character of final death, or Sheol. The use of this Psalm in the feast of Dedication must indicate that the thought of rejoicing because the people had been led out from something like death into salvation, was present in the significance of the feast. An example of such a thought is found in the account of the institution of the feast of Dedication in II Maccabees 10:7, in which, from a condition "wandering like wild beasts in the mountains and caves", the people were led out to the joy of the rededication of the Altar. The joy over the leading of the people out of the mountains to the reinstitution of the Temple worship expressed in the feast of Dedication becomes a symbol in the Fourth Gospel for the ministry of Jesus, who, by his death and rising again, leads the people to true joy.

The personal importance of Jesus, emphasized through the discourse of 10:1 - 16, is made clear in regard to the Crucifixion and Resurrection in verses 17 and 18. These
things take place because the Father has given the Son power over his life, to lay it down and take it up.

This high view of the relationship of the Father and Son becomes explicit in verse 10:30, which follows 10:18 in the revised order of the text. In the expression "I and the Father are one", the most explicit statement of this relation found in the Fourth Gospel is made. It sums up the main point of the "Book of Signs". Such explicit statement brings the violent response from the hearers which is the subject of the following section, 10:31 - 42.

C. John 10:30 - 42.

The explicit statement of Jesus' relation to the Father in 10:30, brought the reaction from the Jews which would lead to the stoning of Jesus (10:31). They charged him with blasphemy, which was punishable by stoning, in accord with Leviticus 24:16. In the Mishnah, Sanhedrin 7:5, the blasphemer is not culpable unless he pronounces "the Name" itself. Although the clear meaning of Jesus in his statement would be blasphemous in the eyes of the Jew, it does not appear that he used the form which was forbidden, יְהֹוָ֥ה . To Jesus, the statement which he made, "I and the Father are one" was no


different than the meaning of his works, which were signs of the same fact. His question to the Jews is "for which of these do you stone me?" (10:32). In answer to the charge of blasphemy the answer is given, using Rabbinic interpretation of Psalm 82:5, that in the law (although this is not a Jewish expression for the Psalms) the people are called "gods". Since this Psalm was taken as referring to people, not to other spirits, the argument is that the person particularly consecrated by God must certainly be properly called "the Son of God", if all others can be called "gods". The use of the expression "consecrated" (ἡγιαστέω) must refer back to the teaching of 10:17-18, that Jesus' peculiar work of God comes to its fulfillment in the Crucifixion and Resurrection. The Evangelist did not use the same word for the consecration of Jesus as for the dedication of the Temple (ἐνκαίνιον) because the latter refers to things, not people.5 The parallelism in thought cannot have been missing, however. The works of Jesus are signs of this consecration, and the primary argument for belief throughout the "Book of Signs" (10:38).

In the above section, in addition to the use of the expression, "consecrated" of Jesus, with its parallelism to the dedication of the Temple, the threat of stoning in the passage may well be a result of the association of

the discourse with the feast of Dedication. In I Maccabees 1:54, the faithful Jews carry the stones which defiled the Temple, outside to dispose of them. Here the Jews are taking up stones in the very same Temple-site, in an awful reversal of the earlier action of their fathers, to stone to death the true revealer of God among them. The result is a Christian reinterpretation of the feast, for it is Jesus who is the true center of it, and the Jewish leaders who are making a hollow mockery of it.

The passage related directly to the feast of Dedication ends with a short section, 10:40 - 42 in which Jesus goes back across the Jordan, and is testified to by the followers of John the Baptist. This is, significantly, upon the basis of his signs, whereas John had not done any signs.

D. The possible relation of John 11:1 - 54 to the feast of Dedication.

There are suggestions in the long and detailed story of the raising of Lazarus which might relate it to the feast of Dedication, although not so closely as the previous section. The event takes place at some time between the feast of Dedication and the week before Passover season, 11:55. The state of death, in which Lazarus is found, 11:13, would in a very highly symbolic sense, occur in the season of winter, even as renewal would be associated with spring. To care for Lazarus, Jesus comes
out of the country across the Jordan, as Judas Maccabaeus had come with his followers, to the rededication of the Temple. They came to bring back the worship which was dead; Jesus comes to raise the person who is dead. On the way to Judea, Jesus speaks the enigmatic parable, John 11:9 - 10, "Are there not twelve hours in the day: If any one walks in the day, he does not stumble, because he sees the light of this world. But if any one walks in the night, he stumbles, because the light is not in him."

This would mean that instead of remaining away, hidden, in the country across the Jordan, until he is subjected to the powers of evil. Jesus must come out and do the works of God, for he is the light of this world. This use of the figure of "light" may refer to the feast of Dedication, which was the "feast of Lights," or "feast of illuminations". Then, in John 11:35, where Jesus wept over the death of Lazarus, one finds a possible reference to the weeping of the Jews over the desecration of the Temple, I Maccabees 4:39 - 40.

The above possible associations of the raising of Lazarus with the feast of Dedication, are mere suggestions, and would constitute, even if they were intentional associations on the part of the Evangelist, a minor theme only in this chapter.
E. Conclusions concerning the feast of Dedication and John 10:1 - 42.

It is concluded that all the material in John 10:1 - 42, except 10:19 - 21 and 10:40 - 42 is associated with the feast of Dedication. The short passage 10:19 - 21, relocated to precede the reference to the feast of Dedication, is associated with the feast of Tabernacles. The passage 10:40 - 42 is an interlude introducing the next section of the Gospel.

It is further concluded that in the passage 10:22 - 29, 1 - 18, 30 - 39, the theme of the feast of Dedication found in II Maccabees 10:1 - 8, the bringing out of the people from wandering, into the re instituted worship of the new age, is an important theme of the discourse of Jesus associated with this occasion. Other themes of the feast have found their place in this section of the Gospel as well. The result of the use of these themes of the feast of Dedication in the Gospel of John is the proclaiming of Jesus, through his death and Resurrection, as the one who fulfills the hope expressed in the feast, and who brings a greater fulfillment than that signified in the feast. Having used the theme "the light of the world" in chapter 8, in relation to the feast of Tabernacles, the Evangelist does not use this major theme of the feast of Dedication. A suggestion of its use may be found in the story of Lazarus.
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In this study it has been concluded that in the Fourth Gospel, the following sections of the text are related to the feasts of the Jewish calendar year:

2:13 - 25  The introductory Passover
6:1 - 15; 25 - 65  The Passover
5:1 - 47; 7:15 - 24  Pentecost
10:22 - 29; 1 - 18; 30 - 39  Dedication

From the beginning of chapter 5 (or from the beginning of chapter 6 in the restored order of the text) to the end of chapter 10, the only sections of the Fourth Gospel not related to one of the feasts are: 6:16 - 25 and 6:66 - 70. These short sections are necessary to indicate transitions from one phase of the narrative to another. It is clear that since such a large block of the "Book of Signs" of the Fourth Gospel is related to the feasts of the Jewish year, these feasts, their sequence and symbolism, form a major theme of this section of the Gospel.

In the restored order of the text of the Fourth Gospel, the sequence of the feasts forms one complete cycle of the Jewish feasts with one introductory feast - the Passover of 2:13. In this scheme:
1. The cleansing of the Temple at the introductory Passover indicates the theme to run through the remaining feasts, that Jesus in himself now supersedes the worship of the Temple.

2. The "going up" of Jesus to the pilgrimage feasts is a sign of the ascension of the Son of Man to the Father.

3. The progress of the festival cycle toward the coming of the last Passover conveys the increase of tension as the ministry of Jesus proceeds to the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

4. In relation to each of the feasts, Jesus, through his death and Resurrection, is shown to be the one fulfilling beyond all the highest expectations of Judaism, the hopes symbolized in the feasts. The fulfillment goes beyond expectations in that this Christ is not only the One who leads the people when they receive the Messianic blessings, but he is himself the source of these blessings. He does not merely purify the Temple cultus, but in himself supersedes it. The blessings of the Messianic age, corporate in prevailing Jewish thought, were given an intensely personal interpretation in his fulfillment of them.

5. The symbols and motifs of the feasts used by the Evangelist are selected and used in independent
manner, not always reflecting the prevailing interpretations of the feasts in Judaism.

If the Fourth Gospel were read according to the lectionary which would make some of the feasts coincide with the time when the synagogue observed them, it would constitute a very strong argument to the Jew, or Jewish Christian, that the new Christianity properly supersedes and fulfills the Jewish cultus. This would be a particularly pointed argument just following 70 A.D. when the Temple was destroyed. It would be a much weaker argument to a Hellenistic audience.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Works referred to in text:

All quotations from the canonical books of the Bible in English, are from the Revised Standard Version, Published by Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York, 1952.


Farrer, Austin, A STUDY IN ST. MARK, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1951.


Moffatt, J., AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1911.


Oehler, article, FESTE DER ALTEN HEBRAER, in Real-Encyclopadie fur Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Ed. Herzog und Flitt, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1878.


Schauss, Hayyim, THE JEWISH FESTIVALS FROM THEIR BEGINNINGS TO OUR OWN DAY, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1938 (Translated by Samuel Jaffe).


Wellhausen, Julius, PROLEGOMENA TO THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL, Translated from the German, by J. S. Black and A. Menzies., Adam and Charles Black, Edinburgh, 1885.


B. Works Consulted, but not referred to in text:


Altmann, Ulrich, HILFSBUCH ZUR GESCHICHTE DES CHRISTLICHEN KULTUS, 1 Heft, Alfred Topelmann, Berlin, 1941.


Donciach, N. S., PURIM, OR THE FEAST OF ESTHER, Jewish Publication Society in America, Philadelphia, 1933.


Koehler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter, LEXICON IN VETERIS TESTAMENTI LIBROS, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1953.


Ruckstuhl, Eugen, DIE LITERARISCHE EINHEIT DES JOHANNES EVANGELIUMS, Der gegenwartige Stand der einschlagigen Forschungen, Paulusverlag, Freiburg in der Schweiz, 1951.


