Version 2.0.
Still a draft without a summary. The best way to read is to start from the end (section 20: Concluding Remarks)

Basil Lourié
St Petersburg
hieromonk@gmail.com

"THE PROCESSIONS OF MY GOD": The Liturgical Structure behind the Signs in the Gospel of John

1. Introduction

Annie Jaubert has never accomplished her studies on the Gospel of John, although this gospel was the object of her primary interest since the early 1960s until her death.[1] Her summarising article on the chronology of the Passion (1972)[2] was based mostly on the Gospel of John, and so, it is this article (and not *La date de la Cène*, 1957[3]) that one has to take as the point of depart for understanding Jaubert's views on the Passion chronology. Near to the end of her life, she published a monograph and a popular booklet dedicated to the Gospel of John as a whole.[4] She certainly had in mind a plan of a large-scale study of John, which would take into account its interwoven calendrical, liturgical, and exegetical traditions... This work apparently stopped with her death (1980) but is to be resumed now, with our present knowledge of the Second Temple Judaism and its calendars. In our time, Jaubert's ideas concerning the importance of the calendar containing 364 days per (its non-interpolated) year (henceforth 364DY calendar)[5]

[1] Her publications especially relevant to John are the following: A. Jaubert, "La symbolique du puits de Jacob," in *L'homme devant Dieu : Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac.* I : *Exégèse et patristique*. Théologie, 56; Paris: Aubier, 1963, 67–73; "Les séances du Sanhédrin et les récits de la Passion," *Revue d'histoire des religions* 166 (1964) 143–169; 167 (1965) 1–33; "Symbolique de l'eau et connaissance de Dieu," *Cahiers bibliques* 3 (1965) 455–463; "Une lecture du lavement des pieds au mardi-mercredi saint," *Le Muséon* 79 (1966) 257–286; "Une discussion patristique sur la chronologie de la Passion," *Recherches de science religieuse* 54 (1966) 407–410; "L'image de la vigne (Jean 15)," in F. Christ (ed.), *OIKONOMIA. Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie. Oscar Cullmann zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Hamburg: Bergstedt, H. Reich, 1967, 93–99; "Le mercredi où Jésus fut livré," *NTS* 14 (1967) 145–164; "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John," in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *John and Qumran*, London: Geoffrey Chapman Publishers, 1972 [reprinted under the title *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Christian Origins Library; New York: Crossroads, 1990], 62–75; "Jean 17,25 et l'interprétation gnostique," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974, 347–353; "Des gestes libérateurs de Jésus. Dès Synoptiques à Saint Jean," *Évangile* 7 (1974), février, 18–22 (inaccessible to me); "La comparution devant Pilate selon Jean, Jean 18,28–19,16," *Cahiers bibliques de Foi et Vie* 13 (1975) 3–12; *Approches de l'Évangile de Jean*. Parole de Dieu; Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 1976 [Italian tr.: *Come leggere il Vangelo di Giovanni*. Testi, commenti e sussidi biblici; Milan: Gribaudi, 1978]; *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Saint Jean*, Cahiers Évangile, 17; Paris: Cerf, 1976 [Spanish tr. (many times reprinted): *El evangelio según san Juan.* Tr. N. Darrícal. Cuadernos bíblicos, 17; Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, [6]1987]; "Le code de sainteté dans l'œuvre johannique," *L'Année canonique* 23 (1979) 59–67; "La symbolique des femmes dans les traditions religieuses : une reconsidération de l'évangile de Jean," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 50,1 (1980) 114–121; in collaboration with Jean-Louis d'Aragon, "Jean, ou l'accomplissement en Jésus des institutions juives," in G. Langevin (ed.), *Jésus aujourd'hui*, Historiens et exégètes à Radio-Canada, Montréal: Bellarmin—Paris: Éditions Fleurus, 1981, 63–73. Moreover, Jaubert published in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions* a number of short but sometimes important reviews of the books on the NT published in France from the late 1950s to the late 1970s, including French translations of some world classics. Only four of these publications and, of course, *La date de la Cène* are taken into account by Robert Kysar, *Voyages with John: Charting the Fourth Gospel*, Waco, TX: Baylor UP, 2005, whose book contains an outline of the contemporary Johannine studies.

[2] Jaubert, "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John."

[3] A. Jaubert, *La date de la Cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*, Études bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1957. This monograph was founded on the three papers published in 1953, 1954, and 1957.

[4] Jaubert, *Approches…* (monograph), and eadem, *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Saint Jean* (popular booklet).

[5] That is, the calendar presuming the 364-day year. Jaubert knew only one modification of such a calendar, which she called "the calendar of *Jubilees*" or "*the* Priestly calendar"; now we know that such calendars were

in the earliest Christian communities are corroborated with a number of other data still unknown during her lifetime.

To begin with, the very idea of plurality of liturgical calendars in the time of Jesus is not longer anyhow exotic[6] and contains nothing unlikely *a priori*. More specifically, there are several additional reasons, still unseen to Jaubert, to consider Tuesday and not Thursday as the genuine weekday of the Last Supper, despite the explicit statements of the contrary in both John and Synoptics.[7] Thus, Jaubert's conviction that the calendrical data in the available texts of the Passion Narrative resulted from an inconsequent editing process is hardly ungrounded. However, several problems remain. To my opinion, as concerns the Gospel of John, the most acute is that of the day of the Passover in the Jesus' community according to this Gospel (in contrast with the "Passover of the Jews" on Saturday in the year of the crucifixion). Jaubert maintained the view that both Synoptics and John originally placed this Passover on Tuesday. However, even Étienne Nodet, who considers Jaubert's contribution as "breakthrough," disagrees with her on this point.[8]

The question whether the Passion Narrative in John was genuinely presuming the Passover on Tuesday or Saturday will be one of the central ones in the present study. However, I will avoid here a discussion of the Passion chronology in details.

2. The Programme of the Present Study

The Gospel of John has a feature that must be connected, in one or other way, with the 364DY calendar, *if only* such a calendar actually was implied by the author(s) of the Gospel. This feature is the signs (σημεῖα), that is, the miracles testifying that Jesus is sent from God. These signs form the principal knots of the Gospel plot in the chapters from 2 to 12, that is, between the initial scenes with John the Baptist and the five disciples (ch. 1) and the Last Supper (ch. 13). The total number of the signs is near to seven.[9] Given the Sabbatical structure of the 364-day year, it would be extremely unlikely if the chain of the signs would have no relation to the calendar whatsoever—provided, of course, that a 364DY calendrical scheme is actually implied.

To come to the working hypothesis, we have to presume some weekday of the Passover. Let us consider three possibilities compatible with the 364DY calendar, (1) Tuesday counted

---

changing and evolving. Cf. J. C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge, 1998, and below, note 7.

[6] S. Saulnier, *Calendrical Variations in Second Temple Judaism. New Perspectives on the 'Date of the Last Supper' Debate*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 159; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2012, 245, where the author says about his book: "First, it convincingly deals with the calendar objection levelled against the Jaubertian theory by demonstrating that the sources which followed a 364-day year were very likely to have followed a calendar they professed was attached to the seasons. Thus, by removing the main objection to Jaubert's theory, the present work paves the way for the systematic reappraisal of further aspects of Jaubert's theory at a later stage."

[7] B. Lourié, "Les quatre jours « de l'intervalle » : une modification néotestamentaire et chrétienne du calendrier de 364 jours," in M. Petit, B. Lourié, A. Orlov (eds.), *Église des deux Alliances : Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912—1980)*. Orientalia Judaica Christiana, 1; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008, 103–133.

[8] Nodet, "On Jesus' Last Supper," *Biblica* 91 (2010) 348–369, here 368-369. On the other hand, Joachim Jeremias, who was arguing for the Passover nature of the Last Supper meal, considered the whole Jaubert's approach as "unfounded": J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.* Tr. N. Perrin. New York: Scribner, 1966, 25.

[9] It is widely accepted since Rudolf Bultmann that the signs are identified as following: 1. water into wine in Cana, 2. healing of the official's son, 3. healing of the paralytic, 4. multiplication of loaves, 5. walking on the waters, 6. healing of the blind born, and 7. resurrection of Lazarus. Two of them (Nrs 1 and 2) are explicitly named signs (2:11; 4:54), three (Nrs 4, 6, 7) are called signs in the immediate context (6:14 and cf. 6:26; 9:16; 11:47 and 12:17-18), and there are two other pre-resurrection miracle stories whose belonging to the signs is never stated explicitly, and so, is more disputable (Nrs 3 and 5). Nevertheless, there is a scholarly consensus concerning, at least, six signs (all the enumerated above minus Nr 5, walking on the waters). Cf. A. J. Köstenberger, "The Seventh Johannine Sign: A Study in John's Christology," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 5 (1995) 87–103 (a detailed review of scholarship concerning the Johannine signs but limited to the authors published in English and German), and G. Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*, Analecta biblica, 117; Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, ^{2}2011 (providing a larger perspective and a deeper analysis).

from sunrise to sunrise (Jaubert's harmonisation of the Passion Narrative in the four Gospels) and Saturday. Saturday could be counted either (2) from sunset to sunset, thus, in the same manner as in the official Temple calendar (Nodet) or (3) from sunrise to sunrise. 14 Nisan falling on Saturday from sunrise to sunrise would correspond to the Sunday 365DY scheme (presuming 1 Nisan falling on Sunday[10]). The fourth possibility, 14 Nisan on Friday from sunrise to sunrise, is *a priori* untenable, because it would require 1 Nisan (the beginning of the calendar) on Saturday.[11] Thus, we have three preliminary hypotheses: 14 Nisan falling on either Tuesdays or Saturday, and, in the latter case, Saturday begins at the moment of appearance of either moon or sun. These three hypotheses are still not working ones. Our working hypothesis must be more definitive, that is, at least, presuming that the choice between Tuesday and Saturday for 14 Nisan is accomplished. This choice will be our next step.

This step will consist in combining either of these preliminary hypotheses (presuming the Passover on either Tuesday or Saturday) with some calendrical structure relying on the signs.

It is important, at this stage of investigation, to make an abstraction from any idea concerning the editorial history of the Gospel. The present part of investigation could be considered as successful in the case if, at least, *some* important meaning layers will be discovered within (and with the help of) some mathematically strict and elegant calendrical scheme. This would make plausible that this scheme is somewhat meaningful, and so, is not artificially read into the text. Then, such scheme will become our working hypothesis for the subsequent part of research.

An important methodological note should be added right now. On this stage and henceforth we will follow a methodology which is used rather seldom in the studies dedicated to the liturgical structures within the texts of the New Testament. I will try to avoid referring to purely hypothetical liturgical structures but, instead, to point out parallels in the known liturgical customs of both Second Temple Judaism and the antique Christianity. It seems to me *a priori* equally unlikely (even though not logically impossible) that any of the widely accepted Gospels would not share its important liturgical features with some non-Christian Jewish movements or disappear without any trace from the Christian liturgical traditions. The most important proponent of such a methodology was Annie Jaubert[12]. Here, she was in the minority but not alone. Another important proponent of the same method was one of the leading figures working in the paradigm[13] of "lectionary hypothesis," Aileen Guilding.[14]

---

[10] Jaubert did not consider this possibility. S., for more details on the Sunday-type 364DY-calendars, B. Lourié, "Calendrical Elements in 2 Enoch," in: A.Orlov, G. Boccaccini (eds.), J. M. Zurawski (assoc. ed.), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch. No Longer Slavonic Only*. Studia Judaeoslavica, 4; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2012, 191–219; idem, "Cosmology and Liturgical Calendar in *3 Baruch* and Their Mesopotamian Background. (In Appendix: The Calendar of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*), in: A. Kulik, A. Orlov (eds.), *Harry E. Gaylord Memorial Volume*. Studia Judaeoslavica; Leiden—Boston: Brill (forthcoming); idem, "The Calendar Implied in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*: Two Modifications of the One Scheme," in M. Henze, G. Boccaccini, with Collaboration of J. Zurawski (eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth Enoch Seminar, 2011*; Edinburg: T&T Clark (forthcoming) (Sunday 364DY calendar in *4 Ezra* but Wednesday calendar in *2 Baruch*). The Sunday-type may be as well ancient as the Wednesday-type. One of the reasons of such an early dating is the fact that only in the Sunday-type 364DY calendar all the requirements of the *Leviticus* concerning the dates and weekdays of the feasts of the Shaking of the Sheaf and the Weeks can be satisfied in a strictly literal way.

[11] The 364DY calendar begins either on Wednesday, when the luminaries were created, or on Sunday, the first day of creation.

[12] Especially in her *La date de la Cène...*

[13] I use here the word "paradigm" in Thomas Kuhn's sense (cf. Th. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* [1962], Chicago: University of Chicago Press, ^{4}2012): one "paradigm" forms a common background for different scholarly hypotheses and theories. Thus, the "lectionary hypothesis" as a paradigm implies that some biblical texts, e.g. Gospel(s), were written as a series of the lectionary liturgical readings. However, within the unique paradigm, one can propose quite different variants for the liturgy that is meant.

[14] A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. A study of the relation of St. John's Gospel to the ancient Jewish lectionary system*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Guilding was working within the paradigm of the "lectionary hypothesis," rather alien to Jaubert. However, both Jaubert's approach and the "lectionary" paradigm imply a deep involvement with liturgical matters. Michael D. Goulder's criticism of Jaubert's calendrical studies could be especially understandable in the light of such an affinity of their methodological backgrounds, because it

Once established, the working hypothesis must be verified or falsified with testing for the internal consistency and, so to say, attachment to reality. The attachment to reality of a liturgical reconstruction is the higher the more parallels there exist for it as a whole and for each of its liturgical units in the otherwise known Jewish and Christian liturgical traditions.

The liturgical traditions which we will deal with are substantially depending of the exegetical traditions, or, more precisely, the relevant exegetical traditions were living mostly within the liturgy. This is why the history of exegesis will be always in the focus of our study, together with the method of interpretation, rather strict, common to the New Testament authors and to the rabbis, *gezerah shawah* (גזרה שוה) "an equivalent regulation": the rule that one passage may be explained by another, if there are similarities in their wording.[15] This rule needed to be applied without forgetting that, as it is normally in the whole New Testament, the author limits himself to some part of a verse but means that these few words are evocative of a whole context. This method is not a door open to an arbitrary or anachronistic theological symbolism. Instead, this method consists in recognition and proper usage of the key words that the Jewish writers and their intended readers used in a similar way to our modern hyperlinks which one should click and open a new window or tab.

If the working hypothesis turns out to be verified, this would means that the corresponding liturgical scheme is implied in the Gospel of John *in some way*. Its real role in the Gospel's structure must be studied separately.

Our final step must be localisation of this calendrical scheme within the editorial history of the Gospel, that is, with a reference to the available hypotheses concerning this history. In this domain, I will limit myself to a brief sketch, only as an epilogue to the present study and an invitation to the further research.

Finally, I would like to make explicit two features implied by the approach described above.

First: the mentions of Jewish feasts in the Fourth Gospel will be completely ignored at the stages of elaboration and verification of the working hypothesis. This is somewhat unfamiliar for the studies approaching the Gospel of John from the liturgical side. However, this is reasonable in the light of the recent researches. As Brian D. Johnson helpfully put it, "[t]he thematic use of these feasts makes it difficult to argue for a temporal or spatial setting for Jesus' ministry. It is crucial to begin with the narrative purpose of the feasts as they are presented before attempting to understand any chronology they may present. The irony of this is that historical Jesus studies have frequently used this chronological aspect of the historicity of John's Gospel, even when rejecting the events and speeches narrated."[16] The same could be repeated about the genuineness of the liturgical interpretation of some deeds of Jesus in relation to the "feasts of Jews."

Second: our attempt to formulate and to check a hypothesis concerning some liturgical structure based on the signs will become grist to the mill of a very popular paradigm in the Johannine studies, which produced the Signs Source hypothesis with its multiple modifications,[17]

---

was focused mostly on her too immediate, according to Goulder, identification of liturgical sequences with the historical reality. Cf. M. D. Goulder, *The Evangelists' Calendar. A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*, The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies, 1972; London: SPCK, 1978, 7–8. Guilding and Jaubert had in common that they, unlike Goulder in his works on the Synoptic Gospels, refused to construct purely hypothetical liturgical calendars but were limiting themselves in their reconstructions to the construction materials whose existence is documented.

[15] For a difference between this rule and a similar kind of comparison in the Hellenistic rhetoric (σύγκρισις πρὸς ἴσον), s. B. L. Visotzky, "Midrash, Christian Exegesis, and Hellenistic Hermeneutic," in C. Bakhos (ed.), *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*, SJSJ, 106; Leiden: Brill, 2006, 111–131, here 120–126.

[16] B. D. Johnson, "The Jewish Feasts and Historicity in John 5–12," in P. N. Anderson, F. Just, T. Thatcher (eds.), *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. SBL. Early Christianity and Its Literature, 2; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2009, 117–129, here 128–129.

[17] R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Meyers kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [21]1986 [first published in 1941 as the 10th ed. of this *Kommentar*], 78–79 *et passim*; cf. *ibid*., p. 78, n. 4, where Bultmann refers to his predecessors, especially to Alexander Faure's first formulation of the hypothesis which will be called (after Bultmann) that of *Sēmeia*-Quelle:

and, even more specifically, those modifications which unify the Signs narrative with the Passion narrative,[18] as it was first proposed in 1970 by Robert Fortna, and, after him and in other forms, by about half dozen of others. There are some reasons to think that Annie Jaubert was disposed favourably toward the Signs Source *paradigm*, especially in the latter modification (which includes the Passion narrative into the same hypothetic source as the signs), but not toward any particular hypothesis known to her.[19]

On the one hand, the four traditional channels of discourse related to the Signs Source hypothesis (source-critics, stylistics, form-critics, and ideology[20]) do not include liturgy.[21] On the other hand, the liturgical scholars normally prefer to focus their studies of John rather on the "feasts of the Jews" than the signs.[22] Therefore, our present study could be considered as the first attempt to introduce the method of comparative liturgy into the studies relevant to the Signs Source paradigm. However, let us repeat, the present study will not go anyhow deeper into the text-critical issues.

3. Preliminary Hypotheses: Possible Liturgical Frames

Our preliminary hypotheses will concern the general frame of a liturgical calendar, which could tie together the Passion narrative and the Signs narrative. The latter is considering as a unity of the signs narrative preserved in the chapters from 2 to 12 together with the previous narrative on John the Baptist and five disciples in ch. 1. To formulate preliminary hypotheses,

---

A. Faure, "Die alttestamentliche Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese," *ZNW* 21 (1922) 99–121. The idea of such a source in its earliest form was formulated by A. Schweizer in 1841.

[18] In general, the signs paradigm presents an idea that the Gospel of John, partially or as a whole, goes back to some text, written or oral, whose core was a narrative constructed on some "signs," whose total number is either seven or an obvious derivate of seven ($7 \pm 1 = 6$ or 8). There are presently dozens of hypotheses based on this common paradigm, but only a minority of them considers the Passion narrative in John as a part of this Signs Source, because this is going contrary to the most influential initial supposition of Faure—Bultmann.

[19] She knew only Fortna's earliest hypothesis (1970) and Boismard's one. Cf. her review of *L'Évangile de Jean, Synopse des quatre évangiles*, t. III. Commentaire par M. E. Boismard et A. Lamouille…, Paris: Cerf, 1977, in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 196 (1979) 97–98, mentioning favourably also Fortna but without complete agreement with either him or Boismard; cf. another her mention of Fortna's 1970 monograph: "Cet essai, fort intéressant, reste hypothétique" (Jaubert, *Approches…*, 17, n. 5). Jaubert's respectful attitude toward the form-critical method of Bultmann is especially revealing in her defense of him in the review of Mgr de Solages, *Critique des évangiles et méthode historique*, Toulouse, 1972, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 185 (1974) 100: "L'A[uteur] manifeste une incompréhension profonde pour les méthodes bultmaniennes. La critique qu'il fait pas à pas des procédés de l'École des Formes est pleine d'humour…, souvent aussi marquée au coin du bon sens. Mais le bon sens ne suffit pas et la critique tourne parfois à la caricature." However, this is not to say that Jaubert herself was not treating Bultmann's ideas without humour: "Il convient assurément de montrer quelque humour à l'égard des thèses — florissantes il y a trente ans — de feuillets déplacés ou à l'égard de notre logique occidentale qui n'est pas celle des Sémites," she wrote in the 1970s providing a further disambiguation in a footnote: "L'exemple le plus significatif est celui du grand commentaire de R. Bultmann, qui étudie le IV^{e} évangile en déplaçant des péricopes ou même des chapitres entiers, selon un ordre qui lui apparaît plus « logique »" (Jaubert, *Approches…*, 14 et n. 3).

[20] Cf. the most exhaustive review of the relevant publications to 1994 (from an adversary of the Signs Source hypothesis): G. Van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel. Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 116; Leuven: University Press, 1994. One of the main targets of Van Belle's criticisms, Robert Fortna, acknowledges that "...this book will provide a definitive tracking of the elaborate argument during this century over the hypothesis in question" (in his review in *Review of Biblical Literature* [http://www.bookreviews.org] (2000)).

[21] However, there are rare cases when, even outside the lectionary paradigm, a liturgical approach is applied to discussion of the structure of the Gospel: s. a detailed review in Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure...*

[22] To mention only the most recent ones: G. A. Yee, *Jewish Feasts in the Gospel of John*, Eugen, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2007; M. A. Daise, *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and the Jesus' 'Hour' in the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2.229; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007; D. Felsch, *Die Feste im Johannesevangelium. Judische Tradition und christologische Deutung*, WUNT 2.308; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011; G. Wheaton, *The role of Jewish Feasts in John's Gospel*, PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2010 (on-line at http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/942).

we need to propose liturgical schemes connecting the day of the Passover 14 Nisan, Tuesday or Sunday, with the days of John the Baptist's witness.

Some of the signs are explicitly (ch. 5 and ch. 9) or implicitly but rather clearly (resurrection of Lazarus) dated to the Saturday, and Saturday is as well the day of the last Passover of Jesus (at least, according to the official calendar). Given the pre-eminence of the Saturday in the structures based on the 364DY calendar, it is reasonable to propose, that the supposed calendrical structure (liturgical cycle) is a Sabbatical one—based primarily on the Sabbaths.

The logically simplest structure would establish a sort of symmetry between all the signs as the "knots" of the liturgical network. It would suppose a cycle involving a number of Sabbaths equal to, at least, the number of signs (six to eight) plus one for the Sabbath of the Passover. This hypothesis now must be précised and checked roughly with examining of possible, within this calendrical scheme, liturgical interpretation of the meeting between John the Baptist and Jesus described in ch. 1. This meeting is to be dated several days before the seventh or eighth Sabbath[23] presuming the counting backward from the Sabbath of the last Passover, which is the first Sabbath of the whole cycle.

I have to underline that here and henceforth, when I say "date" or "to be dated," I mean only liturgical date of the *commemoration* of the event, without any particular interest in its historical date or its historicity at all. We are interested here in liturgical time exclusively. If our hypothesis results in an acceptable liturgical interpretation of the initial scenes between Jesus and John, we will have to check the whole hypothesis further in its details.

To calculate the hypothetical date of the initial scene of the Gospel of John, we have to find out, among the Second Temple Jewish liturgical traditions, a liturgical cycle presuming counting backwards from the Passover a period more than seven but no more than nine weeks. The date of the meeting of John and Jesus is to be counted according to the formula $p - N$, where p is the date of the Passover night[24] (14.I for *nychtemeron* from sunrise to sunrise and 15.I for from evening to evening) and N is a number of days that belongs to the interval $49 < N \leq 63$.[25]

These conditions are strict enough. There is only one calendrical scheme which is exactly fitting with them: that of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* cycle of the Samaritan calendar (which presumes $N = 59$). The Samaritan feast (or, more exactly, semi-feast) of *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* ("gathering/meeting of the Passover") is falling on the 60th day before the Passover on 15.I (not 14.I!),[26] that is, 15.XI according to the Samaritan calendar.[27]

---

[23] Because the first scenes described in ch. 1 cover several days in succession, thus, most or all of them are not Sabbaths.

[24] The Passover culminates in the night (as well as the passing through the Red Sea took place in the night). For the details, s. esp. R. Le Déaut, *La nuit pascale. Essay sur la signification de la Paque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII, 42*, Analecta biblica, 22: Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963.

[25] Presuming that the liturgical interpretations of the whole ch. 1 have to cover no more than seven days. There are several hypotheses (starting, at least, from Ferdinand Christian Baur, 1847) that the events in ch. 1 cover seven days exactly, in parallel with the week of creation in Genesis and/or the Passion Week; the extant text of the Gospel, in this case, is either read as presuming a seven-day chronology, too (1:39, in this case, does not refer to the time of Peter's calling in 1:40-41 but marks the exact time of some—which?!—event(s) during two disciples' staying at Jesus' home), or considered as corrupt. Cf., e.g., M. E. Boismard, A. Lamouille, *Synopse des quatre évangiles*, t. III, *L'Évangile de Jean*, Paris: Cerf, 1977, 99. Boismard's hypothesis is based on an exegetical and theological idea of a parallel with the first week of creation, and so, without strong textological and/or liturgical reasons, it would be safer to ignore it in the liturgical research. However, at the present very initial stage of the research we are not ruling it out when accepting $N = 63$ as an *a priori* allowable value.

[26] The Samaritans are counting the *nychtemeron* starting from the evening, and so, they slay the ram on the evening of 14.I, just before the beginning of 15.I. The proper day of the feast is, for them, 15.I. The same situation is in the rabbinic Judaism (although rabbinic 15.I is astronomically different day from Samaritan 15.I), but not in the calendars where the day begins on the sunrise. In the latter case, the proper date of feast, the night of the Passover with its vigil, belongs to 14.I.

[27] In the Samaritan calendar, the XI month contains 30 days but the XII month only 29 days. On the origin of this feast, s. J. Bowman, "Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 91 (1959) 23–37, and, somewhat polemically toward Bowman, S. Powels, *Der Kalender der Samaritaner anhand des*

The feast on 15.XI is certainly going back to the Second Temple period and has parallels in both Jewish rabbinic and Christian sources (we have to review them below). The Samaritan liturgical tradition is peculiar in its accentuation on the link between this feast and the Passover. This accentuation, in turn, is not without parallels in the Second Temple Jewish sources.

The period of 60 days before an important feast is a major subdivision of the liturgical calendar of the *2 Enoch*, although the feast in question is here the Pentecost and not the Passover.[28]

Moreover, in the Gospel of John, Jesus' phrase "Do you not say, 'Four months more, then comes the harvest'? But I tell you, look around you, and see how the fields are ripe for harvesting" (4:35) could be interpreted as marking 120-day period between the feast of 15.XI (whose agricultural meaning may be connected with the sowing) and the Pentecost (the feast of the harvest of wheat). The original chronological setting of this phrase is unclear, especially taking into account its Synoptic parallels (Mt 9:37; Lk 10:2, whose chronological setting is imprecise: cf. Mt 9:35); its chronological setting in the Gospel of John will be discussed later (section 13.4), but its direct meaning can be discussed here.

The "four months" is the exact interval between 15.XI (sowing) and 15.III (harvest = Pentecost) according to the Wednesday 364DY calendar in its classical form (that of the *Jubilees* etc.).[29] Theodor Zahn, basing on the agricultural considerations concerning the time of sowing, has already noticed that Jn 4:35 was probably originally said "in the middle of January,"[30] and, independently from him, John Bowman interpreted this verse as relating to the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*, but without precise chronology.[31] Other exegetes noticed difficulties of chronological interpretation of 4:35 using rabbinic sources.[32] Jaubert's considerations on importance of the calendar of the *Jubilees* in the Synoptic Gospels make my calendrical interpretation of Jn 4:35 (the verse going back to a tradition shared with the Synoptics) especially plausible. I am mentioning this here as a likely witness of the presence of the 15.XI festival in the background of the Synoptic traditions, too.

The parallels from the Samaritan liturgy are especially important for understanding the Fourth Gospel, whose relation to the Samaritans is still a disputable matter but certainly going much deeper than a unique scene with the Samaritan woman.[33] Moreover, we have to recall that

---

Kitāb Hisāb as-Sinīn und anderer Handschriften, Studia Samaritana, 3; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1977, 124–128, and eadem, "The Samaritan Calendar and the Roots of Samaritan Chronology," in A. D. Crown (ed.), *The Samaritans*, Tübingen: Mohr Sibeck, 1989, 691–742, here 734. Both Bowman and Powels, however, agree that this feast is to be dated to the Second Temple period.

[28] Lourié, "Calendrical Elements in 2 Enoch."

[29] 15.XI + 59 days = 13.I (31 day in the XII month); the 60th day is 14.I, Passover, Wednesday; plus 4 days up to 19.I, Monday, the first day of the Unleavened Bread festival; plus 7 days of this festival (from Monday 19.I to Sunday 25.I); plus 49 days before the festival of the Weeks (Pentecost) = 120 days = four months. Months are considered as containing always 30 days, the four 31st days at the end of each quarter being considered as additional days of the ideal 360-day year, and so, 4 months = 120 days; cf. J. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years. Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran and Their Ancient Context*, STDJ, 78; Leiden: Brill, 2008. In the Sunday 364DY calendar having the same distribution of the four additional days and following the rules of Leviticus in counting the date of the Pentecost, the date of the latter would be 11.III, 116 days after 15.XI.

[30] Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 4; Leipzig: A. Deichert, $^{3/4}$1912, 258–259, esp. Anm. 46.

[31] J. Bowman, *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews. A Study of R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John*, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 8; Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1975, 113–114.

[32] Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 207 (normal interval between the sowing and the harvest, in rabbinic sources, is six months). C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John. An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, ^{2}1978, 241, counts from "the firstfruits of harvest" (*scil.*, of barley) 16 Nisan to 16 Chislev, pointing out that the middle of Chislev is the end of the seed-time according to *tTa'anit* 1:7 (on the authority of R. Meir, *ca* 150 AD); however, Tosefta here does not operate with the exact dates, simply enumerating "a half of Chislev" (חצי כסלו) among the months of sowing.

[33] S., for a balanced view, J. D. Purvis, "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans," *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975) 161–198; reprinted in D. E. Orton (ed.), *The Composition of John's Gospel. Selected Studies from* Novum Testamentum, Leiden—Boston—Köln: Brill, 1999, 148–185. The most extreme attitudes include George W. Buchanan's hypothesis on the Samaritan origin of the Gospel and John Bowman's hypothesis on Fourth Gospel's

the Samaritan people and their priesthood are direct descendents of those Jews who remain in Palestine during the Exile (this conclusion of some historians, especially Étienne Nodet,[34] was recently confirmed with the DNA analysis[35]). Thus, some liturgical traditions lacking in the rabbinic Judaism could be shared by different non-rabbinic Jewish communities including the Samaritans and Jewish sectarian direct predecessors of the Christians.

If we apply the rule of the Samaritan reckoning of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* to the dates 14.I and 15.I of the 364DY calendar, we obtain (according to the formula $p - 59$), respectively, 15.XI and 16.XI (presuming 31 days in the XII month) or 14.XI and 15.XI (presuming 30 days in the XII month). The Passover date 14.I requires day reckoning from sunrise to sunrise, which is normal for the 364DY calendar. 31 days in the XII month is, for the 364DY calendar, the most common variant, regardless of either Wednesday or Sunday beginning of the year. The Passover date 15.I corresponds to the day reckoning from evening to evening. It results in the 15.XI as the festal date only in the case, not usual, if the XII month contains 30 days.

Now, we are in position to review more closely the liturgical traditions related to the feast 15.XI.

4. The Feast on 15.XI: Samaritan, Rabbinic, and the Gospel of John

Few scholars were not putting together the Samaritan and the Jewish rabbinic feasts on 15.XI. The rabbinic feast on 15 Shebaṭ is the so-called New Year of Trees (ראש השנה לאילנות; *mRosh ha-Shanah*, 1:1), the day from which fruit tithes are counted. The two feasts coincide[36] not accidentally, because the Samaritans has a symmetrical feast before the Tabernacles,[37] *Ṣimmut Sukkot*, on 15.V, which coincides with the Jewish rabbinic feast on 15 Ab (*Megillah Ta'anit*; *mTa'anit* 4:8-10; *bTa'anit* 30b–31a).[38] Only the Samaritans, however, preserved a liturgically explicit relation of the two *Ṣimmut*-feasts to their corresponding major festivals. It is

---

purpose as a missionary tool primarily aimed at the Samaritans; s. G. W. Buchanan, "The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John," in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to *Numen*), 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968 [repr. 1970], 149–175; J. Bowden, "Samaritan Studies. I. The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1958) 298–329. Cf. also H. H. Scobie, "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity," *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972–1973) 390–414, and, most recently, É. Nodet, "Le salut vient des Juifs (Jn 4,22), et non de Simon le Magicien (Ac 8,9)," *Revue biblique* 120 (2013) 553–569. Cf., on the importance of Samaria for the Johannine tradition, Jaubert, *Approches…*, 49–50.

[34] J. Nodet, *In Search of the Origin of Judaism: From Joshua to Mishnah*, JSOTSup, 248; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997 (revised English tr. of the French 1992 edition), 12: "…the Samaritans of Gerizim were the most direct heirs of the ancient Israelites and their cult… Judaism, dispersed throughout the whole Seleucid Transeuphrates, was an import from Babylon and was made up of ancestral traditions and memories of the Kingdom of Judah… [T]he union between these two… took place a little before 200 BCE…" Thus, without being in any way specifically "Samaritan" Gospel, the Gospel of John might simply follow Jewish traditions that were closer to those of the Samaritans than to those of the "Jews" (τῶν Ἰουδαίων) of the official Jerusalem cult.

[35] P. Shen *et al.* "Reconstruction of Patrilineages and Matrilineages of Samaritans and Other Israeli Populations from Y-Chromosome and Mitochondrial DNA Sequence Variation," *Human Mutation* 24 (2004) 248–260: "Principal component analysis suggests a common ancestry of Samaritan and Jewish patrilineages"; "...we speculate that the Samaritan M304 Y-chromosome lineages present a subgroup of the original Jewish Cohanim priesthood that did not go into exile when the Assyrians conquered the northern kingdom of Israel in 721 BC, but married Assyrian and female exiles relocated from other conquered lands..." (p. 248, 258–259). Such facts are still normally not taken into account by the critics of Nodet; cf., e.g., I. Hjelm, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism. A Literaly Analysis*, JSOTSup, 303; Copenhagen International Seminar, 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

[36] Coincide by ordinal numbers of the month and of the day within this month, whereas not by the days themselves, because the rabbinic and Samaritan calendars are different.

[37] On the symmetry between the Passover and the Tabernacles in the Second Temple period, s. J. B. Segal, *The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A. D. 70*, London Oriental Series, 12; London—New York—Toronto: Oxford UP, 1963, 117–127.

[38] On the feast of 15 Ab in the rabbinic tradition, s. H. Lichtenstein, "Die Fastenrolle. Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte," *HUCA* 8-9 (1931–1932) 257–351, here 268–271.

clear that the liturgical cycles introducing the Passover and the Tabernacles were, in Jesus' time, common to the Samaritan and (at least, some) other Israelite communities.

Our preliminary hypotheses concerning the presence in the Gospel of John of a liturgical structure similar and genetically related, through a common source, to that of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*–Passover in the Samaritan calendar were, at first, based on the numerical parameters only. Now, we are in position to point out three more structural parallels out of hand and, then, the fourth parallel which must be established as a result of the verification of our working hypothesis (s. below, section 8). Thus, the total number of the structural parallels with the Samaritan liturgical calendar will be five. Let us start with the three the most evident.

The structure of the Samaritan *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*–Passover cycle is sabbatic. The great festivity of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* is celebrated not on its theoretical date 15.I (which can fall on any day of the week) but on the following Saturday. This Saturday is the first in the sequence of eight lesser Sabbath festivities, where the last one (the eighth) is called *Shabbat ha-Gadol* ("Great Sabbath"): the last Sabbath before the Passover, when the congregation asks the High Priest to accept their Passover lambs.

The seven Sabbaths before the *Shabbat ha-Gadol* are called *mofetim*, which means signs, מופת "wonder" (τέρας in LXX) being a synonym of אות / σημεῖον "sign." The "wonders/signs" are those of Exodus, whereas only seven from the ten plagues of Egypt. The Sabbaths are called after the corresponding signs: Serpent, Blood, Frogs, Gnats, Swarm, Cattle, Boil, and Hail. Purvis considers the seven signs of the Gospel of John in a Samaritan context (as a contraposition of the diabolical signs of Samaritan magicians[39]), but he ignores the meaning of Samaritan "sign" as a liturgical and temporary division relevant to the pre-Passover period of the year.

The major theme of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* is the meeting of Moses and Aaron as described in Ex 4. In the next section we will discuss the typology of Moses and Aaron behind the meeting between the New Moses, Jesus, and John the Baptist. Oddly enough, it escaped attention even of those who elaborated a lot on the Moses–Jesus typology in the Fourth Gospel.[40] Here I only have to note that the topics of Ex 4 belong to the earliest layer of the liturgy of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*.[41] Therefore, Sylvia Powels' criticisms of Bowman's interpretation of the feast are ignoring the available data on the liturgical development,[42] and so, unfounded.

---

[39] Purvis, "The Fourth Gospel...," p. 184 of reprint.

[40] The presence of the typology of Jesus as a New Moses in the Fourth Gospel is a commonly acknowledged fact, but not all its details are equally obvious. The groundbreaking studies in the field are P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1965, and W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967.

[41] The earliest layer of the Samaritan liturgy is the system of reading of the Pentateuch, whose all the five books are to be read on each great festivity but in a digest containing selected verses only. These selections (called *qᵉṭafim*) are somewhat different for the different feasts. "Elementary analysis of the services showed at once that the QeṬAFIM are the skeleton giving definite and distinctive shape to each service, and around which, through the centuries, has grown the flesh in the form of hymns, responses, antiphons, various 'glorias', and so on" (D. D. W. Mowbray, *A Critical Edition and Translation of the Samaritan Liturgies for the Ẓimmut Pesaḥ and Ẓimmut Sukkot and Associated Semi-Festival Liturgies*, PhD Thesis (unpublished), University of Leeds, 1958, p. c–ci). The verses of Ex 4 for the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* are 5, 8-9, 17, 21, 27-30, the verses from 4:9 to 4:30 belong to this feast exclusively (cf. table in Mowbray, *A Critical Edition...*, p. xliii). Unfortunately, the *qᵉṭafim* are excluded from the publication by A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy. The Common Prayers, Based on a Copy of the Vatican Ms. Made by P. Bollig*, 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909. The signs taken from Ex 4 assigned to the two first Sabbaths of the *mofetim* show that Ex 4 is important for the very idea of the liturgical cycle, and so, are an additional argument for the genuine character of the Moses and Aaron topics.

[42] Powels stresses agricultural aspects of the feast, more or less common with the rabbinic New Year of Trees (the period when life returns to nature, especially to the trees, whereas the *Ṣimmut Sukkot* marks the beginning of the period when the nature withers)—however, traceable exclusively in paraliturgical sources—and postulates, without taking into account Mowbray's liturgical analysis, that the topics of Moses and Aaron are secondary and late: Powels, *Der Kalender der Samaritaner...*, 124–126; eadem, "The Samaritan Calendar...," 734.

5. John the Baptist meets Jesus: the New Aaron meets the New Moses

The first chapter of the Gospel of John makes the Moses–Jesus typology explicit: "The law indeed was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (1:17). It is in this context that the preaching of John the Baptist is introduced. It is not explicitly said, in this Gospel, that John the Baptist is a priest and a son of a priest according to the order of Aaron, but introducing some personages as already known to the audience is normal to this Gospel (cf. Annas (18:13) and Pilate (18:31)). The Fourth Gospel, instead, from the very beginning, contains polemics against messianic interpretations of John the Baptist (1:8, 19-27), that is, certainly presumes some foreknowledge of this figure by its audience.

John the Baptist's refuse to acknowledge himself a prophet (1:21) can be interpreted in the sense that he is not the messianic "prophet like Moses" (Deut 15:15-18), because this title is reserved to Jesus (cf. Peter's preaching in Acts 3:22-23).[43]

If, together with many exegetes, we prefer in 1:34, according to the earliest manuscripts, the reading "Chosen (ἐκλεκτός) of God" instead of "Son of God,"[44] we could consider this term as another mark of Mosaic typology (cf. Ps 105(106):23, where "the Chosen of God" is Moses), even if the term itself is not exclusively Mosaic. It is important to our study that the same title "Chosen of God" is applied to another Moses-like, in the sense of Deut 15:15-18, figure, Joshua (Num 11:18). We will see that Jesus performed a part of his signs as a New Moses, whereas another part as a New Joshua—but "New Joshua" still means "New Moses."[45]

However, some important elements of the Moses-typology in Jn 1 becomes transparent against their background in Ex 4 (s. Table 1; our final analysis will be summarised in the Table 10, section 20.3).[46]

Table 1.

John 1	**Exodus 4**
John the Baptist is a priest (presumed in Jn).	**14** What of your brother Aaron, the Levite? I know that he can speak fluently; even now he is coming out to meet you, and when he sees you his heart will be glad.
23 He said, "I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord' [Is 40:3 LXX]," as the prophet Isaiah said.	**15** You shall speak to him and put the words in his mouth; and I will be with your mouth and with his mouth, and will teach you what you shall do.
34 And I myself have seen and have testified that this is the Chosen of God.	**16** He indeed shall speak for you to the people; he shall serve as a mouth for you, and you shall serve as God for him (וְאַתָּה תִּהְיֶה־לּוֹ לֵאלֹהִים).

John the Baptist is a Levite, as Aaron, he is "the voice" of the Messiah, while Aaron is "a mouth" of Moses, and, the most important, Moses becomes "God" to Aaron, whereas not in the absolute sense of word, while Jesus is God to John the Baptist in the most strict sense of word.[47]

The chapter 4 of Exodus contains as well, with no explicit relation to the meeting between Moses and Aaron, an important topic of circumcision, that is, of entering into the Covenant (Ex 4:24-26), whose parallel in Jn 1 are the topics of baptism and *Agnus Dei*.[48]

---

[43] R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols., The Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1966–1969, I, 49–50.

[44] Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 57, 66–67.

[45] The typology of Joshua in Gospels' portraits of Jesus is studied far less than that of Moses. As one of the pioneering studies, cf. É. Nodet, "De Josué à Jésus, via Qumrân et le 'pain quotidien,'" *Revue biblique* 114 (2007) 208–236.

[46] Cf., brief notes on the use of Ex 4 in Jn 4: Th. L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993, 125–126.

[47] S. especially D. Boyarin, "The Gospel of the *Memra*: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *The Harvard Theological Review* 94 (2001) 243–284, and also the whole monograph by John L. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010.

[48] Cf. A. Jaubert, *La notion d'Alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne*, Patristica Sorbonensia, 6; Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1963 [repr. 1977].

However, the very imagery of Ex 4:24-26 together with Moses' sign of blood (Ex 4:9) will be recalled in the Gospel of John later, at the wedding in Cana (s. below, section 12).

We have to conclude that the major topic of the Samaritan *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*, the meeting of Moses by Aaron, is implied in the meeting of Jesus by John the Baptist. This can be established without any liturgical analysis. However, the wording of the chapter 1 is intensively corroborated, according to our supposition, with the structure of liturgical calendar underlying the text: the liturgical commemoration of the meeting of (the New) Moses by (the New) Aaron is especially convenient to the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* topics.

6. Christian Heirs of the Jewish Feast on 15.XI

Before formulating the working hypothesis, we have to test the feast of 15.XI for continuation in Christian liturgies. It is hardly probable, let us repeat, that any liturgical custom important for, at least, one community responsible for Gospel writing, would disappear without any trace from the Christian sources.

6.1. The Theotokos of Seeds and Related Feasts (15 and 16 January)

The remarkable liturgical events could relatively easily change their contents but not their dates (places in the liturgical calendar). The liturgical calendar as a system is a more rigid structure than the interpretations of its particular "knots" (remarkable liturgical dates). The contents of liturgical commemorations ("words") are much more volatile than the numbers (dates).[49] The first law of Baumstark (the Law of Organic Development of the liturgy) applied to the liturgical calendar would require that the liturgical events are developing mostly through their reinterpretation, without change of their liturgical dates, and only in a much lesser extent, through misplacing and dropping out of the dates.[50]

The most popular way of "translation" of the liturgical dates from one calendar into another consisted in preserving the ordinal number of the day within a month when changing the name of the month of the first calendar to that of the roughly corresponding month of another calendar. In translations from Jewish calendars into different modifications of the Julian calendar the prevailing rule was Nisan = March, although in the Asia Minor this rule was Nisan = April (which predefined the month names in Christian Syriac).

Among the Christian rites, only the Western Syrian one preserves a feast of Mary the Mother of God (Theotokos) called "(Feast) of Theotokos of Seeds" (ܕܝܠܕܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܠ ܙܪ̈ܥܐ) on 15 January (Second Kanun; Syriac Shebaṭ corresponds to February).[51] Its hagiographical legend is completely lost. However, its agricultural overtones are evident (connexion to the sowing), and so, it is hardly not an avatar of the Jewish 15 Shebaṭ tradition. A non-Syrian origin of the feast is clear from the correspondence Shebaṭ–January (instead of Shebaṭ–February, as is to be expected in Syriac) and is confirmed with other Christian data.

The the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (unique ninth-cent. ms copied in the Anglo-Saxon England but going back, through a lost Gallican late sixth-cent. recension, to the patriarchate of Aquilea in the 430s or 440s) provides, for 18 January: *XV Kal*[*endae*] *Feb*[*ruarii:*] *depositio sanctae Mariae*. In the Roman version of the Julian calendar, such a metamorphose of the day number is quite normal, if not normative: the ordinal numbers counted, in their original calendars, forward from the beginning of the month, become counted back from the Kalendes, Ides, or

---

[49] This fact was first noticed by Hippolyte Delehaye who introduced the notion of the "coordonnées hagiographiques" of time and place. These "coordinates" are always more stable than the corresponding hagiographical legends, the names of the corresponding saints or commemorations, etc.: H. Delehaye, *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique*, Subsidia hagiographica, 21; Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1934 (s. Leçon 1). In our case, the coordinate of time is 15 Shebaṭ, regardless of the Jewish calendar meant (e.g., Samaritan or rabbinic or that of the Fourth Evangelist's community) and the methods of "translation" of this date into the calendars of the non-Jewish (Christian) communities. For a few examples, s. B. Lourié, "Afterlife of the 2 Enoch Calendar: Major Christian Feasts on the Sixth Day," *Enoch* 33 (2011) 102–107.

[50] See A. Baumstark, *Liturgie Comparée: Principes et méthodes pour l'étude historique des liturgies chrétiennes*. 3me éd., revue par Dom B. Botte. Coll. "Irénikon": Chevetogne/Paris: Éd. de Chevetogne, 1953. For a discussion of applicability to the Early Christian/Second Temple Jewish studies, s. B. Lourié, "The Jewish Matrix of Christianity Seen through the Early Christian Liturgical Institutions," in D. Bumazhnov, A. Toepel *et al.* (eds.), *Akten der 3. Tübinger Tagung zum Christlichen Orient, 2008*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (forthcoming).

[51] Presents in the most of the calendars published by François Nau (Nrs from IV to XIII; the complete text of the calendar XIII is published by Sebastian Brock in 1970) and in the calendar of Rabban Ṣliba; cf.: F. Nau, *Un martyrologe et douze ménologes syriaques*, Patrologia Orientalis, X, 1, Paris: Firmin-Didot et C[ie], 1915; S. Brock, "A Calendar Attributed to Jacob of Edessa," *Parole de l'Orient* 1 (1970) 415–429; P. Peeters, "Le Martyrologe de Rabban Sliba," *Analecta Bollandiana* 27 (1908) 129–200. Brock mentions this feasts as "regularly found" (*op. cit.*, p. 423, n. 36). Sometimes, in the Syriac Jacobite calendars, this feast is called simply "of Theotokos" or "of Mary."

Nones. Such a procedure allows preserving the value of the ordinal number, and so, notwithstanding the prevailing view, I am not inclined to consider this operation as erroneous. The date of the Marian feast in January is still the 15th day, what is the priority task of such translation. The feast of Dormition in the middle of January is witnessed with a number of other Latin documents from the sixth to the eighth centuries, although without the precise date.[52] The feast of Dormition of the Theotokos became, in the first half of the fifth century, the major feast of the Theotokos, but its calendrical localisation in August is a later development (since 444 in Palestine).[53] A reinterpretation of the 15 January Marian feast as the Dormition would be especially opportune in the short time between the Third Ecumenical Council in Ephesus (431), which was a "Mariological" council, and establishing of the Palestine Dormition feast in Gethsemane in the middle of the fifth century—precisely the time when the original *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* was composed.

In the Coptic rite, the Marian feast on 15 January was also reinterpreted as the Dormition but, this time, with a little temporary shift: it was replaced to the next day, 16 January.[54] This replacement took place already on the Palestinian ground, because, in Palestine, we have a Melkite (common to all Chalcedonian factions: Greek, Georgian, and Syrian) feast of the Theotokos on 16 January in Choziba.[55] In Palestine, the Dormition reinterpretation of the January Marian feast was, of course, prevented with the competing August Dormition cycle, but the archaic agricultural interpretation ("of Seeds") was replaced with some other—most likely, related to the Nativity of the Theotokos and, certainly, with the local hagiographical legend of the late fifth-century monastery in Choziba.[56] It is clear, anyway, that the main church of the monastery of Choziba was dedicated on the day of the pre-existing Marian feast.

The reasons of shifting of the date from 15 January to 16 January (in both Coptic and triple Melkite rites) remain obscure but our present study, I hope, will shed some light on this problem. Nevertheless, it is clear, from the above survey, that the feast on 15 January, the heir of the Jewish feast on 15 Shebaṭ, was continuing its life in all Christian rites within Byzantium up to the end of the first Christian millennium (and, in the Coptic and Western

---

[52] B. Capelle, "La Fête de l'Assomption dans l'histoire liturgique," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 3 (1926) 33–45, here 42–43.

[53] Cf., for the details, B. Lourié, "Peter the Iberian and Dionysius the Areopagite: Honigmann—van Esbroeck's Thesis Revisited," *Scrinium* 6 (2010) 143–212, here 180–191, with further bibliography.

[54] S., for the details of the complicated history of the Dormition/Assumption in the Coptic rite, Lourié, "Peter the Iberian...," 190–191, with further bibliography. The Coptic rite, in its (Alexandrinian) version of the Julian calendar, normally does not care of preserving the ordinal numbers of the days, and so, this feast is on 11 Tobi (= 16 January).

[55] In the Palestinian rite in Greek: Τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς μονῆς τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου τῆς ἐπιλεγομένης Χοζεβᾶ "The Dedication of the monastery of the Holy Theotokos, which is called Chozeba". This title is preserved, together with the hymnography of the feast, in a unique Greek manuscript (Sinai, ΜΓ 56) which is one of the most ancient Greek liturgical manuscripts ever, 8th–9th cent.; it presents the liturgy of the Anastasis Cathedral in Jerusalem. The table of contents of the manuscript is published in А. Никифорова, *Из истории минеи в Византии. Гимнографические памятники VIII–IX вв. из собрания монастыря Святой Екатерины на Синае* [A. Nikiforova, *From the History of the (Liturgical)* Menaia *in Byzantium. Hymnographic Monuments from the Collection of the St Catherine Monastery at Sinai*], Moscow: Izdatel'stvo PSTGU, 2012, 31–40, here 32. I am grateful to Alexandra Nikiforova for having provided me with the unpublished text of the liturgy of the feast. In the Palestinian Melkite rite in Syriac: ܕܝܠܕܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܘܙܝܒܐ "(feast) of the Theotokos of Choziba" [A. Binggelli, "Un ancien calendrier melkite de Jérusalem (Sinaï syr. M52N)", in F. Briquel Chatonnet, M. Debié (eds.), *Sur les pas des Araméens chrétiens. Mélanges offerts à Alain Desreumaux*, Cahiers d'études syriaques, 1; Paris: Geuthner, 2010, 181–194, here 185]. In the Georgian rite (inside and outside of Palestine), there are two feasts, on 16 and 18 January (it remains unclear whether the Georgian date of 18 January has anything to do with the Latin one). On January 18: ქუზიბას ღმრთისმშობელისა მონასტერსა, სატფური "In Choziba [K'uziba], dedication of the monastery of the Theotokos" [G. Garitte, *Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du* Sinaiticus 34 *(X^e siècle). Édité, traduit et commenté*, Subsidia hagiographica, 30; Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1959, 45; on January 16, s. the next note; for the comparative data, s. *ibid.*, 132–134]. It is probably this feast on 16 January that is witnessed with an (unpublished) Armenian source called *The feasts of the holy martyrs according to the Roman months, kept for the glory of God* (preserved in the unique ms Vatic. Arm. 3, AD 1287, English tr. in F. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum...*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905, 529–532, here 529), where on 16 January is stated: "Mariam Virgin and Bassa and the four sons." In the Armenian rite itself no one trace of the feast is known.

[56] Presented only in Georgian (for the feast on 16 January): ღმრთისმშობელისაჲ, ოდეს ახარა ანგელოზმან იოვაკიმს ქუზიბას მობისა თჳს ღმრთისმშობელისა მარიამისა "(the feast) of the Theotokos, when the angel announced to Joachim in Choziba the nativity of the Theotokos Mariam" (Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 45). The unnamed desert in the *Protevangelium of James* (1:4; 4:2) is interpreted as that of Choziba, near to the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, which seems reasonable if one takes into account that, short before departing to the desert, James was participating in the liturgy of an (unnamed) great feast in Jerusalem. The feast of the Nativity of the Theotokos on 8 September is a later (second half of the fifth cent.) Palestinian development (cf., for dating and a further bibliography, Lourié, "Peter the Iberian...," 188–190).

Syriac rites, up today), although was never adopted by the Christians who were mostly enclosed within the Iranian realm (the Eastern Syrian and Armenian rites). The Marian interpretation of the feast testifies that the corresponding place in the framework of the liturgical year was considered as that of great importance. The omnipresence of the feast in the late Roman Empire's Christianity is an additional confirmation of this.

The history of the feast is explainable as a continuation of a Jewish Palestinian liturgical tradition. This tradition was strong enough to survive under extremely hard pressure of the Christian (ultimately, Jewish) Egyptian competitive tradition of the Epiphany feast on 6 January.[57]

6.2. The Unknown Gospel on the Sowing on Jordan (*P. Egerton* 2)

Our idea of the importance of the 15.XI festival for the structure of the Fourth Gospel is corroborated with a witness of the so-called Unknown Gospel (UG) preserved in a unique papyrus dated to *ca* 200 AD[58] (the date of the work itself remains unknown, but even the earliest possible date of the middle of the first century is not excluded). Some scholars (Mayeda, Koester, and others) consider UG to be an independent work whose author had an access to the traditions underlying the canonical Gospels, especially that of John; some others (e.g., Tzerpos) consider it to be depending on the Gospel of John (if not on the Synoptic Gospels) but still in its earlier shape than the present one.[59] Anyway, UG is a work roughly contemporary and closely cognate to both Johannine and Synoptic traditions.

The only fragment of UG, fr. 2 *verso* (= ll. 60-75), which apparently has, in its contents, no parallel in the canonical Gospels—although it has one slight parallel with the Gospel of John in its wording[60]—is normally excluded from the discussions of the possible common roots of UG and the other Gospels. It tells a story about miraculous sowing by Jesus on Jordan.

In the frame of our hypothesis about connexion of the initial scene of the Gospel of John with the feast on 15.XI, this story turns out to be a parallel to the Fourth Gospel. Ii is true that, in this Gospel, Jesus is not baptized at all (his own baptizing activity is localized in Judaea but in an unnamed place: 3:22), whereas John the Baptist is baptizing in other places than Jordan.[61] Jordan as a place of a theophany is a Synoptic feature. But the theophany as a sowing is not.

Let us look at the relevant fragment of UG more closely. The text is severely damaged, and so, I quote it in my favourite reconstruction.[62] However, our purpose does not require following any particular reading unattested in the preserved text.

[τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; γεωργοῦ τινος]	Was meint ihr? Ein Landmann hat
[σπέρμα] τῷ τόπῳ [κ]ατακλείσαν-	Samen in seinem Acker verschlossen,
[τος ἤδη] ὑποτέτακτα[ι]· ἀδήλως	nun liegt er unter (der Erde); wird er unsichtbar
[μενεῖ] καὶ τὸ βάρος αὐτοῦ ἄστατο(ν)	bleiben und sein (Ernte)gewicht unwägbar
[ἔσται]; ἀπορηθέντων δὲ ἐκει-	sein? Während jene (Jünger) ratlos waren
[νων ὡς] πρὸς τὸ ξένον ἐπερώτημα	angesichts seiner befremdlichen Frage,

[57] Cf. R. Coquin, "Les origines de l'Épiphanie en Égypte," in B. Botte, E. Melia *et al*. (eds.), *Noël--Épiphanie. Retour du Christ. Semaine liturgique de l'Institut Saint-Serge*, Lex orandi, 40; Paris: Cerf, 1967, 139–170, and Lourié, "Afterlife of the 2 Enoch Calendar...," 102–103.

[58] This papyrus is divided into two parts: *P. Egerton* 2 of the British Library and *P. Köln* 255; the latter contains but a small part of the text but turned out to be crucial for precise dating. S. *editio princeps* and dating in M. Gronewald, "Unbekanntes Evangelium oder Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem ‚Evangelium Egerton')," in M. Gronewald, B. Kramer, K. Maresch, M. Parca, C. Römer, *Papyrologia Coloniensia. Kölner Papyri*, vol. VII, Bd 6, Cologne: Westdeutscher Verl., 1987, 136–145. The *editio princeps* of the Egerton 2 is H. I. Bell, T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Papyri*, London: The British Museum, 1935. An especially important study is G. Mayeda, *Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment Papyrus Egerton 2 und seine Stellung in der urchristlichen Literaturgeschichte*, Bern: Verl. P. Haupt, 1946. Cf. also an important introduction by Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press Int., 1990, 205–216. The most exhaustive and up-to-dated study (including textology and the history of scholarship) is now that of Vasilios Tzerpos: Β. Δ. Τζέρπου, "Ὁ Πάπυρος Egerton 2 (+ Πάπυρος Köln 255) καὶ ἡ σχέση του μὲ τὰ Εὐαγγέλια τοῦ Κανόνος τῆς Κ.Δ.," *Θεολογία* 81 (2010) 177–242. There exists, since 1998, a valuable web-site "The Papyrus Egerton 2" by Wieland Willker at http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/Egerton/Egerton_home.html .

[59] For an exhaustive review of the relevant scholarship, s. J. W. Pryor, "Papyrus Egerton 2 and the Fourth Gospel," *Australian Biblical Review* 37 (1989) 1–13, and Τζέρπου, "Ὁ Πάπυρος Egerton 2..."

[60] S., e.g., Τζέρπου, "Ὁ Πάπυρος Egerton 2...," 235.

[61] Cf. Nodet, "De Josué à Jésus…," and, for localisation of "Bethania/Bethabara beyond Jordan" (Jn 1:28), s. below, section 17.1. Nodet notices that Flavius Josephus in his description of John's baptism (*Ant* 18:117) does not connect it with Jordan either. When John was baptizing in Aenon near Salim (Jn 3:23) in Samaria (s. for localisation below, n. 134), Jesus was baptizing in an unspecified place in Judaea (Jn 3:22) (however, Jn 3:22 may be unrelated to the signs narrative at all: s. below, section 14.1).

[62] J. B. Bauer, "Die Saat aufs Wasser geht auf. PEgerton 2 fr. 2 verso (Bell/Skeat)," *ZNW* 97 (2006) 280–282.

[αὐτοῦ, π]εριπατῶν ὁ Ἰη(σοῦς) [ἐ]στάθη	ging Jesus hin und blieb stehen
[ἐπὶ τοῦ] χείλους τοῦ Ἰο[ρδ]άνου	an den Ufern des Jordan-
[ποταμ]οῦ καὶ ἐκτείνα[ς τὴν] χεῖ-	flusses und streckte seine Hand,
[ρα αὐτο]ῦ τὴν δεξιὰν [ἐγέ]μισεν	die rechte aus, füllte sie
[σπόρου κ]αὶ κατέσπειρ[εν ἐπ]ὶ τὸν	mit Saatgut, säte aus über den
[ποταμ]όν· καὶ τότε [τὸ γε] κατε-	Fluss. Da trat das be-
[σπραμ]ένον ὕδωρ· ἔπ[λησ]εν τὴν	säte Wasser über die
[κρηπῖδα]· καὶ ἐπλη[ρώθη ἐνώ-	Uferböschung – und (das Ufer) wurde
[πιον αὐτῶν. ἐ]ξήγα[γ]εν [δὲ] καρπὸ(ν)	ganz überströmt vor
[περισσῶς] πολλ[ὸν γάρ] εἰς χα-	ihren Augen – und es brachte Frucht
[ρὰν μεγάλην] τα[μβοῦν <*sc.* θαμβοῦν> α]ὐτοῦς.	über die Maßen viel zu ihrer
	großen Freude (und) erstaunte sie sehr.

On can see that it is not certain what precisely Jesus sowed on Jordan: maybe seeds, maybe water (as reconstructed Lietzmann, Dibelius, and Dodd), maybe something else.[63] Anyway, he was sowing on the water of Jordan, then, he poured this sowed water onto the earth, and, finally, some plants instantly grew up and brought fruits. The latter motive—plants become ready for harvest in the time of sowing—is presented in Jn 4:35, also related to the feast of 15.XI (s. above, section 3), and is to be interpreted in an eschatological sense.[64]

The parallel between our fragment and Jn 4:35 is overlooked by the students of UG but it is observable immediately. The most important parallel, however, is the topic of the feast of 15.XI, which is observable only within the general liturgical framework of the Gospel of John, which remains so far hypothetical. The present review of UG renders it a bit more plausible and provides an additional reason to check it further.

Certainly, the feast of 15.XI, the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*, belonged to an influential liturgical tradition(s) within the Jewish matrix (or, rather, matrices) of Christianity.

7. The Liturgical Framework: From the Preliminary Hypotheses to the Working Hypothesis

Our preliminary hypotheses of the liturgical framework implied in the Fourth Gospel are identical in their base, a 60-day pre-Passover sabbatic cycle, but differ according to the type of the 364DY calendar involved. The weekday of the Passover is depending on the exact type of the 364DY calendar.

Providing that the whole cycle must cover precisely 60 days (the date of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* = *p* – 59), and, taking into account that 56 days of this cycle are reserved to eight full weeks from Sunday to Saturday, we obtain that, for the Passover, the day of the week is three days later than for either 15.XI or 16.XI. The latter date must be taken into account because it has some history of its own in both Coptic and Byzantine/Melkite Palestine traditions, which presupposes a common Palestinian ground no later than in the middle of the fifth century—a sufficiently early date for being a part of the ancient Jewish heritage.

The scrupulous chronology of the events described in the first chapter of John must (if our intuition is right) provide a key to the distribution of these four days among the days of the week.

The chronometry starts not at the moment of appearance of John the Baptist but "on the next day" (τῇ ἐπαύριον), when Jesus comes to John (1:29). If we are dealing with a kind of *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*, the beginning of the 60-day liturgical cycle is the day of the meeting of (the New) Moses by (the New) Aaron, that is, precisely on this "next day." This must be the first day of our hypothetical liturgical cycle, but already "the next day" mentioned in 1:29.

On the following day (τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν; 1:35), Jesus acquires two first disciples, Andrew and an unnamed one (1:40). Andrew brought his brother Simon to Jesus (1:41-42) on the same day: just before this scene, the exact time is indicated: ὥρα ἦν ὡς δεκάτη "about 10th

[63] Cf. a comparison of all available reconstructions on Wieland Willker's web-site "The Papyrus Egerton 2."

[64] E.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 182.

hour (= 4 p.m.)" (1:39). Such an exactitude is certainly important to the author: this one day must not be counted as two.[65]

Again on the following day (τῇ ἐπαύριον): calling of Philip (1:43) who found—on the same day, because there is no daybreak indicated—Nathanael (1:45).

Finally, "on the third day" (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ), the wedding in Cana (2:1). The plain meaning of the text is "on the third day after the day of calling Philip and Nathanael," the fifth day of the liturgical cycle, not the third day counted from any other unspecified date.

The chronology of the wedding in Cana will be discussed below, but even here we can remark that, normally, in the pre-rabbinic times, the first day of the seven-day wedding banquet was Sunday. This is corroborated with the fact that the fourth day after the appearance of Jesus (or the fifth day after the activity of John the Baptist on the eve of the coming of Jesus) is skipped: it was a Sabbath.[66]

Thus, the meeting between John and Jesus took place on Wednesday, which is the first day of the liturgical cycle. But John the Baptist is shown as acting for an unspecified time before, at least, on the eve of this day, on Tuesday.

We have to consider the two possibilities: the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* falls either on Wednesday or on Tuesday. It is *a priori* more likely that the right date is Wednesday because it presupposes the meeting between John and Jesus, the event corresponding to the commemoration of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* (meeting between Moses and Aaron).

The *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* on Wednesday would correspond to the Passover on Saturday (according to the formula p = *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* + 59, from which follows that the weekday of the Passover is three days later than that of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*). In the 364DY calendars, the Passover on Saturday implies the beginning of the year, 1.I, falling on Sunday. The Passover Saturday in this calendar corresponds to 14.I and not to 15.I (because 15.I is Sunday). Thus, the Passover night (the night between 14 and 15 Nisan) belongs to 14.I, Saturday, which requires the beginning of the day on the morning, as it is usual in the 364DY calendars. The Gospel of John in its actual form contains traces of two different methods of day counting, from the sunrise and from the evening, but they could coexist with each other.[67] However, in this calendar, the date of the Wednesday of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* would be 16.XI, and not the more familiar date of 15.XI. This is also possible and, moreover, would explain why the date of the eve of the beginning of the liturgical cycle is also mentioned: the day when John the Baptist was already baptising but Jesus still not came to him: this day, 15.XI, even though not properly the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*, is nevertheless a feast (corresponding to the Talmudic "New Year of Trees"). Every date in the context of a liturgical calendar must be loaded with liturgical meaning, and this meaning needs to be explained.

In the Wednesday 365DY calendar, 14.I falls on Tuesday, which would correspond to 16.XI on Saturday and to Thursday as the day of the Cana wedding as it is specified in Jn 2:1. Even if Saturday could be appropriate for the meeting of Jesus by John, Thursday is the proper day to marry a widow, according to the rabbinic tradition (*mKetubot* 1:1 and parallel texts), which is hardly applicable to our case. At the present stage of research, we have no mean to rule out such a possibility, but there is no reason to take the Wednesday 364DY calendar as a working hypothesis. We can take as the working hypothesis its Sunday alternative but, in the

---

[65] Even if the present text does not imply a separate day for Peter (on the contrary, it rather argues against such a possibility), it could be an editing of an earlier text where a daybreak preceding the calling of Simon was presumed; cf. above, n. 25, on Boismard's hypothesis. Anyway, this hypothetical earlier edition of the passage is beyond the scope of the present study.

[66] More on this Sabbath see below, section 11, esp. 11.3.

[67] Cf., for the Gospel of John, R. Beckwith, "The Day: Its Divisions and Its Limits in Biblical Times," in idem, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian. Biblical, Intertestamental and Patristic Studies*, Leiden—Boston: Brill, 1996 [repr. 2001], 1–9. The two manners of counting the *nychtemeron*, from the evening and from the morning, still coexist in the Byzantine rite and, during the Lent, provoke such strange phenomena as two Vespers for the Annunciation on the two subsequent evenings related to March 25.

hypothetical case if our material will match the Wednesday calendar, this will become easily observable from the liturgical events falling on the Sabbaths.

Therefore, our working hypothesis will be a Sunday 364DY calendrical scheme. This hypothesis will be verified in the case if the supposed liturgical framework will provide satisfying liturgical interpretations of each of the signs performed by Jesus and, in the same time, will resolve some long-discussed puzzles of Fourth Gospel's text.

Note: the Sunday 364DY Calendar

I have to recall briefly the main features of the Sabbath 364DY calendar, which is the only calendar where the prescriptions of Leviticus concerning the feast from the Passover to the Pentecost are followed literally.

The day of the Passover is 14.I (Lev 23:5). It is followed by the seven-day feast of Unleavened Bread, 15–21.I (Lev 23:6-8). The counting of the seven weeks of the Pentecost must be started "from the day after the Sabbath (מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת), from the day on which you bring the sheaf of the elevation offering" (Lev 23:15). The latter norm in its literal sense needs a Sabbath 364DY scheme. The rabbinic tradition rejects the literal meaning of the mention of Sabbath (in both Lev 23:15 and Lev 23:11 "He shall raise the sheaf… on the day after the Sabbath"), reconsidering "Sabbath" here as the first day (from evening to evening) of the Passover, 15.I. Thus, the day of raising of the sheaf is 15.I, too, the first day of counting of the seven weeks is 16.I, and the Day of Shavuoth (Pentecost) is 6.III (the 1st month having 30 and the 2nd month having 29 days). Of course, the rule that the Day of Pentecost must fall on Sunday (Lev 23:16: "the day after the seventh Sabbath") is also ignored in its literal sense. The Samaritans and the Karaites, as well as the "Boethusians" known as an object of the rabbinic calendrical polemics (*mMenachot* 10:3; *tRosh ha-Shanah* 1:15), start their counting of the seven weeks on the first post-Passover Saturday, and so, preserve the literal sense of "Sabbath" in Leviticus, whereas without avoiding breaking the requirement to put the day of raising of the sheaf (in these calendars, Sunday after the first post-Passover Sabbath) *after* the seven-day feast of Unleavened Bread (Lev 23:6-8, 11).

In the Wednesday 364DY calendars, the situation is quite different. All the rules of Lev 23 regarding the Sabbath are kept in their literal sense. 14.I falls on Tuesday. Thus, the final day of Unleavened Bread, 21.I, is Tuesday as well. The first day of counting of the seven weeks must be the Sunday after the feast of Unleavened Bread. The first Sunday after 21.I is 26.I. Thus, the Day of Pentecost is Sunday 15.III (both 1st and 2nd months having 30 days). However, these calendars involve a pause between 21.I and 26.I, and, therefore, breaking, in its literal sense, the commandment "…from the day on which you bring the sheaf of the elevation offering" (Lev 23:15).

In the Sunday 364DY calendars, the Day of Passover 14.I is Sabbath, the days of the Unleavened Bread festival occupy the period from 15.I to 21.I, from Sunday to Saturday. The day of raising of the sheaf is the Sunday immediately after the end of the festival of Unleavened Bread, 22.I, which is in perfect correspondence with Lev 23:11. The same day is the beginning of counting of the seven weeks, again, in the perfect correspondence with the commandment of Leviticus (23:15): to start on the Sunday but on the day of raising of the sheaf.

The Sunday 364DY calendar is presented in, at least, several Jewish documents of the Second Temple period. It is not necessarily more recent than the Wednesday 364DY calendar.[68] In the New Testament, the tradition of the Passover falling on Saturday is presented, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*.[69]

8. Structurization of the Working Hypothesis: the General Shape of the Sabbatic Cycle

The only 60-day sabbatic pre-Passover cycle whose structure is preserved is that of the Samaritans. We have seen that it consists from a series of seven Sabbaths dedicated to particular "wonders/signs" with the final eighth and the most important Sabbath. These signs seem to be, nevertheless, quite different from those that could be meant in the Fourth Gospel. However, the Samaritan calendar preserves another sabbatic sequence placed between the Passover and the Pentecost: (1) "Week of the crossing of the (Red) Sea" (Ex 14:26–15:21), (2) "Week of the changing of the water of Marah" (Ex 15:22-26), (3) "Week of Elim, where they found twelve water springs and seventy palm trees" (Ex 15:27–16:3), (4) "Week of the *man*, which fell down upon them from heavens in the desert" (Ex 16:4–36), (5) "Week of the welling out of water from the rock" (Ex 17:1-7), (6) "Week of the battles against 'Amaleq" (Ex 17:8-17), (7) "Week of

[68] S. note 10 above.

[69] B. Lourié, "Calendrical Implications in the Epistle to the Hebrews: Seven questions concerning the liturgy of the Sabbath rest," *Revue biblique* 115 (2008) 245-265.

standing at Mt. Sinai" (Ex 19:1f.).[70] This is much closer to what is to be expected in the Fourth Gospel providing that our working hypothesis is true.

First of all, the Fourth Gospel begins somewhere on the eastern bank of the Jordan (1:28: πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) but places its Passion Narrative in Jerusalem. Thus, here, some post-Pentecostal commemorations are to be expected, up to the commemorations of the events accompanying entering into the Promised Land. Therefore, some parallels with the Samaritan *post*-Passover sabbatic cycle would be at place.

Moreover, for, at least, one Jesus' sign, multiplication of breads, its Exodic prototype is established quite clearly: the manna. There are some other hints, more or less explored by the students of the Fourth Gospels, but never arranged and presented as a unique system. For instance: one can recall some parallels between the two miracles with waters, in Cana and in Marah; 38 years of the illness of the paralytic in Jn 5:5 and the same number of years passed in the desert according to Deut 2:14, or an early Christian exegesis connecting the resurrection of Lazarus and the fall of Jericho... It is often useless to deal with such similarities when they are taken one by one. Such similarities between Gospel's scenes and Old Testament episodes could gain a probative value only within a system. But, so far, only rarely was articulated the idea that all the seven signs form a unique strategy of messianic Moses-like prophet's preaching, and so, are patterned after the Exodus story.[71]

Thus, if we are working with the method of comparative liturgy, we have to deal with our liturgical topics somewhat in the same way, *mutatis mutandis*, as in the comparative linguistics.

To consider our working hypothesis verified we have to discover a regularly recurring match between the signs of the Gospel and the appropriate biblical events on the route from the Red Sea to the Holy Land. Such a structure would be a close cognate of that of the Samaritan 60-day pre-Passover and post-Passover sabbatic cycles.

> It is obvious that my liturgical reconstruction will be rather far from any rabbinic Jewish liturgical model such as, e.g., the triennial lectionary cycle proposed by Eileen Guilding.[72] Nevertheless I consider my study as a partial revalorisation of her work. Some scholars including no less than Raymond Brown highly esteemed her particular observations concerning the Old Testament allusions in Gospel's text but almost nobody followed her even in the prerequisite hypothesis of her liturgical reconstruction, namely, that the triennial cycle could be no less old than the Gospel. Moreover, unlike Jaubert who joined the community of the DSS scholars already in the early 1950s, Guilding even in 1960 was writing as if in the pre-Qumranic epoch. Her book became soon looking archaically and, therefore, forgotten by new generations of the scholars. However, now we know, thanks to Helen Jacobus, that the triennial cycle itself is old enough, and the corresponding calendar was somewhere used in harmonization with the 364DY calendar (a Qumranic document, 4Q318 being a table containing such a harmonization).[73] Moreover, other

[70] Powels, "The Samaritan Calendar...," 729.

[71] Cf. W. Nicol, *The Sēmeia in the Fouth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction*, Leiden: Brill, 1972, 83–94, where the author recalls as well parallels with Elijah/Elisha and Joshua. These parallels will be partially discussed in our study.

[72] Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel*... Indeed, her monograph appeared as an edited version of her 1955 PhD thesis, and so, was mainly written in the early 1950s, still a pre-Qumranic epoch for the most of the scholars. S., about Guilding, D. J. A. Clines, "Aileen Guilding, her Life and her Work," in D. J. A. Clines and J. Ch. Exum (eds.), *The Reception of the Hebrew Bible in the Septuagint and the New Testament: Essays in Memory of Aileen Guilding*, Hebrew Bible Monographs, 55; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013 (forthcoming). The paper by John Tudno Williams, "The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: Guilding's Theory Revisited" from the same volume is so far inaccessible to me. Cf. also Bruce D. Chilton's criticisms of Leon L. Morris' book *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1964) that ruined both reputation of Guilding's monograph and—judging from her subsequent suddenly retirement in 1965 and the uninterrupted scholarly silence during remaining 40 years of her life—her scholarly career, too: B. D. Chilton, "Festivals and Lectionaries: Correspondence and Distinctions," in Ch. A. Rollston (ed.), *The Gospels according to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press Int., 2002, 12–28, here 13–14. Chilton's main point is that "Farrer's work, and Guilding's and Goulder's, cannot logically be dismissed with the laconic observation that lectionaries came later... Critical reflection must not exclude possibilities from discussion just because the dates of our sources are not always what we would like them to be" (p. 14; Farrer was a common teacher of both Guilding and Goulder).

[73] H. Jacobus,"4Q318: A Jewish Zodiac Calendar at Qumran?" in Ch. Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010, 365–395; eadem, "Group Identities and Calendars," in S. W. Crawford and C. Wassen (eds.), *The Library at Qumran* (Proceedings of ISBL

later rabbinic documents have been proven as useful sources for comparative historical reconstruction of the mystical ideas implied in the Fourth Gospel. Thus, even if the rabbinic triennial lectionary system itself did not shaped Fourth Gospel's structure, both Gospel and rabbinic liturgical reading system could share some common exegetical views which were expressed in Jewish liturgies preceding both of them. Here I make an accent that the relevant exegetical theories existed within a liturgy and were channelled through *liturgical* traditions. Thus, Guilding recourse to the rabbinic liturgy is, as such, a legitimate technique of the study in comparative liturgy, even if the Samaritan liturgical traditions seem to me staying closer to the Fourth Gospel than the rabbinic ones.

There is no need to run ahead too far and describe here the method of study in every detail. However, one can notice that our hypothesis entails some geographical restrictions: the signs must be arranged geographically on the route from Galilee to Jerusalem, somewhat closer to the simple geographical scheme of the Synoptic Gospels. The actual geography of the Fourth Gospel would certainly resist to such an attempt. However, this geography, is it is well known, is highly problematic itself.[74]

9. The Signs of Jesus: a Bird-Eye View

Our working hypothesis can be verified or falsified with an analysis of each sign in their contemporary context of liturgical and exegetical traditions. Before the beginning of such an enterprise, it would be useful, for facilitating reading, to sketch in advance the main conclusions of our study.

In result of our analysis, each sign will be understood as an agglomeration of traditions related to different biblical events, but such an agglomeration itself is not arbitrary and is, in turn, a Jewish Second Temple tradition. Moreover, even if every "knot" of our sabbatic network is a multilayer pie, there is some common layer in all the signs which belongs to traditions about the route from the Red Sea to the Holy Land (based on the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Joshua). In the Table 2 below I provide their list but deliberately omit the references to the biblical books. Such references would be, in a great extent, misleading, because the actual pictures of the corresponding events that are meant in the Gospel differ from the literal sense of the Hebrew Bible. Sometimes, they are even hardly recognisable without recourse to the Second Temple period exegesis.

Table 2.

Signs (and other key events)	Prototypes	Actual Nr	Restored Nr
(John the Baptist meets Jesus)	(Aaron meets Moses)	—	—
Water into wine	Marah	I	I
Healing of official's son	Elim	II	II
Healing of the paralytic	Crossing the Jordan	III	IV
Multiplication of the loaves	Manna	IV	III
(Walking on the waters)	(Passing though the Red Sea)	after IV	before I
Healing of the blind born	Second circumcision	V	V
Resurrection of Lazarus	Seizure of Jericho	VI	VI

One can see that the order of the signs is not different from the actual one very much. The healing of the paralytic and the multiplication of the loaves must change with each other, but this is the well known problem of the order between chapters 5 and 6: a great number of exegetes consider the order of these two chapters to be reversed. The only somewhat unexpected feature of the proposed order is replacement of the walking on the waters ahead, but, even here, we have to recall that, in John, this episode is not firmly embedded into its immediate context (multiplication of the loaves).

Qumran sessions, Amsterdam, July 2012), Leiden: Brill (forthcoming), and also her forthcoming monograph: *The Aramaic Zodiac Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls and their Reception.* IJS: Studies in Judaica; Leiden: Brill.

[74] Cf.: "No rearrangement can solve all the geographical and chronological problems in John, and to rearrange on the basis of geography and chronology is to give undue emphasis to something that does not seem to have been of major importance to the evangelist" (Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 236).

10. The Wilderness of Sinai Placed before the Exodus

We begin our discussion of Fourth Gospel's signs as a route from the Red Sea to the Promised Land not from what there is here but from what there is no. There is, in the Gospel of John, nothing similar to the ascending to the Mount Sinai scene.

Indeed, the topics of the Sinai revelation itself are quite well presented in the Prologue (1:1-18), as especially an analysis by Craig A. Evans shows. I limit myself to summarizing some of his conclusions.

> The incarnation of the logos cannot be correctly understood, unless it is seen against this comparison and contrast with Moses and the Sinai covenant... In essence... the second half of the Johannine Prologue presupposes the second half of the book of Exodus (chs. 20–40), which tells of Israel's meeting God at Sinai. The balance of the Fourth Gospel bears this out, as we find several comparisons between Jesus, Moses and various aspects of the wilderness story.
>
> ... It is clear that there are two principal biblical themes presupposed by the Johannine Prologue. The first is creation, primarily alluded to in the opening five verses. The second is the Sinai covenant, primarily alluded to in the final five verses. In Exodus creation and covenant are linked, primarily with respect to the Sabbath (cf. 20.8-11; 31.12-17; 35.1-3).[75]

An eminent role of Sabbath in the preaching of the Covenant in Exodus, noticed by Evans, is, to my opinion, completely preserved in the Fourth Gospel, but applied to the New Covenant preached by the New Moses.

The Prologue of John introduces the whole further story of Jesus with the verse καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (1:14), whose literal sense is that the Logos was "tabernacling/tenting" with us. As Craig R. Koester pointed out, this is the fulfilment of prophecies that someday God would tabernacle among his people (Ez 37:27; Joel 3:17; Zech 2:14[10]).[76] I would add that this is also a designation of the further Jesus' route from Galilee to Jerusalem.

Even if the Prologue, as some scholars think, is a later addition to the Gospel, it is certainly matching its major theme, that of the messianic Moses-like prophet leading his people to the New Exodus and giving them the New Covenant.[77]

However, even in the Prologue, there is nothing specific about the *ascension* topic connected to the Sinai revelation. It appears only in 1:51 (and reappears in 3:13), where the primary reference is not Sinai but the ladder of Jacob (Gen 28:12): "Very truly, I tell you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." The underlying text of the Hebrew Bible is ambiguous (עֹלִים וְיֹרְדִים בּוֹ) allowing understanding of בּוֹ as both "on it" (the ladder) or "on him" (Jacob). The Gospel text, unlike the Septuagint and a part of rabbinic teachers but in agreement with another part of the Jewish sources follows the interpretation that the angels were ascending and descending on Jacob, viz. the Son of Man.[78]

---

[75] C. A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*, JSNT Supplement Series, 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993, 79–83, here 81–82.

[76] C. R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*, CBQMS, 22; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1989, 104, followed by, e.g., Evans, *Word and Glory*, 82, and A. C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, WUNT 2.158; Mohr Siebeck, 2003, 158 (Ps 118 was also a vehicle for translating Exodus traditions). Jaubert noted that this idea of "tabernacling" of the Logos goes to Sir 24 (a well-known parallel to the Prologue of the Gospel of John), especially Sir 24:8 ("tabernacling in Jacob"); Jaubert, *Approches...*, 19.

[77] For a summary of an earlier scholarship, s. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 18–23. Cf., for a more up-to-dated review of scholarship and an interesting fresh approach, T. Thatcher, "The Riddle of the Baptist and the Genesis of the Prologue: John 1:1-18 in Oral/Aural Media Culture," in A. Le Donne, T. Thatcher (eds.), *The Fourth Gospel in First-Century Media Culture*, London—New York: T&T Clark Int., 2011, 29–48.

[78] As it was first noticed by C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1922, 112–114, who provided some of the relevant rabbinic references; cf. also H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*, Uppsala—Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1929, 33–42, 72–111. The relevant rabbinic and other texts include the midrash *Bereshit Rabba* 68:18, the targums Ps.-Jonathan, *Neofiti I*, and Fragment Targum, *ad loc.*, and the Jewish but preserved in Greek *Prayer of Joseph* (J. Z. Smith, "The Prayer of Joseph," in J. Neusner (ed.),

The traditional background of Jn 1:51 could be summarised with the following words of Jarl E. Fossum: "Jesus belongs inseparably" to the heavenly sphere. "The author of the Fourth Gospel would even appear to go as far as saying that Jesus was in heaven at the same time as he was on earth."[79] He may have been inspired with the Jewish tradition "that Jacob had a heavenly counterpart, who was even the Glory of God, the man-like figure on the heavenly throne, with whom the patriarch was united in a mystical way. In John 1.51 the author clearly adapts an exegesis of Gen 28.12 to the effect that the angels ascended and gazed on the Glory upon the heavenly throne, and then descended and looked at Jacob."[80]

In such a perspective, no ascension to the Mount Sinai is needed or allowable, even in the most "typological" (symbolical) form. The Johannine "prophet like Moses" is different from his prototype precisely in that he remains even higher than Sinai, in the heaven,[81] but he is the heaven itself, the unique true way to the Father (cf. Jn 14:6, 9-12), "tabernacling" on the earth together with his chosen people, the New Israel.

We will see, however, that the topic of descent from heaven and, then, from a mount, but without any ascent, is present in background of the Fourth Gospel and connected with Moses traditions (s. below, section 17.3-5).

Even without New Moses' ascension to the Mount Sinai, the New Exodus is not passing by the wilderness of Sinai.

In the absence of the ascension to Sinai scene, the testimony about the New Moses by the New Aaron becomes the only Exodic scene suitable for introducing the New Moses to his New Israel. This is why the typology of the meeting between Moses and Aaron turned out to be so important for the general plan of the Fourth Gospel. In the book of Exodus, Moses was introduced to the people by God himself, and this was performed in two stages: at first, to Aaron, in the wilderness of Sinai, and, secondly, to the whole congregation gathered around the Mount Sinai, that is, in the same place (where God was addressing, in some manner, the people directly:

Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to *Numen*), 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968 [repr. 1970], 253–294). The most important studies are: Ch. Rowland, "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984) 498–507; J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford: Oxford UP, ^{2}2007 [first publ. in 1991], 244–259; J. E. Fossum, "The Son of Man's Alter Ego: John 1.51, Targumic Tradition and Jewish Mysticism," in idem, *The Image of Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*, Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus, 30; Freiburg: Universtitätsverlag—Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995, 135–151. Especially important for understanding of the Jewish tradition underlying Jn 1:51 is a first-century Jewish text preserved only in Slavonic, *The Ladder of Jacob* (which escaped the attention of the previous authors); s. A. Orlov, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*," in C. A. Evans (ed.), *On Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, vol. 2, Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; London: T&T Clark Int., 2004, 59–76 [repr. in idem, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism. Studies in Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007, 399–419]. For a larger perspective within the Jewish mysticism, s. Ch. Rowland, "Things into which Angels Long to Look: Approaching Mysticism from the Perspective of the New Testament and the Jewish Apocalypses," in Ch. Rowland, Ch. R. A. Morray-Jones, *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, III, 12; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2009, 1–215, here 123–131. Also of special importance are G. Quispel, "Nathanael und der Menschensohn," *ZNW* 47 (1956) 281–283; W. A. Meeks, "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *JBL* 91 (1972) 44–72 [repr. in J. Ashton (ed.), *The Interpretation of John*, Studies in New Testament Interpretation; Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, ^{2}1997, 169–205]; S. Bunta, "The Likeness of the Image: Adamic Motifs and צלם Anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions about Jacob's Image Enthroned in Heaven," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 37 (2006) 55–84.

[79] These Fossum's words are almost verbatim coinciding with a later Christian (and Christological) commentary to the *Ladder of James*, which is now preserved as its chapter 7 (according to Lunt's subdivision): "What was above will be below also" [H. G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob (c. First Century A.D.). A New Translation and Introduction," in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1985, 401–411, here 410].

[80] Fossum, "The Son of Man's Alter Ego...," 150.

[81] The Jewish tradition that Moses from the top of the Mount Sinai ascended to the heaven is a probable target of polemics in Jn 3:13 (s. the same bibliography as for 1:51 above, n. 78).

Ex 19:16, 19; normally, God was not spoken to the people). In the Gospel, the two scenes became telescoped into the unique one, still in a desert (cf. Ex 4:27; 3:1).

Our understanding of Jn 1:19-51 as a chain of events patterned after the two Exodic scenes in the wilderness of Sinai, with a preponderance of the first of the two (meeting of Moses by Aaron), could be attained without any liturgical hypothesis but is already corroborated with our former liturgical interpretation of the meeting of John the Baptist with Jesus as marking a feast analogous to the Samaritan *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*. Now we see that it is fitting perfectly with our hypothetical liturgical sequence of sabbatic commemorations.

11. The Sea of Galilee: the New Red Sea and not a Sign

11.1. Geography. The similarities between the Johannine walking on the waters account and the story of crossing the Red Sea have been noticed long ago.[82] The original place of the walking on the waters episode in the Gospel is, however, an open question. Against the background of general unevenness of the narrative, it is especially striking that, whereas Jesus' and his disciples' destination is indicated as Capernaum (6:17, 24, cf. 6:59), they landed near Tiberias (6:23), on the opposite (western) coast of the sea.[83]

This is the first instance where our working hypothesis comes into conflict with the actual geography of the Gospel. Fortunately—for my hypothesis, at least,—the Gospel text is here already in conflict with itself. According to the working hypothesis, Jesus' route from the Transjordan desert, the new desert of Sinai, needs to be a route (probably through the neighbourhood of Bethsaida[84]: cf. 1:44; 12:21) to the western coast, which has to be continued far inland up to Cana. It is necessarily because the passing through the Sea must precede all the other signs which will be performed on the route. Thus, if the extreme points of the crossing of the Sea are some spots on the seashore near Capernaum and Tiberias, we have to choose the Capernaum—Tiberias direction, and not *vice versa*. Therefore, it is 6:23 that preserves a mark of the original geography of the account, whereas the mentions of Capernaum in Jn 6 are misleading (Capernaum was not the destination but the point of depart).

11.2. Liturgy. These results of the text-redaction and geographical considerations must be examined within the context of liturgy. Eileen Guilding followed by Raymond Brown has already put the scene in the context of the Passover liturgy.[85] Guilding's parallels from Isaiah are

---

[82] Cf. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 245, 255–256. Unfortunately, I have no access to an important monograph by John Paul Heil, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21*, Analecta biblica, 87; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981; cf. Susan Hylen, *Allusions and Meaning in John 6*, Beihefte zur *ZNW*, 137; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2005, 131–134, who stresses that the role of Jesus is here that of God rather than Moses in the passing through the Red Sea (p. 133).

[83] For a recapitulation of earlier scholarship, s. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 258–259 (in the commentary to 6:22-24). For a detailed demonstration that the episode was originally unconnected to that of the multiplication of the loaves (and not only in John but even in the Synoptics), s. P. J. Madden, *Jesus' Walking on the Sea: An Investigation of the Origin of the Narrative Account*, Beihefte zur *ZNW*, 81; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1997, although this author's conviction that the account has no parallel in the Old Testament is untenable, as well as his understanding of the walking episode as a misplaced post-resurrection account (partially because of Madden's insensitivity toward other pre-resurrection demonstrations of the divinity of Jesus in John). Cf. also criticisms by Rachel Nicholls, *Walking on the Water. Reading Mt. 14:22-33 in the Light of its* Wirkungsgeschichte, Biblical Interpretation Series, 90; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2008, 44–45, who recalls, among others, that Madden develops C.H. Dodd's hypothesis, while the latter eventually abandoned this view: C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: a study in the form-criticism of the Gospels" [first publ. in 1957], in idem, *More New Testament Studies*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 1968, 102–133, esp. 119–123.

[84] For a recapitulation of the studies related to the recently discovered Bethsaida site, together with a discussion of the Gospel material related to Bethsaida, cf. F. M. Strickert, *Philip's City: From Bethsaida to Julias*, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011.

[85] Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 66–68; Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 246, 257–259, cf. 278–280, Brown's evaluation of Guilding's approach: due to "a sharp criticism by Leon Morris" (s. above, n. 72), we are reluctant to make our approach to John vi dependent on anything more than the general implication that the themes in John plausibly reflect themes familiar in the synagogue at Passover time" (p. 280).

especially significant. There are many texts in the Hebrew Bible that recall, in one way or another, the crossing of the Red Sea. However, the importance of the Isaiah's texts is twofold: on the one hand, Is 51:6–15 is especially close to the very wording of Jn 6—even more than the texts of Exodus (s. Table 3): the imagery of the tempest is common to John and Isaiah, but not to Exodus, even if a ἐγώ εἰμι phrase is present in all the three parallel places (another Guilding's parallel, Is 63:11ff. is not so strikingly similar). On the other hand, Guilding's quotes from Isaiah are the *haftarot* to Ex 14, that is, the prophetic readings added to the readings from the Pentateuch *within the liturgy*. Thus, regardless of the precise calendar of these readings, they were certainly accepted into the Jewish liturgy as a *liturgical* explanation of the Exodic description of the passing through the Red Sea.

Table 3.

John 6:18-20	**Isaiah 51:12, 15**	**Exodus 14:18, 21**
The sea became rough because a strong wind was blowing. When they had rowed about twenty five or thirty stadia, they saw Jesus walking on the sea and coming near the boat, and they were terrified. But he said to them, "It is I; do not be afraid (ἐγώ εἰμι μὴ φοβεῖσθε)."	I, I am he who comforts you (LXX: ἐγώ εἰμι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ παρακαλῶν σε); why then are you afraid of a mere mortal who must die, a human being who fades like grass? <...> For I am the Lord your God, who stirs up the sea so that its waves roar—the Lord of hosts is his name.	And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord (LXX: ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος), when I have gained glory for myself over Pharaoh, his chariots, and his chariot drivers. <...> The Lord drove the sea back by a strong east wind all night, and turned the sea into dry land; and the waters were divided.

The actual recension of the Gospel, indeed, put the narratives of both manna and walking on the waters in the Passover context (6:4), as one can expect from the parallels with the rabbinic Passover liturgy provided by Guilding. According to our working hypothesis, too, the walking narrative is related to a commemoration of the Passover, whereas not the yearly commemoration but a commemoration at the beginning of the pre-Passover cycle, namely, on the first Sabbath of this cycle which is the ninth Sabbath counting backward from the Passover. We suppose that the liturgical tradition underlying the Fourth Gospel is not identical to the synagogal one but has with it common roots, and so, in the Gospel, the Passover narrative of Exodus is read through the lenses of the *haftarot* from Isaiah.

11.3. Calendar. It is especially important, that, according to the Sunday 364DY calendar, the Passover falls on the Sabbath, and the commemoration of the passing through the Red Sea is falling on the Sabbath night. If, as it is according to our working hypothesis, the day is counted from the morning to the morning, the Sabbath night is the night between Saturday and Sunday. Indeed, the Gospel not only states that the event took place in the night (when it became dark, σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει: 6:17, with a variant reading echoing 1:5: κατέλαβεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ σκοτία), in the same time as Israel's passing through the Red Sea, but specifies that the day is counted from the morning, because the morning after this night is referred to as "the next day" (6:22: τῇ ἐπαύριον).[86]

In the general framework of our working hypothesis, there is only one Sabbath whose night is fitting with the walking on the waters, namely, the first Sabbath of the cycle which is on the eve of the wedding in Cana. Thus, we have to restore the first week of the Gospel of John as following:

Up to 15.XI, Tuesday: John the Baptist is baptizing "beyond Jordan."[87]
16.XI, Wednesday: John the Baptist meets Jesus in the same place.
17.XI, Thursday, near the same place: calling of the first three disciples.
18.XI, Friday, near the same place or near Bethsaida: calling of two more disciples.
19.XI, Saturday night: route through the Sea of Galilee from Capernaum to Tiberias.

[86] As it is noticed by Beckwith, "The Day...," 7.

[87] The precise localisation of this scene is not vital for our argument here, although the context of Bethsaida opts for a Northern localisation; anyway, in disagreement with the Synoptics, this place is not on the bank of Jordan. The precise locale of Jn 1:28 will be important to us mostly in connexion with 10:40; see below, section 17.1.

20.XI, Sunday: the first day of the seven-day wedding in Cana (still without Jesus, s. section 12.1).

In the present recension of the Gospel, the day 19.XI, Saturday, is void. This would be in accord to the widespread, in the Second Temple period, understanding of keeping the Sabbath, where "the Sabbath Day's journey" was limited, in the best case, to a short distance: 2000 cubits (as it is in the later rabbinic practice, *mEruvin* 4:1-11) or 1000 cubits (as in some but not all DSS). Some authoritative texts of the Second Temple period, especially *Jubilees* 50:8,12, forbid to leave one's home at all.[88] However, it is clear that the adopted practices were different (there is no uniformity even among the documents found in Qumran). Unfortunately, the part of the Sabbatic *halacha* related to the limitation of journey is still in the margin of historical studies.

Anyway, the necessity, within the liturgical frame of the Sunday 364DY calendar, to commemorate the Passover on the Sabbath night, would create a collision with the widespread views on the keeping of Sabbath. Any editor who himself was not a follower of the Sunday 364DY calendar, would have to suppress any link between walking on the waters and Saturday. This is why, in the resulting text of the Gospel, we have an episode rather poorly embedded into its textual environment.

11.4. Signs and Their Reality. The restoring of the walking on the waters scene to its original place before the beginning of the signs could explain why the walking episode is never called sign in the Gospel. In the same way, in the book of Exodus, a series of the signs in Egypt was a prelude to the main event of the Passover. The Passover itself, the passing through the Red Sea, is never called "sign." Thus, the passing through the New Red Sea, the Sea of Galilee, is, too, never called "sign." In the book of Exodus, the pre-Passover signs have significance of demonstrating the power of God, which will be able to perform the main miracle in the near future. In the liturgical cycle of the Fourth Gospel, the signs have the same significance but, now, they are placed between the two Passover Sabbaths: the symbolical one on the Sea of Galilee and the true one in Jerusalem.

I think, this liturgical reconstruction confirms Raymond Brown's conclusion based on the difference between the signs and the reality that they "signify": "Except for the summary statement in xx 30, the Johannine use of 'sign' is confined to chs. i-xii, whence the designation [*sc.*, of this part of the Gospel. — *B. L.*] 'The Book of Signs.' With ch. xiii and 'the hour,' John passes from sign to reality."[89] Indeed, in the Exodus situation, the corresponding "reality" was the passing through the Red Sea, which was not counted among the signs. In the Gospel situation, we have two different levels of such "reality" behind the signs, but, nevertheless, the signs and their "realities" (denotations) are not to be confused.[90]

The walking on the waters is not to be counted among the signs and, therefore, the numeration of the two first signs preserved in 2:11 and 4:54 must be taken as authentic.

11.5. Conclusion. Our interpretation of the walking on the waters episode is depending on the whole framework of our working hypothesis—unlike our analysis of the previous scene (Jn 1:19-51), which can be true even if our working hypothesis is wrong. However, it, at least, does not contradict the actual knowledge of the textual history of the Gospel and could provide a resolution of the corresponding textual puzzles, which is not less plausible than other available

---

[88] For a detailed study of *Jub* 50:8 and some other documents forbidding or limiting the Sabbath Day's journey, s. L. Doering, *Schabbat. Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*, TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, 83–94 *et passim*. Cf. also an important study by H. Weiss, *A Day of Gladness: the Sabbath among Jews and Christians in Antiquity*, Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003, esp. 17–19 (early Judaism), 55–56 (Samaritans).

[89] Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 528.

[90] One can see that I have to share, although because of different reasons, a minority view that the number of the signs in the Fourth Gospel is limited to the six ones recognised by the scholarly consensus (s. above, n. 9, for the bibliography). Methodologically my approach has something in common with one of the (two) approaches of Boismard resulted in his "symbolical-liturgical structure" presuming only six signs in the Gospel. Both our approaches are liturgical, even if different in their liturgical reconstructions (Boismard, Lamouille, *Synopse des quatre évangiles*, III, esp. 38–39; cf. criticisms by Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure...*, 76–81).

hypotheses. Thus, without becoming one of the pillars of my argumentation, the above analysis of the walking on the waters scene becomes its consistent part.

12. The First Sign: Marah and the Blood of the New Covenant

The Cana sign is the first in the sequence, and so, is especially meaningful: it is the "beginning" or the "principle," ἀρχή, of the other signs[91]: ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Jn 2:11). It is the inauguration of the whole chain of the signs leading to the new reality of the New Covenant. In some way, this sign is the most important and, therefore, needed to be studied in detail.

It is now commonly accepted that this sign was prefigured with several scenes of the Old Testament. A popular in the middle of the twentieth century view of the History of Religions school (advocated, among others, by Bultmann and Morton Smith) seeing here an immediate borrowing from the cult of Dionysus is now not met with a great deal of enthusiasm.[92]

12.1. Chronological Timeline. The Mishnaic and Talmudic parallels provided to the wedding in Cana by Strack–Billerbeck are mostly anachronistic[93]: they still reflect a multiday ceremony and a reluctance of allowing the consummation of the marriage on the Sabbath,[94] but not the earlier custom of the ceremony occupying the whole week.[95] Nevertheless, there are also a number of rabbinic references to a seven-day wedding ceremony (including a mention of "all seven days (כל שבעת הימים)" of the wedding feast in *tBerakot* 2:9 = 2:10 Zuckermandel); after having taken them into account, Theodor Zahn concluded that Jesus with his disciples arrived to this seven-day feast not at its first days, whereas "on the third day" of Jn 2:1 marks the first day of the feast counted after the day indicated in 1:43 (calling of Philip). Jesus with his disciples arrives when Jesus' mother is already present.[96]

---

[91] Cf. I. de la Potterie, "La notion de 'commencement' dans les écrits johanniques," in R. Schnackenburg *et al.* (ed.), *Die Kirche des Anfangs:Festschrift für Heinz Schürmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, Leipzig: St Benno, 1977, 379–403.

[92] Especially after the criticisms by Martin Hengel, "The Interpretation of the Wine Miracle at Cana: John 2:1-11," in L. D. Hurst, N. T. Wright (eds.), *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in the Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987, 83–112; repr. without changes but under the title "The Dionysiac Messiah," in idem, *Studies in Early Christology*, London—New York: T&T Clark Int., 1995 [repr. 2004], 293–332. The question about possible influence of the Dionysus tradition on the Gospel looks closed; only eventual meaning of this tradition for the audience of the Gospel is still discussed: s. C. Claussen, "Turning Water to Wine: Re-reading the Miracle at the Wedding in Cana," in J. H. Charlesworth, P. Pokorný *et al.*, *Jesus Research: An International Perspective. The First Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research, Prague 2005*, Grand Rapids, MI—Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2009, 73–97, here 86. As an introduction to the actual bibliography could be of help D. S. Kulandaisamy, "The First 'Sign' of Jesus and the Wedding at Cana. An Exegetical Study on the Function and Meaning of John 2.1-12," *Marianum* 68 (2006) 17–116. Unfortunately, this scholarly myth about Dionysus at Cana affected the corresponding part of Guilding's analysis: Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 184–186.

[93] H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* Bd. II: *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, ^{3}1961, 398–399; cf. M. L. Satlow, *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001, 169–170. Cf., however, in *bKetubot* 1:13 a reminiscence of the wedding on the first day of the week (this practice is rejected by the rabbis in the following discussion). Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 97–98, follows the Mishnaic claim that the virgin should be married on Wednesday and, assuming that the Cana wedding took place on Wednesday, proposes quite different chronology for both wedding at Cana and the events described in Jn 1.

[94] Cf. Michael L. Satlow's conclusion: "[b]oth Talmuds are uneasy with marriage on Friday because, as the Tosepta states, it involves the first act of intercourse on the Sabbath, and such an act might entail a violation of the Sabbath (Satlow, *Jewish Marriage...*, 169).

[95] Cf., for the seven-day marriage ceremony as a standard for the whole Ancient Near East, M. Stol, *Birth in Babylonia and the Bible. Its Mediterranean Setting*, Cuneiform Monographs; Groningen: STYX Publications, 2000, 117–118; for the same in the Hebrew Bible, s., e.g., J. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2003, 251, in Tob 8:20 (with references to Gen 29:27 and Judg 14:12-18).

[96] Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 146–147 and notes 70 (for the rabbinic sources on the 7-day ceremony) and 71 (p. 146).

Indeed, the situation when the reserves of wine—accumulated in advance for multiday continuous drinking—are already exhausted corresponds better to the end of the seven-day banquet. The wonder of the ruler of the feast (2:10: "Everyone serves the good wine first, and then the inferior wine after the guests have become drunk. But you have kept the good wine until now") becomes even more understandable if it was expressed on the seventh and concluding day. The amount of wine consumed has, in the Cana narrative, a role of a time measuring instrument, as if a kind of clepsydra, and this instrument points out rather unequivocally the final day of the banquet, the Sabbath. In a different way, the Sabbath is pointed out implicitly by its preponderant importance among the days of the week in comparison with the importance of the day when Jesus arrived among the days of the wedding festival. Any choice of the day other than the Sabbath would be unjustified with any narrative strategy. Therefore, there is no way to accept a non-Sabbath dating for the miracle unless we presume that the Gospel narrative is here an automatic chronicle registering the events when they occurred and the events, in turn, occurred in an accidental order.

Thus, the "first sign" performed in Cana must be inserted into our chain of Sabbath liturgical commemorations. This is the second Sabbath of the cycle whose first Sabbath is that of the walking on the waters.

12.2. The New Marah. Despite the Second Temple period's trend to agglomeration of different source-stories of the book of Exodus, the scene at Cana has some distinctive treats that are selectively referring to Marah (Ex 15:23-26). At first glance, the most striking is, of course, the presence, in both cases, of a miracle of transformation related to a liquid for drinking: "Moses at Marah purified the water to make it fit to drink. Jesus at Cana transforms or 'purifies' the water into something greater than itself."[97] However, an important feature of the Marah miracle is missing: there is no healing at the wedding—which is in contrast with Ex 15:26 ("I will not bring upon you any of the diseases that I brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord who heals you"). Healing in Cana does occur but only next time, as the second sign of Jesus (s. below, section 13).

The resemblance of the wedding at Cana narrative with the Marah story could be seen especially in the case if we read this story in Flavius Josephus (*Ant* 3:7-8).[98] As it is well known, Josephus explains the miracle in a purely rational way: Moses' performance with a stick was needed exclusively as a show for the superstitious Hebrews, whereas the waters of the well were purified in a mechanical way, being "with the incessant blows treated and purified" (ὑπὸ τῶν συνεχῶν πληγῶν γεγυμνασμένον καὶ κεκαθαρμένον) during drawing of the greatest part of the waters. Nevertheless, regardless of Josephus' own intentions, he provides a different story about the miracle borrowed from an unknown source, where the "purification" of the waters was performed without any "wood" or "tree" but with drawing out the water.

> The waters of Marah are called "well" (φρέαρ), that is, a human-made stony construction rather than a natural source (the Hebrew and Greek Bibles are imprecise at this point). This recalls the "stone water jars" (λίθιναι ὑδρίαι) of Jn 2:6. In fact, both of them go back to the tradition of the portable stony source of the water accompanying Israel in the wilderness, which resulted from telescoping of the different Exodic stories about different water sources on the route to the Promised Land; this tradition is represented, beside Jewish sources, in one of the earliest Christian texts, 1 Cor 10:4 ("and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ"; this is said about Israel in the Exodus).[99]
>
> The word "purified" (κεκαθαρμένον) used by Josephus in reference to the well has no parallel in either Greek or Hebrew biblical accounts on Marah but, indeed, has a striking parallel in Jn 2:6, where the stone jars were κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι ("set for the purification of Jews").

---

[97] Cf. E. Little, *Echoes of the Old Testament in the Wine of Cana in Galilee (John 2:1-11) and the Multiplication of Loaves and Fish (John 6:1-15): Towards an Appreciation*, Cahiers de la Revue biblique, 41; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1998, 38–41, here 41.

[98] As it was first noticed by a mathematician and theologian, the author of the *Flatlandia*, Edwin Abbott Abbott, *The Fourfold Gospel.* Section III: *The Proclamation of the New Kingdom*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1915, 344, n. 2.

[99] See Jaubert, "La symbolique du puits de Jacob."

> Moses persuaded the Hebrews that God promised to render the water drinkable but only if they will be obedient to Moses. Then, "[w]hen they asked what they should do in order to change the water for the better, he ordered those who stood in the prime of life to draw water, stating that what remained after the greater part had been emptied beforehand would be drinkable to them."[100]
>
> The words of Moses related to himself are similar to the words of Jesus' mother related to Jesus: λέγει ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ τοῖς διακόνοις ὅ **τι** ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν **ποιήσατε** (2:5) compare with ἐρομένων δ' αὐτῶν **τί** καὶ **ποιούντων** ἂν μεταβάλοι τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον (here and below *Ant* 3:8 is quoted).
>
> In both cases, the role of "drawing" is central: **ἀντλήσατε** νῦν καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ (2:8) compare with **ἐξαντλεῖν** λέγων ("ordered to draw").
>
> An important although not verbal parallel presents the phrase "those who stood in the prime of life (τοὺς ἐν ἀκμῇ)," where the direct addressees of Moses' order are meant. This is an idiom indicating the age of marriage (often used in the form ἀκμὴ τοῦ γάμου).[101] Jesus performed his miracle at the marriage ceremony; Moses was helped with those in the age of marriage.
>
> Finally, Jesus performed his miracle when "the wine gave out" (ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου, 2:3), but also Moses performed his work when "the larger part had been emptied" (προεκκενωθέντος τοῦ πλείονος) and transformed only "the remaining part" (τὸ ὑπολειπόμενον).

In the Marah narrative seen through the Gospel, one has to discern a stone well or jar (or simply a miraculous "rock" able to produce the drinkable water), people in the age of marriage as the main actors to whom Moses gives his commands, drawing of the water as the main procedure (without any wood or tree), and, finally, the resulting amount of the "purified" (*sic!*) water which is rather small in comparison with the initial amount (cf. the same situation with the comparative amounts of the natural and miraculous wines at Cana). Reshaped in this manner, the story of Marah becomes much more recognisable in the story of the wedding at Cana.

12.3. Water into Blood. In the Gospel of John and the New Testament in general the meaning of wine as a symbol of the blood—quite widespread in the Second Temple Judaism,[102] especially in the eschatological context[103]—is emphasised so strong that, naturally, both modern and ancient exegetes were often connecting the miracle at Cana with the transformation of water into blood by Moses. Normally, they are referring to Ex 7:14-25, the first of the ten plagues of Egypt when the waters transformed into blood were the waters of Nil together with all other waters of Egypt.[104]

---

[100] English tr. from S. Mason (ed.), Flavius Josephus: *Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 3: *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, tr. L. H. Feldman, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 234. Greek text from B. Niese, Flavii Iosephi *Opera*, I, Berlin: Weidmann, ^{2}1955, 160.

[101] Cf. in the Greek Bible: 3 Mac 4:8; 4 Mac 18:9; cf. also ἐὰν ᾖ ὑπέρακμος in 1 Cor 7:36 translated in the King James Version "if she pass the flower of *her* age." Cf. also a lexicographical work by Moeris (2^{nd} /3^{rd} cent. CE), where the "Attic" idiom ὡραία γάμων is translated into "Hellenic" dialect as ἐν ἀκμῇ γάμου: K. Hajdú, D. U. Hansen, Ps.-Herodian, *De figuris: Überliefungsgeschichte und kritische Ausgabe. Das attizistische Lexikon des Moeris: quellenkritische Untersuchung und Edition*, Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, 8/9; Berlin—New Yourk: W. de Gruyter, 1998, 160.

[102] One of the first instances is already Deut 32:14 (Song of Moses, a liturgical composition having a manuscript tradition and liturgical usage in various languages, Jewish and Christian, independently of the book of Deuteronomy).

[103] Cf. especially the symbol of "tree of vine" or other trees which produce blood: 4 Ezra 5:5; *On the Fifteen Signs of Judgement* (a Jewish work preserved in different Christian traditions: M. E. Stone, *Signs of the Judgement, Onomastica Sacra and the Generations from Adam*, Univ. of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, 3; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981, 13–15, 24–25, 31, 46–47); and in early Christian texts: *Epistle of Barnabas* 12:1; *Ladder of James*, 7 (in the part that is a Christian addition); a still unpublished in Coptic but published in translation epistle of Horsiesius, 368–386 CE (saturated with Jewish traditions, as the Pachomian monasticism in general): "Par le sang du bois je serai purifié" [A. de Vogüé, "Les nouvelles lettres d'Horsièse et Théodore. Analyse et commentaire," *Studia monastica* 28 (1986) 7–50, here 11]. For the development of tradition, s. B. M. Лурье, "Чаша Соломона и скиния на Сионе. Часть 1. Надпись на Чаше Соломона: текст и контекст" [B. Lourié, "The Chalice of Solomon and the Tabernacle at Sion. Part 1: The Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon: Text and Context"], *Byzantinorossica* 3 (2005) 8–74, here 14–19. Also relevant here is the Philonic contraposition between bread and wine presented to Abraham by Melchizedek and the failure of the Ammonites and Moabites to meet Israel with bread and water: Philo underlines that, in Melchizedek's case, the wine was "instead of the water" (ἀντὶ ὕδατος οἶνον προσφερέτω: *Legum allegoria* III.xxvi.82); cf. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 183 and 185, n. 1, against C. K. Barrett.

[104] Nicol, *The Sēmeia in the Fouth Gospel...*, 89; Hengel, "The Interpretation of the Wine Miracle...," 106–107 [= idem, "The Dionysiac Messiah," 324]; C. S. Keener, *The Gospel of John. A Commentary*, Peabody, MA:

However, we have two mutually independent reasons to look for the nearest prototype at the account of Ex 4:9, where the same miracle with water transformed into blood is described differently[105]: first, its greater similarity with the Gospel account, and, second, its belonging to the narrative of ch. 4, which turned out to be a cornerstone of our liturgical cycle of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ*.

In Ex 4:9, God instructs Moses to perform the miracle in a different way than it was eventually performed: "...you shall take some water (וְלָקַחְתָּ מִמֵּימֵי / λήμψῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος) from the River and pour it on the dry ground; and the water that you shall take from the River will become blood on the dry ground." Only a relatively small amount of water is to be transformed into blood, far less than the whole Nil, not to say about all other waters of Egypt. And, in the same manner as at Cana and (Josephus') Marah, the central operation is drawing the water: the verb לקח "to take" (translated into Greek literally as λαμβάνω) followed with מן has the meaning "to take away," which in the context means the same as "to draw."

Unlike Rev 8:8 with its clear allusion to Ex 7:14-25, the Cana narrative primary refers to Ex 4:9 (even though in Ex 7:19 the stone vessels are mentioned among other reservoirs of water).

Finally, an important Jewish witness of water changed into wine contains a semi-explicit reference to the "New Year of Trees," and so, goes back to a liturgical tradition having common roots with that of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* cycle. It is the (rabbinic) Targum of Job (2:11) datable to the middle of the first millennium C.E. but quoting an earlier source. One of the friends of Job explains Job's situation with a reference to an epoch, "when they saw the trees of their gardens withered, and the bread of their meal changed to living flesh, and the wine of their drinking changed to blood" (כד חמון ית אילני פרדסיהון די יבישו ולחם סעודתהון אתהפיך לבישׂרא חייא וחמר משתיהון אתהפיך לדמא).[106] The general meaning of the saying is that there will be an epoch when everything will turn and, among others, the trees will wither in the time when they must bear fruits. The mention of trees is a proof that the text initially had no anti-Christian intention (otherwise such a mention would be unexplainable) and that it is datable to an early epoch when the New Year of Trees was still an important festival.

This parallel is remarkable from the viewpoint of comparative liturgy because it helps to put the narrative of the sign at Cana into the frame of the *Ṣimmut Pesaḥ* cycle, whereas without recourse to our working hypothesis. This conclusion is corroborated with parallels from ch. 4 of Exodus, also independently from our working hypothesis. With this conclusion, we are prepared to continue our analysis of the first sign of Jesus against the background of Ex 4.

12.4. Bridegroom of Blood. After having stated that the miraculous wine at Cana is a symbol of blood, we have to investigate what blood is really meant. Of course, in the context of the Synoptic Gospels and the subsequent Christian liturgical tradition(s), one can say that this blood was prefiguring the blood of Christ in the Eucharist. This is not an answer, however, but rather a reformulation of the initial question. In the Fourth Gospel, unlike the Synoptic ones, the

---

Hendrickson Publishers, 2004, I, 495. Hengel (*ibid.*) quotes, through a monograph (inaccessible to me) by Adolf Smitmans [*Das Weinwunder von Kana: Die Auslegung von Jo 2, 1-11 bei den Vätern und heute*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, 6; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966], Ephrem the Syrian, Pseudo-Martin of Turin, and Cassiodorus. Hengel states (n. 93), with reference to Smitmans (p. 193 and 225), that Pseudo-Martin mentions "seven" (!) miracles of punishment instead of ten. I was unable to find out such reference in Pseudo-Martin (neither in the *PL* 57 edition used by Smitmans nor in the critical edition by Almut Mutzenbecher, Maximi episcopi Taurinensis, *Collectionum sermonum antiquam nonnulis sermonibus extravagantibus adiectis*, Corpus Christianorum. Series latina, 23; Turnhout: Brepols, 1962). Probably, this is a mistake instead of the "seven" (and not six!) jars at Cana mentioned and symbolically explained by Arnobius and referred to by Smitmans (*ibid.*, p. 135).

[105] The two accounts differ because of their different sources; s. C. Houtman, *Exodus*, 4 vols. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Kampen: Kok Publishing House, 1993–2002, vol. 2, 25; cf. vol. 1, 403; cf. B. S. Child, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary*, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1974 (pbk 2004), 78.

[106] D. M. Stec, *The Text of the Targum of Job. An Introduction & Critical Edition*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 20; Leiden: Brill, 1994, 16*.

account of the Last Supper (ch. 13) does not contain anything similar to institutional words, and, likewise, there is no institution of any rite even in Jesus' words about eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking his blood (6:53-56). Therefore, the narrative of the "first" or rather "principal" sign at Cana must be read as such an institution narrative of a liturgical rite using blood represented through wine. But what is the *liturgical* meaning of the rite? Thus question must be answered in the material language of liturgical institutions and without recourse to any speculative theology.

When we reread chapter 4 of Exodus with the above analysis of the wedding at Cana in mind, out attention is immediately captured with the "bloody bridegroom" scene (Ex 4:24-26; the term "bridegroom of blood" is suppressed in a part of tradition, including the Septuagint and all the six known rabbinic targums to these verses[107] but preserved in the Syriac Peshitta). The Hebrew and Syriac texts run as follows:

> [24]On the way, at a place where they spent the night, the Lord met him and tried to kill him <*either Moses or his son from Zipporah; in Syriac "to kill Moses"*>. [25]But Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin, and touched his <*Moses' or Lord's?*> feet with it, and said, 'Truly you are a bridegroom of blood (חֲתַן־דָּמִים; ܚܬܢ ܕܡܝܢ) to me!' [26]So he let him alone. It was then she said, 'A bridegroom of blood by circumcision (חֲתַן דָּמִים לַמּוּלֹת; ܚܬܢ ܕܡܝܢ ܠܡܘܠ).'

The history of this passage within the book of Exodus is difficult[108] but not especially relevant to us. We are interested in its place in the Second Temple Judaism only. This topic has been approached by Géza Vermes who drew several important conclusions.[109] The Jewish interpretations of the passage datable to the Second Temple period, especially those preserved in the targums, stress, as Vermes' analysis shows, a sacrificial and especially expiating and salvatory character of the blood of circumcision. The roots of Apostle Paul's teaching on the Christian Baptism as a new substitute of the circumcision, according to Vermes, go back here. We have to elaborate on this conclusion later (section 12.6; cf. 16.4) but, just now, we have to point out that Vermes was dealing with the part of the exegetical tradition where the bridal elements were lost. However, the key term of this Exodic passage, "the bridegroom of blood," points out some ritual,[110] and this ritual must preserve connexion with the bridal customs, at least, on the symbolical level.

There is another exegetical tradition of Ex 4:24-26, where the bridal connotations were preserved: the early Syriac commentaries to the book of Exodus. Thus, in the commentary by Ephrem the Syrian (IV, 3), Zipporah addresses her words "bridegroom of blood" to the angel of the Lord, who appeared with the purpose to kill Moses as a punishment for not having circumcised his son. The Syriac Christian exegesis follows here a part of the Jewish exegetical

---

[107] According to the database of *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* at http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/ . Cf. also a comparison of these verses in different targums and other rabbinic sources by Israel Drazin, *Targum Onkelos to Exodus: an English translation of the text with analysis and commentary (based on the A. Sperber and A. Berliner editions)*, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1990, 71–73, and especially by Géza Vermes, "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources," *NTS* 4 (1957–1958) 308–319 [republished in a reworked version as ch. VII "Circumcision and Exodus iv.24-26 — Prelude to the Theology of Baptism" in his *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, Studia post-Biblica, 4; Leiden: Brill, ^{2}1973, 178–192].

[108] The recent monograph by John T. Willis, *Yahweh and Moses in Conflict. The Role of Exodus 4:24–26 in the Book of Exodus*, Bible in History; Bern: Peter Lang, 2010, provides an extensive dossier of scholarship. Especially important is a study by William H. Propp, "That Bloody Bridegroom (Exodus IV 24-6)," *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993) 495–518. Cf. an attempt of rehabilitation of the hypothesis on the Madianite origin of the story: H.-F. Richter, "Gab es einen 'Blutbräutigam'? Erwägungen zu Exodus 4,24-26," in M. Vervenne (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Exodus. Redaction—Reception—Interpretation*; BETL 126; Leuven: Leuven UP, 1996, 433–442.

[109] Vermes, "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis..."

[110] Cf. Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 95–101, esp. 100, about the phrase "Bridegroom of blood": "Whatever it meant, it belonged to the rite." Originally, before the time when the editor of the book of Exodus worked, this ritual was, most probably, the circumcision itself as a prerequisite for marriage: s. Propp, "That Bloody Bridegroom...," esp. 515.

tradition, which makes the blood of circumcision of a son of Moses an expiation sacrifice for Moses.[111]

Zipporah argues: do not make the banquet day of circumcision (of Gershon) into a day of mourning, this day must be, instead, as joyful as was the day when Abraham circumcised Isaac:

> ܠܐ ܬܥܒܕ ܚܫܐ ܒܝܘܡܐ ܕܚܠܘܠܗ ܕܓܙܘܪܬܐ܀ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܕܚܕܘܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܝܘܡܐ ܕܓܙܪ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܠܐܝܣܚܩ.
> ܐܡܪܬ ܚܬܢܐ ܕܕܡܐ ܐܢܬ ܐܦ ܠܝ.
>
> Do not make sorrow in the day of the banquet of circumcision. This is why, because the day when Abraham circumcised Isaac was a great joy, she said ‘You are a bridegroom of blood also to me.’[112]

The word ܚܠܘܠܐ translated here “banquet” has often a specific meaning of “wedding banquet.”[113] Thus, one could translate as well “the day of the wedding banquet of circumcision.” Given that the bridal connotations of this exegesis are not accidental, one has to accept that Ephrem here follows an ancient Jewish tradition, as it would be quite usual for a fourth-century Syrian author.[114] The same tradition is to be seen in another early Syriac commentary preserved only in the Armenian version, also under the name of Ephrem. However, here the author argues that, to “us,” unlike Abraham, the day of circumcision is that of sorrow. This commentary, nevertheless, preserves the idea that, normally, it would be a day of joy. Moreover, this commentary stresses the (rather obvious[115]) fact that the circumcision is the symbol of the Covenant: “A bridegroom of blood is a covenant of blood, although when Abraham was circumcised there was joy and exultation, but for us grief and sorrow.”[116]

The exegetical tradition preserved in these commentaries is the missing link between the words of Exodus (especially its term “bridegroom of blood”) and the scene at Cana.

Thus, for Ephrem, it is Christ who is the true bridegroom, “the bridegroom from above” (ܚܬܢܐ ܥܠܝܐ, *sc.*, heavenly) who invited to “his pure (wedding) banquet” (ܚܠܘܠܗ ܕܟܝܐ) at Cana (*De virginitate*, XXXIII, 3).[117] Naturally, Ephrem himself explains Cana as a symbol of the Eucharistic banquet and the Kingdom of Heavens, but his imagery and even wording still preserve some traces of an earlier Jewish context, which is closer to the background of the Gospel itself.

The presentation of Christ as the bridegroom at Cana will be translated from the language of liturgy into plain words by John the Baptist (3:29).

12.5. The Mother of Jesus as the New Zipporah. The presence of the mother of Jesus in the scene at Cana dispels residual doubts in identifying Zipporah, her son, and the “bridegroom of blood” imagery in background of the narrative of Cana. It is Jesus’ mother but

---

111 Cf., for more details, A. Guillaumont, “Un midrash d’Exode 4:24-26 chez Aphraate et Ephrem de Nisibe,” in R. H. Fischer (ed.), *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus*, Chicago: Lutheran School of Theology, 1977, 89–95. For the place of this Ephrem’s commentary in the patristic exegesis, s. an ample dossier by Andrew S. Jacobs, “Blood Will Out: Jesus’ Circumcision and Early Christian Readings of Exodus 4:24-26,” *Henoch* 30 (2008) 311–332, here 320–321.

112 R.-M. Tonneau, Sancti Ephraem Syri *in Genesim et in Exodum commentarii*, CSCO, vols. 152–153; Scr. Syri, tt. 71–72; Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1955; Syriac: vol. 152, 133; cf. Latin tr., vol. 153, 113; cf. a less literal English tr. in K. McVey (ed.), Saint Ephrem the Syrian, *Selected Prose Works*, Tr. by E. G. Mathews, Jr., and J. P. Amar, The Fathers of the Church, 91; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994, 235.

113 J. Payne Smith (Mrs. Margoliouth), *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1903, 142: “*a banquet, supper*, esp. *a marriage feast*.”

114 Guillaumont, “Un midrash d’Exode 4:24-26...”; cf., for a broader perspective, R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study in Early Syriac Tradition*, Revised Ed., London—New York: T&T Clark Int., 2006.

115 Cf. observations by Aristide Serra in a number of his publications, e.g., E. Dal Covolo, A. Serra (eds.), *Storia della mariologia*, vol. 1, Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 2009, 113–114.

116 E. G. Mathews, Jr., *The Armenian Commentaries on Exodus—Deuteronomy attributed to Ephrem the Syrian*, CSCO vols. 557–558; Scr. Arm., tt. 25–26; Louvain: Peeters, 2001, 10 (tr.); text: փեսայ արեան ուխտ արեան. զի առ Աբրահամ յորժամ թլփատեաց, ուրախութիւն եւ ցնծութիւն. եւ առ նեզ սուգ եւ տրտմութիւն (p. 9).

117 E. Beck, Des heiligen Epraem des Syrers *Hymnen de virginitate*, CSCO, vols. 223–224; Scr. Syri, tt. 94–95; Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1962, 120 ; cf. German tr., 104.

not Jesus himself who decides to produce more wine/blood, in an exact analogy with Zipporah who decides to produce the blood of circumcision of her son.

If Mariam is, at Cana, the New Zipporah, one has to wonder whether any traces of such an exegetical tradition are preserved in Christianity. Indeed, they are. So far, I do not know any exegetical or quasi-exegetical text but I think that it is this tradition that explains the link between Mariam and the capital of Galilee Sepphoris (Σεπφωρίς) traceable up to *ca* 570, the Pilgrim of Piacenza.[118] Zipporah is Σεπφωρ in the Greek Bible. Given the absence of any architectural construction related to Mariam, the mother of Jesus, in Sepphoris even in *ca* 570, the mediaeval legends about Mariam's or her parents' home in this city look not ancient enough to be relevant for the context of the Gospels. Nevertheless, Sepphoris is certainly present behind the Galilee scenes of the Gospels, even though it is apparently never mentioned explicitly,[119] and it continued to be an important centre later. Thus, the link between Mariam and Sepphoris could be created based on the simple homonymy between the names of the city and Zipporah.[120] Be that as it may, the Christians of the first centuries felt a need to create such a link. This need is perfectly explainable if Mariam were mentioned in connexion of some "Sepphor" but already nobody knew what Sepphor is meant.

12.6. Circumcision and the Lamb of God. Our conclusion that the Cana wine is the blood of circumcision shed by Jesus as the New Moses (and therefore, the new son of Moses representing Moses) turns out to be in complete accord with the medieval rabbinic rite of circumcision as it is known from the eleventh or twelfth centuries and whose symbolism is now traced back to the eighth or ninth century midrash *Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer*. Namely, the atoning power of the rite is focused on the blood, and the blood is represented with the wine. It is especially striking when the circumciser puts a few drops of wine on the lips of the just-circumcised infant reciting Ez 16:6: "in your blood live..." A thorough liturgical analysis of this rabbinic rite is provided by Lawrence A. Hoffman.[121] However, Hoffman was criticized by Shaye J. D. Cohen for his assumption that this meaning of the circumcision is not a later development within the rabbinic Judaism. The discussions of the circumcision in the Mishnah and both Talmudim do not prove Hoffman's point: thus, according to Cohen, Hoffman failed to fill the gap between the mysterious passage of Ex 4:24-26 and the *Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer*.[122]

This gap, however, could be filled with the rabbinic discussions of this same Exodic passage analysed by Vermes as well as with the early Christian data related to the wedding at Cana—the latter in conformity with Martin Hengel's words that "...a history of classical Jewish

---

[118] Who mentions (*Itinerarium*, IV) Sepphoris as a place of pilgrimage and Mary's "flagon and breadbasket" as its relics. S., for further details of traditions and a larger context: J. E. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places. The myth of Jewish-Christian origins*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993, 289–290; S. Ward, "Sepphoris in Sacred Geography," in E. M. Meyers (ed.), *Galilee through the Centuries. Confluence of Cultures*, Duke Judaic studies series, 1; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999, 391–405, here 396–397.

[119] Possible connexions between Sepphoris and the historical Jesus are discussed by Sean Freyne, *Jesus, a Jewish Galilean. A New Reading of the Jesus-Story*, London—New York, T&T Clark Int., 2004, *passim*, R. A. Batey, "Sepphoris and the Jesus Movement," *NTS* 47 (2001) 402–409, and especially by Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus. A Re-examination of the Evidence*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press Int., 2000, 100–114. On a possible mention of Sepphoris in a variant reading of Jn 11:54, s. J. F. Strange, Th. R. W. Longstaff, D. E. Groh, *Excavations in Sepphoris*, vol. I, The Brill Reference Library of Judaism, 22; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2006, 14.

[120] But this could be not as simple as that. Sepphoris is also a city of some priestly families, which could turn out to be related to, e.g., traditions preserved in the *Protevangelium of James*... Cf. S. S. Miller, *Studies in the History and Traditions of Sepphoris*, Leiden: Brill, 1984.

[121] L. A. Hoffman, *Covenant of Blood: Circumcision and Gender in Rabbinic Judaism*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996, 72–76 *et passim*.

[122] Sh. D. Cohen, "A Brief History of the Jewish Circumcision Blood," in E. W. Mark (ed.), *The Covenant of Circumcision: New Perspectives on an Ancient Jewish Rite*, Brandeis series on Jewish women; Lebanon, NH: Brandeis UP, 2003, 30–42.

literature would have to include that of early Christianity, even if the latter went on to become independent and go its own way."[123]

Our conclusion concerning the wine at Cana, in turn, paves a way for understanding John the Baptist's proclamation of Jesus as "the Lamb of God" (1:29) and corroborates our previous conclusion about the immediate neighbourhood between the sign at Cana and walking on the waters (as the new passing through the Red Sea). All these episodes proclaim Jesus as the Passover Lamb, as it was declared in advance by John the Baptist.

In early Jewish sources (including the Book of Joshua, which will be dealt with below), the circumcision is a paschal ceremony.[124] The same is the conclusion by Géza Vermes: "...the first Passover in the desert was celebrated by the mingling of the blood of both," the blood of circumcision and the blood of the Passover lamb; then he quotes the midrash *Exodus Rabbah* 19:7 and *Mekhilta* on Exodus 12:6 paraphrasing Lev 17:11 ("For the life of the flesh is in blood") as "Life is in the blood of the Passover; life is in the blood of circumcision."[125]

In the Fourth Gospel, the topic of circumcision, already "spiritualized" in some extent according to the Second Temple period Jewish fashion, will occur twice, with its two symbolical materials already recognised as such in Jewish pre-Christian milieux: blood (represented with wine) and water (s. below, section 16.4). In both cases, it will be attached to the Passover, although, calendrically, in different ways.

12.7. Six Water Jars and Six Signs. The sign at Cana is sixfold: the same transformation took place in six water jars. Ephrem the Syrian is elaborating on this underlying that there were six miracles within one (*De virginitate*, XXXIII, 2):

ܗܐ ܐܬܘ̈ܬܐ ܬܗܪ̈ܝܢ ܬܡܝܗܢ ܗܘܘ ܬܡܢ
ܚܡܪ̈ܐ ܐܬܘ̈ܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܝܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܡ̈ܝܐ

Indeed, six wonderful miracles were there:
Six wines were separated from the waters.[126]

Ephrem does not however explain in any way the meaning of this number six. It looks, in his hymn, as an undigested fragment of an earlier tradition. However, in the context where the miracle at Cana is the first and principal one among the six, the symbolism of the number of the jars is not only understandable but helps to the reader to grasp the following six-signs chain as a unique whole.

The word "separated" as a mean of producing wine from waters looks oddly enough, unless it is placed into the context of the Marah-like procedure, as described by Flavius Josephus. This is another trace of an ancient Jewish tradition behind this text by Ephrem.

I consider all this as an important argument in favour of the number six as the original number of the signs. The principal sign already contains all the six of them. The number of signs will receive as well a calendrical explanation (s. below, section 19.10).

12.8. Conclusion. Stefanos Mihalios in his recent monograph about the Danielic ὥρα (Dan 12:1) in the Johannine literature considers Jn 2:4, the first mention of "hour" in the Fourth Gospel, as an instance where the term was already "not fully disclosed" in its eschatological meaning.[127] It is not the case, however. The meaning of the eschatological New Covenant is disclosed here in the most complete way, but in the language of liturgy, namely, the paschal liturgy of the circumcision and the liturgy of the wedding. This language is less accessible to the

---

[123] M. Hengel, "Early Christianity as a Jewish-Messianic, Universalistic Movement," in D. A. Hagner (ed.), M. Hengel, C. K. Barrett, *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press Int., 1999, 1–41, here 16.

[124] S. an extensive dossier in Propp, "That Bloody Bridegroom...," 510–515.

[125] Vermes, "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis...," 319.

[126] Beck, Des heiligen Epraem des Syrers *Hymnen de virginitate*, 120 (text); cf. 104 (German tr.).

[127] S. Mihalios, *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature*, Library of the New Testament Studies, 436; London—New York: T&T Clark Int., 2011, 171–172.

later audience (even mediaeval, not only modern) but was always the best understandable within the communities sharing the relevant rituals, at least, partially.

The calendrical liturgical setting of the Cana sign is defined with its Marah background. In the Samaritan sequence of the Exodus commemorations (although placed in their calendar between the Passover and the Pentecost), the first post-Passover commemoration is also that of Marah.

13. The Second Sign: Elim and the Wall in the Rock

13.1. Connexion with Samaria. The account about the healing of the official's son is both introduced and concluded with the mention of the first miracle at Cana (4:46, 54); thus, the present text of the Gospel calls our attention to the similarities between the two Cana stories. The two accounts are patterned after the same scheme including the following elements: "someone comes with a request; indirectly Jesus seems to refuse the request; the questioner persists; Jesus grants the request; this leads another group of people (the disciples; the household) to believe in him. In neither story are we told exactly how the miracle was accomplished." There are, moreover, obvious geographic similarities (both miracles are localised at Cana, in both cases Jesus has just came back to Galilee and, after having performed the miracle, goes to Jerusalem). Such similarities led many scholars to suggest that both stories stem from a unique tradition.[128]

Moreover, our previous analysis established that the miracle with the waters in Cana omitted an important feature of its prototype, the miracle at Marah: the motive of healing. In the second sign, this motive becomes central. One can see that, even regardless of geographic connexions, the two signs attributed to Cana are closely linked to each other.

It is this closeness, however, that poses a problem for the text in between. In 4:54 the sign of healing is numbered as the "second sign" of Jesus, whereas the text in between mentions twice some other signs (2:23; cf. an implicit mention in 4:45). Moreover, in 7:2 (and, probably, also in 6:2), it seems to be implied knowledge of only Galilee miracles. These facts are called by Raymond Brown "the backbone of the theory of a collection of signs as one of the sources for John."[129] Without backing any particular hypothesis concerning the "signs source," we have to admit, for the chain of the six signs, that it is this history of healing that is its second link after the wedding at Cana.

The localisation of the second sign at Cana poses problems, too. The official reached his home on the next day, whereas his son was healed "yesterday at the seventh hour" (1 p.m.) (4:52). He spent too much time for the short distance between Capernaum and Cana, about 16 miles (25–26 km), given that the royal official could hardly go on foot. Raymond Brown's guess that the next day could be reckoned from the evening (and so, the official "have been travelling only a few hours")[130] sounds too artificial, especially because "the seventh hour" in the same verse is counted from the early morning.

The distance between Capernaum and the original place of the healing must be evaluated by official's travel time. He spent in travel half a day but had to pass the night on the route. This indicates some place outside Galilee. Thus, one has to conclude that the official overtook Jesus who was on his route to Jerusalem through Samaria. The place where he caught him must be localised in Samaria. If so, the story about Jesus in Samaria in 4:4-43 was originally connected to the second sign internally and not only as two consequent episodes, as it is in the present text of the Gospel.

---

[128] In this paragraph, I have paraphrased and quoted Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 194.

[129] Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 194–195.

[130] Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 191. His alternative guess, that the official could pass some time in Cana before going home, is not motivated by the narrative: such a narrative allows only a person in a hurry to see his son. Cf. *ibid.*, 192–193, on independency of John's account from its two Synoptic parallels (Mt 8:5-13; Lk 7:1-10) which localise their corresponding scene of healing in Capernaum.

The actual geography of the Gospel, where Jesus comes after the first miracle from Cana to Jerusalem and then passes Samaria on his way back to Cana is not to be taken as belonging to the original account of the signs. We can notice that, normally, the destinations themselves could be more ancient than the stories which connect them with each other through specific routes.[131] Thus, the story about official's son's healing would manage to preserve, at least, an implicit trace of its original localisation, and the story about the Samaritan woman and the well of Jacob preserved it even explicitly, whereas the mutual connexion of these episodes with the trajectories of Jesus' travels became a subject of changes.

The traces of a rather rough editorial misplacing are to be seen at both beginning and ending of the Samaritan narrative. The episode is introduced with the words whose plain sense presumes a geographical necessity: ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας "but he had to go through Samaria" (4:4). There was no such necessity if Jesus was going from the Jordan valley, as it ought to be according to the actual Gospel's geography (3:22): in this case, his easiest route would be north through the valley and, then, up into Galilee through the Beth Shan (Scythopolis) gap, avoiding Samaria. To preserve authenticity of the actual geography, scholars have to assume some non-evident and even not clear at all meaning for 4:4.[132] I think it is necessary to re-establish the verse 4:4 in its rights of a genuine geographical marker: Jesus was going south from Galilee through Samaria.

At the end of the scene, the transitional passage to the further narrative (4:43-45) contains a blatant self-contradiction: Jesus' movement is motivated with the proverb "it is in his own country that the prophet has no honour" (4:44) but Jesus is going to his own country Galilee, where the Galileans welcome him (4:45). This contradiction was discussed already by Origen (*In Jo.* XIII, 53) and almost all modern exegetes. It is unexplainable without recurs to some unhelpful editing.[133] I have only to repeat that this editing was aimed at suppressing the southward Jesus' movement from an earlier text, where Jesus was leaving Samaria for going to Judea. The proverb in 4:44 originally would illustrate why, when leaving Samaria, he did not choose to go home.

Our geographical reconstruction is corroborated with the localisation of "Aenon near Salim" (3:23) where John the Baptist is mentioned as being baptising in 3:23-36, somewhere in Samaria.[134] This time, John preaches about Jesus as a bridegroom (3:29), which is especially fitting with a context formatted with the first sign at Cana.

13.2. The New Elim. After having concluded that the scene before the well of Jacob and the healing of official's son are internally related, we have made a step toward appreciation the possible role of the well of Jacob in the healing. In the present text of the Gospel, this sign is the only sign of healing that is unrelated to a specific sacred source of water. It is not the case of the two remaining healing signs (the paralytic at Bethesda and the blind born at Siloam). And, moreover, we were still waiting for a healing with the waters from the source of Marah, which could not get into the frame of the story of the wedding at Cana, and, therefore, we could expect to meet the healing motive agglutinated to another story about a source of waters. However, we still need to understand better the Exodus prototype(s) of the well of Jacob in Samaria. It is clear *a priori* that direct comparisons between the Gospel and the Hebrew Bible would be almost useless, because we have to deal with the Exodus in the Jewish traditions of the Second Temple period.

---

[131] In accordance with Delehaye's theory on the relative invariability of the "hagiographical coordinates," s. above, n. 48.

[132] E.g., Raymond Brown is referring to the will of God as "necessity" in question (cf. 3:14) (Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 169). But what would be the reason of such will of God in this particular case?

[133] Cf., e.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 186–188.

[134] This localisation, first proposed by E. Robinson in 1857, is now accepted by an impressive scholarly consensus including, e.g., F. M. Abel, W. P. Albright, J. A. T. Robinson, J. Murphy-O'Connor, and M. E. Boismard, although some of them differ in secondary details of the Samaria localisation: s. J.-M. Guillaume, *Jésus Christ et son temps. Dates, lieux, personnes, dans le Nouveau Testament*, Vivre la Parole, Montréal: Médiaspaul, 1997, 20–22.

Even though the scene near the well of Jacob is basically patterned after Gen 29:10 (meeting of Jacob and Rachel near the well), it continues a long and dense biblical and post-biblical tradition, which had already amalgamated several other scenes (including two scenes with Moses, Numb 21:16-18 and Ex 2:15); it was studied by Annie Jaubert.[135] Jaubert traced this tradition of a mythical portable rock-well, which accompanied Israel in the wilderness and was identified with Moses' well in Madiam (Ex 2:15)[136] and Jacob's well at Beersheba ("Well of the Oath") (Gen 28:10), which was witnessed, among others, by 1 Cor 10:4.[137] All these traditions were ultimately focused on the figure of Jacob, the father of all the twelve tribes of the people of Israel.[138]

This is why the Exodic scene of Elim, which the book of Exodus packed into one verse (15:27: "Then they came to Elim, where there were twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees; and they camped there by the water"), acquired an enormous importance in Jewish traditions. In the Samaritan liturgy, we see Elim on the place of the second Exodic commemoration after that of Marah. The various early Jewish, rabbinic, and early Christian accounts establish a "typological" correspondence between the twelve springs and the twelve tribes (and, of course, the twelve apostles) and between the seventy palm trees and the seventy elders of Israel (Ex 24:1,9) or the seventy apostles (mentioned only in Lk 10:1,17).[139]

This exegesis resulted into a morphological transformation of the spring of Elim and its further telescoping with the next spring of Rephidim (Ex 17:1-7), where Moses stroke the rock and the water came out. The uniqueness of the rock at Rephidim became a symbol of the unity of Israel, whereas the number of springs at Elim became a symbol of Israel's twelve tribes. The resulting source of water turned out to be unique but divided into twelve branches, as it is depicted on a fresco from the Dura Europas synagogue.[140] This fresco is not especially ancient (*ca* 245 C.E.) but represents an older, although seemingly post-Exilic[141] tradition already witnessed in the second century B.C. by Ezekiel the Tragedian (fr. 16, l. 250): (Elim is) πηγὰς ἀφύσσων δώδεκ' ἐκ μιᾶς πέτρας "drawing twelve sources from one rock."[142]

The Gospel's story does not imply a fountain or well with twelve different branches but insists on the link between the well and Jacob, the common father of the Israelites including the

---

[135] Jaubert, "La symbolique du puits de Jacob"; eadem, "La symbolique des douze," in A. Caquot, M. Philonenko (eds.), *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971, 453–460; eadem, *Approches…*, 140–146 (Dossier II: Les images d'eau vive dans le judaïsme contemporain du IV[e] évangile). Cf. above, section 12.2.

[136] The wording of the Gospel in 4:6, as first noticed Bultmann (*Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 130, n. 1 and 2; cf. Jaubert, "La symbolique du puits de Jacob," 72; eadem, *Approches...*, 59, n. 11), is especially similar to Flavius Josephus' retelling of Ex 2:15 (*Ant* 2:257). This observation acquires some additional importance in the light of the similarities between the narrative of the wedding at Cana and Josephus' retelling of the story of Marah. Joseph's retelling of Ex 2:15 is responsible for "the woman's choice of time for coming to the well," the sixth hour (the noun) (4:6), being "unusual" (Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 169): it is Moses, but only in Josephus, who was the first to go to the well at the noon (μεσημβρίας οὔσης), where he met his future wife: Niese, Flavii Iosephi *Opera*, I, 137.

[137] Cf. also H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* Bd. III: *Des Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926, 406–408.

[138] "Cependant, c'est à propos de Jacob, le père des douze tribus d'Israël, que sont développés de la manière la plus décisive les divers éléments de la symbolique du Puits" (Jaubert, "La symbolique du puits de Jacob," 68).

[139] Cf. also L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, [2]2003, 567–568. There is no, to my knowledge, an exhaustive work on Elim in the Christian exegesis, but Jaubert's data are representative enough.

[140] The fresco on the West wall. Reproduced in, e.g., E. R. Goodenough, *The Jewish Symbols of the Greco-Roman Period*, vol. XI, Toronto: Pantheon Books, 1964, pl. XII.

[141] A post-Exilic date is suggested because this tradition is not shared by the Samaritans: in their post-Passover Exodic commemorations Marah and Rephidim occupy two separate Sabbaths, with the Manna commemoration at the Sabbath in between, in the literal agreement with the text of the book of Exodus.

[142] P. Lanfranchi, *L'*Exagoge *d'Ezékiel le Tragique*. *Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*, SVTP, 21; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2006, 273. For a discussion of the contamination between Elim and Rephidim, see *ibid.*, 276, 280–282.

Samaritans (symptomatically, Jesus, unlike the rabbis, does not object to this Samaritan version of the history of Israel).

Jacob is called by the woman "our father Jacob, who gave us the well" (4:12). The words "who gave us the well" (having no referent in the Hebrew Bible) are a direct reference to the Jewish tradition studied by Jaubert, and, in this way, identify the present well with the well of Jacob in Haran (Gen 28:10 considered as identical to the well in Gen 29:10). With these words, the Gospel narrative installs and activates a powerful program formatting the subsequent account.

Even though in the absence of the twelve branches of the water source, the twelve branches of the people of Israel are present behind the scene. Given that we are on the route from the Red Sea to the Promised Land, our present station is Elim—telescoped, let us add, with Rephidim. And the well here is the well of Jacob in Haran, which turned out to be all other wells relevant to the Exodic traditions (Moses' well in Madiam, Elim, and Rephidim).

Before turning to the connexion between the sign of the healing and the well of Jacob, we still have to look closer at the implications of the Jacob traditions referred to in the scene.

13.3. A Missing Scene: Election of the Twelve vis-à-vis the Election of the Five. In the actual form of the narrative about the well of Jacob we do meet some imprecise number of "disciples" (4:27-38) but still do not meet "the Twelve." The first explicit mention of the Twelve will occur in 6:67, apparently in the context of the sign of multiplication of loaves and in a striking connexion with the number of the baskets (also twelve) in 6:13. However, then, Jesus will say that he himself has chosen the Twelve (6:70). Jesus will recall this choosing two more times (13:18; 15:16). But, oddly enough, the scene of election of the Twelve is missing.

One can say, together with Richard Bauckham (and many others), that "the role of the Twelve in the narrative (6:67-71; 20:24) is very minor by comparison with the Synoptics."[143] But this is not an explanation of what why they appeared as a definite group from nowhere, first time in the narrative related to the sign of loaves.

If the choosing of the Twelve took place at some moment, then, when the group of the Twelve is implied to be chosen? In the present text of the Gospel, the preceding narrative to their first appearance is ch. 5, but a great number of scholars consider it as misplaced. Me too, I will have to argue for rearranging of chapters 5 and 6 (s. below, section 14.1). Thus, it is the narrative of the second sign (including the whole ch. 4, both Samaria scene and the healing) which is immediately followed with the narrative where the Twelve appeared first time as a definite group. Given that the well of Jacob narrative implies the semantics of twelve, it fits for embedding the institution of the Twelve narrative as the socket for the plug. And, indeed, there is an important narrative on disciples embedded into the scene near the well of James, that is, near the source of the Israel's duodecimality itself. Let us consider this narrative closer.

The scene itself contains Jesus' words where he defines a task for the disciples (4:35-38). Such words are perfectly fitting with some institution narrative. However, they contain a number of difficulties and especially the following *crux interpretum*, v. 38: "I sent you to reap that for which you did not labour. Others have laboured, and you have entered into their labour." Who are these "others"?[144] Does the Gospel say something about these "others" earlier?

Indeed, the Gospel contains a narrative about the first group of disciples in ch. 1, where the number of the disciple is five. Some of them (at least, Nathanael) were not counted among the Twelve.[145] Normally, with an important exception of Annie Jaubert, both mediaeval and

---

[143] R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses. The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids, MI—Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006, 414.

[144] The available answers are rather numerous but very tentative, that is, without a firm ground in the text of the Gospel; cf. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 183–184.

[145] On Nathanael as a disciple outside the Twelve and identification of the anonymous disciple in ch. 1 with John the Elder, also outside the Twelve (instead of John of Zebedee), s. esp. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses...*

modern exegetes do not consider these five as a definite group.[146] However, we have two witnesses of contrary views from an early epoch, one of them being from the Jewish anti-Christian polemical tradition and another one from Christianity.

The passage about the Jesus' disciples in *bSanhedrin* 43ab (uncensored recension) provides a definite list containing only five names. Peter Schäfer reasonably argues that these names are constructed artificially with polemical purposes, and so, one has not to look for their historical prototypes. The Talmud, according to Schäfer, has no intention to provide information about the historical Jesus. Therefore, "[w]hat is important is only the message that the author/editor of our text wants to convey."[147] This is not to say, however, that Talmud's message was not in relation to the Christian ideological constructs. And so, it is hardly probable that the number five is a rabbinic creation: such a creation would have little sense at all and especially embarrassing in polemics, whereas the most natural explanation of its appearance in the rabbinic tradition is its real presence in some kind of early Christian ideology. In other words, that there was an early Christian tradition where the number of the closest Jesus' disciples was defined as five.

This conclusion is corroborated from the Christian side. The situation of the five disciples near a messianic figure at the moment of revelation recalls that of Ezra with his five scribes, also called "the five" (4 Ezra 14:24), in a Jewish work roughly contemporary to the Gospel and preserved in the Christian tradition only. In the Fourth Gospel, one of the five disciples called in ch. 1, Nathanael, was also a Jewish "scribe" (γραμματεύς, סופר), according to an early Christian tradition widespread throughout both Christian East and West: it is in this sense that Jesus said (as this tradition explains) that in Nathanael, unlike other scribes of Israel, "there is no deceit" (1:47); Nathanael is mentioned as a "scribe" in the earliest Christian lists of apostles.[148] Even if this tradition is not attested to in the Diatessaron itself, as Tjitze Baarda argues, its appearance in Ephrem the Syrian's Commentary on the Diatessaron and other exegetical works from John Chrysostom to Augustine is suggestive.

Annie Jaubert has already noticed the parallel with 4 Ezra 14:24, and, on the ground of different Talmudic parallels (not only *bSanhedrin* 43ab mentioned above but also *bYebamot* 62b, five disciples of R. Aqiba, and *bSanhedrin* 14a, five elders established by R. Judah), supposed that the number five "...pourrait correspondre au chiffre normal des disciples des rabbins."[149]

Nathanael's role in the narrative of ch. 1 is analogous to that of the five scribes of Ezra: it is Nathanael who is the direct addressee of the revelation about the Son of Man in 1:51. Thus, the same pattern of a messiah with his five disciples around, with only a slight difference (only one of the five disciples is a scribe, not all the five), is shared by both Fourth Gospel and Fourth Ezra. The number of the disciples in ch. 1 must be, in some sense, a definite one, that is, the number of people in a definite group. The rabbinic polemical tradition supports this conclusion from an external observer's viewpoint.

Now, we are in position to find out the "others" of 4:38 within the same Gospel of John: they must be the previously elected disciples, namely, the Five.

Such a conclusion is in conflict with the mediaeval interpretations of the role of the Twelve and, of course, with the Synoptic accounts, too. However, it is in accordance with other data of the Fourth Gospel. As Richard Bauckham concluded in his study of the ultimate sources behind the four Gospels, "...the distinctive narratives of the Gospel of John derive not simply from the Beloved Disciple himself, but from a particular circle of disciples of Jesus in which the

---

[146] Although David Flüsser noticed that "Am Anfang hat allerdings Jesus aus seinen Schülern einen inneren Kreis von fünf ausgesondert…"; (D. Flüsser, "Qumran und die Zwölf," in C. J. Bleeker (ed.), *Initiation: Contributions to the theme of the Study-conference of the International Association for the History of Religions held at Strasburg, Sept. 17th to 22nd 1964*, Studies in the history of religions, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1965, 134–146, here 143; repr. in D. Flüsser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988, 173–185, here 182).

[147] P. Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud*, Princeton—Oxford: Princeton UP, 2007, 75-81, 170–172, here 76–77.

[148] S., for the references, T. Baarda, "Nathanael, 'The Scribe of Israel.' John 1,47 in Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 71 (1995) 321–336, esp. 334–335.

[149] Jaubert, *Approches...*, 38, n. 57.

Beloved Disciple moved. The circle included a few of the Twelve, especially Philip and Thomas, but not the inner circle so prominent in Mark. Other disciples who were not members of the Twelve were just as prominent in this circle" (Nicodemus, Lazarus, Martha and Mary).[150] It is this circle of disciples, I think, who considered the group of the Five as more important than the group of the Twelve, even though both groups were partially overlapping.

We have obtained an interpretation of 4:38, where the meaning of "others" is perfectly clear but hardly harmonisable with the Synoptics. Obviously, it led to a lot of editing of the passage whose present remains are the verses 4:27-38. The "others" without an antecedent is only the most striking mark of these changes. Another mark is the form of aorist in the same verse (4:38): "I sent (ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα) you to reap...," whereas it has been not said previously about this sending. Several tentative (or even highly tentative) explanations were proposed by the modern exegetes, but Raymond Brown, as it seems to me, made the most logical conclusion that this is "...a reference to a mission of the disciples during the ministry of Jesus, a mission that has not been narrated."[151] Indeed, such is the situation in the present text of the Gospel. As to the original text, this verse, if my reconstruction of the general meaning of the episode is correct, had been preceded with some words concerning the mission of the newly established group of the Twelve. Moreover, the words of the institution of this group contained a reference to the previously elected five disciples.

To sum up, the scene with the disciples near the well of Jacob was originally the institutional narrative of the Twelve. However, the group of the Twelve was instituted, according to this narrative and in a sharp contrast with the Synoptic accounts, as a subordinate or secondary group in relation to the group of the Five established at the beginning. This is why this passage was severely edited already in an early epoch.[152]

13.4. A "Calendrical" Proverb and the *Ipsissima Dicta*: 4:35. The situation of the election of the Twelve but having in the background the election of the Five is the context of the proverb whose calendrical meaning was dealt with above (section 3): "Do you not say, 'Four months more, then comes the harvest'? But I tell you, look around you, and see how the fields are ripe for harvesting" (4:35). The meaning of the harvest in the present context is explained in v. 38. However, the four-month interval is not fitting the original context as we have just reconstructed it. Moreover, the proverb has an exact calendrical meaning only in the Wednesday 364DY calendar but not in the Sunday one. In other words, this verse is certainly not a creation of the author of the text written along with lines of our working hypothesis. In the same time, it is hardly a creation of the later editor who was eliminating the references to the Five, because this verse forms a part of the contraposition of those who are called to harvest to those who were called to sowing, that is, the Twelve to the Five.

As a matter of fact, this verse presents a case of the direct speech of Jesus in a more or less exact translation into Greek. It has sharp stylistic differences with the other Johannine texts and even other Gospels' texts. According to Peter W. Ensor's classification, 4:35 belongs to the category of *Ipsissima Dicta*, which differs from the category of *Ipsissima Verba* only with the language. The verse contains "anti-redactional features" proving that it turned out to be able to survive the pressure of editorship. For instance, such are the rare Greek word τετράμηνος (a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament), the word θερισμός (only here in the Gospel of John and only in Jesus' words in other Gospels)... [153] Following Ensor, I understand this verse as a

---

[150] Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses...*, 414.

[151] Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 183.

[152] The historicity of this narrative is beyond the scope of this study, but I could not hold from notify that the presence of the "seventy" disciples in Luke could be another ramification of the same narrative of the New Elim and an argument in favour of the historicity of John when he contradicts to the Synoptics.

[153] P. W. Ensor, "The Authenticity of John 4.35," *Evangelical Quarterly* 72 (2000) 13–21; cf. idem, "The Johannine Sayings of Jesus and the Question of Authenticity," in J. Lierman (ed.), *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*, WUNT 2.219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 14–33, here 27–28 ("Unparalleled *Ipsissima Dicta*"). Cf. also the same author's more theoretical monograph and especially an analysis of 4:34 there: P. W. Ensor, *Jesus*

sufficiently exact translation of the real words of Jesus said in a more or less the same context (if not the institution of the Twelve, then, at least, some distribution of the duties among the different categories of disciples).

The author of the text preceding the actual Gospel of John might have felt himself obliged to preserve these words as they were but to enchase it into the frame of his own narrative. Maybe we should take v. 35 as an argument in favour of the hypothesis that Jesus himself was following a calendar similar to that of the *Jubilees* (at least, in the part of the year from the month XI to the month III).

13.5. The Healing Sign near the Well of Jacob. Neither Jesus' communication with the Samaritans or his dialogue with the disciples did contain any sign. The sign was the healing of royal official's son. The latter story is now separated from the well of Jacob context, but this separation is later and artificial. We have to restore the scene in its original form providing that the official obtained the healing for his son near the well of Jacob, whose waters are recalling the healing waters of Marah. The exact details of the scene are hardly recoverable and, probably, not so important.

Above we were arguing for the original unity of the well episode and the healing from geographical and textological considerations. However, the most powerful argument follows from the Jewish traditions about the signs on the well of Jacob. Annie Jaubert knew these traditions from the targums of Ps.-Jonathan and Neofiti 1 (now to add two fragmentary targums published by M. L. Klein in 1980[154]) on Gen 28:10. These targums (echoed in later Jewish sources) add a list of five signs (miracles) given to Jacob at this well; the signs are slightly different in different recensions but some of them are related to the abundance of water in the well and some others with shortening of daytime and space: these topics are never identical but somewhat similar to those of the Gospel scene. Already Jaubert noticed that the Aramaic term "*...nissa'* rappelled celui de σημεῖον (signe) employé dans l'évangile de Jean..."[155] Indeed, we have, e.g., in Targum of Isaiah 7:11, Aramaic נסא as a rendering of Hebrew אות and a parallel of Greek σημεῖον.

Also of importance the parallels in numbers: five signs in targums, five husbands of the Samaritan woman (4:18), and, let us add, the group of the five disciples in the background of the institution of the Twelve...

Ezekiel the Tragedian called "sign" the column of fire on the source of Elim (fr. 16, l. 245–247):

> Car, comme peut-être toi aussi tu le vois,
> il se trouve là-bas, d'où un éclat a brillé
> pendant la nuit, signe pareil à la colonne de feu (σημεῖον ὡς στῦλος πυρός).[156]

The parallels from the targums and Ezekiel the Tragedian point toward the well of Jacob as a principal component of the sign, involved into "sign producing" in the same extent as the six water jars at Cana or the corresponding water pools in the healings of the paralytic and the blind born.

So far, however, in our reconstruction of the healing episode, there is nothing which could explain why it was so severely destroyed by the later editor. Our answer will be again, as it was with the walking on the waters episode, related with the observation of the Sabbath.

---

and His 'Works': the Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective, WUNT 2.85; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996, 135–154.

[154] M. L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch*, Analecta Biblica 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980; electronic edition of these targums as well as those of Ps.-Jonathan and Neofiti 1 is in the database of *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* at http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/ . Cf. the longest account in Neofiti 1: A. Díez Macho, *Neofiti 1. Targum Palestinense. Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana*. T. I. *Génesis*, Madrid—Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968, 177.

[155] Jaubert, "La symbolique du puits de Jacob," 70, quoted n. 15.

[156] Lanfranchi, *L'*Exagoge *d'Ezékiel le Tragique*, 273.

13.6. Sabbath. The story about Jesus' staying in Samaria contains a "void" day: the day when Jesus is reported to stay with the Samaritans (4:40,43). Again, as it was in the case of the day before the first day of the wedding at Cana, one can suppose that this day is the Sabbath. Jesus not only interrupts his journey but does nothing worth to be written down. It is hardly possible in the original Gospel text. Normally, in the Gospel the "void" days are not mentioned at all as separate time entities.

Taking into account our reconstruction where the healing of official's son was performed during the staying in Samaria, it is reasonable to suppose two things: that the "void" day became void only after the editing which misplaced the healing to Cana, and that this day was, indeed, the Sabbath—and so, the healing was performed on the Sabbath, in the same manner as the two subsequent healings where the Sabbath is mentioned explicitly.

This reconstruction leaves unresolved the problem of the official's travel on the Sabbath. We do not know, let us repeat, Jesus' own views on the limitation of travelling on the Sabbath. Moreover, the official was, most probably, not a Jew. It is not improbable that there was, here, an example of a travel which must scandalise some part of the audience (and the later editor turned out to be a representative of this part)—in the same manner as the demonstrative healing on the Sabbath in the two following healing stories.

13.7. Conclusion. The above reconstruction of the second sign narrative is fitting with our working hypothesis although was performed independently from it. Taken within the frame of our hypothesis, this reconstruction provides a cumulative case in its favour.

14. The Third Sign: Manna

Fortunately, there is no need to argue anymore that the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves is patterned after the manna miracle in the Exodus.[157] Therefore, I will focus on the problems of the sequence of the signs and chronology.

According to the Exodus succession (and the Samaritan calendar), the manna miracle must follow that of Elim. Thus, our working hypothesis would require ch. 6 (multiplication of loaves) following ch. 4. Long ago, such a replacement of the chapters 5 and 6 was proposed by a number of modern exegetes. Of course, it turned out much easier to proof some editorial work behind the present succession of the episodes narrated in the chapters from 5 to 7 than to propose a compelling rearrangement.

14.1. A Feasts Narrative Source? Let us start from reviewing some traces of editorship. We have already discussed some editorial problems of the chapters from 5 to 7 when dealing with the walking on the waters episode (section 11.1; cf. 15.1). Now we have to review the others.

The present recension of the Gospel at the end of ch.4 left Jesus at Cana in Galilee. In 5:1, however, he is in Jerusalem for an unnamed but apparently great (pilgrimage [*hag*]?) feast, after some imprecise time interval (μετὰ ταῦτα "after this"). Then, once more μετὰ ταῦτα (6:1), Jesus arrived to the opposite shore of the Sea of Galilee (called here Sea of Tiberias). This seems to be in agreement with our reconstruction of the walking on the waters from a spot near Capernaum (which is on the opposite shore of the Sea of Galilee for the observer from the south) to a spot near Tiberias, although the following narrative on the walking on the waters is geographically confused. Jesus is still on the opposite shore of the Sea shortly before the Passover (6:4), thus, without planning a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The multiplication of the loaves followed with the walking on the waters takes place at this moment. The Exodic prototype of this miracle, the manna, was not related to the Passover time. However, in both

[157] S. especially Borgen, *Bread from Heaven...*, Meeks, *The Prophet-King...*, and B. J. Malina, *The Palestinian Manna Tradition: The manna tradition in the Palestinian targums and its relationship to the New Testament writings*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des späteren Judentums und des Urchristentums, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1968. However, even before them important observations were made by Eileen Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 58–66.

John and Synoptics the multiplication of loaves account is attached to the walking on the waters, but the latter is directly connected to the Passover. This liturgical fact could be remotely echoed in 6:4.

Then, Jesus continued "to go about in Galilee" (7:1). He remained in Galilee when it was time to go in pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the feast of Tabernacles (7:2-9), but departed for Jerusalem shortly after (7:10) and arrived, at least, still before the middle of the eight-day feast (7:14). Then, Jesus will depart from Jerusalem, once more for Galilee, only much later (10:40).

It is tempting to "rectify" this shuttle trajectory (Galilee—Jerusalem—Galilee—Jerusalem—Galilee), and the simplest effective rearrangement would be a permutation of chapters 6 and 5: this would result in an uninterrupted staying in Galilee and, then, a long and also uninterrupted straying in Jerusalem.

However, even this "...sequence is not perfect," wrote Raymond Brown: "[t]here is no transition between the scene at Cana and the scene at the Sea of Galilee."[158] Our previous discussion of the original place of the walking on the waters episode is another argument against such a simplistic resolution. Let us continue to browse the difficulties of the actual text.

> The movement of the crowds in ch. 6 looks contradictory. In 6:5, Jesus "looked up and saw a large crowd coming toward him," whereas in 6:2 the crowd was already with him ("a large crowd kept following him"); moreover, εἰς τοσούτους in 6:9 without an article is strange, especially if the already mentioned crowd is meant.
>
> Again, in 6:2, the crowd kept following Jesus "because they saw the signs that he was doing for the sick" (plural: τῶν ἀσθενούντων). One sick could be the paralytic in Jerusalem (ch. 5) but how to understand plural? The healing of the official's son was, anyway, unknown to the people in Jerusalem (whether it took place in Cana or Samaria), not to say that it was witnessed only privately in Capernaum. The whole verse 6:2 looks as an editorial insertion in attempt to suture two pieces from different sources; the editor had in mind that Jesus performed numerous healings but failed to notice that still not at this point of the plot.
>
> In 7:21, Jesus replied to the crowd in Jerusalem: "I performed one work [ἔργον, a synonym of "miracle"], and all of you are astonished." In the present context, this "work" could be only the healing of the paralytic performed already in ch. 5, before Jesus' departing for Galilee. The memory of such healing would hardly preserved fresh enough to be recalled in such a manner.
>
> Very important is the testimony of 7:3: "So his brothers said to him, 'Leave here and go to Judea so that your disciples also may see the works you are doing.'" It implies that Jesus has not performed, so far, any miracle in Judea. Let us notice that this difficulty is irresolvable with simple putting ch. 5 before ch. 7.

My own approach to all these difficulties is liturgical. I suppose that the Passover in ch. 2, the unnamed feast in ch. 5, the Passover in ch. 6, the Tabernacles in ch. 7, and the Dedication in ch. 10 form some narrative of their own, but torn apart and inserted into the chain of the six signs. It must have been dedicated to the major feasts, and so, localised in Jerusalem. It is this narrative that required a total deformation of the geography behind the ch. 5–10. Only for the Passover in ch. 6 the Jerusalem localisation was prevented with the need of keeping the multiplication of the loaves together with the walking on the waters (as it is in the Synoptic accounts), and this resulted into the "shuttle trajectory" for Jesus. The verse 7:3 is a part of the exchange between Jesus and his brothers about the pilgrimage for the feast of Tabernacles, and so, most likely, belongs to the same narrative.

The anonymity of the feast in 5:1 is, in this respect, revealing. It is hardly an unimportant feast, but, nevertheless, its name is dropped out. In general, the narratives overloaded with liturgical contents could lost such major details as the name of their principal feast only in the case of deliberate editing, when this feast ceased to fit new liturgical views. Thus, the most important problem with 5:1 is not to make known what feast is meant but the very fact of its

[158] Cf. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 235–236, here 236. I mostly follow Brown's list of difficulties (but not always his conclusions) in my further discussion in this section, with the only exception of 5:1. I will not discuss now popular views ascribing to the feast in 5:1 some symbolical meaning but denying any precise liturgical value even in the original recension of the text. Such views ignore the very nature of liturgical data. It is similar to reading of the symbols forming a hypertext link instead of clicking on it.

anonymity. It is a mark of editorship, namely, of an attempt to insert a part of an alien narrative into a previously existing one. Such an editor would have needed to work with scissors.

Probably, there is a need to return to Zahn's identification of the feast in 5:1 as the Tabernacles without necessarily considering it (as Boismard does) to be a part of the second account on the Tabernacles in ch. 7.[159] The feast of Tabernacles with its libation rituals is a fairy suitable place for the healings performed with water, and so, two Tabernacles accounts would have been edited to encompass the two healings with water. This is probably a good explanation why the story of the paralytic turned out to be misplaced. The feasts narrative originally would have two pairs of Passover and Tabernacles feasts. However, the feast of Tabernacles shortly before the Passover mentioned in ch. 6 would imply that the chapters 5 and 6 are divided with a big chronological gap, which could be considered as undesirable and leaded to anonymisation of the feast.

My hypothesis of the second narrative source does not, at first glance, overweight many others already available, but in the case if my main working hypothesis will be verified, it will become attractive. Nevertheless, a detailed study of this second narrative source is beyond the scope of the present paper.

The need of permutation of the signs of the multiplication of loaves and the healing of the paralytic will find a mathematically strict confirmation below (section 15.1).

14.2. Chronological Timeline. If the Exodic prototype of the multiplication of loaves sign is already established, a key calendrical observation could be made out of hand. In Exodus, there was only one day in the week when the manna was collected for the next day as well, the day before the Sabbath (Ex 16:22-30). When the disciples collected twelve baskets of the remained loaves (6:13)—the symbolical amount of food for the whole Israel,—they prepared these loaves for the Sabbath which must have been the next day. In the Gospel narrative their action of collecting loaves is underlined. Considered against the manna background, this action clearly points out that the twelve baskets became disciples' food for the Sabbath.

The manna miracle, as it was in Exodus, must culminate on the Sabbath, but the Sabbath itself is a "void" day: the day when the miracle stops, thus becoming a squared miracle. Now this "void" space is filled with the walking on the water account (itself originally a sabbatic story), and its connexion with the Sabbath is overshadowed. Again, as it was in the case with the institution narrative of the Twelve, we have now a lacuna in the original signs narrative, but, however, it is difficult to fill it. Very probably, Jesus' sermon in 6:26-58 was originally allotted to this Sabbath. At least, the discussion about "what must we do to perform the works of God" (6:28-29) looks especially appropriated for the Sabbath: the day which must be especially dedicated not to the idleness but to the works of God.

Be that as it may, the sign of the multiplication of loaves is connected to the Sabbath, as all other signs in the Gospel of John.

14.3. Geographical Setting. As it follows from the above analysis, the original setting of the scene must be somewhere on the route from Samaria to Judea, but where? Where was located, in the signs narrative, this new wilderness of Sin (cf. Ex 16:1)? "Much grass in that place" (6:10) is a feature incompatible with the wilderness in the literal sense (and especially compatible with the Jordan valley), but, anyway, the place was relatively remote from the towns and villages. In the following sermon Jesus mentioned twice that the miracle with manna took place in the wilderness (6:31,49), thus stressing the motive of desert.

The localisation of the place "the other side (πέραν) of the Sea of Galilee" (6:1) is repeated for the sermon of Jesus: "they found him on the other side (πέραν) of the sea (6:25). Actually, in these two verses, the two opposite shores of the Sea of Galilee are meant, but the walking on the waters story between them is a later addition. Therefore, they could refer to the same region—however, not near the Sea of Galilee. If the place where there is much grass is

[159] Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 275–279. For the review of more recent scholarship, s., e.g., Daise, *Feasts in John...*, 15–18.

located in the Valley of Jordan, the place originally meant could be on the eastern bank of Jordan, the bank opposite that of Cana and Samaria.

Here I formulate this conclusion as a plausible hypothesis. It can be verified or falsified in the analysis of the original geographical setting of the next sign (s. below, section 15.4).

15. The Fourth Sign: Crossing the Jordan

15.1. Confirmation of the Calendrical Core of the Working Hypothesis. In the story of the healing of the paralytic we have two crucial facts for the whole calendar of our working hypothesis: the healing was performed at the Sabbath (5:8), and the paralytic had been ill for thirty-eight years (5:5).

According to our working hypothesis, this Sabbath must be the thirty-ninth day of the whole liturgical cycle started at the Wednesday of the *Agnus Dei*, after the first thirty-eight days have been completed. The probability of a hazardous coincidence of numbers is here negligibly small, especially taking into account that the number 38, unlike such numbers as 40, 49 or 50, is of *very* rare occurrence in the Bible.[160]

Therefore, the following facts are confirmed just now: (1) that the healing of the paralytic occurred at the fifth Sabbath of the cycle, (2) that the permutation of the fourth and fifth signs corresponds to the places of these signs in the original signs narrative, (3) that the first day of the whole cycle is the Wednesday of the *Agnus Dei*, and (4) that the walking on the waters episode corresponds to a Sabbath of its own, just creating an additional week to the weeks marked with the signs.

Moreover, we can consider now as confirmed the whole duration of the cycle up to the Sabbath of the Passover. The next Sabbath, that of the healing of the blind born, as well as the Sabbath of the Passover will be named Sabbath explicitly, whereas the resurrection of Lazarus day was, at least, near the Sabbath (cf. 12:1; in fact, also on the Sabbath, s. section 17.1). Thus, we still have only three weeks before the Sabbath of the Passover, and the whole calendrical frame of the cycle must be considered as proven.

However, the working hypothesis as a whole is still not proven. Its calendrical core is only its skeleton without flesh, whereas the flesh is the liturgical contents.

15.2. The Station of the Exodus: Place of the Judgment and Separation. Now we have to determine, at first, the place of the current sign in the symbolical geography of the Exodus. The mention of 38 years in Deut 2:14 has been noticed as a parallel very long ago, but only Eileen Guilding has shown that there is here something more than a coincidence of numbers.[161] Unfortunately, her work was forgotten by the further students of the Deuteronomy material in the Fourth Gospel.[162]

The parallels noticed by Guilding cover both the scene of healing itself and the subsequent sermon of Jesus.

Deut 2:13-14 provide a parallel to the healing scene (Table 4):

Table 4.

Deut 2:13-14	John 5:5, 8

[160] Only in Deut 2:14 discussed in the next section and 1 Chr 23:3 where it is the number of men, not years or other time units.

[161] Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 82–86. Guilding provides as well a number of parallels with Deut 30-32 and some other books, which are important to her in her attempt to connect Jn 5 with the synagogal readings of the New Year cycle. However, the closest parallel Deut 2:14 does not fit Guilding's liturgical reconstruction.

[162] Cf. esp. an article by Michael Labahn, "Deuteronomy in John's Gospel," in M. J. J. Menken, S. Moyise (eds.), *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, Library of New Testament Studies, 358; London—New York: T&T Clark Int., 2007, 82–98 (with previous bibliography but without mentioning Guilding). Labahn quotes a reference book (H. Hübner, A. Labahn, M. Labahn, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo.* Vol. 1/2: *Evangelium secundum Iohannem*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003; unaccessible to me) saying that the total number of Deuteronomic allusions in John is 128, whereas the modern exegetes are normally hardly providing more than 15 references.

[Moses said:] Now rise up and get you over the brook Zered (ἀνάστητε καὶ ἀπάρατε ὑμεῖς καὶ παραπορεύεσθε τὴν φάραγγα Ζαρετ / קֻמוּ וְעִבְרוּ לָכֶם אֶת־נַחַל זֶרֶד)… And the length of time we had traveled from Kadesh-barnea until we crossed the Wadi Zered was thirty-eight years…	One man was there who had been ill for thirty-eight years… Jesus said to him, "Stand up, take your mat and walk (ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει)."

In both accounts, the key word is "to stand/rise up," slightly different in Greek but probably the same in the Hebrew Bible and the Semitic prototype implied behind the Greek text of the Gospel.

Other parallels noticed by Guilding cover the subsequent sermon by Jesus in comparison with the same sermon of Moses in the Deuteronomy (Table 5).

Table 5.

Deut	John
1:16-17 [Moses said:] And I charged your judges at that time… …for the judgment is God's…	**5:22, 27** The Father judges no one but has given all judgment to the Son… …and he has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man."
4:12, 15 Then the Lord spoke to you out of the fire. You heard the sound of words but saw no form (φωνὴν ῥημάτων ὑμεῖς ἠκούσατε καὶ ὁμοίωμα οὐκ εἴδετε ἀλλ᾽ ἢ φωνήν / קוֹל דְּבָרִים אַתֶּם שֹׁמְעִים, וּתְמוּנָה אֵינְכֶם רֹאִים זוּלָתִי קוֹל); there was only a voice… Since you saw no form (οὐκ εἴδετε ὁμοίωμα / לֹא רְאִיתֶם כָּל־תְּמוּנָה) when the Lord spoke to you at Horeb out of the fire…	**5:37** And the Father who sent me has himself testified on my behalf. You have never heard his voice or seen his form (οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε).

The topics of the judgement and the authority of the judge based on the theophany are certainly common between the sermons of Moses and Jesus.

Michael Labahn adds that Jn 5:31-34 refers to Deut 17:6 and Numb 35:30 as an answer to the Jews' wish to kill him (5:18): the death sentence requires two or three witnesses.[163] Labahn notes that "[i]t is surprising that quotations... and allusions cannot be found everywhere in the Gospel. According to my analysis, most often they occur only in polemical contexts: John 5 and John 7-8."[164] Indeed, the story of the healing of the blind born has much in common with the present story of the paralytic. However, only this story is clearly patterned after the sermon of Moses to Israel short before entering the Holy Land but still in the wilderness, at the one of the last stations with Moses on the eastern bank of Jordan.

Eileen Guilding noticed that not only the first sermon of Moses in the Deuteronomy is referred to in Jesus' words in ch. 5 but also the last sermon—delivered by Moses in the land of Moab (Deut 29:1; 31:2) just before his death and on the last station of Exodus before crossing the Jordan. The common themes are life and death, "turning" to God (Deut 30:8, 10), and the judgment where Moses will be the witness against Israel (Table 6).[165]

Table 6.

Deut	John

[163] Labahn, "Deuteronomy in John's Gospel," 86–87. Labahn discuss as well (*ibid.*, 90–91) the parallel between Jn 5:21 and Deut 32:39 but this verse is too popular in different compositions, especially Odes 2:39 and Dan LXX 4:37 [1].

[164] Labahn, "Deuteronomy in John's Gospel," 97.

[165] Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel...*, 84–85.

30:16 If you obey the commandments of the LORD your God that I am commanding you today, by loving the LORD your God, walking in his ways, and observing his commandments, decrees, and ordinances, then you shall live and become numerous, and the LORD your God will bless you in the land that you are entering to possess.	**5:24** Very truly, I tell you, anyone who hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life, and does not come under judgment, but has passed from death to life.
30:17 But if your heart turns away and you do not hear, but are led astray to bow down to other gods and serve them,	**5:29** …and will come out—those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation.
30:18 I declare to you today that you shall perish; you shall not live long in the land that you are crossing the Jordan to enter and possess.	**5:40** And ye are unwilling to come to me, that life eternal may be yours.
30:19 I call heaven and earth to **witness** against you today that I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Choose life so that you and your descendants may live,	**5:39** You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that **testify** on my behalf.
30:20 loving the LORD your God, obeying him, and holding fast to him; for that means life to you and length of days, so that you may live in the land that the LORD swore to give to your ancestors, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.	**5:46** If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote about me. **5:47** But if you do not believe what he wrote, how will you believe what I say?

The "Scriptures" referred to by Jesus in 5:39, apparently the Scriptures by Moses (5:46-47), are primarily the sermons of the Deuteronomy and especially the last sermon of Moses before Israel crosses the Jordan. This is the place of penitence and of judgment which separates those who "turn" to their God from the impenitent.

The mention of the number 38 refers to the verse Deut 2:14 which explains the reason of the thirty-eight year travelling in the desert as following: "...until the entire generation of warriors had perished from the camp, as the Lord had sworn concerning them." These 38 years are an instrument of separation between those who will enter the Promised Land and those who will not. In fact, it is a tool of dispensation of justice.

It is against this symbolical background that we should interpret the fourth sign of Jesus: the judgment and separation before crossing the Jordan.

15.3. The Crossing the Jordan Ritual. The topic of judgment is connected with the topics of sin, penitence, and atonement. Among the three healing stories in the Fourth Gospel, only the present story contains such motives: Jesus says to the healed man: "Do not sin anymore, so that nothing worse happens to you" (5:14). The following story of the blind born not only does not mention the problems caused by sin, but contains an explicit Jesus' statement that this blindness is not because of sin (9:2-3).

Now we know that, in the Second Temple Judaism, there existed specific rituals unifying the penitence, the separation between the penitent and impenitent, entering into the renewed Covenant with God, and, in the same time, focused on Jordan. The best documented variant of such a ritual is available from the Dead Sea Scrolls (not only 1QS but also the *Damascus Document*, 5QRule, and 4QBerakot),[166] but a number of parallels from other "baptist" practices (including those of John the Baptist) suggests that the real variety and popularity of such rituals were enormous.[167] At least, in one liturgical calendar of the Second Temple period the crossing

[166] To mark only the most important studies related to understanding of the ritual as a whole: W. H. Brownlee, "The Ceremony of Crossing the Jordan in the Annual Covenanting at Qumran," in W. C. Delsman *et al.* (eds.), *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. Dr. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O. P., zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979. überreicht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 211; Neukirchen—Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl., 1982, 295–302; S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ, 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997, 141; D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, & Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998, 219–230; C. A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space. Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ, 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004, 117–127.

[167] J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J.-C. — 300 ap. J.-C.)*, Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad graduum magistri in Facultate Theologica vel in Facultate Iuris Canonici

of the Jordan is commemorated annually, but not only as a separate feast but also within the cycle related to the Day of Atonement and the Tabernacles.[168]

For a somewhat detailed comparison with the Gospel material, it is only the Qumranic rite that is available. One of its main components, the entering into the Covenant, is, nevertheless, absent from the Gospel narrative on the paralytic; we will see that it will become prominent in the following and similar narrative on the blind born. However, in the Gospel narrative on the paralytic, in the same manner as in the Qumranic ritual, is prominent the motive of separation between those who enter into the new Covenant and the Promised Land and those who will not because of their impenitence.

As Russel C. D. Arnold summarised the latter motive in the Qumranic rite, "[s]omeone who refused to enter this covenant was to be cut off, and no members were to have any contact with him (1QS 2:25–3:2; 5:13–18). This language indicates that repentance was a boundary issue marking clearly the boundary between those who were inside (the repentant) and those who were outside (the wicked)." [169]

The healing of the paralytic by Jesus has a similar meaning. Moreover, the water is involved. But does the water of Bethesda replace the water of Jordan which was presented in the original signs account? And, if the crossing the Jordan rite is really meant, where the allusions to the traditions related to Joshua?

The traditions related to Joshua are kept for the next sign and will be dealt with below (section 16). But now, let us turn to the problem of Bethesda passing from the symbolical geography discussed above to the real geography implied in the original narrative.

15.4. The Geographical Setting of the Third and Fourth Signs. Now we are in position to resume our previous discussion on the geographical setting of the third sign (s. above, section 14.3), given that the fourth sign was performed still on the road to Jerusalem. After having rejected the genuineness of the "shuttle trajectory" resulting from merging of two different narrative sources, we have no possibility to take at face value both the Galilee localisation of the third sign and the Jerusalem localisations of the fourth and fifth signs. The two largest water pools designated to the ritual washing of the crowds of pilgrims entering the Temple court from the north (Bethesda) and the south (Siloam)[170] replace in the present text some other water bodies, whereas preserving Jesus' original direction from north to south (thus, Bethesda appears before Siloam).

The latest place on Jesus' route which is so far localised with a sufficient certainty is the Samaritan town Sychar: the details are still disputed but, at least, it is clear that it was located in near vicinity of Shechem.[171] This area was placed on the crossroad of the major routes through the Palestine. The Ridge Route leading south was providing the shortest way to Jerusalem. Another road was leading to the *Via Maris* (a major route along the seashore), and the third road led northeast along the Wadi Beidan to Tirzah and, then, through the Wadi Faria descended east to the Jordan Valley, forded the Jordan near the town Adam, and, from then, through the Jabbok canyon, led to the Transjordan caravan route (King's Highway). From the town Adam, there was

---

consequendum conscriptae. Series II. Tomus 28; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1935; cf. D. Vigne, *Christ au Jourdain. Le Baptême de Jésus dans la tradition judéochrétienne*, Études bibliques, n. s., 16; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1992.

[168] B. Lourié, "A 364-Day Calendar Encapsulated in the Liturgy of the Seventh Sabbath of the Beta Israel of Ethiopia," in A. McCollum (ed.), *FS Getatchew Haile* (forthcoming).

[169] R. C. D. Arnold, "Repentance and the Qumran Covenant Ceremony," in M. J. Boda, D. K. Falk, R. A. Werline (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God.* Vol. 2: *The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*, Early Judaism and Its Literature, 22; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007, 159–175, here 166.

[170] Both Bethesda and Siloam are now archaeologically studied. The most recent and important works are those by Shimon Gibson, *The Final Days of Jesus. An Archaeological Evidence*, New York: HarperOne, 2009, 59–80 (ch. 4 "Signs and Wonders at Bethesda and Siloam").

[171] S., e.g., A. J. Köstenberger, *John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004, 146–147.

a road south through the Jordan Valley along the eastern bank up to the ford opposite Jericho, the modern Al Maghtis (about 18 miles/29 km).[172]

In Joshua 3:16 the waters of Jordan were divided near the town Adam, but "the people crossed over opposite Jericho." This Joshua narrative unites the two nearest places of fords (the total number of the fords through Jordan was five or six; no bridge still existed).

Moses in Deuteronomy spoke to Israel "beyond the Jordan, in the wilderness" (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ / בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן בַּמִּדְבָּר; Deut 1:1). Above (section 14.3) we have supposed that the multiple "πέραν the Sea of Galiliee" in ch. 6 were originally, too, "πέραν the Jordan" ("beyond the Jordan"). Now, in the account of the fourth sign, the Jordan itself stood out against a background (and the area near Jordan will be still in background of the next, fifth sign, s. below, section 16). And, once more, we are still "beyond the Jordan," together with Moses —at least, up to the moment when a rite corresponding to the Qumran-like crossing the Jordan is performed.

Even now, before discussion of the geographical setting of the fifth sign, it becomes reasonable to conclude that there is a strong cumulative case for concluding that the stations of the third and fourth signs correspond to the two spots "beyond the Jordan" near the two fords mentioned in Josh 3:16: near the town Adam and opposite Jericho (Al Maghtis). The crossing of Jordan from the western bank to the eastern was not marked with either sign or something important.

15.5. Conclusion. Of course, the verse Josh 3:16 is of first importance for understanding of the whole geography of Jesus' route from Samaria to Bethany. From now, the book of Joshua will become the main prototype of the signs narrative. Therefore, the landscape implied in the Gospel becomes that of the book of Joshua.

At the moment of crossing the Jordan the Gospel narrative switches from the book of Exodus as its main reference to the book of Joshua. However, the very moment of switching, the fourth sign, is based on the book of Deuteronomy.

These conclusions are obtained independently from our working hypothesis but are perfectly fitting with it.

The number of the years passed by the paralytic in his illness, 38, corresponds to the ordinal number of the day of our liturgical cycle, the 38th, and must be considered as the proof of, at least, its calendrical core.

16. The Fifth Sign: the Second Circumcision

The account on the next sign, the fifth, in the present text of the Gospel turned out to be very distant from the account of the paralytic (ch. 5): 9:1-41. Chapters 7 and 8 are filled mostly with the narrative of the Tabernacles but with different inclusions, among which the most noticeable is the pericope on the adulteress (8:3-11). The next sign narrative starts at 9:1 with "a rather abrupt beginning."[173]

As one can see directly from the text, Jesus' treatment of the blind man was a demonstrative repetition of Elisha's treatment of Naaman. At first, I will try to show that the reason why Elisha became so important is geographical. Then, we will be able to discuss the point of the fifth sign by Jesus.

16.1. Repeating Elisha. The similarity between Jn 9 and 2 Kgs 5 is a common place of the commentaries to John, but the real extent of similarity is not always realised. Here I recall some observations from an important study by Thomas L. Brodie,[174] which cover both general outlines (Table 7) and minor details (Table 8) of the two accounts.

---

[172] Or the next ford Hajla located 2 km south from Al Maghtis, still opposite Jericho. I will not mention this possibility below for the sake of simplicity; it has no importance for our argument.

[173] Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 371.

[174] Th. L. Brodie, "Jesus as the New Elisha: Cracking the Code," *The Expository Times* 93 (1981) 39–42 (tables on pp. 40, 41). These observations deserve much more attention than it is already paid: e.g., Brodie himself

Table 7.

2 Kgs 5	**John 9**
The Man 1-5a Instrument of God's salvation ("through him [ἐν αὐτῷ] the Lord gave salvation to Syria").	*The Man* 1-5 Instrument of God's revelation ("In him [ἐν αὐτῷ] the works of God are to be revealed").
The Cure 5b-14 Sent to go wash in the Jordan. Washes and is cured.	*The Cure* 6-17 Go wash in Siloam—interpreted "sent." Washes and is cured.
The Double Reaction 15-24 (b) Gehazi sees cure only from his own point of view. Gehazi dismisses servants of the cured Naaman. (a) Naaman: gratitude in the form of worship.	*The Double Reaction* 18-39 (a) Pharisees see cure only from their own point of view. Pharisees throw out the cured man. (b) Cured man: gratitude in the form of worship.
The Confrontation 25-27 Elisha *vs* Gehazi: Transferral of leprosy.	*The Confrontation* 40-41 Jesus *vs* Pharisees: Transferral of blindness.

Table 8.

2 Kgs 5	**John 9**
6 Naaman comes to the king of Israel (the institutional leader) for a cure.	**13** The cured man is led to the Pharisees (Israel's institutional leaders).
7a The king reacts to the idea that he heal by asking if he is God.	**14-16b** The Pharisees ask about the healer's relationship to God.
7b The request for a cure is seen as a source of a quarrel.	**16c** Discussion of the cure leads to a division.
8 Elisha wants Naaman to know there is a prophet (ὅτι ἔστιν προφήτης) in Israel.	**17** The blind man says Jesus is a prophet (ὅτι προφήτης ἐστίν).
9-12a Go, wash… Why not touch by hand?	**6-7** Jesus touches and says, Go wash…
12b Turns away with anger.	**18a** Reaction of unbelief.
13 Naaman's servants (παῖδες, lit. "children") intervene to speak about the manner of the cure.	**18b, 19** The blind man's parents are called to speak about the manner of the cure.
14 Naaman's flesh becomes like that of a little child, *i.e.* a new body.	**20-21** The man's sight is in contrast to his blindness at birth, *i.e.* a new birth.

One can add to these Brodie's lists a detail having liturgical importance: in both cases, a numeric symbolism related to seven is involved. Naaman had to wash in Jordan seven times (2 Kgs 5:10, 14), Jesus healed the blind man at the seventh day, the Sabbath (9:14).

I can only subscribe to Brodie's conclusion: "The complexity and coherence of the relationship of John 9 to 2 Kings 5 is such that, in my judgment, it can be explained only by a conscious and systematic process."[175] However, this fact is difficult to explain, and this is why, I think, it is not often mentioned in the commentaries to John.

16.2. Geographical Setting: the Source of Elisha near Jericho. Repetition of the healing performed by Elisha would require to be performed at the Jordan. This is certainly not the case, however. It is an Exodic station on the western bank of Jordan that is meant.

There are three main reasons to prove this. (1) Two signs at the same place are hardly compatible, but the Jordan as the place of a sign is already occupied with the fourth sign. (2) In accordance with a widespread Second Temple tradition (not limited to the Dead Sea Scrolls and

---

does not mention these parallels with Elisha and his own study in his detailed commentary on the scene: Th. L. Brodie, *The Gospel according to John. A Literary and Theological Commentary*, Oxford—New York: Oxford UP, 1993, 343–357 *et passim*.

[175] Brodie, "Jesus as the New Elisha...," 41.

attested to in the Gospels), the ritual washing in Jordan must contain a penitential component, as it is in the case of the fourth sign but not of the fifth. (3) The accent on the symbolism of new birth in both fifth sign itself and its Elisha's prototype, even without a further study, looks especially fitting with the "second circumcision" performed by Joshua in Gilgal just after the crossing the Jordan (but this point will be dealt with below, section 16.3).

Such a detailed repeating of Elisha would look absolutely unreasonable—unless it has a reason for all that, although overlooked by both modern and mediaeval exegetes. This reason becomes more understandable with the help by Flavius Josephus.

Flavius Josephus provides (*War* 4:459-466)[176] a tradition about the source near Jericho whose waters were "healed" by Elisha (2 Kgs 2:19-22). Some important details of Josephus' story are lacking from the biblical account but are relevant to understanding the background of the Jesus repeating Elisha scene.

> In the Hebrew bible (2 Kgs 2:21), the waters before their healing were provoking "death and miscarriage/abortion (מְשַׁכֶּלֶת), whereas in the Septuagint and the Peshitta not "abortion" but "infertility/sterility" (ἀτεκνουμένη, ܥܩܪܐ). The targumic text is here flawing: some manuscripts have only "death and abortion (מתכלא)," whereas some others add "miscarriage (תכלו) and abortion,"[177] but תכלו is similar to תכלא "childless." Josephus unifies all these traditions: "...this spring originally not only blighted the fruits of the earth and of trees but also (provoked) women's miscarriages (γυναικῶν γονάς) and disease and corruption for everything (καθόλου τε πᾶσιν εἶναι νοσώδη τε καὶ φθαρτικήν) until it was reclaimed and turned out to be a most salubrious and fertilizing (γονιμώτατην) source by a certain prophet Elisha" (4:460). Before Elisha's intervention, the waters were "causing orphanhood/bereavement (ὀρφανία) and famine" (4:464). Elisha prayed "to grant to the inhabitants alike an abundance of fruits and a succession of children (δοῦναί τε ἅμα καὶ καρπῶν εὐθηνίαν τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις καὶ τέκνων διαδοχήν)" (4:463). The resulting water is called γεννητικὸν ὕδωρ, literally, "engendering water" (4:461). It became "water distributing εὐτεκνία (blessing of children/parents' fertility) and plenty (κόρος)" (4:464). The water became miraculous: "Such, in fact, is its power of irrigation, that if it but skims the soil, it is more salubrious (νοστιμώτερον) than waters which stand and saturate it" (4:465; the next paragraph continues this theme of miraculous power of irrigation). Some of these motives proper to Josephus are recognisable in the early Christian exegesis.[178] Cf., moreover, the scene of sowing with water in the Egerton papyrus (s. above, section 6.2).

The spring of Elisha is preserved until now as the main spring called Ein es-Sultan of the Jericho oasis, near the eastern slope giving onto Jordan of the Tell es-Sultan hill, the archaeological site of the ancient Jericho.[179] It is clear from the Josephus' account, that it could be considered as a more than suitable place for any water rites implying a new birth.

The biblical account on the healing of waters is immediately preceded with the account of Elijah's assumption and two-way crossing the Jordan (2 Kgs 2:8,14). Elisha's crossing the Jordan is presented as a proof of his succession to Elijah in the eyes of the "sons of the prophets" in Jericho and the reason of the hospitality toward him in this city (2 Kgs 2:15). Indeed, the distance between the city and the nearest ford on the Jordan was about 5 miles (8.5–9 km). Thus, the scenes of crossing the Jordan by Elisha on his road to Jericho and the following scene of his stay in Jericho including the healing of the waters are mutually closely interwoven.

---

[176] B. Niese, Flavii Iosephi *Opera*, VI, Berlin: Weidmann, [2]1955, 407–408; English translation in the Brill Josephus project is still in preparation; cf. Josephus, with an English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray, in nine vols., III, Loeb Classical Library; London: W. Heinemann—Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1928 [repr. 1961], 135, 137, 139 (quoted below with changes).

[177] A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Vol. II: *The Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden: Brill, 1959, 275, with apparatus.

[178] E.g., Didymus the Blind, *De Trinitate*, 2; *PG* 39, 700.8-27: the water γόνιμον καὶ νόστιμον πᾶσι γεγενῆσθαι (this wording is close to that of Josephus but not of the Septuagint). The attribution to Didymus is dubious but not spurious; anyway, the text originated in Alexandria in the late fourth cent.: cf. A. Heron, "Some sources used in the *De Trinitate* ascribed to Didymus the Blind," in R. Williams (ed.), *Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989, 173–181.

[179] Cf., e.g., L. Nigro, H. Taha (eds.), *Tell es-Sultan/Jericho in the Context of the Jordan Valley. Site Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development*, Rome "La Sapienza" Studies on the Archaeology of Palestine & Transjordan, 02; Rome: La Sapienza, 2006, as well as other materials of the Italo-Palestinian archaeological expedition.

The main spring of the Jericho oasis, the modern Ein es-Sultan, made the whole road between Jericho and Jordan a memorial of Elisha. Jesus healed the blind born in this Elisha memorial environment. Jesus as the leader of the New Exodus—that is, for the post-Jordan part of the route, the New Joshua bar Nun—temporarily concealed himself with the image of the New Elisha. The reason was the sacred geography of the route between Jordan and the eastern wall of Jericho with its spring-shrine of Elisha outside the walls.

Jesus' manner of repeating Elisha together with the "sacred geography" of the Jericho oasis of his time make a strong cumulative cause for the genuineness of the proposed geography of the signs narrative and for the unoriginality of the Jerusalem localisations of both healings of the blind born and the paralytic.

This geography is perhaps corroborated with the Synoptics who put the healings of the blind(s) near Jericho (but never within the walls): Mt 20:29-34 (two blind men; 20:29: "they departed from Jericho"), Mk 10:46-52 (the blind Bartimaeus; 10:46: "...were leaving Jericho"), but Lk 18:35-43 (one blind man once more; however, 18:35: "he approached Jericho," as it is in the John's account).

16.3. The Second Circumcision. Nevertheless, the New Joshua bar Nun did never leave the scene. His main action after having crossed the Jordan was the "second circumcision" of the people of Israel (Josh 5:2 MT, targum Jonathan, Peshitta; the words ἐκ δευτέρου are preserved in the *Codex Alexandrinus* but missed in the most of the Greek manuscripts). It was this second circumcision, although in a "spiritualised" form, that the early Christian exegesis unanimously saw in the actions of Jesus, especially in his baptism in Jordan. Such an exegesis was, of course, heavily depending on the Synoptic accounts unparalleled in the Gospel of John (where nothing is said about Jesus being baptised in the waters). However, some recent targumic studies resulted in discerning of an earlier layer of Christian exegesis, where the second circumcision by Joshua was still unconnected to the water rites (as it was in the book of Joshua itself).

The principal finding was an early Jewish fragmentary Targum to Josh 5:2-15 found in a liturgical manuscript as a *haftarah* reading for Passover. The text is datable to the pre-Christian time.[180] In 1999, Robert Murray studied in details (even though still not exhaustively) the relation of this targumic tradition to the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 4:1-12) and to the early Syriac tradition of understanding the baptism as the second circumcision by Joshua bar Nun.[181]

The targumic interpretation of the circumcision scene is wholesale allegorising. The instruments for circumcision are interpreted as the "wise men, in whose hearts was no folly, and he [*sc.*, Joshua] admonished the Israelites with the fullness of the Torah, and he called that place [Place] of Returning [= Gilgal] of part of the Israelites to the service of Y' [= YHWH]" (Murray's tr.). From a larger context of the Targum, Fahr and Glessmer followed by Murray understood these "men of admonition" as Caleb and Pinehas.[182] We shall see that the presence of Pinehas in this scene will be of importance for understanding the Fourth Gospel (s. the next section).

---

[180] Published with a study by Heinz Fahr and Uwe Glessmer, *Jordandurchzug und Beschneidung als Zurechtweisung in einen Targum zu Josua 5 (Edition des MS T.-S. B 13,12)*, Orientalia Biblica und Christiana, 3; Gluckstadt: Otto Harrassowitz Verl., 1991. These authors first noticed parallels with Heb 4.

[181] R. Murray, "'Circumcision of Heart' and the Origins of the *Qyāmâ*," in: G. J. Reinink, A. C. Klugkist (eds.), *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor Han J. W. Drijvers*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 89; Leuven: Peeters, 1999, 201–211. Cf. some additional observations in B. Lourié, "Calendrical Implications in the Epistle to the Hebrews: Seven questions concerning the liturgy of the Sabbath rest," *Revue biblique* 115 (2008) 245–265. A detailed study of the Epistle to the Hebrews against this targumic tradition still remains a *desideratum*, which is not accomplished with a new (and otherwise useful) study dedicated to the Epistle to the Hebrews: R. Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*, WUNT 2.328; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012. For the Jewish background of the doctrine of "circumcision of heart," especially targumic, s. R. Le Déaut, "Le thème de la circoncision du coeur (Dt. XXX 6; Jér. IV 4) dans les versions anciennes (LXX et Targum) et à Qumrân," in J. A. Emerton (ed.), *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Congress Volume — Vienna 1980*, Leiden: Brill, 1981, 178–205.

[182] Fahr, Glessmer, *Jordandurchzug…*, 66–71; Murray, "'Circumcision of Heart'…," 210.

The terms used for the instruments are unusual—but well-known to Murray grace to the Syriac tradition of the interpretation of the baptism as circumcision studied by him previously: "sabres (*saypîn*) and lances (*rûmhîn*), two instruments of war..."[183] Even before knowing the new Targum, Murray saw that this exegetical tradition, best preserved in Syriac but attested to as well in the Western parts of the Christian world, is confirming J. Rendel Harris' intuition "...that the two-edged sword of the word of God in Heb 4:12 is a hidden allusion to Joshua's stone 'swords.'" This hypothesis must be considered as proven with the new targumic witness.[184]

I would like to add that the same background is to be discerned behind a key term of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ὀνειδισμός — the "reproach" of Christ that the faithful should put on themselves (Heb 13:13; cf. 10:33), in the same manner as Moses esteemed "the reproach of Christ (τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ) greater riches than the treasures in Egypt" (Heb 11:26). The same term occurs in the explanation of the meaning of the second circumcision in the book of Joshua (5:9): "The Lord said to Joshua, 'Today I have rolled away from you the reproach of Egypt (τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν Αἰγύπτου / אֶת־חֶרְפַּת מִצְרַיִם)." The original meaning of this phrase is somewhat obscure,[185] but its meaning in the early Christian exegesis and in the Epistle to the Hebrews is sufficiently clear. It means the Egyptian life as a whole, even in its apparently non-slavish and luxurious variants which were available to Moses. The life valuable in the eyes of this world is the true "reproach of Egypt." The second circumcision is not a penitence in some actual evil-doing but putting aside the whole life of sin and acceptance, instead, of a new life in the "rest of God" which was prefigured with the Promised Land under Joshua (Heb 3–4).[186] The same theology is felt behind Paul's admonition in Rom 6:11-22 on the baptism as a new birth from servitude (to the sin) to freedom, and this is why Origen interprets Rom 6:11 through Heb 11:26.[187]

Interestingly, Origen recalls the healing of Naaman in the context of interpretation of the "reproach of Egypt" from Josh 5:9, despite the fact that his exegesis, even though in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (VI, 250), is related to the Jordan as the river where Jesus was baptised (Origen harmonises John with the Synoptics and follows the Synoptics in his interpretation of Jn 1): "For this reason those who come to wash themselves in him [*sc.*, the Son] put away the *reproach of Egypt*; and become more fit to be taken up. They are cleansed from the most abominable leprosy [as Naaman], and receive a double portion of gifts [as Elisha], and are prepared to receive the Holy Spirit, since the dove of the Spirit has not flown to another river [as in the Synoptic accounts of the baptism of Jesus]."[188] Here, Origen replaced into the context of the Synoptic accounts on Jordan a tradition unifying Jordan, Naaman, Elisha, and Jesus together

---

[183] R. Murray, "The Exhortation to Candidates for Ascetical Vows at Baptism in the Ancient Syriac Church," *NTS* 21 (1974) 59–80, esp. 65–73. Cf. Murray, "'Circumcision of Heart'…," 203, n. 4, and 209, n. 26.

[184] Murray, "'Circumcision of Heart'…," 203–206, quoted 204; cf. J. R. Harris, with the assistance of H. V. Burch, *Testimonies*, Part II, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1920, 54–57. On the Harris' idea, s. a study by Alessandro Falcetta, "The Testimony Research of James Rendel Harris," *Novum Testamentum* 45 (2003) 280–299.

[185] Cf., e.g., an overview of the available viewpoints in A. E. Gorospe, *Narrative and Identity: An Ethical Reading of Exodus 4*, Biblical Interpretation Series, 86; Leiden: Brill, 2007, 136, n. 173.

[186] See more on this theology of the "rest of God" in Lourié, "Calendrical Implications in the Epistle to the Hebrews…" For the early Christian exegesis, s., e.g., in a commentary to Josh 5:9: Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἀφεῖλον τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τῆς γηΐνης γενέσεως, καὶ τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τῆς τοῦ θανάτου φθορᾶς ἀπὸ σοῦ, ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ ("On this day, I removed from you the reproach of the earthly birth and the reproach of the corruption of death, on the today's day"); Ps.-Athanasius of Alexandria, *De sabbatis et circumcisione*, *PG* 28, 141. The work is added to those of Athanasius in the Late Antiquity, within the so-called *x*-Sammlung; critical edition is to appear within the *Athanasius Werke*, Bd 4., Lfg. 1.

[187] In his fragmentary *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* in the catenae: J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 4, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1844, 69 = A. Ramsbotham, "The Commentary of Origen on the Epistle to the Romans," *JThS* 13 (1912) 209–224, 357–368; 14 (1913) 10–22, here 366.

[188] This paragraph recapitulates a long digression about the Jordan. English tr.: Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John. Books 1–10.* Tr. R. E. Heine, The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation, 80; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989, 236; critical ed.: E. Preuschen, *Origenes Werke*, Bd 4. *Der Johanneskommentar*, GCS, 10; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903, 157.

with “putting away the reproach of Egypt.” Such a tradition is unattested in the Synoptics but remained in the background of the Gospel of John. One has to conclude that Origen was following an earlier exegesis of the Fourth Gospel but tried (or followed someone who tried) to harmonise it with the Synoptics.

The symbolism of the new birth for an unearthly life is presented in the scene of the healing of the blind born: this is a new birth where the healed man is no longer blind. Moreover, the Gospel text preserves an explicit reference to the circumcision as the meaning of this scene. In the present form, the account of 9:1-41 looks abrupt, especially in contrast with the account of the healing of the paralytic in ch. 5. There, in the case of the paralytic, Jesus delivered a long discourse explaining why it is right to heal on the Sabbath. Here, in the case of the blind born, no discourse is preserved within the account itself. However, an additional discourse about the Sabbath is preserved in 7:21-24. The only Jesus’ argument here is allowableness of performing the circumcision on the Sabbath (7:22-23). It is reasonable to understand this passage as a *membrum disjectum* of the account on the blind born, namely, of Jesus’ sermon explaining the sign. Thus, “one work” mentioned in 7:21 is to be reread as originally pointing at the healing of the blind born. In the present Gospel text, as we have noticed, the verse 7:21 sounds not very appropriately (s. above, section 14.1). The verse 7:24 continues the motive of judgment started with the fourth sign: “Judge not, with a respect for persons (κατ᾽ ὄψιν); but judge ye a righteous judgment.” This phrase is ideally fitting the context of the fifth sign, where the central theme is the inner meaning of the circumcision.

The local tradition unifying into a unique geographical area Gilgal and the spring of Elisha is reported *ca* 530 by archdeacon Theodosius (*De situ terrae sanctae*, 18): “The Field of Lord in Gilgal is watered from the Fountain of Elisha.”[189] Historical Gilgal of the book of Joshua is not localised exactly[190] but, in the best case, it was 2 or 3 km from Jericho and, in any case, not watered from the Fountain of Elisha. The tradition reported by Theodosius goes back to identification of Gilgal with the oasis of Jericho out of theological reasons, which is also in the background of the Gospel account of the fifth sign, whereas disappeared from the actual text of the Fourth Gospel.

16.4. Circumcision and Water. Géza Vermes was oversimplifying the situation when, at the eve of the subsequent flourishing of the targumic studies, wrote: “... it becomes evident that the whole structure of the Pauline theology of baptism is strictly related to the contemporary Jewish doctrine of circumcision... It is evident that the link between baptism and the death of Christ, far from being a simple reminder of the moral obligations of Christian life, is as organic as the connexion between circumcision and covenantal sacrifice.”[191] In fact, his data were directly related not to the baptism but to the Christian usage of the wine as a substitute of the blood (s. above, sections 12.3-4). However, his intuition turned out to be basically right when the early Christian theology of the “second circumcision” was studied by Robert Murray and the editors of the ancient fragmentary Targum to Joshua Heinz Fahr and Uwe Glessmer (apparently without knowing Vermes’ study).

The developed theology of the baptism as circumcision was referring to the Synoptic accounts to the baptism of Jesus. Robert Murray collected a rich dossier of beautiful hymns and exegetical texts. [192] Very early these accounts became read into the Gospel of John. Nevertheless, in the Gospel of John itself, the place occupied with the water as a material sign of the spiritual

---

[189] “Ager Domini, qui est in Galgala, inrigat<ur> de fonte Helisaei...”; P. Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi IIII–VIII*, CSEL, 39; Prague—Vienna: F. Tempsky—Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1898, 145; English tr.: Theodosius (A. D. 530.), Translated by J. H. Bernard, London: Palestine Pilgrim’s Texts Society, 1893, 14.

[190] S. a review of scholarship in Hutton, “‘Bethany beyond the Jordan’...,” 322–323.

[191] Vermes, “Baptism and Jewish Exegesis...,” 319.

[192] I limit myself to one quotation from Ephrem’s *Hymn on the Epiphany*, VIII, 16: “See, Our Lord’s sword/sabre (ܣܦܣܪܗ ܕܡܪܢ) is in the waters, / which divides (ܦܠܓ) sons and fathers; // for it is a living sword/sabre (ܣܦܣܪܐ ܗܘ ܚܝܐ ܕܗܐ ܥܒܕ) which (see!) makes / division (ܦܘܠܓܐ) of the living among the dead” (tr. by Murray, “The Exhortation...,” 64; original: E. Beck, Des heiligen Ephraem *de nativitate (Epiphania)*, CSCO, vol. 186; Scr. Syri, t. 82; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1959, 173).

circumcision is more modest. Primarily, it is related to the sign of the healing of the blind born. This is not all, however.

In the Passion narrative, we read: "…one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once blood and water came out." (19:34). Then, the blood is explained in 19:36 *via* Ex 12:10 LXX (cf. Ex 12:46) as the blood of the Passover Lamb, whereas the water is explained in 19:37 *via* Zech 12:10 (closer but not identical to variant readings in both MT and LXX probably going back to a collection of the *testimonia*) as the symbol of the Spirit in libation rituals of the Tabernacles, with an obvious reference to Jn 7:38-39.[193] At least, the Zechariah reference is related to the "feasts" narrative and is unlikely to be a part of the signs narrative. However, the original meaning of the blood and the water in 19:34 seems to be closely related to the first and the fifth of the six signs.

The blood of the Lamb of God was represented at Cana with the wine as the blood of circumcision. The spear, however, is, too, an instrument of circumcision, according to the Palestinian fragmentary Targum quoted above ("sabres and lances"). The Targum uses the word רומחא "javelin," which occurs in all the four known Targums to Numb 25:7[194] and Peshitta (ܪܘܡܚܐ) as an equivalent of Hebrew רֹמַח and Greek σειρομάστης—the weapon used by Pinehas. Pinehas is, in the same old Palestinian Targum, one of the "men of admonition" symbolised with the instruments of circumcision, "sabres and javelins." The javelin of Pinehas as an instrument of atonement is mentioned in the Septuagint of Ps 105(106):30: "Then Pinehas stood up, and made atonement (καὶ ἐξιλάσατο): and the plague ceased." The Hebrew and Aramaic (in Tg Psalms) texts here do not describe the scene of Numb 25:7, referred to in Ps 105(106):30, as a specific ritual of atonement: Pinehas here, respectively, either "interceded" (וַיְפַלֵּל) or "prayed" (וצלי). Given that the rite of circumcision has also an atonement value, the Septuagint of Ps 106:30 is close to the tradition of the old Palestinian Targum where both Pinehas and his javelin become the instruments of circumcision.

Thus, the λόγχη "spear, lance" in Jn 19:34 is a replica of the σειρομάστης of Pinehas, that is, another Greek rendering of the Aramaic term רומחא. Jesus on the cross occupies the very place of the sinners pierced by Pinehas, and both (new) Pinehas and his "javelin" are the instruments of circumcision. The circumcision, in the exact accordance with the signs at Cana and at the spring of Elisha, produces the blood and the water (exactly in this order[195]).

There is no room, in the present paper, to explore further the Johannine Passion narrative in the light of the obtained understanding of the signs, neither to speculate about the value of such understanding of Jn 19:34 for the further Christian sacramentology. It is important to note here only the fact that "blood and water" and the spear in the crucifixion scene form a representation of the circumcision and are prefigured with the first and fifth signs by Jesus.

16.5. Conclusion. The above analysis of the fifth sign shows, independently from our working hypothesis, that the scene of the healing of the blind born is inscribed into the sacred geography of the route between the Jordan and Jericho and symbolically corresponds to the second circumcision of Israel at Gilgal. This is fitting perfectly the corresponding place of the scene in our working hypothesis.

17. The Sixth Sign: the Fall of Jericho

[193] Cf., e.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, II, 955. For a detailed analysis of the Jewish background of both citations, s. M. J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Christology, 15; Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996, esp. ch. IX "'Not a Bone of Him Shall Be Broken' (John 19:36)," p. 147–166 [first publ. 1992], and ch. X "'They Shall Look on Him Whom They Pierced' (John 19:37)," p. 167–186 [first publ. 1993].

[194] Onqelos, Neofiti, Ps.-Jonathan, and one fragmentary targum; cf. the database of *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*.

[195] Cf. "water and blood" in 1 Jn 5:6,8; Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, II, 936.

The last sixth sign is the resurrection of Lazarus.[196] It is described in ch. 11 and is separated from the fifth sign, ch. 9, with the ch. 10 containing the mutually connected Good Shepherd discourse and narrative dated to the Feast of Dedication in Jerusalem (10:1-38).[197] This is not a part of the signs narrative (but rather a part of the hypothetical "feasts" narrative). The verses 10:39-42 serve as a transitional passage to the sixth sign account but already contain important chronological and geographical information.

17.1. Chronological Timeline and Geography. It would be imprudently to date the resurrection of Lazarus basing on the phrase "six days before the Passover" (12:1), as normally the mediaeval exegetic traditions did (thus, the chronology of the Sabbath of Lazarus as the Sabbath preceding the Great Sabbath of the Easter). There is some break of the narrative between the chapters 11 and 12. After having resurrected Lazarus, Jesus escaped to some town Ephraim (11:54) hypothetically identified by the scholarly consensus with the modern At-Tayibeh, 4 miles north-east from Bethel (cf. 2 Sam 13:23; Josephus, *War* 4:551; etc.).[198] Regardless of the exact localisation of Bethel, somewhat disputable (at least, it is known that it must lay 12 Roman miles north from Jerusalem), this results in about 24–26 km from Jerusalem, or more than half day travel on foot. Therefore, it is unlikely that the present arrangement of 12:1 would correspond to any real geography and chronology of ch. 11.

Nevertheless, the resurrection of Lazarus is to be dated to a Sabbath from the internal chronology of the sixth sign narrative.

The internal chronology is formulated mainly in the language of geography. At first, Jesus "...went away again across the Jordan to the place where John had been baptizing earlier, and he remained there" (10:40). Then, on some unspecified day, he received the news that Lazarus is ill (11:3; cf. 11:1). He remained on the same place two days (11:6), that is, the day when the news was received and the following day. Then (ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο), he said to the disciple that they have to go to Judea (11:7); it is obviously implied that this is the first day of their travel on foot to Judea. Then, Jesus said that Lazarus died (11:11-15). Presumably, this dialogue with the disciples takes place on the morning of the next day after Lazarus' death. The morning is implied because the travel to Judea is presented by Jesus as an immediate task; it is more suitable to depart for a long travel on the early morning. The most natural understanding of the sequence of the events is the following: Lazar is ill on the day when the news about this is received; Jesus is waiting one more day until Lazar dies; Jesus says about Lazarus' death to the disciples on the next day, and they immediately go to Judea.

Jesus and his disciples arrived to Bethany on the fourth day after Lazarus' death (11:17). This implies no more than four days for the travel. If they departed on the second day after Lazarus' death, the travel took three days. The distance was long enough: it took three days, whereas the travellers were healthy men and they were in a hurry; it counts not less than 45 km per day (according the Mishnaic and Talmudic standards for the healthy men and a full day's march[199]) but probably even more (50 km per day would require about 10 hours of walking per

---

[196] For a review of the mainstream scholarship on Lazarus, s., beside the major commentaries, W. E. Sproston North, *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

[197] On their mutual connexion, s. esp. J. C. VanderKam, "John 10 and the Feast of the Dedication," in H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins, Th. H. Tobin (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*, College Theology Society Resources in Religion, 5; New York: University Press of America—London: Lanham, 1990, 203–214, with a possible adjustment by Brian D. Johnson, "'Salvation Is from Jews': Judaism in the Gospel of John," in F. Lozada Jr., T. Thatcher (eds.), *New Currents through John: a Global Perspective*, Resources for Biblical Study, 54; Atlanta, GA: Society of the Biblical Literature, 2006, 83–99, here 94–97. Cf. also J. Painter, "Tradition, History and Interpretation in John 10," in J. Beutler, R. T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context. Studies by members of the Johannine Writings Seminar*, Society for the New Testament Studies. Monograph Series, 67; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991 [repr. 2005], 53–74, here 67–71.

[198] Cf., e.g., Köstenberger, *John*, 354 (with further references).

[199] Cf. R. Riesner, "Bethany Beyond the Jordan (John 1:28). Topography, Theology and History in the Fourth Gospel," *The Tyndale Bulletin* 38 (1987) 29–63, here 44–45, quoting Gustav Dalman and, through him, *mTa'anit* 1:3, *bPesahim* 93b, and Flavius Josephus, *Vita* 269–270. These calculations were criticised by Jeremy

24 hours; however, this is still not the limit of forces for the healthy men in a hurry, especially if they are, as Jesus with his disciples were, accustomed to the walking on foot and without luggage). Thus, the distance was about 150 km or even more.[200] All this correspond to a northern localisation of the place referred to in 10:40 and corroborated with the apparent nearness to Bethsaida to the places described in ch. 1. As William H. Brownlee helpfully put it, "So natural is this Galilean setting for the coming together of the Baptist, Jesus and his disciples, that it seems well nigh self-authenticating."[201] We will continue the discussion of the locale below (section 16.3).

Let us turn now to the chronological timeline. The whole sequence of the events preceding the resurrection of Lazarus occupies seven days. The last day is the day of the resurrection itself; it is the third day of the travel. The preceding day to the first day of the travel was the day of Lazarus' death and the day when Jesus was still staying an additional day in the remote place (11:6). One can presume that the travel from Judea to this place occupied three days, too. In sum, we have the whole week. Put in the context of the chain of the six signs, it gives a perfect sense: Jesus performed the previous sign near Jericho at the Sabbath; then, he and his disciples departed for this remote place on Sunday and arrived here on Tuesday evening. At this moment, Jesus was caught up with the news of Lazarus' illness. He stayed on the same place for one additional day, Wednesday. Then, on the next day, Thursday, he departed for Judea to arrive in Bethany on the next Sabbath after the Sabbath of the previous sign.

This time schedule would imply that a huge part of the Sabbath was covered with the travel. In this way, the problems with the apparently broken Sabbath could be caused not only with the "Jews" in Judea, as usual, but also with the editor of the present Gospel text, who, as we have seen, did not tolerate long journeys during the Sabbath.

17.2. The Forty-Ninth Day of the Liturgical Cycle. Once more, the Gospel account presupposes a "void" day which has to have a liturgical meaning. However, this day is not a Sabbath but Wednesday. Its liturgical meaning becomes clear from the fact that this is the 49th day of the liturgical cycle started on 16.XI. This is, so-to-say, a Sabbatic Wednesday.

Hutton, "'Bethany beyond the Jordan' in Text, Tradition, and Historical Geography," *Biblica* 89 (2008) 305–328, here 315, from the viewpoint of our modern sport medicine, which seems to me blatantly anachronistic. The ancient sources collected by Dalman correspond to the physical capacities of the people of the given place and epoch. These people could be compared with the modern Bedouins but not with the European tourists. However, Hutton seems to be right when he criticises Riesner's assumption "that Lazarus died and was buried on the same day as the messengers arrived" (Riesner, "Bethany...," 44) as an artificial reading which does not take into account the theological meaning of the additional day of staying in a remote place (11:6). This day is needed to testify that the death of Lazarus (not simply his illness) occurred when Jesus was still far away (Hutton, "Bethany...," 314–315). It is a principal point for the account that Jesus, already informed that Lazarus is fallen ill, continues his staying in a remote place until Lazarus dies. It is in this context that the mention of the one more day of staying is inserted: Jesus needed one more day to leave to Lazarus time to die. Only at the moment when Jesus and his disciples have to depart for Judea he declares that Lazarus died.

[200] Thus, it is not only "...the traditional site of Christ's baptism" is "completely excluded... as the starting-point" (Riesner, "Bethany...," 44), but also the place proposed by Hutton (Aenon near Salim, at the two-day distance from Bethany of Lazarus). Hutton follows an early suggestion by Fortna that the toponym Aenon is probably a part of the "Signs Source," but misplaced from 1:28 to 3:23 (Hutton, "Bethany...," 317). Oddly enough, Hutton does not refer to the later version of the same Fortna's study, where Fortna is sceptical toward his own earlier idea: "No notice of locale, if one was given, has survived," said he about the place of the scene of the Baptist's testimony and the conversion of the first disciples. Only in a note, Fortna adds: "Unless Aenon-near-Salim (3:23) was once a part of S[igns] G[ospel] and has been displaced by Johannine redaction, as I held in *T[he] G[ospel] O[f] S[igns]*, 179. But if so it gives us little help, since its location is now unidentifiable" (R. T. Fortna, "F. Theological Locale: Jesus' Itinerary and the 'Jews,'" in idem, *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1989, 294–314, here 297 and n. 136; this appendix F to the Fortna's monograph is a new version of the 1974 paper quoted by Hutton). In fact, there is absolutely nothing in the texts that would authorise establishing of a direct link between Aenon and Jn 1, whereas Samaritan connexions of the "signs narrative" are important and could be related to Aenon as well (s. above, section 13.1).

[201] W. H. Brownlee, "Whence the Gospel According to John?," in Charlesworth (ed.), *John and Qumran*, 166–194, here 173.

A digression within Jesus' speech to the disciples (11:9-10) mentions the topics of a certainly misplaced passage 12:44-50[202]: light and darkness, salvation and not judgment by Jesus (12:47) but, nevertheless, judgment by the "word" (12:48, especially understandable if the word is a sword...). It is tempting to suppose that these two fragments are *membra disjecta* of the discourse by Jesus delivered at the 49th day of the cycle. Its general topics were related to a kind of the well-known paradigm of "the two ways" (way of darkness and way of light) as the main criterion of the final judgement.[203] The number 49 itself refers to some final and the end of the world, as it will be additionally corroborated with the meaning of Lazarus' resurrection at the seventh Sabbath of the liturgical cycle.

Jesus' words οὐχὶ δώδεκα ὧραί εἰσιν τῆς ἡμέρας ("Are there not twelve hours in the day?"; 11:9) are difficult. In what manner the exact number of hours in the day could clarify the good qualities of the light and bad qualities of the darkness? The context seems to justify such translation as "daylight" for ἡμέρα, as, e.g., NRSV does. But the daylight time is changeable and not always and everywhere is twelve hours. This seems to be an idealised imagery related to "I am come a light into the world" (12:46) and connected to some astrological wording.[204]

The themes of judgment and light interwoven together recall the *Similitudes* of Enoch,[205] which seems to be not an accident (s. the next section). For instance, compare 12:46 (ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα), taken into account 1:9 (ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον; cf. also 1 Jn 2:8) with 1 Enoch 58:6: "There will be light that does not cease, and to a limit of days they [*the righteous ones*] will not come; for darkness will first have been destroyed, and the light will endure before the Lord of Spirits, and the light of truth (ወብርሃነ፡ርትዕ፡ [= καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν *or* τῆς ἀληθείας]) will endure forever before the Lord of Spirits."[206] This Enochic "light of truth" enduring forever before the Lord of Spirits and revealed to the elect ones is a prototype of Jesus as the light of truth revealed by John the Baptist and himself to his own elect ones.

Even though the Jesus' discourse dedicated to the 49th day of the liturgical cycle could be restored only putatively, the existence of a liturgically important day must be concluded from the

---

[202] That this passage is out its original place is the common opinion of the most of the exegetes. Short before, 12:36, it was said that Jesus has gone into hiding, and so, his "crying aloud" (12:44) would have no audience. Cf., e.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 490.

[203] This imagery of the judgment related to the "two ways" is mostly studied in relation to the Gospel of Matthew but not of John; cf., e.g., D. C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, Society for the New Testament Studies. Monograph Series, 88; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. For a general perspective, s. a still relevant article by M. Jack Suggs, "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function," in D. E. Aune (ed.), *Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, Leiden: Brill, 1972, 60–74.

[204] Cf. 4Q186 1 ii 7-8: "There is a spirit of him in the house of light (of) six (parts), and three (parts) in the house of darkness"; M. Popović, "Light and Darkness in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS III 13–IV 26) and in 4Q186," in G. G. Xeravits (ed.), *Dualism in Qumran*, Library of Second Temple Studies, 76; London—New York: T&T Clark Int., 2010, 148–165, quoted 157.

[205] Here a separate study is needed, because the topic of Son of Man attires so much scholarly attention that inhibits exploration of other aspects of 1Enoch relevant to the Gospel of John. Cf., however, Jey J. Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into Its Background*, JSNT Sup 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 289, n. 39, who notices (only in a footnote) in his review of the parallels to the light motive in John: "The visions described in the *Similitudes* refer to light coupled with salvation for the elect ones and destruction to their enemies (cf. *I En.* 39.7; 41.2, 9; 48.4, 7-10; 58.3-4, 6; cf. 61.6-12 with 62–63; cf. 71.2, 5 with 71.15-17)."

[206] The Greek retroversion is mine. English tr.: G. W. E. Nickelsburg, J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation. Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004 page!; Ethiopic: M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, vol. 1, 158. The word ርትዕ፡ could be understood as both ἀλήθεια (as Nickelsburg and VanderKam as well as Uhlig ["Wahrheit"] do) or δικαιοσύνη (as other English translators do: "uprightness" in Knibb, *ibid.*, vol. 2, 141, and Ephraim Isaac); cf. S. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd 5., Lfg. 6; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1984, 603; E. Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch...", in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1983, 5–89, here 40, and Ch. F. A. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1865 [repr. Osnabrück, 1970], col. 291.

very fact that one day is implied as "void." This is the same situation as in 2:11 and 4:40,43 (s. above, sections 11.3 and 13.6). Moreover, the fact of this day's fitting with the place of the 49th day of the liturgical cycle makes a strong cumulative case for both the calendrical core of our working hypothesis and the timeline of the week before Lazarus' resurrection as it is restored above.

17.3. Broad Localisation: Bashan/Batanaea, Not Bethany/Bethabara. The principal merit of Jeremy M. Hutton's study[207] is, to my opinion, his linguistic analysis of the toponyms. He managed to prove that both names "Bethany beyond Jordan" and Bethabara (with all their variants) in Jn 1:28 imply a southern localisation, near the traditional places of the baptism of Jesus. The name "Bethabara" which Origen interprets as plural (*In Jo.*, VI, 205) relates to the ford system including the two neighbouring fords opposite Jericho, near the Wadi Charrar and the hill where the pre-Christian Jewish tradition locates the ascension of Elijah. Hutton considers such a localisation as theologically conditioned—presenting John the Baptist as the New Elijah—and belonged to a later layer than the "signs source" (Hutton follows Fortna's hypothesis).

I can only second this Hutton's interpretation. Indeed, John the Baptist as the New Elijah is an important part of the Synoptics' doctrine (Mk 9:12-13 // Mt 17:10-12), but in the Gospel of John the situation is exactly opposite: the idea that John is the New Elijah is explicitly denied (1:21,25)![208] Thus, appearance of both "Bethany" and "Bethabara" in Jn 1:28 is a result of "harmonisation" of the Fourth Gospel's tradition with the Synoptic one but certainly not a part of the original Johannine tradition. In sum, we have no original toponym for either 1:28 or 10:40.

Riesner's localisation of the place implied in these verses in Batanaea (biblical Bashan) retains its full value for the original signs narrative.[209] Riesner meant some locale in the southeast corner of Batanaea, near to the Sea of Galilee. Riesner's speculations about possible derivation (corruption) of "Bethany" in 1:28 from "Batanaea" are not out of place, *pace* Hutton, because, anyway, this area was a part of Batanaea, the tetrarchy of Herod Philip, whose capital was Caesarea Philippi (Banias) and the second important city was Bethsaida.

Riesner argued that the localisation in Batanaea is not less theologically conditioned than the southern localisation of the activity of the "New Elijah" (John the Baptist) and is somewhat related to the Second Temple traditions about the Mt Hermon and the confession of the apostle Peter in the Caesarea Philippi district (τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου) according to Mt 16:13-19 (// Mk 8:27-30 localising "on the road" "to the villages of Caesarea Philippi" // Lk 9:18-21 with no localisation at all); discernibility of an Enochic background behind the Petrine tradition is a known fact. [210]

George W. E. Nickelsburg localised the place of the revelation to Enoch in 1 Enoch 12–16 near Tell Dan in Upper Galilee, southwest of the foot of the Mt Hermon. This location is connected with the Mt Hermon itself as the place of the descent of the watchers (rebel angels) in

---

[207] Hutton, "Bethany..."

[208] On possible grounds of this feature of the Fourth Gospel's theology, s. a review of the available viewpoints by Markus Öhler, *Elias im Neuen Testament. Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum*, Beihefte zur *ZNW*, 88; Berlin—New York: W. de Gruyter, 1997, 94–97.

[209] Riesner wrote, among others: "The evidence indicates rather the northern Trans-Jordan, and the reference in Matthew 19:1 to Joshua 19:34 (MT) could indicate the region of Bashan-Batanaea, for in both the Septuagint (Nu 32:32f.; Dt 3:8; 4:47) and Josephus (*Ant.* VIII.37) Bashan is designated explicitly as πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου"; Riesner, "Bethany...," 53. Riesner's localisation is accepted, e.g., by D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Leicester, UK: Apollos—Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991, 146–147. Cf. B. Pixner, "Bethanien jenseits des Jordan," in idem, *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche. Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse.* Hrsg. R. Riesner, Giessen: Brunnen-Verl., ^{3}1996, 166–179. Riesner states (*ibid.*, 45) that even before him and Pixner, Rudolf Schnackenburg, who was preferring the southern localisation for 1:28, "left open the possibility that a pre-Johannine source for 1:28 could have presupposed a location in Galilee" (*The Gospel according to St John*, II, London: Burns & Oates, 1980, 515, n. 39).

[210] Riesner refers to the now classical paper by George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981) 575–600.

1 Enoch 6. The revelation to Levi in the *Testament of Levi* 2–7 is localised on the top of the Mt Hermon. The district of Caesarea Philippi, the place of the confession of Peter, begins several miles south from Tell Dan and goes further to south along Jordan and the Lake Huleh.

Thus, the places meant in 1:28 and 10:40 could be localised somewhere within about 40–50 km (*ca* 25–30 miles) width band on the eastern bank of Jordan from Caesarea Philippi on the north to Bethsaida or even the Sea of Galilee on the south.[211] It is obvious from the context that 10:40 means a somewhat large region—suitable for living and walking during several days—and not the exact spot within it which is meant in 1:28. Thus, Jesus' sermon recalling the *Similitudes* of Enoch (s. previous section) was pronounced in the places preserving the memory of Enoch.

The distance between Caesarea Philippi and Bethany near Jerusalem would be about 165–170 km (102–105 miles), which is really difficult to cover on foot during three days even for trained men. However, this problem disappears if Jesus and his disciples departed for Bethany from some place north of Bethsaida but about 20 km south of Caesarea Philippi. In this case, they were still in the same place (in a larger sense) where John the Baptist was baptising and where Peter made his confession of Jesus as Messiah.

It is a relation to the Caesarea Philippi district that could be of principal value. Peters' words of confession preserved by the Synoptics are echoed in the Gospel of John's scene of the calling of Peter: Andrew says to his brother Simon "We have found the Messiah" (1:40-41), and, then, Jesus "looked at him and said, 'You are Simon son of John/Jonas. You are to be called Cephas'" (1:42). Together with Pixner and Riesner, we have to localise this scene "in the district of Caesarea Philippi," that is, in the same area as Matthew and Mark did.

17.4. The Mystical Tradition behind the Batanaea (Bashan) Localisation. The traditions related to the Mt Hermon and the Christian Petrine tradition with its Enochic background do not exhaust the mystical meaning of Batanaea (Bashan) in the Gospel narrative. This tradition is still passing almost unnoticed. I am not prepared to study it in detail either but limit myself to putting some landmarks.

Its basic text is certainly Ps 67(68), one of the classical texts of the Merkabah mysticism and Moses' ascent and descent from Sinai to the heavenly Temple and back to Sinai (vv. 17-18: "…mighty chariot, twice ten thousand, thousands upon thousands, the Lord came from Sinai into the holy place. You ascended the high mount, leading captives in your train and receiving gifts from people…")[212] quoted in the Epistle to the Ephesians (4:8-11).[213] Even in this seminal text, the tradition is already related to Bashan as well as to some "sea" which could be easily interpreted as the Sea of Galilee: "I will bring them back from Bashan, I will bring them back from the depths of the sea" (Ps 67(68):22). Psalm continues, after the mention of the "sea," with "so that you may bathe your feet in blood" (v. 23), which recalls to us the sign of transformation of water into blood, the key sign of our six-sign tradition, where it is performed at Cana after the crossing the Sea of Galilee. The same basic text of the tradition establishes a messianic procession: "Your solemn processions are seen, O God, the processions of my God, my King, into the sanctuary…" (v. 24), which becomes the program of the Gospel plot which is Jesus' triumphant procession starting with a "sea" (of Galilee) and waters transformed into blood (even though represented with wine). Of course, Ps 67(68) is to be perceived as well in the background of the Passion narrative in John and the Synoptic Gospels, but this is beyond our task here.

17.5. The Grotto of Paneas and the Way of the Messiah. After having established the setting of Jn 1:28 and 10:40 in the mystical geography of the Caesarea Philippi district, we are in position to interpret some details of the Gospel account in the light of the early rabbinic

---

[211] Cf. also a geographical commentary to all the mentions of Caesarea Philippi's neighborhood in the New Testament and the early rabbinic literature in J. F. Wilson, *Caesarea Philippi: Banias, the Lost City of Pan*, London—New York: I. B. Tauris, 2004, 73–84.

[212] D. J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot. Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988, 289–358, esp. 336, 342–344, including a discussion, beside Jewish sources, Origen's *Homilies on Ezekiel*, where Origen refers to a similar exegesis of Ps 67(68).

[213] Cf. W. Hall Harris III, *The Descent of Christ: Ephesians 4:7-11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 32; Leiden: Brill, 1996.

traditions about the locality. We have, at least, two important witnesses attributed to rabbis of the second century. They are to be interpreted against each another.

> The disciples of R. Jose b. Kisma asked him, 'When will the Messiah come?' — He answered, 'I fear lest ye demand a sign (אות) of me [that my answer is correct].' They assured him, 'We will demand no sign of you.' So he answered them, 'When this gate[214] falls down, is rebuilt, falls again, and is again rebuilt, and then falls a third time, before it can be rebuilt the son of David will come.' They said to him, 'Master, give us a sign.' He protested, 'Did ye not assure me that ye would not demand a sign?' They replied, 'Even so, [we desire one].' He said to them. 'if so, let the waters of the grotto of Paneas turn into blood;' and they turned into blood (אם כך יהפכו מי מערת פמייס לדם ונהפכו לדם).[215]

The waters of the grotto of Paneas (a cavern at the foot of the Mt Hermon) are the waters of the Jordan. The spring near this grotto was considered as one of the sources of the Jordan or even its principal source. The text is about the messianic signs, and the principal of them (and the only performed) turns out to be that of water transformed into blood. This is obviously the tradition going back to Ps 67(68) (at least, in its Second Temple period interpretation) and shared with the Gospel of John, especially with its narrative of the "first/principal" sign at Cana.

Localisation of the initial scene of the Gospel of John at the spring of the grotto of Paneas does not cause any problem, providing that the exact localisation of the place mentioned in 10:40 at 15–20 km south would imply still the same "district." The grotto of Paneas and its spring form a park adjacent to Caesarea Philippi on the north, less than 500 m from the Cardo (the central street of the city, now archaeologically investigated). The archaeological site of the spring is still not studied completely, but probably there was here a great cistern with water supply from the spring—a construction analogues to the Siloam in Jerusalem.[216] A hypothesis that this was the precise locale where John was baptizing seems to me very plausible, especially in the light of the role of Herod Philip in the life of John the Baptist (Mt 14:3-12 // Mk 6:17-29 // Lk 3:19-20). The northern direction of Jesus' flight from Judea is normally explained with Philip's tolerance toward him. Philip's tetrarchy was a safe place for Jesus.[217]

Anyway, it is the area of the upper reaches of Jordan, be it precisely the grotto of Paneas or not, that had a very specific messianic meaning. It is partially clarified with our second rabbinic witness.

> R. Joshua (*sc*., b. Hananiah, d. 131) explains God's words to Moses from Deut 3:26 ("And the Lord said unto me: Let it suffice thee") with a following midrash. Moses was not content with the world to come only; he was making a series of petitions to God to be allowed to enter the Holy Land – if not as a king, then, at least, as a private man,—but in vain. Thus, Moses said unto God: "Lord of the world, since the decree has been issued that I should enter (אכנס) it neither as a king nor as a private man, let me then enter (אכנס) it by the cave of Caesarion which is below Paneas." God answered with Deut 34:4 ("But thou shalt not go over thither"). "Then Moses said before Him: Lord of the world, since the decree against me is that I should enter it neither as king, nor as a private man, and not even by the cave of Caesarion which is below Paneas, then let my bones at least go over [*or* cross: יעברו] the Jordan. But He said to him: 'For thou shalt not go over [*or* cross: תעבור] this Jordan' (Deut 3:27)."[218]

John Francis Wilson noticed Moses' point: "Moses's culminating argument seems to be that he will not have technically 'crossed' the Jordan if he enters the Promised Land by skirting

---

[214] The gate of Caesarea Philippi, the home of R. Jose.

[215] *bSanhedrin* 98a, Soncino tr.

[216] Wilson, *Caesarea Philippi…*, 10: "It is likely that the waters flowing from the cave via the arched passageway were captured in some sort of 'sacred pool' outside the cave as well, situated approximately where the springs burst forth today."

[217] Cf., in addition to the literature related to the northern localisation of the Baptist's activity, a discussion of the NT data related to Philip in, e.g., . Strickert, *Philip's City…*

[218] *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, *Amalek*, 2; J. Z. Lauterbach, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. A Critical Edition, Based on the Manuscripts and Early Editions, with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes*, vol. 2, JPS Classic Reissues; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, ^{2}2004, 264–265 (the Hebrew text on the facing pages with the same numbers).

the northern edge of the springs of Banias."[219] Indeed, this argument is understandable in the light of Deut 3:27 referred to shortly after, where the key word "to cross" is eventually used.

Moses was not allowed not only to cross but even to get round the Jordan. But Jesus did. He went through this way—or this gate—forbidden to Moses but prepared for the New Moses, the Messiah, as we have been already told by R. Jose b. Kisma.

The saying of R. Jose b. Kisma seems to give us the key to the riddle of Jesus' return to the initial point of his route just before reaching its final point. This is certainly not a phenomenon of "shuttle trajectory" resulting from mixing of two different sources: Jesus' retirement to the north forms the spatiotemporal frame of the sixth sign, and so, belongs to the signs narrative. The saying of R. Jose is very close to the tradition represented with the signs narrative (and is itself a narrative about signs). Therefore, such particularity as a threefold coming of messianic figure(s) from the north (where the gate has to fall down three times, thus, obviously, somebody has to pass through this entrance) is, most probably, also an element of the tradition shared with the Gospel of John.

This tradition has an Enochic background. George Nickelsburg noticed a connexion between the allusion to the Ladder of Jacob in Jn 1:51 and the descent of the watchers on the Mt Hermon in 1Enoch 6:6: the latter "... suggests Genesis 28. Jacob sleeps at Bethel (later the companion shrine to Dan) and finds that it is 'the gate of heaven,' where the angels descend and ascend between heaven and earth."[220] The threefold entrance from the north is, however, a further tradition, already related to the messianic signs, attested to by R. Jose b. Kisma. We have to conclude that Jesus' return to the starting point of his journey was needed to fulfil the number three of the messianic entrances. However, we will continue the discussion of the number of Jesus' entrances later (section 19.10).

Thus, the Enochic tradition in the Gospel of John is perceivable not only indirectly through the Petrine tradition (1:40-42) but also directly through the northern localisation of the initial point of Jesus' route.

Jesus appeared and is witnessed by John the Baptist near the place of the Enochic gate of heaven. Then, he fulfils the two remaining, after Enoch, entrances of the Messiah into the Holy Land through the gate of Caesarea Philippi.

17.6. Resurrection of Lazarus as the Fall of Jericho and Prefiguration of the End of the World. The early Christian exegesis preserves an interpretation of the resurrection of Lazarus as the fall of Jericho. The principal witnesses are Origen and Hesychius of Jerusalem.

Origen elaborates on the classical (especially after his own other commentaries) imagery of Jericho as a symbol of the present world.[221] Then, he continues an interpretation of the fall of Jericho as the end of this world with an accent on the resurrection:

> Haec ergo Hiericho, id est mundus hic, casurus est; consummatio etenim saeculi iam dudum sanctis voluminibus pervulgata est. Quomodo ergo ei consummatio dabitur? Quibus organis? Vocibus, inquit, tubarum. Quarum tubarum? Paulus tibi secreti huius prodat arcanum; audi, ipse quid dicit: *Canet*, inquit, *tuba, et mortui, qui in Christo sunt, resurgent incorrupti* [1 Cor 15:52], et: *Ipse Dominus in iussu, in voce archangeli et in tuba Dei descendet de coelo* [1 Thes 4:16]. Tunc ergo Iesus Dominus noster [Jesus, not Joshua! — *B. L.*] cum tubis vincit Hiericho et prosternit eam, ita ut ex ea meretrix sola salvetur et omnis domus eius.[222]

---

[219] Wilson, *Caesarea Philippi…*, 76.

[220] Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter…," 584.

[221] See the references to the parallels in other works by Origen in, e.g., W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke.* Bd 7.: *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*, Teil 2.: *Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices*, GCS, 30; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1921, 325, and A. Jaubert, Origène, *Homélies sur Josué. Texte latin, introduction, traduction et notes*, SC 71; Paris: Cerf, 1960, 188–189, n. 1.

[222] Origen, *Homilies on Joshua*, VI, 4; 326.3-12 Baehrens = Jaubert, Origène, *Homélies sur Josué*, 190. Jaubert's tr.: "Or, cette ville de Jéricho, c'est-à-dire le monde où nous sommes, doit s'effondrer. Car depuis longtemps les livres saints ont annoncé la fin du monde. Et comment lui viendra la fin ? Par la voix des trompettes, dit l'Écriture. De quelles trompettes ? Que Paul t'ouvre les arcanes de ce secret ; écoute ses propres paroles : « La trompette sonnera et ceux qui sont morts dans le Christ, ressusciteront incorruptibles », et encore : « au commandement et à la voix de l'Archange, au son de la trompette divine, le Seigneur lui-même descendra du ciel ».

Origen stresses, with a mention of Jesus, that the fall of Jericho under Joshua is a prefiguration of the salvation of those who died in Christ by Jesus. The mention of Rahab the harlot and her family evokes a parallel with Lazarus and his family.[223]

The mention of the "voice" of the archangel, not only the trumpets—although presenting in Paul's words only and not commented by Origen—is also of importance. Paul was alluding to shouting of the people when the seventh circumambulation of Jericho was finished (Josh 6:20: ὡς δὲ ἤκουσεν ὁ λαὸς τὴν **φωνὴν** τῶν σαλπίγγων ἠλάλαξεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἅμα ἀλαλαγμῷ **μεγάλῳ** καὶ ἰσχυρῷ... "As soon as the people heard the sound of the trumpets, they raised a great shout..."). Compare the wording of Jn 11:43: καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν **φωνῇ μεγάλῃ** ἐκραύγασεν Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω. In all the three cases—Paul in 1Thes 4:16, the book of Joshua, and the scene of the resurrection of Lazarus—the goal achieved not immediately after the blows but only after some word(s) cried with a loud voice (respectively, by the archangel, the people, and Jesus).

The Lazarus narrative does not contain explicitly seven circumambulations but it does contain them twice on different levels of the calendrical scheme. At first, the event takes place on the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath. Secondly, this Sabbath is the seventh Sabbath of our liturgical cycle. The last sign falls on the last Sabbath of signs (although this is not the last Sabbath of the 60-day cycle as a whole). The seventh Sabbath is, in different liturgical cycles, always marked as the most solemn, and so, its sign is, in the Gospel, the most spectacular.

This calendrical symbolism is traceable in the Jewish tradition as well, where the fall of Jericho is always understood as taking place on the Sabbath (implying that the first day of the circumambulations was the first day of the week), which gives a pretext for a number of discussions on the halachic matters, some of them being continued even among Christian exegetes.[224]

The connexion between the trumpets of Jericho and the resurrection of the dead is explicit also in Hesychius of Jerusalem, who is a principal witness of the Jerusalem liturgical traditions of the first half of the fifth century. These traditions incorporated a good deal of Jewish-Christian heritage "reactivated" in the tradition of the official Jerusalem Church by the archbishop of Jerusalem John II (387–417).[225] Hesychius calls alluding to the trumpets of Jericho:

> «Σαλπίσατε», ἵνα τῇ φωνῇ τὸν ἐχθρὸν καταλάβητε καὶ τῆς νοητῆς Ἰεριχὼ τὰ τείχη καταστρέψητε. Ὁ ἦχος εἰς ὦτα κωφῶν εἰσέλθοι, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείροι τοὺς ἴσα θανάτῳ τὸν βαρὺν ὕπνον τῆς ἁμαρτίας καθεύδοντας.[226]

This world falls, and the dead arise. A prefiguration of the common resurrection is the meaning of the resurrection of Lazarus—even in a greater extent than a proof of the imminent resurrection of Jesus. It is not incidentally that Martha said to Jesus "I know that he will rise

---

C'est alors qu'au son des trompettes notre Seigneur Jésus triomphe de Jéricho et sa victoire est si accablante que seule sera sauvée du désastre la courtisane et toute sa maison" (*ibid.*, 191).

[223] I avoid here a discussion of possible identity between Maria in 12:3 and one of the harlots who anointed Jesus' foots according to the Synoptic Gospels. Such a discussion goes back to early patristic authors whose opinions were divided. Anyway, its future student will have to take into account this parallel with Rahab.

[224] Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, 845 and the long n. 22, p. 846–847, where, along with Jewish sources, Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*) and Ps.-Tertullian (*Adv. Iudaeos*, 4) are discussed. Among other Christian exegetes is, e.g., John Chrysostom, *Homilies in the Gospel of John*, 38, 2; *PG* 59, 214.14-15.

[225] Cf. M. van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984) 99–134.

[226] Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Homily VII, In sanctum Andream*, 1; M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem.* Vol. 1. *Les homélies I–XV*, Subsidia hagiographica, 59; Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1978, 240.14-17; tr.: " « Sonnez de la trompette », afin que par cette sonnerie vous surpreniez l'ennemi et renversiez les murailles de la Jéricho spirituelle. Que son bruit parvienne aux oreilles des sourds, qu'il ressuscite d'entre les morts ceux qui dorment, comme dans une mort, du lourd sommeil du péché" (*ibid.*, 241).

again in the resurrection on the last day" (11:24). The seventh Sabbath is a prefiguration of this "last day."

The earliest Christian witness of this tradition is however the book of Revelation (another work traditionally considered as a Johannine one, although this attribution is disputable[227]). The eschatological fall of Babylon at the seventh trumpet blow is patterned after the fall of Jericho.[228]

Obviously, this interpretation of Lazarus' resurrection is, in turn, important for understanding the meaning of the resurrection of Jesus according to the author of the "signs narrative." I will, however, refrain from elaborating on this because such a task would require an interpretation of the whole Passion narrative.

17.7. Conclusion. The sixth sign has a particular importance for verifying our working hypothesis. It corresponds to the seventh Sabbath and its narrative passes through the 49th day of the cycle. These seven in the square dates are always the most important points of any Sabbatical liturgical cycle. Indeed, we have obtained now that these dates correspond to the final sign, and that this final sign corresponds to the final event in the world history. The liturgical interpretation of the Lazarus narrative was obtained without recourse to the working hypothesis, and so, is an independent confirmation of the latter.

18. The Meaning of the Signs

18.1. The Signs and Hardening of the Heart of the Collective New Pharaoh. The narrative directly related to the signs is concluded with the passage 12:37-43, whose opening verse is "Although he had performed so many signs (σημεῖα) in their presence, they did not believe in him" (12:37). Its original place must be somewhere not so far from the last sign, the scene of the resurrection of Lazarus. Its present connexion with the passage related to the "Hellenes" ("God-fearers" from Gentiles; 12:20-36) forms a context for Isaiah 6:9-10 quoted in 12:40, where the Isaiah's prophecy could be interpreted not only in the sense of rejection of the obdurate Jews[229] but also of allusion to the calling of the Gentiles.

Now we know that the passage 12:37-43 concludes the account about the signs of the New Exodus. The verse 12:37, as John L. Ronning noticed, echoes Numb 14:11 "how long will they not believe in me in spite of all the signs which I have performed in their midst...," and this similarity is further theologically expressed in the targums, where "not believe in me" became "not believe in my Memra (Onqelos, Ps.-Jonathan)" or "in the name of my Memra (בשם ממרי)" (Neofiti I), in accordance with John's identification of Jesus as the Logos of God.[230]

Gospel's recourse to Isaiah 6:9-10 must be interpreted in accordance with the Exodic background of the Book of Isaiah itself. The motive of the New Exodus, which becomes the leitmotif of the Deutero-Isaian part of the book (ch. 40–55), is introduced already in the calling

---

[227] Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, attributes the Gospel of John to John the Elder, the traditional author of the Book of Revelation.

[228] R. Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy. Studies on the Book of Revelation*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993, 205: "To his account of the fall of Babylon many Old Testament nations and cities have contributed: Egypt, Babylon, Tyre, Edom, the cities of Plain. But when in 16:19 (and also in 11:13) he described the fall of Babylon in an earthquake, he could have had none of these precedents in mind. If he had an Old Testament precedent it could only have been Jericho. There is some reason to suppose that the fall of Jericho may have played a part in his composition, though there are no verbal allusions. The sevenfold circuit of Jericho, the seven trumpets and the multiplication of the seventh circuit by seven, the ark accompanying the march (cf. Rev 11:19; 16:17), all suggest parallels with John's trumpet and bowl visions. Perhaps also his thought ran ahead from the fall of Jericho to the rain of great hailstones on the Amorites (Josh 10:11)." Cf. further A. J. P. Garrow, *Revelation*, New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1997, 22–24.

[229] Cf. C. A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*, JSOTSup, 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989, 129–135. On the form of quotation (a mix from LXX and an otherwise unknown Greek tr.) s. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel...*, ch. VI "'He Has Blinded Their Eyes...' (John 12:40)," p. 99–122 [first publ. 1988].

[230] Ronning, *The Jewish Targums...*, pages!

narrative in Isaiah 6:1-10.[231] The importance of the Isaianic tradition of the New Exodus has been recently studied for Luke–Acts,[232] but it is of importance for the Gospel of John, too.

Thus, the Gospel's reference to Isaiah is an indirect reference to the Book of Exodus, namely, to the motive of hardening of the heart of Pharaoh.[233] The purpose of Isaiah as an intermediary is obvious: through Isaiah, the historical account of Exodus is transformed into a prophecy, whose fulfilment is described in the Gospel. Thus, the implicit prophecy of an historical account becomes explicit, and so, more readable and emphasised.

In the Hebrew Bible, the hardening motive has a rather precise basic meaning related to the meaning of "sign": "Hardening was the vocabulary used by the biblical writers to describe the resistance which prevented the signs from achieving their assigned task."[234] Most often, this resistance was interpreted as caused by God directly, without any contribution of the human free will, but, however, after some evil deeds performed with the full consent of one's free will. The door of repentance could turn out to be closed even before one's physical death.

The same situation is in the Book of Isaiah: "...in Isa. 6,9-10 divine hardening is presented as the means of ensuring punishment for past sins by preventing repentance."[235]

In the Fourth Gospel, we see the same meaning of the hardening motive with the same relation to the signs. The obduracy of the unbelievers—but especially the Pharisees and chief priests (cf. 11:56-57)—described in 12:37-43, which prevented them from understanding Jesus' signs, is explained as a result of hardening of their hearts caused directly by God. The spiritual leaders of the Jewish nation are, thus, depicted as a collective Pharaoh and spiritual enslavers of Israel—but they are already condemned by God. The New Passover is prepared: the Pharisees and chief priests will act the part of the Pharaoh and his army, whereas Jesus and his disciples will act the part of Moses and the people of God.

This explanation of the actions of Jesus' enemies is certainly a part of the signs narrative, because it goes back to the Book of Exodus, as well as the signs themselves.[236]

Thus, the signs narrative already presumed that Jesus started to act, like Moses, in a situation where some part of the Israelites (viz. "truly Israelites"; cf. Jn 1:47) was (religiously) oppressed by the Jewish official leaders, while a part of the Jewish people that was loyal to the official religious authorities and, therefore, was considered by the former part as beneficiaries of this oppression (like the Egyptians). This is the situation of an intra-Jewish religious conflict and not a situation of the conflict between the Judaism *in toto* and the emerging Christianity. Such a conclusion is in accordance with Jaubert's and some others' general view on the Christian origins[237] and especially with Daniel Boyarin's understanding of the Gospel of John and the Johannine usage of the term Ἰουδαῖοι.[238] The history of the latter term, as it is presented by

---

[231] J. L. McLaughlin, "Their Hearts *Were* Hardened: The Use of Isaiah 6,9-10 in the Book of Isaiah," *Biblica* 75 (1994) 1–25; cf. *ibid.*, 7, for Moses typology of the calling of Isaiah, including the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh reflected in Is 6:9-10.

[232] D. W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, WUNT 2.130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

[233] This is not to say that a secondary association with Deut 29:1-3 (LXX 2-4) (hardening of the Jews analogous to the previous hardening of the Pharaoh) is to be excluded. Cf. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 485; Evans, *To See and Not Perceive...*, 50.

[234] Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 170–175 (Excursus I, The Hardening of Pharaoh), here 174. Childs believes that, among the sources of the Exodus, Yahwist does not share Elohist's and Priestly Source's conviction that the hardening is caused directly by God.

[235] McLaughlin, "Their Hearts *Were* Hardened...," 9.

[236] D. Moody Smith in his text-critical study concluded that 12:37-40 and possibly 41 have the same *Sitz im Leben* as "the sign material": D. M. Smith, "The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source," *JBL* 95 (1976) 231–241, here 240 [repr. in idem, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on Its Setting, Sources, and Theology*, London—New York: T&T Clark, ^{2}2006, 80–93, here 92].

[237] E.g., Ch. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*, London: SPCK, 1982; D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

[238] D. Boyarin, "The Ioudaioi in John and the Prehistory of 'Judaism,'" in J. C. Anderson, Ph. Sellew, and C. Setzer (eds.), *Pauline Conversations in Context: Essays in Honor of Calvin J. Roetzel*, JSNTSup, 221; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 216–239. Cf., most recently and, to my taste, most conclusive, a development of

Boyarin and Bennema, leads to the conclusion that the same intra-Jewish conflict was lying behind those parts of the present Gospel of John that I consider as going back to the feasts narrative, where "the festivals of Jews" were presented as the feasts of an adversary religious group.

18.2. The Liturgical Meaning of the Sabbath as the Principal Sign. It is clear from our analysis that the signs are mostly oriented to the Moses' signs related to the Exodus. This result was to be expected judging from the previous studies.[239] Beside this, there is some less trivial knowledge.

One can see that our "sources" narrative is constructed on a very literal understanding of Ex 31:13: "You yourself are to speak to the Israelites: 'You shall keep my Sabbaths, for this is a sign (אות / σημεῖον)[240] between me and you throughout your generations, that you may know that I, the Lord, sanctify you." This verse explains the origin of our liturgical cycle where each "sign" is assigned to a Sabbath. The Sabbath itself is interpreted as a "sign," if not *the* "sign": the principal sign of the Covenant.

19. The Eighth Sabbath of the Liturgical Cycle: the Sabbath of New Covenant

19. 1. A Week "Lost and Found." Our liturgical cycle presupposes 60 days. This is less than nine weeks but this period contains nine Sabbaths. The last Sabbath is that of the Passover, and the first seven Sabbaths are described above. The eighth Sabbath is somewhat mysterious because the traditional understanding of the Gospel chronology puts the resurrection of Lazarus at the Sabbath preceding that of the Passover, and, therefore, considers the entrance into Jerusalem as falling on Sunday after the Saturday of Lazarus. This chronology is incompatible with our reconstructed liturgical cycle. Fortunately, it is incompatible with the Gospel text, either.

Above (section 17.1), we have discussed the break in the narrative between the resurrection of Lazarus and the date "six days before the Passover" in 12:1. After having resurrected Lazarus, Jesus escaped to the town Ephraim (11:54), laying about 24–26 km from Jerusalem. It was physically possible to travel to Ephraim during the night following the resurrection of Lazarus and to be back in Jerusalem to the next day's evening, but such a journey would leave absolutely no place for "abiding with disciples" in Ephraim (11:54: κἀκεῖ ἔμεινεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν).

Nevertheless, 12:1 implies a Sunday (six days before the Passover which falls on Saturday). This Sunday opens the Passion Week, but it is not the Sunday following the Sabbath of Lazarus. Therefore, both the Fourth Gospel and our reconstructed liturgical cycle imply an additional week between that of Lazarus and that of the Passion.

This "additional" week provokes a salient question about its meaning: we have no more signs to fill it.

19.2. Ephraim as a Substitute of Shiloh: the Shiloh arriving from Shiloh. Facing the necessity to fill an "extra" Sabbath with some remarkable scene, we have to ask, first of all,

---

Boyarin's approach in Cornelis Bennema, "The Identity and Composition of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in the Gospel of John," *Tyndale Bulletin* 60 (2009) 239–263. Cf. Bennema's conclusion: "...οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in the Gospel of John are a particular religious group within Judaism—the (strict) Torah- and temple-loyalists who are mainly located in Jerusalem and Judaea but could also have been present in Galilee. Their leaders consist of the chief priests who had the power of control and policymaking, and the Pharisees who had the 'power' of influence. We argued that John had a single referent in mind—albeit the referent is a composite group which does not present a uniform response. Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι as a group is and remains hostile towards Jesus, but it is also divided about him and some individual Ἰουδαῖοι were able to express sympathy and even belief in Jesus—though not always in the full Johannine sense" (*ibid.*, 262).

[239] See esp. W. J. Bittner, *Jesu Zeichen im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT 2.26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987, 284, 289.

[240] Among the targums, Onqelos avoids this term at all, Ps.-Jonathan uses את (as well as Peshitta: ܐܬ), whereas the Neofiti I uses a loanword from Greek סימן.

whether still remains a fitting scene in the part of the book of Joshua corresponding to the period after the seizure of Jericho. It is obviously the scene of the assembly in Shechem, where Joshua delivered his farewell sermon (Josh 24:1-29).

In the Septuagint, this scene takes place not in Shechem but in Shiloh (Josh 24:1,25 LXX is at variance with MT, TgJonathan, Peshitta). This difference is normally considered as theologically grounded. The mainstream hypothesis attributes this relocalisation to the Greek translator, although a difference between the Hebrew original of the Septuagint and the Masoretic text is not completely excluded.[241] Anyway, the Septuagint represents a Jewish tradition and not an arbitrary invention of the translator.

It is Shiloh and not Shechem which will be interesting to us as the locale of Josh 24:1-29, as it could be seen from the following messianic "sacred geography."

Shiloh, whose site is identified with Khirbet Seilun, lies in the Ephraim hill-country (biblical Mount Ephraim) in several miles (5–7 km) from the town Ephraim mentioned in 11:54, almost exactly on the half-way between Jerusalem and Shechem (40 miles, or 64 km; Shiloh lies on the distance of 20 miles = about 32 km). In Judg 21:19 Shiloh's location is described in relation to Shechem and the nearby shrine of Bethel: "a place which is on the north side of Bethel, on the east of the highway that goes up from Bethel to Shechem..." To the Second Temple period, two kinds of traditions related to Shiloh survived: the northern tradition completely positive toward Shiloh as a former place of the Ark of Covenant and the Jerusalem tradition insisting that Shiloh was rejected (cf. Ps 77(78):60).[242]

Geographically Shiloh and Ephraim are very close to each other. If Jesus abode in Ephraim, he could easily visit Shiloh, or, alternatively, Ephraim itself could be considered as a locale belonging to Shiloh.

Shiloh, according to the Gospel of John and unlike the Synoptics, has a direct relation to the Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (12:12-18). As well as Mt 21:5, John (12:15) presents this entry as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah (Zech 9:9). However, John's quotation of Zech 9:9 has a peculiar form which differs from all known variants of both Zech 9:9 and Mt 21:5 and is independent from Matthew. His quotation from Zechariah is edited in order to include a reference to Gen 49:11 LXX, whose πῶλον τῆς ὄνου (itself not a quite adequate translation of בְּנִי אֲתֹנוֹ, lit. "his male child of a she-ass") is quoted in John 12:15 as πῶλον ὄνου, and this phrase does not occur in either Zechariah or Matthew.[243] Thus, by a lucky accident that the author of our source was writing in Greek, we obtained a key for further understanding of the entry into Jerusalem scene: there is certainly Jacob's prophecy on Judah in its background, and the quoted words from Gen 49:11 are evocative for the whole prophecy. However, it is not the Greek text of the book of Genesis that is meant in the scene itself described in the Greek Gospel.

In Hebrew, the passage was normally read as containing a prophecy about the messianic figure called Shiloh (49:12): "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until Shiloh comes to him ((שִׁילוֹ) עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה)); and the obedience of the peoples is his." Reading שילה "Shiloh" as שלו "which belongs to him" underlies the translations of the Septuagint (ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ "until there come the things stored up for him") and the Peshitta (having here variants but with an exact rendering of שלו as ܕܠܗ). Both readings "Shiloh" and "which belongs to him" are rendered in the targums, but, in the targums as well as in the whole rabbinic tradition, the messianic reading is normative and omnipresent, whereas the readings related to Hebrew שלו are additional. A messianic midrash on the Genesis 4Q252, fr. 6,

[241] Cf. W. T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative*, JSOTSup, 93; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990, 259–261 *et passim*.

[242] See D. G. Schley, *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History*, JSOTSup, 63; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

[243] Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel...*, ch. V "'Do Not Fear, Daughter Zion...' (John 12:15)," p. 79–98 [first publ. 1989].

also contains a messianic interpretation of Gen 49:10.[244] The targums render "Shiloh" as "Messiah (מְשִׁיחָא)" (Onqelos) or "King Messiah (מלכא משיחא or מלכא דמשיחא)" (Ps.-Jonathan, Neofiti I, and two fragmentary targums).[245]

The whole prophecy about Judah is fitting perfectly with the entry into Jerusalem of a messianic king Jesus (Gen 49:9-12), exactly as Jesus was met by the crowd, and points toward the death and resurrection of Jesus using the symbolism of wine/blood:

> [9] Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, you have gone up. He crouches down, he stretches out like a lion, like a lioness—who dares rouse him up? [10] The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until Shiloh comes; and the obedience of the peoples is his. [11] Binding his foal to the vine and his donkey's colt to the choice vine, he washes his garments in wine and his robe in the blood of grapes; [12] his eyes are darker than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk.

The Christian tradition of the exegesis of this prophecy is, of course, immense. It was not so obvious, however, that it was already implied in the Fourth Gospel.

Thus, the scene of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem with its Jacob's prophecy on Judah in background excludes that the place of Jesus' departure for Jerusalem, the town Ephraim, was chosen by accidence. It is certainly Shiloh, identified with its neighbouring town Ephraim in one or another way.

Given that there is a Jewish tradition (Septuagint) locating the farewell discourse of Joshua at Shiloh instead of Shechem, we have an additional and powerful reason to look at it more attentively. However, our comparative material from the Fourth Gospel must be—first of all, even though not exclusively—the farewell discourse of Jesus, which is a part of the Passion Week narrative. Thus, it becomes unavoidable to take some position concerning the chronology of the Passion Week.

19.3. The "Longest" Chronology of the Last Week(s) of Jesus. It is hardly possible to detach the farewell discourse of Jesus from the narrative of the supper with footwashing. If so, we have to consider a possibility that this supper took place, according to the signs source, before the Passion Week. In fact, such a possibility has been recently defended by Étienne Nodet, whose argumentation primary deals with the "historical Jesus" but, secondary, with the Gospel of John, which turns out to be, according to Nodet, closer to the historical reality than the Synoptics.[246] We have to review some of the arguments by Nodet and, first of all, their cornerstone, the account on Jesus in the Slavonic version of the *Jewish War* by Flavius Josephus.

Indeed, in the Slavonic Josephus, Jesus was at first arrested and released by Pilate but, then, was arrested second time and condemned, by Pilate, only several days later (Slavonic *War*, "addition" after 2:174); in between, Jesus had a time to preach to the crowds in his "familiar place" on the Mount of Olives.[247]

The key words, for us, are those which define the duration of the time interval between the two arrests: "And he went to the usual place [*variant reading*: usual (*pl.*) places] and performed his usual deeds. And [once] again, as more people gathered around him, he became

---

[244] A detailed review of the available data is presented by Emmanouela Grypeou and Helen Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity: Encounters between Jewish and Christian Exegesis*, Jewish and Christian perspectives series, 24; Leiden: Brill, 2013, here 376–379.

[245] According to the database of *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*, the phrase is preserved in these five targums.

[246] É. Nodet, "On Jesus' last week(s)," *Biblica* 92 (2011) 204–230.

[247] Critical edition (which replaced Meščerskij's 1958 critical edition): А. А. Пичхадзе, И. И. Макеева, Г. С. Баранкова, А. А. Уткин, *«История Иудейской войны» Иосифа Флавия. Древнерусский перевод* [A. A. Pichkhadze, I. I. Makeeva, G. S. Barankova, A. A. Utkin, *"The History of the Jewish War" by Josephus Flavius. The Old Russian Translation*], 2 vols., Памятники славяно-русской письменности, новая серия; Moscow: Jazyki Slavjanskoj Kul'tury, 2004, vol. 1, 163–164. English tr. (from Meščerskij's edition): H. Leeming, K. Leeming (eds.), *Josephus'* Jewish War *and Its Slavonic Version. A Synoptic Comparison of the English Translation by H. St. J. Tackeray with the Critical Edition by N. A. Meščerskij of the Slavonic Version in the Vilna Manuscript translated into English by H. Leeming and L. Osinkina*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 46; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2003, 261–262.

renowned for his works more than all [others].”[248] That the place meant is the Mount of Olives is clear from a phrase above: “But it was his habit rather to remain in front of the city on the Mount of Olives.”[249] The time interval implied in this passage is not less than several days, three or more.

The two different trials by Pilate reported in the canonical Gospels as well, are, in the Slavonic Josephus, separated with a perceivable, even though imprecise, amount of days, for which, as Nodet points out, even the “long chronology” advocated by Jaubert would be not enough (that is, the Last Supper on Tuesday evening and the arrest the following night). The Gospel of John localise the two trials by Pilate at different places (*praetorium* in 18:28 but Gabbatha in 19:13), which does not accord with the “short” chronology placing the two trials in immediate succession but fits well the chronology of the Slavonic Josephus.

Nodet defends the thesis that the Slavonic version preserves the earlier Greek edition of the *War*, whose existence is witnessed by Josephus himself but which was considered as being lost; in the final edition, Josephus, according to Nodet, purged his favourable accounts related to Jesus’ and John the Baptist’s movements wishing to avoid an association with these “troublemakers.”[250] For our study even a weaker thesis would be sufficient: that the Slavonic “additions” to the Greek Josephus, even if interpolated in a later (or even much later) epoch, preserve an ancient material contemporary to the canonical Gospels.[251] I consider that, at least, one of these two hypotheses is true, because the text of “additions” is certainly neither Byzantine nor Slavonic. It is especially unbelievable that a Byzantine or, *a fortiori*, Slavic interpolator would invent himself two different trials of Jesus by Pilates separated with a period of several days. Such a contradiction to all known traditions about the Passion chronology would contribute, in the eyes of any mediaeval Christian audience, to destroying Josephus’ credibility.[252] Given that an important part of the Jewish heritage preserved by the Christians and lost by the rabbinic Judaism (especially pseudepigraphic traditions) subsists only in Slavonic, even though the Slavs received it from Byzantium, there is nothing strange if a rare edition of Josephus’ *War* subsists, too, only in Slavonic. Regardless of such questions as genuineness of the “additions” and historicity of their contents, we are authorised to conclude that they preserve some ancient traditions about Jesus alternative to the present canonical Gospels.

Nodet’s study deals with the “historical Jesus,” and so, he tries to harmonize the Slavonic Josephus with three other traditions: the Synoptic Passion chronology (accepting its Jaubert’s reconstruction with Jesus’ Passover falling on Tuesday evening but rejecting Jaubert’s conviction that the Last Supper was Jesus’ Passover rite), the Johannine Passion narrative, and 1 Cor 11:23 (“the Lord Jesus, on the night when he was handed over, took bread...”).[253] We have a

---

[248] Text (in a simplified orthography): и шед на обычное место [*variant reading* обычная места], и обычная дела делаше. и пакы бóлшым людем съвокупляющимся окрест его, и славляшеся своим творением паче всех (p. 164). English translation is adapted from Leeming, Leeming, *Josephus’* Jewish War..., 262.

[249] Text: обычаи же ему бысть пред градом в Елеонстеи горе паче пребывати (p. 163); English tr., p. 261.

[250] See Appendix II in the English edition of É. Nodet, *The Historical Jesus?* Tr. E. J. Crowley, London: Continuum, 2008, 223–237 (absent in the original French 2003 edition).

[251] As it was proposed, among others, by Felix Scheidweiler, “Sind die Interpolationen im altrussischen Josephus wertlos?,” *ZNW* 43 (1951) 155–178. Scheidweiler came to the conclusion (p. 178) that “…wir den Niederschlag einer Schrift aus der Zeit des Josephus selbst vor uns haben, welche die jüdische Geschichte von einem anderen Standpunkt bearbeitete als Josephus und diesem nicht freundlich gesonnen war. Wie derartiges in die Hand des byzantinischen Interpolators kam, auf dessen Ausgabe die altrussische Übersetzung fußt, das entzieht sich allerdings unserer Kenntnis.”

[252] It is symptomatic that those scholars, who, in Solomon Zeitlin’s hypercritical fashion (cf., e.g., S. Zeitlin, “The Hoax of ‘Slavonic Josephus,’” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 39 (1948) 171–180) date the Slavonic “additions” to a mediaeval epoch, fail to explain the purpose of the so peculiar chronology of the Passion; cf. a review of the scholarship by Louis H. Feldman, “A Selective Critical Bibliography of Josephus,” in L. H. Feldman, G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, Detroyt: Wayne State UP, 1989, 330–348, here 339–340.

[253] In this way, he arrives to the following chronology (Nodet, “On Jesus’ Last Week(s),” 215–216): (1) “Saturday evening: possibly at Bethany after the anointing, the rite of bread and wine, with similarities to the Eucharistic rite. Judas is provoked.” (2) “Arrest that night by soldiers and Jewish officers, led by Judas.” (3)

more modest task to understand the Johannine narrative *per se*, using the Slavonic Josephus only as a witness of possibility, for an ancient biographer of Jesus, of the "longest" chronology, where the farewell discourse of Jesus would have pronounced no later than at the last Sabbath before the Sabbath of the Passover.

19.4. The Original Place of 12:20-36 and 12:37-43. Now we have to look backward at the passages already dealt with above (section 18.1). In the present Gospel's text, where the solemn entry into Jerusalem forms an almost immediate continuation of the resurrection of Lazarus, the passage 12:37-43 together with the previous passage 12:20-36 (dealing with the converts from the Gentiles) are placed into the context of the meeting of Jesus in Jerusalem without ceasing to be summing up of the results of Jesus' signs. However, if we accept the chronology proposed above, the natural place of 12:20-36 and especially of 12:37-43 is one week earlier: at the end of the resurrection of Lazarus scene.

12:20-23 describe a situation when some specific group of people (the "Hellenes") needs to search Jesus, which is certainly not the context of the entry into Jerusalem, where Jesus was met by the crowds and seen by everybody. Such a situation is quite understandable on the day following Lazarus' resurrection, but only providing that this day is not that of the entry into Jerusalem. Thus, the Sunday after the Sabbath of Lazarus seems to me the most natural place for 12:20-36. The later editor did not succeed in replacing this scene into the context of the solemn entry into Jerusalem smoothly. The conclusion of the signs account, 12:37-43, was the immediate continuation of 12:20-36, as it now is, but, in this case, standing before the entry into Jerusalem.

This conclusion does not contradict to those who insist that the whole material of 12:20-50 makes a perfect sense on its present position. It is only to say that this later "perfect sense" is not the original but not less perfect sense.

19.5. The Synoptic Last Supper and the Gospel of John. There are a great number of parallels between the Synoptic accounts on the Last Supper and John's account of the supper with the washing of feet. The two traditions, even though being independent, go back to the same scene in reality, but there is a problem. All these parallels cover only the content of the farewell discourse and have absolutely nothing common in the matter of rite: John says nothing about the rite of bread and wine, whereas the Synoptics say nothing about the footwashing.[254] In other words, the parallels are limited to the preaching of Jesus but do not touch the respective rites. Liturgically, the two scenes are presented as completely different, because the shared elements of the respective Jesus' discourses are detachable from the respective rites and, therefore, are not sufficient for identification of the liturgical material.

Explicitly, the Johannine supper is dated to some day before the Passover (13:1: πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα), not necessarily on Thursday evening, although the latter date follows from the subsequent present text of the Gospel (counting backward from Saturday and without presuming implicit daybreaks between the events). Given the complexity of the editorial history of John's chapters 12 and 13, the original place of the supper scene could be somewhere earlier, as many modern exegetes admit.

"Sunday: Pilate releases Jesus, who then returns to the usual place." (4) "Monday ("the following day" in John 12,12): crowds of pilgrims arrive and greet Jesus as 'King of Israel,' the very development that Judas and the Jewish rulers wanted to avoid." (5) "Tuesday evening: Jesus' Passover in Jerusalem, which includes the following day." (6) "Wednesday or Thursday: second arrest of Jesus, maybe Thursday evening, following the Johannine chronology." (7) "Friday afternoon: crucifixion at the time of the slaughtering of the lambs." In the Gospel of John, we have no rite of bread and wine. I think that it is not an accidental omission but a mark of a different from the Synoptics understanding of the relative importance of the events. The most of the chronological differences between the Synoptics and John resulted from harmonising attempts in the final edition of John, where several different events (that occurred, of course, at different moments) were identified; s. below. Thus, only points from (5) to (7) of Nodet's reconstruction will turn out to be compatible with my reconstruction below.

[254] Cf., e.g., a detailed comparison between John's and the Synoptics' account in Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, II, 557–558.

My point here is a little different, namely, that there is no reason at all to admit that the Johannine supper was the Last Supper in Synoptics' sense. The two traditions of supper do not ultimately go back to the common scene in the historical reality, whereas nothing prevents both of them from being historical. Their shared reality is limited to the farewell discourse by Jesus alone, without its historical context. At least, *a priori* we have to think that the scenes of the two suppers were different, even if, in the available traditions, they share a common Jesus' farewell discourse.

I still think, together with Jaubert and Nodet, that the Synoptics imply the Passion chronology with the Last Supper including the rite of bread and wine on Tuesday evening. However, now I think, *pace* Jaubert, Nodet, and myself in my earlier study, that this supper has no trace in John, whereas John's supper with footwashing has no trace in the Synoptics—except the common roots of Jesus' farewell discourse, which is, however, not an inalienable part of any rite.[255]

19.6. The Ritual Footwashing at Shiloh. Between Jesus' departure from Jerusalem for Ephraim (end of ch. 11) and the supper with footwashing (ch. 13) is now placed ch. 12, whose material is of different origin. Its final part (12:44-50), as we have mentioned above, is certainly misplaced. The material of 12:20-43, as I have argued above (section 19.4), is, most probably, misplaced, too.

The remaining material of ch. 12 is distributed as following: Jesus returns to Bethany where he had resurrected Lazarus (12:1); a supper at Bethany: anointing scene, Judas is provoked (12:2-8); Jews' and priests' reaction to Jesus and Lazarus (12:9-11); solemn entry into Jerusalem (12:12-19). Given that the misplaced material of 12:20-43 is closely attached to ch. 11, it would be better to say that it is rather the material of 12:1-19 that is misplaced—namely, inserted into the middle of the account of the resurrection of Lazarus and its immediate consequences. Its original place is to be found somewhere later and, if we accept the "longest" chronology described above, near the last Sunday before the Passover and after the farewell supper with footwashing.

The rite of footwashing is always, throughout the Hebrew Bible, distinct from the full ritual bath and has a ritual function of its own.[256] This ritual function is distinct from the ordinary footwashing before meals or going to bed (cf. Cant 5:3). The ritual footwashing is established in order to access the highest order of the ritual purity—in comparison with the level of purity already attained with the preceding full bathing—before entering the Tent of Meeting (Ex 30:17-21; cf. 40:30-32, carrying out of this commandment by Moses, Aaron, and his sons). The same meaning of footwashing is formulated by Jesus: "One who has bathed does not need to wash, except for the feet, but is entirely clean" (13:10).

Jesus performed his footwashing not before but after the meal and so, any other meaning than the ritualistic one is to be excluded. After having washed disciples' feet, Jesus pronounced his farewell discourse, and, then, led them outside the place where they were gathered (14:31: ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν "Arise, let us go hence"); the word "arise" is a mark that the supper is finished and the place of gathering will be immediately left. It is hardly possible that the footwashing was performed for simple walking on the roads. It was a ritual preparation before

---

[255] Thus, I still consider my earlier arguments, additional to those of Jaubert, concerning the Last Supper on Tuesday as valid; cf. Lourié, "Les quatre jours « de l'intervalle »..." However, my arguments in support of Jaubert's theory that both Synoptic and John's accounts of the Last Supper share a common rite (which I supported with a witness of the recension GII of the Book of Tobit) I consider now as far-fetching. The main liturgical problem is still a washing (namely, footwashing) *after* and not before the meal. The second ritual bath after the banquet is mentioned in Tob 2:9 GII (ms S) but this is certainly a full bath and not a footwashing and far from being enough to identify the whole rite in John with this rite of Tobit. Thus, my earlier reconstruction that both Synoptics and John describe the same rite but with different omissions fails. Tobit's rite does not share any specific feature of the Jesus' supper with footwashing.

[256] See, as a general introduction to the relevant traditions, J. Ch. Thomas, *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Christianity*, London—New York: T&T Clark Int., ^{2}2004 (first publ. 1991), written, however, without knowing the fundamental study by Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "The Baptism of the Apostles," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 9 (1956) 203–251, which presents the most complete dossier of Christian data, both written sources and artefacts.

entering some most sacred area.[257] The further story of entry into Jerusalem gives us an idea of what area is meant, but, in the present study, we avoid any deeper analysis of the Passion narrative.

The ritual meaning of the footwashing is, most probably, echoed in the fragmentary Gospel of the *Papyrus Oxyrynchi* 840 (so-called *Gospel of the Saviour*), which is now reconsidered as being a representative of an early Christian tradition close and roughly contemporaneous to the Johannine one.[258] A "certain Pharisee, a chief priest named Levi" meets Jesus and his disciple near a ritual bath in the Temple area and rebukes them: "Who allowed you to trample this place of purification and to see these holy vessels, when you have not bathed yourself nor have your disciples washed their feet?" Jesus asks him, whether he is clean himself. After having received a detailed positive answer, Jesus continues: "Woe to you blind men who do not see! <...> having washed, you have wiped the outer skin, which also prostitutes and flute-girls anoint and wash <...> But I and my disciples, who you say have not bathed, have been bathed in living waters..." The real place and meaning of the footwashing in this text is a difficult and still unresolved problem, but, at least, its witness corroborates our analysis above that the footwashing described in the Gospel of John had have a ritual meaning as a prerequisite of entering some sacred area in Jerusalem.

The ritual nature of the footwashing is preserved with the most of the Christian tradition, although in a slightly "modernised" form: it was reinterpreted, since a very early (but remaining unknown) date, as the baptism of the apostles.[259] It would be more fitting, from a historical point of view, to interpret this rite as a (episcopal) consecration of the apostles, although, of course, any "modernisation" would be necessarily misleading. The Gospel shows only a ritual allowing the apostles to participate in the messianic entry of the Shiloh-Messiah from Shiloh into Jerusalem.

One miniature in a Greek hymnographic manuscript (sticherarion) from Sinai place Jesus' footwashing in an open place surrounded by mountains. This is perhaps the only known exception in the Christian iconography, where the normal place of the footwashing is the Upper Chamber in Sion.[260] I think that this miniature could preserve, through an earlier Jerusalem tradition, an early Christian recollection of the Ephraim/Shiloh localisation of the footwashing.

---

[257] Beside the biblical precedents related to the Tent of Meeting, there were analogous requirements related to the Temple mount (*mBerakot* 9:5), the sanctuary (Josephus, *War*, 4:150). For a number of pertinent places in Philo who represents a tradition shared also by the Gospel of John, cf. H. Weiss, "Foot Washing in the Johannine Community," *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979) 298–325, here 302–304; cf. esp. *De vita Mosis*, II, 138: the washing of the feet of the servants of the altar is "a σύμβολον of the blameless life lived by those who do not travel on the road of vice (κακίας ὁδὸν ἢ κυριώτερον εἰπεῖν ἀνοδίαν [the road of evil or, to say more properly, off-roadness]), but rather on the high road of virtue" (quoted is Weiss' summary of the passage, p. 304); Gr. text: L. Cohn, P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 4, Berlin, 1902, 232. Richard Bauckham in his arguments against Thomas' interpretation of the footwashing performed by Jesus as a religious ritual (and, thus, limiting its significance to "...the one of the most countercultural practices of early Christianity, symbolizing most radically the status-rejecting ideals of the early Christian communities") completely disregards the place of the footwashing *after* the meal and its similarity with Jesus' feet anointing by Maria (*after* the meal as well, s. below, section 19.9), either. Even if the whole footwashing story is "an etiological myth, projecting the origin of this distinctive practice back into Jesus' ministry" (although Bauckham does not exclude that the fact of footwashing did really take place), both the practice of footwashing *after* the meal and the parallelism with the Jesus feet's anointment scene would need to be explained. I see no explanation without recourse to a religious ritual. Cf. R. Bauckham, "Did Jesus Wash His Disciples' Feet?," in idem, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007, 191–206 [reworking of author's 1999 article], quoted 206.

[258] M. J. Kruger, *The Gospel of the Savior. An Analysis of P. Oxy. 840 and Its Place in the Gospel Traditions of Early Christianity*, Texts and Editions for New Testament Study, 1; Leiden: Brill, 2005, esp. 65–68 (uncial text, reconstruction, translation) and 140–142 (discussion of the footwashing problem).

[259] Kantorowicz, "The Baptism of the Apostles."

[260] Sinai, Ms. gr. 1216, f. 203r, 13th cent.; Kantorowicz, "The Baptism of the Apostles," fig. 43, cf. p. 236.

In this section, we were focused on the direct liturgical meaning of the rite of footwashing. Such an approach is not exhaustive and needed to be completed with another one (s. the next section).

19.7. Chronological Timeline. Our localisation of the supper with footwashing at Ephraim leads us further to interpret the following walking (14:31) as a night (13:30 "and it was night") journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem.

In the present Gospel text 14:31 is followed with a long discourse (occupying three chapters, 15–17, entirely). The next landmark occurs only in 18:1 ("After Jesus had spoken these words, he went out [ἐξῆλθεν] with his disciples across the Kidron valley to a place where there was a garden, which he and his disciples entered"), which states that Jesus "went out" only now—thus, presuming that the whole previous discourse was pronounced at the previous place. This and many other contradictions and repetitions between the two discourses, that of 13:31–14:31 and that of ch. 15–17, are explained by the secondary character of the latter. However, the discourse in 13:31–14:31 has also a difficult and not completely clear editorial history.[261] But, at least, it occupies the place where some farewell discourse was already presented in the earliest narrative.

The distance between Ephraim and Bethany, about 25 km, could be covered by foot in about five hours. Thus, this journey took place at the night before the Sunday of the supper at Bethany (13:1 clearly implies Sunday: six days before the Passover which falls on Saturday), which is the night of the Sabbath (the night which follows the day of Saturday).

This interpretation is completely consistent with both Johannine Jesus' former custom to perform long journeys on Sabbath as well as the way of censorship used by the final editor of the Fourth Gospel, who did not tolerate such a Sabbath-breaking practice.

Moreover, an appearance before the large public after a night journey during the Sabbath night preceded the whole chain of the signs (at the first Sabbath of the liturgical cycle). Now, an analogous procession precedes the reality toward which these signs were pointing, the Sabbath of Jesus' resurrection (the night from Saturday to Sunday belongs to the Sabbath[262]). Thus, this eighth Sabbath of the liturgical cycle is, in some way, repeating the first one. And, thus, the footwashing rite is connected with the walking on the waters and, consequently, also the crossing the Jordan.

19.8. Two Farewell Sermons at Shiloh: Jesus and Joshua. The two sermons delivered at Shiloh, that of Joshua (Josh 24:1-27) and Jesus (13:31–14:31) have striking parallels in both contents and context, which are not limited to their genre (farewell discourse) and locale. However, they are limited to the material of ch. 13 of John, with no contact point with 14:1-31. Probably this is related to the composite nature of the present text of Jesus' farewell discourse. Anyway, the parallels with ch. 13 are revealing enough (s. Table 9) to conclude that the Farewell discourse of Jesus—at least, in its ch. 13 part but including Jesus' dialogue with the disciples—is patterned after Josh 24 as its most direct, even if not exclusive, prototype.

Table 9.

Josh 24	**John 13**
1 LXX *Place:* Shiloh.	*Place:* Ephraim (Shiloh).
1 *Membership:* elders, heads, judges, officials of Israel.	*Membership:* apostles (leaders of Jesus' followers).
2 Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel...	**31-32** *Jesus speaks on authority of the Son of Man explaining that it is the authority of God.*
5-7 *Recalls the plagues of Egypt and the passing through the Red Sea.*	*Liturgical setting of the footwashing rite: repeating of the walking on the waters at the first Sabbath of the*

[261] S., e.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, II, 582–597. An example of contradiction: in 13:36 Peter asks: "Lord, where are you going?", whereas in 16:5 Jesus said to the disciples: "Not one of you asks me, 'Where are you going?'" (*ibid.*, p. 587).

[262] The same idea that Jesus resurrected on the Sabbath is presented in the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Lourié, "Calendrical Implications in the Epistle to the Hebrews..."

	cycle, which is, in turn, patterned after passing through the Red Sea.
17 *People, when answering Joshua, recalls delivering from the land of Egypt and* the great signs in our sight.	*The six Jesus' signs as a background of the whole scene.*
11 *Recalls crossing the Jordan.*	*Footwashing as a purification rite recalls the crossing the Jordan interpreted (s. sign of paralytic) as a purification rite, too.*
15 Now if you are unwilling to serve the Lord, choose this day whom you will serve, whether the gods your ancestors served in the region beyond the River [*Euphrates*] or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my household, we will serve the Lord.	**2,21-30** *Judas chose "this day" to serve "the gods of his ancestors"* (cf. 8:44: "You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires").
19, 21, 23 You cannot serve the Lord, for he is a holy God. He is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions or your sins. **<...>** And the people said to Joshua, "No, we will serve the Lord!" *Joshua said*: Then put away the foreign gods that are among you, and incline your hearts to the Lord, the God of Israel.	**36-38** *Peter argues with Jesus whether he will be able to go where Jesus is going.* **30** *Judas* went out.
25 LXX So Joshua made a covenant with the people on that day, and gave them a law and an ordinance in Shiloh.	**34** I give you a new commandment, that you love one another.
26-27 *Joshua* ...took a large stone [אֶבֶן MT, אַבְנָא TgJ, λίθος LXX, *but*ܐܒܢܐ Peshitta], and set it up there under the oak in the sanctuary of the Lord. Joshua said to all the people, "See, this stone shall be a witness against us; for it has heard all the words of the Lord that he spoke to us; therefore it shall be a witness against you, if you deal falsely with your God."	**36-38** *These Petrine motives, whether they are borrowed from the Synoptic tradition or not, could correspond to the Aramaic tradition of Josh 24:26-27 preserved by the Peshitta (where the word for "stone" is "Cephas").*

Note: There are some closer parallels to Josh 24 in the previous material of the Fourth Gospel. All of them, however, are from similar situations of Jesus' preaching to the disciples. Thus, the dialogue between Joshua and the people has a more elaborated parallel, also involving Judas and Peter, in Jn 6:61-71 (a passage whose textual history is rather unclear). Josh 24:13 ("I gave you a land on which you had not labored, and towns that you had not built, and you live in them; you eat the fruit of vineyards and oliveyards that you did not plant"), as Nodet pointed out,[263] has an almost literal parallel in Jn 4:36-38 (esp. 38: "I sent you to reap that, on which ye labored not: for others toiled, and ye entered into their labor").

19.9. Chronological Outline of the Passion Week and Anointing of Jesus' Feet. Jesus' arrival to Bethany on Sunday morning (12:1) implies that it is the supper at Bethany with anointing that was the real Johannine *Last* Supper. Judas' behaviour here is to be explained in the light of 13:27 ("After he received the piece of bread, Satan entered into him"). The verse 12:9 ("When the great crowd of the Jews learned that he was there, they came not only because of Jesus but also to see Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead") would imply that Jesus was staying at Martha's and Maria's home not only for a relatively short time of the supper but, at least, several hours; this would be in accordance with the arrival at the morning.

The solemn entry into Jerusalem falls on the next morning (12:12: τῇ ἐπαύριον), Monday. The same day is the earliest possible time for the first arrest with releasing on the same day. This provides enough time before the second arrest on Thursday, as it must happen according to the Johannine chronology.

Such a chronology of the supper at Bethany places it immediately before the entry into Jerusalem, which is the opening scene of the history of Passions (especially if we adopt the

[263] Nodet, "On Jesus' Last Week(s)," 228.

chronology with the first arrest soon after the entry into Jerusalem). This is more fitting the idea of preparation to the burial (12:7) than the chronology of the preserved Gospel text.

Our chronology recovers on the level of the plot composition the symmetry between the washing of the feet of the disciples and the anointing of Jesus' feet, already noticed by Herold Weiss: "Both the anointing of Jesus by Mary and the washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus take place during supper, and in both it is important that Judas is there… Particularly significant is that in both accounts the drying of the feet is mentioned. Drying is an action that would naturally follow washing, but is not at all to be expected after an anointing. Thus the anointing followed by a drying, looks more like a washing and a drying of the feet."[264] Indeed, the two washings, the footwashing performed by Jesus and the washing-anointing performed by Mary are thus performed at the extreme points of the unique night journey from Ephraim to Bethany.

I agree that this anointing must be interpreted as a specific kind of washing. After having washed the feet of disciples, Jesus himself receives washing of the feet from a female disciple. "The costly ointment made of pure nard (μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου)" (12:3) is chosen instead of the water as a clear designation of the Messiah ("The Anointed One"). Anointing of the feet instead of the head poses a problem but can be explained as a mark of the highest ritual purity, as it was in the case of the footwashing of the disciples. Moreover, messianic prophecies about the feet of the Messiah (Nah 1:15; Is 52:7) are to be heard from behind the scene. Nahum could be especially relevant if he was, in the eyes of the Gospel's author, a "prophet from Galilee" (cf. Jn 7:52).[265]

Combining this messianic meaning of the specific anointing-washing with the more ordinary ritual meaning of the footwashing as a preparation for the entry into a sacral area, we obtain that the anointing in Bethany was a preparation of Jesus to the messianic priestly service. However, in this service he has to become both priest and the sacrifice ("for Thou art He that offereth and is offered," as an ancient liturgical prayer says), and so, it was, in the same time, the preparation to his death and burial. The Leviticus' commandment to wash the legs of the sacrificial calf (Lev 1:9) is interpreted in an indirect connexion with the anointing of Jesus' feet already in Origen.[266] The legs of the sacrificial animal must be washed after the immolation, and so, it was appropriate to say that this is a preparation to the burial rather than to the death.

Jesus is crucified at the Friday evening, which is, most probably, the evening of 14.I according to the official calendar.[267] According to the Sabbath 364DY calendar, this is the

---

[264] Weiss, "Foot Washing...," 313. Author's conclusion, on the ground of this symmetry, that the washing of disciples' feet had the same specific meaning of their preparation to the martyrdom, seems to me going too far (and is not literally applicable to the author of the Gospel), although the idea of martyrdom is, of course, the basing idea of the Christian life as the whole (cf., e.g., Rom 6:3). However, Weiss' reasoning is presented already in Origen (s. note 266 below).

[265] Cf. R. Bauckham, "Messianism According to the Gospel of John," in J. Lierman (ed.), *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*, WUNT 2.219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 34–68, here 52, n. 63, who points out that only two biblical prophets could be claimed as having the Galilean origin: Jonah (2 Kgs 14:25) and Nahum. Nahum is "the Elkoshite" (Nah 1:1), and Jerome derives this from the name of a village Elkosh in Galilee, whereas there are other localisations of Elkosh in the Fathers. "The name Capernaum probably means 'village of Nahum,' but the Nahum who gave it its name need not have been the prophet Nahum," wrote Bauckham. I think the real etymology of the toponym Capernaum is completely irrelevant, because it was known to the Jesus' contemporaries even less than to the modern scholars. What really matters is the fact that Jesus came from Capernaum before traversing the Sea of Galilee.

[266] Origen recalls Jesus' feet washing and anointment when commenting Lev 1:6 (another stage of the sacrifice preparation process), whereas, when commenting 1:9, Origen recalls only the washing of the feet of disciples interpreted as a reference to the baptism; the two topics in both Leviticus and Origen's commentary are very close to each another and interpreted by Origen in a very similar direction; *Homilies on Leviticus*, I, 4; W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*. Bd 6.: *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*, Teil 1.: *Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus und Leviticus*, GCS 29; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1920, 285–287. Origen's commentary follows the anointing scene in Luke but the anointing itself as a common element of both Luke and John.

[267] The phrase ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα (19:4) is difficult; its literal sense remains disputable. However, its general meaning is much less disputable; it may be recovered from the context as Friday, 14 Nisan according to the official calendar. Cf., e.g., valuable discussions in Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 646–648; Strack,

evening of 13.I. The proper time for the immolation of the Passover lamb would be, according to this calendar, at the Saturday evening, in order that the following night from Saturday to Sunday would become the true Passover of the resurrection. One can see here the culmination of the polemics against "the feasts of Jews" led throughout the Gospel, whereas only within the "feasts narrative." With this contraposition between the two Passovers the crucifixion scene thus recalls 8:44 ("You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him"), which is, most probably, not a part of the signs narrative. Thus, appointing of the crucifixion exactly at the time of immolation of the Passover lambs for "the feast of Jews" reveals that the sacrifice of this feast is not a sacrifice but a murder of the Lamb of God, whereas the proper time for the immolation of the lamb is different (Saturday according to the Sunday 364DY calendar or Tuesday according to the Wednesday one).

Any deeper study of the chronology of the Passion Week is, however, beyond the scope of the present article.

19.10. The Blessing of the Beloved Disciple and the Sabbath of New Covenant. Annie Jaubert seems to be the only scholar who recognised in the Johannine supper, despite its lack of the bread and wine rite, a ritual meal. There is a need to unpack her too condensed exposition.[268]

Jaubert discerns two different aspects of the ritual meaning of the Johannine meal. First, it is a kind of funeral repast performed when the person that is going to die is still alive; this person has to deliver a testament speech. Such repasts were rather common in the Second Temple Jewish literature, and Jaubert quotes a series of examples from the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Testament of Naphtali*.[269] Secondly, it is a banquet when a special blessing is transmitted with a physical contact such as reclining and/or sleeping closely to the blessing person, in an immediate contact with his body. Such a banquet was not necessarily coinciding with the farewell repast. Thus, in the *Jubilees*, Abraham transmitted his blessing to Jacob at the repast where he was going to die (*Jub* 22:1–23:2), but Isaac blessed his grandsons Levi and Judah at a banquet long before his farewell repast (*Jub* 31:9–23);[270] Isaac's and Rebecca's farewell repasts (*Jub* 36:1-18 and 35:1-27) do not contain a scene of transmitting the blessing, and the repast of Naphtali either.

The transmission of a special blessing through a close physical contact during a special banquet is exactly the same as Beloved Disciple's "leaning on Jesus' bosom (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ)" (13:23) or "breast (ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος)" (21:20). The parallel with Abraham's blessing of Jacob, as already noticed Jaubert, is especially revealing. Abraham makes a repast on the day of the festival of weeks, that is, the festival of the Covenant, when "…Jacob apporte à Abraham gâteaux nouveaux et boisson (du vin, d'après la traduction latine[271]). Abraham mange, boit et

---

Billerbeck, *Kommentar...*, Bd. II, 835–837; L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John.* Revised ed., The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1995, 686–687, n. 104.

[268] S. an important and largely unnoticed two-page sketch in Jaubert, *Approches…*, 43–44. I recall that Jaubert considered the Johannine Last Supper narrative as a partial description of the Last Supper described, also partially, by the Synoptics, whereas I consider the two as quite different events.

[269] For the *Testament of Naphtali* (esp. 1:2-4), s. now M. de Jonge *et al.*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graecae, I,2; Leiden: Brill, 1978, 112–124, esp. 112. The relevant passages of the *Jubilees* are the following: 22:1–23:2 (Abraham), 35:1-27 (Rebecca), and 36:1-18 (Isaac); J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO, vols. 510–511; Scr. Eth., tt. 87–88; Louvain: Peeters, 1989, 119–125/277–278/127–135 (Eth/Lat/Eng), 190–196/289/230–237 (Eth/Lat and Heb 1Q18/Eng), and 196–200/289–290/237–240 (Eth/Lat/Eng), respectively; references to the English translation imply the pages of the vol. 511, the others—of the vol. 510.

[270] VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 170–173/285–286/202–206 (Eth/Lat/Eng). The description of the exact mode of the corporal contact (31:22-23) is available only in Ethiopic: "They ate and drank happily. He [*sc.*, Isaac] made Jacob's two sons sleep, one on his right, one on his left" (p. 173/205).

[271] Here (22:5) the Ethiopic text is corrupted and omits several words, but the Latin version is intact: "Isaac, too, sent through Jacob [his] excellent peace offering [and wine (et uinum) to his father] Abraham for him to eat and drink" (VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 120/277/127–128); cf. VanderKam's note to 22:5 in his translation (p. 127).

transmet à son petit-fils la bénédiction de l'Alliance et les Promesses." Jaubert comments: "L'on ne saurait dire que nourriture ou contact servent de véhicule à la transmission (il n'y a pas là de caractère magique), mais ils l'accompagnent comme une sorte de support signifiant."[272]

The description of the corporal contact between Abraham and Jacob (*Jub* 22:25-26) is exactly the same as that between Jesus and the Beloved Disciple according to 13:23. It becomes clear in retroversion from Ethiopic into Greek: "Then he finished commanding and blessing him. The two of them lay down together on one bed. Jacob slept in the bosom (ውስተ፡ሕፅነ፡ [= ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ][273]) of his grandfather Abraham…"[274]

Here we have to recall the Ladder of Jacob imagery (1:51) and other Jacob motives accompanying Jesus (those focused on the Jacob's well). The leaning of the Beloved Disciple on the bosom of Jesus seems to be one more Jacob motive, whereas inversed: Jesus as the New Abraham is now inaugurating the Jacob of the New Covenant, the father of the twelve tribes of the New Israel, and so, the common "father" of the Twelve. Indeed, this "leaning on the bosom," "[c]e n'est pas une indication sentimentale. Rien n'est plus éloigné du IV[e] évangile que la mièvrerie qu'on lui a parfois prêtée. Il faut remonter à l'arrière-plan juif, où des repas d'adieu sont aussi des 'testaments.'"[275]

This conclusion corroborates the view of those who, like Bauckham (even though unlike Jaubert), consider the figure of the Beloved Disciple as distinct from John the son of Zebedee and not included into the number of the Twelve.[276] Such a leadership of the Beloved Disciple would be hardly compatible with that of Peter and the Twelve, and this is why, I think the Johannine supper is completely absent from the Synoptic accounts.

Both Abraham's farewell repast according to the *Jubilees* and Joshua's farewell speech in Shiloh (Shechem), the two prototypes of the Johannine supper, are procedures of transmitting the Covenant. Joshua, too, after having started with recalling the history of salvation from Abraham through Isaac and Jacob to Moses and himself (Josh 24:2-13), arrived to "making a covenant with the people that day and making statutes and ordinances for them" (Josh 24:25). "That day" of Joshua remained unspecified in the calendar, whereas the Abraham's repast is dated exactly to the "festival of weeks" (*Jub* 22:1). The Johannine supper is certainly preceding the annual festival of weeks, but it falls on the seventh Sabbath after the six Sabbaths of signs. This is an Exodic pattern: the Covenant is given after the seven-week interval from the crossing the Red Sea, which corresponds, in the Fourth Gospel, to the seven-week interval after the Sabbath of crossing the Sea of Galilee. The Sabbath of the Johannine supper is a kind of the festival of weeks, one of the different kinds of such pentecontad festivals known from the Second Temple period. And this is also an explanation why the number of signs is six and not seven or other: there are only six Sabbaths free to performing such signs.

Therefore, both rite performed at the Johannine supper and its calendrical place indicate that the meaning of this event consisted in establishing a covenant, in continuation with the analogous and prefigurating actions of Abraham (according to the *Jubilees*) and Joshua.

19.11. The Third Entrance through the Gate of Caesarea Philippi? Why Jesus stepped back from Jerusalem once more after his retirement to the north just the previous week? This question remains unresolved. It is tempting to suppose that, this time once more, he reached "the place where John was baptising" in the district of Caesarea Philippi to complete the full number of "falls" of the Caesarea gate, which are necessary according to the messianic sign tradition reported by R. Jose b. Kisma (s. below, 17.5). Anyway, this tradition is present in our Gospel, and it is very probable that the number three of the entries through the north gate is here implied, too. If so, Jesus must either himself arrive from the north three times or, in the case if

---

[272] Jaubert, *Approches...*, 43 and 43–44.
[273] For this idiom, s. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, cols. 137–138.
[274] VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 124/133. This verse is available in Ethiopic only.
[275] Jaubert, *Approches…*, 43.
[276] Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*..., esp. 402–403.

Jesus arrived only twice, imply that the first messianic arrival was performed by some his predecessor such as Enoch.

The hypothesis of the threefold arrival of Jesus himself seems to me the most plausible. In this case, Jesus and his disciples arrived to Ephraim on their way back from the Caesarea district at the end of the whole six-day journey (without one-day staying on the same place, as it was before the resurrection of Lazarus).

Be this as it may, the above reconstruction of the events fits our working hypothesis with its "additional" eighth Sabbath before the final Sabbath of the Passover.

19.12. Conclusion: the Sabbath of the New Covenant and the Beloved Disciple as the New Jacob. The above analysis, independently from our working hypothesis but mostly out of geographical reasons and Slavonic Josephus' witness, provided argumentation in favour of the presence, in the Johannine chronology, of one "additional" Sabbath between the Sabbath of Lazarus and the Sabbath of the Passover.

Our interpretation of the town Ephraim as Shiloh and, then, recognition in background of Jesus' farewell discourse of a Josh 24 pattern, provided an explication of the liturgical meaning of both time (Sabbath) and place (Ephraim) of the Johannine supper. The town Ephraim, which is representing Shiloh, is the place from which the Shiloh-Messiah arrives in Jerusalem. The eighth Sabbath of the liturgical cycle turned out to be the seventh Sabbath of a specific festival of weeks counted from the crossing the Sea of Galilee, the new Red Sea. This is enough for confirmation of the relevant part of our working hypothesis.

The Johannine supper is the farewell repast including the rite of transmission of the blessing to a leader who will represent the whole chosen people in the Covenant with God. It is the Beloved Disciple who becomes such leader, that is, the New Jacob and the father of the Twelve.

The footwashing rite has, in this context, the meaning of establishing a new priesthood.

This Sabbath evening supper is continued, on the next evening, with the supper at Bethany with a rite of anointing (and washing, although with a precious substance instead of water) the feet of Jesus. This is a messianic anointing but applied to an already immolated sacrificial animal (being washing of animal's legs prescribed by Leviticus), and, therefore, referring to Jesus' burial as if he was already dead. The Bethany supper is a commemorating repast as a part of the funeral ritual, and so, symmetrical to the farewell repast one day earlier.

20. Concluding Remarks

20.1. Confirmation of the Working Hypothesis. The above analysis satisfies the criteria formulated in the section 8 for verifying the working hypothesis: we have discovered a regularly recurring match between the signs of the Gospel and the appropriate liturgical commemorations of the biblical events on the route from the Red Sea to the Holy Land (and even a bit more: messianic entering from the north and the farewell scene at Shiloh patterned after the Joshua's farewell scene, all this against the Exodic background of seven weeks between crossing the Red Sea and Sinai). This structure is a close cognate of that of the Samaritan pre- and post-Passover sabbatic cycles.

20.2. The Liturgical Calendar. The liturgical cycle starts on the next day after the festal day 15.XI (the day when John the Baptist appeared in the narrative), which is 16.XI. It covers exactly 60 days including 14.I, the Sabbath of the Passover according to the Sunday 364DY calendar. The cycle has especially marked days: the 39th (when 38 days are completed; s. section 15.1), the 49th (s. section 17.2), the seventh Sabbath, that of the resurrection of Lazarus (s. section 17.6), and another seventh Sabbath (the eighth Sabbath of the cycle) counted from the symbolical crossing the Red Sea (represented through the Sea of Galilee), which is a kind of festival of weeks (s. section 19.10).

The present Gospel of John obviously contains some important post-Passover liturgical material, but it was not studied here. Even the Passion Week was not studied in any detail.

There is a little chance, I think that the Sunday 364DY calendar was in liturgical usage in the historical Jesus community. Even the Fourth Gospel's text provides an argument—although far from being decisive—in favour of the Wednesday 364DY calendar in this community (s. section 13.4). Otherwise Jaubert's reasoning concerning *La date de la Cène* still seems to me the best explanation of the available historical data. Even if we have to accept that, in most cases, John's account is historically more accurate than that (or those) of the Synoptics, this does not mean that we have to accept the same in the particular case of the calendar.

Anyway, I am not pretending here to resolve the problems of correspondence between the liturgical calendar in the signs narrative in John and the calendar(s) of the Synoptics and the historical Jesus' group.

"Une modification" of the 364DY calendar postulated by Annie Jaubert for the Jesus community[277] remains unknown. However, at least, the modification of such calendar responsible for the very origin of the Gospel of John is recovered.

The Sunday 364DY calendar is not to be found in such authoritative calendrical sources as 1 Enoch, the *Jubilees* or the Dead Sea Scrolls, but it is traceable in a number of pseudepigrapha and, what is the most important, it is the only calendar that respects literally *all* Leviticus' commandments dealing with mutual relations of the Passover, the feast of Unleavened Bread, and the feast of the Weeks (s. Note after section 7). Thus, such a calendar was of enough authority to being adopted by some Jewish religious groups. However, it presumes that the Red Sea was traversed on the day of Sabbath and, therefore, creates an important halachic problem related to the limitation (viz. prohibition) of travelling at the Sabbath. The editor of the present Gospel of John and the author of the signs narrative were at the opposite extremes of the corresponding spectre of opinions, and this fact drastically affected the present condition of the work of the latter (s. sections 11.3, 17.1, 19.7).

20.3. A Stational Liturgy. The liturgy and the geography of the signs narrative are interwoven. It presumes not only specific commemoration dates but also some specific geographical locales forming a system of "sacred geography," which are, in turn, resulting from the mapping of their symbolical prototypes onto the actual landscape of the Holy Land.

The "sacred geography" would imply a network of pilgrimage places and routes inherited by the Johannine community from its Jewish pre-Christian matrix. This system needs further investigation, which is, however, out of scope of the present study.

The above analysis is summarised in the Table 10.

Table 10.

Signs narrative events	**Prototypes (and Parallels)**	**Date acc. to John's Calendar**	**Actual Locale**	**Symbolical Prototype**	**Locale in the Present Gospel Text**
John the Baptist on Jordan	Feast on 15.XI (cf. P. Egerton 2, fr. 2)	15.XI Tue	Spring of Paneas	Desert of Sinai / Gate of Caesarea	"Bethany (Bethabara) beyond Jordan"
John the Baptist meets Jesus	Aaron meets Moses (Ex 4) / Enoch (1En 12–16) or Messiah (*bSanh* 98a) comes from the north	16.XI Wed			
Calling of five disciples	Five scribes of Ezra (4 Ez 14)	17–18.XI Thu—Fri	The same area	The same area	The same area
Walking on the waters	Passing though the Red Sea	19.XI Sat	Sea of Galilee (Capernaum—Tiberias)	Red Sea	Sea of Galilee (Capernaum—Tiberias, but indicating the direction in a contradictory manner)
Sign I: Water into wine	Marah / Circumcision of Moses' son by Zipporah	26.XI Sat	Cana	Marah	Cana

[277] Jaubert, *La date de la Cène…*, 72, 74.

Sign II: Healing of official's son	Elim/Rephidim (contaminated stories)	3.XII Sat	Well of Jacob near Sychar, Sychar	Elim/Rephidim	Well of Jacob near Sychar, Sychar
Sign III: Multiplication of the loaves	Manna	10.XII Sat	Eastern bank of Jordan, near Adam	Desert of Sin	Northern shore of the Sea of Galilee
Sign IV: Healing of the paralytic = 39th day of the cycle (38 days are completed)	Farewell discourses of Moses in Deuteronomy / Crossing the Jordan	17.XII Sat	Eastern bank of Jordan, ford opposite Jericho	Places of Moses' discourses on the western bank of Jordan / Jordan between the fords near Adam and opposite Jericho	Bethesda in Jerusalem
Sign V: Healing of the blind born	Second circumcision	24.XII Sat	Spring of Elisha in the Jericho oasis	Gilgal	Siloam in Jerusalem
49th day of the cycle	Enoch's *Similitudes*	28.XII Wed	District of Caesarea Philippi	Gate of Caesarea	"The place where John was baptising"
Sign VI: Resurrection of Lazarus	Seizure of Jericho	31.XII Sat	Bethany	Jericho	Bethany
Sabbath of Weeks / Covenant: The supper with the blessing of the Beloved Disciple, footwashing, and farewell discourse	Farewell speech by Joshua (Josh 24) / Footwashing before entering a sacred area (cf. P. Oxy. 840) / Farewell repast of Abraham at the festival of weeks with blessing of Jacob on his bosom (*Jub* 22:1–23:2) [Exodic pattern: Sinai, Pentecost at the end of the seventh week after crossing the Red Sea.]	7.I Sat	Ephraim	Shiloh	Jerusalem
The supper with anointing	Feet of the Messiah (Nah 1:15; Is 52:7) / Footwashing before entering a sacred area and washing of the legs of the sacrificial calf	8.I Sun	Bethany		Bethany
Entry into Jerusalem	Jacob's prophecy on Judah through Zechariah's prophecy on the Messiah	9.I Sun	Jerusalem	Jerusalem	Jerusalem
Crucifixion	Immolation of the Passover lamb according to the calendar τῶν Ἰουδαίων (where Fri evening belongs to 14.I)	13.I Fri	Near Jerusalem	Jerusalem	Near Jerusalem
Passover: Resurrection of Jesus	Passing though the Red Sea, the true Passover night (from Sat to Sun)	14.I Sat	Near Jerusalem	Jerusalem Temple	Near Jerusalem

20.4. A "Signs Gospel"? It would be senseless to pretend like I did not take in mind Robert Fortna's "Signs Gospel" hypothesis throughout this study (and so, not only in section 2 and n. 200), especially in its latest—softened—form, where Fortna does not insist on any precise reconstruction of this gospel.[278] I believe my liturgical analysis proves in an independent way

[278] Cf. "...I would no longer hold that that reconstruction is legitimate in its details"; R. Fortna, "The Gospel of John and the Signs Gospel," in Th. Thatcher (ed.), *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: the Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*, Waco, TX: Baylor UP, 2007, 149–158, here 150.

Fortna's intuition of a basic source underlying the Gospel of John, which contains all the signs together with the introductory scenes described in ch. 1 and the Passion Narrative.

Fortna includes in his reconstruction the fishing scene in Jn 21, whereas my analysis does not reach the final scenes of the Gospel. I do not see how this scene could be replaced into the beginning of the narrative and included among the Jesus' pre-resurrection signs (as Fortna does), but this does not mean that this scene must be excluded from the signs narrative at all; moreover, Fortna himself does not insist on the exact order of the events considered by him as the signs. There is a need of a special study dedicated to this scene and taking into account the earliest history of the liturgical commemorations of John himself.

Nevertheless, there are, in my analysis, some major disagreements with Fortna. The most striking difference is, I think, that I do not consider the signs narrative as containing no discourses. On the contrary, the sermon is a natural part of the liturgy, and so, it *must* be here.

Moreover, I consider the narratives related to "the feasts of Jews" as having provenance in a separate and coherent source originally containing Jesus' polemics with the Jews in Jerusalem during the pilgrimage festivals (s. section 14.1). An attempt to adapt this source to the core formed by the signs narrative must be responsible for Jerusalem and other inappropriate localisations of some Gospel events and for the geographical chaos of the Fourth Gospel in general.

Obviously I do not support Fortna's idea to arrange the signs "in a geographically logical sequence"[279] according to their present localisation in the Gospel text. My own analysis reveals, on the contrary, a kind of a "sacred geography" network.

Unlike Fortna, I am not going in any discussion of the theological (Christological) contents of the reconstructed narrative, but—once more unlike Fortna—I see a deep traditional mystical background where Fortna seems to see nothing of the kind. It is always a problem how these traditions must be interpreted in the actual Gospel's (or the Signs Gospel's) context, but the veins of the relevant mystical traditions must be identified anyway.

My opinion that both signs narrative and feasts narrative were created as different expressions of an intra-Jewish religious conflict predating Jesus' activity (s. section 18.1) does not agree with Fortna's views on the development of the Fourth Gospel, either. To Fortna, his Signs Gospel was not only Jewish but still out of conflict with the Jewish official religious authorities.

All this said, I must acknowledge that Fortna's idea of the existence of *some* Signs Gospel seems to me the most attractive explanation of the Fourth Gospel's development.

20.5. A Mystical Moses. The most of the signs narrative is an itinerary symbolically repeating—but the proper word here would be "fulfilling"—the route of Exodus. Jesus is here the New Moses. His deeds were prefigured by Moses himself and by an earlier New Moses and another Jesus, Joshua.

This is not all, however. Jesus is introduced as a Messiah coming from the north (s. sections 17.3-4). A heavy impact of this Hermon-oriented tradition which goes back, at least, to 1Enoch, resulted in turning upside down of the whole map of the Exodus, which is no longer performed from south to north but vice versa. The Sea of Galilee replaced the Red Sea. The New Exodus became simultaneously "the processions of my God, the King" coming from Bashan (Batanaea, the district of Caesarea Philippi), according to the famous psalm of the Merkabah mysticism (Ps 67(68)). In the Jewish exegesis, this psalm was traditionally associated with Moses and his descent from Sinai with the Covenant. No wonder if it is traceable in the New Moses imagery as well.

Some Jewish traditions related to the messianic entry from the north are also related to Moses (s. section 17.5): in the preserved witnesses, either directly (on authority of R. Joshua b. Hananiah) or indirectly (on authority of R. Jose b. Kisma). The latter witness is especially important: it deals with the messianic (but, anyway, Exodic) signs, although only one sign is mentioned, transformation of the water into the blood. But the first sign of Jesus, the miracle at

[279] Cf. Fortna, "The Gospel of John...," 150.

Cana, is the same, even though the blood was represented with the wine (s. section 12.3). Moreover, R. Jose b. Kisma's witness presupposes that the entry of the Messiah will be triple: this is why Jesus twice (or, at least, once) returned to the north before entering Jerusalem (s. section 19.10).

The reinterpretation of the Ladder of Jacob tradition in 1:51 (s. section 10) is also performed within this "northern" context (where Bethel is connected to Dan).

This is the kind of Christology professed by our kind of Signs Gospel. It is "high" enough, *pace* Fortna...

20.6. The Beloved Disciple. Annie Jaubert was the first to recognise the ritual value of Beloved Disciple's leaning on the bosom of Jesus. Going further in the same direction, we were able to establish even more close affinity between this Gospel's scene and the farewell repast of Abraham at the festival of weeks, where the person leaning on the bosom of Abraham was Jacob (*Jub* 22:1–23:2). This background of the Johannine supper is especially transparent because it is inscribed into, on the one hand, the Jacob traditions referred to in the Fourth Gospel and, on the other hand, the calendar where the Johannine supper corresponds to some kind of the festival of weeks (falling on the fiftieth day from crossing the Sea of Galilee). Therefore, the scene of Beloved Disciple's leaning on the bosom of Jesus must be read against this background as an investiture scene of the Beloved Disciple as the New Jacob, and therefore, the father of the Twelve.

Such a reading would be compatible with the views of those who, unlike Jaubert herself, consider the Beloved Disciple as a person different from John the son of Zebedee and standing outside and above the Twelve (e.g., Richard Bauckham).

20.7. A Lectionary Hypothesis? Finally, we cannot refrain from asking whether the sabbatic structure of our Signs Gospel intended to be that of a lectionary. Our version of the Signs Gospel is naturally divisible into nine Sabbath readings with several important additional readings corresponding to the non-Sabbatic important events (15.XI, 16.XI, 49th day of the liturgical cycle, entry into Jerusalem, and, probably, something else for the Passover Week and post-resurrection scenes). Jaubert thought that the four Gospels were primarily composed as cycles of homilies transmitted orally.[280] Such a structure would imply some arrangement within the liturgical calendar. Jaubert did not accept any kind of lectionary hypothesis but her own hypothesis presupposed an unwritten (oral) lectionary.

From a liturgical point of view, it is not so significant whether a lectionary is written or oral. This is a lectionary, anyway.

For the Gospel of John, such a lectionary would be not patterned after the Synagogal triennial reading cycle, as it was proposed by Eileen Guilding, but, nevertheless, it would be Jewish. Michael Goulder's idea of a more compact lectionary would look even closer: Goulder was preparing (but never published in a finished form) a study arguing that the Gospel of John was created as a lectionary for the fifty days from the Easter to the Pentecost, where the readings were similar to those of the Byzantine rite as it is known from the late first millennium.[281]

However, the very limited analysis of the Gospel material proposed in the present study is insufficient for proving or falsifying the lectionary hypothesis.[282]

---

[280] Jaubert, *Approches...*, 15–16; cf. "Le IV^{e} évangile, comme les trois autres, a été prêché avant d'être écrit" (p. 15).

[281] M. Goulder, "The Liturgical Origin of St John's Gospel," in E. A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica VII*, Berlin: Akademie Verl., 1982, 205–232. His later article "The Paschal Liturgy in the Johannine Church" (1987) remained unpublished: s. M. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of the New Paradigm*, JSNTSup, 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996, 294–295, n. 1.

[282] I am grateful to all my friends and colleagues who helped me in one or another way, namely, Nune Barseghian, Elena Bormotova, Étienne Nodet, Alexander Rosenthal, Andrei Orlov, Alexey Ostrovsky, Ilya Pobelov, Nikolai Seleznyov.