

Orientalia Judaica Christiana

1

L'église des deux Alliances

Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)

Edited by

Basil Lourié

Andrei Orlov

Madeleine Petit

gorgias press

**L'Église des deux Alliances:
Mémorial Annie Jaubert
(1912–1980)**

**ÉDITÉ PAR
MADELEINE PETIT, BASILE LOURIÉ,
ANDREI ORLOV**



**GORGAS PRESS
2008**



Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

From the Editor of the Series.....	xi
Preface to the Second Edition.....	xiii
Liste des abréviations.....	xv
Annie Jaubert.	
<i>Par Madeleine Petit</i>	xvii
Bibliographie.....	xvii
Ouvrages.....	xvii
Articles.....	xvii
Une vie — un itinéraire.....	xx
Cursus universitaire.....	xxi
Diplômes.....	xxi
L'enseignante.....	xxii
Le chercheur.....	xxiii
L'itinéraire spirituel.....	xxiv
Le service pastoral.....	xxv
Annie Jaubert et les études de l'Orient Chrétien.	
<i>Par Basile Lourié</i>	xxix
The Sun in 2 Enoch	
<i>By Francis I. Andersen</i>	1
The fourth heaven.....	1
The background of the tradition.....	2
Textual history.....	5
The sun's movements.....	8
2 Enoch 15.....	9
Texts of 2 Enoch 15.....	14
Scientific terminology.....	15
Mythological imagery.....	17
The song for the rising sun.....	21

Literary connections.....	22
Recovering the text.....	27
The song as a poem.....	28
A Song for the Sun at Daybreak.....	28
The structure of the poem.....	29
Notes on the text.....	30
Conclusion.....	35
The Horarium of Adam and the Chronology of the Passion	
By <i>Richard Baucham</i>	39
1. Introduction to the Horarium of Adam.....	39
2. The Horarium of Adam: translation and notes.....	42
3. Affinities with early Jewish literature and practice.....	45
(1) The praise of all creation.....	46
(2) Praise at each hour of day and night.....	47
(3) The times of human prayer.....	49
(4) The entry and exit of prayers.....	51
(5) Cocks at daybreak.....	51
(6) Incense and silence.....	55
(7) Priests anointing the sick.....	59
4. Cock-crow and chronology in the Gospels.....	60
The significance of the 364-day calendar for the Old Testament canon	
By <i>Roger T. Beckwith</i>	69
Un seul ou deux jeunes hommes riches ?	
Par <i>Gilles Dorival</i>	83
L'année régulière de 364 jours dans la controverse au sujet de Chalcédoine	
Par <i>Michel van Esbræck</i> (†).....	97
Les quatre jours « de l'intervalle » : une modification néotestamentaire et chrétienne du calendrier de 364 jours	
Par <i>Basile Lourié</i>	103
1. Considérations préliminaires.....	105
1.1. L'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert : difficultés fausses et vraies.....	105
1.2. Un petit discours de la méthode.....	107
1.3. ...et un petit problème de critique de texte : Marc 14 : 12 // Luc 22 : 7.....	110
2. Le problème majeur du dimanche.....	112

2.1. Les querelles pascales du IIe siècle vues dans le cadre de liturgie comparée : une source commune des deux traditions du calcul pascal ?.....	112
2.2. La Pâque dominicale avant J.-C. ?.....	114
3. Notre hypothèse principale : un calendrier avec nisan « rompu »	115
4. L'assertion « Ces quatre jours qu'on ne fait pas entrer au compte de l'année » (1 Én 75,1) et le destin postérieur de ces quatre jours.....	116
4.1. αἱ διαμέσου ἡμέραι : un terme de la Septante expliqué par une homélie ancienne.....	116
4.2. Lévit. 23 : 5 LXX comme un fondement scripturaire.....	119
4.3. Valeur liturgique : les jours de (11QPsa)	120
4.4. Un chemin parallèle : « les jours de l'intervalle » dans le calendrier chrétien archaïque en Égypte.....	124
4.5. Un paradoxe liturgique : « les fêtes tournées en deuil » et le Livre de Tobit.....	126
4.6. Une Pentecôte égyptienne modélée sur la Pâque palestinienne ?.....	132
5. Conclusion et les voies de la recherche future.....	132
Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies <i>By Andrei Orlov</i>	135
Two Luminaries.....	135
The Background: The Garments of Light.....	137
Adam and Moses in the Macarian Homilies.....	141
The Healing Motif.....	148
Conclusion.....	151
The Use of Evidence from Patristic and Liturgical Sources in Annie Jaubert's <i>The Date of the Last Supper</i> <i>By Walter D. Ray</i>	153
1. Jaubert's Evidence for the Christian Use of the Jubilees Calendar.....	155
2. Jaubert's Evidence for a Tuesday Supper.....	161
3. Further Evidence for the Jubilees Calendar in Early Christianity and Implications for Jaubert's Hypothesis.....	168
4. Conclusion.....	176

Jaubert's Solution to the Passion Chronology	
<i>By James C. VanderKam</i>	179
Index des auteurs modernes.....	195

FROM THE EDITOR OF THE SERIES

Orientalia Judaica Christiana: Christian Orient and its Jewish heritage is a supplement series to *Scrinium. Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique et d'histoire ecclésiastique* dedicated to the afterlife of the Second Temple Jewish traditions within the traditions of the Oriental Christian world as well as to the later Jewish sacerdotal traditions which survived in the Oriental Christian milieu.

It is very meaningful that the series is now inaugurated by paying homage to the memory of Annie Jaubert, a scholar with an exceptionally deep appreciation for the continuity between Jewish and Christian traditions.

The next issues of the series will include both edited volumes on topics pertinent to the problem of Christian Origins as well as publications of the literary texts belonging to either Oriental Christian or priestly Jewish traditions in various languages of the East.

Basil Lourié
St Petersburg
Russia.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of “Mémorial Annie Jaubert” was previously published under the editorship of Madeleine Petit and Basil Lourié in the periodical of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow) and State Hermitage Museum (St Petersburg) entitled “Xristianskij Vostok” (“Christian Orient”), New Series, tome 4 (10) (2002) 359–550. Since the publication of the first edition, it has become clear that the inaccessibility of the Russian periodical “Christian Orient” to many interested readers necessitates a republication of the Mémorial.

The format and the style of the original publication have been changed to comply with the standards of the Gorgias Press. Some alterations also have been made due to printing errors or obvious errors of fact. The photograph of Annie Jaubert and the index of modern authors have been added, and the whole volume has received its new title “Église des deux Alliances.” The editors would like to express their appreciation to Kassia Senina for her patience and professionalism in typesetting the volume and to Vadim I. Pronin for his technical assistance. They are also thankful to the staff of the Gorgias Press for their help during preparation of the Mémorial for publication.

The Editors

LISTE DES ABRÉVIATIONS

<i>AB</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>ANRW</i>	HAASE, W., and H. TEMPORINI, eds. <i>Aufstieg and Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> . Berlin, 1972ff.
<i>APOT</i>	Charles R. H., ed. <i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</i> , I–II. Oxford, 1913
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
GCS	Die Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Supplements to <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Mus</i>	<i>Le Muséon</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to <i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	New Testament Studies
<i>OTP</i>	Charlesworth J. H., ed. <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , I–II. Garden City, 1983
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
<i>RÉA</i>	<i>Revue des études arméniennes</i>

RÉB	<i>Revue des études byzantines</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumrán</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
ROC	<i>Revue de l'Orient Chrétien</i>
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVC	Supplements to <i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
XB	<i>Христианскіи Восток [Khristsianskij Vostok]</i>

ANNIE JAUBERT

Par Madeleine Petit

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Cette bibliographie d'Annie Jaubert est exhaustive : elle comprend toutes ses oeuvres, tant scientifiques que de vulgarisation.

Ouvrages

1957. *La date de la Cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*. Études Bibliques. Paris. Traduction américaine : *The Date of the Last Supper*. Staten Island, 1965.
1960. *Origène, Homélie sur Josué*. SC, 71. Paris.
1963. *La notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne*. Patristica Sorbonensia. Paris.
1967. *Les premiers chrétiens*. Collection Microcosme, Le temps qui court n° 39. Paris.
1971. *Clement de Rome, Epître aux Corinthiens*. SC, 167. Paris.
1976. *Approches de l'Evangile de Jean*. Paris. Traduction italienne en 1978 : *Come leggere il vangelo di Giovanni*.
1979. *Les femmes dans l'Écriture*. Supplément *Vie Chrétienne*, 219. Paris. Et nouvelle édition : Paris, 1992.

Articles

1953. « Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Les origines bibliques ». *VT* 3 : 250–64.
1954. « La date de la dernière Cène ». *RHR* 95 : 140–73.
1957. « Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine ». *VT* 7 : 35–61.

1958. « Le pays de Damas ». *Revue biblique* 65 : 214–48.
1958. « Aperçus sur le calendrier de Qumrân ». *Recherches bibliques* IV (La secte de Qumrân et les origines du christianisme) : 113–120. Le texte est repris et augmenté dans l'article suivant.
1960. « Jésus et le calendrier de Qumrân ». *NTS* 7 : 1–30.
1963. « L'image de la colonne (1 Tim. 3–15) ». Dans *Studiorum Paolinorum Congressus intern. Catholicus 1961*, 1–8. Rome, Inst. Bibl. Pont.
1963. « La symbolique du puits de Jacob. Jean 4–12 ». *L'Homme devant Dieu : Mélanges offerts à Henri de Lubac* (Etudes publiées sous la direction de la Faculté de Théologie S.J. de Lyon-Fourvière 56) 67–73.
1964. « Les sources de la conception militaire de l'Eglise en 1 Clément 37 ». *VC* 18. 4–84.
1964. « Thèmes lévitiques dans la Prima Clementis ». *VC* 18. 193–203.
1964. « Les séances du Sanhédrin et les récits de la Passion ». *RHR* 166. 143–69.
1965. « Les séances du Sanhédrin... (fin) ». *RHR* 167. 1–33.
1965. « Symbolique de l'eau et connaissance de Dieu ». *Cahiers bibliques* 3. 455–63.
1965. « Le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne ». *L'Information historique* 27,1. 29–32.
1966. « Une lecture du lavement des pieds au mardi-mercredi saint ». *Mus* 79. 257–86.
1966. « Une discussion patristique sur la chronologie de la Passion ». *Recherches de science religieuse* 54. 407–10.
1967. « Le thème du "Reste Sauveur" chez Philon d'Alexandrie ». Dans *Philon d'Alexandrie (Colloque Philon d'Alexandrie 11–15 septembre 1966)*. 243–52.
1967. « L'image de la vigne (Jean 15) ». Dans *OIKONOMIA, Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie (Mélanges O. Cullmann)*. Hamburg. 93–9.
1967. « Le mercredi où Jésus fut livré ». *NTS* 14. 145–164.
1967. « La foi de Pierre ». *Évangélisation et Paroisse* (décembre).
1968. « Christ est ressuscité ». Dans *Qui est Jésus-Christ? (Semaine des Intellectuels catholiques)*. Recherches et Débats, 62. 117–23.
1968. « Le mercredi du nouvel an chez les Yezidis ». *Biblica* 49. 244–8.
1970. « Réflexions préliminaires (sur la résurrection) ». *Cahiers Bibliques de Foi et Vie*. 3–6.
1971. « La symbolique des douze ». Dans *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris. 453–60.

1971. « Qui est Jésus-Christ pour moi, exégète ? ». *Cahiers Universitaires Catholiques* 12. 20.
1971. « Philon d'Alexandrie, env. 20 av. J.-C. – 45 apr. J.-C. ». *Encyclopedia Universalis*. 969–70.
1971. « Quel jour Jésus a-t-il célébré la Cène ? ». *En ce temps-là la Bible* 83. I.
1971. « O Espírito, a Agua e o Sangre (1 Jo 5,7–8) ». Dans *Atualidades Bíblicas (Miscellanea in Memoriam de Frei João Jose Peredira de Castro, o.f.m.)*. 616–20.
1971. « Visite et bonne nouvelle dans la Bible ». *Verbum Caro* 25,100. 3–10.
1972. « Echo du Livre de la Sagesse en Barnabé 7–9 ». *Recherches de science religieuse* 60 (Judéo-christianisme. Hommage à Jean Daniélou) 193–8.
1972. « The calendar of Qumrân and the Passion Narrative in John ». Dans Charlesworth, J. H. , ed. *John and Qumran*. London. 62–75 ; republié sous le titre : *John and the Dead Sea scrolls*. New York, 1991.
1972. « Le voile des femmes (1 Cor. 11,2–16) ». *NTS* 18. 419–30.
1973. « L'élection de Matthias et le tirage au sort ». Dans *Studia Evangelica* VI. TU, 112. 274–80.
1973. « Symboles et figures christologiques dans le judaïsme ». *Revue des Sciences religieuses* 47. 373–90. Texte repris dans : *Exégèse biblique et judaïsme*. Strasbourg. 219–36.
1973. « Infaillible : observations sur le langage du Nouveau Testament ». Dans *Eglise infaillible ou intemporelle ? Recherches et Débats*, 79. 93–101. Traduction allemande : *Unfehlbar ? Beobachtungen zur Sprache des Neuen Testaments*. Fehlbar : eine Bilanz. 105–13.
1973. « La femme dans le Nouveau Testament et le christianisme antique ». Dans *Visage nouveau de la femme missionnaire*. 9–26.
1974. « Jean 17,25 et l'interprétation gnostique ». Dans *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*. Paris. 347–53.
1974. « Des gestes libérateurs de Jésus. Des Synoptiques à Saint Jean ». *Evangile* 7 (février). 18–22.
1974. « Les épîtres de Paul : le fait communautaire ». Dans *Le Ministère et les ministères selon le Nouveau Testament, dossier exégétique et réflexion théologique*. Parole de Dieu. Paris. 16–33.
1975. « Symbolisme chrétien et ordination des femmes. Ministères institués/ordonnés ». *Effort diaconal* 37 et 38. 51–3.
1975. « Judaïsme ». Dans *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*. Paris. L'article d'Annie Jaubert est réuni à ceux de K. Hruby et R. Le Déaut en un fascicule indépendant publié par Beauchesne. traduit en américain sous le

- titre : « The Sprituality of Judaism » en 1977 (Religious experience series, 11).
1975. « Saint Paul était-il misogyne ? ». *Cahiers Universitaires Catholiques* (Mai-juin). 3-6.
1975. « Un nouveau calendrier liturgique ». *Dossiers de l'Archéologie* 10. 82-6.
1975. « D'Israël à l'Eglise ». *Les quatre fleuves* 5. 4-13.
1975. « La comparution devant Pilate selon Jean, Jean 18,28-19,16 ». *Cahiers Bibliques de Foi et Vie* 13. 3-12.
1976. « Lecture de l'Evangile selon saint Jean ». *Cahiers Evangile* 17. 5-70.
1976. « Le rôle missionnaire des femmes dans l'Eglise ancienne ». *Evangelizzazione e cultura*. 143-8.
1977. « Les communautés asiates ». *Bible et Terre Sainte* 191. 3-4.
1977. « Exégèse du Nouveau Testament et documents externes ». *Les Quatre Fleuves* 7. 38-42.
1978. « Le calendrier de Qumrân et la date de la Cène ». *Le Monde de la Bible* 4.
1978. « Le rôle des femmes dans le peuple de Dieu. Recherches de critères en référence à l'Ecriture ». *Lectio Divina* 96. Ecriture et Pratique chrétienne (Congrès de l'ACFEB 1977). 53-68.
1978. « L'image de l'Agneau ». *Le Monde de la Bible* 3. 22-4.
1978. « Fiches de Calendrier ». Dans *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium, XLVI. Paris. 305-11.
1979. « Surgissement d'un peuple ». *Histoire vécue du peuple chrétien* I. 19-47.
1979. « Le code de sainteté dans l'oeuvre johannique ». *L'Année Canonique* XXIII. 59-67
1979. « L'Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament ». *Les Quatre Fleuves* 9. 23-32.
1980. « Comment donner un témoignage sur la foi ? ». *Nous croyons en Jésus-Christ*. Paris. 333-6.
1980. « La symbolique des femmes dans les traditions religieuses : une reconsidération de l'évangile de Jean ». *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 50,1. 114-21.
1981. (en collaboration avec Jean-Louis d'Aragon) « Jean, ou l'accomplissement en Jésus des institutions juives ». *Jésus aujourd'hui*. Paris. 63-73.

UNE VIE — UN ITINERAIRE

Née à Bordeaux le 25 octobre 1912 d'un père, Raoul Jaubert, charentais, et d'une mère, Marie-Jeanne Daudin Clavaud, bordelaise, Anne, Marie, Louise

dite Annie Jaubert grandit à Bordeaux jusqu'à l'âge de sept ans dans une famille nombreuse : quatre enfants — dont l'un disparut jeune — nés de la première femme de son père et trois enfants de la seconde épouse, cousine germaine de la première femme. Annie Jaubert est née de ce second mariage ; sa plus jeune soeur, Marie-Edith, est la seule survivante d'une fratrie décimée par le cancer. Raoul Jaubert, notaire à Arles puis à Angoulême, se défit de sa charge avant son remariage et résida un temps à Bordeaux avant de s'installer définitivement à Paris. C'est là qu'Annie Jaubert fit ses études secondaires, d'abord à Sainte Marie de Neuilly puis à l'Ecole Normale Catholique. Elle commença alors des études supérieures à la Sorbonne.

Cursus universitaire

Agrégation de lettres classiques, Paris 1937

Professeur de lycée à Poitiers, Versailles et Paris 1937–1946 (Hélène Boucher)

Congé d'études (= cours de théologie à l'Institut 1946–1948 Catholique de Paris)

Détachement au C.N.R.S. 1948–1951

Pensionnaire à l'Ecole biblique archéologique française 1951–1952

Professeur de lycée à Paris (Molière) 1953–1954

Professeur de lycée et chargée de deux heures de cours de N.T. 1954–1955 au décès de M. Goguel à la Faculté des Lettres Assistante d'Henri-Irénée Marrou et assurant deux heures de cours de 1955–1959

N. T. et deux heures d'hébreu (1ère et 2ème années)

Détachement C.N.R.S. 1955–1972

— assurant deux heures d'hébreu (direction A.Dupont-Sommer) 1959–1969 à l'Institut d'Etudes Sémitiques (Paris)

— assurant un cours de N.T. (Paris IV) en remplacement de depuis 1967 O. Cullmann — partie de l'UVA de christianisme ancien

— assurant une UV de premier cycle en hébreu élémentaire depuis 1969 (Paris III)

— chargée d'enseignement par Charles Pietri à la Sorbonne 1977–1979 (Paris IV) pour les étudiants en histoire sur « l'exégèse du N.T. et les origines chrétiennes ».

Diplômes

Diplôme de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes (Sciences Religieuses) 1957

Doctorat 3^{ème} cycle 1960

Doctorat d'Etat 1963

Monique Alexandre (professeur émérite à l'Université de Paris-IV-Sorbonne) cite les chercheurs et futurs chercheurs qu'Annie Jaubert côtoya au séminaire d'H. I. Marrou dans les années 1955 et suivantes : « Elle appartenait au groupe des aînés, parmi lesquels André Méhat (Clément d'Alexandrie), Michel Spanneut (Stoïcisme des Pères), Marguerite Harl (Origène), Marie-Louise Guillaumin (Cappadociens), Jean-Marie Leroux et Anne-Marie Malingrey (Jean Chrysostome), Anne-Marie La Bonnardière (Augustin). De plus jeunes gravitaient autour de ce centre : Marie-Josèphe Rondeau (exégèse des Psaumes), Charles Pietri (Rome chrétienne), Luce Pietri (Tours chrétienne), Claude Lepelley (cités d'Afrique dans l'Antiquité tardive) et Monique Alexandre (Philon d'Alexandrie) ».

C'est pour plus de clarté que les différentes activités d'Annie Jaubert sont présentées sous diverses rubriques alors qu'en fait ces activités s'interpénètrent et se nourrissent l'une l'autre.

L'enseignante

Les sujets de l'enseignement d'A. J. se confondent évidemment avec ceux de son propre travail. Elle a elle-même défini sa méthode de recherche et l'a enseignée à ses étudiants. Dès 1963 (*La Notion d'Alliance...*, p. 16–17) elle écrit : « Nous avons essayé d'entrer en communication avec ces générations du passé et de revivre avec elles leur passionnante aventure spirituelle, de porter sur elles un regard neuf en nous laissant imprégner et imbiber des textes. Nous avons cherché à adhérer à l'objet, à comprendre ces témoignages de l'intérieur, à pénétrer dans l'âme et dans le cœur de ces générations juives auxquelles nous devons tant et dans lesquelles s'enracine le christianisme primitif ». Elle a conservé jusqu'à la fin les mêmes principes puisque dans un entretien accordé à Guillemette de Sairigné pour « Le Monde » (mai 197) elle déclare : « Faire de l'exégèse, c'est expliquer les textes en les replaçant dans leur contexte. Il faut se glisser dans des raisonnements, des modes de pensée qui nous sont devenus étrangers, à nous hommes du vingtième siècle industrialisé ». C'est dans le même souci de compréhension qu'elle a approché les fidèles d'autres religions ou même les incroyants.

Ses étudiants étaient sensibles au souci qu'elle avait de les former à cette approche des textes, méthode qu'ils employèrent ensuite avec leurs propres étudiants. En témoignent parmi d'autres Gilles Dorival, actuellement professeur à l'Université d'Aix-en-Provence et Annick Lallemand — maître de conférences à la Sorbonne (Paris IV). Cette

dernière rappelle dans une lettre du 17 décembre 2001 : « Précision, clarté, fermeté, écoute attentive des étudiants étaient ses principales qualités ; peu de professeurs de son niveau, quand ils ont atteint une parfaite maîtrise du sujet qu'ils enseignent, préparent leur cours avec autant de soin et exigent d'étudiants de licence des recherches personnelles aussi précises, comme le fit Annie Jaubert » . Elle poursuit son témoignage en donnant l'exemple d'un cours sur l'évangile de Jean : « ...l'explication du texte choisi fut l'occasion d'étudier l'histoire des manuscrits, les variantes des textes du Nouveau Testament, la présentation des différents milieux juifs, l'étude de Flavius Josèphe, de Philon, des textes de Qumrân, des évangiles apocryphes ».

Le chercheur

C'est l'exigence spirituelle — on le verra dans la rubrique suivante — qui fut à l'origine des choix scientifiques d'Annie Jaubert et la poussa « à explorer la doctrine, scruter la Bible, comprendre plus profondément le message [de l'Eglise] » (Nous croyons en Jésus-Christ, p.334). Elle se donna les moyens — s'ajoutant au grec et au latin de sa formation universitaire — d'accéder aux textes originaux par l'étude des langues orientales, en particulier de l'hébreu, de l'araméen et du syriaque, tant pour les études bibliques que pour les apocryphes, pour Philon d'Alexandrie, pour Flavius Josèphe pour la patristique et pour l'approche du Talmud. Elle complète cette formation par l'étude des méthodes historiques et exégétiques à la Sorbonne avec A. Dupont-Sommer et H. I. Marrou et par des cours de philosophie et de théologie à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Enfin elle parachève cet apprentissage à l'Ecole biblique et archéologique de Jérusalem pour laquelle elle a obtenu une bourse d'un an (année universitaire 1951—1952) de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres : elle est la première femme à avoir obtenu cette bourse. Là elle s'adonne à l'étude des « manuscrits de la mer Morte » récemment découverts et que les fouilles de Qumrân enrichissent chaque année. De 1953 à 1960 ses articles et ses livres sont consacrés aux enseignements révélés par ces manuscrits. A la lumière des nouvelles données elle s'attache en particulier à reconstruire la chronologie de la Semaine Sainte.

L'éventail des thèmes abordés par A. J., on le voit par sa bibliographie, s'élargit d'année en année et ses oeuvres traitent non seulement de Qumrân mais de l'Ancien Testament et du judaïsme, des pseudépigraphes, des rapports entre le judaïsme et le christianisme, de Philon d'Alexandrie (importance du judaïsme hellénistique), de Flavius Josèphe, des débuts du

christianisme (en particulier de la Semaine Sainte, de l'évangile de Jean et des ministères) du judaïsme talmudique et de la patristique (Clément de Rome et Origène) mais aussi de la place des femmes dans l'Eglise. L'analyse de ces travaux dans les différents domaines a été faite de façon magistrale par Pierre Grelot « Annie Jaubert » [voir les références sous la rubrique finale « Hommages »]. Le cercle est alors parfait : c'est sa quête spirituelle qui l'entraîne vers les recherches scientifiques et ce sont celles-ci qui nourrissent son itinéraire spirituel et le service pastoral qu'elle assumera.

L'itinéraire spirituel

« Je n'avais pas plus de dix ou onze ans quand on m'a donné les quatre Evangiles : je les ai avalés d'un bout à l'autre ». Cette « boulimie » précoce lui donne le désir de mieux connaître les origines chrétiennes et d'éclaircir la filiation primitive de l'Eglise : « Oui, l'Eglise visible était pierre d'achoppement. Mais qu'était-ce que cela devant l'appel puissant qui me poussait à explorer la doctrine, scruter la Bible, comprendre plus profondément le Message ? La grâce de Dieu, le défi de Dieu étaient au-delà des misères humaines qui défiguraient le visage de l'Epouse. Dès l'âge de 15 ans, je me passionnais pour les origines chrétiennes. La question était alors pour moi : "Vrai ? ou faux ?" Toute l'orientation de ma vie dépendait de la réponse. J'eus la chance de trouver la lumière là où d'autres demeuraient dans l'obscurité. La question du "vrai ou du faux" fut vite dépassée. La Bible m'apparut finalement peu à peu la voie privilégiée pour parler de Dieu à l'homme contemporain » (Nous croyons en Jésus-Christ... 334).

Annie Jaubert ne lit la Bible qu'à 19 ans, déclare-t-elle à G. de Sérigné, et c'est aussi à 19 ans qu'elle formule, à la demande d'un aumônier, ses objections contre la foi ; celui-ci ne l'éclaire pas. Et c'est alors que se décide son destin : « Je sus désormais que moi, et moi seule, pouvais répondre à mes propres questions... et peut-être poser les problèmes autrement » (Nous croyons en Jésus-Christ... 333).

Les réponses à ses questions A. J. les trouve dans la Bible elle-même — Ancien et Nouveau Testaments — qu'elle éclaire par les documents déjà cités (pseudépigraphes, écrits qumrâniens, patristique). Des apparentes contradictions elle fait vertu, exemple et source de foi : « Comment se fait-il que cette Bible [l'ancien Testament] qui apparaissait à certains de mes contemporains comme un agglomérat monstrueux me ravissait précisément dans sa diversité ? Tous ces livres, écrits par des auteurs différents, dans des perspectives différentes, m'émerveillaient par leur réalisme. Ce qui apparaissait contradictoire, disparate se fondait pour

moi dans une cohérence plus profonde, qui témoignait de l'infinie variété de Dieu dans les diverses singularités de l'homme. Comme le disait Pascal, les contraires démontraient une vérité plus haute, les scandales même, oserai-je le dire ? étaient pour moi une source de santé. C'était un peuple véritable que Dieu s'était choisi et qu'il accompagnait, un peuple en bataille avec son propre Dieu, mais le Dieu fidèle ne lâchait pas son peuple. Ce livre était un livre de liberté qui n'avait pas été expurgé par les lorgnettes du Saint-Office ».

« Ce témoignage multiforme de la Bible je le retrouvais dans les Evangiles. Quel bonheur que Jésus n'ait rien écrit lui-même ! Nous aurions été soumis et suspendus à l'esclavage de la lettre. Le Jésus de l'Histoire était indissolublement celui de la Tradition, mais cette Tradition il la débordait de toute part. Aujourd'hui encore Jésus se découvre dans l'Ecriture avec et parmi d'autres croyants ; aujourd'hui encore sous la mouvance de l'Esprit, éclate la permanente nouveauté de l'Evangile. Mais nous voudrions aller plus loin, Jésus-Christ n'est pas un livre. Il se communique dans la foi, sensible ou non, au plus profond de notre être. Cette foi est un don gratuit, nous ne la possédons pas. Nous sommes "confondus", au sens strict du terme, par l'action du Logos qui éclaire tout homme, du Logos qui guérit, qui scrute, qui pénètre les replis les plus profonds du coeur » (Nous croyons en Jésus-Christ... 335). Cette notion de foi comme don de Dieu est au coeur de toute la réflexion spirituelle d'Annie Jaubert.

Ces lignes ont été dictées sur son lit d'hôpital quelques semaines avant sa disparition, et mieux que n'importe quel commentaire elles montrent comment Annie Jaubert a justifié sa foi et l'a vécue tout au long de sa vie.

Le service pastoral

Cette expression englobe les activités d'Annie Jaubert parallèles à son parcours universitaire (enseignement et recherche), quelquefois issues de ce dernier et quelquefois indépendantes de lui puisque purement ecclésiales. C'est pourquoi Pierre Grelot (Annie Jaubert... 148) écrit : « Faut-il donc faire entrer le service de l'Ecriture accompli par Annie Jaubert pendant 30 ans dans la catégorie des ministères ? Assurément ».

Dans la première catégorie se situent ses travaux et son action pour la place des femmes dans l'Eglise. Cette campagne, qui durera toute sa vie, est probablement déterminée par ce qu'on peut appeler son rejet, vers 1950, par l'Institut Catholique : on ne peut accorder un doctorat de théologie à une femme et « quant à enseigner dans l'Eglise, il n'en était pas question » (propos rapporté par G. de Sérigné dans son article). Quinze ans plus tard

Jean Vinatier témoigne des réticences rencontrées « pour qu'elle fasse quelques exposés à des séminaristes ». Par des exemples tirés du N. T. elle démontre dans ses livres, ses articles et ses conférences qu'il n'y a aucune justification scripturaire à la situation mineure faite aux femmes dans l'Eglise. Dans les évangiles c'est à une femme (la Samaritaine) que Jésus dit être le Messie (Jean 4, 25–26), comme il le dira, mais plus tard, au Grand Prêtre (Marc 14, 61–62). C'est à Marie de Magdala qu'il apparaît en premier le jour de la Résurrection et c'est elle qu'il charge de transmettre le message aux apôtres (Jean 20, 17–18). Dans les autres textes du N.T. les *Actes* décrivent l'accueil fait par les femmes aux jeunes communautés chrétiennes (par exemple Lydia en 16, 15). A. J. démontre que la misogynie attribuée à Paul relève en partie des usages juifs de l'époque et qu'une mauvaise traduction engendre souvent une mauvaise compréhension (1 Cor. 11, 7 et 10). C'est pourquoi elle enseigne aussi qu'il ne faut jamais oublier le contexte culturel de l'époque du Christ et de celle des Pères lorsqu'on délibère sur le diaconat ou le « ministère » féminin : elle rappelle que le ministère est un « service » non un « pouvoir » et qu'aucun texte dans l'Écriture ne s'oppose au ministère des femmes et même à leur ordination.

Le « service pastoral » d'Annie Jaubert s'exerce d'abord dans le cadre des « Missions de France » où elle enseigne à des universitaires mais aussi, outre les articles et les livres de vulgarisation, par des sessions et des conférences à « ses frères et sœurs du peuple chrétien » auxquels elle rend accessible les grands problèmes de l'histoire de l'Eglise.

D'autre part elle oeuvre efficacement dans des cadres structurés où ses compétences sont appréciées. Elle participe aux « Semaines des Intellectuels Catholiques » ; de 1966 à 1979 elle est la seule personne à représenter les « laïcs » dans l'Association Catholique française pour l'Étude de la Bible (ACPEB) où elle est choisie parmi les membres du Bureau pour faire partie des trois « Consultants ». Elle est sollicitée par de hautes instances internationales telles que la Commission Foi et Constitution du Conseil œcuménique des Églises à Genève et, en 1971, elle est consultée par les évêques de France pour la préparation du Synode de Rome.

Dans toute sa vie et dans tous les domaines Annie Jaubert a fait partie de ce « peuple chrétien, toujours soumis à des tensions, obligé sans cesse de se référer à ses racines, et obligé de préciser sa foi devant des interrogations toujours nouvelles. Peuple à la fois antique et audacieux, qui doit maintenir son identité dans une créativité permanente » (« Histoire vécue du peuple chrétien »). C'est cette mission qu'a rappelée le cardinal Marty lors de ses obsèques : « J'ai souvent pensé que dans sa discrétion

Annie Jaubert avait oeuvré plus que beaucoup pour faire découvrir aux femmes, aux laïcs, aux intellectuels, leur participation originale à la mission de l'Église. Merci à Dieu de nous avoir donné ce signe ».

Voici quelques **Hommages** auxquels je me suis référée et qui sont d'excellents témoignages sur la vie et l'oeuvre d'Annie Jaubert.

Guillemette de Sérigné, « Femme et exégète ». *Le Monde*. Mai 1979.

Jean Vinatier, « Annie Jaubert : une femme exégète de notre temps ». *La Croix*. 28 février 1980.

Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, « Le "Ministère" d'Annie Jaubert ». *Cahiers universitaires catholiques* 5. Paris, 1980. 30–5.

Pierre Grelot, « Annie Jaubert ». *Les quatre fleuves* 12. Paris, 1980. 137–51.

Il est intéressant de décrire les armoiries des Jaubert tant elles semblent prédestinées à décrire la ténacité et la persévérance d'Annie Jaubert à résoudre les questions qui se présentaient à elle. Elles figurent à sénestre un ange frappant avec une pioche un rocher situé à dextre et portent la devise « peu à peu ».

ANNIE JAUBERT
ET LES ETUDES DE L'ORIENT CHRETIEN

Par Basile Lourié

Aux yeux des contemporains aussi qu'à ses propres yeux, Mlle Jaubert n'était qu'un exégète et un étudiant du christianisme primitif. Aujourd'hui cependant, jetant l'œil sur la rétrospective historique, on voit bien davantage.

Dans le contexte actuel, Mlle Jaubert se présente comme un des découvreurs — et je suppose même que je doive dire *le* découvreur — d'une dimension nouvelle de la science sur l'Orient Chrétien. Il s'agit de l'utilisation systématique des données subsistantes dans les traditions chrétiennes orientales aux buts de reconstruction des traditions juives préchrétiennes. Ici, Mlle Jaubert avait quelques prédécesseurs, même illustres, mais c'est à Mlle Jaubert qu'on doit du fondement théorique des pareilles études.

Il y a une différence importante, se limite-on par un travail philologique de l'édition des textes des œuvres juives anciennes subsistantes dans les versions et les recensions chrétiennes ou bien fait-on des tentatives d'en reconstruire les mouvements religieux, leurs théologies et liturgies, au sein desquels ces œuvres-là ont été engendrées. Dans le dernier cas, on se rencontre avec une variété religieuse au-dedans du monde juif avant J.-C., et on a donc besoin de tenir compte des traditions juives qui ont effectivement contribué à la formation des traditions chrétiennes. L'usage des données chrétiennes pour l'étude des traditions juives préchrétiennes dépend donc de notre conception des origines chrétiennes, mais notre conception de celles-ci, à son tour, peut profiter de l'usage de ces données.

Dans le domaine de la théorie, Mlle Jaubert n'avait qu'un unique prédécesseur, R. H. Charles, qui d'ailleurs n'était pas aussi fortuné. Charles partageait la croyance commune de plusieurs de ses contemporains que les chrétiens ont devenu des héritiers de la tradition « prophétique », et spécialement « apocalyptique », du judaïsme ancien, abandonnée par le judaïsme rabbinique.¹ Mais, ce qui est devenu clair surtout après Qoumrân, cette tradition « prophétique » ou « apocalyptique » dans le judaïsme ancien n'existait que dans l'imagination des savants, et, d'ailleurs, le judaïsme à l'aube de l'ère chrétienne fut si divisé qu'il est impossible de le considérer comme un culte unique. Il fallait donc indiquer les courants religieux dans le monde juif de l'époque néotestamentaire qui ont été responsables de la préformation des traditions chrétiennes. Plus précisément, il fallait trouver des invariants communs au christianisme primitif et à certaines traditions juives préchrétiennes, mais étrangers aux autres traditions juives, pré- et post-chrétiennes, y compris le judaïsme rabbinique.

C'est ici que se pose la découverte faite par Mlle Jaubert au début des années 1950, immédiatement après la découverte des manuscrits de la Mer Morte en 1947.

Le mot-clef de sa découverte, c'est peut-être l'adjectif « sacerdotal ».

Évidemment, la tradition rabbinique ne saurait être sacerdotale, tandis que la tradition chrétienne l'est. Non seulement les chrétiens ont établi leur sacerdoce propre, mais ils insistaient, surtout à l'époque ancienne, que leur

¹ Cf. son article sommaire publié dans ses années tardives: "But though Christianity was in spirit the descendant of ancient Jewish prophecy, it was no less truly the child of that type of Judaism which had expressed its highest aspirations and ideals in pseudepigraphic and Apocalyptic literature. <...> It was Christianity that preserved Jewish Apocalyptic, when it was abandoned by Judaism as it sank into Rabbinism <...>" (Charles, R. H., and W. O. E. Oesterley. "Apocalyptic Literature." In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. 2, 103–4. Chicago/London/Toronto, 1956). Cf. une critique de l'attitude de Charles chez Charlesworth, J. H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*, 30–1. Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series, 54. Cambridge etc., 1985. Au titre des œuvres classiques représentant les attitudes de l'époque on doit consulter Bousset, W. *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung der Apokalypse*. Göttingen, 1895; Volz, P. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur dargestellt*. 2. Aufl. Tübingen, 1934.

sacerdoce ne soit qu'une continuation directe de celui vétérotestamentaire². Ces thèmes ne sont devenus d'ailleurs un objet d'études de Mlle Jaubert que les années 1960³, lorsque la rétrospective vétérotestamentaire dans les études du christianisme ancien était déjà pour elle bien définie. Ce n'est pas les documents chrétiens qui ont donné l'impulse initial à sa pensée, mais les documents juifs, qoumrâniens et autres, comme *Le Livre des Jubilées*.

Tout a commencé par le calendrier de 364 jours que Mlle Jaubert a nommé « sacerdotal » par son appartenance, d'après elle, au Code Sacerdotal biblique. Ce nom s'est trouvé n'être pas très heureux parce que les origines de ce calendrier sont assez discutables⁴, et, en tout cas, son adaptation par le (un ?) culte juif est postérieure au Code Sacerdotal. On connaît maintenant le modèle babylonien du calendrier hébreu de 364 jours. C'est un calendrier décrit dans un traité astronomique babylonien nommé MUL.APIN (« Étoile polaire »), de 364 jours il aussi⁵, mais le Code Sacerdotal est maintenant redaté par une époque plus haute que l'Exil babylonien⁶. Il nous reste donc à discuter d'une possible présence d'un

² Cf., pour la discussion mise au jour: Bauckham, R. *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*. Edinburgh, 1990; Painter, J. *Just James. The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*. Studies on personalities of the New Testament. Columbia, 1997. Sur « les thèmes lévitiques », aussi chers à Mlle Jaubert (v. sa Bibliographie), dans les généalogies de Jésus, voir surtout: de Jonge, M. "Two Messias in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?" Dans Van Henten, J. W. , and H. J. de Jonge *et al.*, eds. *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature (FS J. C. H. Lebram)*, 150–62. Studia Post-Biblica, 36. Leiden, 1986 [republié dans: Idem, *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays*, 191–203. NovTSup, 63. Leiden/New York/København/Köln, 1991], et Idem, "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Bijdragen* 46 (1985): 245–60 [republié dans: Idem, *Jewish Eschatology*, 204–19].

³ Cf. ses études sur la *Prima Clementis* et l'Évangile de Jean (surtout ce qu'elle écrit sur Jean le Baptiste); v. Bibliographie.

⁴ Cf. note 4 dans Lourié, B. « Les quatre jours "de l'intervalle" : une modification néotestamentaire et chrétienne du calendrier de 364 jours » (dans le *Mémorial* présent).

⁵ Albani, M. *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube. Untersuchungen zum Astronomischen Henochbuch*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 68. Neukirchen/Vluyn, 1994.

⁶ Indépendamment par Israel Knohl et Jacob Milgrom. Voir Knoll, I. *The Sanctuary of Silence. The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis, 1995 [en hébreu:

calendrier de 364 jours dans certaines *recensions* tardives de ces livres bibliques qu'on attribue au Code Sacerdotal, mais la discussion sur la présence d'un pareil calendrier dans le Code lui-même peut être considérée comme terminée.

Toutefois, le calendrier de 364 jours est « sacerdotal » dans un autre sens, qui est d'ailleurs plus intéressant pour notre propos. C'est un calendrier parfaitement approprié aux buts cultuels et même au temple et au sacerdoce spécifiques. C'est un trait unique, tout à fait étranger au calendrier rabbinique lunaire ainsi qu'au calendrier solaire de 365 jours, saisi par Mlle Jaubert bien avant des études approfondies de l'espace cultuel de *1 Enoch*, des liturgies des *Cantiques du Sacrifice de Sabbath* et du *Rouleau du Temple* ou des cours sacerdotaux de *4Q'Ottof*. Un pareil calendrier serait donc complètement inutile aux mouvements religieux privés du sacerdoce, comme le pharisaïsme ou le judaïsme rabbinique. En même temps, il est très informatif sur la structure du culte correspondante, y compris la structure du temple, parfois l'organisation des services des prêtres, et toujours — parce que nos temples terrestres sont modelés d'après le Tabernacle céleste (*Exode* 25, 9) — sur la structure interne des Cieux, c'est à dire la structure que voient les visionnaires dans les apocalypses. Le calendrier liturgique, c'était donc une formule cosmologique, liturgique et — disons avec Mlle Jaubert — sacerdotale, et on ne sera pas trop étonné lorsqu'on voit la question de calendrier au centre des luttes entre les courants divers du judaïsme ancien. On le verra, même dans le *Mémorial* présent, que l'actualité du calendrier de 364 jours pour le christianisme naissant reste discutable jusqu'aujourd'hui, mais nous avons à revisiter ce problème quelques lignes plus loin.

Or le calendrier n'était qu'une formule — ou, plutôt, le squelette — de la tradition commune au christianisme naissant et à sa matrice juive, la

Jérusalem, 1992); Milgrom, J. *Leviticus 1–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 13–35. The Anchor Bible, 3. New York etc., 1991.

⁷ Voir: Albani, *Astronomie*; Falk, D. K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 27. Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1998, spéc. 126–49 (sur les *ShirShabb*); Maier, J. *The Temple Scroll. An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. JSOTSup, 34. Sheffield, 1985; Gleßner, U. "The Otot-texts (4Q319) and the Problem of Intercalations in the Context of the 364-day Calendar." Dans Fabry, H.-J., A. Lange und H. Lichtenberger, Hgg. *Qumranstudien. Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993*, 125–64. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, 3. Münster, 1995.

tradition qu'il fallait rechercher. Une notion beaucoup plus vaste, quoique aussi commune pour les traditions messianiques préchrétiennes et chrétiennes, c'est la notion d'Alliance, à laquelle Mlle Jaubert a consacré sa thèse de doctorat. Elle traçait l'histoire de l'Alliance et surtout celle de la *Nouvelle Alliance* à partir du Code Sacerdotal et de Jérémie jusqu'au Nouveau Testament à travers des œuvres intertestamentaires et qoumrâniennes, et c'était pour la première fois que la théologie du christianisme primitif ait été présentée comme un fruit d'un développement continu et organique d'une théologie hébreu. Afin de mieux saisir l'importance d'un pareil résultat, qu'on rappelle qu'à l'époque, la littérature intertestamentaire n'était pas normalement considérée comme un segment nécessaire de la ligne qui conjoint entre eux la Bible hébraïque et le Nouveau Testament, mais plutôt comme un produit des mouvements excentriques et sectaires. D'ailleurs, l'approche commune à la théologie du Nouveau Testament impliquait une sorte du « marcionisme scientifique », où on tentait d'expliquer la naissance de la christologie comme une création *ex nihilo*.⁸

Ce sont les découvertes de Qoumrân qui ont catalysé, dès les années 1950, un changement rapide de tout ce tableau du monde religieux juif à l'aube de l'ère chrétienne.

Au point de vue de la patrologie et, de façon plus générale, des études de l'Orient Chrétien, il y a deux noms qu'on doit rappeler ici immédiatement: celui de Mgr Jean Daniélou († 1974) et celui de Mlle Annie Jaubert. On pourrait même préciser les titres de leurs travaux les plus révolutionnaires: *Théologie du judéo-christianisme* (1958)⁹ et *La date de la Cène* (1957). Les deux monographies contenaient un nombre des points

⁸ Sur les pareils sous-entendus de l'école allemande, la plus autoritaire et influente, on pourrait consulter avec profit, par exemple, Evans, C. A. "Recent development in Jesus Research: Presuppositions, Criteria, and Sources." Dans Idem, *Jesus and His Contemporaries. Comparative Studies*, 1-49. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums*, 25. Leiden/New York/Köln, 1995, spéc. p. 20, conclusion sur Bultmann: « This thinking <...> grows out of a theology that places great emphasis on how Jesus was different from (i. e. 'superior to') Judaism. In essence what we have in Bultmann and his pupils is apologetics not history ». À l'époque présente, ce sont des précautions de nature contraire qui ont devenues peut-être plus actuelles; cf. Hagner, D. A., with a Foreword by G. Lindeskog. *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus. An Analysis and Critique of Modern Jewish Study of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI, 1984.

⁹ L'édition posthume, avec quelques additions éditoriales: Daniélou, J. *Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée. I. Théologie du judéo-christianisme*. Paris, 1991.

critiquables, mais leurs contributions principales présentaient un nouveau paradigme scientifique (au sens de T. Kuhn, l'auteur de *The Structure of the Scientific Revolutions*, 1962, dont le livre, paru à la même époque, a marqué une révolution dans la science de l'histoire de la science¹⁰).

Oui, les critiques de Mgr Daniélou pouvaient lui reprocher à juste titre que sa reconstruction d'une unique « théologie judéo-chrétienne » ne résiste pas aux faits, qu'il n'y avait aucune « théologie » commune à toutes les communautés judéo-chrétiennes.¹¹ N'importe: ce qui valait mieux, ce n'était pas la reconstruction, mais l'idée que *toute* la théologie chrétienne avant la deuxième moitié du II^e siècle ait été, dans un sens, « judéo-chrétienne », d'où encore une conclusion de valeur capitale — que les œuvres pseudépigraphiques répandues parmi les chrétiens doivent être utilisées, tout d'abord, comme les sources sur la pensée théologique au-dedans de la Grande Église, quoique en une époque postérieure, au III^e et surtout au IV^e siècles, les mêmes pseudépigraphes deviennent plus familiarisés par les sectes. Or, une grande partie de ces pseudépigraphes a été d'origine juive et pré-chrétienne, d'où s'ensuivait presque automatiquement ***l'idée centrale de tout « le paradigme scientifique » en question: la théologie du christianisme naissant se développait comme une continuation d'une ou de plusieurs traditions juives.*** Le paradigme vieilli, que la théologie chrétienne ait été « inventée » par quelques-uns en opposition à la tradition théologique juive, a été désormais abandonné.

Qu'on tienne compte qu'une révolution religieuse comme la venue du Messie n'est pas nécessairement une révolution théologique. Dans le cas où cette venue est accomplie en correspondance exacte avec les prophéties (c'est-à-dire, *avec la tradition exégétique* dans laquelle on transmettait des pareilles prophéties¹²), on saurait attendre dans la théologie plutôt une évo-

¹⁰ L'histoire des *humanitas*, non moins que celle des sciences dites « exactes » devrait devenir un objet de l'application des théories de Thomas Kuhn et d'Imre Lakatos sur les mécanismes internes du développement de la connaissance scientifique. Les études des judaïsmes anciens et des origines chrétiennes dans le siècle passé sont riches d'exemples très marquants du changement des « paradigmes » de Kuhn et des « programmes scientifiques » de Lakatos.

¹¹ Cf. la formulation de Marcel Simon: « Le judéo-christianisme tel que le conçoit Daniélou, c'est-à-dire en tant que théologie structurée et cohérente, représente une abstraction ». (Simon, M. « Réflexions sur le judéo-christianisme ». Dans Neusner, R., ed. *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Part II. Early Christianity, 53–76. Leiden, 1975, spéc. p. 56.

¹² Lourié, « Les quatre jours », partie 4.3 et note 42.

lution qu'une révolution. Le paradigme nouveau, adopté par Mgr Daniélou et Mlle Jaubert, c'était donc un paradigme « évolutionniste » au lieu d'un paradigme « révolutionnaire ». La première théologie chrétienne a été, d'après eux, une théologie juive pré-chrétienne où la partie majeure des prophéties pour les temps messianiques est considérée comme accomplie.¹³

Or, la théologie d'inspiration vétérotestamentaire s'expliquait tout d'abord par le langage du culte dont la partie la plus informative est devenu, dans les derniers siècles avant J.-C., le calendrier liturgique — le point central des études de Mlle Jaubert en 1950s.

Tout en étant un co-auteur du même paradigme scientifique que Mgr Daniélou, Mlle Jaubert a donc fourni la première théorie, dans le cadre du même paradigme, acceptable comme une base de travail: *il faut tracer l'histoire de la théologie se basant sur le langage liturgique (dont la partie centrale est le calendrier)*, et non sur les constructions intellectuelles, comme le voulait Mgr Daniélou. Loin de considérer le christianisme ancien comme un mouvement adogmatique ou, du moins, n'ayant aucun système théologique,¹⁴ Mlle Jaubert ne suivait pas Mgr Daniélou dans les recherches d'un fil purement intellectuel pour devenir capable de surmonter les labyrinthes des idées qu'on trouve dans les sources. Au lieu de ceci, elle s'est tournée vers la liturgie, avec son calendrier et son sacerdoce — et avec la conception de l'Alliance sur laquelle cette liturgie a été basée. *Ainsi Mlle Jaubert a saisi le nerf du système théologique tout entier: dans le christianisme naissant, c'était la liturgie juive et non la logique grecque.*

Il en va sans dire que les deux, Mgr Daniélou et Mlle Jaubert, insistaient sur la nécessité d'étudier la littérature pseudépigraphique comme

¹³ Bien qu'il serait prématuré de dire que ce paradigme « évolutionniste » soit devenu maintenant le plus dominant, on peut le nommer très influent. Cf., par ex., Rowland, Ch. *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the Most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism*. London, 1985, p. xvii: « ...I have assumed that, in early Christianity, we are dealing with a Jewish messianic sect... » ; cf. de meme *ibid.*, 75–80 (« Christianity as a Jewish Sect »).

¹⁴ L'absence d'un système théologique basé sur la philosophie grecque, ce n'est pas la même chose que l'absence de système quelconque — circonstance ignorée si souvent par les historiens de la théologie chrétienne, même à notre époque ; cf., par ex.: « Natürlich has es in dieser Frühzeit keine schulmäßig betriebene systematische Theologie gegeben » (Schneemelcher, W. *Das Urchristentum*, 165. Urban-Taschenbücher, 336. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz, 1981). Cela serait « natürlich » dans l'unique cas si la théologie chrétienne est une invention sur la place vide.

les sources de la théologie au-dedans de la Grande Église et la matrice juive du christianisme.

Il serait légitime de préciser quelque chose davantage. Le langage liturgique dont il s'agit chez Mlle Jaubert, c'est toujours le langage sacerdotal. La liturgie sans aucun sacerdoce, tout en étant possible (par exemple, dans les judaïsmes rabbinique et karaïte ou le protestantisme), était sans doute hors des frontières du christianisme naissant et de sa matrice juive. Donc, lorsque Mlle Jaubert dit « sacerdotal », cela veut dire souvent tout simplement « liturgique ». Sa méthode n'était, en effet, qu'une application systématique de la liturgie historique à l'histoire des traditions religieuses entières, la méthode tout à fait justifiable en ce qui concerne le monde juif aux abords de l'ère chrétienne. Nous discutons d'ailleurs la nouveauté et les perspectives d'une pareille approche qui ne fut jamais, aujourd'hui non plus, familière aux étudiants du Nouveau Testament.¹⁵ Ce qu'il nous était important de noter ici, ce que la théorie adoptée par Mlle Jaubert, à savoir que le cordon ombilical conjoint le christianisme avec sa matrice juive est accessible à partir de la liturgie, l'a fait développer une approche de liturgie comparée aux études du Nouveau Testament.

Mais laissons pour le moment de côté la contribution de Mlle Jaubert aux études liturgiques pour revenir à notre thème central des études de l'Orient Chrétien.

Ce sont les données des traditions chrétiennes orientales qui ont fourni à Mlle Jaubert les preuves décisives de l'existence du calendrier de 364 jours dans les milieux chrétiens. Mais les critiques, dès Patrick Skehan en 1958¹⁶ jusqu'à Walter D. Ray dans le présent *Mémorial*, indiquent en revanche que ces données sont trop fragmentaires pour en conjecturer quelque chose sur la communauté de Jésus. Il est nécessaire de s'arrêter un peu sur ce point.

Ce qui est le plus évident, c'est un problème de la connaissance des sources orientales sur l'usage du calendrier de 364 jours ou de certaines particularités liées à celui-ci (comme, par exemple, la commémoration de la Cène le mardi). En effet, elles sont beaucoup plus nombreuses que celles qu'a trouvées Mlle Jaubert et existent à peu près dans toutes les traditions orientales.¹⁷ Cependant la spécialisation sur le Nouveau Testament et même sur le christianisme primitif ne présuppose jusqu'à maintenant aucune

¹⁵ Lourié, « Les quatre jours ».

¹⁶ Voir note 15 dans Lourié, « Les quatre jours ».

¹⁷ Cf. surtout van Esbroeck, M. « L'année régulière de 364 jours dans la controverse au sujet de Chalcédoine » (dans le présent *Mémorial*), de même que Lourié, « Les quatre jours ».

connaissance approfondie des sources chrétiennes orientales. D'ailleurs, la spécialisation dans les christianismes orientaux, malgré des efforts des certains savants et même de certains milieux scientifiques (comme le cercle de la rédaction pré-révolutionnaire de la revue *Христианский Восток*), ne présuppose, à son tour, aucun intérêt ni connaissance des problèmes des origines chrétiennes. À mon avis, ces barrières interdisciplinaires sont l'unique raison pourquoi l'assortiment des sources discutées en connexion à l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert est jusqu'ici si pauvre.

Ce qui va ensuite, c'est un problème de méthode. Il ne suffit pas de collectionner les sources, il faut les mettre en ordre. Par exemple, les évidences présentées par M. van Esbroeck dans le présent *Mémorial* ont leur origine, parfois éloignée, à Jérusalem, et une pareille localisation de la tradition du calendrier de 364 jours ne saurait être tout à fait sans importance pour les recherches du calendrier primitif de la communauté chrétienne de cette même ville. Or cette localisation dans Jérusalem ne serait jamais possible sans la méthode de l'hagiographie critique que le Père van Esbroeck applique à ses sources — des légendes hagiographiques orientales (et parfois occidentales) qui reflètent les querelles christologiques des V^e et VI^e siècles ! Rien d'extraordinaire si l'hagiographie fournit des données à la liturgie comparée, mais c'est hors d'habitude lorsqu'il s'agit d'un domaine relevant des études néotestamentaires.

La liturgie comparée, c'est, à mon avis, l'unique méthode qui saurait être applicable pour établir la forme du calendrier de la communauté de Jésus, et j'ai essayé de le démontrer dans ma propre contribution à notre *Mémorial*. Mais il faut souligner que cette même méthode a été testée pour la première fois, quoique sans la nommer, par Mlle Jaubert elle-même.

Enfin, un autre thème majeur de Mlle Jaubert, celui de l'Alliance, ne doit pas être occulté par la question de calendrier. Aujourd'hui il est temps de constater que l'idée d'une alliance renouvelée n'a pas cessé être productive dans le christianisme comme elle l'était dans les mouvements juifs pré-chrétiens. Il semble que c'est une idée centrale du monachisme et un

fondement théologique de la vie ascétique au IV^e siècle,¹⁸ dont les racines sont naturellement dans le christianisme avant Nicée.¹⁹

L'*impetus* donné par Mlle Jaubert aux études de l'Orient Chrétien ne se limite pas par l'intensification de l'usage des sources orientales dans les études du christianisme ancien, ni même par l'application de la liturgie comparée (discipline enfantée dans le milieu des études de l'Orient Chrétien) aux études néotestamentaires. Elle a ouvert des perspectives nouvelles pour les études des traditions juives, ce qui n'est pas moins important pour les études des origines chrétiennes.²⁰

C'est ici qu'on voit la dimension nouvelle des études de l'Orient Chrétien dont Mlle Jaubert est devenue un découvreur et, oserais-je dire, le premier théoricien à succès. Si le christianisme héritait d'une (ou des) tradition(s) juive(s) sacerdotale(s), au contraire du judaïsme rabbinique privé du temple et du sacerdoce, les données chrétiennes peuvent être utilisées dans les études de ces formes du judaïsme, souvent mieux que les sources rabbiniques. En effet, les judaïsmes « sacerdotaux », c'est-à-dire ayant sacerdoce, sacrifices, temple ou tabernacle, sont assez nombreux. Pas seulement les mouvements religieux de l'époque du Second Temple, y compris la secte de Qoumrân, mais encore quelques traditions survivantes (comme les Samaritains et les *Beta Israël* (Falachas) éthiopiens) et disparues (comme la tradition peu connue qui a engendré la littérature des *Hekhaloth*,²¹

¹⁸ Voir, d'abord, Couilleau, G. « L'«alliance» aux origines du monachisme égyptien ». *Collectanea Cisterciensia* 39 (1977) : 170–93, et ensuite, pour une perspective plus large, Лурье, В. М. *Призвание Авраама. Идея монашества и ее воплощение в Египте*. Богословская и церковно-историческая библиотека. Санкт-Петербург, 2001 [Lourié, V. *Vocation of Abraham. The idea of monasticism and its incarnation in Egypt*. Theological and Church History Library. St Petersburg, 2001].

¹⁹ Cf. Лурье, В. М. «Цитата из Папия в составе армянской версии Толкования на Апокалипсис св. Андрея Кесарийского: перевод и историко-экзегетическое исследование». Dans Дунаев, А. Г., ред. *Писания Мужей Апостольских*. Москва, 2002 [Lourié, V. «A quotation from Papias in the Armenian version of the *Commentary on Apocalypse* of St. Andrew of Caesarea.» In Dunaev, Alexey, ed. *Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. Moscow, 2002], 511–32, прим. 32.

²⁰ Je me permettrais de citer encore une fois Christopher Rowland: «...to understand early Christianity is, first of all, to understand first century Judaism in all its complexity» (Rowland, *Christian Origins*, xiii).

²¹ Il va sans dire que les traditions en question sont capables de localiser leur temples soit sur la terre, soit dans les Cieux ou bien dans l'imagination. Sans entrer dans la discussion trop haute sur la provenance de la littérature des *Hekhaloth* je me limiterai de quelques références sur son côté « sacerdotal », c'est-à-dire liturgique:

probablement le premier judaïsme des Khazars²² et une secte juive de l'Arabie par laquelle a été influencée la structure du sanctuaire de la Mecque²³).

Ces perspectives des études de l'Orient Chrétien aux intérêts de l'Orient pré-chrétien et non-chrétien, c'est une nouvelle dimension de notre discipline scientifique qu'elle doit à Mlle Jaubert.²⁴

Sed, N. *La mystique cosmologique juive*. École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales. Études juives, 16. Berlin/Paris/New York, 1981 [cette monographie, finie en 1969, quoique assez vieillie, fournit des données fort intéressantes sur la continuation d'une «cosmologie liturgique» du type énochien dans la littérature des *Hekhaloth*]; Elijor, R. "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines. Prayers and Sacred Songs in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 4 (1997): 217–67. L'analyse liturgique est assez rare dans les études sur la littérature des *Hekhaloth*, c'est pourquoi il serait utile de citer la thèse de Michael Dov Schwartz, *Liturgical Elements in Early Jewish Mysticism: A Literary Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah*. New York University PhD thesis. Research Advisor L. H. Schiffman. 1986 (microfiche: University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, MI, n° 86-26916).

²² Voir l'analyse des données liturgiques dans ma recension de Brook, K. "The Jews of Khazaria." *XB* 2 (8) (2001): 436–41, spéc. 439–41.

²³ Cf., sur les difficultés de l'approche traditionnelle aux origines de l'Islam: Wansbrough, J. *The Sectarian Milieu. Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History*. London Oriental Series, 34. Oxford, 1978, mais voir les reconstructions des structures liturgiques faites par G. R. Hawting, par ex.: Hawting, G. R. "The Origins of the Muslim Sanctuary at Mecca." Dans Juynboll, G. H. A., ed. *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society*, 23–47, 203–10. Papers on Islamic History, 5. Carbondale/Edwardsville, 1982; idem, "The Disappearance and Rediscovery of Zamzam and the *Well of the Ka'aba*." *Bulletin of the School of the Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980): 44–54. «Certain Jewish ideas» dont parle ici Hawting concernant la structure liturgique du sanctuaire de la Mecque sont les très reconnaissables structures du Temple/Tabernacle eschatologique du type ézéchiélique (avec une source d'eau) bien connues par les édifices chrétiens (cf. Лурье, В. М. «Из Иерусалима в Аксум через Храм Соломона: архаичные предания о Сноне и Ковчеге Завета в составе *Кебра Негест* и их трансляция через Константинополь» [Lourié, V. "From Jerusalem to Aksum through the Temple of Solomon: Archaic traditions related to the Ark of Covenant and Sion in the *Kebrā Nagast* and their translation through Constantinople"]. *XB* 2 (8) (2001): 137–207); en tout cas, ces «idées juives» n'ont rien à voir avec le judaïsme rabbinique.

²⁴ Cet article a été écrit au cours d'un dialogue avec le R. P. Étienne Nodet, o.p., et avec une assistance continue de Mlle Madeleine Petit. Je les remercie de tout mon cœur.

THE SUN IN 2 ENOCH

By Francis I. Andersen

THE FOURTH HEAVEN

The description of the fourth heaven in the *Second Book of Enoch* (Slavonic Enoch), chapters 11–17, contains a great deal of lore concerning the sun and its movements. The activity of the moon is also described, but the moon receives less attention than the sun. The central concept is that the rising and setting of the sun and moon throughout the annual cycle are made by means of two sets of gates, six in the East, six in the West. Here are two representative versions of chapter 14, the first from MS **A** (“shorter” recension), the second a maximum reconstruction (“longer” recension) based on **J**, with contributions from readings found only in **R** shown in parentheses.

And when he goes out through the western gates, then four angels remove his crown, and they carry it to the LORD.¹ But the sun turns his chariot around and goes on without light. And they put the crown back on him again (2 Enoch 14:2–3 [**A**]).

Thus he goes back once again to the eastern gates, under the earth. (And when he goes out from the western gates,) he takes off his light, the splendor that is his radiance, (and four hundred angels take his crown, and carry it to the LORD). For, since his shining crown is with God, with four hundred angels guarding it, (the sun turns his chariot around) and goes back under the earth on wheels, without the great light that is his great radiance and ornament. And he remains for seven great hours in night. And the chariot spends half the time under the earth.

¹ In *3 Baruch* this has to be done because each day its rays are defiled by the sight of all the wickedness on the earth.

And when he comes to the eastern approaches, in the eighth hour of the night, (the angels, the four hundred angels, bring back the crown, and crown him). And his brightness and the shining of his crown are seen before sunrise, and the sun blazes out more than fire does (2 Enoch 14 [“longer”]).

In this part of the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* there are attempts at exact science, with precise calculations of the seasonal changes in the sun’s movements. This enterprise has ancient roots. The information in 2 Enoch derives from the same tradition as is found in the astronomical portions of the original books of Enoch, which can be traced back to Qumran.² There is a lot of information about the several cycles of the two main heavenly bodies, and various explanations of the phenomena are supplied. Mythology is mixed with these data. The sun drives across the sky in a chariot, accompanied by angels and other beings, who perform various tasks. The sun wears a blazing crown on his head that he removes at night and puts on again just before dawn.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE TRADITION

It is not always easy to grasp the picture, and the explanations do not seem to be consistent. The solar and lunar calendars are not compatible, and there are various estimates of the length of the year.

The tensions in the texts arise from confusion of four incompatible components. First, there is the scientific background in ancient astronomy;³ secondly there seems to be an overlay of scribal drift under the influence of competing calendrical systems; thirdly there is the mythological background that had passed into folklore;⁴ fourthly it seems that theological

² Milik, J. T., and M. Black, eds. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford, 1976; Black M. *The Books of Enoch or I Enoch*. SVTP, 7. Leiden, 1985; Flint, P. W., and J. C. VanderKam. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1998: 25.

³ Böttrich, C. “Weltweisheit — Menschheitsethik — Urkult. Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch.” *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2.50 (1992): 149–53

⁴ Later in this essay we shall explore this stratum, which supplies ingredients common to 2 *Enoch*, 3 *Baruch*, and the **Прѣвнѣ** (“Dispute of the Orthodox with the Latin”). Already in Popov’s majestic edition of three redactions of the Slavonic translation of the **Прѣвнѣ** (Попов, А. Н. *Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических сочинений против латинян (XI–XV в.)* [Popov, A. N. *Historical and bibliographical survey of the Old Russian polemical works against the Latins (11th–15th cent.)*].

embarrassment over the pagan flavor of the mythological components led to attempts to demythologize or even to eliminate these features.

The gathering together of so much disparate material is complicated even further by the sorry state of the MSS in this section, doubtless exacerbated by the conflicts just listed. The MSS differ extensively from one another, and no one MS can be selected as containing a best text.

Moscow, 1875: 238–86), the editor recognized the satirical and popular nature of the polemic, with its use of riddles and caricature. It was not written by a theologian or a scholar, but by a simple person who could read and write. His material did not come from learned books, but from popular traditional beliefs, nurtured more by apocrypha than scholastic theology (Попов, *Историко-литературный обзор*, 247–48). Prince P. P. Vyazemsky recognized the political motivation (Вяземский, П. П. “Прение панагиота с азимитом” [Vyazemsky, P. P. “A dispute between Panagiotes and Azymites.”], 37–64. Памятники древней письменности [Monuments of the Ancient Literature]. Moscow, 1879, see 43). Krasnosel'tsev developed these observations. There is a component of ancient pagan fables (Красносельцев, Н. Ф. “‘Прение панагиота с азимитом’ по новым греческим спискам” [Krasnosel'tsev, N. F. “A dispute between Panagiotes and Azymites according to new Greek manuscripts.”]. *Летопись историко-филологического общества* [Chronicle of the Historico-Philological Society] VI (1896): 293–364, see 299). This folkloristic component of the pseudepigraphy sits uncomfortably with pseudo-scientific ingredients, and has generally been scorned by professional scholars, who are more interested in the work of the academic elite. It is only in recent years that Bulgarian scholars in particular, have explored this level. Professor Donka Petkanova-Toteva in the leading scholar in this field: Петканова-Тотева Д. “Близости между апокрифи и фолклор” [Petkanova-Toteva D. “Correlations between the apocrypha and the folklore”]. In *Българската литература и народното творчество* [Bulgarian literature and folklore]. Sofia, 1977; idem. *Апокрифна литература и фолклор* [Apocryphal literature and folklore]. Sofia, 1978; idem. *Старобългарск книжовник и античната култура. Проблеми на културното наследство* [The Old Bulgarian literary man and the culture of Antiquity. Problems of the cultural legacy]. Sofia, 1981; idem. “Красивото в Апокрифите” [“The Beauty in the Apocrypha”]. In Диневков, П., ed. *Литературознание и фолклорът* [Dinekov, P., ed. *Literature scholarship and folklore*], 48–52. Sofia, 1983; idem. “Гадателните книги и фолклорът” [“Divination books and folklore”]. *Starobulgarska Literatura* 18 (1985): 47–57; see the review in Andersen, F. I. “Pseudepigrapha Studies in Bulgaria.” *JSP* 1 (1987): 41–55. The academic snobbery that has affected disdain for this kind of material as lacking in religious or inspirational or moral value has left such marginal literature neglected for more than a century. In the case of *3 Baruch* see the remarks of Harlow D. C. “The Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch* (3 Baruch).” In *Hellenic Judaism and Early Christianity*, 3. SVTP, 12. Leiden, 1996.

Attestation for some readings is often meager, and the considerations that usually weigh with textual critics are hard to control. Opposite forces seem to have been at work. On the one hand, there are evident glosses, intended as explanatory notes; but some of them only obscure or contradict the basic text. An obvious example is the assertion in 14:1 that the length of the solar year is $365\frac{1}{4}$ days. This intrusion of the Julian calendar contradicts the original calendar of the Enoch traditions, which is based on the sectarian solar year of 364 days.⁵ This number apparently meant nothing to the mediæval scribes, and it has suffered much damage or even complete loss in the individual MSS. Charles regarded it as a scribal error, and emended it to 354.⁶ That was before the Dead Sea Scrolls made it clear that this was precisely the calendar of the Qumran sectarians. The full details of the 364-day solar year are preserved in only one MS (**R**), and the full details of the 364-day lunar year are not preserved in any MS.

On the other hand, there have been extensive losses in some MSS. An obvious example is the description in chapter 13 of the 10-month, 364-day solar year, which has disappeared completely from some MSS, is mutilated in others, and survives (albeit with minor blemishes) in only two or three. The textual history can be reconstructed along the following lines. The bizarre details of this exotic calendar were made even more incredible by its clash with the Julian calendar — hence the gloss in 14:1. This contradiction

⁵ As an outcome of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the use of such a calendar is now indisputable, and the discussion of the competing calendrical systems at the turn of the era has become very voluminous. See Амусин, И. Д. *Кумранская община* [Amusin, I. D. *Qumranic Community*]. Moscow, 1983: 130–4; Greenfield, J. C., and M. Sokoloff. “Astrological and Related Omen Texts in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 48 (1989): 201–14; Карпов, А. Ю. “О календаре славянской книги *Откровения Варуха*” [Карпов, А. Ю. “About the calendar of the Slavonic book of the *Revelation of Baruch*?”]. *Палестинский сборник* [*Palestinian volume*] 32 (95) (1993): 81–83; Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 25; VanderKam, J. C. “Calendars and Calendrical Information in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *XB* 1 (7) (1999): 207–33. The antiquity and Mesopotamian origin of the 364-day year is now established: Horowitz, W. “The 360 and 364 Day Year in Ancient Mesopotamia.” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 24 (1996): 35–44. In spite of sustained criticism (most recently Ben Zion Wacholder, “Patterns of Biblical Dates and Qumran’s Calendar: The Fallacy of Jaubert’s Hypothesis.” *HUCA* 66 (1996): 1–40), Jaubert’s work on the calendar has remained significant for more than forty years. It is an honour to present this present study for her memory.

⁶ *APOT*, II, 438, n. 5

remains in **R**, which thus represents an intermediate stage in the textual history. The last stage is represented by **J, P**, which have completely lost the details of the months of the solar calendar from chapter 13, and which have moved the details of the lunar calendar in chapter 16 in the direction of the Julian calendar. In effect, the gloss has displaced the text it was supposed to clarify, because it only contradicted it.

TEXTUAL HISTORY

The example of chapter 14 should be enough to show that the textual history of the MSS of 2 Enoch cannot be reconstructed by means of a simple theory that an original (“shorter”) recension was revised by making substantial additions to produce the so-called “longer” recension. This may be broadly true in some portions of the text, but it does not supply much help in the determination of the value of individual readings. And it could be a hindrance, because it creates a prejudice against readings found only in MSS of the “longer” recension.⁷

Every individual reading needs to be carefully weighed; and there are indications that MSS of the “shorter” recension have suffered drastic abbreviation in many places. When that has happened, it is possible that original and authentic readings have survived only in MSS of the “longer” recension. The likelihood of this is increased when we observe some tell-tale evidence. The MSS of the “longer” recension are frequently divergent among themselves; but occasionally one of them will present a unique reading that has a high claim to authenticity.⁸ Evidence of the claims of MSS of the longer recension to preserve readings with a good claim to originality is sometimes seen in surprising cross-agreement with a good reading in some MSS of the “shorter” recension. The agreement from time to time of **R** with **A** (both of them against all other MSS of their respective recensions!) is a most remarkable feature that intrinsically enhances the claims of the unique readings in **R**, even when they have no other attestation. It has already been pointed out by Vaillant⁹ that mistakes in the use of numerals prove that ancient MSS of 2 Enoch were written in

⁷ This prejudice is reflected in the editorial policy followed by André Vaillant in his edition of 2 Enoch: Vaillant, A. *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*. Texte slave et traduction française. Paris, 21976 [1952]: xv. All of the supposed “additions” in the “longer” recension were relegated to an *Annexe* (pp. 86–119).

⁸ See Böttrich, “Weltweisheit — Menschheitsethik — Urkult,” 80–95

⁹ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, xv.

Glagolitic.¹⁰ Such a mistake is perpetuated in the reading “five” instead of “six” in two places with absurd results. Instead of six gates at 14:1, in **J** five: (“ѣ” — numeral) and also in **R** (word — **петора**). **P** has the correct numeral “ѕ” = 6. At 2 Enoch 16:8 MS **B** has the numeral “.ѣ.” for the number of wings (“five”!) of the angels that pull the sun’s chariot. In Glagolitic it would be “six”. This shows that even a MS of the “longer” recension, in spite of its generally bad reputation, and in spite of the fact that the MSS of the “longer” kind do contain a number of passages justly suspected of being interpolations, nevertheless can preserve traces of connections right back to the earliest stages in the transmission history of this work. So it is possible that more than a few grains of wheat might be found in all the chaff of the “longer” recension.

As far as chapter 14 is concerned, the best reconstruction of the textual history is the one that explains most of the features in most of the MSS. The shorter MSS seem to be the outcome of abbreviation, motivated, perhaps, by a desire to reduce the mythological component (the sun driving his chariot across the sky, through gates in the West, then back under the earth to the eastern gates). The account in MSS of the shorter recension of what happens to the sun between sunset and sunrise has been so condensed as to omit the explanation of how the sun gets back to the East and rises again in the morning.

There is competition between the roles of the sun and the attendant angels: in **J** and **P** the sun removes his blazing crown at sunset; in **A** and other “shorter” MSS four angels perform this duty. In “longer” MSS the number of angels has inflated to 400. The LORD is passive in all recensions, but one action of the sun remains in “shorter” MSS. He “turns his chariot around and goes on”. This detail is lacking in the main “longer” MSS (**J** and **P**), but it is present in **R**. This kind of agreement of a “long” MS with “shorter” MSS suggests that the reading is original.

¹⁰ Two writing systems were in use for Slavic languages from the earliest stages of literacy. Glagolitic, while somewhat ornate, displays considerable resemblance to the Greek script of the time; Cyrillic is generally closer to Greek uncial style. When using letters as numerals, Cyrillic followed Greek practice, so that, for instance, Ѡ = 9, even though ѠИТА was displaced to the end of the Slavic alphabet. Glagolitic, in contrast, assigned numerals to the letters in their alphabetical sequence. Cyrillic distinguished between Б and В. As a consequence the sixth letter, **ксть**, has the numerical value 5 in Cyrillic, 6 in Glagolitic. Cf. Лихачев, Д. С. *Текстология на материале русской литературы X–XVII вв.* [Likhachev, D. S. *Textology, applied to the Russian literature of the 10th–17th cent.*]. Moscow/Leningrad, 1962: 62–3.

Internal contradictions are not enough to determine what is original and what is an addition. All MSS attest that the Enoch writings tended to gather in all kinds of things, with little concern for consistency. If some of this material has been added to the Slavonic translation, either when it was made or as it was copied, additions are not confined to MSS of the “longer” recension; MSS of the “shorter” recension have some too. And it is just as possible that MSS that have fewer of these internal contradictions have been simplified by removing discrepant readings. An obvious instance of this is the removal of the details of the 35- and 42-day months from MSS of both recensions. They must have seemed erroneous to scribes who knew only the Julian calendar. Yet traces of this very curious feature remain in MSS of both recensions.

On general grounds **J** has a stronger claim than the others, not only because of its high score of agreement with one or other of **R** and **P**, or with both, but also because of its consistently archaic character. This needs to be said, because the differences among the three MSS of the “longer” recension are particularly striking in chapters 14 and 15. In chapter 14 an eclectic text of maximum size would have about 130 words. (The exact count depends on arbitrary decisions about counting clitics as separate words.) Ignoring differences in spelling, which are considerable, all three MSS (**J**, **R**, **P**) agree in only 40 words. **J** and **P** agree in 88; **J** and **R** in 45, **R** and **P** in 43. Of the possible total, **R** has 82 words, **P** 100, **J** 104. **J** thus has the fullest text. And **P** follows it, for the most part. The twenty-six words by which the longest possible eclectic text exceeds **J** are due largely to passages in **R** not found in **J** or **P**. These include the information that, at sunset, 400 angels take the sun’s crown and carry it to the LORD, that the sun turns his chariot around in order to drive back to the East under the earth, and that just before dawn the 400 angels crown him once more. These details make for more symmetry in the events of sunset and sunrise, and — more importantly — they are a point of agreement with MSS of the “shorter” recension, as already noted.

In this respect **R** might have the better readings; or, rather, the putative ancestor of **J** and **P** might have omitted these materials. The material found in **J** and **P**, but not in **R**, is harder to assess. Either it is original material, omitted in **R**, or it is not original, but has been added to the source of **J** and **P**. The last clause, which says that the sun blazes out more than fire, might be suspected of being a stray piece of text, since it does not altogether fit the development at this point, and **R** reads quite smoothly without it. Yet it is not obviously a gloss. We accept its claim to

authenticity, but suggest below that it might be a missing colon from the poem in chapter 15.¹¹

THE SUN'S MOVEMENTS

The main difference among the MSS lies in the accounts of exactly what happens at sunset and sunrise. **R**, as we have just said, highlights the services of the 400 angels who take the crown to the LORD for keeping during the night, and restore it to the sun in time for daybreak. **J** and **P** do not entirely ignore the 400 angels, but they emphasize more the activity of the sun, who takes off his crown unaided at night and puts it back on in the morning. They agree with **R** that the crown is with the LORD (**J** says *God*) during the night. Unfortunately the MSS have got the eastern and western gates a bit mixed up in this account. At the beginning of 14:2 **J** reads *eastern* where **R** and **P** both have *western*. To judge from the “shorter” recension, which also have *western*, **J** is incorrect, having anticipated the description of sunrise. All in all, **R** seems to be more original in the readings lacking in **J** and **P**, especially when its resemblances to MSS of the “shorter” recension are taken into account.

The motivation for the changes introduced into the source of **J** and **P** (if such they be) is not clear; but the example just discussed shows that quite substantial revisions (deletions, additions, and word substitutions) could be made by the copyists.

The places where all three “longer” MSS have a reading, but where all three do not agree, have their own story to tell. Leaving aside minor differences in spelling, **J** and **P** agree against **R** in about a dozen readings. In most of these, **R** comes under doubt. For one thing, **R** seems to have changed some of the verbs. More significant is the frequent agreement of **R** with **J** against **P** — at least nine times. In most of these the fault lies with **P**.

¹¹ Although it seems to be not more than a stray remark, it could express the concern of commentators on Genesis 1 who tried to match its reported events with other beliefs about creation, and in particular with the creation of fire (not mentioned in Genesis 1) as one of the four primary elements. In order to be available for subsequent synthesis of composite beings, the four elements would have to be created first, at least on the first day. This is the procedure in the *Hexaëmeron of Pseudo-Epiphanius* (Trumpp, E. “Das Hexaëmeron des Pseudo-Epiphanius.” *Abhandlungen der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften* XVI, Bd. 2, Abth. 23 (1882)), the creation of the four elements being followed by the production of various derivatives, along with the *three* heavens, the angels, and other arrangements.

All this points to the general superiority of **J**. In saying this we are not simply counting votes in a crude way, two against one. The close affinity between **J** and **P** forbids that. To put it another way, **P** makes the poorest showing; and this is in accord with its already well-known reputation.¹² So the agreement of **J** and **P** does not settle the claim of a unique reading in **R** negatively. **R** competes with **J**. But it does mean that a reading found only in **P** cannot be correct; it is, however, unlikely. The agreement of **R** and **P** against **J** is a different matter. There are only two or three such cases. The third is merely a different way of writing the numeral *j*, where **R** and **P** use a word. More interesting is **J**'s use of *God* where **R** and **P** have the more correct *LORD*. This shows that **J** can make mistakes.

2 ENOCH 15

Chapter 15 in the “shorter” recension resembles its chapter 14 in being similarly succinct. Whereas **J** has four verses, **A** has only one. It reads like a few concluding remarks about the sun’s gates, to the effect that the LORD created these gates to be a kind of cosmic sun-dial, keeping track of the times of the year in the way that a sun-dial keeps track of the hours of the day.

Chap 15

A	се рашеніе показаша ми слнца и враты нми* входитъ и исходитъ	
U	се рашеніе показаша ми слнца и враты нмиж входитъ и исходит	
B	се разчиненне ми показаша солнцѹ и врата нмиже входитъ и	исходитъ
N	се разчникіе показаста ми аггела вратъ нмы же всхвдитъ и	исхвдитъ
A	си бо врата сотворитъ гъ	часоворіе лѣтовное, [4] слнце скажаетъ.
U	си бо врата сотвори ^т гъ	часоворье лѣтовное, [4] слнце скажаетъ.
B	снї бо врата сотвори Господь,	часоверіе лѣтное, [4] скажаетъ слнце.
N	се врата сътвори Господь,	часверіе и лѣтное, [4] сказаніе слнцѹ.

¹² “...le plus retouché et le moins utilisable des manuscrits du *Livre des secrets d'Hénoch*” (Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, VIII).

Сѡп 15: Р СТИХІА СЛНЧНІА. ФИННИЗИ И ХАЛКИДРЫ. ВОСПѢША.

J и тог^а въспѣваж^т стихїи слнчныи. рекомїи Финниси и Халке^ари
 R и въспое^т стихи, рекоми Финниксь и Халкедри.
 P тогда воспѣваю^т стихїа слнчнїа, рекомїа Финниси и Халкидры,

J того ра^м вса птица въс^трепещж^т крылами своими ра^ужщес^е
 R и того ради вса птице въстрепещж^т крыли своими ра^ужщеса
 P того ради вса птица вострепещетъ крылами своими, радѹщиса

J живѣтодавцоу и въспѣваж^т пѣнїе повелѣнїе Гдне
 R сѣтодавцоу, пожше гл'сы своими.
 P сѣтодавцѹ, и воспѣша пѣнїе повеленїемъ Гднимъ.

J [2] приходи^т свѣтодавецъ дати сїанїе въсемоу миру.
 R [2] приходи^т свѣтодавецъ и даж^т свѣтъ твари своеж.
 P [2] Приходитъ свѣтодавецъ и дати сїанїе всемоу миру.

J И вѣде^т стража оутрнѣа еже сж^т зари слнчныа, и изыде^т слнце
 R
 P и вѣде^т стража оутрнѣа еже сѹтъ зари слнчнїа, и изыйде^т слнце

J на лице земное, и прїиме^т сїанїе свое просвѣтити въсе лице земное
 R
 P земное, и прїатъ сїанїе свое просвѣтити все лице земли,

J [3] и се расчитанїе показаша ми хождѣнїа слнчнаго.
 R [3] и се разчитанїе показаста ми хожденїе слнчнаго.
 P [3] и се разчитанїе показаша ми хожденїа слнчнаго.

J и врата илиже въходи^т и "сходи^т", сїи сѹтъ великїа врата
 R и врата илиже въходи^т и исходи^т сна бо врата велика
 P и врата еже воходитъ сїи сѹтъ великїа врата

J еже сътвори Бъ часоверенїе лѣтѣвное, [4] сего ради слнце великое
 R еже сътвори Бъ часоверїе лѣтовнїа, [4] того ради слнце
 великотварно
 P еже сътвори Бгъ часоверїа лѣтовнїа, [4] сего ради слнце велика
 есть

J	варь е ⁶ и ввѣхож ^а еніе	емоу до килѣ ^т и паки испрѣва начинается
R	естъ	
P	тв ^р а, вѣхожденія	ем ^о до к и и лѣ ^т ъ, и паки исперва начинается

This augmentation they showed me of the sun and the gates by which he comes in and goes out. For these gates the LORD created as an annual horologue. The sun says ... (2 Enoch 15:3 [A]).

The angels showed Enoch the **раценіе** or **разчиненіе** of the sun. It is not clear what feature of the Sun's behavior this word refers to. The forms are equivalent, the original form being **рац(ь)теніе**.¹³ The word occur twice more in 2 Enoch. In 16:1, 8 the angels show Enoch the **ра(з)ценіе (У, А)** or **разчиненіе (В)** of the moon. This use of the same word to describe the phenomena of both sun and moon requires that those phenomena be comparable. In the case of the sun it is clear from the details in chapter 13 that the sun sets through six gates in the West and rises through six matching gates in the East. The sun uses the first and sixth gate only once per year, so the year is divided into ten "months."¹⁴ The astronomical texts associated with Enoch are driven by a belief that the heavenly bodies, and preeminently the sun and the moon, follow precisely the schedule assigned to them by the Creator. In the face of the incongruity of the cycles of the sun and the moon that makes a solar and a lunar calendar incompatible, this science insisted that the sun and moon moved in concert. "They bring about all the years punctiliously, so that they for ever neither gain upon nor fall behind their fixed positions for a single day, but they convert the year with punctilious justice into three hundred sixty-four days" (1 Enoch 74:10¹⁵).¹⁶ This thought persists in 2 Enoch: "All this [referring to the sun's annual cycle] is by measurement, and by the most precise measurement of the hours" (48:4).

¹³ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, 14.

¹⁴ Neugebauer, O. "Notes on Ethiopic Astronomy." *Orientalia*, n.s. 33 (1964): 49–71. The system of gates through which the sun sets and rises are arcs on the two horizons. The sun's strength increases and diminishes annually, the moon waxes and wanes by the month.

¹⁵ *OTP*, I, 54.

¹⁶ See the *Exkurs* on this verse in Albani, M. *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube. Untersuchungen zum astronomischen Henochbuch*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments, 68. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1994: 70–75.

A different idea is suggested by the word **рацение**. It translates αὔξις (“growth,” “increase”), αὔξη (used to refer to the waxing of the moon).¹⁷ It is glossed *incrementum*,¹⁸ **возрастание** (“growth,” “increase”), **увеличение** (“augmentation,” “expansion”).¹⁹ That “variation” is in mind is indicated by the variant **различения** in **Chr.** In the Slavonic translation of Athanasius’ *Treatise against the Arians* **рацение** renders the famous ἡλικία of Mt. 6:27, with its ambiguity of growth in stature or extension of lifespan. The language is not entirely suited to describe the phases of the moon; it fits waxing, but not waning. By analogy it could apply to the annual rhythm in which the sun gets hotter and cooler. 2 Enoch explains this as coming closer to the earth and moving away (48:3). But this is not how events in the fourth heaven are reported in 2 Enoch 11–17.

The reading **расчитание** of the “longer” recension is rendered “calculation.”²⁰ It translates διατάξις and denotes “arrangement,” “assignment,” “regulation,” *Anordnung* (Riessler).²¹ This reading preserves the interest of the ancient Enoch astronomical literature in the exactitude with which the celestial bodies routinely carry out their appointed duties.

There are two additional words — **солнце сказает** (the sequence is inverted in **B**) — that seem to be the commencement of a new sentence, the rest of which has been lost. **N** has “the recital of the sun,” which seems to be a colophon. The next chapter (16) proceeds to talk about the moon along similar lines.

MSS of the “longer” recension present a text of chapter 15 that is quite different from the “shorter” MSS. The fullest text of chapter 15 in the “longer” recension is supplied by **J. P** has most of **J**’s text, although the usual errors and omissions are evident. **R** is shorter again, lacking most of verse 2.

¹And then the solar elements, called Phoenixes and Chalkedras, burst into song. That is why every bird flaps its wings, rejoicing at the light-giver. And they burst into song at the LORD’s command. ²The light-

¹⁷ Lampe, G. W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 265. Oxford, 1961.

¹⁸ Kurz, J., ed. *Slovník Jazyka Staroslovenskeho [Lexicon Linguae Palaeo-Slovenicae]*, III, 628. Prague, 1966ff.

¹⁹ Срезневский, И. И. *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка [Sreznevskij, I. I. Materials for the Dictionary of Old Russian]*, I–III. St. Petersburg, 1893–1903: III, 112.

²⁰ *APOT*, II, 438.

²¹ **הַשְּׁבוּי מִהַלְלֵה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ** (Kahana, A. “Sefer Hanok B.” In *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah*, 111. Jerusalem, 1936).

giver is coming, to give radiance to the whole world; and the morning watch appears, which is the sun's rays; and the sun goes out over the face of the earth, and retrieves its radiance, to give light to all the face of the earth. ³And they showed me this calculation of the sun's movement and of the gates by which he comes in and goes out. These are the big gates that God created to be an annual horologue. ⁴This is why the sun is the greater creature (J: heat[?]). And the cycle for him goes on for 28 years, and begins once more from the start (2 Enoch 15: 1–4 [R]).

Verses 3 and 4 resemble the “shorter” recension up to a point, but verses 1 and 2 are not represented there. Attention is focussed on the fabulous birds, the phoenixes and the chalkydras, who have already been introduced in chapter 12. That chapter of the “shorter” recension, like its chapter 15, lacks the details about the phoenixes and chalkydras. These creatures, however, are not simply an invention of a “reviser” who might have added in this material at these places. For the account of the sixth heaven in both recensions includes these birds once again. These details constitute a distinct problem; they are an aberrant tradition, for only here in all literature is the phoenix ignorantly pluralized.²² Émile Turdeanu²³ has tried to account for this mistake as the outcome of confusion with the Ophanim; but this explanation does not work very well for the phoenixes in the fourth heaven. In any case, the phoenixes are a genuine part of the Slavonic Enoch tradition, and one must ask if they have been eliminated from MSS of the “shorter” recension to remove the discrepancy of having them in two different places (or by some learned scribe, who knew that the phoenix was *sui generis*). Neither the author nor the scribes seem to have worried about the number and variety of heavenly beings, since all kinds of angels accompany the sun, and perform a range of tasks. The function of the earthly birds, to sing at sunrise, does not clash with the duties of the angels who manage the crown or (in some MSS) propel the sun's chariot.

²² СОКОЛОВ, М. Н. “Феникс в апокрифах об Энохе и Варухе” [Sokolov, M. N. “Phoenix in the apocrypha on Enoch and Baruch”]. In *Новый сборник по славяноведению, составленный учениками акад. В. И. Ламанского* [A new collection on the Slavonic studies, composed by the disciples of the academian V. I. Lamansky], 305–403. St. Petersburg, 1905; James, E. A. “Notes on Apocrypha.” *JTS* 16 (1915): 412, expressed doubt over the plural phoenixes in 2 Enoch.

²³ Turdeanu, E. “Une curiosité de l'Hénoch slave: Les phénix du sixième ciel.” *Revue des études slaves* 47 (1968): 53–4.

The concluding remark about the Solar Cycle of twenty-eight²⁴ years is characteristic of the “longer” recension, and it matched by a similar remark about the Metonic Cycle of nineteen years at the end of the description of the movement of the moon in chapter 16.²⁵ These data are compounded into the Dionysian Cycle of 532 years in 2 Enoch 16:5. None of these details is found in the “shorter” recension. These glosses represent a loose overlay of scientific knowledge. The underlying text has not been reconciled with these other facts. The argument that features of this kind point to a late (even medieval) date for the expansion of an earlier, shorter, more authentic version is invalid. Details in 15:1–2, 4 in **J**, **R**, and **P** that are not in shorter MSS are not comparable to these obvious glosses. The detailed account of sunrise in chapter 15 interrupts the description of the gates, and could be an interpolation. But its fantastic content contrasts with the sober mathematics of the other additions.

TEXTS OF 2 ENOCH 15

It is inappropriate to use evidence of this kind to give a blanket opinion about the lesser worth of MSS of the “longer” recension. They differ among themselves; and they differ in various ways. They tend to agree two against one, or all together. A three-way split is rare. For the most part **J** agrees with **R**, or **J** agrees with **P**. Agreement of **R** with **P** against **J** is less common. But, since **R** and **P** are so often divergent, their rare agreements throw doubt on **J**’s unique readings, and this is usually confirmed by arguments from intrinsic probability. An obvious example is **J**’s unique designation of the sun as *Life-giver* [живѣтодавцю] at 15:1 rather than *Light-giver* [сѣтодавецъ] as in **R** and **P**. The reading of **R** and **P** is preferable. Incidentally, this kind of evidence shows that neither **R** nor **P** is a direct descendant of **J**.

2 Enoch 15:1–2 has not yielded much sense to investigation so far. This can be seen from the translations and meagre notes available. Vaillant,

²⁴ This cycle is of interest to Christians whose liturgical year is geared to the Julian calendar, with festivals based on both solar (four-year) cycle and the seven-day week. The same month dates come on the same weekday every twenty-eight years.

²⁵ This cycle integrated the lunar months and solar year. Although known to the Babylonians before 500 B.C., it is named for the Greek Meton, who worked it out in 432 B.C.

by preferring **R**, does not even report the fuller text of **J** and **P**.²⁶ Charles ventured very little comment.²⁷

It is harder to weigh the agreement of **R** and **P** against **J** at a difficult place in 15:3. The former, although not identical, point to a statement that the sun is the greatest (largest — **вѣлик-**) *creature*; **J** says that the sun has the greater *heat* (if this is what **варь** means).²⁸ The point is not clear in either case, so the claims of the MSS cannot be settled by working out which makes more sense. **J**'s unique reading might go back to the statement made in 11:2 that the sun's light is seven times greater than that of the moon.

SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGY

P is the only MS with a heading to this chapter. It merely repeats the opening words, except that the present tense, used to describe the impending sunrise, has been mistakenly converted into an aorist, as if Enoch actually observed the event. Here, as in chapter 12 (at least in **P**'s chapter heading), the wondrous birds are called "solar elements." In 12:1 the text of **J** and **P** calls them "solar elements," but **R** calls them "birds," or rather, says that there are two birds, one like a phoenix and the other like a chalkedri. The accompanying description, however, is that of a composite monster, hard to identify, but not much like a bird. In the Prologue and here the term **стихія**, in contrast to the physical meaning it has in 23:1 and 27:3, could refer to the ranks of the heavenly armies. The term was evidently considered neutral. Some Christian writers called the sun, moon, and stars στοιχεῖα. **Стихія**, στοιχεῖα, usually **стихія**, goes back to the fundamental elements, traditionally reckoned as four in number. This is the connotation of στοιχεῖα in 2 Pe 3:10, 12. But in Paul "the στοιχεῖα of the world" are seen as a menace to faith (Gal 4:3, 9; Col 2:8, 20). The background of Paul's references is not clear, perhaps some kind of nascent Gnosticism was in mind, with powers of nature revered as elemental forces in the cosmos. It is remarkable, therefore, that texts transmitted by Christians give an honorable place to the στοιχεῖα in the heavens. In 2 Enoch the term is used in the Prologue (angels), in 23:1 (physical — "the earth and the sea and all the elements"), and 27:3 (likewise physical — "water and the other elements").

²⁶ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, 93.

²⁷ Charles, R. H., and W. Morfill, eds. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Dublin/Oxford, 1896 (p. 17), or in *APOT*, II, 437.

²⁸ It is almost certainly an error for **тварь**, "creature."

Scientific cosmology in Slavic culture during the Middle Ages was dominated by the **ШЕСТОДНЕВ**, “Six Days (of Creation)” of John Exarch.²⁹ John acknowledges his dependance on Aristotle and other philosophers and on Basil (the Great) and other Fathers. John struggles with the same tensions between science and Holy Scripture as are found throughout Basil’s *Hexameron*.³⁰ In his discussion of Genesis 1:1 Basil did not mind referring to God as “the Creator and Demiurgos;”³¹ God is “the Supreme Artificer.” John Exarch denies that God works like a craftsman. Basil is impatient with people who want an enumeration of the elements (στοιχεῖα).³² He refers to attempts by “the wise of the world” to explain the nature (φύσις) of the cosmos as “a lot of talk.” Basil then mentions the usual four elements (στοιχεῖα)³³ and recognizes the suggestion that there is a fifth. John Exarch lifts this passage almost literally:³⁴ “some say that it is put together out of four elements” (*aus den vier Elementen zusammengesetzt sie* [Sh I

²⁹ Баранкова, Г. “Об астрономических и географических знаниях” [Barankova, G. “On the astronomical and geographical knowledge”]. In Боголюбов, А. Н., ed. *Естественнонаучные представления Древней Руси* [Bogoljubov A. N., *The natural sciences in Old Rus*], 48–62. Moscow, 1978. Documentation to this source in the form “Sh I 49” refers to Volume I, page 49 in Aitzetmüller, R. *Das Hexameron des Exarchen Johannes*, Bd. 1–6. Graz, 1958–1971. Quotations of the German translation are from the same source. Bulgarian translations are from Кочев, Н. [Kochev, N.]. *Йоан Ексарх, “Шестоднев”*. Sofia, 1981.

³⁰ Norman, H. W. *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Hexameron of St. Basil, or, Be Godes Six Daga Weorcum, and the Anglo-Saxon Remains of St. Basil’s “Admonitio ad Filium Spiritualem.”* London, 1849; Egleston Robbins, F. *The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis*. Chicago, Il, 1912.

³¹ *The Fathers of the Church* 46 (1963): 23

³² *Ibid.*, 17

³³ Καὶ οἱ μὲν σύνθετον αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν στοιχείων εἰρήκασιν,...

³⁴ ...они рекоше, како сложено кстьство невеснок ксть от четырь съставъ,...

Earlier, and closely rendering Basil, John had struggled to bring Genesis 1 alongside Greek physics, and in particular to explain why the account reports the creation of air and water, but not of earth and fire. What is the connection between light and fire? Does the language of Gen 1:3 imply that God first created darkness? Basil brings in reference to these elements from other parts of Scripture and eases the problem by arguing that, just as the Savior did not enumerate all the members of the human body, so the Creator does not itemize everything, but covers everything under the word “all” in Genesis (especially 2:1) — πάντα, conveniently plural — πάντα οὖν ἐγένετο· πῦρ ἐγένετο, ἄβυσσοι ἐγένοντο, ἄνεμοι, τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, γῆ, πῆρ, ὕδωρ, ἀήρ. John Exarch renders this literally (Sh I 101). In Homily 4 Basil is comfortable with the usual doctrine of the elements.

138]; [Е]ДНИ ОТ ТЯХ КАЗВАТ, ЧЕ НЕБЕСНОТО ЕСТЕСТВО Е СЪСТАВЕНО ОТ ЧЕТИРИ ЕЛЕМЕНТА³⁵].³⁶

The point of this digression in the context of chapter 15 is that, while Slavic translations render στοιχείον sometimes by **СЪСТАВЪ** (as by John Exarch), the word can be transliterated (as in 2 Enoch 14, 15). Now **СЪСТАВЪ** is used in 2 Enoch 30:8 to describe the composition of man out of seven “ingredients.”³⁷ These elements are different from the four primary substances of Greek physics, but the distribution of the terms in 2 Enoch indicates that this is not the connotation of **СΤΥΧΙΑ** in chapter 15. The use of this term to classify the fabulous creatures associated with the sun is unique and away from current scientific terminology.

MYTHOLOGICAL IMAGERY

The account of the third heaven in the Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch*³⁸ has a lot of material resembling 2 Enoch’s account of the fourth heaven. Its mythological affinities are more transparent (the sun’s chariot is a quadriga, with angel horses, and the iconography of Helios³⁹ is evident in the description of the rider as “a man wearing a fiery crown”); it has considerably more information about the Phoenix, there properly *sui generis*; and it has integrated the activities of this bird with the activities of the angels who manage the sun’s shining crown. The fact that these two motifs are

³⁵ Кочев, *Йоан Ексарх*, 55

³⁶ For a review of the teaching of John Exarch on all five elements see Ватев, Й. “Идеята за елементите в ‘Шестоднев’ на Йоан Ексарх” [Vatev, J. “The idea of the elements in the ‘Hexahemeron’ of John the Exarch”]. *КМС* 5 (1988): 61–75.

³⁷ Andersen, F. I. “On Reading Genesis 1–3.” *Interchange* 33 (1983): 11–36. Philo said that “he [man] in so far as the structure of his body is concerned is connected with the universal world; for he is composed of the same elements as the world, that is of earth, and water, and air and fire” (*De Opificio Mundi*, LI [146]).

³⁸ 3 Baruch 6 in *APOT*, II, 536–8, and *OTP*, I, 468–71; Picard, J. C. “Apocalypse Baruchi Graece.” In Denis, A.-M., and M. de Jonge, eds. *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece*, II, 88. Leiden, 1967.

³⁹ This transparently Hellenistic motif, however, does not rule out Jewish background for the apocalypse. The picture was at home in Jewish art, as attested by the famous synagogue floor mosaics at Hammat Tiberias and Bêt ʿAlpha, to name only two specimens. The accompanying angels are more distinctively Jewish, and their more prominent role in 2 *Enoch* suggests that it is more Jewish than 2 *Baruch*, at least in this detail.

connected in 3 Baruch is worth noting, since in this it is closer to the “longer” recension, which also has both, than to the “shorter” recension, which has only the crown. 3 Baruch also makes it clear that the singing of the celestial bird that heralds the coming dawn is accompanied by, or, rather, prompts, a matching song of earthly birds. According to **J** and **P** (but not **R**), they “burst into song at the LORD’s command.” This language obscures the drama, since a superficial reading could give the impression that it is the celestial birds who thus begin to sing, as already stated once (twice, if we include **P**’s chapter heading). Hence we might miss the point that it is “every bird” that flaps its wings at this time. This does not refer necessarily to the phoenixes and chalydras. The detail about “the LORD’s command” in **J** and **P** seems to be a gloss introduced for theological reasons, to cast God rather than “the solar elements” as the conductor of the dawn chorus. But the theology of 2 Enoch in general is that God is remote from that kind of thing, having entrusted the supervision of all natural processes to his numerous angels (chapter 19). 3 Baruch makes it clear that it is not the LORD who commands the celestial birds to begin their day-break song, but the celestial birds who begin and who are then followed by their terrestrial cousins.

3 Baruch also describes a sound (ὁ κτύπος τοῦ ὀρνέου) made by the Phoenix.⁴⁰ This is clapping, not singing, and it is identified as the sound that wakes up the roosters upon earth — τὸ ἐξυπνίζον τοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλέκτορας. 2 Enoch 15:2 now becomes clear. There are two bird sounds in the world to match the two bird sounds in heaven.

All the birds flap their wings,

⁴⁰ 3 Baruch differs substantially in the work assigned to the Phoenix, more in keeping with its role as the sun-bird. The bird runs ahead of the sun (6:2). It is as large as a mountain (Gk.) or perhaps nine mountains (Sl.). The phoenix’s wings serve as a gigantic parasol, shielding humans from the direct fiery rays which would otherwise destroy everything (6:3–6). At the end of the day the bird is exhausted (8:3). The phoenix has an inscription on his right wing (6:7–8). The phoenix lives on heavenly manna and dew and produces cinnamon as excrement (6:11–12). The effect of all this detail makes 3 Baruch more like the story of the Phoenix than the sun. Yet 3 Baruch does not use the two most definitive features of phoenix lore — its longevity and its self-reproduction in death; and the details it does use are not part of the mainstream beliefs concerning the phoenix. They are rather taken from Jewish traditions concerning *Zifzif*, the Rabbinic sunbird (Harlow, “Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch*,” 137, n. 88). And they are not found in 2 Enoch either, leaving the possible relationship between 3 Baruch and 2 Enoch in this matter quite tenuous.

rejoicing at the giver of light,
singing with their voices (15:2).⁴¹

The verb translated “flap (the wings)” — **вѣстрепецѣꙗꙗ крыли
своими** — means “clap,” not “flutter.”⁴² The emphasis is on noise, and the action is energetic. The Slavonic word can describe an earthquake or the loud heart-beat of a frightened person.⁴³ It is rhythmic. In 3 Baruch (Slavonic) 3:14 the flapping of the Phoenix’s wings is “like thunder.” Originally Charles thought that a reference to “the early song of birds at sunrise” was “unlikely,” supposing that only Phoenixes and Chalkydras were involved.⁴⁴ James later recognized that the birds, although not named in 2 Enoch, must be roosters (“every cock”).⁴⁵ So it is the vigorous noises made by the cocks before sunrise, not “a parenthetical reference to the songs of birds at sunrise”⁴⁶ that are being described.

3 Baruch (6:16) has a little saying that describes the event: ὁ ἥλιος γὰρ ἐτοιμάζεται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων, καὶ φωνεῖ ἀλέκτωρ, “for the sun is being prepared by the angels, and the cock is crowing.” This apocalypse was particularly popular among the eastern Slavs, and manuscript attestation is more abundant and generally of better quality than the Greek.⁴⁷ Moreover, arguments for an early date for the composition of this work (“in the first two centuries A.D.”)⁴⁸ are more compelling than for 2 Enoch. This makes the similarities in their accounts of the behavior of celestial and terrestrial birds at sunrise of special interest. We provide the Slavonic text for the relevant places:⁴⁹

⁴¹ We have given **R**’s variant reading for the third colon.

⁴² *APOT*, II, 437.

⁴³ Бархударов, С. Г. *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.* [Barkhudarov, S. G., ed. *Dictionary of Old Russian of the 11th–17th cent.*], т. 3, 62–3. Moscow, 1971.

⁴⁴ Charles and Morfill, *Book of the Secrets*, 17.

⁴⁵ James, “Notes on Apocrypha,” 412

⁴⁶ Charles in *APOT*, II, 437.

⁴⁷ Gaylord in *OTP*, I, 653–5.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 657.

⁴⁹ Text according to Slavonic 34 of St. Catherine’s Monastery. I am grateful to Dr. Harry Gaylord for sending me prepublication copies of his working notes on the critical edition of the Slavonic text of 3 Baruch. Gaylord, H. E. “Славянский текст третьей книги Варуха” [“The Slavonic text of the 3rd book of Baruch”]. *Полтава книгописная. An Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Texts* 7 (1983): 49–57.

и заиде ⁵⁰ слнчнѣ и приде гла:	And the sun went in and a voice came out;
свѣтодавче слнчнѣ даждь	Light-giver Sun, give
мирѹ свѣтъ:	the world light!
прострѣ птица крилѣ свои:	The bird spread his wings,
и покры лѣча слънечныи:	and covered the solar rays; ⁵¹
и оудри крилома:	and he flapped his wings,
и выстѣ гла ꙗко {громъ}.	and there was a voice like thunder,
и възва птица глаци:	and the bird cried, saying:
свѣтодавче даи мирѹ свѣтъ:	Light-giver, give the world light!

The portion quoted is enough to show the difference between 3 Baruch and 2 Enoch in the vocabulary for sunlight. While the scene is the same, the scenario has enough differences to suggest that neither can be explained as a borrowing from the other. For one thing, in 3 Baruch, the phoenix is properly *sui generis*, and, moreover, displays more of his classic role as the sun-bird. 3 Baruch continues, “As I heard the voice of the bird, I said, ‘What is that?’ This is the cocks [2 Enoch is not so specific] on earth, beginning to wake up the world. At the first call they call out, knowing that the sun is about to rise. And the cocks cry out” (3 Baruch 6:14–16).

Jerusalem would be well-called the city of peace, were it not for the roosters, those exuberant choristers of the dawn. The noisy clapping of their wings is an alarm as rousing as their crowing, and it is remarkable how long before the first glimmer of the new day they can begin. This circumstance makes sense of the reference to the eighth hour of the night in 2 Enoch 14:3. 3 Baruch gives the impression that the recital begins when the Phoenix calls upon the sun, as if in conjuration: Φωτοδότα, δὸς τῷ κόσμῳ τὸ φέγγος, “Lightgiver! Give to the world the splendor!” (6:14).⁵²

⁵⁰ Because of the peculiar verb form, Gaylord thinks this refers to the action of getting into the chariot.

⁵¹ The Phoenix’s action in shielding the sun is to protect the world from the full impact of its radiation, which would be too destructive.

⁵² Something very similar turns up in the Byzantine *Physiologus*, where the sun-bird is a griffin. Ἔστιν ὁ γρῦψ μεγεθέστατον ὄρνιον παρὰ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· οὗτος μὲν ἐν ἑώῳ γῆ, εἰς τὸν λιμένα τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ ποταμοῦ. Καὶ ὅταν ἀνατέλλει ὁ ἥλιος εἰς τὸ βάθη τῶν ὑδάτων, καὶ ἰσχυρίζεται τὸν κόσμον τὰς ἀκτῖνας, ἀπολεῖ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ ὁ γρῦψ, καὶ δέχεται τὰς ἀκτῖνας τοῦ ἡλίου. Καὶ ἕτερος συμπορεύεται αὐτοῦ ἕως δυσμᾶς, ὡς γέγραπται· Ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξιν αὐτοῦ πορεύου, Φωτοδότα δὸς τῷ κόσμῳ φῶς (Pitra, J. B. *Spicilegium Solesmense Complectens Sanctorum Patrum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum Anecdota Hacenus Opera Selecta e Graecis Orientalibusque et Latinis Codicibus*, III. Paris, 1855; repr. Graz, 1963; quoted by Harlow, “Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch*,” 138, n. 94).

Lactantius also describes how the Phoenix greets the sun by beating its wings.⁵³ The resemblance of these traditions to 2 Enoch 15 is unmistakable. And this similarity leads to the conclusion that in 2 Enoch 15 we have a text of the words of the song to be sung by the roosters when they hail the first signs of dawn.

THE SONG FOR THE RISING SUN

The hypothesis that 2 Enoch 15 preserves the text of a sun hymn receives support in a number of ways from a thirteenth-century polemic against the “unleavened” Western Christians, *Disputatio Panagiotæ cum Azymita*.⁵⁴ This treatise is not a scholarly work, but a *διάλεξις*, an imaginary discussion between an Eastern and a Western Christian. It is really a scurrilous satire, with an oblique target in the emperor Michael Palæologos, intended to sabotage his negotiations with the Papal legation.⁵⁵ In his edition of three Slavic recensions, Popov drew attention to the affinities of some of its motifs to themes in apocrypha. But apocryphal sources for many of the details have not been tracked down. The material used by the Orthodox author was drawn from the popular opinions of the masses, not from academic theology or philosophy.

Like 2 Enoch and 3 Baruch, the *Disputatio* speaks of the birds clapping their wings and calling out. There are some differences, however. The phoenix and the rooster act in concert, and the Orthodox spokesman adds the quaint detail that the roosters sing the song antiphonally:⁵⁶

ὁ εἷς λέγει	πορεύου,
ὁ ἕτερος	Φωτοδότα,
ὁ τρίτος	δὸς τὸ φῶς,
ὁ τέταρτος,	τὸν κόσμον.

This tradition is a little nearer to the text of 2 Enoch than to 3 Baruch.

⁵³ van den Broek, R. *The Myth of the Phoenix according to classical and early Christian tradition*, 283. Leiden, 1972.

⁵⁴ For texts and discussion see Попов, *Историко-литературный обзор*; Красносельцев, “Прение”; Вяземский, “Прение”.

⁵⁵ Вяземский, “Прение”, 46

⁵⁶ Texts in van den Broek, *Myth of the Phoenix*, 272–5. In the Greek text published by Krasnosel'tsev the four birds complete the wake-up call by invoking Christ in unison: καὶ ἀναπλήρουσιν οἱ τέσσαρα ἡγουν ὁ Χριστός (Красносельцев, “Прение”, 185).

2 Enoch	3 Baruch (S)	3 Baruch (G)	<i>Disputatio</i>
ПРИХОДИТ	ПРИДЕ		πορεύου,
СВѢТОДАВЕЦЪ	СВѢТОДАВЬЧЕ	Φωτοδότα	Φωτοδότα
ДАТИ СІАНІЄ	ДАИ...СВѢТЪ	δὸς...τὸ φέγγος	δὸς...τὸ φῶς
ВЪСЕМΟΥ МИРЪ	МИРЪ	τῷ κόσμῳ	τὸν κόσμον

The language is distinctive enough to suggest a common source, even though each version is different. 2 Enoch has a story where 3 Baruch and *Disputatio* have a prayer. And, although 3 Baruch says that the cocks cry out, it does not report what they sing, neither the antiphonal response of the *Disputatio* nor the fuller text of the song as in 2 Enoch. And no version entirely captures the symmetry in the behavior of the celestial and terrestrial birds, both clapping their wings and both singing. The poem uses the term “Light-giver,” not the familiar name of the Dawn star Phosphorus — “light-bringer.” Φωτοδότης was used by Christians hailing Christ. 3 Baruch lacks the opening verb, but its φέγγος is closer to **СІАНІЄ**; the usual equivalent of φῶς, **СВѢТЪ**, which 3 Baruch uses and **R** has as a variant of **СІАНІЄ**. 2 Enoch has adapted the hymn; by changing the imperative verb it has turned the song from an invocation into a description. The word order of “Give the world your light” of 3 Baruch Greek is preserved in Slavonic 3 Baruch, but changed in 2 Enoch.

LITERARY CONNECTIONS

The attestation of the hymn in such diverse places requires caution in identifying any one text as the source of another. In particular, Vaillant’s argument that the “longer” recension of 2 Enoch is indebted to the *Disputatio* for this interpolation, with inferences as to the internal textual history of 2 Enoch and the date of its supposed “revision,” would be stronger if it could be demonstrated that 2 Enoch has verbal dependence on the Slavonic translations of the *Disputatio*.⁵⁷ Without fresh study of good and complete texts of the *Disputatio* in both Greek and Slavonic, it is hard to make progress.⁵⁸ While Vaillant was confident that the material in 2 Enoch that includes the hymn for the sun is taken from the *Disputatio*,⁵⁹ he

⁵⁷ I shall discuss Milik’s elaborate scheme for the many-wayed literary dependence among these texts in a separate paper.

⁵⁸ Texts of three Slavic recensions in Попов (Ποпов, *Историко-литературный обзор*, 238–86). Greek text (Cod. Vindob. theolog. 244. Lamb 297) in Васильев, А. [Vassiliev, A.] *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, I, 179–88. Moscow, 1893.

⁵⁹ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, XVI.

nevertheless suspected that the reviser also amplified this borrowed material.⁶⁰ But it only seems to be amplified because it is not the same as the text of the *Disputatio* that we now have. The more ample version might have the better claim to authenticity, that is, to be a genuine part of the Enoch tradition or at least to be a collateral old tradition, if both the *Disputatio* and 2 Enoch (or the reviser of the hypothetical first — the “shorter” — recension of 2 Enoch) got it from some earlier common source.

The excerpts available in van den Broek’s book on the Phoenix⁶¹ may be augmented by some passages adduced by Sokolov in his paper on the Phoenix⁶² and in his posthumous notes on 2 Enoch.⁶³ That there are connections cannot be denied. Whether these links are literary or not is more problematic. As one indication we might note that the *Disputatio* discusses the question of the location of Paradise in the rank of being, whether it is corruptible or incorruptible. The problem of what happened to the Garden of Eden after the expulsion of Adam and Eve is an old one. It cannot be separated from the question of the nature and location of the Paradise of the eschaton. This problem has a long history, tied in with belief in a three-heaven cosmos, with paradise in the third heaven (2 Cor 12:4). On the one hand the original garden, as described in Genesis, is part of the created order, with a well-defined geographical location, even if not now identifiable. On the other hand, as the future home of the blessed, it must be eternally unchangable. The compromise location of Paradise “between corruption and incorruption” is a detail shared by the “longer” recension of 2 Enoch and the *Disputatio*.

Although Sokolov’s researches into the literary connections between the *Disputatio* and 2 Enoch were never completed, he did record his impression that the Greek original of 2 Enoch was the source of similar ideas in the *Disputatio*, and not the other way around. “Очень возможно, изъ нея [2 Енох] попали эти черти в ‘Прение’ [Disputatio], составленное вообще на основании апокрифической литературы въ космо-

⁶⁰ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, XVII.

⁶¹ van den Broek, *Myth of the Phoenix*, 272–5.

⁶² Соколов, “Феникс в апокрифах.”

⁶³ Соколов, М. Н. “Славянская книга Эноха праведного” [Sokolov, M. N. “Slavonic book of Enoch the Righteous”]. In *Чтения в обществе истории и древностей российских* [*Lectures in the Society of Russian History and Antiquities*] IV (1910): 1–167, see 136–44.

графической части.”⁶⁴ Among such cosmographic matters, the *Disputatio* retains a great interest in the ocean of primeval creation, the abyss of the old myths. Its view on this subject does not agree with 2 Enoch’s location of the great sea in the first heaven; but the related idea of the *Bottomless* is found later on in the Creation Story (2 Enoch 28), in both recensions, although much more elaborate in the “longer” recension. The *Disputatio* has theologized the cosmographic information gleaned from the apocalypses, often by analogical interpretation. This didactic motive is retained, or even elaborated, in the Slavonic versions of the *Disputatio*. One example: An analysis of the sun’s nature as Source, Radiance, and Fire (Heat?) supplies the familiar illustration of the Holy Trinity.

μερίζεται δὲ ὁ ἥλιος εἰς τρεῖς·
 σάρκος εἰς μίμησιν τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
 φῶς καὶ εἰς μίμησιν τῆς σαρκός
 καὶ εἰς μίμησιν τοῦ πατρὸς,
 εἰς ἀκτίνας τοῦ υἱοῦ,
 καὶ εἰς πῦρ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος

**И раздѣляютъ на трое
 плоть въ подобіе Х҃а моего
 и светило въ подобіе ѿцовъ
 и луча сіяетъ въ подобіе стаго дха**⁶⁵

There is no trace of such good Christian trinitarian theology in what 2 Enoch says about the sun. Why, then, would the medieval reviser, presumably a Christian, have cut it out?⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Соколов, “Славянская книга Эноха,” 136–7.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 141.

⁶⁶ Similar methodological issues are posed by the material differences between the Greek and Slavonic versions of *Apocalypse of Baruch* (*3 Baruch*), the most obviously Christian ingredients in the latter being absent from the former. As Harlow points out, “It is difficult to imagine why *3 Baruch* would have been progressively de-christianized by Christian scribes [or, one might add, by Christian Slavic translators — FIA]. The initial impression gained from the available textual evidence is that the overtly Christian elements in the Greek belong to later Christian *reworking* [his italics]” (Harlow, “Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch*,” 83). Again, “it is highly unlikely that Christian scribes in either tradition would have omitted original Christian terminology” (p. 85). The situation with 2 Enoch is only notionally similar, since no Greek source is known. The similarity, all the same, lies in the fact that some isolated MSS of 2 Enoch contain small passages with Christian language that are lacking in the rest. These are obviously Christian touches. The relations

The *Disputatio* is explicitly Christological in its interpretation of the sun's movement. Christ is given the role that the angels have in 2 Enoch. Three examples may be given. (1) When the Catholic asks the Orthodox how the sun rises, the latter answers: ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος, δίδει τὸ στέμμα τῶν ἀγγέλων, καὶ ἐδύουσι τὸν ἥλιον καὶ ἀνατέλλει... Immediately two birds called Griffins — the one called φοῖνιξ⁶⁷ and the other χαλκῆδρις⁶⁸ — become involved.⁶⁹ (2) The birds respond χάριτι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ σημαίνουσι τῶν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (“by the grace of Christ and signify the resurrection of Christ”).⁷⁰ Here the second redaction of the Slavonic translation of the *Disputatio* reads: **и плещеть петель криаѣ свон и проповѣдѣтъ мироуи воскрѣнїе**. The resurrection of Christ has been toned

among MSS of 2 Enoch are similar to the relations between Greek and Slavonic 3 Baruch.

The two cases are also similar in another feature that renders many problems encountered in both works are virtually insoluble. One such shared problem is the determination whether the original work was either Jewish or Christian. Given the likelihood that both works come from a similar background in the second century A.D., when some Christian writing was comfortable with the Jewish heritage, and did not need either to distance itself from that heritage or even to augment it with explicitly Christian ingredients. It is misleading to brand the early Christians as supersessionist in relation to the Old Testament and Jewish roots of Christianity. Part of the evidence for the congenial state of mind is the remarkable fact that so many writings of undoubted Jewish origin were preserved by Christians, and disappeared from ongoing Judaism. By the same token, Christians could have written works imitating those Jewish models, with little or no distinctively Christian content. Both 2 Enoch and 3 Baruch fall into this neutral category. And each work is attested only in late mediaeval MSS. In the case of 3 Baruch the oldest Slavonic MSS (13th century) is older than the two extant Greek MSS (15th and 16th century). Manuscripts of 2 Enoch are equally late, and no Greek originals are known at all. It is futile to speculate what might have happened in the gap between the original composition and the oldest MS attestation, a gap of more than one thousand years.

⁶⁷ φοῖνιξ (Васильев, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, I, 185).

⁶⁸ χαλκῆδρις (ibid., 185). The Greek text published by Krasnsetsev does not have these details (Красносельцев, “Пренїе”, 24–5). Moreover, the fourth bird invokes Christ.

⁶⁹ Соколов, “Славянская книга Эноха,” 142

⁷⁰ The rising sun as a symbol of Christ's resurrection is an old Christian topos, found already in Clement (ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ ἀναστάσιν ἡμῖν δηλοῦσιν [1 Clem 24:3]). Ignatius of Antioch saw his journey to Rome as travel towards the place of sunset, to be followed by resurrection: “It is good to set from the world unto God, that I may rise unto him” (Ign. Rom. 2).

down to “universal resurrection”. Once more 2 Enoch has missed the opportunity to declare this orthodox doctrine. (3) In the Slavonic version of the *Disputatio* there seem to be only two earthly bird singers, not four as in the Greek text quoted above. They do, however, sing antiphonally. The first bird says three times — a sure give-away that this is a Christian liturgy; **ПОНДИ СВѢТОДАВЧЕ**, *Come, O Lightgiver!*⁷¹ The significance of this title will be discussed further in the notes on the Hymn for the Sun. The second bird responds: **ХС ЖИВЪ ЕСТЬ И ВСА СВЕРШАЕТ ЯКОЖЕ И ХОЦЕТЪ**, *Christ is alive! And he accomplishes everything, even whatever he wishes.*⁷²

It is conceivable that a Christian controversialist might have taken a text like that in 2 Enoch and adapted its ideas to cosmic Christology, as in the *Disputatio*. It seems unlikely that a Christian scribe would have expanded a text like the present “shorter” Enoch by the wholesale incorporation of material from the *Disputatio*, while at the same time eliminating from this secondary material all traces of its distinctively Christian coloring. It is in fact hard to detect any explicitly trinitarian or christological components in “longer” 2 Enoch as it now stands.

This is not to deny that a Christian hand has been at work here and there. But such glosses are readily detected. One obvious case is the addition of the *Trisagion* (in its Christian, not its Jewish form) as the song of the worshipping spirits in the seventh heaven. This is found in **J** and **P**, but not in **R**; so it looks like a later development, even within the transmission of the “longer” recension.

When we compare the song for sunrise in 2 Enoch with the versions in texts of the *Disputatio*, we have the impression that 2 Enoch is still much closer to a Jewish, to say nothing of a possibly pagan, original than the *Disputatio*.

This affinity does not carry much weight in an argument for the authenticity of the song as an original ingredient of the Enoch writings. It is acknowledged that the song, along with other companion details found also in the *Disputatio*, is attested only in the “longer” recension of 2 Enoch. **J** has the best text, as usual. **P** is like it, but blemished in details. **R**, as we have already noted, differs considerably. **R** preserves only two colons of the song, the first of which agrees with 3 Baruch and the *Disputatio*. **R**’s second colon is unique: **И ДАЖЪ СВѢТЬ ТВАРИ СВОЕЖ**, *and he gives light to his creation.*

⁷¹ See Срезневский, *Материалы*, III 995

⁷² Соколов, “Славянская книга Эноха,” 142–3.

The theological awkwardness of this language constitutes a special problem. We shall return to it later.

RECOVERING THE TEXT

The longest text is preserved in **J** and **P**. Here a textual judgment has to be made. Do 3 Baruch, the *Disputatio* and MS **R** of 2 Enoch represent the complete, but very brief, hymn, of which the longer text in **J** and **P** is a later expansion? This is possible. The combined witness of three different works is impressive, and we have already seen that the distinctive readings of **R** have to be weighed seriously. Furthermore, we have seen that **J** and **P** come from an earlier text that has often received additions. But then **R** has a tendency to condense; and its unique reading in the second colon points to independence. It is possible, then, that **J** and **P** preserve the complete hymn, and that what the others have is an incipit. And, whether or not it is a survival of an ancient poem, it is in its own right a well-wrought composition whose poetic features may be retrieved with some measure of confidence, and with a minimum of restoration.

This hymn for the sun at his rising has not received much attention up to now. This neglect has been due in part to textual and philological difficulties, but the half-heartedness of the investigation has been due mainly to the low esteem in which the MSS containing it have been held. For most scholars it was known only through **P**, notorious for its corruptions. The only other MS of the “longer” recension that has been properly published, **R**, preserves only the first two colons. The translation, from **P**, supplied to Charles by Morfill⁷³ and its revision by Forbes⁷⁴ are rather garbled. In the first English translation of 1896 preference was given to the shorter text, and most of the poem, which, of course, was not recognized as such, was relegated to a footnote. This was rectified in “The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,” but the translation was not noticeably improved. In 1922 Bonwetsch, influenced by Sokolov’s preference for the readings of **R** rather than **P**,⁷⁵ reverted to the pattern of

⁷³ Charles and Morfill, *Book of the Secrets*, 17.

⁷⁴ *APOT*, II, 437–8.

⁷⁵ Соколов, М. Н. “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Вып. 3. VII: Славянская книга Эноха: текст с латинским переводом” [Sokolov, M. N. “Materials and notes on the old Slavonic literature. Fasc. 3, VII: Slavonic book of Enoch: text with Latin translation”]. *Чтения в обществе истории и древностей российских* [*Lectures in the Society of Russian History and Antiquities*] IV (1899): 1–80.

Charles' 1896 edition.⁷⁶ Vaillant, who had a very low opinion of the value of **P**,⁷⁷ does not even report the variant text of **P** at this point.⁷⁸

THE SONG AS A POEM

The availability of the text of **J** now changes this.⁷⁹ It confirms the text of **P**, but enhances its authority by the general superiority of **J**'s readings. This rehabilitation of the "longer" recension does not settle the question of the authenticity of the song. That is not what is being claimed. All that is affirmed at this stage is that the text is too interesting to be left out of critical editions of 2 Enoch. It is long enough to disclose an underlying poetic form. It is distinctive enough and coherent enough to suggest that it is an intrusive block, a whole piece, and not an internal scribal development from a shorter text like that of **R**.

A Song for the Sun at Daybreak

1 приходи́ свѣтодавецъ
 2 дати сѣаніе въсѣмоу миру.
 3 и вждет стража оутрѣнѣа
 4 еже сжѣ зарі слнчныа,
 5 и изыде́ слнце на лице земное,
 6 и приимѣ́ сѣаніе свое
 [7 и раждежетъ ся слнце паче огна]
 8 просвѣтити въсе лице земное

1 The Light-giver arrives,
 2 to give radiance to all the world;
 3 and the morning watch appears,
 4 which is the rays of the sun.
 5 And the sun goes out over the face of the earth,
 6 and receives back its radiance.
 [7 And the sun blazes out more than a fire,]
 8 to give light to all the face of the earth.

⁷⁶ Bonwetsch, G. N. *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs. Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch*, 14. TU, 44. Leipzig, 1922.

⁷⁷ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, III.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 92

⁷⁹ I wish to record my gratitude to the authorities of the Library of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. for providing microfilm of **J**, and to Professor James Charlesworth for his good offices.

That this poem is a composition in its own right, independent of the rest of 2 Enoch, or at least tangential to it, is suggested by several kinds of evidence.

(1) The vocabulary includes some items that are not typical of 2 Enoch. In the terminology for sunlight there is lacking (in **J** and **P**) the ordinary words **СВѢТЬ**, *light*, and **ΛΟΥЧА**, *ray*, with preference for the more fancy, poetic words **СΙΑННИК**, *radiance*, and **ЗАРЯ**, *beam*. There are no one-to-one correspondences that permit back-translation to likely Greek originals; the vocabulary functions as a set of near synonyms that range over the rich Greek vocabulary for various kinds of light — αἴγλη, ἀκτίς, αὐγή, λαμπρότης, φέγγος, φῶς. There are, all the same, differences in semantic focus, with свет = φῶς, *light*, сияние = *radiance*, while заря has come to mean *dawn*.

(2) The unmistakable biblical character of certain phrases, notably *the morning watch* (see the note below), *all the world* (not in the Greek parallels above!), and *all the face of the earth*.⁸⁰

THE STRUCTURE OF THE POEM

The poem (if such it be) consists of seven, perhaps eight, well-marked colons, each of which is a complete grammatical clause or construction. This pattern is characteristic of Hebrew prosody, but not, of course, exclusive to that tradition; in fact it is likely to be met in any simple poetry. The colons are grouped in pairs, each pair of colons being a complete sentence. This is more typical of biblical verse, although the classical Hebrew *parallelismus membrorum* is not evident here. Each two-colon unit consists of a lead clause (the odd-numbered colons) followed by a dependent clause (the even-numbered colons). The lead clauses all begin with an imperfect (present-future) verb, and each of these verbs describes an activity of the sun. These four activities of the sun represent the four well-defined stages of sunrise.

⁸⁰ One of the most vexing problems in tracing literary affinities or even origins of language-specific features is to distinguish among a Hebraism so distinctive as to suggest direct translation from a Hebrew text, a biblicism (a Hebraism can survive through Greek into other languages and is then evidence of a Hebrew original only at second remove), and a cliché or calque that might pass into general circulation and no longer evoke its biblical associations. On the last category see Гурт, И. “Библиейские фразеологизмы в современном русском языке” [Gurt, I. “Biblical idioms in modern Russian”]. *Jews and Slavs*, I (1993): 129–31. The inventory in that article does not include “upon (all) the face of the earth.”

- Colon 1. The first glimmerings of light appear in the sky.
 Colon 3. The first rays shoot up before the sun itself can be seen.
 Colon 5. The edge of the sun peeps above the horizon.
 Colon 7. The full circle of the solar disk is visible.

The four dependent colons (colons 2, 4, 6, 8) describe some corresponding activity in the world as a result of this activity of the sun. Colon 4 is not quite as clear-cut as the others in this respect. Two of these dependent constructions are infinitival (colons 2 and 8); two are relative clauses (colons 4 and 6 — the latter with less certainty, since a small emendation is required).

The description of the sunrise in four stages gives a steady progress to the poem. In addition to this narrative coherence, there are repetitions of key words and a balancing of ideas that unify the whole artistically. The closing pair of colons match the opening pair, but they are more dramatic. There is movement to climax also in the phrases:

- all the world* (colon 2)
the face of the earth (colon 5)
all the face of the earth (colon 8)

The connection between colon 2, in which the sun gives its radiance, and colon 5, in which the earth receives its radiance, is less clear.

NOTES ON THE TEXT

1. *Light-giver*. **СВѢТОДАВЕЦЪ** is a more magnificent title than its synonym **СВѢТОДАТЕЛЬ**.⁸¹ In Christian liturgies it is used to address divine persons. In the *Успенский Сборник* (2966 ll. 30–31) it is a title of God the Father. A *Минея* for November of 1097 includes: **Омраченъи просвѣти, Владце, свѣтодавца Ха рожши Болти**, *O Lord, make Christ, the Light-giver, born of the Mother of God, illuminate the darkness!* Note the use here of the same verb, **просвѣтити** as in colon 8 of the poem. This language raises the question of whether the sun is addressed in the poem as a divine being. This possible interpretation seems to be neutralized in 2 Enoch 15:4, which makes it clear that the sun is a creature, albeit the greatest of all God's creations. The reading **твар** is dubious, since **Ј** reads **варь**, *beat* (?). See the discussion below of the reading of **Р** in colon 2. In spite of the similarity, the title *Light-giver* does not seem to have been developed by analogy from *Life-giver*, the title of the Holy Spirit in the Nicene Creed. This is **животворащъи**,

⁸¹ Срезневский, *Материалы*, III, 293.

Creator of Life, τὸ ζωοποιόν. The *Миня* already quoted speaks of illumination with the *light-giving rays of the Spirit*, СВѢТОДАВЬНЫМИ ЛУЧЧАМ ДУХА. A trace of this tradition might, however, be detected in the remarkable variant of **J** in 2 Enoch 15:1, which reads ЖИВѢТОДАВЦУ, *Life-giver*, instead of the СВѢТОДАВЦУ of **P** and **R**. SJS does not list the word ЖИВѢТОДАВЕЦЬ, which is not the same as the usual term in the Nicene Creed, but Sreznevsky has ЖИВОДАВЕЦЬ and ЖИВОДАТЕЛЬ.⁸² The curious spelling in **J** reads as if the scribe began to write ЖИВОДАВЕЦЬ and switched to СВѢТОДАВЦУ.

2. *to give*. **R** reads ДАЖ^т, *and they give*, apparently. This is probably a spelling error, or a provincialism. **J** and **P** agree in the infinitive, although this is not supported by the Greek parallels we have. This infinitive matches ПРОСВѢТИТИ in colon 8. Nevertheless **R**'s reading does match И ПРИАТЬ in colon 6, and **R**'s phrase ТВАРИ СВОЕЖ resembles СІАНІЕ СВОЕ in colon 6.

radiance. **J** and **P** agree in the use of СІАНІЕ as against **R**'s СВѢТЬ, *light*. As already mentioned, the latter is the more ordinary word, common in other parts of 2 Enoch, but not found in the poem, except in the compound СВѢТОДАВЕЦЬ found in colon 1 (but not in **J**). This word choice is more a matter of style than semantics; for the meanings overlap, and it is not possible to make equations with precision to words in the Greek repertoire. Note the equivalence of СІАНІЕ to φέγγος and φῶς in the chart on page 12–13.

all the world. **R** reads “of (or to) his creation;” ТВАРИ can be genitive or dative. СВОЕЖ is genitive; but Vaillant thinks that it is a mistake for dative СВОЕН.⁸³ In any case the recipients of the sun's light are called in **R** “his,” that is, the Light-giver's, “creature.” On the face of it, the sun is both god and creator, and the thought is pagan. It can hardly be original, however, for it is **J** (with **P**), not **R**, that agrees with the Greek parallels quoted above. Not that this similarity decides the matter of the original reading in the Enoch manuscript tradition, for the *Disputatio*, as we have seen, has heavily Christianized the song. If **R**'s deviant reading for colon 2, which has no parallel anywhere, is deliberate, its stronger theology would be suitable for the Christian God as creator, but not entirely in keeping with the idea of Christ as the Light of the World, a theme beloved in eastern Christendom, especially in its hymns. The reading of **J** and **P** — *to all the world* — sounds more Hebraic than the simple “the world” of the Greek parallels, and harmonizes with other phrases in the poem. In choosing between **R** and **J**

⁸² Срезневский, *Материалы*, I, 865.

⁸³ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*, 92.

(with **P**) at this point, the question is whether **R**'s reading represents a later stage of Christianizing, or is the remains of an originally Christian hymn to Christ as the “Sun [of Righteousness]” (to be sung in a dawn service), confused with a hymn to the sun as such (the language purely poetic in Christian use), but still containing the tell-tale words “his creation;” or whether it is what it seems most naturally to be — the remains of an original pagan hymn to the sun as god; or whether the extravagant language found at this point is in keeping with the fascination with the sun that dominates 2 Enoch's account of the fourth heaven. If the rest of the book is to be a guide, it is generally true that, in spite of its fantastic mythology, 2 Enoch does safeguard a strong monotheism in which the one God is the creator and ruler of the world, however transcendently, and is not much else. So it is very difficult to decide between **R** and **J** (with **P**) in the reading of colon 2. With this goes also the question of the remainder of the poem, found only in **J** and **P**.

A point in favor of the fuller text is its comparative restraint. It is theologically innocuous. Its description of the sunrise is straightforward and matter of fact. The mythology is reduced to vanishing point. There is no talk of the sun's crown or chariot or retinue of angels. Nor does the hymn contain any conventional pieties about the sun as a witness to the power and goodness of the Creator.

3. *morning watch*. **Стража** can mean abstractly protection or a guard on watch-duty.⁸⁴ And, by association, the time of duty and the several periods of the night (φυλακή). The same phrase as here occurs in Psalm 129 [Hebrew 130]:5 (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* [EMS], p. 172).

УПЪВА ДША МОА НА ГЪ: ~	ἤλπισεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον
УТЪ СТРАЖА ОУТЪРНЪ ДО НОШТИ	ἀπὸ φυλακῆς πρωίας μέχρι νυκτός
УТЪ СТРАЖА ОУТЪРНЪ	ἀπὸ φυλακῆς πρωίας
ДА ОУПЪВА ЙНЪ НА ГЪ: ~	ἐλπισάτω Ἰσραηλ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον

Behind these texts lies **שמרים לבקר**, and the identification of the morning watchers, as those watching for morning to come, so as to announce sunrise, rather than those on guard during the last period of the night, represents a change in focus. Identification with the sun's predawn rays (colon 4) represents a change in image, in keeping with the plural of the Hebrew and the plural of **зари**. But the ideas in the Psalm are fluid, and the

⁸⁴ Срезневский, *Материалы*, III, 533.

note of hope shows that the dawn is awaited with expectation of relief, not apprehension; compare Isaiah 21:11–12.

appears. **Βγδϵτ (P)** is reflected in Morfill's "there will be," Forbes' "takes shape," Bonwetsch's "es wird." While future is possible ("it will be dawn"), we suggest that the verbs are all present tense, not in the timeless or punctiliar sense, but as incipient future ("it will soon be dawn"). The whole song is sung at the first signs of day.

4. **the rays of the sun.** Since the sun does not actually rise until colon 5, these are the first streaks of light from the as yet unrisen sun, picturesquely called in the Old Testament "the eyelids [lashes?] of **šaḥar**" (Job 3:9; 41:10). Compare Homer's "rosy-fingered Dawn."⁸⁵ The most interesting feature of the poem is its tracing of four distinct stages in the coming of the new day. Hebrew vocabulary makes a clear distinction between the predawn twilight (**שחר**), morning (**בקר**) and daylight (**אור**).⁸⁶ The period between the first signs of dawn and the full light of day was an ominous one, critical in several incidents. At Wadi Yabboq (Genesis 32) it was the signs of **שחר**, which "goes up" (**עלה**) that alarmed the "man" wrestling with Jacob. The sun "rises" (**זרח**) or "goes out" (**יצא** — the vocabulary of 2 Enoch), and this does not happen until Genesis 32:32. The crisis of dawn is the time for conjurations and prayers.

5. **goes out (изыде).** The movement of the sun is described from his point of view, not in the perception of an observer on the earth. The sun "goes out" when it rises, "comes in" (Jos 10:13) when it sets, like a soldier on an expedition.⁸⁷ In a famous simile, the high gods made Hammurabi *kima Šamaš ana šalmat qaqqadim wašēmma*, "like Shamash [Sun] over the black-headed [people] to rise [lit. go out]." (*Codex Hammurapi* I:42).

the face of the earth. The reading of **P (σῆμα ζεμιοε)** caused difficulty to translators: "the earthly sun;"⁸⁸ "the sun of the earth."⁸⁹ The

⁸⁵ For **šaḥar** = Phosphoros = Lucifer see Gaster, T. H. *Thepsis*, 410–2. San Francisco, 1950).

⁸⁶ ותשכב מרגלתו עד הבקר ותקם בטרם יכיר איש את רעהו "and she lay down at his feet until the morning, and she got up before a man could recognize his fellow" (Ruth 3:14).

⁸⁷ van der Lingen, A. "bw[□]—yš[□] ('to go out and to come in') as a military term." *VT*, 42 (1992): 59–66.

⁸⁸ Charles and Morfill, *Book of the Secrets*, 17.

⁸⁹ N. Forbes in *APOT*, II, *ad loc.*

reading of **J**, adopted in the text above, is superior, even though it makes the colon a bit long. It was accepted by Bonwetsch.⁹⁰

6. *and*. This conjunction makes colon 6 somewhat independent, in conflict with the analysis given above, where it was stated that each even-numbered colon is dependent on the preceding odd-numbered colon. Since we cannot demand perfect symmetry, a more serious problem should be noticed. That is the sequence of events. In 2 Enoch 14 it is explained that the first signs of dawn are due to the action of the angels who return the sun's crown to him at this moment. Although the angels are not mentioned, it seems as if colon 6 is describing this event. But, if that is so, it is in the wrong order. That stage of sunrise is described in colons 1–4; the sun has already risen in colon 5, so it is a bit late to say in colon 6 that the sun gets its radiance back. The problem can be solved by a minimum emendation, changing the conjunction **и** to the relative pronoun **иже**, written as **и** with a very small superscript letter **ж** → **ї**, which could have been confused with the breathing. But note the spelling **еже** above in colon 4. The MSS should be re-examined, since the interpretation in the mind of the scribes or editors might have inclined to the conjunction, and they misread the relative pronoun. Since **J** reads **и**, the emendation will have to be defended on general grounds. It restores the structure of the poem as four couplets, each dealing with one stage in daybreak. If that is so, it is not the sun that receives back its own radiance at this point, but the earth that receives the sun's radiance directly, after it has risen. The word "earth" is a more adjacent antecedent in the preceding colon.

There is, however, a further difficulty. The adjective **CBOE** is generally reflexive; that is, it has the same referent as the subject of the verb.⁹¹ This would mean that the sun receives its own light. But if "the earth" is the subject, "its" refers to the earth. Neither interpretation is entirely satisfactory. It is possible that "its" does refer to the sun's radiance, which the earth now receives; but this would be a somewhat irregular use of the adjective. It could be that "radiance" rather than "light" is used to refer to this received rather than emitted light.

⁹⁰ Bonwetsch, *Die Bucher*, 14.

⁹¹ The problems created for translators by differences in the pronominal systems of Hebrew and Slavonic have been pointed out by Metropolitan Ilarion. (Ivan Ohijenko Ilarion (Metropolitan). "Die Hebraismen in der altkirchenslavischen biblischen Sprache." *Münchener Beiträge zur Slavenkunde* 41 (1953): 163–78. He emphasizes in particular the lack of a reflexive pronoun in Hebrew.

accepts. There is no material difference between the different verbs used in **J** and **P**, since *прѣмлати*⁹² and *прѣлати*⁹³ are synonyms.

7. This colon has been brought in from 2 Enoch 14:3 (**J**, **P**), where it is does not fit very well. It hangs loosely at the end of the chapter and it is not found in **R**. It seems to be too climactic at that stage for the sun to be blazing up more than a fire does. It follows the return of his crown at the beginning of the dawn process, and we have seen that this causes only the first faint glimmer, not a blaze of fire. The dramatic language of colon 7 describes better the actual rising of the sun into view. So it fits nicely between colon 6 and colon 8. Nevertheless it would be unwise to claim too much for the correctness of a re-arrangement of a text that in so many places is irretrievably out of control, but some supporting arguments for the proposed restoration are: (1) It has a length suitable to be a colon in this poem. (2) It completes a pattern in which each odd-numbered colon begins a new couplet with an initial verb of the same kind. (3) It completes the series of colons 1, 3, and 5, each of which describes an activity of the rising sun, with colon 7 as the last and most dramatic moment. (4) Grammatically colon 7 resembles the other odd-numbered colons, particularly colons 3 and 5 with the construction: conjunction + verb + subject (+ adverb). (5) Without colon 7, the connection between colon 8 and the rest of the poem is not clear, as existing translations show. If, as commonly supposed, the sun is the subject of the verb in colon 6, the only description of sunrise itself is in colon 5. But then the sequence of colon 6 and colon 8 (the way the text is in **J** and **P**) has a clash in the repetition of the phrase “the face of the earth.” It is not good poetry to say: *And the sun goes out over the face of the earth... to give light to all the face of the earth.* But with colon 7 in place, this phrase at the beginning and end of the quatrain is more tolerable.

CONCLUSION

2 Enoch 15:2, in two MSS of the “longer” recension (**J** and **P**) preserves in more complete form the text of a hymn for the sun at daybreak of which only the first two colons (and the second one quite different at that) are preserved in **R**. Similar incipits in Greek are preserved in the Apocalypse of Baruch and in the *Disputatio Panagiotis cum Azymita*. Some hints of biblical affinity in the fuller text of the “longer” recension point behind the Greek

⁹² Срезневский, *Материалы*, II, 1404.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 1502–4.

originals to an earlier Jewish tradition. Too much should not be made of this; for a Christian scribe might have brought in such biblical phrases.

The creaturely status of the sun is evident, despite the curious reading of **R**; and it is placed beyond doubt by the additional comment in 2 Enoch 15:4, despite the curious reading of **J**.

We can only guess at a possible source for such a poem. The people who made so much of the sun also set great store on a 364-day calendar. In spite of obvious bewilderment on the part of the scribes, the latter has been preserved in 2 Enoch. In spite of its limited attestation, the other tradition about the sun expressed in the dawn song for the birds could be similarly tenacious, particularly since it has not suffered any doctoring at Christian hands, and is, indeed, almost pagan in mood. These circumstances make the Essenes, or the Qumran people, a candidate. Amusin concluded from his study of 11QMelch that 2 Enoch 71 (chapter 23 in **U** used by Vaillant)⁹⁴ has affinities with Qumran texts.⁹⁵ See also my paper “2 Enoch 35 and the Dead Sea Scrolls.”

Josephus reports that the Essenes made devotions for the sun at dawn:

Before the sun is up they utter no word on mundane matters, but offer to him (εἰς αὐτόν) certain prayers that have been handed down from their forefathers, as though entreating (ικετεύοντες) him to rise (Loeb Josephus 11, p. 373).

Although singing is not mentioned, this supplication reminds us of the imperative verbs in some of the texts quoted above. The Slavonic version of this passage has some significant differences from the Greek:

⁹⁴ Vaillant, *Livre des secrets*.

⁹⁵ Амусин, И. Д., ed. *Тексты Кумрана*. Вып. 1 [Amusin, I. D. *Texts of Qumran*. Fasc. 1], 295–8. Moscow, 1971; cf. Амусин, *Кумранская община*, 79.

И къ божествѹ благочъстиви сѹтъ паче всѣх. Мало же почиваютъ ношью и вѣстають на пѣнне, славяще моляще Бога. И прежъ сѣльчанаго вѣс хѹда ничто же не глаголють, но токмо молитвы отъчьскна к нему вѣсылаютъ,⁹⁶ яко молящеся о воснанни его.⁹⁷

And towards the Deity they are more pious than everybody else. And they rest but little by night, but get up for singing, glorifying and praying to God. And before the sun's coming forth they say nothing, but only ancestral prayers recite to him, as if praying about his shining forth.

The addition to the Slavonic Josephus of the detail that the Essenes get up during the night to engage in singing resembles closely what Philo reports concerning the therapeutæ or therapeutrides in his treatise *De Vita Contemplativa*.⁹⁸ He gives a very full description of these musical activities, considering them a most refreshing intoxication. When morning comes, they turn and face the East, and, as soon as they see the rising sun, they raise their hands to heaven and pray for serenity, truth, and sagacity (§ 89).⁹⁹

Such ceremonies at sunrise might account for the branding of one group of early Christian heretics as “Sun-worshippers” (Sampsæans), but veneration of the sun is an almost universal phenomenon, and comparisons are hazardous. Nevertheless the situation, and some of the circumstantial details, suggest a milieu in which a hymn like that in 2 Enoch 15 might have been used.

Pliny, in his famous letter to the Emperor Trajan, reports a Christian custom of meeting “regularly before dawn on a fixed day to chant verses alternately among themselves in honor of Christ as if to a god” (Pliny *Letters* 294). Perhaps this means “in the way other people conduct similar ceremonies for a god,” obviously the sun.

The Jews, in the Feast of Tabernacles, had a ceremony that began — perhaps this is significant — at cock-crow. The priests blew a blast on the

⁹⁶ On the liturgical significance of the verb **вѣсылати**, which can refer to hymns as well as to prayers, see Kurz, *Slovník*, I, 348. On similarities between sun worship and Jewish liturgy see Philonenko M. “Prière au soleil et liturgie angélique.” In *La littérature intertestamentaire: Colloque de Strasbourg, 17–19 octobre 1983*. Paris, 1985.

⁹⁷ Мещерский, Н. А. *История Иудейской войны Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе* [Meshchersky, N. A. *History of the Jewish War by Flavius Josephus in the Old Russian translation*], 253. Moscow/Leningrad, 1958.

⁹⁸ Елизарова, М. М. *Община терапевтов* [Elizarova, M. M. *Community of therapeutae*]. Moscow, 1972.

⁹⁹ Yonge, C. D. *The Works of Philo*, 706. Peabody, 1993.

trumpet, and processed through the temple precincts to the eastern gate. At the gate they turned their back to the East, solemnly renouncing the worship reported in Ezekiel 8:16 (*Sukkah* 5:4). Perhaps this action also served to disown the contemporary practice of the Essenes, as reported by Josephus.¹⁰⁰

In contradistinction to Jewish scruples about facing East for prayer, Christians defended their practice by drawing on biblical passages that spoke of Christ as Light, including expectation that the Parousia will be visible in the East (John of Damascus).¹⁰¹

With such a broad background, an original possible setting for the hymn of 2 Enoch 15 is impossible to establish. It seems to be neutral as to theological content; so it cannot be identified with any sect. It seems to be prechristian; it could be pagan, or belong to a paganizing sect, Jewish or Christian. If Christians could sing it, or something like it, as Constantine the panagiotes believed, they would fill its neutral content with the idea that the sun is a good symbol of Christ, and its rising a symbol of his resurrection. This theme could be developed into more explicit Christian hymnody, as the various recensions and companion pieces show. 2 Enoch 15 is the least Christianized of these versions; there is no indication that its version of the hymn betrays the hand of a Christian interpolater.

¹⁰⁰ For literature on this point, see Амусин, *Тексты Кумрана*, 357, n. 2.

¹⁰¹ For the development in Western Christian hymnody of the imagery of Christ rising from the dead like the sun and dawning like the sun in his parousia see Fauth, W. "Der Morgenhymnus *Aeterne rerum conditor* des Ambrosius und Prudentia Cath. 1 (*Ad Galli Centum*)."
JAC Jahrgang 27/28 (1984/85): 97–115.

THE HORARIUM OF ADAM AND THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PASSION

By Richard Baucham

Annie Jaubert is best known to New Testament scholars for her pioneering work on early Jewish calendars and her innovative theory about the chronology of the passion. Even though the latter as a whole has not won much support, it has undoubtedly stimulated fresh thinking about the topic. The present article is a minor contribution to the issue of understanding the chronologies of the gospel passion narratives by way of a neglected Jewish work about hours of the night and the day which, I shall argue, can be fairly confidently dated within the Second temple period.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE HORARIUM OF ADAM

The work which I am here calling the Horarium of Adam is a catalogue of the hours of the night and the day, detailing how the worship of God by all his creatures takes place throughout the twenty-four hours, in most cases specifying which of the creatures worship or petitions God at each hour. It is widely attested in several languages and forms: three recensions in Syriac,¹ two in Greek,² two in Arabic,³ one in Garshuni,⁴ two in Ethiopic,⁵ two in

¹ Edited and translated by Robinson, S. E. *The Testament of Adam: An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions*, 45–104. Chico, California, 1982. A more idiomatic translating of the first Syriac recension, also by Robinson, appears in: *OTP*, I, 993.

² Edited and translated by Robinson, *Testament of Adam*, 105–33. The second recension is a passage from the *Compendium* of George Cedrenus, which no doubt abbreviates a text of the Horarium, but does specify what happens at each hour of the day. Since it frequently agrees with the Syriac recensions against the first Greek

Armenian⁶ and one in Georgian.⁷ Its popularity in Christian use may be due partly to monastic interest in the theme of worship throughout the hours of day and night, as well as to its combination with other Adam literature, while in one Greek recension and one Armenian it has been adapted to magical use. These last two recensions form a quite distinct form of the work, distinguished especially by the fact that names are given to all the

recension, it is clearly independent of the latter, and its value as a witness to the text is dismissed too quickly by Robinson, *Testament of Adam*, 139.

³ Shorter recension edited by Bezold, C. "Das arabisch-äthiopische Testamentum Adami." In *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, vol. 2, 893–912. Giessen, 1906; and by Gibson, M. D. "Apocrypha Arabica." *Studia Sinaitica* 8 (1901), with English translation (13–5). Bagatti, A. "La Caverna dei Tesori." *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Collectio Minor)*, 25. Jerusalem, 1980, re-publish Gibson's text, with Italian translation: 47–9. Longer recension published and translated by Troupeau, G. "Une Version Arabe du Testament d'Adam." In Coquin, R.-G., ed. *Mélanges Antoine*, 3–14. Cahiers d'Orientalisme, 20. Geneva, 1988., and translated from a different manuscript by Galbiati, E. "Il Testamento di Adamo un Codice Arabo della Bibliotheca Ambrosiana." In Manns, F., and E. Alliata, eds. *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents*, 459–72. *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Collectio Maior)*, 38. Jerusalem, 1993. The longer recension is a considerably expanded and rewritten version of the Horarium.

⁴ English translation in: Mingana, A. *Woodbrooke Studies, III, 1: Vision of Theophilus, 2: Apocalypse of Peter*, 111–5. Cambridge, 1931.

⁵ First recension edited by Bezold, "Das arabisch-äthiopische Testamentum." French translation in: Grébaut, S. "Littérature Éthiopienne Pseudo-Clémentine III: Traduction du Qalémentos." *ROC*, 16 (1911): 172–4. The English translation in: Budge, E. A. W. *The Book of the Cave of Treasures*, 242–5. London, 1927, is translated from Bezold's Arabic and Ethiopic texts. A Falasha version (which does not seem to have noticed in studies of the Testament of Adam) is translated in: Leslau, W. "Falasha Anthology." *Yale Judaica Series* 6 (1951) 118–9, from the Ethiopic text published by Halévy J. *Prières des Falashas*. Paris, 1877.

⁶ First recension edited and translated by Stone, M. E. *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Patriarchs and Prophets*, 39–72. Jerusalem, 1982; second recension edited and translated by Stone, M. E. *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve*, 167–173. SVTP, 14. Leiden, 1996.

⁷ Edited and translated by Avachvili, Z. "Notice sur une Version Géorgienne de la Caverne des Trésors: Appendice." *ROC* 26 (1927–28) 396–405; new edition: Kourcikidze, C., ed. *La Caverne des Trésors: Version Géorgienne*, 17–21. CSCO, 526; *Scriptores Iberici*, 23. Louvain, 1993. French translation in: Mahé, J.-P. *La Caverne des Trésors: Version Géorgienne*, 13–5. CSCO, 527; *Scriptores Iberici*, 24. Louvain, 1992.

hours and instructions about the talismans that can be made during them are added. In this form also the work is ascribed not to Adam, but to Apollonius of Tyana.⁸ There is now scholarly agreement that this form of the work is a secondary and relatively late development. All other versions except the Falasha Ethiopic and the Garshuni⁹ are ascribed to Adam, and in most of these cases (all except the second Armenian recension) the Horarium forms the first part of the Testament of Adam.¹⁰ This latter work comprises the Horarium and s Prophecy given by Adam to his son Seth before Adam's death and burial.¹¹ In one case only (the first Syriac recension) a third component is added: an Angelology.¹² It is very probable that Horarium originated separately from the patently Christian Prophecy, and it may not have been ascribed to Adam until it was combined with the

⁸ Balinas in Armenian.

⁹ This is ascribed to Jesus Christ.

¹⁰ The second Syriac recension, the second Armenian recension, and the Falasha Ethiopic contain only the hours of the night, while George Cedrenus' report of the contents (second Greek recension) refers only to the hours of the day. All versions containing the hours of both night and day place those of the day first, except the first Syriac version, which most likely preserves the original order, following the Jewish understanding that a twenty-four hour day begins at sunset.

¹¹ In the first Arabic, Garshuni, first Ethiopic and Georgian recensions, the Testament of Adam itself is incorporated into the work known as the Cave of treasures, which in its Syriac texts does not contain the Testament of Adam. In the first Arabic, Garshuni and first Ethiopic recensions, the Cave of Treasures is in turn incorporated into the Book of the Rolls (Ethiopic Qalementos). Ri, S.-M. "Le Testament d'Adam et la Caverne des Trésors." *OCA* 236 (1990): 111–22, argues that the Testament of Adam is a work supplementary to the Cave of Treasures, forming an exegesis of the this latter work, but the argument is unconvincing. The hours of prayer in the Horarium do not in fact correlate with the times of Adam's first day according to the Cave of Treasures 5:1 or with the times of Christian prayer attached to the Horarium, in a clearly secondary development, in the Garshuni version (Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies*, 116–8).

¹² For a survey on scholarship on the Testament of Adam up to 1982, see: Robinson, *Testament of Adam*, chapter 2. It is unfortunate that Robinson's book was published in the same year as Stone's edition of the first Armenian recension, so that neither was able to refer to the other's work. In the article Robinson, S. E. "The Testament of Adam: An Updated Arbeitsbericht." *JSP* 5 (1989): 95–100, he was still unaware of Stone's work, and in fact the article adds nothing to his survey of scholarship in his 1982 book, except for a reference to M. Beit-Arié's unpublished Hebrew University dissertation on the Perek Shirah. See also Stone, M. E. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, 77, 85–7, 100, 108–9, 111. Atlanta, 1992.

Prophecy. references to the priests (N7, N12, D10)¹³ are anachronistic as spoken by Adam, while the two passages in which Adam speaks in the first person, recalling his experiences in paradise (N4, N5), could be additions to the text.

The problem of the relationships between the many forms of the text is too complex to be discussed here. Stephen Robinson makes a good case for the regarding the first Syriac recension as the most original of the texts we have,¹⁴ but he also correctly points out that while this entails “the overall priority of recension 1,” “any of the three [Syriac recensions] may preserve the original reading at a given point.”¹⁵ The same may be said, with greater caution, of some of the versions in other languages, especially Greek 2 (George Cedrenus’ summary of the text he knew), which Robinson dismisses rather too cavalierly.¹⁶ The fact that it uniquely agrees with Syriac 1 at D1 suggests that it reflects an early form of the text, and this also throw some doubt on Robinson’s argument that the Horarium was first composed in Syriac. While there can be no doubt, in view of Robinson’s evidence,¹⁷ that Greek 1 is derivative from the Syriac tradition, Greek 2 (which is clearly quite independent of Greek 1) could be evidence of a Greek *Vorlage* behind the Syriac. In such a short text the absence of indications in the Syriac of translation from Greek¹⁸ may not be very significant. Alternatively, a Hebrew original still remains a possibility.

2. THE HORARIUM OF ADAM: TRANSLATION AND NOTES

For our purposes in this article it will not be necessary to establish the original text of the Horarium in every detail. For the convenience of readers I reproduce below Stephen Robinson’s translation of Syriac 1,¹⁹ with some

¹³ I follow Stone in designating the sections of the text that deal with the hours of the night N1–N12 and those that deal with the hours of the day D1–D12. Robinson’s treatment of the hours of the night as chapter 1 (divided into 12 verses) and the hours of the day as chapter 2 (divided into 12 verses) is potentially confusing because only in Syriac 1 do the hours of the night precede the hours of the day. (The confusion occurs in Robinson’s book itself: in the first paragraph on p. 140, the references to chapter 2 should be to chapter 1, and vice versa.)

¹⁴ Robinson, *Testament of Adam*, 102–4.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 103.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 139.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 139–40.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 140.

¹⁹ From Robinson, *Testament of Adam*, 53–9.

notes and comments on other readings in cases where they may be preferable.

The hours of the night

(N1) The first hours of the night: the praise of the demons. And in that hour they neither injure nor harm any human being.

(N2) The second hour: the praise of the doves.

This reading is unique to Syriac 1. Other forms of the text refer here to fish and other aquatic animals and omit fish from N3. Syriac 1's inclusion of the fish in N3 is odd, since "the depths" of that hour are probably not the seas, but the subterranean regions. Probably other forms of the text are in this respect preferable to Syriac 1. But cf. Psalm 148:7–8, which may be the source, and 4Q405 Frags. 1–2 7:8–9.

(N3) The third hour: the praise of the fish and of fire and of all the depths below.

(N4) The fourth hour: the trishagion of the seraphim. Thus I used to hear, before I sinned, the sound of their wings in paradise when the seraphim were beating them with the sound of their trishagia. But after (transgresses against the law, I did not that sound any longer.

(N5) The fifth hour: the praise of the waters that are above the heavens. Thus I myself used to hear, with the angels, the sound²⁰ of mighty waves, a sign which would inspire them to raise a mighty hymn of praise to the Creator.

(N6) The sixth hour: the construction of the clouds and the great fear which occurs at midnight .

The reading of Ethiopic 1 — "the clouds worship the Lord in fear and trembling" (Arabic 1 is similar) — may be preferable, since the fear of midnight in Syriac 1 seems to have no connexion with the clouds.

(N7) The seventh hour: the viewing of their powers when the waters are sleeping. And in that hour the waters are taking up the priest of God mixes them with consecrated oil and anoints those who are afflicted and they rest.

Syriac 3's version of the first sentence (supported by Armenian 2 and broadly by several other forms of the text) may be preferable: "the powers of the earth are resting when the waters are sleeping."

²⁰ Or, "both the angels (and) the sound" (Robinson's note).

(N8) The eighth hour: the springing up of the grass of the earth while the dew is descending from heaven.

(N9) The ninth hour: the praise of the cherubim.

All other forms of the text refer to angels variously described, partly in language corresponding to D7 and D9 in Syriac 1. Priority here is hard to establish.

(N10) The tenth hour: the praise of human being and opening of the gate of heaven where the prayers of all living things enter and worship and depart. And in that hour whatever a man will ask from God is given to him when the seraphim and the roosters beat their wings.

(N11) The eleventh hour: joy in all the earth while the sun is rising from paradise, and shining upon creation.

(N12) The twelfth hour: the awaiting of incense and the silence which is imposed upon the all ranks of fire and of wind until all the priests burn incense to his divinity. And at that time all the powers of the heavenly places are dismissed.

The hours of the day.

(D1) The first hour of the day: the petition of the heavenly beings.

This is supported By Greek 2 (Cedrenus: “the first prayer is completed in heaven”), but all other forms of the text refer to prayer by humans. Syriac 1 is probably more original, allowing D1 and D2 to correspond to the first two verses of Psalm 148. Other forms of the text may be influenced by Christian practice of prayer at the first hour of the day.²¹

(D2) The second hour: the prayer of the angels.

(D3) The third hour: the praise of flying creatures.

(D4) The fourth hour: the praise of the beasts.

The beast reading of Syriac 3 has “creeping things” here at D4 and “every beast” at D5, while Greek 2 has “domesticus animals” here and “wild animals” at D5. In either case D2, D3 and D4 would then correspond to three of the four categories of creature in Psalm 148:10. Arabic 1, Ethiopic 1, and Garshuni all refer in D4 to spiritual beings, meaning probably creatures with souls (so Georgian).

(D5) The fifth hour: The praise which is above heaven.

²¹ Cf. the references to this practice in the Horarium in the Garshuni version: Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies*, 116–7.

This odd reading has no support from other forms of the text, which all (except Greek 1) refer in some way to animals here (see note above on D4).

(D6) The sixth hour: the praise of the cherubim who petition against the iniquity of our human nature.

(D7) The seventh hour: the entry and exit from before God, when the prayers of all that lives enter and worship and depart.

Greek 3 and Ethiopic 1 refer to the entry and exit of angels, doubtless understood as carrying the prayers.

(D8) The eighth hour: the praise of fire and of the waters.

Instead of fire and waters, various manuscripts of Syriac 3 have “heavenly and fiery beings,” “heaven and earth and fiery beings,” “sun and fire” and “heaven and fire” (cf. Arabic 1: “all heavenly beings and fiery creatures;” Ethiopic 1: “heavenly and shining beings;” Georgian: “winged beings of heaven”). If some form of this reading is original, the references may be to the heavenly bodies (cf. Ps 148:3), otherwise surprisingly absent from the Horarium (except for the reference to the sun’s rise in N11).

(D9) The ninth hour: the supplication of those angels who stand before the throne of majesty.

(D10) The tenth hour: the visitation of the waters when the Spirit is descending and brooding over the waters and over the fountains. And if the Spirit of the Lord did not descend and brood over the waters and over the fountains, human beings would be injured, and all whom the demons saw, they would be injured. And in that hour the waters are taken up and the priest of God mixes them with consecrated oil and anoints those who are afflicted and they are restored and they are healed.

(D11) The eleventh hour: the exultation and the joy of the righteous.

(D12) the twelfth hour, the hour of evening: the supplication by human beings, for the gracious will of God,²² the Lord of all.

3. AFFINITIES WITH EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE AND PRACTICE.

In this section we shall build a case for the origin of the Horarium within Second Temple Judaism by demonstrating its affinities with pre-Mishnaic Jewish literature and practice. One particular feature of the text (discussed

²² Lit. “which is with God” (Robinson’s note).

in [6] below) will enable us to be more precise and to date the original Horarium in the period before 70 CE.

(1) The praise of all creation.

The Horarium is a particular kind of the conviction that all creatures praise their Creator. That conviction is found in the Hebrew Bible most fully in Psalm 148 (cf. also Pss 19:1; 96:11–13; 98:7–9; 103:20–22; 150:6; Isa 42:10–12; and in early Jewish literature: Tob 8:5; Enoch 51:5J; 4Q287 Frag. 3; 4Q501 Frag. 1:1–5). Psalm 148 calls on the various creatures, mentioned one by one in some detail, from the heavens to human beings, all to praise God their Creator. This psalm is evidently the most important scriptural source of the Horarium,²³ as the following allusion show:

<i>Horarium</i>	<i>Ps 148</i>
N3	7–8
N5	4
D1	1
D2	2
D3	10
D4–5	10
D8	3?

The Song of the Three among the Greek Additions to Daniel is also deeply indebted to Psalm 148.²⁴ The Horarium shows no specific correspondences with the Song of the Three beyond those which derive from common dependence on Psalm 148 (which might be a minor indication that the Horarium does not come from a context in which the Septuagint was commonly used), but the resemblance shows that it is not difficult to envisage the origins of the Horarium in Second Temple Judaism. Also in the tradition of Psalm 148 is the Qumran text 4Q504 frags. 1–2 7:4–9.

The idea of the praise of God by all his creation is also expressed in another Jewish work, Perek Shirah.²⁵ Here each of category of the creatures (e. g. each kind of plant or bird) has his own hymn of praise, usually consisting of an appropriate sentence or two from Hebrew Bible. This kind of attribution of biblical sentences is characteristic of rabbinic Midrash and

²³ The other major source appears to be the Genesis 1 creation narrative.

²⁴ Moore, C. A. “Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions.” *AB* 44 (1977): 70–3, 75.

²⁵ Beit-Arié, M. “Perek Shirah.” *Encyclopedia Judaica* 13 (1972): 274–5.

probably dates the Perek Shirah after the Second Temple period. Nevertheless it is further evidence that the theme of creation's praise is at home in the Jewish religious tradition.

(2) Praise at each hour of day and night.

Neither Psalm 148 nor the Song of the Three assigns the praises and prayers of the various parts of creation on the various hours of night and day as the Horarium does. But there are a few traces of this idea in early Jewish literature. In the Apocalypse of Abraham, the angel Yahoel includes among his powers and responsibilities: "I teach those who carry the song through the medium of man's night of the seventh hour" (10:10). From 18:11 we know that those he teaches the song are the living creatures (the *ḥayyot*) or the cherubim, while the song he teaches them is evidently "the song of peace which the Eternal One has in himself" (18:11; cf. Job 25:2). The text is too obscure to permit any very secure conclusions, but the reference to the seventh hour of the night would suggest some relationship to the kind of traditions we find in the Horarium. The allusion is evidently not to precise the same traditions, since in the Horarium the praise of the cherubim occurs at the ninth hour of the night (according to Syriac 1, though not other forms of the text) and/or at the sixth hour of the day (according to most forms of the text). But in the latter case it is described as "the praise of the cherubim who petition against the iniquity of our human nature" (D6 Syriac 1), which might suggest a connexion with "the song of peace" sung by the cherubim according to the Apocalypse of Abraham (18:11).

The Life of Adam and Eve explains that Eve sinned when her guardian angels were not with her: "the hour drew near for the angels who were guarding your mother to go up and worship the Lord" (Greek 7:2; cf. 17:1; Latin 33:2).²⁶ A similar reference to a specific time of the day at which the angels worship God occurs in the shorter recension (B) of the Testament of Abraham: Michel "was taken up into the heavens to worship before God, for at the setting of the sun all angels worship God" (4:4–5). However, the fact that this point is not made in the longer recension (A), along with the fact that the Apocalypse of Paul expresses the belief that all the angels wor-

²⁶ See the various versions in: Anderson, G. A., and M. E. Stone, eds. *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. Second Revised Edition, 36, 37, 51. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17. Atlanta, 1999.

ship God at sunset (long Latin recension 7), means that we may here be dealing with a Christian contribution to the Testament of Abraham.

Finally, mention may be made of 2 Enoch 51:5–6 (recension J), where the injunction to human to worship God in his temple in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, is followed by the reason: “For every kind of spirit glorifies him and every kind of creature, visible and invisible, praises him.” The association on this statement with the hours of prayer in the temple could perhaps suggest the kind of sequence of human prayers and those of other creatures at various hours that we find in the Horarium.

Two early Christian apocalypses, quite plausibly depended on Jewish sources, also contain similar ideas. In a passage, already mentioned, of the Apocalypse of Paul (long Latin recension 7), humans are exhorted to “bless the Lord God unceasingly, every hour and every day; but especially at sunset,” since this is the hour at which all the guardian angels of men and women go to worship God and to bring before God all the deeds which people have done during the day.²⁷ This is said to be the first hour of the night. They do the same at the twelfth hour of the night.

Previously unnoticed in this connexion is a passage in the Coptic Mysteries of John. When the apostle wishes to know how the hours of the day and night are ordered, he is told that the twelve cherubim each sing a hymn that lasts for one hour of the day. The hours of the night are similarly ordered, but by animals rather than angels: “when the beasts, and the birds, and the reptiles pray, the first hour is ended. When the second hour is ended, the beasts pray [again?], and so on until the twelfth hour of the night; it is the animals of God which set limits to them.”²⁸ This is clearly not depended on the Horarium of Adam, but belongs to a similar world of ideas about a daily liturgy of the creatures.

²⁷ This idea is also found in the Greek version of 3 Baruch 11–16, where it is clearly a secondary addition to a text which originally referred to angels bringing the prayers (not the deeds) of humans to God, as in the Slavonic version of these chapters.

²⁸ Translated in: Budge, E. A. *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, 254. London, 1913.

(3) The times of human prayer.²⁹

The best evidence from the Second Temple period shows that devout Jews prayed at home at the very beginning and at the end of the daylight hours (Wis 16:28; Sir 39:5; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:212; SibOr 3:591–592; Ps-Aristeas 160, 304–305; 1QS 10:10; 1 QM 14:13–14; Ps Sol 6:4; 4Q503). These times were understood to be set by Deuteronomy 6:7 as the times when the Shema‘ was to be recited (“when you lie down and when you rise”) (Josephus, *Ant.* 4:212–213; Ps-Aristeas 160; 1QS 10:10). The Shema‘ was accompanied by the decalogue and prayers, and this act of worship was normally the first thing to be done on waking and the last thing done before sleeping. Since most people got up at or even just before first light in order to make the most of all the daylight hours, the morning prayers would have preceded sunrise (this is explicit in Wis 16:28; cf. Ps 57:8) by as much as an hour or more. Later the Rabbis in the Mishnah rule that the Shema‘ must be said between first light and sunrise, and the debate exactly what constitutes first light and light and whether the third hour of the day might not be considered the later limit (m. Ber. 1:2). Since modern scholars often write vaguely about dawn, not distinguishing first light and sunrise, it is important to stress that the distinction was important to ancient people in general, but especially to the Jews because of its relationship to the times of prayer.

These practices are clearly reflected in the Horarium, which assigns prayer to the tenth hour of the night and the twelfth hour of the day.³⁰ The former, as we shall see below, is the time of daybreak, before sunrise, which is assigned to the eleventh hour of the night. Most forms of the text of the Horarium refer to human prayer also at the first hour of the day, but, as we have noted above, the more original text is probably that of Syriac 1 and Greek 2, which refer here to prayer in heaven.

²⁹ On this subject, see especially: Falk, D. F. “Jewish Prayer Literature and the Jerusalem Church in Acts.” In Bauckham, R., ed. *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, 267–301. Carlisle, 1995.

³⁰ Philonenko, M. “Prière au soleil et liturgie angélique.” In Caquot, A., ed. *La Littérature Intertestamentaire*, 227. Paris, 1985, thinks that the Horarium of Adam is of Essene origin, on the grounds that it contains a liturgy to be followed throughout the hours of the night. He seems to have been misled by the second Greek recension, which includes prescriptions for making talismans at each hour. This is a magical adaptation of the Horarium, which in its more original forms does not expect humans to do anything at most of the hours of day and night.

There is minimal evidence for a third time of Jewish prayer also at noon (Dan 6:10; Ps 55:17; Enoch 51:4;³¹ Acts 10:9). This might have been a minority practice of those who wished to supplement the more common twice-daily prayers. The Horarium apportions noon (the sixth hour of the day) to the cherubim rather than to humans, though the prayer of the cherubim is for humans. The curious events of the seventh hour of the day, to be discussed below, might indicate the entry into heaven of prayers offered at noon on earth, but the prayers are said to be those of all living beings, not just humans.

In addition to the twice- or trice-daily prayers whose time was determined by the daily cycle of the sun, there is also evidence of Jewish prayers at the times of the daily morning and evening burnt-offerings in the temple in Jerusalem, or, more especially, at the time of offering of incense which preceded the morning sacrifice and followed the evening sacrifice. Such prayers certainly took place in the Temple itself, where people assembled to pray at both times (Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2:193–197; Sir 50:19; Luke 1:10; Acts 3:1). The time of the evening sacrifice changed during the Second Temple period from the last hour of daylight to the ninth hour of the day, and we have evidence from before this change of time (Ps 141:2; Ezra 9:5; Dan 9:21; Jdt 9:1³²) of people not in Jerusalem praying at the time of the evening sacrifice. But at that time this would have coincided in any case with the regular prayer around sunset. After the change, Acts 10:3, 30 attests prayer at the time of the evening sacrifice (and for possible early rabbinic corroboration, cf. *m. Ber.* 4:1), but we have no evidence for prayer outside the temple at the time of the morning sacrifice. We do not know whether prayer at the ninth hour was alternative or additional to prayer around sunset. But certainly the evidence suggests that outside the Temple itself prayer was much more commonly at sunset than in the afternoon. It is therefore unproblematic that the Horarium does not refer to the latter.

³¹ This last text is apparently the only one which speaks of prayer at morning, noon and evening in the Temple (though Dan 6:10 may well indicate that Daniel prayed at the times when prayers would have been offered in the Temple). But 2 Enoch might refer to the Jewish temple at Heliopolis in Egypt.

³² Since the date of the change is unknown and the date of the book of Judith is uncertain, it is not possible to be sure whether this text refers to prayer at the earlier or the later time.

(4) The entry and exit of prayers.

At the seventh hour of the day, according to the first and the third Syriac recensions, occur “the entry and exit from before God, when the prayers of all that lives enter and worship and depart.” Although Greek 1 (Cedrenus’ summary) refers to “the entrance of the angels to God and the exit of the angels,” the reading of the Syriac recensions is probably original. It is confirmed by the Georgian (“every prayer enters before God”), while Arabic 1 has modified the text to make it more intelligible, but without mentioning angels: “the entrance to God and the exit from the presence, for in it the prayers of every living thing rise to the Lord.” Ethiopic 1 introduces angels: “the angels enter before the Lord; they go out from before him, for, at this hour, the prayer of all living things rises to the Lord.”

This passage may be related to the picture of the offering of prayers in heaven found in 3 Baruch 11–16. (The Greek and Slavonic versions of these chapters differ in that while the Slavonic speaks consistently of prayers, the Greek refers to deeds as well as prayers. Probably the Slavonic preserves the original text more faithfully, while the Greek has been influenced by the ideas found in Apocalypse of Paul 7.) There, in the fifth heaven, the seer sees the guardian angels of humans bringing their prayers to Michael, who feels a huge receptacle with them and then enters through the door into the higher heavens, where, unseen, he presents the prayers to God. He returns to the fifth heaven bringing the angels the answers to or rewards (negative as well as positive) for the prayers, for the angels to take back to the humans whose prayers they had brought.³³

The passage in the Horarium differs in that angels are not mentioned; instead the prayers themselves, personified, go in out before God. It also differs in that it refers to prayers of all living beings (presumably on earth and in the lower heavens; the prayers of the cherubim would not need to enter before the God), not just those of humans. Perhaps we are to understand that the prayers offered at all the other hours of the day and night come into God’s presence at this special hour, the seventh of the day. (If so, the passage is in tension with the meaning of the events of the twelfth hour of the night as we shall see.)

(5) Cocks at daybreak.

Some of the words of D7 occur also in N10:

³³ For angels bringing human prayers to God, cf. also Tob 12:12,15; Enoch 47:1–2; 99:3.

D7: “the entry and exit from before God, when the prayers of all that lives enter and worship and depart.”

N10: “the praise of human beings and opening of the gate of heaven [where] the prayers of all living thing enter and worship and depart. And on that hour whatever a man will ask from God is given to him when the seraphim and the roosters beat their wings.”

There is reason to think that these words, original in D7, are a secondary intrusion into N10, borrowed from D7 by a scribe who thought that the significance of the “opening of the gate of heaven” (N10) on conjunction with “the praise of human beings” must be that prayers enter God’s presence through this gate. But parallels with the rest of the content of D7–8 show that the opening of the gate of heaven here has a different significance.

There are three passages in early Jewish apocalypses in which the seers get to view sunrise and sunset from a high point in the heavens: 3 Baruch 6–8; 2 Enoch 11–15; and 1 Enoch 72. In all three cases there are gates of heaven which are opened before sunrise so that the sun may enter the world through them.³⁴ According to 3 Baruch 6:13, angels open 365³⁵ gates of heaven. The number must correspond to the days of the solar year, on each of which the sun enters the world through a different gate and so at a different point on the horizon. Enoch sees six gates in the east, through which the sun comes in the morning (2 Enoch 13:2), and six in the west, through which it leaves in the evening (14:1). In probably the best text at 13:2 (recension A), he sees one of the six eastern gates open, since presumably only one is open at any one time. There is a quite elaborate scheme (defective in our texts) explaining how the sun uses different entrances and exits in different portions of the year (13:2–5). The same kind of scheme, with six gates of heaven in the east and six in the west (1 Enoch 72:2–3), along with a more complete and elaborate explanation of the way the sun’s use of these various gates accounts for the varying lengths of day and night throughout the year, is found in the Astronomical Book of Enoch (1 Enoch 72).³⁶ Finally, the rather fragmentary Qumran text (4Q503) which provides blessing to be at sunrise and in the evening on each day of a month refers on the sixth day to “the six gates of light” similarly on each day for which

³⁴ There are also gates of heaven for the stars and the winds: 1 Enoch 33–36, 75–76.

³⁵ This figure in the Greek version is clearly preferable to 65 in the Slavonic.

³⁶ For the text and explanation see Neugebauer, O., in: Black, M., ed. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 389–96. SVTP, 7. Leiden, 1985.

the relevant portion of text survives. In the fragmentary state of the text it is difficult to know the function of these gates, but they would seem most probably to be those through which the sun enters the world.

We should also notice that, according to 2 Enoch, the light of the sun is already seen presumably through the open gate of heaven, before the sun rises (14:3J). According to 1 Enoch 72, it seems that each gate has twelve windows through which, when opened at the proper time, flames from the sun emerge ahead of the sun's own rising (72:3,7).

In the light of these parallels, it becomes clear that the description of the events of the tenth hour of the night in the *Horarium* really refers to the opening of that gate of heaven through which the sun will rise in the next, the eleventh hour. Already before sunrise light from the sun comes through the gate, and it is at this time at first light people get up and recite the Schema and pray before starting their daily work.

According to the *Horarium*, this time of the opening of the gate of heaven is also the time "when the seraphim and roosters beat their wings" (N10). 3 Baruch and 2 Enoch can also help us with this statement. Baruch sees a huge bird, the phoenix, whose function is to fly in front of the sun, absorbing some of the dangerous heat of the sun's rays with its wings.³⁷ When the angels open the gates of heaven for the sun to rise, Baruch hears this bird cry out. "Light giver, give splendour to the world!" (3 Bar 6:13–14). This cry, Baruch is told, is what wakens the cocks on earth, so that they crow, announcing to the world that the sun is going to rise (6:16). A somewhat differing version of the same idea occurs in 2 Enoch, where the sun is accompanied by several flying creatures called phoenixes and chalcédras (2 Enoch 12:1–2J). It is these who, before sunrise, burst into song, celebrating the imminent coming of the light-giver and announcing the morning watch, which begins at first light (15:1–2J). 2 Enoch does not refer specifically to the cock, but merely notes that, when the phoenixes and chalcédras sing, "every bird flaps its wings, rejoicing at the giver of light" (15:1J). This generalizing (perhaps a secondary development in the textual tradition of 2 Enoch) obscures the more specific point made in 3 Baruch about the crowing of the cock, which was thought to crow even before first light, announcing the dawn before any other creature on earth is aware of its ap-

³⁷ On the wider religious historical parallels to 3 Baruch's account of the phoenix, see: Harlow, D. C. "The Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch* (3 Baruch)." In *Hellenic Judaism and Early Christianity*, 131–8. SVTP, 12. Leiden, 1996. The parallels between 3 Bar 6 and 2 Enoch 12–12 were first discussed by James, M. R. "Apocrypha Anecdota: Second Series." *Texts and Studies* 5/1 (1897): LXIV–LXVII.

proach. (Hence the benediction that the rabbis taught should be said on hearing the cock crow: “Blessed is who has given the cock understanding to know the difference between day and night” [b. Ber. 60 b].) 2 Enoch explains this remarkable ability of the cock by supposing that, while the angels are still preparing the sun for its rising, the cock hears the cry of the phoenix when it calls on the sun to rise.³⁸

It seems that the Horarium alludes to a similar but distinct tradition, according to which the imminent arrival of the sun was announced by the seraphim beating their wings. The cocks hear the seraphim and in turn beat their wings while crowing. As we know from N4, the seraphim sing with their wings, a notion which is elsewhere found in rabbinic and Jewish mystical literature with references to the *hayyot* or cherubim (b. Hag. 13b; 3 Enoch 22:15; Hek. Rab. 11:4; Pesiqta de Rab Kahana 9:3; Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer 4)³⁹ and which probably originated as an interpretation of Ezekiel 1:24–25. The idea may already be implied in 4QShirShabb (4Q405 frags. 20–21–22). The Horarium connects it with the observation that cocks beat their wings while crowing. Since N4 (in Adam’s reminiscence of his time in paradise) connects the seraphim with paradise, and according to N11 it is from paradise⁴⁰ (usually, in Jewish tradition, located in the east, following Gen 2:8) that the sun rises over the earth, we should probably think of the music of the seraphim greeting the sun’s arrival in paradise in preparation for its rising. Brief though the description in N10–N11 are, they allude to a coherent cosmological picture of the dawn comparable to those found in 3 Baruch and 2 Enoch.

³⁸ Another such explanation is given in the Perek Shirah, as summarized by Ginzberg: “When God at midnight goes to the pious in Paradise, all the trees therein break out into adoration, and their songs awaken the cock, who begins in turn to praise God” (Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 1, 44. Philadelphia, 1913); cf. also the Zohar as reported in: Ginzberg, L. “Cock.” In Singer I., ed. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, 138–9. New York/London, 1903: when God visits paradise to confer with the souls of the pious, a fire proceeds from paradise and touches the wings of the cock, who then breaks out into praise of God, at the same time calling on humans to praise the Lord and do this service.

³⁹ For other references and discussion, see: Halperin, D. J. *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision*, 52, 59 and n. 20, 122, 131–2, 388–9, 398. Tübingen, 1988.

⁴⁰ Cf. the reference to paradise in the Perek Shirah’s account of the cock’s crowing.

(6) Incense and silence.

Following daybreak at the tenth hour of the night, the sun rises from paradise, bringing joy to all the earth (N11). Syriac 1 probably gives us the best text of what then happens, at the twelfth and last hour of the night: “the awaiting of incense and the silence which is imposed upon all the ranks of fire and of wind until all the priests burn incense to his divinity. And at that time all the powers of the heavenly places are dismissed.”

I have discussed this passage elsewhere, along with detailed discussion of later Jewish texts which evidence a similar tradition.⁴¹ These texts explain that the worship of the angels in heaven is silenced at the time when Israel prays on earth, so that Israel’s prayers may be heard by God in heaven. For example, according to b. Hagigah 12 b, the fifth heaven is full of angels who sing God’s praise during the night, but are silent by day so that God may hear the prayers of his people on earth. Here the silence begins at dawn, when Israel prays the morning prayer on rising, and presumably continues until the evening prayer at sunset has been said. Another text, in the early medieval Jewish mystical work *Hekhalot Rabbati*, describes how every day at the approach of dawn God sits on his throne and blesses the *hayyot* before commanding them to be silent so that he may hear the prayers of his children Israel.⁴² In view of the Horarium’s notion of the seraphim singing by beating their wings, a notion elsewhere in Jewish literature associated with the *hayyot*, it is also worth noticing Ezekiel 1:24–25 was interpreted to mean that it is when the *hayyot* drop their wings that they fall silent (4Q405 frags. 20–21–22, lines 12–13; Tg. Ezek. 1:24–25). In *Genesis Rabbah* (65: 21) this is connected with the silence of the *hayyot* during the times when Israel says the Schema’ (at dawn and sunset).

Dating from periods after the destruction of the Second Temple, these texts refer to the angelic worship in the heavenly temple and to the prayers of Israel on earth, but not to the ritual of the Jerusalem Temple. What is

⁴¹ Bauckham, R. *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Revelation*, 70–83. Edinburgh, 1993. See also: Wick, P. *There Was Silence in Heaven (Revelation 8, 1)* [Ann. to:] Knöhl, I. “Between Voice and Silence.” *JBL* 117 (1998): 512–614 (written without reference to my work), who connects Rev 8:1 and Horarium of Adam N12 with the fact that sacrifices took place in silence in the Jerusalem Temple (as shown by Knöhl I. “Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship between Prayer and Temple.” *JBL* 115 (1996): 17–30), but fails to take full account of the fact that in Horarium of Adam N12 it is the worship in heaven that is silenced while the prayer of people on earth are offered.

⁴² Schäfer, P. *Übersetzung der Heikhalot-Literatur*, II, 112–3. Tübingen, 1987.

distinctive about the Horarium is that it refers to the silence of all the ranks of angels in the heavens (“all the ranks of fire and wind” alludes to Ps 104:4, the basis of a Jewish notion of two kinds of angels: those of fire and those of wind; cf. 2 Bar 21:6; ApAbr 19:6) until the *priests* on earth *burn incense*. In its position at the twelfth hour of the night this can only refer to the daily service in the Jerusalem Temple, in which the burning of incense on the altar of incense took place soon after daybreak between the slaughter of the sacrificial lamb and its offering as the daily morning burnt-offering. This passage in the Horarium is indubitably Jewish rather than Christian, since there is no evidence of liturgical use of incense by Christians until the late fourth century,⁴³ while, even when it was used, it did not have the key significance which the Horarium’s singing out the offering of the incense for mention requires. In the daily Temple ritual the incense offering did have this significance, as accompanying, symbolizing and assisting the prayers of the people. If this passage in the Horarium is indubitably Jewish rather than Christian, it also most probably dates from before the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. The reference to the incense offering is current practice cannot be explained by the attribution of the Horarium to Adam (whether by a Christian or post-70 Jewish writer), since it is, of course, anachronistic as spoken by Adam.

Comparison with Revelation 8:1, 3–5 is also instructive. If the Horarium is a pre-70 CE text, then, among texts that deploy the theme of silence in heaven for a sake of God’s hearing of prayers by humans on earth, Revelation is chronologically the closest to the Horarium, though (in my view) Revelation should be dated after 70. It is also the only other text to refer specifically to the incense offering, though in Revelation 8:3 this is the incense offering performed by an angelic priest on the altar on incense in the heavenly counterpart of what had happened, before 70, in the Jerusalem Temple, and, like the latter, it serves the function of conveying the prayers of God’s people on earth up to the throne of God. The silence specifically for half an hour, to which Revelation refers, is most plausibly explained as more less the time which the incense offering in the earthly Temple had taken when it was part of the daily Temple ritual. In the light of Revelation

⁴³ Fehrenbach, E. “Encens.” In *Dictionnaire d’Archéologie Chrétienne et de la Liturgie*, vol. 5/1, 6–8. Paris, 1922; Atchley, E. G. C. F. *A History of the Use of Incense in Divine Worship*, 81–96. Alcuin Club Collections, 13. London, 1909; Ashbrook Harvey, S. “Incense Offerings in the Syriac *Transitus Mariae*: Ritual and Knowledge in Ancient Christianity.” In Malharbe, A. J., F. W. Norris, and J. W. Thompson, eds. *Early Church in its Context*, 176–9. NovTSup, 90. Leiden, 1998.

8:1,3–5 we can recognize in Horarium N12 a pre-70 reference to this Jerusalem Temple ritual itself along with the belief that the angelic worship of heaven ceases while the levitical priests burn the incense in Jerusalem. N12 gives the clearest indication we have of the date of the original Horarium.

For the precise timing of the morning ritual in the Temple our only substantial evidence is that of tractate Tamid of the Mishnah.⁴⁴ Even though we cannot be sure how far this account reflects accurate memories of what happened in the Second Temple, its references to timing seem very plausible. Events in the Temple begin when the officer whose task is to cast lots to determine which of the serving priests undertake which duties arrives: “sometimes he came at the cockcrow and sometimes a little sooner or later” (m. Tam. 1:2). Clearing the altar of ashes and other preparations then take place in darkness. After casting lots to determine the respective duties of the priests in the acts of sacrifice, the officer “said them, ‘Go and see of the time is come for slaughtering’” (3:2). This time is first light, but there appears to be a disagreement in the Mishnah as to precise indication of this that was required. One view was that the priest who had observed reported, “The morning star!” (referring to the appearance of Venus which accompanies the first glimmerings of dawn). The other view was that he said, “The whole east is alight,” and when asked, “As far as Hebron?” replied, “Yes” (m. Tam. 3:2). In either case, it is not yet sunrise. Having ascertained that dawn was beginning, the priests proceed to a variety of other duties preparatory to the sacrifice, of which the most important were the opening of the main doors of the sanctuary and, immediately following, the slaughtering of the lamb. The priests then recite the Shema’ and other prayers. (Presumably at this point it is still not quite sunrise, since, according to m. Ber. 1:2, the Shema’ should be recited between daybreak and sunrise.) Further lots determine who is to offer the incense that morning. The incense offering takes place on the altar of incense inside the holy place, and the priests concerned with it come out and pronounce the priestly blessing on the assembled people. The offering of the sacrificial animal on the altar of burnt-offering follows, then the grain-offering and drink-offering are offered, immediately following which the Levites begin singing psalms and blowing trumpets.

⁴⁴ M. Eduy. 6:1 attributes to R. Judah b. Baba the view that the morning burnt-offering was offered at the fourth hour of the day. But on context it appears that this was a singular view held by R. Judah, and it is not easy to harmonize with m. Tamid.

Sunrise itself is not mentioned in the account, presumably because it was not regarded as a point of time which the priests had to note on order to proceed with the appropriate duties, but it must have occurred around the time of the incense offering. The reason the priests had to determine that dawn was beginning, before proceeding with the main preparations for sacrifice, was presumably to ensure that the incense- and burnt-offerings would be made when there was sufficient light and as early as possible once there was sufficient light. Since the Temple faced east the rising sun would shine into the holy place, where the incense was offered, and onto the court of the priests, where the altar of burnt-offering stood. The holy place had its own lighting, the menorah lamps, but the sun may have enabled the people assembled outside the court of the priests to see the incense offered.

Thus the morning Temple ritual, so far as we are able to ascertain it, does correlate chronologically with the sequence in the Horarium. The events in N10–N12 in sequence seem to be: cock-crow, first light, morning prayers, sunrise, incense offering. More dubious is the way three hours are allotted to these events, in particular because it seems to require an hour to elapse between sunrise and the incense offering. While not impossible, this is unlikely. But the Horarium is also surprising at this point in that it treats the hour after sunrise, the hour in which the incense is said to be offered after the heavenly hosts have waited in silence for it, as the last hour of the night, rather than the first hour of the day, as it would usually have been reckoned. Hours of the night were, of course, of a length that varied through the year, consisting of a twelfth of the actual time between sunset and sunrise, but since they were also very difficult to determine with accuracy, they were also very approximate.⁴⁵ Observable events of the early morning — cock-crow, first light, sunrise, and, for people in the temple, incense offering — were the real indicators of time in practice. Cockcrow, rather than some independent way of knowing that it was 3.00 a. m., signalled the beginning of the fourth of the three watches of the night; the gradually dawning light indicated the progress of these last three hours of the night; sunrise marked the beginning of the day itself. The degree of artificiality in the way the Horarium assigns these events to three hours would not have concerned ancient readers. We need not press the scheme to requiring a full hour between sunrise and incense offering, since it is the sequence that matters much more than the duration. What is interesting is

⁴⁵ On the reckoning of hours of the day and night, see: Bickerman E. J. *Chronology of the Ancient World*, 13–6. London, 1980 (revised ed.).

that the Horarium, uniquely so far as our evidence goes, places the boundary between night and day not at sunrise itself but at the liturgical act in the Temple (the only one the Horarium mentions) that occurred probably soon after sunrise.

This may be the Horarium views the events of N10–N12 as a unified sequence, beginning with morning prayers (N10) and ending with the incense offering that symbolically and effectively raised these prayers up to the heavenly throne of God where the angels kept silent while the prayers were heard by God. We have noted above that, whereas people assembled in the Temple court itself would have prayed at the time when the incense was offered (cf. Luke 1:10), there is no evidence that Jews elsewhere prayed at the time of the morning incense offering rather than at first light. (Since most people started work before sunrise, this would in any case not have been practicable for many.) Most Jews could not have understood the link between their own morning prayers and the Temple liturgy as strictly chronological coincidence. rather they would think that the prayers they had uttered on rising would come into God's presence and be heard at the time of the incense offering. A degree of confirmation for this can be found in Revelation 8:3, where the prayers of the saints that the angel offers with the incense on the heavenly altar are not being prayed at that moment. They are the prayers already in the golden incense bowls held by the twenty-four elders in 5:8.

(7) Priests anointing the sick.

So far we have demonstrated how the Horarium of Adam fits well into a context in early Judaism and also that there is one strong indication of a date before 70 CE. However there is one feature of the Horarium which may be considered problematic in a Second Temple Jewish context. The events described at the seventh hour of the night and the tenth hour of the day are exceptional. They do not consist in the praise of God by his creation. Rather, at the seventh hour of the night, all the natural powers on earth, including the waters, rest without movement: "And in that hour the waters are taken up and the priest of God mixes them with consecrated oil and anoints those who are afflicted and they rest." This is a kind of medicinal sympathetic magic: the sleeping waters bring rest to those who cannot rest for pain. At the tenth hour of the day the Spirit of God descends and broods over waters and springs (with allusion to Gen 1:2), preventing the harm the demons would otherwise do (by poisoning the waters?): "And in that hour the waters are taken up and the priest of God mixes them with

consecrated oil and anoints those who are afflicted and they are restored and they are healed.” Here the water that has been healed by the Spirit brings healing to sick people.

The difficulty these accounts pose is that there seems to be no other evidence in Jewish literature associating priests with healing. In other ancient cultures priests were often healers, but not, it seems, in Judaism according to extant sources. The only association between priests, disease and healing in the Bible is in the case of the purification of someone with skin disease (leprosy), according to Leviticus 14. Here the priest does use oil as part of the purification ritual (14:12, 15–18, 21, 26–29), but he has no part in the physical healing. The disease must be healed before the person comes to the priest to have the healing verified and purification from ritual impurity secured. However, despite the lack of corroborative evidence, it is not difficult to suppose that, at the level of popular practice in the localities of Palestine where most priests lived most of the time, when not officiating in the temple, priests may have functioned as healers because they were able to consecrate the oil that was used to anoint the sick. If the *Horarium* is accepted as evidence for such practice in Second Temple Jewish Palestine, then it very interesting provides evidence, such as hitherto been lacking,⁴⁶ that Jewish practice lies behind the religious anointing of the sick to which two New Testament passages refer (Mark 6:13; Jas 5:14).

4. COCK-CROW AND CHRONOLOGY IN THE GOSPELS

According to all four Gospels Jesus on the evening of his arrest predicted that Peter would deny him three times before a cock crowed (Matt 26:34; Mark 14:30; Luke 22:34; John 13:38). All four Gospels record the cock-crow itself after recounting Peter’s denials (Matt 26:74; Mark 14:72; Luke 22:60; John 18:27). In Mark uniquely the prediction is that Peter’s denials will occur before the cock crows twice, and the actual cock-crow, when it occurs, is said to be second (Mark 14:30, 72). The meaning of these references to cock-crow and the time of the night to which they refer have been discussed. Notable discussions include those of Ramsay (1917),⁴⁷ Mayo (1921),⁴⁸ Latter (1953),⁴⁹ Kosmala (1963 and 1967–1968),⁵⁰ Brady (1979),⁵¹

⁴⁶ Cf. Hogan, L. P. *Healing in the Second Temple Period*, 295–6. NTOA, 21. Freiburg, 1992.

⁴⁷ Ramsay, W. M. “The Denials of Peter.” *ExpT* 28 (1916–17): 276–81.

⁴⁸ Mayo, C. H. “St. Peter’s Token of the Cock Crow.” *JTS* 22 (1921): 367–70.

⁴⁹ Latter, C. “A Note on Cockcrow.” *Scripture* 6 (1953): 53–5.

Derrett (1983),⁵² and Brown (1994)⁵³. None of these mentions the evidence of the Horarium N10,⁵⁴ which we can now recognize as one of perhaps only half a dozen references to the morning cock-crow in non-Christian Jewish literature up to the Mishnah (the others are 3 Macc. 5:23; 3 Bar 6:16; m. Yoma 1:8; m. Sukk. 5:4; m. Tamid. 1:2). In the following discussion the Horarium will corroborate and supplement the other evidence.

We should note, first, that “cock-crow” (*gallicinium*, ἀλεκτοροφωνία) was used as the name for the third watch of the night, according to the Roman system that divided the night into four theoretically equal parts, two from sunset to midnight and two from midnight to sunset. By New Testament times this Roman system of four night watches had replaced the older Israelite scheme of three watches.⁵⁵ The four watches are listed in Mark 13:35, which gives them their usual names (“late” or “evening” [ὄψέ], “midnight” [μεσονύκτιον], “cock-crow” [ἀλεκτοροφωνία], “early” or “morning” [πρωί]). the suggestion of Mayo and others that Jesus’ prediction in the Gospels referred not to the actual crowing of a cock but to this period of three hours after midnight has been adequately refuted.⁵⁶ We may add that Kosmala is certainly wrong when he cites m. Yoma 1:8 as an instance of “cock-crow” (בקר־את הַנֹּבֵר) referring to the whole period of the third watch.⁵⁷ This reference (“at cock-crow and sometimes a little sooner or later”), in the account of the morning service in the Temple, cited above. Neither can conceivably refer to a three-hour period.

⁵⁰ Kosmala, H. “The Time of the Cock-Crow.” *ASTI* 2 (1963): 118–20; Idem. “The time of the Cock-Crow (II).” *ASTI* 6 (1967–68): 132–4.

⁵¹ Brady, R. E. “The Alarm to Peter in Mark’s Gospel.” *JSNT* 4 (1979): 42–57.

⁵² Derrett, J. D. M. “The Reason for the Cock-crowing.” *NTS* 29 (1983): 142–4. Derrett argues that cock-crowing was the time when the evil spirits, who had been abroad during the hours of darkness, returned to their own abode, but remarkably he cites no evidence that actually makes this point.

⁵³ Brown, R. E. *The Death of the Messiah*, vol. 1, 136–7, 605–7. New York, 1994.

⁵⁴ Nor do they notice 3 Bar. 6:16.

⁵⁵ Luke 12:38 is not an exception, *pace* Beckwith, R. T. *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian*, 2, n. 7. AGJU, 33. Leiden, 1996. People such as the servants in the parable got up at the end of the third watch and started work around the beginning of the fourth watch. During the fourth watch the servants would not be staying awake exceptionally to await their master’s return; they would be awake then in any case, even if they had gone to bed earlier in the night.

⁵⁶ Brady, “Alarm,” 44–6; Brown, *Death*, 606.

⁵⁷ Kosmala, “Time,” 119.

While the references to cock-crow in the Gospel passion narratives are not to the third watch of the night, there is some relevance for us in asking why the third watch was called cock-crow. Kosmala assumes it got this name because there were three regular cock-crows within it (as well as irregular cock-crows if the birds were disturbed).⁵⁸ But it was worth noting that the second watch was called “midnight” because it *ended* at midnight. If, as we shall argue below, there was one cock-crow, shortly before first light, which was considered *the* cock-crow, the one on which people actually relied for telling the time, it seems more likely that the third watch was also named by what occurred at its end: *the* cock-crow that heralded the dawn. Pliny (*N. H.* 10. 24. 47) speaks of this cock-crow as the beginning of the fourth watch.

Probably the most significant of the arguments about the actual time at which the cock-crow in the passion narratives would have occurred is that of Kosmala and consists of three major points: (1) He claims, on the basis of his own observation over twelve years, that in Jerusalem the cocks crow three times in the later part of the night, each time for three to five minutes. These crows occur with regularity at about 12.30, about 1.30 and about 2.30 a. m., and do not vary through the year, despite the fact that the time of the dawn does vary. (In addition to these three regular crows, Kosmala allows that cocks may also crow at other times if alerted by any disturbance.) (2) He takes two ancient references to a “second” cock-crow (Aristophanes, *Ecc.* 390–391; Juvenal, *Sat.* 9.107–108) to be to the second of the three regular crows he observed, i. e. at around 1.30 a. m. (3) Assuming this to be the most important of the three, he thinks it is one intended in most of the references to cock-crow in Greco-Roman literature, where only one cock-crow is mentioned.⁵⁹

However, with reference to (1), Kosmala’s observations are in apparent conflict with those of Père Lagrange, who often listened for the first cock-crow in Jerusalem during late March and early April. He observed that the time of the first cock-crow varied much, but that 2.30 a. m. was the earliest time he heard it and that it occurred most often between 3.00 and 5.00 a. m.⁶⁰ The conflict with Kosmala’s evidence diminishes if we suppose that in every case Lagrange heard the cock-crow that Kosmala reckoned as the third, and that Lagrange was simply not listening for cock-crows as early as 12.00 or 1.30. It would have been more helpful if both observers had noted

⁵⁸ Kosmala, “Time,” 118.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* (II), 135–6.

⁶⁰ Latter, “Note,” 53.

the times of first light and the times of sunrise, but it seems likely that Kosmala's third regular crowing and Lagrange's earliest crowing are the one that ancient writers speak of as occurring before first light and which was used as an important indication of the time during the hours of darkness, marking the time at which most people woke and got up in preparation for beginning work as soon as there was sufficient light. That the time of this cock-crow and the interval between it and first light varied quite a lot would not have mattered to people who had few other means of easily telling time at night and expected only very approximate times.⁶¹

With reference to points (2) and (3) in Kosmala, he can cite only one ancient reference to three cock-crows at night (b. Yoma 21a) and two to cock-crows (Aristophanes, *Ecol.* 30–31, 390–391; Juvenal, *Sat.* 9.107–108; he could have added Ammianus Marcellinus 22.14.4).⁶² Other Greco-Roman references, like those in Jewish literature (Horarium of Adam N10; 3 Macc 5:23; 3 Bar 6:16; m. Yoma 1:8; m. Sukk. 5:4; m. Tamid 1:2), refer to a single event of cock-crow at the time when most people woke and got up. This cock-crow served to wake them if they had not already woken. But the texts Kosmala himself cited make it implausible that this was the second of the regular three he observed, i. e. the one around 1.30 a. m. Even on a summer day, Kosmala's third cock-crow (c. 2.30 a. m.) would surely be early enough for people to rise in time to begin work in the daylight. We should probably conclude that for most people, most of the time, there was only one cock-crow that mattered, the one that occurred sometime before first light. It is therefore also likely that this was the one occasionally called, for the sake of greater accuracy, the second cock-crow.

Most people, of course, would not have been woken each night by each cock-crow, regular or not, and have counted them. Most people would sleep soundly through any cock-crow before the only one that mattered, the one that coincided with the time their body-clocks were accustomed to register as the time to wake. Like Lagrange, they would not normally be interested in earlier crowings. Poor sleepers might sometimes be wakened (and

⁶¹ Other observations of the times of cock-crow are reported in: Ramsay, "Denials," 280 (his own in Asia and London) and Brady, "Alarm," 48–9. Ramsay distinguishes between "isolated crowings, at long intervals, and at last a real chorus" just before first light. He considers only the latter to be fairly regular. These and other writers, including, in antiquity, Cicero (*De Div.* 2. 26, 54), point out that random cock-crows could be heard at any hour of the night.

⁶² The texts of these passages are quoted in: Brady, "Alarm," 51, n. 24; 55, n. 39.

misled, for only the passage of time would reveal the mistake) by earlier cock-crows, but more often by Kosmala's second than by his first. This kind of experience might lead to *the* cock-crow becoming known sometimes as the second cock-crow. But, more probably, this reckoning could derive from soldiers and guards who kept watch through the night, and were interested, not in a cock-crow near the beginning of the third watch (Kosmala's first), but in Kosmala's second cock-crow, since this would indicate that a considerable part of the third watch had passed.

There is one Jewish text which does seem to confirm Kosmala's observation of three regular cock-crows, the first occurring not long after midnight. This is the Perek Shirah, here summarized by Ginzberg:

Great among singers of praise are the birds, and greatest among them is the cock. When God at midnight goes to the pious in Paradise, all the trees break out into adoration, and their songs awaken the cock, who begins in turn to praise God. Seven times he crows, each time reciting a verse. The first verse is: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and he ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is the King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle" [Ps 24:7–8]. The second verse: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; yea, lift them up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord of hosts, He is the King of glory" [Ps 24:9–10]. The third: "Arise, ye righteous, and occupy yourselves with Torah, that your reward may be abundant in the world hereafter." The fourth: "I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord!" [Gen 49:18]. The fifth: "How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard? When wilt thou arise out of thy sleep?" [Prov 6:9]. The sixth: "Love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty; open thine eyes, and thou shalt be satisfied with bread" [Prov 20:13]. The seventh verse sung by the cock runs: "It is time to work for the Lord, for they have made void Thy law" [Ps 119:126].⁶³

The number seven is no doubt contrived, but it is notable that if we correlate the first three songs with Kosmala's three cock-crows, the first two do not relate to wakening or rising from bed. The third cock-crow is the first that constitutes a wake-up call, confirming that, of Kosmala's three, it must have been the third, not the second, that was generally regarded as the one cock-crow that actually mattered for most people most of the time. It may well be significant that the words of the cock's third crow are the only ones of the seven that do not consist of words of Scripture. These words, summoning the righteous to get up and to recite the Schema, may have been a tradi-

⁶³ Ginzberg, *Legends*, vol. 1, 44–5.

tional understanding of the one important cock-crow, to which has been added in this account appropriate scriptural quotations to make up the unusual series of seven. The fourth crow perhaps greets first light or sunrise, and the remaining three are addressed to sluggards who sleep late.

There remains the one text Kosmala himself cited as evidence that the Rabbis knew of the three regular cock-crows he observed: b. Yoma 21 b:

We have learnt in accord with R. Shila: If one starts out on a journey before *keri' atb ha-geber* [cock-crow⁶⁴], his blood comes upon his own head! R. Josiah says: [He should wait] until he has crowed twice, some say: Until he has crowed thrice. What kind of cock? The average type.

Kosmala's interpretation of this passage is possible, but produces an odd meaning. The general point must be that it is dangerous to travel in the hours of darkness. But it is no more dangerous before 12.30 than before 1.30 or before 2.30 a. m. Another possible interpretation is that R. Shila refers to *the* cock-crow, the one not long before first light. R. Josiah envisages that someone might be wakened and misled by an earlier cock-crow (regular or not), and so counsels waiting to see if the cock crows again before daybreak. Then *the* cock-crow will be the second one heard. The anonymous "some" think the would-be traveller should play even safer, in case the cock-crow that wakes him or her should turn out to be an even earlier one.

It seems that we can reasonably assume that *the* cock-crow, the one that mattered and the one usually referred to in ancient literature, marked the division between the third and fourth watches of the night, which was also the time at which most people woke and got up. Since the night was envisaged as lasting twelve hours, these being each a twelfth of the actual time from sunset to sunrise, whatever that was at the time of year, and since each watch was a three-hour segment of the night, the cock-crow would conventionally be thought to occur three hours after midnight and three hours before the beginning of the day proper. Measured as we would measure the time, in strict clock-time, the time of the cock-crow would no doubt vary quite a lot and the interval between it and sunrise would also vary according to the time of year, and so the third and fourth watches, divided by the cock-crow, would often be of rather unequal length. But this to think with a temporal precision quite foreign to the ancients who lacked, especially during the night, the means of being at all precise about time (a star-clock, the most accurate means of telling

⁶⁴ The Soncino translation leaves the phrase untranslated here because in the context there is debate as to whether *geber* means cock or man.

time during the night, would not be accessible to most people).⁶⁵ moreover, such temporal precision was quite unnecessary for them. A conventional time for cock-crow placed it in relation to other times quite sufficiently accurately for ordinary purposes. It is this conventional time that appears in the Horarium, which assigns cock-crow to the tenth hour of the night, three hours after midnight and three before the beginning of the day proper. What, so far as our evidence goes, is unusual is that the latter is marked not by sunrise but by the incense-offering, placed a conventional hour later. As we have noted, it may not have occurred in strictly measured time much after sunrise. But the Horarium here illustrates how vague even the point of transition from night to day might be.⁶⁶ After all, again for most people, cock-crow and daybreak, rather than sunrise, marked the beginning of their own day, the time during which they were awake and active.

Jesus' prediction in the Gospels cannot mean that Peter will deny him three times before any cock is heard to crow at any time during the night. It must mean that Peter's denials will occur before *the* cock-crow, before the end of the third watch of the night, before the time when those who slept would be up in the morning. Three of the evangelists follow the usual practice of calling this simply cock-crow, whereas Mark follows the apparently rare practice of calling it second cock-row. Perhaps, since Peter spends the third watch of the night with people who, like him, stayed awake all night, it seemed appropriate to Mark to refer to cock-crow as those on watch through the night might do. But, in any case, even Mark does not record

⁶⁵ In b. Pesah 11b–12b there is a discussion of the degree of error that could be expected in the reckoning the hour of a reported incident by a witness in court. Opinions differ from half an hour to almost three hours. But the subject is hours of the day, for which the height of the sun and the length of shadows provided a reliable guide, not hours of the night, which were more difficult to reckon.

⁶⁶ On the beginning of the day in antiquity, see: Unger, G. F. "Tages Anfang." *Philologus* 15 (1892): 14–45, 212–30; Beckwith, *Calendar*, 3–9; Ramsay, W. M. "The Sixth Hour." *Expositor* (5th Series) 3 (1896): 457–9; Finegan, J. *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*, 3–7. Princeton, 1964. Although the Roman civil day ran from midnight to midnight (Pliny, *N. H.* 2. 79. 188), Ramsay (following Unger) disputes that it was ever reckoned in hours: "Even when a Roman was describing a civil Day, or series of civil Days, he still counted his 'first hour' as beginning from sunrise; and he called midnight, which was the beginning of his twenty-four hours day, «the sixth hour of the night» (458). If this is right, it is the decisive argument against the claim (adopted by Finegan) that John, unlike other New Testament writers, reckons the hours of the day from midnight.

the occurrence of the first cock-crow⁶⁷ presupposed by his reference to the second. Even Mark is not counting cock-crows, but employing one way of referring to the one cock-crow that usually mattered.

The reference to the cock-crow in the four Gospels, while it cannot provide a precise time in terms of our modern understanding of temporal precision, does provide a precise time within the conventions of ancient time-keeping. It signals the transition from the third to the fourth watch of the night. Moreover, each evangelist follows it with an indication that events now take place from daybreak onwards, during the fourth watch which was known as “early” or “morning” (πρωῖ) and lasted for a conventional three hours until sunrise or the beginning of the day proper:

Mark 15:1: “And immediately, in the early morning (πρωῖ), the chief priests...”

Matthew 27:1: “And when the early hour had come (πρωΐας γενομένης), all the chief priests...”

Luke 22:66: “And when daylight came (ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα), the assembly of the elders of the people...”

John 18:28: “Then they led Jesus from Caiaphas to the praetorium. now it was early (ἦν δὲ πρωῖ).”

There is no difficulty in supposing that the evangelists represent the Jewish authorities as taking Jesus to Pilate a considerable time before sunset. It was at daybreak that the working day began, and Roman officials, like other people, began work as early as possible.⁶⁸ It is also not especially surprising to find that, according to Mark’s chronology, Simon of Cyrene is coming back into the city from working in the fields outside not long before the third hour of the day. He could easily have put in four hour’ work (Mark 15:21–25).

It is not infrequently been observed that Mark’s passion narrative seems to follow a schematic division of time dividing the whole day from sunset on Maundy Thursday to sunset on Good Friday into three-hour segments. The sequence begins with “evening” (Mark 14:17: ὀψίας γενομένης, suggesting the beginning of the first night-watch at sunset. The crucifixion itself takes place at the third hour of the day (15:25), the preternatural darkness falls at the sixth hour, i. e. noon (15:33), and Jesus dies at the

⁶⁷ I take it that the words καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν in Mark 14:68, omitted in some manuscripts, are not original but added by a scribe in the light of 14:72; cf. Brown, *Death*, 601, 605.

⁶⁸ Evidence in: Brown, *Death*, 629.

ninth hour (15:34). It is when the whole day's cycle is completed with the coming of evening (ὄψιας γενομένης) again, that Jesus' body is taken down and buried (15:24). Between the commencement of the Last Supper and the time of the crucifixion itself, Mark has only one (double) indication of a similar temporal moment, at 14:72–15:1, which indicate the transition from the third to the fourth watch of the night. Contrary to some representations of the Markan scheme,⁶⁹ Mark does not allocate three hours, the first three of the day, to the trial before Pilate. He overlooks the transition from night to day at sunrise completely. Nor does he indicate the transition between the first, second and third watches of the night. His indications of time thus divide the whole day: (1) from the beginning of the first to the end of the third watch of the night (9 "hours"); (2) from the end of the third/beginning of the fourth watch of the night to the third watch of the day (6 "hours"); (3) from the third to the sixth hour of the day (3 "hours"); (4) from the sixth to the ninth hour of the day (3 "hours"); (5) from the ninth hour of the day until sunset (3 "hours"). The lack of division within the first nine hours of this scheme is intelligible in that there were no readily observable signs of the transition from first to second and from second to third watch. Few would be aware of them. The omission of sunrise, one of the most easily observable time-markers, is less easily explicable, since it would have divided Mark's six hour period into precisely two three-hour blocks like the three which follow. However, Mark's narrative in fact has relatively little to fill these six hours. We have to suppose that sunrise occurred during the trial before Pilate, but there is no turning-point in Mark's narrative which it could appropriately mark. Mark's chronological scheme is therefore not imposed rigidly on his material, but adapted both to the realities of time-keeping and to the components of his narrative.

⁶⁹ E. g. Nolland, J. *Luke 18,35–24,53*, 1025. Dallas, 1993.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 364-DAY CALENDAR FOR THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON

By Roger T. Beckwith

All students of the Jewish calendar owe a great debt to the late Annie Jaubert. It was she who showed that the 364-day year, consisting of an exact number of weeks, is not only championed but exemplified by the Book of Jubilees, in such a way that in this book the days of the month always fall, from year to year, on the same day of the week (the year beginning on Wednesday), and that no journey takes place on any journey on any Sabbath-day.¹ Her theories about the antiquity and priestly origin of this calendar, and about its applicability to the question of the date of the Last Supper, have proved to be open to weighty objections,² but her basic thesis that the Book of Jubilees begins its year on Wednesday (understood as the day of the creation of the heavenly luminaries, in accordance with Genesis 1:14–19) stands fast. It has since been confirmed by independent evidence from Qumran, where the same calendar was observed.

It is in fact likely that the author of Jubilees would have judged many activities which his book records, besides journeys, unsuitable for the Sabbath-day. He is extremely restrictive about activity on the Sabbath (Jubilees 50:6–13) and holds that the Sabbath-rest is observed not only by men but by God and the higher angels (Jub. 1:17 f., 21). In the Book of Jubilees, events of various kinds take place on most days of the week, particularly

¹ See: Jaubert, A. "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumran. Ses origines bibliques." *VT* 3 (1953): 250–64; Eadem, *La date de la cène*. Paris, 1957: part 1, ch. 2.

² They are summarized, among other places, in my book: Beckwith, R. T. *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christians*, 102, 296 ff. Leiden, 1996.

Wednesdays and Sundays, but also Tuesdays, Fridays and Mondays, ranging from about 29 events on Wednesdays to about 8 on Mondays. Events on Thursdays are rare, but they do occur (see Jub. 2:11 f.; 3:1; 16:29; 32:30; 48:15). At first sight, it might seem that the same is true of Sabbaths, and that events on Sabbaths, though similarly rare, are also allowed for. On closer inspection, however, all such cases prove capable of being otherwise explained. “Till the sixteenth” (of the second month Jub. 5:23) may mean up to but not including the sixteenth; the naming of two infants on Sabbaths (Jub. 28:11, 21) reflects the unpredictability of births and the strict rule of circumcising, and therefore naming, infants on the eighth day after birth (cp. Jub. 15:12–14, 25 f.); Jacob’s sacrifice on the seventh day of the third month (Jub. 44:1) is probably the appointed Sabbath-day sacrifice (cp. Jub. 50:10 f.), carried back, in the manner of Jubilees, to the patriarchal age; and the continuance of the binding of Mastema or Satan until after the eighteenth day of the first month, i. e. the Sabbath, so that he may not accuse Israel (Jub. 48:15), is a case of enforced idleness rather than action. So further investigation only strengthens Annie Jaubert’s contention that, in Jubilees, there is one day of the week on which work does not take place, and that this day must be the Sabbath. She reconstructs the Jubilees calendar on that basis, and concludes that its year always begins on Wednesday. The plan of the year works out as follows:

Day of the Week	Months: I, IV, VII and X					Months: II, V, VIII and XI					Months: III, VI, IX and XII				
	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	20	27	4	11	18	25		
4th (Wed)	1	8	15	22	29		6	13	20	27		4	11	18	25
5th (Thurs)	2	9	16	23	30		7	14	21	28		5	12	19	26
6th (Fri)	3	10	17	24		1	8	15	22	29		6	13	20	27
7th (Sabbath)	4	11	18	25		2	9	16	23	30		7	14	21	28
1st (Sun)	5	12	19	26		3	10	17	24		1	8	15	22	29
2nd (Mon)	6	13	20	27		4	11	18	25		2	9	16	23	30
3rd (Tues)	7	14	21	28		5	12	19	26		3	10	17	24	31

Though the immediate source of the Jubilees calendar evidently the Astronomical Book of Enoch (1 Enoch 72–82, in its longer, Aramaic form), Mlle. Jaubert very reasonably infers that its ultimate origin is the Old Testament. However, the year of 364 days does not lie upon the surface of the Old Testament,³ like the lunar year of about 354 days or the rough solar year of 360 days, and it is against these popular counts that 1 Enoch and

³ See: Baumgarten, J. M. “The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees and the Bible.” In Idem, *Studies in Qumran Law*, 101–14. Leiden, 1977.

Jubilees have to argue in favour of their own more sophisticated reckoning (1 Enoch 75:1–2; 82:4–6; Jubilees 6:36–38). The way that they derive it from the Old Testament is in the same way that the Book of Jubilees applies it, that is, by making sure that the Scriptures, like Jubilees, avoid activity on the Sabbath day. A day of the week is assigned to all the dated events of the Old Testament, in accordance with the fixed year of 364 days or 52 complete weeks, and the question is then asked, which day of the week is it on which nothing happens? For, in the mind of the divine author of the Scriptures, that day must be the Sabbath.

At what period the 364-day calendar originated is a disputed matter. In the view of the present writer, it originated in the mid-third century B.C.,⁴ and now that the oldest manuscripts of the Astronomical Book are being dated to that century, few would want to place its origin any later. What would the Scriptures have consisted of that period? According to the older critical orthodoxy, they would have consisted of the first two sections of the Hebrew Bible, the Law and the Prophets, but not of the third, the Hagiographa, which remained outside the canon until the first century A.D.⁵ On this view, the Scriptures would have consisted of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Twelve Minor Prophets. However, the actual evidence indicates that the recognition of the Hagiographa as Scripture must have taken place earlier than this, and the first really substantial piece of evidence on the matter, dating from about 180 B.C., indicates an acceptance of four or five of the eleven Hagiographa as scripture. Ben Sira's catalogue of famous men in Ecclesiasticus 44–55 starts with the patriarchs and ends with Simon and Just, but before introducing the last named it sums up the earlier names in Ecclus. 49:14–16 by returning to the patriarchs and identifying the greatest of all the famous men. This separation between the earlier names and the last one strongly suggests that up to the point so far reached the names have been biblical names, whereas the one to follow will not be. The books that Ben Sira draws upon in chapters 44–49 were all later to have a place in the Hebrew Scriptures, so it is likely that they already did. And among these books are Psalms and Proverbs (Ecclus. 44:4 f. Heb. cp. 47:8, 14–17), Ezra-Nehemiah (Ecclus. 49:11–13), Chronicles (Ecclus.

⁴ Beckwith, *Calendar and Chronology*, 105–10.

⁵ So Ryle, H. E. *The Canon of the Old Testament*. London, 1909 (1892), and many others. For the evidence against this theory, see the writer's book: *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church, and its Background in Early Judaism*. London, 1985.

47:9 f.) and probably Job (Ecclus. 49:9 Heb.). The books most conspicuous by their absence from the list are Daniel and Esther, though Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and Lamentations are also apparently missing. This suggests that, though Daniel and Esther may well have existed at the time, there was no agreement as yet to include them among the Scriptures.

To turn from Ecclesiasticus to the 364-day calendar is to go back at least seventy years, to the mid-third century B.C., and to a quite different sort of evidence. We turn from book connected with famous men to books containing dates. Most of the books of the Hebrew Bible are connected with famous men, but only two thirds of the twenty-four books contain dates. Those that do not contain dates may or may not have been in the canon, but those that do contain dates provide actual evidence whether they were in the canon or not. This evidence, as it would have been interpreted by the framer of the 364-day calendar, is as follows. The interpretation, as here given, leaves open the question of whether he would have counted the Sabbath in week-long festivals as one of the festival-days or not (later adherents of this calendar would not have done so, but would have rested on the Sabbath and lengthened the festival by one day). Implicit dates are included here as well as explicit ones.

Genesis

7 : 11	The flood began on 17th day of second month	(Sunday)
7 : 13	On selfsame day Noah and his family entered the ark	(Sunday)
8 : 4	The ark rested on Ararat on 17th day of seventh month	(Friday)
8 : 5	On 1st day of tenth month the tops of the mountains were seen	(Wednesday)
8 : 13	On 1st day of first month the waters were dried up	(Wednesday)
8 : 14	On 27th day of second month the earth was dry	(Wednesday)

Exodus

12 : 3	On 10th day of first month a lamb to be taken	(Friday)
12 : 6	On 14th day of first month a lamb to be killed	(Tuesday)
12 : 15	On 15th day of first month leaven to be removed	(Wednesday)
12 : 16	On 15th and 21st day of first month a holy convocation to be held	(Wed. and Tues. or Wed.)
12 : 18	From evening of 14th to evening of 21st day of first month, no leavened bread to be eaten	(Tuesday and Tues. or Wed.)
13 : 6	On 21st day of first month a feast to be held	(Tuesday or Wednesday)

16 : 1	On 15th day of second month Israel reached wilderness of Sin	(Friday)
40 : 2	On 1st day of first month tabernacle to be erected	(Wednesday)
40 : 17	- ditto -	(Wednesday)

Leviticus

9 : 1 f.	On 8th day of consecration and of first month Aaron's offering to be made	(Wednesday or Thursday)
16 : 29 f.	On 10th day of seventh month the fast of Day of Atonement to be held	(Friday)
23 : 5	On 14th day of first month is the Passover	(Tuesday)
23 : 6 f.	On 15th day of first month is a holy convocation: Unleavened Bread	(Wednesday)
23 : 8	On 21st day of first month is a holy convocation: Unleavened Bread	(Tuesday or Wednesday)
23 : 11	On 26th day of first month is the Sheaf	(Sunday)
23 : 15 f.	On 15th day of third month is Pentecost	(Sunday)
23 : 24	On 1st day of seventh month is Trumpets	(Wednesday)
23 : 27	On 10th of seventh month the Day of Atonement	(Friday)
23 : 32	From evening of 9th day of seventh month the rest day of Atonement	(Thursday)
23 : 34 f.	On 15th day of seventh month is a holy convocation: Tabernacles	(Wednesday)
23 : 36	On 22nd day of seventh month is a holy convocation: Tabernacles	(Wednesday or Thursday)
23 : 39	On 15th and 22nd of seventh month is a rest day: Tabernacles	(Wednesday and Thursday)
23 : 40	On 15th day of seventh month booths are made: Tabernacles	(Wednesday)
25 : 9	On 10th day of seventh month a trumpet to be sound: Day of Atonement	(Friday)

Numbers

1 : 1	On 1st day of second month the Lord speaks to Moses	(Friday)
1 : 18	On 1st day of second month the congregation was assembled	(Friday)
9 : 2 f	On 14th day of first month is Passover	(Tuesday)

9 : 5	On 14th day of first month Passover was kept	(Tuesday)
9 : 11	On 14th day of second month is Second Passover	(Thursday)
10 : 10	On new moons a trumpet to be sounded	(Wednesday, Friday and Sunday)
10 : 11	On 20th day of second month the cloud taken up	(Wednesday)
28 : 11	On new moons sacrifice to be offered	(Wednesday, Friday and Sunday)
28 : 16	On 14th day of first month is Passover	(Tuesday)
28 : 17 f.	On 15th day of first month is a holy convocation: Unleavened Bread	(Wednesday)
28 : 25	On 21th day of first month is a holy convocation: Unleavened Bread	(Tuesday or Wednesday)
29 : 1	On 1st day of seventh month is Trumpets	(Wednesday)
29 : 7	On 10th day of seventh month a holy convocation: Day of Atonement	(Friday)
29 : 12	On 15th day of seventh month is a holy convocation: Tabernacles	(Wednesday)
29 : 35	On 22nd day of seventh month is a holy convocation: Tabernacles	(Wednesday or Thursday)
33 : 3	On 15th day of first month Israel left Rameses	(Wednesday)
33 : 38	On 1st day of fifth month Aaron died	(Friday)

Deuteronomy

1 : 3	On 1st day of eleventh month Moses spoke to Israel	(Friday)
-------	--	----------

Joshua

4 : 19	On 10th day of first month Israel crossed the Jordan	(Friday)
5 : 10	On 14th day of first month Israel kept the Passover	(Tuesday)

Judges

No dates

Samuel

1 Sam. 12 : 17	Today is wheat-harvest, i. e. Pentecost, 15th day of third month	(Sunday)
1 Sam. 20 : 5	Tomorrow is new moon	(Wed., Fri. or Sun.)

1 Sam. 20 : 18	- ditto -	(Wed., Fri. or Sun.)
1 Sam. 20 : 24	The new moon meal	(Wed., Fri. or Sun.)
1 Sam. 20 : 27	The morrow after the new moon	(Thurs., Sabbath or Mon.)
1 Sam. 20 : 34	- ditto -	(Thurs., Sabbath or Mon.)

Kings

1 Kings 8 : 66	(cf. 2 Chron. 7 : 10) The people return home on 23rd day of seventh month	(Thursday or Friday)
1 Kings 12 : 32	On 15th day of eighth month was Jeroboam's feast	(Friday)
1 Kings 12 : 33	- ditto -	(Friday)
2 Kings 4 : 23	New moon	(Wed., Friday or Sunday)
2 Kings 25 : 1	Nebuchadnezzar's army comes on 10th day of tenth month	(Friday)
2 Kings 25 : 3	Famine begins on 9th day of fourth month	(Thursday)
2 Kings 25 : 8 f.	On 7th day of fifth month Nebuzaradan comes to burn Jerusalem	(Thursday)
2 Kings 25 : 27	On 27th day of twelfth month Jehoiachin released from prison	(Friday)

Jeremiah

39 : 2	On 9th day of fourth month a breach made in Jerusalem	(Thursday)
52 : 4	On 10th day of tenth month Nebuchadnezzar's army arrives	(Friday)
52 : 6	On 9th day of fourth month famine begins	(Thursday)
52 : 12 f.	On 10th day of fifth month Nebuzaradan comes and burns Jerusalem	(Sunday)
52 : 31	On 25th day of twelfth month Jehoiachin released from prison	(Wednesday)

Ezekiel

1 : 1-3	On 5th day of fourth month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Sunday)
8 : 1	On 5th day of sixth month the hand of the Lord fell upon Ezekiel	(Thursday)
20 : 1	On the 10th day of fifth month elders came to enquire of the Lord	(Sunday)
24 : 1 f.	On 10th day of tenth month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Friday)

26 : 1	New moon	(Wed., Fri. or Sun.)
29 : 1	On 12th day of tenth month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Sunday)
29 : 17	On 1st day of first month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Wednesday)
30 : 20	On 7th day of first month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Tuesday)
31 : 1	On 1st day of third month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Sunday)
32 : 1	On 1st day of twelfth month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Sunday)
32 : 17	On 15th day of twelfth month the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel	(Sunday)
33 : 21	On 5th day of tenth month news came of fall of Jerusalem	(Sunday)
40 : 1	On 10th day of first month the hand of the Lord was upon Ezekiel	(Friday)
45 : 17	New moon	(Wed., Fri. or Sun.)
45 : 18	On 1st day of first month sanctuary to be cleansed	(Wednesday)
45 : 20	On 7th day of first month atonement to be made	(Tuesday)
45 : 21	On 14th day of first month is Passover	(Tuesday)
45 : 25	On 15th day of seventh month is Tabernacles	(Wednesday)
46 : 1	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
46 : 3	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
46 : 6	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
Isaiah		
1 : 13	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
1 : 14	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
The Twelve		
Hos. 2 : 11	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
Amos 8 : 5	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)

Hag.	1 : 1	On 1st day of sixth month came the word of the Lord by Haggai	(Sunday)
	1 : 14 f.	On 24th day of sixth month work began on the house of the Lord	(Tuesday)
	2 : 1	On 21st day of seventh month came the word of the Lord by Haggai	(Tuesday)
	2 : 10	On 24th day of ninth month came the word of the Lord by Haggai	(Tuesday)
	2 : 18	On 24th day of ninth month came the word of the Lord by Haggai	(Tuesday)
	2 : 20	On 24th day of ninth month came the word of the Lord by Haggai	(Tuesday)
Zec.	1 : 7	On 24th day of eleventh month came the word of the Lord by Zechariah	(Sunday)
	7 : 1	On 4th day of ninth month came the word of the Lord by Zechariah	(Wednesday)

Ruth

1 : 22	Naomi arrived home at the beginning of barley harvest, i. e. 26th day of first month	(Sunday)
--------	--	----------

Psalms

81 : 3	The trumpet to be blown at the new moon	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
--------	---	-----------------------

Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations

No dates

Daniel

10 : 4 f.	On 24th day of first month Daniel saw a vision	(Friday)
-----------	--	----------

Esther

3 : 12	On 13th day of first month Haman's letter sent	(Monday)
3 : 13	On 13th day of twelfth month the Jews to be slain	(Friday)
8 : 9	On 23rd day of third month Mordecai's letter sent	(Monday)
8 : 11 f.	On 13th day of twelfth month the Jews to defend themselves	(Friday)
9 : 1 f.	On 13th day of twelfth month the Jews punished their enemies	(Friday)
9 : 15	On 14th day of twelfth month the Jews in Shushan slew their enemies	(Sabbath)
9 : 16 f.	On 13th day of twelfth month the Jews in the provinces slew their enemies	(Friday)

9 : 17	On 14th day of twelfth month the Jews in the provinces rested	(Sabbath)
9 : 18	On 13th and 14th day of twelfth month the Jews in Shusha slew their enemies and on 15th day they rested	(Friday and Sabbath) (Sunday)
9 : 19	On 14th day of twelfth month the Jews in the villages hold a feast	(Sabbath)
9 : 21	On 14th and 15th day of twelfth month the Jews to hold a feast	(Sabbath and Sunday)

Ezra-Nehemiah

Ezra	3 : 5	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
	3 : 6	On 1st day of seventh month sacrifice recommences	(Wednesday)
	6 : 15	The temple finished on 3rd day of twelfth month	(Tuesday)
	6 : 19	On 14th day of first month Passover was kept	(Tuesday)
	7 : 9	On 1st day of first month Ezra left Babylon and on 1st day of fifth month he reached Jerusalem	(Friday)
	8 : 31	On 12th day of first month the Jews leave river of Ahava	(Sunday)
	10 : 9	On 20th day of ninth month the Jews assemble	(Friday)
	10 : 16	On 1st day of tenth month mixed marriages start being investigated	(Wednesday)
	10 : 17	On 1st day of first month investigation completed	(Wednesday)
Neh.	6 : 15	On 25th day of sixth month the wall finished	(Wednesday)
	8 : 2	On 1st day of seventh month Ezra brings the Law-book	(Wednesday)
	8 : 13	On 2nd day of seventh month Ezra continues the reading	(Thursday)
	8 : 18	A solemn assembly held on 22nd day of seventh month	(Wednesday or Thursday)
	9 : 1	On 24th day of seventh month a fast held	(Friday)
	10 : 33	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)

Chronicles

1 Chron.	23 : 31	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
----------	---------	-----------	-----------------------

2 Chron. 2 : 4	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
(?) 3 : 2	On 2nd day of second month Temple commenced	(Sabbath) ⁶
7 : 10	On 23rd day of seventh month people sent home	(Thurs. or Fri.)
8 : 13	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
	Unleavened Bread: 15th and 21st day of first month	(Wed. and Tues. or Wed.)
	Pentecost: 15th day of third month	(Sunday)
	Tabernacles: 15th and 22nd day of seventh month	(Wed. and Wed. or Thurs.)
29 : 17	On 1st day of first month sanctification begins	(Wednesday)
	On 8th day of first month they reach the porch	(Wednesday)
	On 16th day of first month they finished	(Thursday)
30 : 15	On 14th day of second month, Second Passover held	(Thursday)
31 : 3	New moons	(Wed., Fri. and Sun.)
35 : 1	On 14th day of first month, Passover held	(Tuesday)

When one sums up the evidence, one finds that the Book of Esther is a special case. In the other books, events occur as follows:

34 on Sundays	(+ 5 possibles)
0 on Mondays	(+ 2 possibles)
18 on Tuesdays	(+ 6 possibles)
48 on Wednesdays	(+ 18 possibles)
10 on Thursdays	(+ 8 possibles)
39 on Fridays	(+ 7 possibles)
0 on Sabbaths	(+ 3 possibles)

In the Book of Esther, however, events occur as follows:

⁶ The date here occurs in only some Hebrew manuscripts and is not supported by Greek or Syriac.

2 on Sundays
 2 on Mondays
 0 on Tuesdays, Wednesdays or Thursdays
 5 on Fridays
 5 on Sabbaths

So, whereas in other books no events occur on Mondays and (what is more important) none on Sabbaths, in the book of Esther two occur on Mondays and five on Sabbaths. It follows that the Book of Esther cannot have been among the Scriptures on which the framer of the 364-day calendar based it,⁷ though any of the other books in the Hebrew Bible may have been. This was doubtless one of the principal reasons why the men of Qumran later had problems with Esther: it conflicted with their calendar. To other Jews, using one of the popular calendars, this was not an issue, however.

Of the remaining books (those comfortable to the 364-day calendar), the ones which have several explicit dates in them are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, while those with just one explicit date are Deuteronomy and Daniel. The former group, therefore, were almost certainly canonical, and possibly the latter group; while of the books which do not contain dates, or explicit dates, one should probably add to these Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Psalms, Job and Proverbs (as in Ecclesiasticus), though one cannot be certain.

POSTSCRIPT

It was perhaps a surprise to the framer of the 364-day calendar to find that his year, consisting as it did of complete weeks, could not begin on the first day of the week, Sunday. The simplest arrangement would have for the first day of creation-week to be also the first day of the first year of world history. In that case, however, the seventh day of the first month, and the corresponding day in every week thereafter throughout the year, would have been a Sabbath, and these Sabbaths would have clashed with several of the

⁷ By parity of reasoning, the deuterocanonical books were not among the scriptures on which 364-day calendar was based. The only one of them which was probably in existence as early as the mid-third century B. C. is Tobit; and in Tobit 2:12 (according to the older text, reproduced in Codex Sinaiticus) Anna is doing her daily work on the seventh day of the twelfth month, which according to the 364-day calendar is a Sabbath.

biblical dates listed above as dates on which events occur. It was probably also a surprise to him to find that there are two weekdays, and not just one, on which non of the biblical dates fall, and so no events occur. Which of these two vacant days was the Sabbath? The Sabbath could be on the fourth day of the first month, or it could be on the sixth day; in the former case the year would begin on Wednesday, in the latter case on Monday. The way that he resolved this problem was probably from the symbolism of creation-week. If the year began on Wednesday, this was not indeed the first day of creation, the day of the creation of light, but it was the day of the creation of the heavenly luminaries (Gen. 1:14–19), which might be thought an almost equally suitable day for year to begin. If, on the other hand, the year began on Monday, this was merely the day of the creation of the firmament between the upper and lower waters (Gen. 1:6–8). So, in the interests of appropriate symbolism, the year had to begin on Wednesday, and in that case the Sabbath would be on the fourth day of the first month, and on the corresponding day each week throughout the 52 weeks of the year.

UN SEUL OU DEUX JEUNES HOMMES RICHES ?

Par Gilles Dorival

Pour rendre hommage à Annie Jaubert, dont les travaux ont porté sur le judaïsme du Second Temple, les écrits intertestamentaires, le Nouveau Testament, les Pères de l'Église des premiers siècles, comme Clément de Rome ou Origène, il a paru approprié de traiter un sujet touchant à plusieurs de ces domaines. L'épisode du jeune homme riche que rapportent Matthieu 19 : 16–30, Marc 10 : 17–31 et Luc 18 : 18–30, va nous permettre d'aborder, outre un épisode particulièrement célèbre du Nouveau Testament, le domaine du judéo-christianisme, et singulièrement l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*, ainsi que le champ de la patristique, en l'occurrence Origène.

C'est Origène qui fournira notre point de départ. L'épisode du jeune homme riche est expliqué dans le *Commentaire sur Matthieu XV 10–20*.¹ C'est vers 249 qu'Origène a composé les 25 tomes de ce Commentaire, dont il nous reste, en grec, les tomes X–XVII sur Matthieu 13 : 36–22, 33. En outre une traduction latine ancienne, de la deuxième moitié du Ve siècle ou du VI^e siècle, démarre au tome XII 9 et s'achève à la fin des derniers chapitres du tome XXV ; elle offre le commentaire de Matthieu 16 : 13–27, 63. On a pris l'habitude d'appeler *Vetus interpretatio* la partie de la traduction dont nous possédons le grec et *Series* (abrégé de *Series veteris interpretationis commentariorum Origenis in Matthaeum*) celle des tomes qui ne sont connus qu'en latin.²

¹ Edition dans Klostermann, E., et E. Benz, édés. *Origenes Werke X. Origenes Matthäuserklärung, I. Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*. GCS, 40. Berlin, 1935–37. Le volume donne à la fois le texte grec et la *Vetus interpretatio*.

² Voir Girod, R. «La traduction latine anonyme du Commentaire sur Matthieu». Dans Crouzel, H., Lomiento, G., et J. Rius-Camps, édés. *Origeniana*.

Le contexte immédiat du passage qui nous intéresse est le suivant. Le jeune homme riche vient de demander à Jésus quels commandements il doit observer pour entrer dans la vie éternelle. Et Jésus de répondre : « Tu ne commettras pas l'adultère, tu ne tueras pas, tu ne voleras pas, tu ne porteras pas de faux témoignage, honore ton père et ta mère. Et tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ». Origène commente en disant qu'il y a une progression dans les commandements, le plus difficile à observer étant cité en dernier. Il cite l'apôtre Paul qui, en Romains 13, 9, affirme que le « tu ne tueras pas, tu ne commettras pas l'adultère, tu ne voleras pas et tout autre commandement sont récapitulés dans cette parole : tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ». Origène en conclut que, si celui qui observe tous les commandements est parfait, celui qui observe le commandement d'amour du prochain est parfait.

Voici la traduction du texte grec, dans laquelle j'ai introduit des numéros de paragraphes, pour la clarté de la comparaison entre le grec et le latin. On remarque que le paragraphe 3 manque dans le grec :³

1. Mais, si celui-là est parfait, on peut se demander comment il se fait que, alors que le jeune homme a dit : « tout cela, je l'ai observé depuis ma jeunesse ; que me manque-t-il encore ? » (Matthieu 19, 20), le Sauveur a répondu comme si celui qui avait fait tout cela n'était pas parfait, tout en donnant son assentiment à l'affirmation « tout cela, je l'ai fait »,⁴ par les mots : « si tu veux être parfait, va, vends tes biens et donne aux pauvres, et tu auras un trésor dans le ciel, et viens, suis-moi » (Matthieu

Premier colloque international des études origéniennes (septembre 1973), 125–38. Bari, 1975. Meslin, M. *Les Ariens d'Occident*. Paris, 1967, a proposé d'attribuer la *Vetus interpretatio*, mais non les *Series*, à un arien. Cette hypothèse a été réfutée par P. Nautin dans le compte rendu qu'il fait de l'ouvrage dans la *RHR* (1970) : 74 sq, et par R. Girod lui-même.

³ Il s'agit d'un texte difficile. J'ai consulté la traduction allemande de Vogt, H. J., Hg. *Origenes. Der Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus*, II. Stuttgart, 1990, et la traduction italienne de R. Scognamiglio, dans Danieli, M.-I., et R. Scognamiglio, eds. *Origene. Commento al vangelo di Matteo/2 (Libri XIII–XV)*. Rome, 1999.

⁴ La correction de μή en μήπω n'est pas nécessaire pour le sens et je ne l'adopte pas, même si μήπω a un support dans la *vetus interpretatio*: *nondum*. Si l'on considère que la négation porte à la fois sur le génitif absolu et sur le participe nominatif apposé au verbe principal, on traduira : « le Sauveur a répondu comme si celui qui avait fait tout cela n'était pas parfait et comme s'il ne donnait pas son assentiment à la phrase etc. » Toutefois, comme, un peu plus bas, Origène affirme que, selon Marc 10 : 21, Jésus a donné son assentiment, la traduction proposée paraît préférable.

19, 21). Fais donc attention si nous pouvons répondre à la présente recherche d'une seule façon, ainsi : peut-être, à propos de la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », peut-on supposer qu'elle n'a pas été transmise en cet endroit par le Sauveur, mais qu'elle a été ajoutée par quelqu'un qui ne comprenait pas l'acribie de ce qui était dit. Or ce qui parlera en faveur de la supposition de l'ajout, en cet endroit, de la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », c'est l'exposition des faits semblables de la part de Marc et de Luc : aucun des deux n'a ajouté aux commandements transmis en ce lieu par Jésus la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ». Et celui qui veut conforter l'idée que le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » a été inséré hors de propos dira sûrement que, s'il est vrai que les mêmes paroles ont été transcrites avec des mots différents chez les trois, Jésus n'aurait pas dit « une seule chose te manque » (Marc 10 : 21) ou « une seule chose te fait encore défaut » (Luc 18 : 22) à celui qui a proclamé qu'il a accompli le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ». Surtout si, selon l'Apôtre, la parole « tu ne tueras pas et la <suite et>⁵ tout autre commandement sont récapitulés dans cette parole : tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » (Romains 13 : 9). Mais, étant donné que, selon Marc, « ayant regardé » vers ce riche qui avait dit : « tout cela, je l'ai observé depuis ma jeunesse », « il l'aima » (Marc 10 : 21), il est clair qu'il a donné son assentiment au fait d'avoir fait ce qu'il avait proclamé avoir accompli.⁶ En effet, il le scruta de sa pensée et il vit un homme qui proclamait en toute bonne conscience avoir accompli les présents commandements. Mais, si la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » avait été dite en plus des autres commandements, Marc et Luc n'auraient pas omis ce commandement capital et suprême, sauf à dire que ce qui a été écrit est semblable, mais n'a pas été dit sur le même. Mais comment Jésus aurait-il pu s'adresser à celui qui a accompli, en plus du reste, le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » comme s'il était un homme pas encore parfait et comment aurait-il pu lui dire « si tu veux être parfait, vas, vends tes biens et donne aux pauvres etc. » ?

⁵ La correction de *καὶ τὰ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐν καὶ τὰ ἕξῃς καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα* est nécessaire pour la syntaxe et est fondée sur la *vetus interpretatio*.

⁶ Il n'est pas nécessaire de retenir la correction d'E. Klostermann qui, se fondant sans doute sur l'expression *τῷ ἐπαγγειλαμένῳ πεπληρωκέναι*, qui figure quelques lignes plus haut (et qui est reprise, à l'accusatif, quelques lignes plus bas), propose: *τῷ < ἐπαγγειλαμένῳ > πεποιηκέναι ἃ ἐπηγγείλετο πεπληρωκέναι*. En fait, ici, Jésus donne son assentiment, non aux mots prononcés par le jeune homme riche : « tout cela, je l'ai observé », mais à son acte même d'observance.

2. Et si, dans beaucoup d'autres cas, il n'y avait pas de désaccord entre les exemplaires entre eux, en sorte tout ce qui est selon Matthieu ne s'accorde pas avec les autres, et de la même façon pour les autres évangiles, celui qui suppose que le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » a été inséré en cet endroit sans avoir été dit par le Sauveur pourrait passer pour être impie. Mais en réalité il est évident que nombreuses se trouvent être les différences entre les exemplaires, soit du fait de la négligence de certains copistes, soit du fait de l'audace mauvaise de certains, « soit du fait de ceux qui n'ont pas soin »⁷ de la correction de ce qui est écrit, soit encore du fait de ceux qui, dans la correction, ajoutent ou suppriment ce qui leur semble bon. Or donc, le désaccord entre les exemplaires de l'Ancien Testament, avec l'aide de Dieu, nous avons trouvé le moyen de lui porter remède : nous utilisons comme critère les autres éditions. En effet, les passages contestés chez les Septante à cause du désaccord entre les exemplaires, nous en faisons la critique grâce aux autres éditions : nous avons gardé ce qui est d'accord avec celles-là et nous avons obélisés certains passages qui ne se trouvaient pas dans l'hébreu, sans avoir l'audace de les supprimer complètement, tandis que nous avons ajouté d'autres passages en les pourvoyant d'astérisques, afin qu'il soit évident qu'ils ne sont pas présents chez les Septante et que nous les avons ajoutés d'après les autres versions en accord avec l'Hébreu. Notre but est que celui qui le veut les introduise, mais que celui qu'une telle chose heurte fasse ce qu'il veut en ce qui concerne leur acceptation ou non.

4. Ainsi donc celui qui veut que n'ait pas été inséré en cet endroit le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », mais que, vraiment, il ait été alors dit par le Seigneur après les premiers commandements, celui-là dira que notre Seigneur, qui voulait reprendre légèrement et sans haine ce riche-là dans la mesure où il n'était pas dans le vrai quand il avait dit avoir observé le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », lui a dit la parole « si tu veux être parfait, vas, vends tes biens et donne aux pauvres » ; car, de la sorte, il sera évident que tu es dans le vrai en ce qui concerne le fait d'avoir observé le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ».

Voici la traduction du latin, avec les mêmes numéros de paragraphes qu'en grec :

1. Mais, si celui-là est parfait qui aime son prochain comme lui-même, cherche comment il se fait qu'au jeune homme qui a dit : « tout cela, je

⁷ La correction d'E. Klostermann, nécessaire pour le sens, consiste en une rétroversion de la *vetus interpretatio*.

l'ai observé depuis ma jeunesse ; que me manque-t-il donc ? » (Matthieu 19 : 20) le Seigneur a répondu comme si celui qui avait fait tout cela n'était pas encore parfait et, comme s'il approuvait celui qui avait dit : « tout cela, je l'ai fait », il a répondu : « si tu veux être parfait, vas et vends tout ce que tu possèdes et donne aux pauvres et tu auras un trésor dans les cieux et viens, suis-moi » (Matthieu 19 : 21). Vois donc si nous pouvons répondre à la question proposée d'une seule façon, ainsi : peut-être, à propos de ce qu'il a dit « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », peut-on supposer que cela n'a pas été placé par le Seigneur en ce lieu, mais a été ajouté par je ne sais qui, qui ne comprenait pas la subtilité de ces dits. Or, que cela ait été ajouté, le recommande le fait que Marc et Luc, qui exposent le même passage, n'ajoutent ni l'un ni l'autre la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ». D'autre part, celui qui veut défendre l'idée que cela a été ajouté dira : s'il est vrai que les mêmes paroles ont été exposées avec des mots différents par les trois, le Seigneur n'aurait jamais dit : « une seule chose te manque » (Marc 10 : 21) ou « une seule chose te fait défaut » (Luc 18 : 22), à celui qui a proclamé qu'il a accompli le commandement qui dit : « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même ». Surtout si, selon l'Apôtre, ce qui est dit : « 'tu ne tueras pas', etc. et tout autre commandement est récapitulé dans cette parole : tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » (Romains 13 : 9). De fait, selon Marc, il dit ainsi : « le regardant, lui » qui avait dit : « tout cela, je l'ai observé depuis ma jeunesse », « il l'aima » (Marc 10 : 21), c'est-à-dire il l'embrassa. En effet, il est clair qu'il a approuvé la proclamation de celui qui avait dit qu'il avait accompli tout cela. Car, le scrutant mentalement, il vit un homme qui proclamait en toute bonne conscience qu'il avait accompli les commandements proposés. Jamais en effet, s'il avait dit avoir accompli aussi la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » en plus des autres commandements, Marc et Luc n'auraient omis ce commandement capital et suprême, sauf à dire que les écrits sont semblables, mais qu'ils n'ont pas été dits du même. Mais comment Jésus aurait-il pu répondre à celui qui a accompli, en plus du reste, le commandement « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » comme s'il n'était pas encore parfait et lui dire : « si tu veux être parfait, va, vends tout ce que tu possèdes et donne aux pauvres » ?

2. En effet, nous avons trouvé de nombreuses différences entre les exemplaires, soit du fait de la négligence des copistes, soit du fait de l'audace de certains, soit à cause de ceux qui négligent de corriger les Ecritures, soit à cause de ceux qui, dans leurs corrections, ajoutent ou suppriment ce qui leur semble bon. Et dans les exemplaires de l'Ancien Testament, nous avons pu, avec l'aide de Dieu, ajuster ensemble tous les passages en désaccord : nous utilisons le jugement des autres éditions.

En effet ce qui semblait être douteux chez les Septante à cause du désaccord entre les exemplaires, en faisant jugement d'après les autres éditions nous l'avons conservé quand il y avait accord. Et certains passages nous les avons notés comme n'étant pas présents dans l'Hébreu, sans oser les enlever complètement ; à d'autres, nous avons fait un ajout au moyen d'astérisques, afin qu'il soit évident que ce qui n'est pas présent chez les Septante, nous l'avons ajouté d'après les autres éditions en accord avec l'Hébreu.

3. Mais, dans les exemplaires du Nouveau Testament, je n'ai pas pensé pouvoir faire cette même chose sans danger. Seulement, j'ai pensé qu'il n'était pas contraire à la raison de devoir exposer les suppositions, ainsi que les raisons et les causes des suppositions, ainsi dans ce passage où il est dit « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », puisqu'il n'est pas présent chez Marc et Luc. Que ceux qui le peuvent jugent si est vrai ou faux ce dont nous traitons. Cependant, agissons comme si la parole « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » était présente, et traitons de ce passage d'une autre façon. Il est écrit dans un évangile qui est dit selon les Hébreux (si cependant on convient de le recevoir non à titre d'autorité, mais à titre d'éclaircissement de la question proposée) :

« Un autre parmi les riches, est-il dit, lui dit : “Maître, quel bien dois-je faire pour vivre ?” Il lui dit : “Homme, fais la Loi et les Prophètes”. Il lui répondit : “Je l'ai fait”. Il lui dit : “Va, vends tout ce que tu possèdes et partage-le parmi les pauvres, et viens, suis-moi”. Or le riche commença à se gratter la tête et cela ne lui plut pas. Et le Seigneur lui dit : “Pourquoi dis-tu : J'ai fait la Loi et les Prophètes ? En effet il est écrit dans la Loi : Tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même, et voici que sont nombreux tes frères fils d'Abraham qui sont vêtus d'excréments, mourant de faim, et ta maison est pleine de nombreux biens, et rien du tout ne sort d'elle vers eux”. Et se tournant vers Simon son disciple assis près de lui, il lui dit : “Simon, fils de Jonas, il est plus facile à un chameau d'entrer par le chas d'une aiguille qu'à un riche dans le royaume des cieux” ».

Donc il est vrai que le riche n'a pas accompli le commandement : « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », lui qui a méprisé beaucoup de pauvres et ne leur a distribué aucune de ses si grandes richesses. En effet, il est impossible de remplir le commandement qui dit : « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », et d'être riche et surtout d'avoir de si grandes possessions.

4. Donc celui qui n'estime pas que doit être rejetée comme fausse cette parole : « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », mais qu'elle

doit être reçue comme un vrai dit du Seigneur, celui-là dira que⁸ notre Seigneur, qui voulait reprendre ce riche, non tant en le reprenant ouvertement, mais légèrement et sans la moindre haine, dans la mesure où il ne disait pas des choses vraies en affirmant qu'il avait accompli aussi ce commandement : « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même », lui a dit la parole : « si tu veux être parfait, va, vends tout ce que tu possèdes et donne aux pauvres » ; car, de la sorte, il sera évident que tu dis le vrai, puisque tu as chéri et aimé ton prochain comme toi-même.

Au paragraphe 1, la traduction latine est assez proche du grec, malgré quelques différences : la première phrase n'est pas absolument identique ; le passage où Marc et Luc sont introduits est plus développé en grec qu'en latin ; inversement, à propos de Marc 10 : 21 (« il l'aima »), le latin ajoute : « c'est-à-dire il l'embrassa ». Le début du paragraphe 2 (« Et si, dans beaucoup d'autres cas (...) pour être un impie ») et la fin du même paragraphe (« Notre but est que (...) leur acceptation au non ») manquent en latin ; toutefois la fin du paragraphe 2 a un parallèle dans une phrase latine située au début du paragraphe 3 : « Que ceux qui le peuvent jugent si est vrai ou faux ce dont nous traitons ». Le paragraphe 3 est entièrement propre au latin (sauf la phrase dont il vient d'être question). Le paragraphe 4 est très proche en grec et en latin.

C'est le paragraphe 3 qui importe pour mon sujet, puisqu'il contient une citation de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* où il est question d'un autre jeune homme riche. Le plus souvent, l'authenticité origénienne de ce passage a été suspectée et on a proposé d'y voir une interpolation du traducteur latin. On parle d'un Pseudo-Origène.⁹ C'est A. F. J. Klijn qui a proposé l'argumen-

⁸ Au lieu de *dicet, non satis arguitione aperta, sed quoniam strictim et non satis odibiliter etc.*, je propose de lire: *dicet quoniam, non satis arguitione aperta, sed strictim et non satis odibiliter etc.* ou bien: *dicet quoniam non satis arguitione aperta, sed quoniam strictim et non satis odibiliter etc.*

⁹ Voir Schneemelcher, W. *New Testament Apocrypha I. Gospels and Related Writings*. Traduction anglaise de R. McL. Wilson, 137. Cambridge, 1991 ; Bertrand, D. A., dans *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, 442. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris, 1997. Toutefois Vogt, H. J. "Das Verhältnis der alten lateinischen Übersetzung (L) zum griechisch erhaltenen Text des Matthäus-Kommentars (Gr)". Dans Hanson, R., et H. Crouzel, eds. *Origeniana Tertia*, 91–108. Rome, 1985 (= Idem., *Origenes als Exeget*, 121–34. Paderborn/Munich/Vienne/Zurich, 1999, en particulier 131), semble plutôt partisan de l'authenticité du passage et suggère l'existence de deux éditions du *Commentaire sur Matthieu* ou de différents types d'intervention sur le texte grec original.

tation la plus détaillée contre la paternité origénienne du paragraphe.¹⁰ Voici l'analyse qu'il donne : Origène est d'avis que le commandement de l'amour du prochain en Matthieu 19 : 19, est une addition introduite par un copiste. Il rapproche alors le cas de Matthieu des additions et des omissions de la Bible des Septante par rapport à l'Hébreu. Faisant allusion à la cinquième colonne des *Hexaples*, celle qui contenait la Septante, ou encore à une édition de la Septante, il signale qu'il a mis des obèles devant les additions qu'il emprunte aux autres éditions conformes à l'Hébreu (il s'agit des versions d'Aquila, de Symmaque et de Théodotion) et qu'il a pourvu d'astérisques les passages propres à la Septante et absents dans les versions faites sur l'Hébreu. De la sorte, le lecteur peut accepter ou refuser les versets pourvus de ces signes. A. F. J. Klijn note que cette dernière précision est absente de la traduction latine, qui propose à la place : « Mais, dans les exemplaires du Nouveau Testament, je n'ai pas pensé pouvoir faire la même chose sans danger ». Il estime qu'ainsi la traduction fait dire à Origène le contraire de sa pensée véritable, qui est de faire appel à la liberté du lecteur. C'est à ce moment-là qu'est cité l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*, dont la citation doit donc être attribuée au traducteur latin.

Que penser de ce procès en inauthenticité ? D'abord la pensée d'Origène sur la présence, ou non, du commandement d'amour du prochain dans Matthieu est beaucoup plus nuancée que ne le dit A. F. J. Klijn. Au paragraphe 1, il est vrai qu'il argumente en faveur de l'ajout du commandement par un copiste inintelligent. Mais, au paragraphe 4, il donne l'argumentation de ceux qui refusent que le commandement de l'amour du prochain soit une insertion maladroite. A. F. J. Klijn n'a pas remarqué qu'Origène se livre ici à une argumentation et à une contre-argumentation. Il rapporte en fait des propos tenus par d'autres et il est difficile de décider en faveur de qui il tranche. Son point de départ consiste à repérer l'existence d'une contradiction scripturaire entre Romains 13 : 9 et Matthieu. Romains 13 : 9 affirme que le commandement d'amour du prochain est une récapitulation des autres commandements. En conséquence, celui qui pratique cet amour du prochain est parfait, et notamment le jeune homme riche de Matthieu. Mais alors comment Jésus peut-il s'adresser à lui comme s'il n'était pas parfait ? La question est donc de savoir s'il est possible de lever cette contradiction. C'est là qu'intervient la supposition selon laquelle, chez Mat-

¹⁰ Klijn, A. F. J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 24–5, 56–60. Leyde, 1992. Voir aussi Idem, "The Question of the Rich Young Man in a Jewish-Christian Gospel." *NovT* 8 (1956) : 149–55.

thieu, le commandement de l'amour du prochain serait une interpolation introduite par un scribe maladroit. Cette supposition a pour elle un argument fort : le fait que le commandement de l'amour du prochain ne figure pas dans les récits parallèles de Marc et de Luc. Le jeune homme riche n'apparaît pas chez eux comme un « parfait », puisque, à la différence de Matthieu, Jésus lui dit : « une seule chose te manque » (Marc 10 : 21) ou « une seule chose te fait encore défaut » (Luc 18 : 22). Ce manque et ce défaut sont précisément le fait que, jusque là, le jeune homme riche n'a pas mis en pratique le commandement de l'amour du prochain. En revanche, Jésus n'a pas de doute sur sa pratique effective des autres commandements et il l'en approuve. Origène fait enfin remarquer que, si vraiment le jeune homme riche avait affirmé qu'il pratiquait l'amour du prochain, qui est le commandement « capital et suprême », Marc et Luc n'auraient pas manqué de le mentionner. Mais il est important de noter que l'ensemble de cette argumentation est contrebalancé par une autre argumentation, qui figure au paragraphe 4 : ceux qui pensent que Jésus a énoncé, non seulement les autres commandements, mais aussi le commandement d'amour, expliquent qu'il veut faire prendre conscience au jeune homme qu'il n'a pas réellement mis en pratique le commandement d'amour, puisqu'il n'a pas donné ses richesses aux pauvres.

En second lieu, la phrase latine sur les exemplaires du Nouveau Testament n'a pas la portée que lui attribue A. F. J. Klijn. Origène affirme en réalité qu'il n'a pas cru possible de traiter le Nouveau Testament comme l'Ancien, en mettant des obèles et des astérisques devant les versets problématiques.¹¹ Il faut se contenter d'énoncer les arguments qui font suspecter tel ou tel verset. Au lecteur de se déterminer. On retrouve donc, dans le cas du Nouveau Testament, l'appel à la liberté du lecteur dont A. F. J. Klijn a raison de souligner la présence dans le cas de l'Ancien.

Venons-en aux arguments en faveur de l'authenticité origénienne du passage :

1. Les quelques fragments de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* ont été transmis par des citateurs qui vivaient en Égypte : Clément d'Alexandrie, Origène, Didyme.¹² Rien ne prouve que cet Évangile ait circulé dans le monde latin. La présence d'un fragment de cet Évangile chez un traducteur latin est

¹¹ Il est facile de deviner le signe qui pourrait figurer devant la phrase « tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même » : l'astérisque, puisqu'il signale tout ce qui est en plus.

¹² Voir Dorival, G. « Un groupe judéo-chrétien méconnu : les Hébreux ». *Apocrypha* 11 (2000) : 7–36, notamment 8–21.

difficile, voire impossible, à expliquer. Les partisans de l'inauthenticité origénienne du passage répliquent à cet argument en faisant valoir que le fragment en question provient, non de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*, mais de l'*Évangile des Nazoréens*.¹³ À l'appui de cette idée, on peut faire valoir deux arguments : d'abord, le fait qu'un auteur comme Jérôme attribue souvent à l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* des fragments qui appartiennent en réalité à l'*Évangile des Nazoréens* ; ensuite, le fait que, dans la *Vetus interpretatio*, Simon soit qualifié de « disciple » du Seigneur, comme c'est le cas dans le fragment 15a de l'*Évangile selon les Nazaréens*.¹⁴ Ces deux arguments ne sont guère convaincants : le premier ne prouve pas que, dans le cas de la *Vetus interpretatio*, il y a eu changement de titre ; il rend simplement l'hypothèse envisageable ; mais la démonstration reste à faire. Cette démonstration serait-elle faite à l'aide du second argument ? Il n'en est rien. D'abord, Simon peut être appelé « disciple » de Jésus aussi bien par l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* que par l'*Évangile des Nazoréens*. Ensuite et surtout, dans le fragment cité par la *Vetus interpretatio*, Simon est qualifié de « fils de Jonas », ce qui n'est pas le cas dans les fragments connus de l'*Évangile des Nazoréens*, où il est dit « fils de Jean ». ¹⁵ De cette remarque, on tirera la conclusion que le fragment latin a peu de chances de provenir de ce dernier évangile et que son appartenance à l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* est beaucoup plus probable. ¹⁶ L'origine origénienne de la citation devient dès lors tout à fait plausible.

2. La citation de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* est précédée d'une remarque qui mérite de retenir l'attention : « Il est dit dans un évangile qui est dit selon les Hébreux (si cependant on convient de le recevoir non à titre d'autorité, mais à titre d'éclaircissement de la question proposée) ». En effet cette remarque n'a pas de parallèle dans les citations que font Clément d'Alexandrie et Didyme, mais elle rappelle la manière dont Origène introduit un extrait de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* dans le *Commentaire sur Jean II*

¹³ Voir Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 31. L'*Évangile des Nazoréens* est parfois appelé dans l'Antiquité l'*Évangile des Nazaréens*.

¹⁴ Il s'agit de la numérotation de l'édition de Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 161 ; c'est le fragment XXIV de l'édition de Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 105.

¹⁵ Voir fragment 14 Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 161 = fragment XXXIV Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 114.

¹⁶ Le fragment 15a, où Simon est qualifié de « disciple » du Seigneur, provient de Jérôme, *Contre les Pélagiens* III 2. Jérôme l'attribue explicitement à l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*. On peut se demander s'il ne provient pas effectivement de cet évangile et s'il ne faut pas le retirer des fragments de l'*Évangile des Nazoréens*.

12 : « Si l'on admet l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*, où le Sauveur lui-même dit : « Récemment, ma mère, le Saint Esprit, m'a pris par un de mes cheveux et m'a emporté sur la grande montagne du Thabor », on soulèvera la question etc ». Cette manière de parler de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* a un parallèle dans les *Homélie sur Jérémie* XV 4, où, commentant Jérémie 15 : 10 (« Malheur à moi, mère, qui as-tu enfanté en moi ? »), Origène fait l'hypothèse que la « mère » est ici soit l'âme de Jésus soit Marie. Il ajoute, sans toutefois donner d'indication de provenance : « Mais si l'on reçoit le verset : « Récemment, ma mère, le Saint Esprit, m'a pris par un de mes cheveux et m'a emporté sur la grande montagne du Thabor », on peut voir qui est sa mère ». Ce sont là les trois seuls passages où Origène fasse référence à l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*. Ils ont en commun d'affirmer le caractère simplement admissible de cet évangile (« si on convient de le recevoir » ; « si on l'admet » ; « si l'on reçoit le verset »), qui ne peut donc être imposé à l'ensemble de l'Église. On remarque cependant que la formule de la *Vetus interpretatio* est plus développée que les deux autres : « si on convient de le recevoir non à titre d'autorité, mais à titre d'éclaircissement de la question proposée ». A. van den Hoek s'est demandé si la fin de la formule ne provenait pas du traducteur de la *Vetus interpretatio*.¹⁷ Utilisant une remarque d'A. F. J. Klijn,¹⁸ elle note que l'expression « non à titre d'autorité » est caractéristique pour parler des évangiles apocryphes à l'époque tardive. Mais précisément, la phrase ne se limite pas à cette formule, mais distingue ce qui existe à titre d'autorité et ce qui est donné à titre d'éclaircissement. Une telle distinction paraît originale. Est-elle le fait d'Origène lui-même ? On est tenté de le penser, car la distinction entre l'autorité et l'éclaircissement fait écho à une thématique constante dans l'œuvre d'Origène : celle qui distingue ce qui relève des énoncés de la tradition apostolique et ecclésiastique et ce qui relève de la recherche (voir par exemple la préface du *Traité des Principes*). En définitive, le parallélisme entre la remarque introductive du fragment de la *Vetus interpretatio* et la manière dont sont introduits ou commentés les fragments de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* dans les œuvres d'Origène constitue un argument fort en faveur de l'authenticité origénienne de notre passage.

3. L'argument peut-être le plus fort en faveur de l'authenticité origénienne du paragraphe 3 de la *Vetus interpretatio* consiste dans une

¹⁷ van den Hoek, A. "Clement and Origen as Sources on 'Noncanonical' Scriptural Traditions during the Late Second and Earlier Third Centuries." Dans Dorival, G., et A. Le Boulluec, *Origeniana Sexta*, 93–113, surtout 103–4. Louvain, 1995.

¹⁸ Klijn, A. F. J. "Das Hebräer- und das Nazoräerevangelium". *ANRW*, II, 25.5 (1988) : 4020.

phrase du paragraphe 1, qui figure à la fois dans le grec et le latin : « Mais, si la parole “tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même” avait été dite en plus des autres commandements, Marc et Luc n’auraient pas omis ce commandement capital et suprême, sauf à dire que ce qui a été écrit est semblable, mais n’a pas été dit sur le même » (Grec). « Jamais en effet, s’il avait dit avoir accompli aussi la parole “tu aimeras ton prochain comme toi-même” en plus des autres commandements, Marc et Luc n’auraient omis ce commandement capital et suprême, sauf à dire que les écrits sont semblables, mais qu’ils n’ont pas été dits du même » (Latin). Cette phrase est difficile, car le raisonnement, elliptique, doit être reconstitué partiellement. Je comprends ceci : pour Origène, il est impensable que Marc et Luc aient omis de mentionner le commandement de l’amour du prochain, si vraiment il a été énoncé, car c’est le commandement « capital et suprême ». On peut cependant envisager l’hypothèse que Marc et Luc parlent d’événements semblables (*scil.* semblables à ceux rapportés par Matthieu), mais ne parlent pas du même (*scil.* du même jeune homme riche que Matthieu). Le jeune homme riche de Marc et Luc pratique les commandements hors le commandement d’amour, celui de Matthieu les pratique tous. Il est donc normal que Marc et Luc ne citent pas le commandement d’amour, puisqu’il s’agit d’un autre jeune homme riche que celui qui pratique ce commandement. Quoi qu’il en soit de cette interprétation, il paraît sûr que la phrase « ce qui a été écrit est semblable, mais n’a pas été dit sur le même » annonce l’expression « un autre parmi les riches » par laquelle commence le fragment de *l’Evangile selon les Hébreux*. Si Origène introduit ce fragment, c’est précisément parce qu’il montre que Jésus n’a pas eu affaire à un seul jeune homme riche, mais à plusieurs, probablement à deux. Le fragment permet donc d’aller dans le sens de l’hypothèse formulée au paragraphe 1. Il y a donc une continuité entre les paragraphes 1 et 3 de la *Vetus interpretatio*, ce qui implique qu’ils soient de la même main.

Il est toujours risqué de reconstituer une pensée aussi elliptique que celle d’Origène, notamment dans le cas de l’exégèse du Nouveau Testament, pour laquelle l’Alexandrin explique que l’on doit se contenter de suppositions (début du paragraphe 3). Tentons-le cependant. Marc et Luc présentent un jeune homme riche qui pratique les commandements de la Loi, mais à qui il manque de pratiquer l’amour du prochain, qui implique le renoncement aux richesses. Matthieu parle d’un jeune homme riche qui pratique les commandements et l’amour du prochain, mais à qui Jésus s’adresse comme s’il ne pratiquait pas cet amour. Il y a donc une contradiction dans le texte de Matthieu, qu’on peut lever de trois manières :

d'abord, en disant que la phrase sur l'amour du prochain est une interpolation, comme le montre son absence chez Marc et Luc (paragraphe 1) ; cette interpolation provient de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* (paragraphe 3) et un copiste peu intelligent l'a introduite à une mauvaise place alors qu'elle était à une place correcte dans l'évangile qui a servi de source (paragraphe 1 et 3) ; ensuite, en disant que Matthieu ne parle pas du même jeune homme riche que Marc et Luc (paragraphe 2), ce que le témoignage de l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux*, où il est question d'« un autre parmi les riches » rend tout à fait plausible (paragraphe 3) ; enfin, en disant que Jésus a voulu faire prendre conscience au jeune homme riche qu'en réalité il ne mettait pas en pratique le commandement d'amour (paragraphe 4). Il paraît difficile d'aller au delà. En particulier, reconstituer l'épisode du premier jeune homme riche dans l'*Évangile selon les Hébreux* ne paraît pas possible, à ceci près que le jeune homme en question devait lui aussi s'en aller loin de Jésus. Sinon, la chute du fragment qui se termine par l'analogie célèbre entre le chameau et le chas d'une aiguille, d'une part, le riche et l'entrée dans le royaume des cieux, d'autre part, serait incompréhensible. Enfin, il ne semble pas qu'entre les trois manières de résoudre la difficulté du texte de Matthieu, Origène ait une préférence. Notre passage doit donc être ajouté à ceux du *Commentaire sur Matthieu* dont H. J. Vogt a dressé la liste et dans lesquels Origène laisse des questions ouvertes.¹⁹ Tant il est vrai que, pour reprendre une belle formule du *Traité des Principes*, « maintenant, c'est encore pour l'instant la recherche, mais alors là-bas l'on verra désormais manifestement ».²⁰

¹⁹ Vogt, H. J. "Wie Origenes in seinem Matthäus-Kommentar Fragen offen lässt". Dans Crouzel H. et A. Quacquarelli, eds. *Origeniana Secunda*, 191–8. Bari, 1980 (= Idem, *Origenes als Exeget*, 105–11).

²⁰ II 11, 5.

L'ANNEE REGULIERE DE 364 JOURS DANS LA CONTROVERSE AU SUJET DE CHALCEDOINE

Par Michel van Esbræck (†)

Annie Jaubert avait elle-même déjà repéré en arménien une retombée tardive de ce calendrier sacerdotal dont elle avait si bien retrouvé l'importance d'après la rédaction sacerdotale de la Bible, le livre des Jubilés et le Nouveau Testament, comme B. Lourié vient de le commenter ici même. Elle notait en effet le témoignage du synaxaire de Ter Israël, tel qu'il a été édité par G. Bayan dans la *Patrologie Orientale*.¹ Quelle que soit la généalogie beaucoup plus compliquée du synaxaire arménien, l'édition de la *Patrologie* ne remontant sûrement pas à Ter Israël qui écrivait vers 1240,² le synaxaire doit avoir employé une source qui n'était peut-être qu'une compilation. La brève notice pour le 6 janvier mérite d'être rappelée ici avec le commentaire qu'Annie Jaubert lui a adjoint.

« Trente ans après, en ce même jour du 6 janvier, un jour du dimanche, Jésus vint au Jourdain pour être baptisé par Jean ; il est né en effet un jeudi soir, à l'heure ou pointait le vendredi, jour où fut créé Adam ; il fut annoncé le mercredi et fut baptisé le dimanche, jour de la création et de la résurrection ». Annie Jaubert commente : « la naissance du Christ est rapportée au vendredi ; la raison en est clairement indiquée : le nouvel Adam naissait le jour même où fut créé le premier homme ; le Livre d'Adam et

¹ Bayan, G. *Le synaxaire arménien de Ter Israël*, 195. PO, 18. Paris, 1912.

² Der Nersessian, S. « Le synaxaire arménien de Grégoire VII d'Anazarbe ». *AB* 68 (Mélanges Peeters, II) (1950) : 261–85 [repris dans Eadem, *Études byzantines et arméniennes*, 417–35. Louvain, 1973].

Ève nous avait habitués à ces interférences de symbolismes ».³ C'est en effet dans le sillage d'un commentaire sur le *Livre d'Adam et Ève* éthiopien qu'Annie Jaubert insert le témoignage arménien tardif du synaxaire.

Voici presque vingt ans, nous avons déniché un court texte héortologique attribué à Basile dans un codex daté de 1196. A n'en pas douter, il s'agit du texte complet dont Annie Jaubert avait repéré la notice condensée et déjà quelque peu retouchée au 6 janvier dans le synaxaire.

A la création du monde un mercredi, ce texte ajoutait une donnée encore plus claire pour la reprise consciente de l'année de 364 jours : entre le 6 avril comme Annonciation et le 6 janvier comme Nativité, le texte mentionne 274 jours, alors qu'en année julienne il devrait en compter 276 en incluant le jour d'arrivée comme le plus souvent dans l'antiquité. Il était donc nécessaire de ne laisser dans l'ombre rien de ce qui pouvait toucher à l'origine de ce petit texte pseudo-basilien. C'est ce que nous avons fait dans huit publications, dont nous rappellerons brièvement ci-dessus les conclusions. Une d'entre elle est restée d'accès difficile.

Les résultats de cette recherche peuvent se résumer de manière brève : après la promulgation de la formule de foi au concile de Chalcédoine en 451, un certain Théodose empêcha Juvénal de reprendre le trône épiscopal de Jérusalem, et se livra pendant vingt mois comme évêque de la Cité sainte à des nouveautés liturgiques, lesquelles renouaient avec l'antique calendrier sacerdotal. Ce faisant, Théodose prolongeait une initiative similaire de Jean II de Jérusalem (387–417), qui réunit en 394 lors de l'embellissement de la Sainte-Sion de nombreux éléments d'une tradition judéo-chrétienne, impliquant l'intégration d'un groupe judéo-chrétien dont plus d'une tradition orale refait surface à l'époque de son épiscopat.⁴ Mais alors que Jean de Jérusalem ne toucha pas au calendrier, Théodose quelque quarante ans plus tard s'autorise du particularisme traditionnel d'un groupe d'alors pour s'opposer au concile de Chalcédoine avec le prestige d'une tradition plus antique. Mais comme Théodose dut céder à la police de Constantinople, se réfugier au Mont Sinai où il fut saisi, conduit en prison à Antioche où il ne tarda pas à mourir, les traces de ses créations liturgiques ne sont repérables qu'à travers les remous qu'elles ont laissés dans plusieurs textes, difficiles à classer en raison même de l'oubli de la politique religieuse dont ils dépendent.

³ Jaubert, A. *La date de la Cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*, 66–7. Études bibliques. Paris, 1957.

⁴ van Esbrœck, M. « Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix ». *AB* 102 (1984) : 99–134.

Nous n'arrivons évidemment pas à cette conclusion sans une série d'études intermédiaires. La première publication touche évidemment le texte même du Pseudo-Basile.⁵

La thèse centrale du petit pseudo-Basile est l'union des deux natures dans le Christ, du fait qu' à trente années de distance il est né et baptisé le même jour. Ce théologoumène est défendu avec éloquence par Jean de Gabegheantz vers le début de son accession au catholicoscat en 557. Contrairement à la notice déjà accommodée de Ter Israel, mais conformément au calendrier exhumé par Annie Jaubert, le pseudo-Basile place la création le mercredi, ainsi que l'annonciation et la trahison appelée ici « dessein de malice ». Il a ensuite un triduum du sixième au huitième jour, soit de vendredi à dimanche, où le jumelage touche d'abord la Nativité avec la crucifixion, le Baptême avec l'ensevelissement, et l'Épiphanie avec la résurrection. Ces trois jours n'en sont toutefois qu'un seul, d'où la mise en parallèle de l'Épiphanie et de la Nativité à 274 jours de distance. Tel qu'il se présente, le pseudo-Basile n'est évidemment pas tout à fait cohérent. Il témoigne déjà d'une certaine adaptation à une année julienne, du seul fait qu'il entend se référer au 6 janvier par rapport au 6 avril un mercredi. Les jours de la semaine ne sont fixes dans chaque mois que dans le calendrier de 364 jours, et l'initiative de réemployer ce calendrier s'est évidemment heurté à la continuité du calendrier julien. Mais ce n'est pas seulement l'usage qui a arrêté cette tentative de restauration antique. Politiquement, l'initiative a été complètement anéantie avec la personne de Théodose anti-évêque de Jérusalem, et ce n'est que par des traces éparses qu'on peut en récupérer l'action éphémère.

La première chose à faire au vu du pseudo-Basile était de sonder les traditions arméniennes mieux datables. C'est ce que nous avons fait en envisageant sept autres documents arméniens relatifs à l'unité des deux fêtes, dont quatre ont été traduits en annexe du même article.⁶ Le résultat obvie est que le pseudo-Basile ne peut être situé qu'en amont de toute cette tradition, au moins avant le deuxième concile de Dwin en 555, mais sans aucune exclusion d'une date beaucoup plus ancienne. C'est cette date plus ancienne que nous avons postulée dans le mouvement aaronite, branche

⁵ van Esbroeck, M. « Un court traité pseudo-basilien de mouvance aaronite conservé en arménien ». *Mus* 100 (1987) : 385–95. Réimprimé : van Esbroeck, M. *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*. Variorum Reprints. Aldershot, 1995.

⁶ van Esbroeck, M. « Impact de l'Écriture sur le concile de Dwin en 555 ». *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 18 (1988) : 301–18. Également repris dans *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*.

des apthartodocètes auxquels doit avoir appartenu le syrien ‘Abdicho, qui se fit consacrer évêque par le catholicos Nersès II (548–557).⁷

Dans une troisième publication,⁸ nous avons envisagé la portée du pseudo-Basile vis-à-vis de l’histoire byzantine et arménienne. Cette communication entend faire le point des retombées de ce petit texte dans les littératures contiguës du Moyen-Orient antique. Du côté arménien, nous constatons qu’Ananie de Shirak a explicitement déclaré qu’entre le 6 janvier et le 6 avril il y a 276 jours.⁹ Il est probable qu’il a connu le pseudo-Basile.

Nous précisons là aussi la symbolique cosmique du mercredi du pseudo-Basile. En effet ce jour-là sont créés le soleil et la lune selon la Genèse. Comme le Psautier dit que pour Dieu mille ans sont comme un jour (Ps 89,4), c’est donc dans le quatrième millénaire ou jour de Dieu qu’Abraham est appelé ; enfin le mercredi également, par l’annonciation à la Vierge, le Verbe se fait chair. Du côté grec, le Chronicon Paschale, dont la plus ancienne rédaction est d’avant 532, constitue sans doute une réponse voulue, mais curieusement il place l’annonciation le lundi et le baptême le jeudi, mais ailleurs la Nativité et la circoncision le mercredi.¹⁰ Y a-t-il là des vestiges de la théorie de Jérusalem ? La question mériterait une étude approfondie.

Le pseudo-Basile mentionne aussi les huit jours du service du culte, rythmée selon le mercredi, le vendredi et le dimanche. La semaine pour la Pâque de l’Épiphanie est parfaite dans le calendrier sacerdotal en janvier 452 : le 2, le 4 et le 6 font aboutir au triple jour identique de la Nativité et de l’Épiphanie. En 453, la semaine qui suit l’Épiphanie où selon l’expression des Coptes la Pâque de l’Épiphanie comporte les 14, 16 et 18 janvier cette

⁷ Cf. note 5. Les affinités du pseudo-Basile avec la Caverne des Trésors excluent pratiquement une dépendance directe arménienne avec l’opposition à Chalcedoine en 451–453.

⁸ van Esbrœck, M. « Signification d’un court traité basilien conservé en arménien. » Dans Hovsepian, L., ed. *The Second International Symposium on Armenian Linguistics. Proceedings*, t. 2, 181–7. Yerevan, 1993. Il s’agit d’une communication donnée à Yerevan en 1987. Elle aurait dû être incluse dans le *Variorum Reprints*, mais elle n’était pas encore publiée quand le volume de *Variorum Reprints* a demandé les divers articles. Au surplus on y trouve seulement le xérox de la dactylographie avec une machine à écrire mécanique, les difficultés économiques ayant été très grandes en Arménie durant cette période.

⁹ Florilège du ms. 2678 du Matenadaran, traduit dans *Impact de l’Écriture*. 318.

¹⁰ Dindorf, L., ed. *Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum*, vol. 1, 386, 382, 375. Bonn, 1832.

fois pour la Dormition de la Vierge ; (le 16 et le 18 janvier ont été connus en occident pour la Dormition).¹¹ Le vendredi 16 selon les Coptes doit avoir été la date de l'assaut de la police contre l'église de Gethsémani, et le début de l'éviction de Théodose. En cette journée symbolique, la Theotokos meurt effectivement sous les coups du pouvoir chalcédonien, qui ne la reconnaît pas. L'assomption du corps de la Vierge est alors reportée 206 jours plus tard, au 9 août, où se trouvait primitivement la semaine de la Dormition. Cette semaine de la Dormition est encore complètement présente dans le *Transitus géorgien*, aussi attribué à Basile,¹² d'après une liturgie parallèle à celle de la Sainte-Sion, partant cette fois à une autre date de Sainte-Marie-la-Neuve, inaugurée en 543 par Justinien face à la Sainte-Sion, jusqu'à Gethsemani. De cette semaine mariale, une réplique a été introduite à Constantinople vers 512 au temps de l'empereur Anastase, grâce à l'évêque très peu chalcédonien Timothée, qui s'empressa de mettre dans le diptyques de Constantinople le nom de Jean Nikiotès, patriarche d'Alexandrie.¹³

Nous avons constaté alors que le 16 janvier, ou 21 Tobi copte, est le rendez-vous d'une série de saints légendaires symbolisant la résistance au concile de Chalcédoine, à savoir les saintes Sophie de Jérusalem, sainte Hilaria et le saint non légendaire Macaire de Tkow. Qui plus est, les Coptes ont gardé un autre récit de l'Invention de la Croix, destiné à remplacer la tradition de Jean de Jérusalem qui patronnait un culte désormais au mains des hérétiques chalcédoniens.¹⁴ Enfin, même du côté arabe, et toujours sous la garantie d'une attribution basilienne, il y a deux homélies sur le dimanche et le vendredi, dont les données se rattachent au même symbolisme.¹⁵ Ces homélies témoignent déjà du vendredi, qui prendra une place prépondérante dans l'Islam qui suivra après un siècle.

¹¹ Voir van Esbrœck, M. « La Dormition chez les Coptes. » Dans Rassart-Debergh, K., et J. Ries, éd. *Actes du IV^e Congrès Copte*, 436–45. Louvain-la-neuve, 1992. Également dans *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*.

¹² van Esbrœck, M. « L'assomption de la Vierge dans un transitus pseudo-basilien ». *AB* 92 (1974) : 125–63.

¹³ van Esbrœck, M. « Le culte de la Vierge à Constantinople aux 6^e et 7^e siècles ». *RÉB* 46 (1988) : 181–90. Également dans *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*.

¹⁴ Tout ceci est largement expliqué dans l'article cité plus haut « La Dormition chez les Coptes ».

¹⁵ van Esbrœck, M. « Deux homélies pseudo-basiliennes sur le Dimanche et le Vendredi ». *Parole de l'Orient* 16 (Samir, Kh., éd. *Actes du troisième congrès international d'études arabes chrétiennes, Louvain-La-Neuve, septembre 1984*) (1990–91) : 49–71.

Il est enfin un dernier domaine où la personnalité de Théodose, invoquant l'autorité divine sur l'église de Jérusalem en faveur de la sacralisation du mercredi, a complètement disparu, mais où elle se laisse néanmoins lire au travers d'une nuée de variantes dans une bonne dizaine de langues. Il s'agit de la Lettre sur le Dimanche, un texte prétendument écrite directement par Dieu le Père, et tombée du ciel à un endroit variable selon les différentes versions.¹⁶

En fait, le document a été détourné de sa destination première. Chez les latins, elle a servi d'objurgation pour l'assistance obligatoire à la messe dominicale. Chez les orientaux, elle s'est transformée en apocalypse sur la signification des victoires de l'Islam. Mais son insistance sur le Dimanche possède un intéressant parallèle, en plein dans le dossier de la Dormition. La majorité des textes grecs qui nous restent et quelques uns en syriaques ou arabe possèdent une courte exclamation selon laquelle toutes les grandes fêtes ont lieu le dimanche. La théorie écartée est évidemment celle du pseudo-Basile. Ceci montre que dès la disparition de Théodose de Jérusalem, on a dû revenir au calendrier julien, et on en a profité au moment de rassembler les traditions si diverses sur la Dormition dans des synthèses qui sont davantage des justifications juxtaposées de théories antérieures diverses, que le montage d'un texte cohérent. La Bible elle-même n'a-t-elle pas été élaborée de manière semblable, au point de raconter trois fois les même épisodes dans un seul chapitre ? C'est pourquoi il nous paraît très probable que l'idée d'une lettre tombant à Jérusalem pour la promulgation de la valeur initiale du mercredi correspond tout à fait à ce qu'a dû faire Théodose pour assurer son autorité liturgique. La censure de tout son système a entraîné la lettre dans des dérives diverses dont il serait ici superflu de raconter ici une fois de plus l'étonnante variété et le succès surprenant.

Il est évident que ces témoins indirects montrent avant tout que l'étude de la Dormition de la Vierge, et de tout ce qui l'entoure dans les traditions de Jérusalem, est très loin d'être terminée. Le tableau général que nous en avons donné en 1981¹⁷ reste plus utile que ce qu'en a déduit l'auteur des pages de la *Clavis Apocryphorum* sur la Dormition de la Vierge.¹⁸

¹⁶ van Esbrœck, M. « La lettre sur le Dimanche descendue du ciel ». *AB* 107 (1989) : 267–84. Également dans *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*.

¹⁷ van Esbrœck, M. « Les textes littéraires sur l'Assomption avant le X^e siècle ». Dans Bovon, F., éd. *Les Actes Apocryphes des apôtres. Christianisme dans le monde païen*, 51–77. Genève, 1981. Également dans *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*.

¹⁸ Voir van Esbrœck, M. "Some Earlier Features in the Life of the Virgin." *Marianum. Ephemerides Mariologiae* 63 (2001): 297–308.

**LES QUATRE JOURS « DE L'INTERVALLE » :
UNE MODIFICATION
NEOTESTAMENTAIRE ET CHRETIENNE
DU CALENDRIER DE 364 JOURS**

Par Basile Lourié

L'hypothèse de Mlle Annie Jaubert concernant la date de la Cène n'a jamais été controuvée ni prouvée. D'après elle, le calendrier des synoptiques devait être « une modification » de celui du *Livre des Jubilés*.¹ Or, Mlle Jaubert ne parlait que des traits particuliers de cette « modification », sans établir la structure d'ensemble de ce calendrier. Cela était d'ailleurs impossible à l'époque où personne ne savait distinguer entre les différents calendriers de 364 jours, au point que même les calendriers des *Jubilés* et du *1 Énoch*, bien distincts entre eux, ont été considérés comme identiques.²

Aujourd'hui, nous savons qu'il y a, dans le monde juif peu avant J.-C., un nombre considérable de calendriers luni-solaires de 364 jours, dont le calendrier des *Jubilés* ne constitue qu'un exemple. Il ne s'agit donc point

¹ Jaubert, A. *La date de la Cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*, 72, 74. Études bibliques. Paris, 1957.

² Voir maintenant, pour ces deux calendriers : Albani, M. *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube. Untersuchungen zum Astronomischen Henochbuch*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 68. Neukirchen/Vluyn, 1994 ; Albani, M., J. Frey, and A. Lange, eds. *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Texte und Untersuchungen zum antiken Judentum, 65. Tübingen, 1997. Cf., en outre, pour les calendriers de Qumrân : VanderKam, J. C. « Calendars and Calendrical Information in the Dead Sea Scrolls ». *XB* 1 (7) (1999) : 207–33 ; idem, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls : Measuring Time*. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London/New York, 1998.

d'une secte exotique, si nous sommes en présence d'une communauté utilisant un calendrier de 364 jours,³ et c'est un fait capital pour revaloriser l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert. En outre, on ne saurait guère attendre que le modèle particulier du calendrier de 364 jours que nous connaissons par *Le Livre des Jubilés* se révèle jouer un rôle exceptionnel dans les évangiles. Dans le cadre de nos connaissances actuelles des calendriers juifs, l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert doit être reformulée. Il s'agit plutôt d'« une modification » d'un calendrier de 364 jours, pas nécessairement celui des *Jubilés*.

Ce n'est pas l'unique modification de l'hypothèse qui découle presque automatiquement de l'état actuel des recherches sur les calendriers juifs. L'hypothèse initiale de Mlle Jaubert doit maintenant être considérée d'après deux faces distinctes, en accord formel avec le double sous-titre de son livre : « Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne ». D'une part, l'hypothèse de l'utilisation d'un calendrier (ou bien, des calendriers, ce qui serait plus conforme à la réalité telle qu'on la voit maintenant) de 364 jours dans certains livres de l'Ancien Testament,⁴ et d'autre part, la restitution du

³ Dans ce contexte, une interprétation d'un dit michnaïque (*mSuké* 5, 4) proposée par Håkan Ulfsgård mérite notre attention spéciale : « Our ancestors when they were in this place turned with their backs unto the Temple and their faces towards the East and they prostrated themselves eastward towards the sun. But as for us our eyes are turned to the Eternal » (tr. de P. Blackman). « Apparently, — explique Ulfsgård — an earlier form of worship is repudiated (prayer in the direction of the rising sun <...>), but the saying reveals that this might not have been restricted to small groups, who turned in the wrong direction — note the expression 'our fathers'! What is referred to must not necessarily have been some kind of non-Jewish sun worship, but is probably an example of prayer in the direction of the rising sun <...>. It might therefore be argued that the rabbinic saying could be a reference to the continuing popularity of the ancient 'solar' calendar — possibly, but not necessarily including the Jubilean/Essene/Qumranite insistence on the 364-day calendar <...>. It is an important indication that the earlier calendar was in fact a solar-oriented calendar ; also, it indicates that this calendar, and varieties thereof, should not be regarded as sectarian as often has been the case ». (Ulfsgård, H. *The Story of Sukkot. The Setting, Shaping, and Sequel of the Biblical Feast of Tabernacles*, 53–4. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, 34. Tübingen, 1998.

⁴ Pour la discussion de la partie « vétérotestamentaire » de l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert, voir le déroulement de la bibliographie : VanderKam, J. « The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar : A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypothesis ». *CBQ* 41 (1979) : 390–411 ; Davies, Ph. R. « Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins : An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory ». *CBQ* 45 (1983) : 80–9 ; Wacholder, B. Z., and Sh. Wacholder, « Patterns of Biblical Dates and Qum-

calendrier de la communauté de Jésus. Ces deux hypothèses sont quasi indépendantes : même dans le cas où le calendrier de 364 serait complètement inconnu de l'Ancien Testament, son usage par la communauté de Jésus serait parfaitement justifié par la pratique de l'époque dite « intertestamentaire ».

Ce n'est que la deuxième hypothèse, celle qui concerne la communauté de Jésus, qui sera ici l'objet de notre attention.

1. CONSIDERATIONS PRELIMINAIRES

L'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert a été novatrice sous deux aspects — pas seulement comme la solution d'une énigme chronologique, mais aussi bien comme une méthode nouvelle dans les études bibliques. Sans la nommer et plutôt intuitivement que consciemment, Mlle Jaubert proposa l'application d'une méthode de liturgie comparée aux études bibliques où pareille approche n'avait jamais été pratiquée. Naturellement, cela a contribué à rendre son hypothèse in comprise. Nous nous attarderons donc, tout d'abord, sur quelques points de valeur méthodologique.

1.1. L'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert : difficultés fausses et vraies

Dans la littérature, pas trop abondante, consacrée à la critique des idées de Mlle Jaubert, ce ne sont pas les spécialistes du Nouveau Testament qui font la majorité. L'intérêt de la part des étudiants de l'Ancien Testament fut plus vive et la discussion plus chaude.

Le P. Joseph Fitzmyer répète dans plusieurs de ses publications assez récentes les prétentions de la critique néotestamentaire « mises à jour ». Les voici : « (a) Is there ever an indication elsewhere in the gospel tradition that Jesus followed the solar calendar in opposition to the luni-solar (official) calendar ? (b) The harmonization of Synoptic and Johannine material in the proposal rides roughshod over the long-accepted analyses of many of the passages according to form-critical methods and betrays a fundamentalist concern ».⁵

ran's Calendar : The Fallacy of Jaubert's Hypothesis ». *HUCA* 66 (1995) : 1–40 ; Beckwith, R. T. « Judaism between the Testaments : the Stages of Its Religious Development ». Dans Idem, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian. Biblical, Intertestamental and Patristic Studies*, 167–216, surtout 174–82. AGJU, 33. Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996.

⁵ Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools for Study*. Revised edition, 186, cf. 183–184. Society of Biblical Literature, Resources for Biblical Stu-

Le point (b) est, en effet, une objection contre un « paradigme scientifique » plutôt qu'un argument au cours d'une discussion particulière. Il ressemble fort bien l'attitude d'Albert Einstein dans sa discussion avec Niels Bohr sur l'interprétation Copenhagienne de la théorie des Quanta. Les fondements de la « critique de forme », on l'admet volontiers, ne sont non moins hypothétiques, et personne n'est donc obligé de les suivre. Mlle Jaubert proposa, en revanche, une méthode qui peut fournir des données plus sûres que la critique limitée aux les frontières du texte du Nouveau Testament, et nous allons discuter cette méthode dans le présent article.

Le point (a) pose un problème à lui seul. Il est répété par un critique aussi bienveillant que James VanderKam : « Her [Mlle Jaubert's] solution, while it has proved attractive to some, founders on the complete lack of evidence elsewhere that Jesus or his disciples used the 364-day calendar. There is reason to think that the different timing for the meal in the gospel of John may be motivated by theological than by historical concerns ».⁶

Quelles sont les « évidences » qu'on pourrait tenir comme prouvant l'usage d'un calendrier de 364 jours par la communauté de Jésus ? Une possibilité d'éliminer les difficultés des narrations évangéliques concernant la Passion et même des apparitions de Jésus ressuscité,⁷ n'est-elle pas suffisante ? Elle serait suffisante, mais à condition que toutes les difficultés soient effectivement éliminées. Ce qui n'est pas le cas. Et ce n'est pas un problème unique, car il faudrait expliquer aussi dans quelles circonstances ce calendrier hypothétique de la communauté de Jésus a disparu de l'usage de l'Église. La dernière tache peut paraître dépasser les limites habituelles de la « critique néotestamentaire », mais, dans le cas de la liturgie, nous sommes en présence d'un problème de la succession entre les *communautés* réelles qu'on ne saurait confondre avec l'histoire des *textes*...

dy, 20, Atlanta, GA, 1990. À peu près mot à mot citation d'idem, *The Gospel According to Luke (X–XXIV)*. Introduction, Translation, and Notes, 1380–2, spéc. 1381. The Anchor Bible, 28A. Garden City, NY, 1985. Pour le résumé de la plupart des publications parues du vivant de Mlle Jaubert, v. surtout : Carmignac, J. Comment Jésus et ses contemporains pouvaient-ils célébrer la Pâque à une date non officielle ? *RevQ* 5 (1964) : 59–79, p. 77–79 pour la bibliographie, de même que Strobel, A. *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, 64. TU, 121. Berlin, 1977.

⁶ VanderKam, J. C. « Calendars. Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish ». Dans *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, I, 814–20, spéc. 820. Garden City, N. Y., 1992.

⁷ Cf., sur la chronologie des apparitions post-pascales, une addition importante au livre de Mlle Jaubert : Audet, J. P. « Jésus et le “calendrier sacerdotal ancien” ». *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 10 (1958) : 361–83.

Certes, on ne saurait diminuer des aspects forts de l'hypothèse en question. Mlle Jaubert a réussi à établir, à partir de son hypothèse, la chronologie de la Passion qui rend inutile de recourir à « l'origine littéraire » de plusieurs événements dont les évangélistes font mention entre la Cène et la Crucifixion, et c'est précisément ce qui laisse perplexes plus d'un des critiques modernes.⁸ En effet, si, d'après Mlle Jaubert, les nombreux interrogatoires de Jésus remplissent le temps entre le mardi (Cène) et le vendredi (Crucifixion), il n'y a aucun besoin de les déclarer fictifs, comme on y est pratiquement réduit lorsqu'on n'a qu'un petit espace de temps entre le jeudi soir et le vendredi matin.⁹

Mais tournons-nous vers les problèmes que soulève l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert.

1.2. Un petit discours de la méthode...

Mlle Jaubert proposa un schème du calendrier liturgique où le jour de Pâques tombe chaque année au mardi. Plus précisément, la date de la *nuît* pascale, c'est la nuit de mardi à mercredi. N'importe quel calendrier où les dates sont fixées aux jours de la semaine présuppose une année de 364 jours (un multiple de 7 le plus prêt à 365) avec intercalations possibles, plus ou moins régulières, qu'on introduit une fois en quelques ans, et qui sont destinées à compenser le retardement de l'année solaire de 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ jours par rapport à l'année de 364 jours.¹⁰ La date de la Cène, comprise comme celle de la nuit pascale, tombe chaque année la nuit de mardi 14 Nisan au mercredi suivant. Telle est l'idée centrale de Mlle Jaubert concernant le calendrier de la communauté de Jésus.

Dès le début, Mlle Jaubert suit deux lignes de démonstration. Bien entendu, elle cherche à établir une chronologie des événements évangéliques privée des contradictions internes. Mais, au surplus, elle recourt continuellement aux données extra-évangéliques dont certaines, comme

⁸ Pour ne nommer qu'un, très caractéristique : Dockx, S. *Chronologies néotestamentaires et vie de l'Église primitive. Recherches exégétiques*, 21–9 et surtout 41. Paris, 1976.

⁹ Voir, par ex., Dockx, *Chronologies*, 41 ; Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte*, 83.

¹⁰ Ce sont les modes d'introduire les intercalations qui sont responsables de la plupart des différences entre les calendriers divers de 364 jours. Au point de vue d'astronomie, ces intercalations peuvent être aussi bien précises qu'imprécises. Cf. Beckwith, R. « Cautionary Notes on the Use of Calendars and Astronomy to Determine the Chronology of the Passion ». Dans Vardaman, J., et E. M. Yamauchi, eds. *Chronos, Kairos, Christos Nativity and Chronological Studies Presented to Jack Finegan*, 183–205. Winona Lake, 1989.

celles de Qumrân et du *Livre des Jubilés* , ont provoqué l'idée même d'attribuer à la communauté de Jésus un calendrier de 364 jours. Cette dernière approche engendrait un problème pour la « critique néotestamentaire » traditionnelle, laquelle ne dépasse les frontières textuelles du Nouveau Testament qu'en quelques cas exceptionnels dans les textes contemporains du Nouveau Testament, sur un point où les méthodes de la liturgie comparée interviennent dans les études bibliques.

N'est-ce pas plus que naturel d'étudier un calendrier *liturgique* par les méthodes touchant l'étude de la liturgie ? Et voici la formulation de Mlle Jaubert elle-même, tirée de l'article qui fait une sorte de résumé de la totalité de ses études concernant le calendrier : « In order to rediscover the original outline [du calendrier de la communauté de Jésus] it is necessary to refer to the various testimonies of the ancient Church, often through an unconscious liturgical « memory », and it is necessary to go back again to the Zadokite calendar [disons, *mutatis mutandis* , « the 364-day calendar »] which alone was able to give the key to a rather complex evolution ».¹¹

En effet, le calendrier de la communauté de Jésus ne saurait disparaître sans aucune trace. Même si les liturgies chrétiennes ne sont pas toutes apparues d'un unique berceau de Sion, elles doivent contenir un nombre considérable des éléments de la liturgie primitive de Jérusalem. Cela suffit pour essayer d'appliquer les méthodes de la liturgie comparée¹² aux études du calendrier de Jésus et ses disciples.

La démonstration que le mardi saint et non le jeudi, fut célébré primitivement comme la date de la Cène a été un des succès les plus marquants de Mlle Jaubert. Au témoignage direct d'Apollinaire d'Hiérapolis (vers 165), d'une autorité incontestable, Mlle Jaubert a ajouté quelques données des liturgies chrétiennes et même non-chrétiennes postérieures qui doivent remonter à une source unique identique à la tradition liturgique suivie par Jésus ou au moins en connexion avec elle.¹³ En outre, en

¹¹ Jaubert, A. « The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative of John ». Dans Charlesworth, J. H. L., ed. *John and Qumran* , 62–75, spéc. 75. London, 1972 [réimprimé sous le titre : Charlesworth, J. H., and R. E. Brown *et al.* , eds. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* , 62–75. The Crossroad Christian Origins Library. New York, 1991].

¹² À titre d'introduction théorique, l'ouvrage de Baumstark, A. *Liturgie comparée. Principes et méthodes pour l'étude des liturgies chrétiennes* . 3^e éd. revue par Dom B. Botte. Chèvotogne, 1953, reste toujours valable.

¹³ Jaubert, *Date de la Cène* , 96–120, spéc. 96–7. Ces observations ont été complétées par l'auteur dans les études suivantes : eadem, « Jésus et le calendrier de

quelques années, « ...la thèse de A. Jaubert reçoit... un très fort appui » dans l'ordre des lectures vétérotestamentaires du Lectionnaire de Jérusalem.¹⁴ On eut ajouter la liturgie copte avant le X^e siècle où la mémoire de la Cène fut célébrée au mardi,¹⁵ ainsi que quelques pièces de la littérature apocryphe chrétienne en slavon.¹⁶

A la lumière de la liturgie comparée, ce n'est donc pas le mardi au lieu du jeudi qui fait un problème. Au contraire, c'est la base la plus solide de toute l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert. À notre avis, le problème majeur est le dimanche qui est aussi, à côté du mardi, un jour pascal remontant à l'époque la plus haute de la liturgie chrétienne. Toutefois, avant de le regarder de plus près, nous nous attarderons sur un problème particulier dont la solution peut être trouvée grâce à la même méthode de liturgie comparée.

Qumrân ». *NTS* 7 (1960) : 1–30 ; « Les séances du Sanhédrin et les récits de la Passion ». *RHR* 166 (1964) : 143–69, et 167 (1965) : 1–33 ; « Une lecture du lavement des pieds au mardi / mercredi saint ». *Mus* 79 (1966) : 264–70 ; « Une discussion patristique sur la chronologie de la Passion ». *Recherches de science religieuse* 54 (1966) : 407–10 ; « Le mercredi où Jésus fut livré ». *NTS* 14 (1967) : 145–64 ; « Le mercredi de nouvel an chez les Yezidis ». *Biblica* 49 (1968) : 244–8 ; « Calendar of Qumran », 65, n. 17.

¹⁴ Ferreira Lages, M. « Étapes de l'évolution du carême à Jérusalem avant le V^e siècle. Essai d'analyse structurale ». *REÁ* n.s. 6 (1969) : 67–102, cité p. 92, n. 46.

¹⁵ Viaud, G. *La liturgie des Coptes d'Égypte*, 51–2. Paris, 1978. Le témoignage copte est plus important car les critiques de Mlle Jaubert indiquent la valeur prépondérante des sources syriaques dans ses dossiers patristiques (par ex., la revue de P. Skehan de *La date de la Cène*, dans *CBQ* 20 (1958), spéc. 195–6).

¹⁶ D'après une œuvre d'origine bulgare (XIII^e siècle environ) de genre des *erotapokriseis* appelée *Razoumnik*, la Cène a eu lieu le 20 mars, mardi, bien que, d'après toujours le même *Razoumnik*, le 22 mars, jeudi, c'est aussi une date de la Cène — nous sommes donc en présence d'une contamination des traditions diverses. Cet indice de la Cène le mardi a été éliminé de la recension postérieure du *Razoumnik*. Voir : Търкова-Займова, В., et А. Милтенова, *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и в средновековна България* [Таркова-Zaimova, V., and A. Miltenova, *Historico-apocalyptic literature in Byzantium and in Mediaeval Bulgaria*], 277–308, spéc. 293 (texte critique de la rec. I), 294 (variantes) ; cf. 298 (texte critique de la rec. II), 299 (variantes). Sofia, 1996.

1.3. ...et un petit problème de critique de texte :

Marc 14 : 12 // Luc 22 : 7

Les narrations de la Cène dans les synoptiques posent un problème de critique de texte dont la résolution apparaît souvent comme décisive pour comprendre si le repas de Jésus a été un repas pascal. D'un part, on ne dit rien de l'agneau pascal, mais, d'ailleurs, Marc (14 : 12) et Luc (22 : 7) utilisent la phrase « immoler (θύειν) la Pâque » terme exact du rite principal de la célébration pascalle. La solution la plus facile, c'est donc de ne pas considérer la Cène décrite dans les narrations synoptiques comme un repas pascal.

On pourrait alléguer plusieurs raisons en faveur de la solution contraire.¹⁷ Il faut constater que la réponse la plus sûre doit provenir d'un examen du système tout entier du calendrier des synoptiques. Mais pour le moment, notre but est plus modeste. Nous avons à évaluer si la phrase citée fait obstacle à l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert, comme le disent ses critiques.¹⁸

Mlle Jaubert elle-même était de l'avis que le sens de la phrase chez Marc et Luc sont effectivement contraire à l'interprétation de la Cène comme un repas pascal. Étant donné que cette phrase est absente chez Matthieu, Mlle Jaubert propose de la traiter comme une glose postérieure.¹⁹

C'était l'unique fois où Mlle Jaubert a recouru à une méthode aussi vulnérable forçant les textes. Sa lecture de la phrase discutée contredisant son hypothèse a entraîné le verdict de l'inauthenticité. Mais dans quelle mesure cette lecture peut-elle être tenue comme certaine, bien qu'étant d'ailleurs acceptée par tout le monde ? Que savons-nous maintenant du langage liturgique des évangélistes ? Est-il vraiment nécessaire d'interpréter le verbe θύειν au sens d' « immoler » ?

À vrai dire, nous ne savons rien de la terminologie liturgique des évangélistes, et surtout *a priori*. L'unique possibilité de la sonder, c'est l'extrapolation entre les sens « antérieur » et « postérieur » à l'usage néotestamentaire. Ce n'est pas la même chose qu'attribuer simplement aux termes évangéliques les sens qu'ils ont dans la *koine* grecque contemporaine ou même dans le grec des juifs hellénisés dont l'appartenance à une tradition liturgique proche à celle de la communauté de Jésus n'a jamais été

¹⁷ Cf., comme un exemple d'une exposée détaillée, avec une brève discussion de la thèse de Mlle Jaubert : Cantalamessa, R. *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza. Le tradizioni pasquali della Bibbia e della primitiva Chiesa*, 96–8. Torino, 1972.

¹⁸ Par exemple, Dockx, *Chronologies*, 24–5 ; Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte*, 83.

¹⁹ Jaubert, *Date de la Cène*, 107.

prouvée. L'extrapolation veut dire que nous avons *deux* champs sémantiques pour le sens d'un mot, l'un étant plus ancien (le grec de l'époque hellénistique, pour notre cas particulier) et l'autre postérieur (le grec de la liturgie chrétienne), et nous avons à trouver le point d'équilibre adéquat entre ces deux extrêmes valable dans notre cas.

En effet, la terminologie de la liturgie chrétienne, dont les témoins sont bien postérieurs aux évangiles, est toutefois très conservatrice, et personne ne saurait donc négliger la possibilité que le sens du verbe $\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ dans l'usage liturgique chrétien remonte à une époque aussi haute que le Nouveau Testament. Or, selon cet usage, le sens du sacrifice du pain eucharistique est normal déjà à l'époque préconstantienne.²⁰ L'« immolation » du sacrifice eucharistique, c'était une terminologie hiérosolymitaine bien établie, attestée dès le début du Ve siècle chez les auteurs de langue grecque,²¹ aussi bien que dans le rite arménien²² où le terme « sacrifice / immolation » ($\mu\upsilon\sigma\theta\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$, un calque de $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$) substitua, dans l'usage quotidien, tous les autres synonymes du mot « Eucharistie ». Nous voyons donc que le mot « $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ » était non seulement utilisable, mais encore d'un usage normatif pour désigner l'Eucharistie dans la terminologie hiérosolymitaine, du moins dès le IV^e siècle, mais un pareil usage a une origine plus ancienne. Bien entendu, cela ne suffit point pour établir que l'usage en question provient de l'époque du Nouveau Testament. Mais on ne saurait prouver le contraire, à savoir, que cet usage aussi enraciné à Jérusalem n'a pas été hérité de la communauté primitive de Jérusalem, c'est à dire, de la communauté de Jésus.

La lecture du verbe $\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ chez Marc et Luc au sens de « sacrifier du pain » est donc théoriquement possible. Il faut admettre que le sens des phrases correspondantes est à établir à partir de l'interprétation de la situation toute entière, et non *vice versa*. Si l'idée centrale de l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert est correcte, on obtient un argument sérieux en faveur d'une lecture du terme des évangélistes conformément à l'usage chrétien postérieur plutôt qu'à celui du monde hellénistique antérieur au Nouveau

²⁰ Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 661. Oxford, 1991, dans le sens 1b : par ex., dans les *Acta Andreae*.

²¹ Un bon dossier commençant par un auteur aussi « jérusalemitain » que St. Hésychius de Jérusalem chez Diekamp, F. *Hippolytus von Theben. Texte und Untersuchungen*, 103–4. Münster im Westf., 1898 ; à ajouter un *triodion* de St. André de la Crète (VII^e siècle) pour le mercredi saint (ode 9^e, tropaire 8^e) où l'Eucharistie est appelée « la Pâque immolée ».

²² Ce rite se base sur le rite jérusalemitain de la fin du IV^e siècle.

Testament. En bref, on ne doit pas se référer au mot $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ comme à une objection contre l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert, bien que l'explication de ce verbe proposée par Mlle Jaubert elle-même n'ait pas été entièrement convaincante.

2. LE PROBLEME MAJEUR DU DIMANCHE

L'approche de la liturgie comparée appliquée de façon systématique ne suffit pas à répondre à toutes les objections. Parfois elle soulève des questions nouvelles, qui, à leur tour, donnent du relief aux détails négligés du tableau. Tel est le cas des querelles pascales de la moitié du II^e siècle.²³

2.1. Les querelles pascales du II^e siècle vues dans le cadre de liturgie comparée : une source commune des deux traditions du calcul pascal ?

En effet, on avait, vers la moitié du II^e siècle, deux traditions sur la date de la Pâque chrétienne, dont chacune prétendait remonter à l'époque évangélique, — l'une de la Pâque quatorzéculaire et l'autre de la Pâque dominicale.²⁴ Personne jusqu'aujourd'hui n'a répondu d'une manière satisfaisante à la question de savoir laquelle des deux traditions est plus ancienne. Étant donné que l'histoire de la séparation entre les deux traditions avait été complètement oubliée vers les années 150, la séparation elle-même a eu lieu, au plus tard, vers le début du II^e siècle. Or, toutes les traditions chrétiennes concernant la célébration de la Pâque doivent avoir les racines communes dans la communauté chrétienne primitive de Jérusalem. S'il en est ainsi, d'où provient-elle, cette étrange séparation dans une coutume liturgique aussi fondamentale, et ceci à une époque assez haute à l'intérieur même du premier centenaire de l'existence de l'Église ? Et pourquoi un épisode d'une pareille importance est-il passé inaperçu ?

²³ Une édition très commode des sources principales traduites et commentées : Cantalamessa, R. *La Pasqua nella Chiesa antica*, 9–12. *Traditio christiana*, III. Torino, 1978. Cf. les exposés analytiques : Cantalamessa, *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza*, 116–37 ; Mosna, C. S. *Storia della Domenica dalle origini fino agli inizi del V secolo. Problema delle origini e sviluppo. Culto e riposo. Aspetti pastorali e liturgici*. *Analecta Gregoriana*, 170 ; *Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae* : sectio B, n. 28. Roma, 1969, spéc. 117 (status quaestionis).

²⁴ Il est maintenant évident que cette approche contient une simplification (qui, d'ailleurs, n'est pas importante ici) : il existait, dans le monde chrétien, plus d'une manière de calculer la date du 14 nisan.

Il n'existe qu'une seule réponse à cette question : le changement de la date pascale a été introduit inconsciemment, et cela par n'importe qui, au sein des Églises de l'Asie Mineure ou dans l'Église de Rome. Habituellement, on ne consie, aussi bien à l'époque ancienne que dans la science moderne, qu'une alternative : il n'y avait dans les querelles pascales du II^e siècle qu'un seul parti dont les prétentions étaient justifiées — soit l'Asie Mineure, soit Rome. L'un des deux a introduit un calcul nouveau de la date pascale. Mais ici, le *tertium quid* existe bel et bien : la troisième possibilité consiste en ce que les deux pratiques ont été postérieures à celle de la communauté primitive de Jérusalem. C'est d'ailleurs la possibilité la plus probable au point de vue de la liturgie comparée : la pratique primitive fut héritée par les communautés chrétiennes de l'Asie Mineure et de Rome, mais dans les régions diverses elle a subi des changements différents. Les deux pratiques dont nous avons des évidences historiques doivent donc avoir des traits de la pratique primitive commune à chacune. Tout est assez simple jusqu'ici. Mais comment faut-il imaginer une pratique commune aux deux traditions, c'est-à-dire une pratique où la nuit pascale du 14 au 15 nisan a toujours lieu du samedi au dimanche ?

Il y a quelques décennies, une pareille conception du calendrier aurait semblé assez bizarre pour que personne n'y prête attention. Mais aujourd'hui, à la lumière des données sur l'usage du calendrier de 364 jours dans les milieux chrétiens,²⁵ cette sorte de possibilité ne peut être négligée. Reformulons donc notre « troisième » hypothèse de travail :

— *les deux traditions du calcul pascal du II^e siècle découlent de l'unique source hiérosolymitaine où la nuit pascale du 14 au 15 nisan avait lieu chaque année du samedi au dimanche, ce qui n'est possible que dans le cas de l'usage d'un calendrier de 364 jours.*

L'hypothèse qu'on vient de proposer a ses cotés forts comme aussi ses points faibles. Par exemple, elle s'appuie sur le fait de l'existence d'un calendrier de 364 jours dans les traditions chrétiennes et surtout dans les usages jérusalemitains (jusqu'au Ve siècle). On voit même des traces des calculs pascaux qui présupposent la coïncidence des deux conditions, à savoir de l'année de 364 jours et du dimanche comme le jour suivant la nuit pascale.²⁶ En outre, du point de vue de la liturgie comparée, notre hypothèse de travail offre une explication très séduisante, du conflit pascal au

²⁵ Voir, après les travaux de Mlle Jaubert déjà cités, l'article du P. M. van Esbroeck dans le volume présent.

²⁶ M. van Esbroeck, dans le volume présent.

II^e siècle. À cette époque, le calendrier de 364 jours fut oublié en Asie Mineure et à Rome, ce qui donnait lieu à des changements différents de la tradition ancienne. Enfin, il y a une convergence entre l'hypothèse en question et l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert sur l'usage d'un calendrier de 364 jours par les évangélistes.

Mais ici les difficultés commencent. D'abord, la plus évidente : la nuit pascale, d'après l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert, n'est pas la nuit du samedi au dimanche, mais celle du mardi au mercredi. Il s'agit d'un calendrier de 364 jours, mais ce calendrier n'est apparemment pas le même. En second lieu, il faut poser la question, dans quelle mesure la célébration pascale fixée au dimanche est probable s'il s'agit de la communauté chrétienne primitive de Jérusalem.

2.2. La Pâque dominicale avant J.-C. ?

Est-il possible que dans le calendrier *juif* (pré-chrétien) de la communauté de Jésus la Pâque ait été fixée au dimanche, c'est-à-dire, que le jour de la semaine où tombe la résurrection de Jésus ait été déterminé par la tradition liturgique préexistante bien avant le fait de la résurrection lui-même ?

Théoriquement, c'est possible, car, dans les calendriers de 364 jours, les jours des fêtes sont habituellement mercredi, vendredi et dimanche. C'est Mlle Jaubert qui attira l'attention de chacun sur ce trait particulier,²⁷ et maintenant nous connaissons de façon assez détaillée un schéma liturgique analogue dans le calendrier du *Rouleau du Temple*. Il n'est pas nécessaire de discuter ici un problème délicat, à savoir lequel des deux modes de célébration chrétienne du dimanche est plus ancienne, l'hebdomadaire ou l'annuelle (pascale). Il nous suffit de connaître que, du moins, dans les calendriers de 364 jours, les dimanches avaient un caractère festal *plus d'une fois l'an*, et le dimanche suivant le dimanche pascal (deuxième dimanche après le 14 nisan) fut la fête importante de l'*omer*. Le dimanche pascal, c'est-à-dire le dimanche suivant la Pâque, a eu donc un caractère très spécial *et même festal* en tout cas (comme un point bien marqué de la période des azymes), ce qui doit être une position favorable au développement la Pâque dominicale. Répétons que nous sommes arrivés à cette conclusion sans présupposition quelconque sur l'origine de la célébration du dimanche hebdomadaire.

Le calendrier de 364 jours avec une Pâque dominicale est donc aussi possible au temps de Jésus que celui avec une Pâque le mercredi.

²⁷ Jaubert, *Date de la Cène*.

Il nous reste maintenant à élaborer, suivant la méthode de la liturgie comparée, un schème théorique du calendrier satisfaisant aux exigences de la *totalité* des données des traditions liturgiques, pas seulement de celles qui concernent la Cène pascale avant le mercredi. Il s'agit d'un schème de l'année liturgique de 364 jours dont la dissociation après son déplacement dans le cadre du calendrier de 365 jours pourrait aboutir à la formation de deux systèmes de calcul pascal, celui de l'Asie Mineure et celui de Rome. En même temps, ce schème doit présupposer la Pâque de mercredi. Le pas suivant sera la vérification de notre schème par des éléments de traditions liturgiques.

3. NOTRE HYPOTHESE PRINCIPALE :

UN CALENDRIER AVEC NISAN « ROMPU »

N'importe quel schème du calendrier de 364 jours contient quatre jours à part, qui n'appartiennent pas à la structure de 12 mois de 30 jours. D'après les schèmes classiques et les plus anciens de *1 Énoch* et des *Jubilés*, ces jours sont à ajouter aux derniers mois de chaque quart de l'année, en formant quatre mois de 31 jours au lieu de 30. Mais d'autres schèmes ne sont pas moins possibles. Les quatre jours peuvent être introduits au-dedans d'une semaine festive. D'après les données des traditions liturgiques chrétiennes et juives qui me sont connues, je ne puis supposer que deux schèmes de la sorte : celui de la Pâque et celui de la Pentecôte. Évidemment, c'est le premier que nous avons à discuter au premier lieu.

Il s'agit du schème du calendrier de 364 jours où le 14 nisan est mardi, mais le 15 nisan est dimanche, tandis que les quatre jours du mercredi au samedi sont les jours additionnels aux mois de 30 jours, et ces jours-là ne sont pas à compter parmi les jours de nisan. En anticipant les données de nos sources, nous nommons dès maintenant ces quatre jours « les jours de l'intervalle ». Il s'agit donc du schème de la semaine pascale, où :

12	nisan	dimanche
13	nisan	lundi
14	nisan	mardi
I ^{er}	jour de l'intervalle	mercredi
II ^{me}	jour de l'intervalle	jeudi
III ^{me}	jour de l'intervalle	vendredi
IV ^{me}	jour de l'intervalle	samedi
15	nisan	dimanche

Déplacé dans le cadre du calendrier de 365 jours, le schème qu'on vient de proposer pourra donner aussi bien la Pâque dominicale que la Pâque quatorzéculaire. D'ailleurs, ses débris devront conserver les traces de la Cène pascale la nuit suivant le mardi.

Il nous reste de vérifier l'existence de ce schème hypothétique par les évidences des traditions liturgiques.

Les questions auxquelles il y a lieu de répondre sont les deux suivantes :

1. y a-t-il, dans les traditions liturgiques, des traces de jours qui ne font pas partie du mois et qui sont placés au-dedans des semaines festales,
2. et plus spécialement, de la semaine pascale ?

4. L'ASSERTION « CES QUATRE JOURS QU'ON NE FAIT PAS ENTRER AU COMPTE DE L'ANNEE » (1 ÉN 75,1)²⁸ ET LE DESTIN POSTERIEUR DE CES QUATRE JOURS.

Pour la suite, nous choisirons l'ordre rétrospectif, à savoir, en commençant par un texte grec chrétien du IV^e siècle environ et quelques parallèles coptes et en remontant aux calendriers du monde juif pré-chrétien.

4.1. αἱ διαμέσου ἡμέραι : un terme de la Septante expliqué par une homélie ancienne

Dans une homélie pascale attribuée (à tort) à St. Jean Chrysostome, il y a un passage qui résiste aux efforts de traduction. Il s'agit de la « typologie » vétérotestamentaire relative aux jours de l'arrêt et de la passion de Jésus. La phrase est la suivante :

Τηρεῖται δὲ τὰς διαμέσους ἡμέρας, αἰνιττόμενον τῇ γραφῇ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ χρόνου μέχρι τοῦ πάθους ἐν τῇ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιδημίᾳ τοῦ

²⁸ Tout en utilisant la traduction d'A. Caquot, je dois noter que sa lecture de cette phrase n'a rien à voir avec les réalités astronomiques sous-entendues (Dupont-Sommer, A., et M. Philonenko, eds. *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires*, 559–60. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris, 1987, et la note (p. 559) au sujet de laquelle on consultera avec profit en dernier lieu, Albani, *Astronomie*, 178.

πάσχα, *καὶ τὴν σύλληψιν ἦν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως συλληφθεὶς ἐτηρεῖτο*.²⁹

L'éditeur a saisi la difficulté liée aux mots τὴ γραφῇ ἐν μέσῳ. C'est pourquoi sa traduction contient une lacune : « Il est « gardé » pendant les jours intermédiaires, laissant entendre... la captivité dans laquelle le Christ a été « gardé » captif chez le grand-prêtre ».³⁰ La traduction explicative de J. P. Audet, bien qu'elle soit plus détaillée, évite de la même manière de traduire ἐν μέσῳ : « Il (l'agneau) est gardé pendant les jours intermédiaires, τὰς διαμέσους ἡμέρας (du 10 au 14) : entendons, d'après l'Écriture, (les jours) qui remplirent jusqu'à la passion, le temps durant lequel attendait la victime (litt., « le corps ») destinée à la Pâque, et la captivité où il a été retenu chez le grand prêtre »³¹.

Tout le monde a perçu l'allusion à *Exode* 12 : 6, bien qu'elle ne soit pas une citation exacte. En effet, dans le texte biblique, il est dit : « vous la garderez (ἔσται ὑμῖν διατετηρημένον) jusqu'au quatorzième jour de ce mois, et toute l'assemblée de la communauté d'Israël l'égorgera au crépuscule », — tandis que dans l'homélie le mot est τηρεῖται. Il est plus difficile de localiser la source des mots ἐν μέσῳ.

Il s'agit d'un verset parallèle à celui d'*Ex.* 12 : 6, dont la phraséologie est la même dans le texte hébreu (ainsi que dans la plupart des traductions modernes), mais remarquablement distincte dans la Septante, *Lév.* 23 : 5 : « Le premier mois, le quatorze du mois, au crépuscule, c'est la Pâque du Seigneur ». « Au crépuscule », en hébreu, c'est toujours בֵּין הָעֶרְבָיִם, littéralement, « entre les (deux) soirs ». Le même idiôme est traduit, dans l'*Exode*, comme πρὸς ἑσπέραν (litt., « vers le soir »), et, dans le *Lévitique*, comme ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν (litt., « entre les soirs »). L'expression ἀνὰ μέσον qui se trouve dans la traduction de la Septante du *Lévitique* est tout-à-fait synonyme de celle de notre homélie, ἐν μέσῳ.

Nous avons donc, dans le passage discuté, une conflation de deux citations bibliques d'après la Septante, celle d'*Ex.* 12 : 6 avec celle de *Lév.* 23 : 5.

Après avoir reconnu la seconde citation, nous sommes en mesure de proposer une autre traduction pour le mot τὴ γραφῇ. On n'a pas désormais à l'éviter, comme Nautin, ni à le traduire « d'après l'Écriture », en forçant les

²⁹ Nautin, P., éd. et trad. *Homélies pascales. I. Une homélie inspirée du Traité sur la Pâque d'Hippolyte*, 151 (§ 21). SC, 27. Paris, 1950. L'italique en second lieu est le mien. Les mots entre les astérisques manquent dans certains mss.

³⁰ Nautin, *Homélies*, 150.

³¹ Audet, « Jésus », 379, n. 31.

normes syntactiques, comme Audet. On peut maintenant le comprendre dans le sens d' « une lecture du manuscrit », « un synonyme (écrit) choisi parmi les autres » ou bien, tout court, « un mot (graphique) ». ³² Il est donc temps de proposer une nouvelle traduction du passage entier. Nous essayerons de traduire de la manière la plus littérale possible :

« (Il est écrit qu') il (l'agneau) est “gardé” pendant les jours de l'intervalle, en s'exprimant d'une manière énigmatique par le mot “dans l'intervalle” (qu'il s'agit) du temps jusqu'à la passion durant la demeure pascalle de (son) corps, ³³ et la captivité dans laquelle il (le Christ) a été “gardé” captif chez le grand-prêtre ».

Le trait qui est le plus marquant dans le passage, c'est la compréhension de « l'intervalle ». Il est facile de voir, chez notre auteur anonyme, qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un point précis de la journée, le crépuscule, comme on devrait l'attendre en ayant pris conscience du sens de l'idiome hébreu correspondant. Ceci ne serait possible qu'à partir d'une compréhension trop littérale de l'expression du *Lévitique* dans la Septante, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν. Lue dans le sens littérale, cette expression nous renvoie à une période plus d'un jour. Or, il s'agit précisément, chez notre homéliste, de la période des quatre jours où on devait « garder » l'agneau pascal. Cette « typologie » de la « garde » de l'agneau pascal est appliquée, par notre auteur, aux jours depuis l'arrestation de Jésus jusqu'à la fin du séjour terrestre de sa chair, c'est-à-dire jusqu'à la résurrection qui est devenue la fin de la « demeure pascalle de son corps ». On peut ajouter, s'il en est besoin, qu'il est impossible de comprendre notre passage au sens du « demeure de l'arrestation jusqu'à la Passion ». En effet, la Passion a eu lieu le vendredi, et la demeure est nécessairement de quatre jours (d'après le précepte de l'*Exode*). Le début de la « demeure pascalle », ce qui est l'arrestation, devrait donc tomber le lundi au lieu du mercredi, ce qui ne correspondrait à aucune chronologie de la Passion attestée par les sources.

³² Cf. la valeur du « MS. reading » *s.v.* γραφή dans : Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a revised Supplement*, 360. Oxford, 1996 ; cf. la version la mieux mise à jour sur le site du projet « Perseus » :

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>.

³³ La phrase τῆ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιδημία τοῦ πάσχα est citée dans Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 521, *s.v.* ἐπιδημία, comme un exemple du sens « of Inc<arnation> either as *coming* or as *dwelling* ». Je comprendrais d'une manière plus littérale le sens de « demeure » comme celle du corps pendant la période pascalle plutôt que de l'Incarnation au sens large.

4.2. *Lév. 23 : 5 LXX* comme un fondement scripturaire

D'où a-t-il puisé, notre auteur (ou bien, plus vraisemblablement, sa source chrétienne), l'arrière-fond liturgique de sa « typologie » ? Pas nécessairement d'une source chrétienne plus ancienne, car une source juive n'est pas moins probable. Il s'agit de la relecture de *Lév. 23 : 5* dans les LXX (qui est un texte juif du III^e siècle av. J.-C. environ, bien que composé en grec) où la date pascale est comprise comme un *intervalle* entre les soirs divisés par quatre journées.

Les quatre journées placées à part, c'est un signe du calendrier de 364 jours. Il s'agit de « ces quatre jours qu'on ne fait pas entrer au compte de l'année » mentionnés déjà dans la description du calendrier juif de 364 jours le plus ancien, celui du *1 Énoch* (*1 Én* 75 : 1), dont l'origine est à trouver dans le prototype babylonien du calendrier juif en question, à savoir, dans le calendrier du MUL.APIN. Le sens astronomique de la séparation de ces quatre jours a été découvert par O. Neugebauer avant même que M. Albani ait pu contrôler ses conclusions par l'analyse du calendrier du MUL.APIN : « the epagomenal days [nos quatre jours] are « not counted in the computus of the year » since it would disturb the linearity of the scheme for the variation of the length of daylight ».³⁴

Dans les schèmes « classiques » du calendrier de 364 jours (comme, par exemple, ceux du *1 Énoch*, des *Jubilés*, du *Rouleau du Temple*), les quatre jours qui ne font pas partie des 12 mois avec 30 jours chacun, sont à ajouter à la fin de chacun des groupes de trois mois. Mais, au point de vue de l'astronomie ou de la mathématique, ils sont à introduire à n'importe quelle place de l'année. Une période d'un petit mois « épagomène » de quatre jours est donc une alternative qu'on n'a jamais à exclure. S'il est difficile d'imaginer cette alternative réalisée déjà au II^e siècle av. J.-C., à l'époque des calendriers de 364 jours les plus anciens et les plus connus aujourd'hui, il n'en est pas de même en ce qui concerne une époque plus récente, à partir du I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.

La phrase de *Lév. 23 : 5* concernant le jour de la Pâque a donc pu être lue dans le sens suivant : « Le premier mois, le quatorze du mois, entre les

³⁴ Neugebauer, O., transl. and comm., and M. Black, notes, *The « Astronomical » Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72 to 82)*, 11, cf. 20. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Matematisk-fysiske meddelelser, 40, 10. København, 1981. Cf., en outre, Albani, *Astronomie*, 178. Ce « scheme for the variation of the length of daylight » était un paramètre fort important du calendrier du *1 Énoch*, complètement ignoré avant Neugebauer. Il est d'ailleurs très babylonien, basé sur les 6 périodes de 60 jours, ce qui présupposait la durée de l'année de 360 jours.

soirs (séparés par quatre jours), c'est la Pâque du Seigneur ». C'est effectivement le sens impliqué par notre homéliste ou sa source chrétienne. La Pâque, ce n'est pas donc ici un jour unique, mais plutôt une période de six jours, ou bien, plus exactement et tenant compte du commandement fondamental de *PEx.* 12 : 42, c'est la « nuit » de la veille qui commence après le jour du mardi et finit avant le jour du dimanche. Toute cette période doit être comprise comme une nuit unique, précisément d'après la définition d'*Ex.* 12 : 42, où la fête de Pâque est définie comme une nuit.

Tel est le calendrier de la Passion impliqué chez notre homéliste anonyme. On voit qu'il correspond à tous les critères de notre hypothèse préliminaire : mardi et dimanche sont tous deux les jours pascals.

On voit maintenant que l'esquisse d'un calendrier que nous venons de tracer comme une hypothèse construite d'après les règles de la liturgie comparée, se trouve être utile pour expliquer un schème « typologique » (et en même temps, liturgique) de la Passion, attesté par un document réel, bien que pas très ancien. Il nous faut donc pousser davantage vers le monde juif contemporain des évangiles.

4.3. Valeur liturgique : les jours de הפנועים (11QP^s)

À côté de la valeur astronomique de nos quatre « jours d'intervalle », il faut prendre en considération leur valeur liturgique. S'il est vrai que tous les calendriers du monde juif étaient des calendriers liturgiques, le sens liturgique des jours qu'on a mis à part, ou selon notre hypothèse introduits, au-dedans de la semaine pascale, mérite l'attention la plus grande.

En ce qui concerne les calendriers de 364 jours « anciens » (dans lesquels ces jours-là ont été distribués à la fin des quarts de l'année), le caractère liturgique est attesté par un document de Qumrân. Il s'agit d'une notice prosaïque dans un psautier (11QP^s) où est indiqué le nombre total et les occasions liturgiques correspondantes de tous les hymnes composés par David. Dans cette liste, il n'y avait qu'un seul passage obscur : שיר על הפנועים — « odes des (ou pour les) פנועים ».

L'interprétation liturgique de cette place difficile fut proposée en 1966 par Shemaryahu Talmon³⁵ qui réagit contre la traduction accompagnant

³⁵ Talmon, Sh. « Extra-Canonical Psalms from Qumran — Psalm 151 ». Dans Idem, *The World of Qumran from Within. Collected Studies*, 244–72, 2 ill. Jerusalem/Leiden, 1989 [publié d'abord en hébreu dans : *Tarbiz* 35 (1966) : 214–34].

l'édition officielle du rouleau par James A. Sanders.³⁶ D'après Talmon, « We may reasonably assume that the four special songs for the פְּנוּעִים correspond to the « four leaders » of the four quarters of the year into which the Qumran calendar was subdivided »,³⁷ c'est-à-dire, aux prédécesseurs de nos « jours de l'intervalle ». En effet, il n'y avait, dans le calendrier qumrânien (ou, disons avec plus d'exactitude, *les* calendriers qumrâniens), pas de groupes de quatre jours si ce n'est le nôtre.

Il est à noter qu'à l'époque personne n'imaginait que les détails spécifiques à cette collection des psaumes peuvent monter à une tradition antérieure à Qumrân. Il n'en est pas de même aujourd'hui.

D'après les études récentes, le rouleau 11QP^s, est un psautier d'origine pré-qumrânienne, bien que copié à Qumrân. Sa structure correspond au calendrier de 364 jours. Enfin, ce qui est le plus important, ce n'est pas un psautier « sectaire », mais bel et bien celui d'un des « mainstreams » du judaïsme.³⁸ Ces conclusions sont applicables à notre notice qui n'est pas donc une invention qumrânienne. Et, en outre, les idées de Talmon concernant les quatre odes pour les quatre jours méritent d'être réexaminées dans un contexte plus large des traditions juives de l'époque du second Temple.

Talmon a indiqué que le terme פְּנוּעִים, dérivé de la racine פָּנַע (dont le sens littéral est « rencontrer »), « connotes “supplication”, “prayer”, or “entreaty” (cp. esp. Jer 7 : 16 ; 27 : 18 ; Gen 23 : 8 ; Isa 47 : 3 ; 53 : 12 ; Jer 36 : 25 ; Ruth 1 : 16) ». ³⁹ Le terme שִׁיר פְּנוּעִים dans la littérature rabbinique

³⁶ Sanders, J. A. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*, 92. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, 4. Oxford, 1965 : « music over the stricken ». Cette édition du rouleau n'est pas complète. Cf., pour la bibliographie postérieure, n. 38.

³⁷ Talmon, « Extra-Canonical Psalms », 246.

³⁸ J'ai résumé ici les conclusions de Flint, P. W. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 17. Leiden/New York/Köln, 1997. Cf. p. 201 : « Taking into account the distinction between *manuscripts* and *collections* [des psaumes], I now conclude that 11QP^s as a scroll was most likely copied at Qumran for the community's use. But this is not the case for 11QP^s as a collection : this Psalter was almost certainly compiled prior to the Qumran period and is representative of more widespread groups for whom the solar calendar was authoritative. It is increasingly apparent that such Jewish groups can no longer be viewed as sectarian — on the contrary, they constitute one or more genuine types of Judaism that were as much 'mainstream' as the Pharisees in the period before Rabbinic Judaism became normative ». Cf., en outre, p. 192–3, sur le calendrier de 364 jours dans 11QP^s.

³⁹ Talmon, « Extra-Canonical Psalms », 246–7.

signifie « invocations against demons and evil spirits ». ⁴⁰ Parmi les références de Talmon, c'est celle à *Is.* 53,12 qui mérite notre attention particulière. La voici : « ...parce qu'il s'est livré lui-même à la mort et qu'il a été compté parmi les criminels, alors qu'il portait le péché des multitudes et qu'il intercédait (יְפַיֵּן) pour les criminels ». Le texte de la Septante est ici distinct pour la fin du verset : ...καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη — « ...et qu'il a été livré lui-même pour leurs [sc., des multitudes] péchés ».

On sait bien que la prophétie messianique d'Isaïe 53 : 12 a été appliquée au Christ par les auteurs du Nouveau Testament. Marc 15 : 28 (vers omis dans une grande partie des manuscrits anciens) et Luc 22 : 37 citent les mots « il a été compté parmi les criminels » (Luc les mit dans la bouche de Jésus). On en peut ajouter, du milieu du judaïsme à l'aube de l'époque du Nouveau Testament, un verset des *Psaumes de Salomon* 16 : 5 (intitulé « hymne de Salomon. Pour le secours des saints » ; le texte subsistant en grec est la traduction de l'original hébreu perdu) : « Je te louerai, ô Dieu, car ton secours m'a sauvé, et tu ne m'as pas compté au nombre des pécheurs pour me perdre ». ⁴¹

Le reste du vers *Is.* 53,12 a été appliqué au Christ par *Rom* 8 : 32 et 34 : « Lui qui n'a pas épargné son propre Fils mais l'a livré pour nous tous... Le Christ Jésus, celui qui est mort, que dis-je ? ressuscité... qui intercède pour nous ». Le parallèle avec *Is.* 53 : 12 est tout clair. Cependant, il ne se limite pas à la partie commune des textes de la Septante et de la Bible hébraïque (« ...l'a livré pour nous tous... qui est mort... » ; cf. dans *Is.* 53 : 12 : « ...il s'est livré lui-même à la mort... il portait le péché des multitudes... »), mais s'étend plus loin : les mots « ...qui intercède pour nous » ne peuvent correspondre qu'à la fin du vers *Is.* 53 : 12 dans sa forme hébraïque : « ...il intercédait pour les criminels ». Rappelons, que le mot « criminels », bien que manquant chez Paul, figurait dans le même contexte d'une paraphrase d'*Is.* 53 : 12 chez Marc et Luc, étant donc un repère bien précis de l'exégèse chrétienne du I^{er} siècle. La ressemblance devient encore plus frappante lorsqu'on regarde de plus près la terminologie utilisée par l'auteur hébreu d'*Is.* 53 : 12 et l'auteur grecophone de *Rom* 8 : 34. Le terme grec pour « intercède », ἐντυγχάνει se trouve être un calque de יְפַיֵּן hébreu, avec le même sens littéraire « rencontrer ». Le même terme est appliqué au Christ dans le même sens en *Héb.* 7 : 25 et à l'Esprit-Saint dans la même *Épître aux Romains* un peu plus haut, dans 8 : 27 et 8 : 26 (en dernier lieu, la forme

⁴⁰ Ibid., 247, n. 12, avec les références aux deux Talmuds et aux *midrashim* sur les psaumes.

⁴¹ Trad. de P. Prigent dans : *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires*, 982.

utilisée est ὑπερευτυχάει) ; on ajoutera de même *Rom* 11 : 2 où le prophète Élie « intercède » auprès Dieu *contre* Israël.

Il est donc certain que le christianisme naissant a reçu de sa matrice juive une tradition spécifique de l'exégèse de la prophétie d'*Is* 53 : 12, en appliquant « l'intercession » dont parle ici Isaïe (en hébreu seulement) à la mort du Christ.

Dans le cadre de cette tradition exégétique il n'était que très raisonnable de nommer les jours de la passion « les jours d'intercession ». Or, ces « jours d'intercession », הפגועים, sont ceux que nous connaissons déjà dans la tradition juive grâce au rouleau *11QP^a* ! Ce sont précisément nos quatre jours intercalés dans le cours annuel de douze mois.

Nous avons déjà reconnu une tradition exégétique du judaïsme pré-chrétien partagée en même temps par les sources trouvées à Qumrân (bien que d'origine pré-qumrânienne : il s'agit du *Document de Damas* et de *4QFlorilegium*) et le christianisme naissant (*Act* 15 : 16). C'est l'explication messianique de la prophétie d'Amos sur le Tabernacle de David (*Am* 9 : 11).⁴² Dans le cas d'*Is* 53 : 12 nous avons une autre tradition de l'explication messianique où les auteurs du Nouveau Testament suivaient leurs prédécesseurs juifs à travers ce dont un document de Qumrân porte les traces à demi effacées.

Résumons notre hypothèse concernant « les jours d'intercession ».

Étape 1 (d'après Talmon) : « L'intercession » est devenue la valeur liturgique des quatre jours intercalés, — et cela s'accomplit à une époque assez haute, au plus tard, vers le temps de la formation de la *collection* témoinnée par le manuscrit *11QP^a*. **Étape 2** : Dans la lumière d'*Is* 53 : 12, cette « intercession » a été comprise comme un acte salutaire qu'on doit attendre du Messie — en même temps ou plus tard que l'étape 1. **Étape 3** : Une réforme du calendrier liturgique : les quatre jours dédiés à la commémoration de « l'intercession » messianique deviennent une partie de la célébration du mystère pascal, c'est-à-dire on remplace ces jours-là au-dedans de la semaine pascale — au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. environ. **Étape 4** : La Passion du Christ se réalise (ou, du moins, est lue par les auteurs du Nouveau Testament) strictement dans le cadre du calendrier liturgique établi à l'étape 3.

⁴² Brooke, G. J. *Exegesis at Qumran : 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series, 29. Sheffield, 1985 ; Nägele, S. *Laubbütte Davids und Wolkensohn. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Amos 9,11 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese*. AGJU, 24. Leiden/New York/Köln, 1995.

Ajoutons que toute cette hypothèse est élaborée dans le contexte d'une discussion d'une réalité liturgique, celle des « odes pour (les jours de) l'intercession ». C'est la liturgie la plus ancienne appropriée aux quatre jours intercalés, qui n'aurait su être ignorée par aucun développement liturgique postérieur.

4.4. Un chemin parallèle : « les jours de l'intervalle » dans le calendrier chrétien archaïque en Égypte

Les noms des jours de la semaine en copte sont normalement traditionnels pour la civilisation judéo-chrétienne : les nombres ordinaux de 2 à 6 plus les termes comme « paraskeué », « sabbat » et « kyriaké ». Mais ceci n'est pas tout. Le copte sahidique utilisait pour le jeudi les expressions synonymiques ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲱ « l'intervalle » et ⲛⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ « l'entre-deux », « dazwischen ». ⁴³ Cette dernière expression était le calque exact des expressions ἐν μέσῳ et ἀνά μέσον de la Septante. ⁴⁴ Ces noms du jeudi sont apparemment une trace d'un système plus compliqué où existaient encore des expressions comme ⲡⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲛⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲱ « le premier jour de l'intervalle » et ⲡⲙⲉⲗϢⲛⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲱ « le deuxième jour de l'intervalle ». ⁴⁵ Les dernières expressions ne sont connues que par trois papyrus thébains datés de 599, 610 et 621 après J.-C. Le nombre mentionné des jours de l'intervalle ne va jamais, dans ces papyrus, au-delà de deux. Un de ces papyrus permet de constater qu'il s'agit du 14 paôné (8 juin), le temps approximatif de la fête de la Pentecôte — d'où vient la conclusion de Crum et à sa suite de Till que le terme ⲟⲩⲱⲱ a pu être appliqué à une fête, ⁴⁶ probablement à la Pentecôte. ⁴⁷ En tout cas, à partir des trois papyrus, « It is to assume that the *ἡμέρας* days were the days of a moveable feast of two (or perhaps more) days which was of some importance in the popular life ». ⁴⁸

⁴³ Till, W. *Koptische Grammatik (Säidischer Dialekt)*, 88–89 (§ 180). Leipzig, ⁵1978.

⁴⁴ Cf. les exemples dans : Crum, W. E. *A Coptic Dictionary*, s. v., 191a. Oxford, 1939 [repr. 2000].

⁴⁵ W. Till a fini par les interpréter comme les noms pour le lundi et le mardi (Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, 88), mais cette conclusion n'a été qu'une pure hypothèse. Cf. ci-dessus sur les données des manuscrits eux-mêmes.

⁴⁶ Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 501b–502a, avec la référence au même papyrus daté de 14 paôné.

⁴⁷ Till, W. C. « A Coptic expression for “Pentecost” ? » Dans *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Enig Crum*, 215–8. Second Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute. Boston, Mass., 1950.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 217.

Il y a encore un indice précieux. Un des « jours de l'intervalle » est devenu le jeudi. Le plus probable est qu'il y ait eu une correspondance entre « les jours de l'intervalle » et certains jours de la semaine, y compris le jeudi. Il est donc bien probable que nous sommes en présence d'une trace du calendrier de 364 jours.

La place de la fête de la Pentecôte dans n'importe quel calendrier égyptien est *a priori* à mettre en parallèle avec la place de la Pâque dans n'importe quel calendrier non-égyptien. En effet, le jour de la Pâque est partout un des points tournants de quatre saisons et même un des deux points tournants des deux semestres de l'année. Mais l'année égyptienne n'a pas les quatre saisons et même les semestres non plus. Au lieu de tout cela, elle comporte *trois* saisons liées aux grandes crues de Nil. Dans un pareil système, la Pâque ne saurait retenir sa place d'un point tournant de l'année, tandis qu'un nouveau point tournant devrait se développer vers le temps de la fête de la Pentecôte. Un certain parallélisme entre la structure de la Pentecôte égyptienne et celle de la Pâque non-égyptienne est donc à prévoir.⁴⁹

Mais revenons aux « jours de l'intervalle » au milieu de la Pentecôte égyptienne.

Au point de vue de l'histoire de la liturgie, la première question qui s'impose, c'est la probabilité de l'existence d'une forme de la fête de la Pentecôte ayant une structure complexe, c'est-à-dire, contenant certains « jours de l'intervalle » au lieu d'un unique jour (dimanche) connu, par exemple, dans le rite éthiopien actuel.⁵⁰ Malgré que, dans certains rites chrétiens actuels, la fête de la Pentecôte comporte une semaine entière (telle est la situation dans le rite byzantin), la fin de la fête au lendemain du dimanche de la Pentecôte est une coutume ancienne. On le voit très clair

⁴⁹ Cf. des exposés plus détaillés : Coquin, R. « Les origines de l'Épiphanie en Égypte ». Dans Botte, B., et E. Melia etc., eds. *Noël — Épiphanie. Retour du Christ. Semaine liturgique de l'Institut Saint-Serge*, 139–70. Lex orandi, 40. Paris, 1967 ; Лурье, В. М. « Три типа раннехристианского календаря и одно разночтение в тексте *Epistula Apostolorum* » [Lourié, B. « Three types of the early Christian calendar and one various lecture within the text of the *Epistula Apostolorum* »]. Dans Afinogenov, D., and A. Muraviev, eds. *Traditions and Heritage of the Christian East. Proceedings of the International Conference*, 256–320. Moscow, 1996.

⁵⁰ Cf., par exemple : Fritsch, E., Zanetti, U., « Christian Calendar ». Dans Uhlig, S., ed. *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, Vol. I, 668–672. Wiesbaden, 2003, et Fritsch, E., « The Liturgical Year and the Lectionary of the Ethiopian Church ». *Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne* XII/2 (1999 [publ. 2001]) : 71–116, spéc. 110.

grâce à l'existence, dans tous les rites, des prières pénitentielles, avec les genuflexions, aux vêpres du dimanche⁵¹. Mais existent-ils des témoins d'une structure compliquée de la fête de la Pentecôte ?

La réponse doit être positive. Le témoin est bien connu, quoique, paradoxalement, il n'ait guère été analysé. C'est le *Livre de Tobit* 2 : 1–10 (également d'après la Septante, la recension S [celle du ms Sinaïtique] et dans un fragment araméen trouvé à Qumrân : *4QTob ar^a*).⁵²

4.5. Un paradoxe liturgique : « les fêtes tournées en deuil » et le *Livre de Tobit*

Le chapitre 2 de *Tob* commence par la scène du dîner préparé à la famille tout entière de Tobit au jour de « notre fête de la Pentecôte, c'est-à-dire la sainte fête des Semaines » (2 : 1 ; *4QTob ar^a* dit tout simplement : « on the festive day of Weeks »⁵³). Toutefois, « avant d'avoir touché » son dîner,

⁵¹ Rücker, A. « Die feierliche Kniebeugungszeremonie zu Pfingsten in den orientalischen Riten ». Dans *Heilige Überlieferung... dem Hw. Abt von Maria-Laach, Dr. I. Herwegen*, 193–211. Münster, 1938 ; spéc. pour le rite copte : Burmester, O.-H.-E. « The office of genuflexion on Whitesunday ». *Mus* 47 (1934) : 205–57 ; Renoux, Ch. *Un rite pénitentiel le jour de la Pentecôte ? L'office de la genuflexion dans la tradition arménienne*. Studien zur armenischen Geschichte, XII. Wien, 1973 (dans le rite arménien actuel l'office de la genuflexion a été déplacé des vêpres aux matins). Cf., sur la Pentecôte chrétienne en général, Cabié, R. *La Pentecôte. L'évolution de la cinquantaine pascale au cours des premiers siècles*. Bibliothèque de Liturgie. Paris, 1965.

⁵² Cf., sur le *status quaestionis* de l'histoire du texte de *Tob*, Moore, C. A. *Tobit. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible, 40A. New York etc., 1996. Les fragments qumrâniens du texte hébreu de *Tob* ne comportent pas le passage qui nous intéresse, et le texte grec GIII non plus. Le texte latin de la *Vulgate* de Jérôme est considéré comme postérieur, malgré qu'il se réclame d'une traduction de l'araméen. Il y a un *consensus* concernant la date approximative de *Tob* : plus tard que l'année 300 av. J.-C., probablement III^e ou II^e siècle. Il n'y a point de *consensus* concernant le lieu d'origine. On verra que nos observations sur le calendrier supportent plutôt l'opinion de Deselaers, d'après laquelle le *Tob* est d'origine égyptienne.

⁵³ Cit. d'après Moore, *Tobit*, 127. Pour le texte grec v. surtout : Hanhart, R. *Tobit*. Septuaginta VIII, 5. Göttingen, 1983. Cf. : idem, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, XVII. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wiss. in Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl., III. Folge, Nr. 139. Göttingen, 1984. La question de la priorité d'un des deux textes grecs de *Tob* existant pour le ch. 2 est très délicate, et on est loin d'un *consensus*. D'après Deselaers, P. *Das Buch Tobit. Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis,

Tobit a été forcé de toucher un cadavre pour le porter chez lui et, ensuite, « d'attendre le coucher du soleil pour l'enterrer » (2 : 4). Après cela, dit-il, « je pris un bain et je mangeai mon pain dans le deuil, en me souvenant de la parole du prophète Amos proférée contre Béthel : *Vos fêtes tourneront en deuil et tous vos chemins en lamentation* [*Am* 8 : 10]. Et je me mis à pleurer. Puis, quand le soleil fut couché, je partis, je creusai une fosse et je l'enterrai » (2 : 5–7). Ayant enterré le cadavre, Tobit « prit un bain » [second bain : ce détail n'a été mentionné que dans le texte GII] « cette nuit-là » et sortit dans sa cour pour coucher (2 : 9). Suit le récit de l'aveuglement de Tobit (2 : 9–10).

Le trait le plus marquant, est le littéralisme liturgique qui accompagne l'application de la prophétie eschatologique d'Amos. Quant à l'application d'*Am* 8 : 10 aux événements contemporains, il y en a un parallèle dans *1 Maccabées* 1 : 39⁵⁴ (et, peut-être, un autre dans *Lam* 1 : 4), mais sans aucune précision liturgique. Chez Tobit, au contraire, nous sommes en présence d'un « typikon » de la célébration d'une fête « tournée en deuil ». Qu'il s'agisse d'une justification d'un usage nouveau, et non d'une situation exceptionnelle, la citation d'Amos l'atteste, car elle prédit une *époque*, et non un cas particulier.

Le schème liturgique est suivant :

1. jeûne jusqu'au coucher du soleil (au lieu d'un festin à domicile en présence de toute la famille, présupposé par la cérémonie « régulière »),
2. bain rituel,
3. repas (au coucher du soleil) — en absence des membres de la famille, limité par du pain,
4. procession nocturne hors de la ville,⁵⁵
5. [bain rituel — d'après la recension du ms. S seulement⁵⁶],
6. sommeil — pour le reste de la nuit seulement [le rite entier est donc un rite de vigile].

43. Freiburg, 1982 [le même auteur a publié en outre un commentaire : Deselaers P., *erl. Das Buch Tobit. Geistliche Schriftlesung. Düsseldorf, 1990*], c'est le texte GI (celui de la plupart des mss) qui est le plus ancien. D'après R. Hanhart, le plus ancien, c'est GII (texte du ms S).

⁵⁴ Situation de Jérusalem dévasté sous Antioche Épiphane en 164 av. J.-C.

⁵⁵ La place de l'enterrement ne pouvait être qu'au-delà de la ville.

⁵⁶ Sans confirmation de la part de la *Vulgate* de Jérôme. C'est détail semble être superflu dans le cadre du rite décrit, une sorte d'hypercorrection de la part d'un éditeur qui a saisi qu'on doit prendre le bain après le contact avec un mort. Cf., cependant, le rite du lavement des pieds *après* la Cène...

Les scrutateurs de la théologie de *Tob* n'ont prêté aucune attention à ce schème. L'unique exception est l'ouvrage de J. van Goudoever.⁵⁷ Bien que son interprétation de l'idée centrale de ce récit peut être insuffisante,⁵⁸ il a laissé nombre d'observations très utiles. Nous allons essayer de les reprendre et pousser davantage.

Van Goudoever a saisi que la situation du banquet dans *Tob* 2 : 1 est encadrée dans une partie de l'année liturgique plus large, à savoir de la période entière entre la Pâque et la Pentecôte. Tobit ensevelissait les morts de sa nation et fut trahi par les habitants de Ninive. Le roi Sennachérib le fit rechercher pour le mettre à mort (*Tob* 1 : 17–20). Or, « il ne s'était pas écoulé 50 jours,⁵⁹ que Sennachérib fut tué par ses deux fils » (*Tob* 1 : 20). Tobit fut sauvé, et le festin au jour de la Pentecôte est devenu un banquet à l'occasion de son sauvetage et de la réunification de sa famille (*Tob* 2 : 1). À partir de ce point-là nous prolongerons la ligne tracée par van Goudoever.

La fête de la Pentecôte chez *Tob* est devenue une fête du salut. Or, la fête du salut par excellence, c'est la Pâque. La Pentecôte traditionnelle ne saurait jamais avoir un pareil sens. Toutefois, le parallélisme entre les deux fêtes chez *Tob* est assez profond. On voit même une figure du roi Sennachérib dont le rôle est comparable à celui du pharaon. L'histoire de Tobit et de Sennachérib est comme l'histoire de l'exode d'Égypte répétée à Ninive. Le salut de la main d'un roi impie se termine par une fête. Le salut de Tobit commence par une situation dangereuse qui a eu lieu aux jours de la Pâque — évidemment, en endeuillant la fête, — et se couronne au jour de la Pentecôte, qui est devenu endeuillé, à son tour !

Ce n'est pas tout. Dans les deux cas, à la Pâque et à la Pentecôte, le deuil a été causé par les morts, plus précisément, par la cérémonie de l'enterrement. Au premier coup d'œil, ce n'est que dans le christianisme

⁵⁷ van Goudoever, J. *Fêtes et calendriers bibliques*. Tr. de l'anglais par M.-L. Kerremans, 132–3. Théologie historique, 7. Paris, 1967.

⁵⁸ « L'auteur montre clairement que la Fête (en captivité) est changée en deuil » (van Goudoever, *Fêtes*, 133). Que le changement de la fête en deuil est ici le point central, c'est clair. Mais quel est le contexte historique d'une réforme aussi radicale de toute vie liturgique ? Qu'il n'ait rien de voir avec la captivité, c'est évident par la date de *Tob* (encore une matière délicate... mais la date avant l'année 300 av. J.-C. est à exclure ; cf. le résumé des recherches chez Moore, *Tobit*, 42).

⁵⁹ Texte GH : 40 jours. En tout cas, il s'agit d'une période un peu plus courte que 50 jours, bien que la lecture « 50 » semble être originale à van Goudoever et à moi-même.

qu'on pourrait en trouver des parallèles, à savoir, le Grand Sabbat avant la Pâque (le jour de l'ensevelissement du Christ) et le samedi avant le jour de la Pentecôte (qui est consacré à la commémoration des morts, ce qui est une coutume ancienne, mais peu étudiée). Le *Livre de Tobit* est donc un important témoin de l'existence d'un certain arrière-fond juif au-delà des liturgies chrétiennes de ces deux samedis. Mais il existe un parallèle plus proche dans une des traditions juives.

Chez les juifs *sefardim* en Syrie, la période préparatoire au *Yôm Kippour* présuppose, parmi les autres bonnes œuvres, la visite des cimetières, surtout les dimanches.⁶⁰ Rappelons, que, dans le calendrier de 364 jours, la Pentecôte tombait toujours le dimanche. Rappelons de même, dans les évangiles, la visite des femmes à la tombe de Jésus a aussi lieu le dimanche.

Il y a, dans une tradition juive pré-chrétienne, un autre témoin du deuil les jours mêmes de Pâque, aussitôt après le 13 nisan, pour « trois jours et trois nuits ». C'est *Esther* 3 : 12. Bien qu'il s'agissait, dans le cas, d'un *danger* de mort, pas du mort actuel, le jeûne d'Esther était tout-à-fait conforme aux coutumes juives concernant les rituels funéraires.⁶¹

Il y avait donc des traditions juives qui présupposaient des cérémonies funéraires aux jours-mêmes des fêtes de la Pâque et de la Pentecôte. Il y en a des parallèles dans les traditions chrétiennes, y compris dans la structure de la semaine pascale.

Il faut donc admettre que les « faits » mentionnés dans *Tob* concernant l'ensevelissement des morts aux jours de fête ne sont pas privés de valeur liturgique. Nous avons à les comprendre dans le cadre général d'un isomorphisme entre les structures internes des fêtes de la Pâque et de la

⁶⁰ Les traditions spécifiques aux *sefardim* sont normalement privées des sources écrites, mais elles sont devenues connues grâce aux interviews collectionnés chez Dobrinsky, H. C. *A Treasury of Sephardic Laws and Customs. The Ritual Practices of Syrian, Moroccan, Judeo-Spanish and Spanish and Portuguese Jews of North America*. Hoboken, NJ/ New York, 1986, spéc. 310.

⁶¹ Voir, pour les détails et la bibliographie actuelle, Collins, N. L. « Did Esther fast on the 15th Nisan ? An extended comment on *Esther* 3 : 12 ». *Revue biblique* 100 (1993) : 533–61, spéc. 535–6. L'auteur propose l'hypothèse d'après laquelle il y a, dans le livre d'*Esther* déjà dans sa forme la plus primitive, deux calendriers distincts. La date du 13 nisan a été donnée d'après celui du narrateur, mais, quant à Esther, elle ne jeûnait, selon son calendrier propre, que dès 11 à 13 nisan. En tout cas, les deux calendriers coexistaient, au point qu'il était possible de dater les jours de jeûne par les jours pascaux sans provoquer une « guerre de calendriers ».

Pentecôte, qui a eu lieu dans certains milieux juifs pré-chrétiens aussi bien que dans les milieux chrétiens.

La compréhension de la Pâque dans le Nouveau Testament, à son tour, a des traits communs avec la Pentecôte, et ces traits sont aussi attribuables à la matrice juive de la communauté chrétienne. Le sang de Jésus, nommé « le sang d'une alliance éternelle » dans *Héb* 13 : 20, a aussi son sens liturgique, ce qui est normal pour n'importe quel sang du sacrifice. La réponse du peuple « Que son sang soit sur nous et sur nos enfants ! » (*Mt* 27 : 25) sonne comme une partie d'un rituel de la Pentecôte modelé sur *Ex* 24 : 8 — aspersion du peuple par « le sang de l'Alliance ». ⁶² Cela justifiera davantage notre idée d'un parallélisme structurel entre les fêtes de la Pâque et de la Pentecôte.

On peut ajouter une identification formelle entre les deux fêtes, Pâque et Pentecôte, chez Tertullien, pour lequel les deux fêtes n'ont formé qu'une fête unique de 50 jours. ⁶³

Les structures internes des deux fêtes, Pâque et Pentecôte, sont devenues isomorphes dans les milieux juifs d'où proviennent ou à lesquelles remontent les traditions liturgiques connues par les sources aussi différentes que *Tob*, les rites chrétiens et les rites des *sefardim* de Syrie. Ce fait est tant plus marquant que la parenté entre les deux fêtes se répand sur un domaine des rites funéraires qui étaient toujours incompatibles avec la vraie notion de la fête dans le judaïsme rabbinique et d'après les normes du Pentateuque.

Il est bien possible que le rituel de la Pentecôte comportant une période de jeûne, décrit dans *Tob*, était pareil à celui de la Pâque. Le rituel de la Pâque présupposait aussi un jeûne aux jours de la fête, aussi bien d'après *Tob* que d'après les traditions chrétiennes, y compris celle de l'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne que nous avons déjà discutée. Le sens liturgique de deux premiers chapitres de *Tob* n'est donc qu'une justification légendaire d'une coutume qui contredisait toutes les traditions juives antérieures.

Le rituel de la cène pentecostale dans *Tob* est assez proche à celui de la Cène de Jésus. Qu'on compare :

⁶² Cf., pour une discussion dans le contexte des *targumim* et de la littérature rabbinique : Potin, J. *La fête juive de la Pentecôte. Étude des textes liturgiques*, t. I : Commentaire, 151–2, 213. *Lectio divina*, 65a. Paris, 1971.

⁶³ Tertullien, *De Baptismo*, 19 : « ...sed enim Hieremias [38 (31), 8 LXX] cum dicit : et congregabo illos ab extremis terrae in die festo, Paschae diem significat et Pentecostes, qui est proprie dies festus ». Voir une brève discussion de ce texte chez Лурье, « Три тина », 264, n. 20.

	<i>Tob</i>	La Cène de Jésus
1	absence des membres de la famille	personnes mentionnées ne sont que les hommes adultes ⁶⁴
2	jeûne jusqu'au coucher du soleil	aucune mention du repas avant la Cène
3	bain rituel	[bain rituel ⁶⁵]
4	du pain qui remplace de la viande	du pain qui remplace de la viande
5	procession nocturne hors de la ville	lavement des pieds
6	[bain rituel ⁶⁶]	procession nocturne hors de la ville

Nous savons d'ailleurs, grâce à Mlle Jaubert, que le modèle le plus proche de la Cène de Jésus, c'est le rite pascal d'après les *Jubilees*.⁶⁷ Or, on a noté que *Tob* contient, à son tour, un nombre de parallèles avec les *Jubilees* que personne n'a observé d'ailleurs.⁶⁸ Cette parenté avec les *Jubilees*, c'est encore une raison de ne pas traiter les éléments identiques indiqués dans la table ci-dessus comme une simple coïncidence.

⁶⁴ Jaubert, « Calendar of Qumran », 71 : « The Last Supper was a meal among men, without women and children. According to the book of Jubilees, the Passover must be eaten in the sanctuary by men twenty years of age and over (Jub 49,16ff.) ».

⁶⁵ Jaubert, « Calendar of Qumran », 70 : « To the words of Peter, "Lord, not my feet only but also my hands and my head" (Jn 13,9), Jesus responds, "He that has bathed does not need to wash, except for his feet ; he is entirely clean" (Jn 13,10). [Ici, dans la note 35, Mlle Jaubert attire notre attention sur le fait que la phrase concernant les pieds manque de plusieurs mss. ; d'ailleurs, Mlle Jaubert fait mention du baptême mandéen qui est toujours suivi par le lavement des pieds.] It would be inadequate, it seems to us, to see in the term *leloumenos* ("bathed") only an evocation of Christian baptism. In the Johannine presentation, the disciples have taken a bath before coming to the meal ». Ce bain rituel est un argument additionnel, dans le système de Mlle Jaubert, en faveur d'un caractère pascal de la Cène (cf. *Jn* 11 : 55 et 18 : 28).

⁶⁶ Cf. ci-dessus, note 56.

⁶⁷ Jaubert, « Calendar of Qumran », *passim* et surtout p. 71 (sur l'absence des femmes et des enfants et sur le sanctuaire comme la place du festin ; le dernier thème est non moins important dans le cadre des traditions chrétiennes sur la valeur de la chambre-haute de Sion comme le sanctuaire chrétien principal).

⁶⁸ Endres, J. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQ Monograph Series, 18. Washington, D.C., 1987, 95–7 (*Jub.* 27 : 1–12, Isaac persuadant Rebecca de laisser Jacob aller à Charran, et *Tob* 5 : 17–21 ; le fait a été observé d'abord par A. S. Hartom dans sa monographie en hébreu de 1969), plus spéc. 95–6 (parallélisme entre *Jub* 27 : 14–18 et *Tob* 5 : 20–22).

Nous sommes donc en position de tirer une conclusion valable pour notre propos initial, à savoir le calendrier des évangélistes. Il est maintenant possible de proposer une hypothèse qui peut avoir une certaine importance dans le contexte de l'argumentation cumulative en faveur de la date de la Pâque dans la communauté de Jésus.

4.6. Une Pentecôte égyptienne modélée sur la Pâque palestinienne ?

Étant donné qu'en Égypte, la Pâque n'était jamais un point tournant de l'année liturgique, il est fort probable que, dans la situation où les rites correspondants aux deux fêtes sont devenus très proches l'un à l'autre, les particularités du calendrier de la semaine pascale aient été déplacées à la semaine de la Pentecôte.

Les jours dits « de l'intervalle » qu'on rencontre en Égypte vers la période de la fête de la Pentecôte pourraient donc remonter au rituel de la Pentecôte décrite dans *Tob*, le livre de l'origine probablement égyptienne.

Le terme égyptien **ⲉⲃⲟⲩⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲩⲱ** est donc probablement un calque du grec διαμέσον ἡμέρα dans le même sens que dans notre homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Pâque.⁶⁹

5. CONCLUSION ET LES VOIES DE LA RECHERCHE FUTURE

Celui qui voudrait prouver l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert concernant la date de la Cène, ne doit que restituer le calendrier entier, c'est-à-dire, il doit proposer un schème expliquant la totalité des faits connus, y compris le

⁶⁹ Il nous reste à préciser encore un point intéressant, le « mécanisme » astronomique responsable pour le regroupement de nos quatre jours en l'unique « épagomène ». L'hypothèse de Collins, « Did Esther fast on the 15th Nisan ? » mérite d'être examinée dans ce contexte. D'après Collins, une source possible de la différence entre les calendriers, c'est la diversité des moyens d'observation de la nouvelle lune. On peut compter le début du nouveau mois soit du moment où le vieux croissant devient invisible, soit du moment où le nouveau croissant devient visible. Dans les régions de Babylonie, Égypte et Palestine cette différence peut compter de 33 à 84 heures. C'est effectivement la différence maximale de 84 heures qui est responsable, d'après Collins, pour la différence entre les deux calendriers d'*Esth*, 3 jours. Mais la même différence de 84 heures pourrait aboutir à la diversité de 4 jours, c'est-à-dire à un calendrier où le jour de la préparation de l'agneau pascal, le 10 nisan, coïncide avec le 14 nisan d'un autre calendrier. Une possibilité de réunir des pareils calendriers, c'est d'établir un « épagomène » de 4 jours dont le sens liturgique présuppose, entre autres, le symbolisme de la préparation de l'agneau.

développement plus récent des deux traditions du calcul pascal, celui de l'Asie Mineure et celui de Rome. Nous sommes encore loin de cela, bien que nous avons accompli le premier pas.

L'approche de la liturgie comparée est l'élément le plus important de notre étude. Notre hypothèse principale en provient. Dans le cadre d'une approche liturgique, il a été possible d'accumuler un nombre d'évidences négligées jusqu'aujourd'hui, comme nos sources mentionnant « les jours de l'intervalle » et comme les données liturgiques de *Tob*, ch. 1 et 2.

L'apparition des « jours de l'intervalle », qui étaient d'abord les jours de jeûne au milieu de la fête, ne peut être possible que dans le sillage d'un mouvement messianique. Les fêtes sont déjà « tournées en deuil », et il est temps de venir à la figure messianique d'*Is* 53 : 12 dont l'action salvifique doit être célébrée d'après la prescription de *Lév.* 23 : 5 lu à la manière de la Septante et comprise selon l'explication de notre pseudo-Chrysostome. Telle était d'ailleurs la matrice juive du christianisme dont nous disposons avec les références explicites à *Is* 53 : 12 et même (oserai-je le dire ?) d'une référence implicite à la lecture liturgique d'*Am* 8 : 10 (à travers une tradition pareille à celle de *Tob* 1–2) qui est la Cène de Jésus.

Une relecture liturgique de trois passages bibliques, Lév. 23 : 5 interprété dans la lumière d'Am 8 : 10 et justifié par Is. 53 : 12, — une relecture qui était d'ailleurs enracinée dans les traditions du monde juif pré-chrétien, tel est le fondement liturgique pré-chrétien du rite de la Cène de Jésus. — Et telle est, à mon tour, ma relecture de l'hypothèse de Mlle Jaubert.

L'hypothèse initiale de Mlle Jaubert, est maintenant, je l'espère, davantage encadrée et mieux étayée. Mais cela ne suffit pas encore pour l'accepter.

On ne saurait discuter une semaine de l'année, même s'il s'agit de la semaine pascale, tout en ignorant le reste de l'année liturgique. Ce qu'il nous faut proposer, c'est le schème de l'année liturgique tout entière, englobant toutes les données du calendrier qu'on trouve dans le Nouveau Testament. Si Dieu le veut, nous proposerons dans le futur une telle étude, et mieux que la tentative présente, cela sera un hommage à la hauteur de la mémoire de Mlle Annie Jaubert.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ Il m'est plus qu'agréable d'exprimer ma gratitude particulière au R. P. Michel van Esbroeck, s.j., pas seulement pour corriger mon français, mais, tout d'abord, pour me faire connaître le nom de Mlle Jaubert.

VESTED WITH ADAM'S GLORY: MOSES AS THE LUMINOUS COUNTERPART OF ADAM IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND IN THE MACARIAN HOMILIES

By *Andrei Orlov*

TWO LUMINARIES

In the group of the Dead Sea Scrolls fragments known under the title the *Words of the Luminaries* (4Q504),¹ the following passage about the glory of Adam in the Garden of Eden is found:

¹ On the *Words of Luminaries*, see: Baillet, M. "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, grotte 4; 'Les Paroles des Luminaries'." *Revue bibilique* 67 (1961): 195–250; idem, "Remarques sur l'édition des Paroles des Luminaires." *RevQ* 5 (1964): 23–42; idem, *Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482–520)*. Oxford, 1982; Glickler Chazon, E. "Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam): *A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications*. Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1991; idem, "4QDibHam: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1991–2): 447–55; idem, "'Dibre Hammêorot'; Prayer for the Sixth Day (4Q504 1–2 v–vi)." In Kiley M. *et al.*, eds. *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology*, 23–7. London, 1997; Evans, C. A. "Aspect of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels." Scott, J. M., ed. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Concepts*, 308–9. JSJSup, 56. Leiden, 1997; Falk, D. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 59–94. STDJ, 27. Leiden, 1988; García Martínez, F., and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. Leiden/New York/Köln, 1997. Vol. 2, 1008–19; Kuhn, K. G. "Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten." *RevQ* 4 (1963): 163–234; Nit-zan, B. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. STDJ, 12. Leiden, 1994; Olson, D. T. "Words of the Lights (4Q504–4Q506)." In Charlesworth, J. H., and H. W. L. Rietz, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation*,

... [...Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory (יִצְרָתָהּ בְּדְמוּת כְּבוֹד [כַּה]) [...] [...] the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge [...] [...] in the garden of Eden, which you had planted. You made [him] govern [...] [...] and so that he would walk in a glorious land... [...] [...] he kept. And you imposed on him not to tu[r]n away... [...] he is flesh, and to dust [...] ...²

Later in 4Q504, this tradition about Adam's former glory follows with a reference to the luminosity bestowed on another human body--the glorious face of Moses at his encounter with the Lord at Sinai:

... [...] Re]member, please, that all of us are your people. You have lifted us wonderfully [upon the wings of] eagles and you have brought us to you. And like the eagle which watches its nest, circles [over its chicks,] stretches its wings, takes one and carries it upon [its pinions] [...] we remain aloof and one does not count us among the nations. And [...] [...] You are in our midst, in the column of fire and in the cloud [...] [...] your [holly [...] walks in front of us, and your glory is in [our] midst (וּכְבוֹדָהּ בְּתוֹכֵנוּ) [...] [...] the face of Moses (פְּנֵי מֹשֶׁה), [your] serv[ant]...³

Two details are intriguing in these descriptions. First, the author of 4Q504 appears to be familiar with the lore about the glorious garments of Adam, the tradition according to which the first humans had luminous attire in Eden before their transgression.

Second, the author seems to draw parallels between the glory of Adam and the glory of Moses' face.⁴ The luminous face of the prophet might rep-

vol. 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers, 107–53. Tübingen/Louisville, KY, 1997; Puech, É. *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future*, 2 vols. Paris, 1993, vol. 2, 563–8.

² García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2, 1008–9.

³ Ibid.

⁴ On Moses traditions, see: Bloch, R. "Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition." In *Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung*, 95–171. Düsseldorf, 1963; Coats, G. W. *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God*. JSOTSup, 57. Sheffield, 1988; Collins, J. J., and M. Fishbane, eds. *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Albany, 1995; Fletcher-Louis, C. N. T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Tübingen, 1997; Fossum, J. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*, 90–4. Tübingen, 1985; idem, *The Image of the Invisible God*. NTOA, 30. Göttingen, 1995; Hafemann, S. J. "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey." *JSP* 7 (1990): 79–104; van der Horst, P. W. "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist." *JJS* 34 (1983): 21–9;

resent in this text an alternative to the lost luminosity of Adam and serve as a new symbol of God's glory once again manifested in the human body. It appears, therefore, that in *4Q504*, traditions about Adam's glory and Moses' glory are creatively juxtaposed with each other. Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the Qumran document does not allow one to grasp the full scope and intentions of the author(s) of *4Q504* in making such a juxtaposition. To understand this juxtaposition better, research must proceed to other sources where the association between the glory of Adam and Moses is more explicit. One such source includes the Macarian Homilies, where the author vividly accentuates this association. However, before our research proceeds to a detailed analysis of the Adam/Moses connection in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian homilies, a short introduction to the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian materials about the glorious garments of Adam and the glorious face of Moses is needed.

THE BACKGROUND: THE GARMENTS OF LIGHT

The Biblical passages found in Gen 1:26–27 and Gen 3:21 represent two pivotal starting points for the subsequent Jewish and Christian reflections on the glorious garments of Adam and Eve. Gen 1:26 describes the creation of human being(s) after the likeness (דְמוּת) of the image (צֶלֶם) of God. It is noteworthy that Gen 1:26–27 refers to the צֶלֶם (*tselem*) of Adam, the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.⁵

Jacobsen, H. *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*. Cambridge, 1983; Meeks, W. A. "Moses as God and King." In Neusner J., ed. *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Leiden, 1968; idem, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden, 1967; Orlov, A. "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition." *Seminar Papers* 39 (2000): 130–47; Schalit, A. *Untersuchungen zur Assumptio Mosis*. Leiden, 1989; Schultz, J. P. "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 61 (1970–71): 282–307; Tromp, J. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Leiden, 1993.

⁵ For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam, see: Aaron, D. H. "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam." *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997): 299–314; Brock, S. "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition." In *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*, 11–40. Eichstätter Beiträge, 4. Regensburg, 1982; De Conick, A. D., and J. Fossum, "Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas." *VC*, 45 (1991): 141; De Conick, A. D. *Seek to See Him: Ascent and*

What is particular interesting in Gen 1:26 is that Adam's *tselem* was created after God's own *tselem* (בצלִמֶנוּ) (literally "in our *tselem*"), being a luminous "imitation" of the glorious *tselem* of God. Some scholars argue that the likeness that Adam and God shared was not physicality — in the usual sense of having a body — but rather luminescence.⁶

The Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, also attest to the prelapsarian luminosity of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. The Biblical background for such traditions includes the passage from Gen 3:21, where "the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin and clothed them." The Targumic traditions, both Palestinian⁷ and Babylonian,⁸ read, instead of "garments of skin," "garments of glory." This Targumic interpretation is reinforced by Rabbinic sources. One of them is found in *Genesis Rabbah* 20:12, which says that the scroll of Rabbi Meir

Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas. SVC, 33. Leiden, 1996; Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. Philadelphia, 1955, vol. 5, 97; Gottstein, A. G. "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature." *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994): 171–95; Mürmelstein, B. "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928): 255; Staerk, W. *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen*, 11. Stuttgart/Berlin, 1938.

⁶ Aaron, "Shedding Light," 303.

⁷ In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 the following tradition can be found: "And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them." Maher, M., tr. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 29. The Aramaic Bible, 1B. Collegeville, 1992. Targum Neofiti on Gen 3:21 unveils the similar tradition: "And the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife *garments of glory* (לבושין דאוקר), for the skin of their flesh, and he clothed them." McNamara, M., tr. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*, 62–3. The Aramaic Bible: 1A. Collegeville, 1992; Díez Macho, A., ed. *Neophiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana*, 1.19. Madrid/Barcelona, 1968. The Fragmentary Targum on Gen 3:21 also uses the imagery of the glorious garments: "And He made: And the memra of the Lord God created for Adam and his wife *precious garments* (לבושין דיקר) [for] the skin of their flesh, and He clothed them." Klein, M. I. *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources*, 2 vols. The Aramaic Bible, 76. Rome, 1980, vol. 1, 46; vol. 2, 7.

⁸ Targum Onqelos on Gen 3:21 reads: "And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife *garments of honor for the skin of their flesh* (לבושין דיקר על משך בסרהון), and He clothed them." Grossfeld B., tr. *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*, 46. The Aramaic Bible, 6. Wilmington, 1988; Sperber, A., ed. *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, I.5. Leiden, 1959.

reads “garments of light” (כתנות אור) instead of “garments of skin” (כתנות עור): “In R. Meir’s Torah it was found written, ‘Garments of light: this refers to Adam’s garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top.’”⁹

It is usually understood that Gen 3:21 refers to God clothing Adam and Eve’s nakedness *after the Fall*. S. Brock, however, argues that sufficient evidence exists to suggest that there was another way of understanding the time reference of Gen 3:21. According to this alternative understanding the verbs are to be taken as pluperfects, referring to the status of Adam and Eve at their creation *before the Fall*.¹⁰

It is noteworthy that in the later Jewish and Samaritan sources, the story about Adam’s luminous garments is often mentioned in conjunction with Moses’ story. In these materials, Moses is often depicted as a luminous counterpart of Adam.

Jarl Fossum and April De Conick successfully demonstrated the importance of the Samaritan materials for understanding the connection between the “glories” of Adam and Moses. The Samaritan texts insist that when Moses ascended to Mount Sinai, he received the image of God which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden.¹¹ According to *Memar Marqa*, Moses was endowed with the identical glorious body as Adam.¹² *Memar Marqa* 5.4 says that:

He [Moses] was vested with the form which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden; and his face shone up to the day of his death.¹³

The Adam/Moses connection also looms large in the Rabbinic sources. Alon Goshen Gottstein stresses that “the luminescent quality of the image (*tselem*) is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials.”¹⁴

Deuteronomy Rabbah 11.3 offers an important witness to the Adam/Moses connection. It includes the following passage in which two “luminaries” argue about whose glory is the greatest:

⁹ Cf. Freedman, H., and M. Simon, tr. *Midrash Rabbah*, 10 vols. London, 1939, vol. 1, 171.

¹⁰ Brock, “Clothing Metaphors,” 14.

¹¹ Fossum, *Name of God*, 93; De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 159.

¹² Fossum, *Name of God*, 94.

¹³ Macdonald, J. *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah*, 209. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 83. Berlin, 1963.

¹⁴ Gottstein, “Body as Image,” 182.

Adam said to Moses: "I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God." Whence this? For it is said, "and God created man in his own image" (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: "I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me." Whence? For it is said: "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deut. 34,7).¹⁵

Goshen Gottstein draws attention to another significant midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4, in which Moses poses as Adam's luminous counterpart. The tradition says that

...in the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt... In the beginning: "and God created man in his image," and in the desert: "and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone."¹⁶

It is also remarkable that later Rabbinic materials often speak of the *luminosity of Adam's face*,¹⁷ the feature that might point to the influence of the Adam-Moses connection. Thus, as an example, in *Leviticus Rabbah* 20.2, the following passage is found:

Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the *brightness of his face!* Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind.¹⁸

Genesis Rabbah 11 also focuses, not on Adam's luminous garments, but rather on his glorious face:

Adam's glory did not abide the night with him. What is the proof? But Adam passeth not the night in glory (Ps. XLIX, 13). The Rabbis maintain: His glory abode with him, but at the termination of the Sabbath He

¹⁵ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. 7, 173.

¹⁶ Cf. Jellinek, A. *Bet ha-Midrash*, 6 vols. Jerusalem, 1967, vol. 3, 168.

¹⁷ According to Jewish sources, the image of God was reflected especially in the radiance of Adam's face. See: Fossum, *Name of God*, 94; Jervell, J. *Imago Dei*, 45. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, 76. Göttingen, 1960.

¹⁸ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. 4, 252.

deprived him of his splendor and expelled him from the Garden of Eden, as it is written, 'Thou changest *his countenance*, and sendest him away (Job XIV, 20).¹⁹

Despite the importance of these late Rabbinic passages linking the luminosity of Adam's body and Moses' face, the chronological boundaries of these examples are difficult to establish. Rabbinic attestations to the Adam/Moses connection are also very succinct and sometimes lack any systematic development.

Much more extensive expositions of the traditions about Moses as the heavenly counterpart of Adam can be found in the writings of the fourth century Christian author, the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius.

ADAM AND MOSES IN THE MACARIAN HOMILIES

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Adam/Moses "glory" typologies for the theological enterprise of the Macarian Homilies.²⁰ The symbolism of the divine light seems to stay at the center of the theological world of the Syrian father.²¹ Adam's luminosity in the Garden and Christ's luminosity at Mount Tabor serve for Pseudo-Macarius as important landmarks of the eschatological *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*. In dealing with these stories of the fall and the restoration of the divine light in human nature, the Macarian writings also employ another important traditional symbol of the manifestation of the divine glory in humans — Moses' luminous face. In his

¹⁹ Ibid., vol. 1, 81.

²⁰ This feature of the Macarian Homilies serves as additional proof of the close relationship between Pseudo-Macarius and the various Syriac developments in which the theme of Adam's garments plays an important theological role. S. Brock notes the extensive usage of "clothing" metaphors in the Syriac tradition. He shows that this imagery is closely connected with Adam Christology: "...the first Adam loses the robe of glory at the Fall; the second Adam puts on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the robe of glory..." Brock, "Clothing Metaphors," 16.

²¹ The traditions about the glorious garments of Adam and Eve were widespread in the Syriac sources. [For a detailed discussion of this subject, see: De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 157–72; Brock, "Clothing Metaphors," 11–38]. It is possible that the early Syrian authors gained access to such traditions through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible. The Macarian Homilies, which were connected with the Syrian milieu, demonstrate that their author was exposed to a great variety of the Jewish and Christian traditions about the luminous garments of the first humans.

employment of the Adam/Moses connection, the author of the Macarian Homilies reveals profound knowledge of the Jewish and Christian esoteric traditions about the glorious manifestations of Adam and Moses.

The story of Adam serves for the homilist as the starting point of his theology of the divine light. Thus, from the homily II.12²² the reader learns that “Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ’ εικόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God’s promise, the full heavenly inheritance” (II.12.1).²³ Further, another important passage in the same homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God’s glory in place of clothing (II.12.8).²⁴ The homily shows a certain continuity between Adam’s “very image itself” and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam’s nature, created after the image and likeness of God, and Adam’s “very image itself”; he speaks of them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author’s familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about the *tselem* of Adam — the luminous image of God’s glory according to which the first human being was created. The Macarian association of Adam’s garments and his creation after the luminous image of God points us again to the Qumran passage from *4Q504*, where Adam is depicted as the one who was “fashioned” in the image of God’s glory. It should be noted that besides this reference to “image,” both texts entertain several other parallels that

²² There are four Byzantine medieval collections of Macarian Homilies. Three of them have appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in Berthold, H., ed. *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)*, 2 vols. Berlin, 1973. Collection II appeared in Dörries, H., E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger, eds. *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*. PTS, 4. Berlin, 1964. Collection III appeared in Klostermann, E., and H. Berthold, eds. *Neue Homilien des Makarios/Simeon aus Typus III*. TU, 72. Berlin, 1961, and Desprez, V., ed. *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles*, vol. I: Homelies propres a la Collection III. SC, 275. Paris, 1980. In references to the Macarian homilies, the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate a Collection, and the following Arabic numerals will designate a specific homily and its subsections.

²³ Maloney, G. A., S. J., tr. *Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 97. New York, 1992. Dörries, Klostermann and Kroeger, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien*, 107–8.

²⁴ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 100.

reveal similarities between the Adamic story in the Macarian Homilies and the Adamic traditions at Qumran.

First, the Qumran Adamic account in 4Q504 8 is distinctive in that it connects Adam's glorious state²⁵ with his ability to exercise dominion²⁶ over the rest of creation. 4Q504 8 reads:

... [...Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory ... You made [him] govern [...] [...] and so that he would walk in a glorious land...²⁷

The Macarian writings also employ the same juxtaposition by linking Adam's glory with his capacity to exercise power over the created order by giving names to various things.²⁸ Homily II.12.6 says that:

...As long as the Word of God was with him, he [Adam] possessed everything. For the Word himself was his inheritance, his covering, and a glory that was his defense (Is 4:5). He was his teaching. For he taught him how to give names to all things: "Give this name of heaven, that the sun; this the moon; that earth; this a bird; that a beast; that a tree." As he was instructed, so he named them.²⁹

A second important detail that connects the Adamic tradition at Qumran with the Macarian writings is that the luminous image (*tsalem*) of Adam in the Macarian Homilies is termed as "the full heavenly inheritance."³⁰ In II.12.1, it is also associated with a very valuable estate:

...he lost the very image itself in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance (κληρονομία). Take the example of a coin bearing the image of the king. If it were mixed with a false alloy and lost its gold content, the image also would lose its value. Such, indeed, happened to Adam. A very great richness and inheritance

²⁵ Cf. 2 *Enoch* 30:11–12 (the longer recension): "And on the earth I assigned him to be a second angel, honored and great and glorious. And I assigned him to be a king, to reign on the earth, and to have my wisdom." Andersen, F. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." In *OTP*, vol. 1, 152.

²⁶ Glickler Chazon, E. "The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In Frishman, J., and L. Van Rompay, eds. *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays*, 15. *Traditio Exegetica Graeca*, 5. Lovain, 1997.

²⁷ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2, 1009.

²⁸ Cf. also Gen 1:26.

²⁹ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 99.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 97.

was prepared for him. It was as though there were *a large estate* and it possessed many sources of income. It had *a fruitful vineyard*; there were fertile fields, flocks, gold and silver. Such was the vessel of Adam before his disobedience like *a very valuable estate*.³¹

The terminology found in this Macarian passage seems to allude to the Qumran Adamic materials, which also refer to Adam's "inheritance." Thus, the Qumran Peshar on Psalms (4Q171) contains a reference to the inheritance of Adam (נְחֻלַּת אָדָם) which the Israelites will have in the future:

...those who have returned from the wilderness, who will live for a thousand generations, in salva[tio]n; for them there is all the inheritance of Adam (נְחֻלַּת אָדָם), and for their descendants for ever...³²

In previous studies, scholars³³ noted that this passage from 4Q171 seems to refer to an eschatological period characterized in part by a reversal of the Adamic curse and the restoration of the glory³⁴ of Adam.³⁵

It is important to note that the Macarian passage links the *inheritance* with the large estate which includes a *vineyard*. The reference to the vineyard is intriguing since in 4Q171 the term, the "inheritance" of Adam, is closely associated with the Temple³⁶ and the Temple mountain.³⁷

The foregoing analysis shows that the theme of Adam's heavenly garments plays an important role in the theological universe of the Macarian Homilies. The homilist, however, does not follow blindly these ancient tra-

³¹ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 97.

³² 4Q171 3:1–2. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1, 345.

³³ Wise, M. O. "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *RevQ* 15 (1991–92) 128.

³⁴ Cf. CD 3:20 "Those who remain steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam (וְכָל כְּבוֹד אָדָם) is for them." García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1, 555.

³⁵ M. Wise observes that this description in 4Q171 "jibes completely with the concept of כְּבוֹד אָדָם in CD." Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 128.

³⁶ On the identification of Eden with the Sanctuary, see: Brooke, G. J. "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, 285–99. Tübingen, 1999.

³⁷ 4Q171 3:11 "...they will inherit the high mountain of Isra[el and] delight [in his] holy [mou]ntain." García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1, 345.

ditions, but, incorporates them into the fabric of the Christian story. The Adamic narrative, therefore, represents an essential part of the Macarian “glory” Christology, where the lost luminous garment of the First Adam has to be restored by the glory of the Second Adam, Christ. The Second Adam thus must put on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the lost clothes of the divine light, which now has to be acquired by the believers at their resurrection.

However, in the Macarian writings this “glory” Christology is not simply confined to the Adam-Christ dichotomy but includes a third important element, namely, the story of Moses, whose glorious face serves as the *prototype* for the future glory of Christ at the Transfiguration.³⁸ The radiance of the patriarch’s face remains in the Macarian Homilies to be the mediator between the former glory of Adam lost in the Paradise and the future glory of Christ, which will eventually be manifested in the resurrected bodies of the saints. Thus, in Homily II.5.10–11, Macarius speaks about Moses’ glorious face as the prototype of the future glory:

...For the blessed Moses provided us with a *certain type* (τὸν τύπον) through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze. This type anticipates how in the resurrection of the just the body of the saints will be glorified with a glory which even now the souls of the saintly and faithful people are deemed worthy to possess within, in the indwelling of the inner man...³⁹

In his presentation of the shining appearance of Moses, the homilist, however, makes a clear distinction between the glory of Moses at Sinai and the glory of Christ at the Transfiguration. Moses’ glory is only a “prototype” of God’s “true” glory. Macarius’ understanding of Moses’ glory as the *prototype* (τύπος) or the *figure* of the “true glory” is observable, for example, in Homily II.47.1:

³⁸ Here again Macarius draws on the established Christian tradition which can be traced to Pauline writings (esp. 2 Cor 3), where the glory of Moses and the glory of Christ are interconnected.

³⁹ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 74; Dörries, Klostermann and Kroeger, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien*, 62. Homily II.5.11 repeats the same idea again: “In a double way, therefore, the blessed Moses shows us what glory true Christians will receive in the resurrection: namely, the glory of light and the spiritual delights of Spirit which even now they are deemed worthy to possess interiorly.” Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 74.

...The glory of Moses which he received on his countenance was a *figure of the true glory* (τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς δόξης). Just as the Jews were unable “to look steadfastly upon the face of Moses” (2 Cor 3:7), so now Christians receive that glory of light in their souls, and the darkness, not bearing the splendor of the light, is blinded and is put to fight.⁴⁰

Another feature of Moses’ glorification is that Moses’ luminous face was only “covered” with God’s glory in the same way as the luminous garments covered the body of the first humans. According to Macarius, Moses’ luminosity was not able to penetrate human nature and remove the inner garments of darkness bestowed by the devil on the human heart.⁴¹ In II.32.4, the Syrian father affirms that:

⁴⁰ Homily II.47.1. Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 232; Dörries, Klostermann and Kroeger, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien*, 304.

⁴¹ The Macarian motif of the garments of darkness bestowed by Satan on the first humans brings us to the connection between the Macarian Homilies and the Targumic traditions. It has been mentioned previously that the Syrian authors might have acquired their knowledge of the Jewish aggadic traditions about the luminosity of the garments of Adam and Eve via their familiarity with the Targumic texts. Some features of Adam’s story found in the Macarian Homilies point in this direction. For example, Homily II.1.7 tells that when “...Adam violated the command of God and obeyed the deceitful serpent he sold himself to the devil and that evil one put on Adam’s soul as his garment — that most beautiful creature that God had fashioned according to his own image.” [Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 41]. This motif of Adam being clothed with the evil one as his garment seems to allude to the Targumic tradition which attests to the fact that God made garments for Adam and Eve from the skin which the serpent had cast off. The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 tells that: “And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them.” [Maher, M., trad. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 29. The Aramaic Bible, 1B. Collegeville, 1992]. It seems, however, that the author of the Macarian Homilies substantially edits this Targumic tradition. In the Macarian Homilies, the garments of the devil become the attire of darkness in contrast to the Palestinian Targum, where they are depicted as the garments of light. On the garments of darkness, cf. also the Homily II.30.7: “In that day when Adam fell, God came walking in the garden. He wept, so to speak, seeing Adam and he said: ‘After such good things, what evils you have chosen! After such glory, what shame you now bear! What darkness are you now! What ugly form you are! What corruption! From such light, what darkness has covered you!’ When Adam fell and was dead in the eyes of God, the Creator wept over him. The angels, all the powers, the heavens, the earth and all creatures bewailed his death and fall. For they saw him, who had been given

...Moses, having been clothed in the flesh, was unable to enter into the heart and take away the sordid garments of darkness.⁴²

For Macarius, only the glory of Christ is able to remove the attire of darkness and “heal” the human heart. It is, therefore, observable that for the Syrian father the glory of Moses shows a greater typological affinity to the glory of Adam⁴³ than to the glory of Christ.

A decisive feature of the Macarian Homilies is that the homilist often emphasizes the connection between the luminosity of Adam’s heavenly attire lost in the Paradise and the luminosity of Moses’ face acquired on Mount Sinai. In the Macarian Homilies, the motif of Moses’ glorious face seems to serve as a sign of the partial restoration of the former glory of Adam,⁴⁴ the glorious garment of light in which Adam and Eve were clothed in the Garden of Eden before their transgression. Moses’ glorious face is, therefore, viewed by the homilist as the counterpart of the glorious garment of Adam. The conflation of the two “glories,” lost and acquired, is observable, for instance, in Homily II.12. After the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells how Adam lost his luminous status and “obeyed his darker side,” Macarius sets before the reader the example of Moses as the one who “had a glory shining on his countenance.”⁴⁵

to them as their king, now become a servant of an opposing and evil power. Therefore, darkness became the garment of his soul, a bitter and evil darkness, for he was made a subject of the prince of darkness.” Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 192–3.

⁴² Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 198.

⁴³ Cf. the Homily I.2.3.14: “I think that the glorified face of Moses was a type (τύπος) and teaching of the first Adam, formed by the hands of God, which death saw and was wounded by it, not being able to look on it, and fearing that its kingdom would be dissolved and destroyed — which, with the Lord, did in fact occur.” Golitzin, A. *The Macarian Homilies from Collection I*, 3 (forthcoming); Berthold, *Makarios/Simeon*, vol. 1, 9. I am thankful to Father Alexander Golitzin for letting me use here his forthcoming English translation of the Macarian Homilies from Collection I.

⁴⁴ Cf. the Homily I.2.3.14 “Now, I think that when the enemy saw the original glory of Adam on the face of Moses, he was wounded because [he understood that] his kingdom was going to be taken away.” Golitzin, *The Macarian Homilies*.

⁴⁵ “...Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food.” (II.12.14).

THE HEALING MOTIF

The employment of an Adam/Moses connection in the Qumran materials does not seem to be confined solely to 4Q504. There is another important document which appears to entertain a similar connection. In the Qumran fragment 4Q374, also known as the *Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition*,⁴⁶ the portentous clause can be found which connects Moses' shining countenance⁴⁷ at the Sinai encounter⁴⁸ with the motif of healing. The passage unveils the following tradition: "[But] he (Moses) had pity with [...] and when he let his face shine for them *for healing* (לְמַרְפָּא), they strengthened [their] hearts again..."⁴⁹

In this passage, as in 4Q504, God's glory is described to be manifested through Moses' shining face. It appears that the passage is related to the ongoing discussion about the luminosity of Moses and Adam. Here again, as in the case of 4Q504, the evidence found in the Macarian Homilies helps to clarify the possible connection.

Homily II.20 describes Christ as the true physician of human nature who can heal the human soul and adorn it with the *garments* of his grace. It is evident that the theme of healing is interwoven in the homily with the motif of the luminous garments. In unfolding this theme, the homilist, first,

Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 102; Dörries, Klostermann and Kroeger, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien*, 114.

⁴⁶ On 4Q374, see: Fletcher-Louis, C. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996): 236–52; Newsom, C. A. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition." In Dimant, D., and U. Rappaport, eds. *The Dead Sea Scroll: Forty Years of Research*, 40–52. STDJ, 10. Leiden, 1992. On Moses pseudepigrapha in the DSS, see: Strugnell, J. "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works." In Schiffman, L. H., ed. *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, 221–56. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series, 8. Sheffield, 1990.

⁴⁷ On the luminosity of Moses' face, see: Haran, M. "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29–35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4]." In *In the Shelter of Elyon*, 159–73. JSOT, 31. Sheffield, 1984; Propp, W. "The Skin of Moses' Face — Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ*, 49 (1987): 375–86.

⁴⁸ Crispin Fletcher-Louis rightly observes that there is ample evidence that the passage from 4Q374 was concerned with the revelation at Sinai. Cf. Fletcher-Louis, "4Q374: A Discourse," 238.

⁴⁹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2, 740–1.

retells the Gospel story about the woman who was *cured* of the blood flow by touching the *garment* of the Lord, and connects the motif of healing with the theme of the garments:

...and again just as the woman afflicted with an issue of blood believed truly and touched the hem of the garment of the Lord and immediately received a healing and the flow of the unclean fountain of blood dried up...⁵⁰

Following the story of the healed woman, Macarius proceeds to the examples of Adam and Moses. It is not a coincidence that in this homily, as in *4Q504*, Moses' name is mentioned in connection with the theme of healing. From Homily II.20.6, we learn that “indeed, Moses came, but he was unable to bring a perfect healing (ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη ἰασιν παντελῆ δοῦναι).”⁵¹ The conflation of Moses' figure with the healing motif in the Macarian Homilies is intriguing since it might indicate that the author of the Homilies draws on traditions similar to those that can be found in *4Q374*.⁵²

The affinities between the healing motif found in the Macarian Homilies and in *4Q374* include another important feature. Both texts interpret *healing* to be the *healing of the human heart*. The Qumran material says that after the healing through Moses' shining countenance the *hearts* of the Israelites were “strengthened” again.⁵³

The Homily II.20.7 also links the motif of healing with the theme of the curing (or cleansing) of the human heart. It says that “man could be healed only by the help of this medicine and thus could attain life by a cleansing of his heart by the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁴

It seems that in both excerpts (*4Q374* and Macarian), the luminosity of Moses' face plays an important role. Although the Macarian passage does

⁵⁰ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 151.

⁵¹ Ibid; Dörries, Klostermann and Kroeger, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien*, 190.

⁵² Cf. also the Homily I.2.12.7–9: “...the devil, by means of a tree and serpent, used jealousy and trickery to deceive Adam and Eve, and arranged [for them] to be thrown out of Paradise, and brought them down from their purity and glory to bitter passions and death, and subsequently, having received from them the whole human race [to be] under his power, caused [it] to stray into every sin and defiling passion... by his inexpressible wisdom, God, making provisions for humanity, send forth Moses the healer to redeem the People through the wood of his staff...therefore half of piety was set aright through Moses, and half of the passions *healed* (ἰάθη)...” Golitzin, *Macarian Homilies*, vol. 1, 24.

⁵³ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2, 741.

⁵⁴ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 152.

not directly refer to the shining face of Moses, the context of the passage, which deals with the garments of the Lord, indicates that in the Macarian Homilies the motif of “healing” is understood as the restoration of the former Adamic glory, the glorious garments with which the first humans were clothed in Eden before their transgression. The author of the Homilies seems to view Moses’ shining face as an important step in the process of the recovery of the former divine glory once manifested in humans during their life in Paradise. According to the homilist, the glory would be restored in humanity only later, in the event of the incarnation of Christ, which brings “perfect healing” to the wretched human nature. In this context, Moses’ shining face appears to be an important, even if not a “final,” step in the process of the healing of human nature.⁵⁵

An additional detail that connects Moses with Adam is that the homilist understands Adam’s deprivation of the luminosity as the *wound* which requires healing.⁵⁶ In II.20.1 and 20.4–5, Macarius links the loss of the external luminous attire by Adam with the internal wound. The homilist says that the human being who...

...is naked and *lacks the divine and heavenly garment*...is covered with the great shame of evil affections... since ... the enemy, when Adam fell, used such cunning and diligence that he wounded and *darkened the interior*

⁵⁵ It is noteworthy that Macarius again follows here the established tradition which connects the glory of Moses and the glory of Christ. The beginning of such a tradition can be found in 2 Cor 3:7–4:6. See: Fitzmyer, J. A., S. J., “Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7–4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif.” *JTS* 42 (1981): 630–44; Orlov, A., and A. Golitzin, “Many Lamps are Lightened from the One: Paradigms of the Transformation Vision in the Macarian Homilies.” *VC* 55 (2001): 281–98. The Synoptic accounts of Christ’s transfiguration seem to be also influenced by Moses typology. Several details in the accounts serve as important reminders of Mosaic tradition(s): the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration, see: McGuckin, J. A. *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition*, 1–19. *Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity*, 9. Lewiston, 1986; Markus, J. *The Way of the Lord*, 80–93. Louisville, 1992; Thrall, M. E. “Elijah and Moses in Mark’s Account of the Transfiguration.” *NTS* 16 (1969–70) 305–17.

⁵⁶ It should be noted that despite the fact that the motif of Adam’s luminous clothing is widespread in Aramaic and Syriac milieux, the conflation of this theme with the imagery of healing seem unique. See Brock, “Clothing Metaphors,” 11–40.

*man... man was, therefore, so wounded that no one else could cure him...*⁵⁷

Despite the extensive “usage” of Moses typology in the Macarian discussion of the Adamic “wound,” the whole purpose of this employment remains Christological. Here again Macarius uses Mosaic traditions as the mediative tool for his glory Christology.

Homily II.20 recounts that Moses’ “healing” was incomplete in comparison with the healing of Christ, since it was “external” and unable to heal the inner wound inflicted by Satan at the Fall. In II.32.4, Macarius sums up the Mosaic argument by saying that:

...Moses, having been clothed in the flesh, was unable to enter into the heart and take away the sordid garments of darkness.⁵⁸

Although Macarius tries to diminish the significance of Moses’ shining face in the process of healing the human heart, he still seems to draw heavily on the Jewish traditions similar to 4Q374, where Moses is depicted as the healer of the darkened human nature.⁵⁹

CONCLUSION

It should be noted in conclusion that the examination of the Adam-Moses connection in the Macarian Homilies and in the Qumran fragments might be mutually beneficial for a better understanding of both textual corpora.

First, the evidence of Adamic and Mosaic accounts found in the Macarian writings can extend the possible scope of the traditions which were preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls materials in a very fragmentary form. In light of the Macarian evidence, which provided an additional context for such traditions, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the passage from 4Q374 might speak about the healing power of Moses’ glorious face as healing the “wound” of Adam in the weak human nature. Therefore, in 4Q374, as well as in 4Q504, one might encounter a very early tradition depicting Moses as the glorious counterpart of Adam, the theme that later became a famous leitmotif in numerous Jewish and Christian materials. Although the Qumran passage about the healing in 4Q374 lacks any reference to Adam or to his glorious garments, its close affinities with the later

⁵⁷ Maloney, *Pseudo-Macarius*, 151.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 198.

⁵⁹ The Macarian Homilies, therefore, can be seen as a set of intense polemics with the Jewish developments.

Macarian evidence, where such connections are explicitly made, seem to clarify the proper meaning of the Qumran reference.

Second, it is also evident that both *4Q504* and *4Q374* can provide further insights for the background of the Adamic and Mosaic traditions in the Macarian Homilies. Despite their fragmentary character, these Qumran references about Adam and Moses help one see that the Macarian employment of the Mosaic traditions has in fact a strong polemical nature. The Syrian father seems to try to diminish the significance of Moses' "glorification" in the process of "healing" human nature, depicting it as the *external* covering unable to heal the inner wound caused by the Adamic transgression. However, the testimony to the Mosaic tradition found in *4Q374* demonstrates that the emphasis on the internal character of the healing was already made at Qumran, where Moses' luminosity was depicted as able to heal the human heart.

**THE USE OF EVIDENCE FROM PATRISTIC
AND LITURGICAL SOURCES
IN ANNIE JAUBERT'S
*THE DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER***

By Walter D. Ray

Annie Jaubert's insight that a calendar similar to that found in the *Book of Jubilees* was used in the early Church is both stunning and revolutionary. It has the potential of significantly altering the way we understand the early Christian landscape, a potential that has not yet been realized. Jaubert herself used her insight to approach a particular problem of exegesis, the divergence between the Synoptic Gospels and John over the date of the Last Supper.¹ In the Synoptics, the Last Supper is a Passover meal celebrated on Nisan 14; in John Jesus is crucified on Nisan 14, and hence could not have celebrated the Passover with his disciples. Jaubert thought that this discrepancy could be harmonized through recourse to the Jubilees calendar. The Last Supper, she argues, took place on 14 Nisan according to the Jubilees calendar, in which it always falls on a Tuesday, and this is remembered in the Synoptic account. The crucifixion took place on 14 Nisan in the "official" Jewish calendar, which fell on a Friday that year, a fact recorded by John. Jesus thus ate the Passover with his disciples according to the Jubilees calendar on Tuesday evening, after which he was arrested. His trials then stretched out over three days until Friday, when he was crucified. Jaubert finds support for her thesis in the Gospels and in the writings and liturgy of the early Christian period. In this paper we examine in particular her use of

¹ For a summary of the problem and Jaubert's solution see J. VanderKam, "Jaubert's Solution to the Passion Chronology," in the present volume.

evidence from patristic and liturgical sources. We will find that there is good reason to think that a Jubilees calendar was in use in some parts of the early Church, but that this fact is less helpful than Jaubert thought for solving the problem of the Passion chronology.

In *The Date of the Last Supper*,² Jaubert uses evidence from the post-apostolic period for two purposes: 1) to show that “there exists a *fundamental continuity between the Jewish fixed-day calendar* [i.e., the calendar of Jubilees] *and the Christian calendar*,”³ and 2) to argue that the early Jewish-Christian community commemorated the Last Supper on Tuesday evening/Wednesday following a liturgical tradition that preserved the memory of the historical events surrounding the death of Jesus. These two purposes serve her larger program of showing that the use of the Jubilees calendar can account for the differences in the Synoptic and Johannine chronologies of the Passion. Clearly, her argument is strengthened if it can be shown that early Christians did in fact use such a calendar. But the presence of a liturgical tradition of a Tuesday evening supper is even more crucial for her argument. First, evidence for such a tradition creates a difficulty, analogous to the exegetical problem, which can be solved by reference to a Jubilees calendar in which Passover always falls on a Wednesday.⁴ But more significant, if it can be shown that the liturgical tradition preserves the historical memory of the Passion, then the Gospel accounts of the Passion must be read in light of the tradition. “The essential question,” Jaubert asserts, is “Are the Gospel narratives opposed to the liturgical tradition?”⁵ It is for this reason that she presents the early Christian evidence before the Gospel evidence; her argument requires that the Gospels be read in light of the Jubilees calendar.

We will look at both parts of Jaubert’s argument from patristic and liturgical sources and at some additional evidence for the continued use of a Jubilees calendar in early Christianity. We will find that there is strong evidence for the early Christian use of a Jubilees-type calendar. The best evidence for this, however, is not the evidence Jaubert presents, which presupposes a view of the Jubilees calendar suited to her larger argument but

² Jaubert, A. *La date de la Cène: calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*. Études bibliques. Paris, 1957; translated into English by I. Rafferty as: Jaubert, A. *The Date of the Last Supper: The Biblical Calendar and Christian Liturgy*. Staten Island, NY, 1965. Citations are from the English translation.

³ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 65, Jaubert’s emphasis.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 81–2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 91.

not completely borne out by the facts. The best evidence for the Christian use of the Jubilees calendar comes from later Christian calendars and from the use in these calendars and elsewhere in early Christianity of the narrative pattern associated with the Jubilees calendar. Far from strengthening Jaubert's hypothesis, however, this evidence points to another interpretation of the evidence for a Tuesday celebration of the Last Supper, an interpretation suggested then rejected by Jaubert. Rather than preserving the memory of a historical fact, it is more likely that the tradition of a Tuesday supper came about as a result of a group "project[ing] onto the life of Jesus the rhythm of their own liturgical life... adapt[ing] the chronology of the passion to their concept of sacred history."⁶

1. JAUBERT'S EVIDENCE FOR THE CHRISTIAN USE OF THE JUBILEES CALENDAR

For Jaubert, the essential feature of the 364-day Jubilees calendar is that its feasts fall on fixed days of the week, Sunday, Wednesday or Friday.⁷ This contrasts with the official Jewish calendar which favors dates in the lunar months and thus allows its feasts to fall on different days of the week from year to year. Jaubert's favored term for the 364-day calendar is thus the "fixed-day calendar." The evidence she amasses for the continued use of this calendar in Christian circles consists of texts which seem to favor the days of the week favored by the Jubilees calendar. These include the *Didache*, with its prescribed Wednesday and Friday fasts, the apocryphal *Book of Adam and Eve*, which frequently notes the days of the week on which events occur — always Wednesday, Friday or Sunday, with an emphasis on Friday; certain chronological traditions which place Jesus' annunciation or birth on Wednesday, including an Armenian synaxarion, the *Armenian Book of the Childhood*, and Hyppolitus' *Commentary on Daniel*; and the majority Christian liturgical preference for celebrating Easter on the fixed day of Sunday rather than according to the lunar date as, for example, in Asia Minor. These bits of evidence are sufficient, Jaubert asserts "to prove an *undoubted continuity* between early Christianity and the Jewish circles who followed the old priestly [i. e., Jubilees] calendar."

The frequency of reference to Wednesday, Friday and Sunday in the texts Jaubert cites is suggestive, but less probative than Jaubert imagines. First, it is not at all clear that attention to these days of the week is an essen-

⁶ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 82.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 21, 52.

tial feature of the Jubilees calendar. The unit of the week is certainly important. One of the values of the 364-day calendar is that the year contains exactly fifty-two weeks and each quarter exactly thirteen. It is inevitable, then, that dates fall on the same day of the week in every year. The yearly festivals thus also fall on the same day of the week every year. The apparent goal of this calendrical arrangement as a whole is to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath (cf. Jub 50). That the festivals fall on Wednesday, Friday or Sunday is consequent upon and incidental to this desire and the way the calendar is constructed to meet it.⁸ The important thing, however, is not that the festivals fall on Wednesday, Friday or Sunday, but that they not fall on the Sabbath. That the festivals fall on these days certainly gives them a prominence that makes them potentially significant. It may also be that, as Jaubert suggests, these days were potentially significant because of their position within the weekly cycle as the days immediately preceding and following the Sabbath and the day in the precise middle of the week.⁹ But that they had not attained such significance for Jubilees is suggested by the fact that, apart from the Sabbath, the book does not mention any days of the week.

The implication that the association of narrative events with days of the week, such as we find in the *Book of Adam and Eve* or the traditions placing the Annunciation or Nativity on Wednesday or Sunday, shows continuity with the importance placed on these days in Jewish circles following the Jubilees calendar is especially misleading. That such a state of affairs would be useful for Jaubert's argument as she adduces a tradition which narrates the Passion using a weekly liturgical cycle is clear. But the facts will not sustain the implied continuity. It is true, as Jaubert notes, that in the *Book of Jubilees* the sacred story "is adapted to *the rhythm of a liturgical cycle*."¹⁰ The liturgical cycle to which the story is adapted, however, is not the weekly cycle, but the annual cycle of festivals. Narrative elements are attached to points in the annual cycle named not as days of the week but as dates of the month or names of the festivals.

⁸ Because the year begins on a Wednesday, the day of the sun's creation according to the Genesis account, the months begin on Wednesday, Friday or Sunday, and the yearly festivals, which tend to fall at the beginning or middle of the month, also fall on these days. That the year begins on Wednesday does not indicate a liturgical preference, however, but an exegetical preference for this day of the week.

⁹ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 39.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 30, Jaubert's emphasis.

Jubilees¹¹ weaves its basic narrative pattern onto the seasonal rhythm of planting and harvest, the rhythm of life which the yearly festivals also reflect. In this it follows the practice of the canonical Hebrew scriptures, e.g., in the Exodus account. But Jubilees extends the practice to other narratives, particularly those related to Abraham, and transposes them into its own distinctive dualistic world view. Thus, the Festival of Weeks, the beginning of the harvest season, is the time of promise-making (the promises to Abraham, the making of the Covenant [14:10, 15:1]) and fulfillment (the birth of Isaac, the reaffirmation of the Covenant [6:1–11, 16:7–18, 1:1–5; cf. 6:17]). The Festival of Booths, the end of the harvest season, is the time of thanksgiving for deliverance (Jub 16:20, cf. 32:7). The time of planting, the rainy season, is the period of danger, when malevolent angelic forces led by Prince Mastema deceive the people and lead them astray (Jub 11:11–18, 12:20–24). Passover is the time of deliverance, the defeat of the evil forces (Jub 18:12, cf. 48:12–17), which leads again to the fulfillment of the Festival of Weeks, the renewal of the Covenant, and the thanksgiving of the Festival of Booths.

It is only in the account of creation that narrative elements are attached specifically to days of the week, but this is a feature which Jubilees shares with, and accepts from, the canonical narrative of Genesis. It is as, if not more, likely that the Christian texts which Jaubert cites develop their practice of placing events on days of the week from the Genesis account as from Jubilees.¹² It appears, in fact, that apart from the account of creation, narration against the weekly cycle is a peculiarly Christian phenomenon. We do not find it at Qumran or, to the best of my knowledge, in rabbinic literature. These Jewish traditions, like Jubilees, prefer the annual cycle. The Christian practice of using the weekly cycle stems from references to days of the week in its own foundational narrative, the Passion of Christ, where we find the day of preparation (*paraskene*), the Sabbath, and especially, the first day of the week (cf. Jn 19:32, 20:1).

The impetus for narrating against the weekly cycle is even greater when these days of the Passion are juxtaposed with the days of the creation

¹¹ VanderKam, J. C., transl. *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO, 511. Louvain, 1989.

¹² It is, of course, likely that Genesis 1 comes from the priestly document. If Jaubert is right that the Jubilees calendar is the old priestly calendar, then, it could be argued that the priestly account of creation is an example of the priestly penchant for narrating against liturgical cycles. The Genesis narrative, however, serves as an etiology for the seven-day week, and in particular the observance of the seventh day, and Jubilees does not go beyond this.

narrative, as they are, not unexpectedly, in the *Book of Adam and Eve*, and also in the Armenian evidence that Jaubert adduces, as in the notice of January 6 in the thirteenth-century *Synaxarion of Ter Israel*.¹³

Thirty years later, on the same day, 6 January, a Sunday, Jesus came to the Jordan to be baptized by John. For he was born on a Thursday evening, just as Friday, the day of Adam's creation, was beginning. He was announced on a Wednesday and baptized on a Sunday, the day of creation and of his resurrection.

The Armenians, of course, celebrate Christ's birth and baptism on the same day, January 6. The two days assigned typological significance here are the Friday of Christ's birth (the day of Adam's creation) and the Sunday of his baptism (the day of creation and resurrection). The Thursday mentioned represents a liturgical fact. In the Epiphany liturgy taken over by the Armenian Church from Jerusalem the celebration of Christ's nativity begins with a vigil liturgy on the eve of the feast.¹⁴ The Wednesday of the Annunciation reflects a calendrical fact. On the Julian calendar, when January 6 is a Friday, April 6 of the previous year is a Wednesday. This calendrical observation bolsters the assertion of a Sunday baptism, for by the same Julian calendar (365-day year with leap-years every 4 years), the January 6 which comes thirty years after a January 6 on a Friday will fall on a Sunday. There is no necessary connection, therefore, between the narrative mention of these days and the world which produced the Jubilees calendar.¹⁵ Friday and

¹³ Cited by Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 58, emphases removed.

¹⁴ According to the Old Armenian Lectionary edited by Renoux, C. *Le Codex arménien Jérusalem 121*. PO, 36/2. Turnhout, 1971. The idea that Christ was born on a Friday may also have come from Jerusalem. According to ms. Jerusalem 121 of the Old Armenian Lectionary, January 8 is a Sunday, making January 6 a Friday. If this does not represent the circumstances in the year of the calendar's redaction — and its modern editor suggests that it does not — then it may represent an ideological value; cf. Renoux, *Codex*, 167.

¹⁵ The evidence for traces of a Jubilees calendar in an Armenian source presented by van Esbroeck, M. "Un court traité pseudo-basilien de mouvance aaronite conservé en arménien." *Mus* 100 (1987): 385–95, is susceptible to similar analysis. Like the notice in the 13th c. synaxarion, the treatise edited by van Esbroeck places the Annunciation to Mary on April 6, a Wednesday, and the birth of Christ 274 days later on the night from the 5th to the 6th of January, from Thursday to Friday. On the Julian calendar, van Esbroeck argues, the distance between April 6 and January 6 would be 275 days. On the Qumran calendar, on the other hand, while the exact interval is 273 days, it could be 274 days if we include the "jour d'arrivée." It is clear from the trea-

Sunday obtain their significance from the juxtaposition of the Christian story and the Genesis creation narrative, and the mention of Wednesday may be just coincidence.

One does wonder, however, why the author of this notice in the synaxarion might be inclined to mention Wednesday specifically, especially in light of other traditions which place Christ's birth on a Wednesday. The assertion in the Armenian *Book of the Childhood*¹⁶ that the Annunciation took place on Wednesday, Nisan 15 (i. e., on Pascha), may be, as Jaubert suggests, "an echo of the old priestly calendar," since in the official calendar Passover could never fall on a Wednesday and in the Jubilees calendar it always fell on a Wednesday.¹⁷ But it may also be the combination of the calendrical fact connected with a Friday Nativity observed above and a separate tradition placing the Annunciation on Passover. Similarly, the suggestion in Hippolytus' *Commentary on Daniel*¹⁸ of a Wednesday Nativity in connection with spring equinox, a coincidence of facts which might reflect a Jubilees calendar, might also simply reflect the author's interest in solar symbolism: Jesus was born (or conceived) on the day of the sun's creation, a fact ascertained from the canonical account of creation.¹⁹ These authors may simply have had no concern for the Rabbinic rules for dating Passover.

It is the association of narrative elements with Wednesday which will be of primary importance for Jaubert when she presents evidence for the tradition of a Tuesday evening Last Supper. The works cited by Jaubert place Jesus' arrest on Tuesday evening/Wednesday. Other writers, following Mat-

tise, however, that Ps.-Basil is consciously using the Julian calendar. For as we have noted, on the Julian calendar whenever April 6 falls on a Wednesday, January 6 in the following year is a Friday. According to the 364-day Qumran calendar, on the other hand, the dates of the month fall on the same days of the week every third month. A pregnancy of exactly nine months to the date, therefore, commences and concludes on the same day of the week. If the author had this calendar in view, Christ would have been born on a Wednesday, the same day as the Annunciation. As for the duration, for the purposes of the treatise the author only needs to extend Mary's pregnancy to the 5th of January, or 274 days, since Christ is born on the night from the 5th to the 6th. We can conclude nothing from this figure.

¹⁶ Cited by Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 59.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Cited by Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 59.

¹⁹ On the symbolic significance of Hippolytus' dating of Christ's birth see Talley, T. J. *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 90–1. New York, 1991.

thew 26:1–16, will connect the Wednesday fast with the plot to kill Jesus.²⁰ But what must be kept in mind is that for all these authors, the significance of Wednesday stems first from of the widespread Christian practice of weekly fasts on Wednesday and Friday already mentioned in *Didache* 8:1. This notice in the *Didache* constitutes some of Jaubert's strongest evidence for a connection between these liturgical days and the Jubilees calendar.

The practice of fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays as presented by the *Didache* is both clearly derived from Jewish practice and clearly opposed to the practice of official Judaism, which fasted on Mondays and Thursdays. Unlike the hypocrites (the Jews), the text says, Christians are to fast on Wednesday and Friday. The Christians, then, continue the same kind of practice, but on different days. *Didache's* choice of fast days, however, is not transparent. The selection of days in the official Jewish practice seems clear. Monday and Thursday are the days not adjacent to the Sabbath that are farthest apart. The choice of Friday in the Christian practice could be accounted for by a simple shift accompanying the shift of focus from the Sabbath to Sunday. But the choice of Wednesday cannot be explained so easily. One would expect Tuesday. There is some other factor at work other than *Didache's* stated desire to differ from the practice of "the hypocrites." It is possible that these days were selected because they already had some special significance in a Judaism opposed to "official" Judaism, such as the Judaism which followed the Jubilees calendar.

There is no reason, however, to think that these fast days also reflect a narrative of the Passion. While it is true that later authors account for the Wednesday and Friday fasts by reference to the Passion narrative, *Didache* does not. It is important to note that *Didache* does not assign any narrative significance to these days, or seek to justify their continued use in this way. There is no reason not to take the *Didache* at face value, that the Wednesday and Friday fasts arose in opposition to an existing Jewish practice, and thus not in response to an underlying narrative. In other words, for the *Didache* and the community it addresses the Wednesday and Friday fasts functioned primarily as group identity markers. It is entirely possible that these fast days already had this function before they were taken over into Christianity, and that the term "hypocrite" in *Didache* 8:1 is carried over from a pre-Christian intra-Jewish polemic.²¹

²⁰ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 89, cites Canonical Epistle 15 of Peter of Alexandria and Apostolic Constitutions 5.15.

²¹ If, as Niederwimmer, K. *The Didache, Hermeneia*, 131, n. 2. Minneapolis, 1998, suggests, this is not an allusion to Mt 6:16.

It may be, then, that days were selected that already had liturgical significance. But this liturgical significance did not depend upon a narrative substructure. Any narrative significance attached to these days would be a secondary feature and a later development. This is a significant blow to Jaubert's theory, one to which we will return when we consider her evidence for the tradition of a Tuesday Last Supper. *Didache* 8:1 does, however, provide at least a suggestion that something like the Jubilees calendar lies behind some early Christian practices, especially if we discount the narrative basis for its selection of fast days.

2. JAUBERT'S EVIDENCE FOR A TUESDAY SUPPER

Having demonstrated to her satisfaction continuity between the Jewish circles that followed the Jubilees calendar and early Christianity, Jaubert advances her argument along two fronts. First she presents the positive evidence for an early tradition that the Last Supper took place on Tuesday evening. For this her main evidence comes from the *Didascalia apostolorum*, which she seeks to bolster with certain passages from Epiphanius of Salamis, Victorinus of Pettau, and the *Book of Adam and Eve*. Then, negatively, she attempts to show the lack of early evidence for the tradition of a Thursday Last Supper, excluding, of course, the unanimous witness of the canonical Gospels, which she will deal with later.

Jaubert's primary witness, Chapter 21 of the *Didascalia*, is quite confusing, and Jaubert has done as good a job as anyone in disentangling the threads of tradition it contains. A Tuesday supper is mentioned three times in the chapter. The first is in a straight-forward chronology of the passion spoken by the apostles, the original purpose of which appears to be accounting for the three-days and three-nights of Jesus' burial, but which is now placed in relation to the Holy Week fast:²²

...Therefore it is not lawful for a believer to swear, neither by the sun nor by any of the other signs of heaven or the elements, nor to make mention with his mouth of the name of idols, nor to issue a curse out of his mouth, but blessing and psalms and (sayings from) the dominical and divine Scriptures, which are the foundation of the truth of our faith.

And especially in the days of the Pascha, in which all the believers who are in all the world fast as our Lord and teacher said when they asked him: "Why do John's disciples fast, and yours fast not? And He

²² Vööbus, A. *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac, II Chapters XI-XXVI*. CSCO, 407 (text), 408 (translation). Louvain, 1979.

answered and said to them: the sons of the bridechamber cannot fast, as long as the bridegroom is with them; but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then they shall fast in those days." Now by His actions, however, is He with us, but to sight He is remote, because He has ascended to the heights of heaven and sat at the right hand of His Father.

On this account, when you fast, pray and intercede for those who are lost, as we also did when our Savior suffered. Indeed, while He was yet with us before He suffered, as we were eating the Passover with Him, He said to us: "Today, in this night, one of you will betray me..."

Now this was on the fourth day of the week. Indeed, when we had eaten the Passover on the third day of the week in the evening, we went out to the Mount of Olives, and in the night they seized our Lord Jesus. And the next day, which was the fourth of the week, He remained in custody in the house of Caiaphas the high priest. And on the same day the chiefs of the people were assembled and took counsel against Him.

And on the next day again, which was the fifth of the week, they brought Him to Pilate the governor. And He remained again in custody with Pilate the night after the fifth day of the week. But when it dawned on the Friday, "they accused Him much" before Pilate. ...And they crucified Him on the same Friday. He suffered, then, at the sixth hour on Friday. And those hours wherein our Lord was crucified were reckoned a day. And afterwards, again, there was darkness for three hours, and it was reckoned a night. And again from the ninth hour until evening, three hours, (reckoned) a day. And afterwards again, the night of the Sabbath of the Passion.

The second occurs in direct discourse from Jesus who appears to the apostles and commands the Holy Week fast, making special reference to the Wednesday and Friday fasts:

...Fast thus from the second day of the week, six days entirely, until the night after the Sabbath, and it shall be reckoned to you as a week...

However, (fast) not according to the custom of the former people, but according to the new covenant which I have set up to you, that you may be fasting for them on the fourth day of the week, because on the fourth of the week they began to destroy their souls, and seized me. For the night after the third of the week is the fourth of the week, as it is written: "There was evening and there was morning, one day" [Gen. 1:5]. The evening therefore belongs to the following day—indeed, on the third of the week at even I ate my Pascha with you, and in the night they seized me. But fast for them again also on the Friday, because on it they crucified me, in the midst of the feast of their unleavened bread.

The last provides an etiology for the Holy Week fast, using the Johannine chronology with the crucifixion on the 14th of Nisan, but placing the paschal meal and Jesus' arrest on Tuesday evening. These diverging chronologies are reconciled by having the priests and elders advance the Passover by three days to Tuesday, 11 Nisan, in order to facilitate the arrest of Jesus:

Therefore it is required of you, brethren, in the days of Pascha, to follow closely with (all) diligence and to perform your fast with all care. And begin when your brethren who are of the people perform the Passover. For when our Lord and teacher ate the Passover with us, He was delivered up by Judas after that hour, and immediately we began to be grieved because He was taken from us. By the number of the moon, as we count according to the reckoning of the believing Hebrews, on the tenth of the moon, on the second day of the week, the priests and elders of the people assembled and came to the court of Caiaphas the high priest; and they devised to seize Jesus and kill Him; but they feared, and were saying: Not during the festival, lest the people be perturbed for everyone was hanging upon him, and they held him for a prophet on account of His miracles of healing which He did among them.

...But because of the crowds of all the people, from every town and from all the villages, who were coming up to the temple to perform the Passover in Jerusalem, the priests and elders devised and commanded and appointed that they should perform the festival immediately, that they might seize Him without disturbance. Indeed the people of Jerusalem were occupied with the sacrifice and the eating of the Passover. And moreover, all the people from without had not yet come, because they had deceived them as to the days. That they might be reproved before God of erring greatly in everything, therefore they anticipated the Passover by three days, and performed it on the eleventh of the moon, on the third day of the week...

And thus in the night when the fourth day of the week dawned, he (namely Judas) delivered up our Lord to them. But they gave the fee to Judas on the tenth of the month, on the second day of the week. On this account they were reckoned by God as though on the second day of the week (they had seized Him, because on the second day of the week) they had devised to seize Him and to kill Him. And they accomplished their wickedness on Friday...

On this account you shall fast in the days of the Pascha from the tenth, which is the second day of the week. And you shall be sustained by bread and salt and water, at the ninth hour, until the fifth day of the week. On the Friday, however, and on the Sabbath, fast entirely and taste nothing.

In Jaubert's estimation, the first two passages preserve originally independent witnesses to the tradition of a Tuesday supper which were collected and used by the editor of the *Didascalia*. The first constitutes "an organic whole, originally independent, inserted by the author to justify the [Holy Week] fasting law after its introduction."²³ The second passage also seeks to justify the Holy Week fast beginning on Monday. But it connects the Tuesday supper and arrest specifically with the weekly Wednesday fast. Since the Wednesday and Friday fasts are older than the Holy Week fast, Jaubert says, "the older of these two traditions must be the one which contains the three-day chronology of the passion."²⁴ The last passage begins from a different tradition which has no place for a Tuesday supper, and so the author has to invent an improbable story to reconcile it with the earlier passages.

Jaubert is almost certainly right that the tradition of the Tuesday supper and arrest attached first to the Wednesday fast before that of Holy Week. The connection between the Wednesday fast and Jesus' arrest which we find in the second passage cited above is clearly a development of the tradition reflected in *Didache* 8:1. It appears to be the author of the *Didascalia* himself who adapts this tradition to the Holy Week fast. The author presses Jesus' arrest into double duty, using it to justify not only the fast on Wednesday, but also the Tuesday of Holy Week by emphasizing that the supper actually took place on the third day of the week, alternating between Jewish and Greco-Roman reckonings of the beginning of the day. This alternation is especially evident in the first passage, calling into question the independence of its witness to the Tuesday supper tradition.

It is also probable that the tradition of Tuesday supper did not originate with the final redactor of the *Didascalia*. The author, accepting the Johannine chronology, finds it necessary in the last passage cited to explain how it came about that Jesus celebrated the Passover on Tuesday evening. At the same time, it is clear from the author's explanation of this Tuesday supper that he does not know or accept the tradition in which Passover necessarily falls on Wednesday, i.e., the Jubilees tradition. There are some indications that the author consciously rejects such a tradition. First there is the assertion that his community calculates "by the number of the moon, as we count according to the reckoning of the believing Hebrews." Then there is the polemic against swearing in particular by the sun at the beginning of

²³ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 75.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 76.

the chapter. It is possible that in his explanation of the Tuesday supper the author knowingly masks the origin of the tradition he cites for his Passion week chronology.

Jaubert seeks to enlist Epiphanius of Salamis, Victorinus of Pettau and the *Book of Adam and Eve* as independent witnesses to the tradition contained in the *Didascalia*. Epiphanius in his *Panarion* 50–51, *De fide* 22, and a fragment published by Karl Holl,²⁵ knows of the *Didascalia* and follows its chronology, including the Tuesday evening supper and arrest, which he connects with the Wednesday fast. In fact, he appears to defend the Tuesday tradition against the tradition of a Thursday supper. This suggests, Jaubert says, that the Wednesday tradition is the one current in Epiphanius' circle, and thus not just a repetition of the *Didascalia*.²⁶ But it may also indicate that Epiphanius accepts the apostolic authority of the *Didascalia*, which he certainly did. It is true that Epiphanius is of Palestinian origin, which for Jaubert suggests that he should be close to the original tradition of the supper. But as we shall see, it is also in Palestine where we first find the practice of commemorating a Thursday supper, which might suggest that this latter practice is closest to the original tradition.

Victorinus of Pettau (d. 304) in a passage in *De fabrica mundi* also connects Jesus arrest with the practice of fasting on Wednesday. Jaubert's main interest in Victorinus is that he betrays "no trace of the influence of the *Didascalia*" thus making him a witness to an "absolutely independent tradition."²⁷ But the lack of direct use of the *Didascalia* is not a certain indicator of the lack of knowledge of the work. As the witness of Epiphanius shows, the *Didascalia* was widely known and respected as authoritative. Already by the end of the fourth century there was a Latin translation which was as close to the original Greek as the Syriac.

Finally, the assertion of the *Book of Adam and Eve* that Adam's Wednesday and Friday fasts foreshadowed the sufferings of Christ is not specific enough to make it a certain witness to this tradition. The connection of the Wednesday and Friday fasts with the Passion was widespread, though accomplished in different ways. The evidence of these last three sources, then, is not sufficient to establish a tradition of a Tuesday evening supper independent of the *Didascalia*. We are left, then, with the internal

²⁵ Holl, K. "Ein Bruchstück aus einem bisher unbekanntem Brief des Epiphanius." *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* 2 (1927): 205–6; cf. Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 69–78.

²⁶ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 78.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 78–9.

criticism of *Didascalia* 21 to determine the merits of this tradition. Thus, even if we accept that this tradition did not originate with the *Didascalia*, we cannot trace it back much beyond the end of the second century.

Jaubert also tentatively adduces a piece of liturgical evidence: Egeria's description of Holy Week in Jerusalem. She thinks that the station for Tuesday of Great Week in both Egeria and the Armenian Lectionary, the Mount of Olives, and the reading of Proverbs 9:1–11 (“Wisdom has built her house...”) out of the order established by Monday's and Wednesday's readings might be survivals of a commemoration of the Last Supper. In Egeria, the gathering at the Mount of Olives takes place at night, after the dismissal from the service in the Anastasis.²⁸ But Renoux has argued that the Proverbs reading fits well with the Genesis reading which precedes it (Gen 6:9–9:17, Noah and the Ark).²⁹ A better fit is with the Gospel, Matthew 24:1–26:2, Jesus' instructions to his disciples on the Mount of Olives, which also explains the station. It is only in Mark and Luke that Jesus and his disciples go out to the Mount of Olives after the Last Supper; in Matthew, Jerusalem's preferred gospel, the place is called Gethsemane. For the Jerusalem church, the Mount of Olives is above all the place of Jesus' teaching (=Wisdom). The station there on Great Tuesday is an example of the process of historicization at work in the Jerusalem liturgy, as is probably the practice of commemorating the Last Supper on Thursday.³⁰ It is here, in fact, in Jerusalem, that we find the first evidence of an actual commemoration of the Last Supper. If there were at one time a commemoration of the Last Supper on Tuesday in Jerusalem, this process has left no trace of it.

²⁸ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 84, 161, n. 7; cf. Egeria, *Peregrinatio*, 33, in Maraval, P., ed. *Égérie. Journal de voyage*. SC, 296. Paris, 1984. Jaubert mistranslates *missa* as Mass in 33.2. It should be dismissal; there is no eucharistic service on the Mount of Olives or at any other station during the first three days of Holy Week.

²⁹ Renoux, *Codex*, 263, n. XXXVI.2.

³⁰ It is true that on Great Thursday, after the station at Zion, there is a station at the Mount of Olives for the evening office and the vigil. But this station follows “immediately,” the rubrics say, after the reading at Zion of Mark 14:1–26, which ends with “and having given thanks, they went out to the Mount of Olives” (translation from Renoux, *Codex*, 269). At the Mount of Olives the gospel reading at the end of the vigil is Jn 13:16–18:1, again a discourse with the disciples. For the reading of the Matthean account of the arrest, the church “went down from the Mount of Olives to Gethsemane” (Renoux, *Codex*, 275). From there they went to the court of the High Priest for the reading of Matthew's account of Peter's denial, further marks of historicization based on the Matthean narrative.

On the negative side, Jaubert tries to show the late development in patristic sources and liturgy of a tradition which placed the Last Supper on Thursday. She notes that the earliest kerygmatic or semi-creedal formula for fixing the time of the supper, 1 Cor 11:23–24: “The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed (*en te nukti he paredideto*)...” It was this formula which was preserved in the earliest eucharistic prayers: Apostolic Tradition and those prayers dependent on it, the Syriac Testament of our Lord and Apostolic Constitutions 8. This is the standard formula of the Eastern anaphoras. The Roman Canon has “the day before he suffered” (*pridie quam pateretur*). It is significant, Jaubert says, that the formula is not “on the day before his death,” which, she says, “would have been the normal formula if the liturgy had followed a Thursday tradition” (84). What this analysis fails to take into account, however, are the rich theological connotations of *paradidonai* and *paschein* in connection with the story of Jesus. *Paradinonai* refers to much more than Jesus’ arrest; it is virtually a synonym for the whole Passion.³¹ And it is suffering, the Passion, rather than precisely death, which is highlighted in the early writers and in the Nicene creed. In fact, all the writers Jaubert cites as placing Jesus’ death the day after the Last Supper — Irenaeus, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Clement of Alexandria — use precisely the term “suffering” as a synonym for death. The liturgical formulae reflect these theological resonances and tell us nothing about the chronological relationship of the supper to the crucifixion.

Jaubert tries to demonstrate from the writings of Irenaeus, Apollinaris of Hierapolis and Clement of Alexandria that the earliest evidence for a Thursday evening supper appears around 165.³² This evidence emerges, as Jaubert notes, in connection with a debate about the discrepancy between the Johannine and Synoptic chronologies. For Jaubert this means that “it is clearly a question of *deduction, not of tradition*.”³³ It should be noted, however, that this second-century debate is not about the date of the Last Supper, but about the character of the Supper and the date of the crucifixion. All sides agree that the Supper took place on the eve of the crucifixion. This fact is not at issue because it is a part of their tradition from the time of the Gospels. There is nothing to indicate that it is a new discovery. Jaubert thus overstates

³¹ Cf. Perrin, N. “The Use of (*para*)*didonai* in Connection with the Passion of Jesus in the New Testament.” In Burchard, C., and B. Schaller, eds. *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern*, 204–12. Göttingen, 1970.

³² Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 85–9.

³³ *Ibid.*, 88 (Jaubert’s emphasis).

her case when she says that “there is no tradition concerning Thursday evening.”³⁴ It is important to note, too, that this evidence for a Thursday supper tradition is still older than patristic evidence for the tradition of a Tuesday evening supper, which must be limited to the *Didascalia apostolorum*.

Jaubert tacitly acknowledges this weakness in her patristic evidence, for it is ultimately the liturgical evidence, and in particular the Wednesday fast, on which she relies to make the bridge between the later patristic evidence and the early Christian period. “The Wednesday tradition [of Jesus’s arrest] marked the liturgy with an indelible imprint, imposing on it the Wednesday fast... It blends with the central axis of the Christian liturgy.”³⁵ But as we have seen, this connection is not secure. It is likely that the Wednesday fast developed independently and was only later connected with the Passion narrative. The liturgical tradition cannot bear the weight that Jaubert places on it.

3. FURTHER EVIDENCE FOR THE JUBILEES CALENDAR IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR JAUBERT’S HYPOTHESIS

The weekly fasts in *Didache* 8:1 tantalizingly suggest the possibility of the continued use of a Jubilees calendar in early Christianity. The best evidence for continuity between the Jubilees and Christian calendars, however, is not to be found in the structure of the week, but in the structure of larger units of time, since the most distinctive characteristics of the Jubilees calendar lie not at the level of the week, but in its organization of the year as a whole. Some of this evidence can be found in the Ethiopic *Book of Adam and Eve* to which Jaubert devotes a considerable number of pages.³⁶ Her main interest, of course, is this text’s practice of assigning events to days of the week, especially Friday, and the fact that it traces the liturgical days of Wednesday, Friday and Sunday to Adam and Eve, linking the Adamic offerings on these days to Christ’s future suffering. The former, we have said, reflects the juxtaposition of the canonical passion and creation narratives. The latter can be accounted for by contemporary liturgical practice, i. e., the Wednesday fast. But she also notes the text’s interest in the 92nd day, which in the Jubilees system would be the beginning of a new quarter, and its use of periods

³⁴ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 90 (emphasis removed).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 90–1.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 55–9, 79–80.

of 50 days.³⁷ The significance for the Book of Jubilees of the number fifty in connection with Festival of Weeks or First-Fruits, the importance of this feast for covenant renewal, and the unique method for calculating the time of its celebration are well known. Jaubert observes in a footnote the connection between the Therapeuts, Slavic Josephus' assertion that the Essenes paid attention to the 7th week, and the reference to seven weeks in Apostolic Constitution 7.36.4.³⁸ The interest in 50-day periods appears even more significant after the discovery that the Qumran calendar had a succession of fifty-day periods marked by successive First-Fruits Festivals, the First-Fruits of Wheat in the middle of the third month, of Wine on the third of the fifth month, and of Oil on the twenty-second of the sixth month³⁹. Hildegard and Julius Lewy had already pointed out parallels between a pentecontad system such as that found among the Therapeuts and the division of the East Syrian Christian calendar into 50-day periods.⁴⁰ Joseph Baumgartner later drew the connection between the East Syrian calendar and the succession of First-Fruit festivals at Qumran.⁴¹

These parallels between Christian sources and the Jubilees calendar are even more suggestive than that found in *Didache*. Better evidence still can be found in the early Christian calendars from Syria and Jerusalem.⁴² There we find several dates which correspond to dates in the Jubilees calendar. More significantly, these dates suggest that the early Jerusalem church retained

³⁷ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 58.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 156, n. 38.

³⁹ Cf., e.g., 11QT, 4Q327. These texts were published after Jaubert's book.

⁴⁰ Lewy, H., and J. Lewy. "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar." *HUCA* 17 (1942–43): 100–2.

⁴¹ Baumgarten, J. M., "4Q Halakal^a 5, the Law of *adash*, and the Pentecontad Calendar." *JJS* 27 (1976): 42–3.

⁴² We have a fifth-century calendar of the church of Jerusalem in a lectionary preserved in Armenian, the old Armenian Lectionary, edited by Renoux, *Codex*. The Syrian evidence is later, although the earliest Syrian *Transitus Mariae* suggest that the May 15 and August 15 dates were already in place by the sixth century. Cf. Nau, F. *Un Martyrologe et douze ménologes syriaques*. PO, 10/1. Paris, 1915; Vööbus, A., ed. *The Lectionary of the Monastery of 'Azizā' el in Tūr 'Abdīn, Mesopotamia* [Ms. Mardin Orth 47]. CSCO, 466. Louvain, 1985; Vööbus, A., ed. *A Syriac Lectionary from the Church of the Forty Martyrs in Mardin, Tūr 'Abdīn, Mesopotamia* [Ms. Mardin Orth 48]. CSCO, 485. Louvain, 1986; *Transitus Mariae*, in Smith Lewis, A., ed. and transl. *Apocrypha Syriaca: The Protevangelium Jacobi and Transitus Mariae*. Studia Syniatica, 11. London, 1902. For a full exposition of the evidence see Ray, W. D. *August 15 and the Development of the Jerusalem Calendar*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2000.

not only the celebrations of the Jubilees calendar, but the same narrative pattern that we find in Jubilees. The dates in question are presented in the following table:

Jerusalem, 5 th c.		Jubilees/Qumran	Syria, 5 th /6 th c.?
(Easter)		I/15 Passover/ Sacrifice of Isaac	
9/18 May (Pentecost)	Infants Slain by Herod	III/15 Feast of Weeks/ Cove- nant/Birth of Isaac	15 May — Mary, Protec- tress of Grain
2 July	Ark of Covenant	V/3 Wine/Covenant	3 July — Thomas
15 August	Mary Theotokos	VI/15 Visitation to Sarah/ Concep- tion of Isaac	15 Aug. — Mary, Pro- tress of Vines
23/24 Aug.	Apostle Thomas	VI/22 Oil/Covenant	(22 Aug., 394 — transfer of St. Thomas' relics to chapel in Edessa)
13–20 Sept.	Dedication/ Cross	VII/15–22 Booths/ Thanksgiving	

The dates of the Jerusalem and Syrian calendar which correspond with dates in the Jubilees calendar include not only Passover, Pentecost/Weeks and, possibly, Booths, which we would expect and which also occur in official Judaism, but also the secondary Feasts of First Fruits, which are unique to the Judaism that followed the Jubilees calendar. These dates are associated either with the Covenant, which is a theme that we find connected with First Fruits in Jubilees, or the apostle Thomas. This association with Thomas is suggestive. Annie Jaubert, in another essay on the Qumran calendar and the Gospel of John,⁴³ connects Jesus' appearance to Thomas on the eighth day after the resurrection (Jn 20:24–29) with the distinctive method which the Qumran calendar uses to fix the date of the omer ceremony, that is, on the day after the first Sabbath after the full feast of Unleavened Bread, or one week after it would have been celebrated according to the official calendar using the Johannine chronology, given the correlation between the official and Qumran calendars that Jaubert assumes. Thomas' absence from the community on the day of the resurrection, and his presence one week later on the day of the Qumran omer ceremony may

⁴³ Jaubert, A. "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John." In Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *John and Qumran*, 63–5. London, 1972.

suggest that, for John, Thomas serves as the representative of a community which used the Qumran calendar. He may serve the same function in the calendars of the early Jerusalem and Syrian churches.

Most significant is the date of August 15, the feast of Mary Theotokos, which first appears in the Jerusalem calendar. It has long been recognized that this date in fifth-century Jerusalem was not the feast of the Dormition/Assumption of Mary that it later became, but a general commemoration of Mary's birth-giving. Why this date was chosen for such a commemoration has long perplexed scholars.⁴⁴ Its significance becomes clear, however, if it is seen against the background of Jubilees. One of the few dated events not dated to a festival in Jubilees is the angelic visitation to Sarah and the conception of Isaac in the middle of the sixth month, nine months before the Festival of Weeks, to which the birth of Isaac is dated (Jub 16:12–13). The birth of Isaac at Weeks, of course, fits into the basic Jubilees narrative pattern of promise and fulfillment. Isaac both fulfills of the promise to Abraham made at the previous Festival of Weeks and represents the promise of a future fulfillment (cf. Jub 16:17–18). Significant also is the fact that Jubilees dates the sacrifice of Isaac to Passover, where it is explicitly linked to the shaming of Mastema and the defeat of the evil powers. Abraham is the one through whose faithful the powers of evil are defeated, making possible the future fulfillment of the promise. In later representatives of this pattern such as 4Q225, Isaac also becomes a participant in this faithful action. Against this background, the mid-August celebration of Mary's birth-giving becomes understandable as part of a typological extension of this Isaac cycle to Jesus.

In this way we would also explain the mid-May celebration of the Infants slain by Herod that we find in the fifth-century Jerusalem calendar. Bernard Botte included this Jerusalem celebration among a handful of data indicating a possible early mid-May feast of Christ's nativity.⁴⁵ Such a mid-May celebration of the Nativity should be connected with the Jubilees narrative, in which Isaac is born on the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) in fulfillment of the promise. Jesus is the Isaac-like figure whose faithful action of self-sacrifice at Passover defeats the evil powers and makes possible the

⁴⁴ A recent investigator concludes that "at present, it is necessary to underscore our incapacity to determine the origin of the date of 15 August"; Mimouni, S. C. "Dormition et Assomption de Marie: Histoire des traditions anciennes." *Théologie historique* 98 (1995): 381.

⁴⁵ Botte, B. *Les Origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie: Étude historique*, 17. Louvain, 1932.

eschatological fulfillment of the “promise of the Holy Spirit,” a term used by Paul and his interpreters (Gal 3:14, Eph 1:13, Acts 2:33; cf. Luke 24:49, Jub 1:24–25). Paul uses both this term and this narrative pattern in his treatment of the Abraham narratives occasioned by his opponents’ argument at Galatia, opponents he identifies with the Jerusalem church. And Paul’s interpreter Luke dates the fulfillment of the promise at Jerusalem precisely to Pentecost.⁴⁶

Thus we find in the early Jerusalem church not only the continued use of the Jubilees calendar, but also of the narrative pattern associated with it. But this means that the early Jerusalem church inherited from the world of Jubilees not only a style of narration through liturgical celebration, but the whole narrative world of Jubilees. This has significant implications for Jaubert’s hypothesis. While the presence of this calendar in early Christianity would appear to lend credence to this hypothesis, the continued acceptance of the narrative associated with the calendar argues against it. A christianized Jubilees narrative would align more closely with the Johannine chronology of the Passion than with the Synoptic. This accords with the generally recognized phenomenon that John stands closer to Qumran than the Synoptics. But this is just the opposite of what Jaubert proposes. For Jaubert, it is the Synoptic chronology which depends upon the Jubilees calendar. Also at variance with Jaubert’s expectations is the fact that in the post-apostolic period it will be those who adhere to the Johannine chronology that will also show the most influence of the Jubilees narrative pattern, the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor. These latter, we would expect from Jaubert’s argument, should be the least influenced by Jubilees and its calendar. Finally, for a christianized Jubilees community, the Eucharist would probably not have its origins in the Passover, and so the Last Supper of Jesus need not have been a Paschal meal.

In the Jubilees narrative, the binding of Isaac corresponds with the sacrifice of the Passover lamb, as Jaubert herself has noted.⁴⁷ It is through this sacrifice, of both Isaac and the lamb, that Mastema is shamed and bound (Jub 18:12, 48:15). In its typological adaptation to the Christian story, Jesus replaces both Isaac and the lamb. This is in fact what we find in the Johannine chronology. In John of course, the crucifixion occurs on Ni-

⁴⁶ It may also be that Luke knows the other significant date of this pattern, the middle of the sixth month; cf. Luke 1:26.

⁴⁷ Jaubert, A. *La notion d’Alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l’ère chrétienne*, 90, n. 5. Paris, 1963, cited in the English translation of Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 149, n. 18; cf. *Jub* 17:15–18:17.

san 14 according to the “official” calendar, since it occurs on Friday and not on Tuesday as one would expect according to the Jubilees calendar. In this John may simply reflect the hard facts of history. But this would not have prevented a Jubilees community from seeing in this event a fulfillment of the type of Isaac, just as John sees a fulfillment of the type of the lamb. The importance of this narrative moment, so central to the Jubilees narrative world, is lost on the Synoptics.

It was not lost, however, on those who most held most tenaciously to the Johannine chronology, who rejected any suggestion that Jesus celebrated the Passover with his disciples, the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor. There we find early and extensive use of Isaac typology. We find it in the *Peri Pascha* and several fragments from Melito, in the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and in another fragment from Apollinarius of Hierapolis. Such typology was embedded in the liturgy, as in this hymn fragment quoted by Melito (Perler’s Fragment XI):

For as a ram he was bound (so it says of our Lord Jesus Christ)
And as a lamb he was shorn
And as a sheep he was led to slaughter
And as a lamb he was crucified...⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Perler, O. *Méliton de Sardes. Sur le Pâque et fragments*, 234. SC, 123. Paris, 1966. Wilken, R. L. “Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis, and the Sacrifice of Isaac.” *Theological Studies*, 37 (1976): 53–69, has argued that these fragments reflect a reaction by Melito to Jewish exegetical developments. What Wilken fails to notice, however, is that Melito takes his lead not from the text in Genesis, but from a hymn in which there is already a developed Isaac typology. In the same fragment Melito expands the first line of this hymn to show the typology: “Not afraid of the sword, nor dismayed by the fire, nor grieving to suffer, he (Isaac) bravely bore the type of the Lord. Isaac, then lay at the center, bound like a ram, and his father beside him brandishing the unsheathed sword, not ashamed to kill his son.” It seems, then, that Isaac-Jesus typology was already current in Asia Minor before Melito.

We find the same typological connection with Isaac in the Martyrdom of Polycarp of Smyrna, which is approximately contemporaneous with Melito’s homily, especially in the account’s insistence that Polycarp is “not nailed, but bound,” so that “with his hands put behind him and bound,” he can be described as “a noble ram out of a great flock, ready for sacrifice, a burnt offering ready and acceptable to God” (*The Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14.1, in Camelot, P. T., ed. and fr. transl. *Ignace d’Antioche. Polycarp de Smyrne. Letters. Martyrdom of Polycarp*. SC, 10. Paris, 1969, revised and corrected edition. English translation in Richardson, C. C. *Early Christian Fathers*. New York, 1970. This description connects Polycarp symbolically with Christ, but also with Isaac.

It even appears that “the Bound One” was used as a title for Jesus, as in a fragment from Apollinarius:

The 14th is the true Pascha of the Lord, the great sacrifice (is) the child of God in the place of the lamb, *the one who was bound* (is) the one who bound the strong man, and the one who is judged (is) the judge of the living and the dead...⁴⁹

Here we see the intimate connection between the Isaac typology and the insistence on the Johannine chronology.

Jaubert opposes the practice of the Asia Minor Quartodecimas, which followed the “official” Jewish calendar in observing 14 Nisan on whatever day of the week it would fall, to the apparent majority practice of celebrating Pascha each year on a Sunday, that is, a fixed day of the week, which she believes derives from the “fixed-day” calendar of Jubilees.⁵⁰ This corresponds to the opposition she draws between the Johannine chronology and the Synoptic. But we not should perhaps be so hasty to oppose the Quartodeciman practice of observing 14 Nisan to the Sunday observance of the Resurrection. The dispute over the Quartodeciman practice was, as Irenaeus notes in a fragment preserved in Eusebius, as much about the character of the fast as about the keeping of the day.⁵¹ If for the Quartodecimans, the fast of Nisan 14 was on behalf of those who crucified Jesus, as *Didascalia apostolorum* 21 says,⁵² then the observance of this fast carried the historical memory of the crucifixion and was necessarily tied, in the view of those who kept it, to the “official” calendar.

This Quartodeciman observation of the anniversary of Jesus’ death on the “official” calendar does not exclude the possibility of a separate celebration of the resurrection in these communities, either on a Sunday or, more probably, for the whole fifty day period culminating in the Festival of Weeks but having the character of a Sunday. It is not perhaps coincidental

⁴⁹ Text in Perler, *Mé lition*, 244.

⁵⁰ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 62–3.

⁵¹ Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 24.8, in Bardy, G., ed. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*. SC, 31, 41, 55. Paris, 1952–64.

⁵² “[O]ur fast which we fast in the Pascha, that you are to fast, is because our brethren have not obeyed....It is required of us, thus, to have pity on them, and to believe and to fast and to pray for them.” Later, this practice of fasting for the disobedient brethren is connected with beginning the fast when “your brethren who are of the people perform the Passover.” Translation from Vööbus, *Didascalia*, 192–3, 196.

that several of the sources for such a fifty-day celebration cited by Robert Cabié in his study of Pentecost can be connected with Asia Minor: the Acts of Paul, Irenaeus, and probably the *Epistula Apostolorum*.⁵³ This fifty-day period, whether or not it was connected with the keeping of 14 Nisan on the “official” calendar, would have been calculated using the criteria of the Jubilees calendar and thus begun and ended on a Sunday. Jaubert is right to note the important place of Sunday in the Jubilees tradition. This importance is closely connected with the importance placed on the number fifty and the succession of fiftieth day festivals, all falling on Sunday. Sunday is the day after the seventh day just as the fiftieth day is the day after the seven times seventh day. The Festival of Weeks (Pentecost) is, as we have seen, the central feast in Jubilees, the feast of fulfillment of the promise and renewal of the covenant. It is not surprising that in the christianized version of this narrative world Sunday, Pentecost and Resurrection should be tightly linked. Sunday in this conceptual framework would perhaps better be thought of as the weekly Pentecost than as the weekly Pascha.

This priority of the Festival of Weeks in the Jubilees community also has significance for the crux of Jaubert’s argument. She rightly notes that “for the primitive community this meal [Jesus’ Last Supper] was central and normative.” It is “the meal around which the whole Christian liturgy revolves.” It could not, then, have been “celebrated in a manner opposed to the basic principles of the liturgy and outside the main-stream of the continuous development which led from one liturgy to the other.” If, then, Jaubert argues, there is “a fundamental continuity between the Jewish fixed-day [Jubilees] calendar and the Christian calendar,” about which our evidence suggests she might be right, and “if the circle to which the disciples belonged used the fixed-day calendar,” which is a distinct possibility, then “how could Jesus himself have celebrated the Pasch on any other day than Tuesday evening?”⁵⁴ This reasoning is impeccable. The question it begs, however, and the question the differing chronologies of the Gospels raise, is Was the Last Supper a Paschal meal? In the Jubilees narrative world it need not have been. Karl Georg Kuhn has shown some similarities between the Last Supper and the ritual meals at Qumran described by Josephus and

⁵³ Cabié, R. *La Pentecôte: l'évolution de la Cinquantaine pascale au cours des cinq premiers siècles*. Tournai, 1965. A case can also be made for the influence of Asia Minor on Tertullian, who also witnesses to such a celebration, via Montanism, for which the Pentecost experience was central.

⁵⁴ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 65–6.

the Qumran Manual of Discipline (1QS and 1QSa).⁵⁵ Among the things that such a hypothesis explains are the focus on bread and wine rather than the traditional elements of the paschal meal such as the lamb and the herbs. Recently, Étienne Nodet and Justin Taylor have expanded on this explanation by noting that in 1QSa it is the first-fruits of bread and wine which are blessed by the Messianic priest. They suggest that this rite derives from the blessing of the first-fruits at the Feast of Weeks which was recreated in every ritual meal at Qumran.⁵⁶ Such a suggestion would make sense in light of the significant place this feast played in Jubilees and in the early Christian community which used the Jubilees calendar. It may be, then, that it was to Pentecost, rather than Passover, that the early Christian community which used this calendar looked for its understanding of the Last Supper. This would also account for its weekly commemoration of the Last Supper in the Sunday Eucharist. Even if, then, Jesus and his disciples celebrated the Passover meal on a Tuesday evening in accordance with a Jubilees calendar, there is no reason not to accept the unanimous witness of the Gospels that the Last Supper and arrest of Jesus took place on Thursday.

4. CONCLUSION

Annie Jaubert, through her elucidation of the Jubilees calendar and her demonstration of its relevance for the early Christian period, has opened up new vistas for exploration. The recognition that such a calendar was indeed in use someplace in the early Church casts light on a number of problems in our understanding of the period, from the fasting practices of the *Didache* to the Paschal controversy of the second century. The further recognition that the group or groups that used this calendar inherited not only the calendar but also the narrative associated with it opens up a new window into their world. Such knowledge, however, cannot solve the question that Jaubert directed it toward: the divergence in the Gospels' chronology of the Passion. Rather than supporting the Synoptic assertion that the Last Supper

⁵⁵ Kuhn, K. G. "The Lord's Supper and the communal meal at Qumran." In Stendahl, K., and J. H. Charlesworth, eds. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 65–93, 259–65. New York, 1992, repr.

⁵⁶ Nodet, É., and J. Taylor, *The Origins of Christianity: An Exploration*, 113–5. Collegeville, MN, 1998. The authors go on to assert that this was also a Passover meal, accepting Jaubert's solution to the chronological problem as "the least difficult hypothesis" (123). If the Last Supper need not have been a Paschal meal, however, there seems no reason to force this harmonization.

was a Passover meal, as Jaubert supposed, the Jubilees narrative actually supports the Johannine position that it was not.

The presence of the Jubilees calendar in early Christianity can, however, explain some of Jaubert's data: the tradition of a Tuesday evening Last Supper and the arrest, especially in the *Didascalia apostolorum*. The historical reality is that the Last Supper took place in close proximity to the official Passover because Jesus was killed in proximity to the official Passover. It may have, but need not have, taken place in proximity to the Passover on the Jubilees calendar. This proximity to the official Passover would have provided sufficient motivation for later writers to make the Last Supper into a Passover meal. The long resistance to such an idea among groups in Asia Minor and Syria who probably used the Jubilees calendar and the affinities between the meal as described by the gospels and sectarian ritual meals suggest that it was not. The kind of compromise which we find in *Didascalia* 21 represents a fusion of the continued celebration of Passover by the Jubilees calendar, that is on Tuesday, with the long-resisted idea that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.

JAUBERT'S SOLUTION TO THE PASSION CHRONOLOGY

By James C. VanderKam

Annie Jaubert became famous for her pioneering work in clarifying a number of significant points regarding the calendrical teachings of 1 Enoch 72–82, Jubilees, and the Qumran scrolls. In particular she established that the 364-day solar calendar of these sources began on a Wednesday, the fourth day of creation when the sun was made (Gen 1:14–19). Because 364 is exactly divisible by seven, finding this one day/date correspondence allowed her to establish all of the others for every year. She went on to argue that the same calendar is presupposed in the priestly parts of the Hebrew Bible so that it was not an innovation of the authors who wrote 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and the scrolls.¹

One of the principal emphases in Jaubert's elucidation of this ancient priestly calendar was what she called the "liturgical days of the week."² Her research on the Book of Jubilees established to her satisfaction that three weekdays were the ones on which the important events of sacred history occurred: Sunday, Wednesday (emphasized most), and Friday. Major undertakings begin on Sundays, the day farthest from the sabbath when travel and other labors were strictly forbidden; it was also the date of the feast of the covenant, the festival of weeks; Wednesday, the midpoint in the week

¹ Jaubert, A. "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân: Ses origines bibliques." *VT* 3 (1953): 250–64. As she acknowledges, she was building on suggestions made by Barthélemy, D. "Notes en marge de publications récentes sur les manuscrits de Qumran." *Revue biblique* 59 (1952): 187–218.

² Jaubert, A. "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine." *VT* 7 (1957): 35–61.

when there was the least danger of violating a sabbath, was the day for the beginning of the festivals of unleavened bread and booths; while Friday, the day before the sabbath, was one for concluding undertakings of various kinds such as journeys.

Much more is known today about the calendrical systems of the Qumran group because many texts have been identified and studied since Jaubert first enunciated her theses. These texts confirm the essentials of her view. So, for example, the day of the week on which the year began is documented as being Wednesday, and the date for the festival of weeks is the fifteenth day of the third month, just as she argued. This is not to say that all aspects of her wider theory have been confirmed. For one, her claim that priestly parts of the Hebrew Bible presuppose a 364-day calendar is disputed and hardly demonstrated, however appealing it is.³

Jaubert's contribution attracted a large amount of attention in the 1950s when her major publications appeared, but she became the center of an even more enthusiastic debate when she attempted to apply the insights from her calendrical researches to an old problem in gospel research: the conflicting chronologies for passion week in the synoptics and John.⁴ In the following paragraphs that problem will be sketched, Jaubert's solution will be explained, and reactions to it will be summarized and evaluated.

A. The chronological conflict: The details of the problem are these. In the synoptic gospels, the last supper that Jesus shares with his disciples is presented as a passover meal. The point is clear from passages such as Mark 14:12 where the disciples ask Jesus a question in a precisely dated context: "On the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover lamb is sacri-

³ I have surveyed the Qumran material in VanderKam, J. C. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London/New York, 1998. See pp. 71–90 for the calendrical texts. For reactions to Jaubert's views about the priestly texts in the Hebrew Bible, see VanderKam, J. C. "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Solar Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses." *CBQ* 41 (1979): 390–411 (= *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, 81–104. JSJSup, 62. Leiden/Boston/Köln, 2000).

⁴ Jaubert, A. "La date de la dernière cène." *RHR* 146 (1954): 140–73. The essay, with some of her other studies, was incorporated into her book: *La date de la cène: calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*. Paris, 1957. The book was translated into English by I. Rafferty as: Jaubert, A. *The Date of the Last Supper: The Biblical Calendar and Christian Liturgy*. Staten Island, NY, 1965. References below will be to the English version of the book.

ficed, his disciples said to him, “Where do you want us to go and make the preparations for you to eat the Passover?”⁵ The biblical instructions for the passover lamb required that it be selected on the tenth day of the first month (Exod 12:3) and then: “You shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month; then the whole assembled congregation of Israel shall slaughter it at twilight.” (12:6) Thus the disciples would have addressed their question to Jesus on the fourteenth day of the first month (Nisan). Upon receiving his instructions they made the necessary preparations (Mark 14:16) and the meal itself followed (vv. 17–31), in line with Exod 12:8 which stipulated that it was to be eaten that night. The same approach to the last supper emerges from Matthew and Luke who based their narratives on the text of Mark (see especially Matt 26:17–19; Luke 22:7–14). In all three of the synoptic gospels the term *πάσχα* is used for the event. On Passover night, after Nisan 14 had passed to Nisan 15, Jesus was arrested and later, but still on Nisan 15 and after a whole series of events, he was crucified. That the same day was involved may be inferred not only from biblical law but also from the time indicators: Mark 15:1 (Matt 27:1; Luke 23:1) mentions that the council met when it was morning; 15:25 says they crucified him at the third hour of the day; 15:33 (Matt 27:45; Luke 23:44) notes the darkness at the sixth hour; and 15:34 (Matt 27:46) puts Jesus’s death at the ninth hour. Mark also allows us to infer that the day in question, Nisan 15, was a Friday because he writes about the time immediately after Jesus’s death: “When evening had come, and since it was the day of Preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath...” (15:42; cf. Luke 23:54 and Matt 27:62)

As a result one can express the synoptic chronology thus:

Nisan 14	Thursday	preparation, meal begins
Nisan 15	Friday	meal ends, arrest, trials, crucifixion, burial
Nisan 16	Sabbath	

In the gospel of John matters are different. The last supper, which is never called a passover meal and lacks key characteristics of one, is said to take place “before the festival of the Passover” (John 13:1; see also v. 29). After eating Jesus went with his disciples to a garden where he was arrested (John 18:1–12). The next verse to mention a time, John 18:28, is set “early in the morning.” It is significant that in the same verse we read: “They [Jesus’s captors] themselves did not enter the headquarters, so as to avoid ritual defilement and to be able to eat the Passover.” According to 19:14 it was “the day of Preparation for the Passover,” about noon, when Pilate

⁵ All scriptural citations are from the *New Revised Standard Version*.

handed Jesus over to be crucified. Once he had died, “[s]ince it was the day of Preparation, the Jews did not want the bodies left on the cross during the sabbath, especially because that sabbath was a day of great solemnity” (19:31; cf. v. 42). So in John, as in the synoptics, the day of crucifixion was a Friday, with the sabbath following. Apparently that year Passover and sabbath coincided if we follow the Johannine dating.

So, this is John’s chronology:

Nisan 13	Thursday	meal begins
Nisan 14	Friday	meal ends, arrest, trials, crucifixion, burial
Nisan 15	Sabbath	Passover

Naturally this set of problems was known long before Jaubert tackled them, and scholars had offered a number of solutions to account for the one-day discrepancy and the different character of the meal.⁶ It is indeed peculiar that for this week, of all weeks, there should be such a disagreement in the earliest sources. One would think that the tradition would have been strong and univocal about the details for Jesus’s last days on earth. Hence there should be some explanation for why the synoptics present the meal as a passover and why John sees it as a pre-passover meal and for why the two traditions put the events on different dates.⁷

B. Jaubert’s hypothesis: A solution often proposed before Jaubert’s work was to hypothesize that different groups celebrated passover on different dates, for whatever reason (e.g., a dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees about when Nisan began that year; a regional difference between Judea and Galilee, etc.). All of these proposals, however, were purely speculative because the relevant sources preserved no evidence of such deviating practices — ones that would have entailed celebration of an event so central as passover at separate times. It was Jaubert’s distinction to be the first to offer an explanation that was textually based.

⁶ See, for example, the survey in Jeremias, J. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 20–4. London, 1966. He divides the opinions into three categories: “The synoptics are right and John should be interpreted accordingly;” “John is right and the synoptics should be interpreted accordingly;” and “Both the synoptics and John are right.” As Jaubert’s work showed, a fourth option is that both the synoptics and John are wrong.

⁷ It seems unlikely that the gospels deal with anything other than a day that began around sunset. See Brown, R. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, vol. 2, 1353. ABRL. New York, 1994.

She knew that the Dead Sea Scrolls documented a 364-day solar calendar that was apparently actually employed by the group that inhabited Qumran. Since the archeological evidence indicated that the group had resided at the site from before 100 BCE until some point during the Jewish revolt against Rome (perhaps 68 CE), the 364-day calendar would have been practiced in the time of Jesus. It was also clear from the scrolls that the Qumran group differed in its calendrical views from the system that regulated the cult in Jerusalem. As a result, there would have been at least two calendars that groups were following during Jesus's lifetime. One was certainly the 364-day calendar, while Jaubert took the other to be the official luni-solar calendar that was used to date the festivals of the Jewish year. Her specific proposal was that the writers in the synoptic tradition followed the 364-day solar calendar, while John dated events according to the official luni-solar calendar. Since the two rarely coincided for a date, it is quite plausible that proponents of the two would celebrate festivals at different times in any given year.

The situation, however, could not be explained simply by proposing the use of conflicting calendars, one of which was the 364-day system known from Qumran. It will be recalled that in this calendar a particular date always fell on the same day of the week, year after year. So, for example, passover would always be celebrated on a Tuesday-Wednesday evening in a system in which the day begins at approximately sunset. Yet, as we have just seen, neither the synoptics nor John put passover that year on a Tuesday: in the synoptics it falls on Friday, in John on Saturday. Jaubert wrote about the synoptic pattern in which the meal is eaten on Nisan 14–15 and the crucifixion occurs on Nisan 15: “This solution has never, in fact, completely satisfied exegetes, for it is difficult to admit so much activity on the part of the Jews during the night and the day of the Pasch⁸ which were sacred and times of rest.”⁹ She appealed instead to the account found in the *Didascalia apostolorum*, a third-century work apparently from Syria.¹⁰ It claims

⁸ “Pasch” is the word used in the English translation of Jaubert’s book for “Pâque” in the French. It is not clear why Rafferty chose such a curious form; “passover” would have been the correct rendering.

⁹ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 96.

¹⁰ For her analysis of the text, see Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 69–80. She found the same chronology (meal on Tuesday-Wednesday, crucifixion on Friday) in Epiphanius (he used the *Didascalia*) who “holds tenaciously to a tradition which he no longer understands” (78), in Victorinus’s *de fabrica mundi*, and in the *Book of Adam and Eve*. From these witnesses, some of which are independent of the others, she traced

that Jesus celebrated the passover on Tuesday evening. He was then arrested that night, the many trials, etc. took place on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and he was crucified later on Friday. Here is the relevant passage (the apostles are the putative speakers):

And Judas came with the scribes and with the priests of the people, and delivered up our Lord Jesus.

Now this was the fourth day of the week. Indeed, when we had eaten the Passover on the third day of the Week in the evening, we went out to the Mount of Olives, and in the night they seized our Lord Jesus. And the next day, which was the fourth of the week, He remained in custody in the house of Caiaphas the high priest. And on the same day the chiefs of the people were assembled and took counsel against Him.

And on the next day again, which was the fifth of the week, they brought him to Pilate the governor. And he remained again in custody with Pilate the night after the fifth day of the week. But when it dawned on the Friday, “they accused him much” [= Mark 15:3] before Pilate. And they could show nothing that was true, but gave false witness against Him. And they asked Him from Pilate to be put to death. And they crucified Him on the same Friday. He suffered, then, at the sixth hour on Friday.¹¹

A few lines later commands about fasts are given: the fourth day because on it he was seized, and the sixth because on it he was crucified. The fasts are unlike those of “the former people,” the Jews.

This Tuesday celebration of passover, Jaubert thought, was according to the old priestly calendar in which Nisan 14 was always a Tuesday, while the passover on Saturday (as in John) would have been calculated in the official calendar according to the date in the month (the fourteenth), irre-

the tradition back to the second century and thought it was a Judeo-Christian one. Her examination of passages from the earliest Christian authors showed “that the results obtained by study of patristic writings confirm those of the calendar. The sole likely date for the paschal meal was, according to liturgical analogy, the Wednesday. The earliest Christian tradition, that which is rooted in the primitive Judaeo-Christian community, gives evidence pointing in the same direction. It is the only tradition which can be primitive — for there is no tradition concerning Thursday evening. The Wednesday tradition marked the liturgy with an indelible imprint, imposing on it the Wednesday fast. It has nothing about it indicative of an eccentric or lateral tradition. It is not the expression of the opinion of a peripheral [*sic*] group. It blends with the central axis of the Christian liturgy” (90–1).

¹¹ Vööbus A., transl. *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac, II Chapters XI–XXVI*, 189–90. CSCO, 408; *Scriptores Syri*, 180. Louvain, 1979 (from chap. 21).

spective of the day in the week. She took care to show how many events are said to have happened between meal and crucifixion and that the one-day time span allowed by each gospel seems inadequate to accommodate all of the events. The longer chronology in the *Didascalia*, then, had the advantage of allowing enough time for the trials and other events mentioned in the gospels.¹²

It was one thing to identify the account in the *Didascalia* as the historically reliable one; it was another to explain how the narratives in the gospels arose from it. Jaubert proposed the following as an explanation for how the temporally compressed tradition in Mark and Matthew took form:

The memory of Peter's denial in the house of the high priest had been preserved. Now, Mark and Matthew mention only one high priest. Consequently, they placed Peter's denial in the house of Caiphas [*sic*]. What is more serious, this foreshortening of perspective led the Mk./Matt. tradition to report *only one* session during which *the high priest questioned Jesus*. And, since the principal session was the trial, it has been transported to the same place as the interrogation by Annas, and so inserted in the episode of Peter's denial. It should be observed that this solution might well solve another problem, that of the *place* of trial, which is no longer necessarily the palace of Caiphas [*sic*].¹³

She also maintained that a longer time for the trials would allow for two sessions of the sanhedrin which would comport more closely with requirements for that body recorded in the Mishnah.¹⁴ Jaubert believed that the early kerygma was concerned more with conveying the substance of events than with their chronology and thus "foreshortenings" involving events that actually occurred twice (two interrogations before high priests, two sessions of the sanhedrin, two appearances before Pilate) took place in the tradition. "The elimination of reduplicated elements was intended to simplify catechetical summaries. When this catechesis passed from a Palestinian environment to a pagan world, which knew only the Pasch of the Jews of the diaspora on the 15th day of the lunar month, it was inevitable that the Last Supper of Jesus should tend to be associated with the legal Pasch. The Gospel tradition solidified only slowly; for many years it re-

¹² She wrote at length about the complex of problems involved with the sessions of the sanhedrin in Jaubert, A. "Les séances du sanhédrin et les récits de la passion." *RHR* 166 (1964): 143–69; 167 (1965): 1–33. Her study showed: "Dans la chronologie courte de la Passion, le problème reste donc insoluble" (33).

¹³ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 108–9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 109–11.

mained relatively fluid, in close association with the oral catechesis.”¹⁵ She also thought that a phrase such as “when the Passover lamb is sacrificed” in Mark 14:12, which is lacking in Matt 26:17 (though a similar clause appears in Luke 22:7), was a “secondary gloss.”¹⁶

Has any evidence of a Tuesday passover meal survived in the present texts of the gospels? Jaubert thought there might be a trace in another puzzling pair of numbers. John 12:1 dates the anointing a Bethany to “six days before the Passover,” while both Mark (14:1) and the parallel in Matthew (26:2) preface the story of the anointing with a notice that it was two days before the passover and unleavened bread. Luke 22:1 says only that “the festival of Unleavened Bread, which is called the Passover, was near.” Jaubert thought she could explain the discrepancy by appealing again to hypothesis of two passovers:

By counting back six days from the legal Pasch, that is, from Friday evening, exclusive, we come to Saturday evening for the anointing at Bethany, according to John’s account. By counting back two days from the old Pasch, that is, from Tuesday evening, exclusive, we come to Sunday evening, or to Saturday evening, depending on the sense given the expression: *meta duo hēmeras*. It seems clear that one should not press to [*sic*] closely the phrase “the feast of the Pasch and of the Azymes [= unleavened bread] was after two days.” According to the same Mk./Matt. tradition, the first day of Azymes began on Tuesday morning, which shortens the time between the anointing and Azymes. The impression to be gained is of a certain concomitance between the anointing, the acclamation of Jesus and the assembly of the chief priests in Mk./Matt.¹⁷

Jaubert claimed that with her solution, which was really an old one present already in early Christian liturgy, Jesus was pictured as summing up both Jewish traditions represented by the two calendars. Moreover, her conclusion about the “liturgical days of the week” seemed to be confirmed:

On *Wednesday*, Jesus was delivered up; on *Friday*, he died. These days were signs of God; they spoke a language which was clear and intelligible to the first Christian community. The most holy of all histories, that of the Messiah who fulfilled the Scriptures, unfolded according to a consecrated ritual. Unique High Priest of the New Alliance, he “gave

¹⁵ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 115.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 97.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 100. See also her essay, Jaubert, “Le mercredi où Jésus fut livré.” *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 145–64.

himself up willingly to death,” knowing that “the hour” had come, “at the appointed time” (*kata kairos*). The final “sign” would be that of the *Sunday* of Resurrection, the first day of the liturgical week, the dawn of the new time, which — because it is the first and eighth day — opened the great messianic week.¹⁸

C. Responses to Jaubert’s theory: The reactions to Jaubert’s far-reaching proposals for the original passion week chronology have been varied. They did win a following for some time, but it is difficult to locate support for them among scholars of the New Testament today, although her creativity has been widely acknowledged. Before examining the different responses, a basic point should be made. It is not quite accurate, it seems to me, to say that Jaubert offered a textually based solution to the discrepancies between the synoptics and John for passion week. Rather, she advanced a suggestion about the historical Jesus, about the historical events that, in some sense, lie behind the literary accounts in the four gospels. Having proposed that thesis, she then attempted to explain how the gospel accounts evolved from the true sequence experienced by the historical Jesus — a sequence preserved in the *Didascalia* but not in Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John. As a result, given her explanation, Jesus both ate a passover meal (as in the synoptics) and died before the official passover (as in John). To put the matter briefly, it appeared that she had established a framework for understanding the gospel chronologies that allowed adequate time for the many events crowded into one day in the extant gospel text, also, with her hypothesis, the actions attributed to the sanhedrin would have been in agreement with Mishnaic law.¹⁹

1. Positive reactions: It is understandable that an impressively argued solution to a gospel crux would garner some support, and that did indeed happen. So, for example, E. Ruckstuhl largely repeated Jaubert’s arguments about the passion week, the *Didascalia*, and the two calendars. He added more details about possible connections between Jesus and the Essenes and

¹⁸ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 121.

¹⁹ See the convenient summary of the positive points of her arguments in Brown, R. “The Problem of Historicity in John.” In *Idem*, *New Testament Essays*, 212–4. Garden City, NY, 1968. Blinzler, J. “Qumran-Kalender und Passionschronologie.” *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49 (1958): 248–50, gives a detailed treatment of this point. He argues that Jaubert has made the problems involved in the one-day chronology more difficult than they really are and that the actions of the sanhedrin, even with her longer chronology, would not comport with aspects of Mishnaic law.

argued that at the time of Jesus adherents of the old priestly calendar were allowed to follow it in more places than just at Qumran.²⁰ He appealed to Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1, 5 (18–19) where the historian states about the Essenes: “They send votive offerings to the temple, but perform their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification. For this reason they are barred from those precincts of the temple that are frequented by all the people and perform their rites by themselves.”²¹ About the passage he wrote: “The only reasonable interpretation of the quoted text would indicate that the Essenes had their own district and their own sacrificial place in the Temple. Josephus very probably describes the situation at the beginning of the Christian era; it is apparent from the preceding and following paragraphs. The time up to the destruction of Jerusalem may be included also. At any rate, the Essenes were obligated to Herod for the acquisition of their Temple district and for his permission to offer sacrifices there.”²² Hence, Jesus’s disciples could have brought their paschal lamb to slaughter at the temple on Tuesday according to the Essene dating of passover (or possibly the slaughter would have taken place in a home in Jerusalem).²³ Against this proposal, apart from the fact that there is no hint of an unusual procedure in the gospels, is the disputed meaning of the passage where Josephus describes Essene sacrificial practices. It is not so obvious from the text that Josephus pictured the Essenes as practicing their rites in a special part of the temple. Moreover, in the context he says nothing about a different Essene calendar; he mentions only their distinctive purity rites.²⁴ Then too an Essene connection for Jesus, however often it has been asserted, is an

²⁰ Ruckstuhl, E. *Chronology of the Last Days of Jesus: A Critical Study*. New York/Tournai/Paris/Rome, 1965, especially pp. 97–124. The book is a translation of a German original: *Die Chronologie des Letzten Mahles und des Leidens Jesu* (Einsiedeln) which appeared in 1963.

²¹ The translation is from Feldman, L. H. *Josephus IX Jewish Antiquities Books XVIII–XIX*. Cambridge/London, 1981.

²² Ruckstuhl, *Chronology*, 100–1.

²³ *Ibid.*, 115–7.

²⁴ For a discussion of the issue and survey of various views, see Beall, T. *Josephus’ Descriptions of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 115–9. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series, 58. Cambridge, 1988. A basic problem is that there is some textual evidence for a negative in the statement about sacrifices (that is, the Epitome and Latin have “they do not offer sacrifices”). But even if one follows the Greek witnesses, it is still difficult to tell from Josephus where the Essenes sacrificed.

undocumented conclusion.²⁵ As J. Meier has written, “there is no solid reason for thinking that Jesus had ever been a member of the Qumran community or the wider group of Essenes. His freewheeling attitude toward the fine points of the Law stands diametrically opposed to all that was most dear to the legal extremists at Qumran.”²⁶ Jaubert was later to clarify that she did not think Jesus was a Qumranian or an Essene, although she clearly put him within the orb of their influence.²⁷ While that may well have been the case, the issue is their calendar and for such an influence on Jesus evidence is lacking.

2. Negative responses: The intention here is not to give an exhaustive overview of negative reactions to Jaubert’s solution to the chronology for passion week; rather I will present what seem to me to be basic prob-

²⁵ For other positive assessments of Jaubert’s thesis, see Vogt, E. “Dies ultimae coenae Domini.” *Biblica* 36 (1955): 408–13; Schwant, B. “War das Letzte Abendmahl am Dienstag in der Karwoche?” *Benediktische Monatschrift* 33 (1957): 268–78; Walker, N. “The Dating of the Last Supper.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 47 (1957): 293–5; Walther, J. “The Chronology of Passion Week.” *JBL* 77 (1958): 116–22; Skehan, P. “The Date of the Last Supper.” *CBQ* 20 (1958): 192–9; and Daniélou, J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity*, 26–28. Baltimore, 1958 (the translator has curiously rendered “passover” as “Easter” and thus produced a confusing text). J. Carmignac, in order to counter the idea expressed by a number of scholars that the majority of critical opinion opposed Jaubert, appended a lengthy bibliography of those who, in varying degrees, supported her (Carmignac, J. “Comment Jésus et ses contemporains pouvaient-ils célébrer la Pâque à une date non officielle?” *RevQ* 5 (1964–66): 59–79, see pp. 76–9). In the article itself he discussed three possible ways for Jesus and his disciples to celebrate passover at a non-official time. M. Black (*The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, 199–201. Brown Judaic Studies, 48. Chico, CA, 1983 (original, 1963)) thought that the Sadducees and Essenes agreed on the old priestly calendar which was therefore widely followed at the time of Jesus. He adds: “If this was to be the last Passover of all, the consummation of Israel’s deliverance in a new Exodus, Jesus might naturally choose what may have been widely and popularly held to be the old ‘Mosaic’ season. Was it, in fact, an *illegal* Passover — so far as the date and place were concerned — which Jesus and His disciples celebrated in Holy Week?” (201) While all of this is interesting, it is highly speculative. Use of qualifiers like “might naturally choose what may have been widely and popularly held” is the only way to formulate proposals of this kind, since there is no concrete evidence to support them.

²⁶ Meier, J. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1: The Roots of the Problem and the Person, 392. ABRL. New York, 1991.

²⁷ Jaubert, A. “Jésus et le calendrier de Qumrân.” *NTS* 7 (1960–61): 16.

lems with it. Some of these are regularly noted in the literature, some are not.

a) Jaubert's appeal to the *Didascalia* is problematic and ultimately unconvincing. On any reading, it seems implausible that a third-century work would be the first one to preserve the correct chronology of Jesus's last days, when all the earliest witnesses have it wrong. But there are other problems with such use of the evidence in the *Didascalia*. J. Jeremias, for one, wrote that "the decisive observation is that the strange passion week chronology first found in the *Didascalia* is a secondary development out of the fasting practice of the Church."²⁸ If so, it would have arisen to meet special needs of a later time, not to furnish the original chronology of passion week. One could more reasonably argue that the reverse had happened: passion chronology was made to conform to later fasting practices.²⁹ Jaubert, it should be said, was quite aware of this point. She too had noted *Didache* 8:1 which prescribes fasts on Wednesday and Friday, unlike the "hypocrites" (= the Pharisees, on her view) who did so on Monday and Thursday.³⁰ To these two days she added Sunday, called "the Lord's day" in Rev 1:10. Hence, these three days were "the liturgical days of the primitive Christian community. These, too, were those of the ancient priestly calendar, in contrast to the official calendar. It is difficult not to see in this a liturgical form of continuity."³¹ Nevertheless, finding the first attestation of the historical order of passion week in a third-century document which highlights Wednesday and Friday in order to differ with opponents is at least unexpected. Jeremias is surely correct in stating that there is no evidence that chronological considerations were involved in attaching the two fast days to events in passion week.³² The point stands even if one can trace this tradition to an earlier period, as Jaubert does. Historical chro-

²⁸ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 25.

²⁹ See Brown, "Problem of Historicity," 214–5. He also notes that the Tuesday passover theme is absent from the Ethiopic version of the *Didascalia*. For the early witnesses outside the New Testament to the one-day chronology, see Blinzler, "Qumran-Kalender," 241–2. He also maintains that Christians at first took over the Jewish fast days (hence they were not connected with the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus) and only later adopted their own in opposition to Jewish practice, not because of the original passion chronology (242–6).

³⁰ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 53.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 54.

³² See also Niederwimmer, K. *The Didache: A Commentary*, 132–3. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, 1998. Here he rejects Jaubert's suggestion: "The association with the days of the passion was altogether a subsequent invention" (133).

nology still does not seem to be the point.³³ She did add later that even if fasting practice emerged in opposition to that of others, one would still have to explain the choice of Wednesday.³⁴ That may be, but it is not obvious that the original order of passion week is the explanation.

b) Even if her appeal to the *Didascalia* were granted, there are substantial difficulties in accepting her thesis about the liturgical days of the week in the 364-day calendar, whether in its original or what she regarded as its modified form.³⁵ True, a number of crucial events do happen on those days of the week, but other important events fall on, say, Tuesday (passover!) or Thursday (the second passover). In the early sources for this calendar (the priestly parts of the Hebrew Bible, Jubilees) the days of the week are never named (apart from the sabbath); they are simply numbered. One could argue that in Jubilees for example the point is not so much to emphasize certain days of the week as to attach festival to events in patriarchal times. “Special days of the month and dates for festivals are stressed, not special days of the week. This is not to say that the calendar was not susceptible to elaboration in such a way that weekdays achieve prime importance, as they do in some Chris-

³³ On this, cf. Blinzler, J. *The Trial of Jesus: The Jewish and Roman Proceedings Against Jesus Christ Described from the Oldest Accounts*. Westminster, MD, 1959. The book is a translation: Blinzler, J. *Der Prozess Jesu*. Regensburg, 1959. He writes: “The chronology of the three days attested by the *Didascalia* has its origin in the second century at the earliest, and is the result of the efforts made later on to derive the traditional weekly fasts on Wednesday and Friday from the passion of our Lord” (79). In the immediate sequel in the *Didascalia* are some rather odd claims about time spans, e.g., that three hours are to be reckoned as a day. Here the concern is clearly to justify the confession that Jesus rose on the third day, not to preserve a historical chronology. On this, see Brown, “Problem of Historicity,” 214–5. He adds the point, made by others as well, that the Wednesday fast may have resulted from confusing Judas’s betrayal, which occurred on Wednesday (Mark 14:10–11), with his leading the authorities to the garden for the arrest. He adds: “We should remember that we have earlier evidence of a Wednesday fast without such a fanciful explanation, and we have a number of first- and second-century writers who are quite content with the one-day chronology.” (215) Cf. also Strobel, A. “Der Termin des Todes Jesu.” *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51 (1960): 77–9.

³⁴ Jaubert, “Jésus et le calendrier,” 27–8.

³⁵ Jaubert thought there was evidence that, as time went on, the principle of liturgical days of the week was retained by some without the 364-day framework of the calendar (Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 45–6, 137–46).

tian sources, but they are not so presented either in Jubilees or in the late priestly documents of the Hebrew Bible.”³⁶

c) Her understanding of how the present gospel accounts resulted encounters a host of problems. For one, it attributes a high degree of freedom to the oral tradition (influenced by diaspora ignorance of Jewish practices); it also ignores the fact that, contrary to what she claims, specific dates must have been important in the early kerygma because each of the gospels retains an ample supply of them (many of these were presented above; there are ten in Mark 14:1–16:1). At least we can say that by the time the four gospels, our earliest sources, were written, exact dates and even days were an integral part of the story of Jesus’s suffering. Second, to term Mark 14:12b (“when the Passover lamb is sacrificed”) a gloss is merely to erase contrary evidence, a seemingly arbitrary procedure. A similar expression is, as we have seen, also present in Luke and there is no textual warrant for eliminating it. The imperfect form of the verb in Mark (ἔθουον) implies that the disciples were acting according to what was customary among Jews. Third, the gospels always present Jesus as observing festivals when other Jews did and never hint that he and his disciples followed a deviating calendar. While this is transparently the case in the passion story of the synoptics, in John it is also true.³⁷ Jaubert attempted to explain the Johannine evidence by arguing that the author wished to portray Jesus as fulfilling and replacing the Jewish festivals; this is true, yet she, as Meier says, “sweeps away the whole of the Johannine tradition with a wave of the hand, but with no detailed discussion. If, early on in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus’ observance of the Jewish feasts in the Jerusalem temple at the same time that other Jews observe them [see John 7–8 for example] is allowed to stand as basically historical, there is no good reason to think that his observance of his last Passover in Jerusalem would diverge from his set custom.”³⁸ Jaubert was later to explore in detail the evidence for Jesus’s opposition to the pharisaic leadership and his association with someone like John the Baptist whose rural priestly roots implied for her an adherence to the traditional calendar, but she could find nothing specifically supporting the notion that Jesus and his disciples followed a calendar according to which passover always fell on a Tuesday.³⁹ She did find a possible trace of a Tuesday meal in the conflicting dates for the anointing at

³⁶ VanderKam, “Origin,” 402. See pp. 399–402 for a full treatment of this part of Jaubert’s theory (= *From Revelation to Canon*, 94, 91–4).

³⁷ Brown, “Problem of Historicity,” 216; Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, 112–3. London, 1959; Blinzler, “Qumran-Kalender,” 247.

³⁸ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, vol. 1, 393 (see all of 392–4).

³⁹ Jaubert, “Jésus et le calendrier,” 11–25.

Bethany, but her explanation of the numbers in John and in the synoptic tradition led her into more difficulties. A major one is that the prior journey to Bethany would have occurred on the sabbath, if the anointing was dated to a Saturday evening. Again she anticipated the objection but hardly answered it.⁴⁰

d) If one were to accept Jaubert's thesis, there would be another curious result. John, who is thought to be most closely related of all gospel writers and perhaps of any New Testament author to Qumran language and thought, would, in calendrical matters, be following a different tradition; the synoptics, however, who show fewer parallels with Qumran, would be following the Qumran calendar. This is not impossible, but it is strange and contrary to what one would expect.⁴¹

Jaubert's case might have been stronger if she could have confined herself to the New Testament and roughly contemporary sources, but her own theory led her into a trap from which the *Didascalia's* chronology provided the only escape. It is reasonably certain that two calendars for dating festivals were used by Jewish people around 30 CE and thus the one-day discrepancy regarding passion week chronology may be explicable on this basis. Or, if the historical last supper took place on a Tuesday, it would be possible (although it would be a remarkable coincidence) to find one year in which the Essene and the official dates for passover differed by just three days.⁴² However, in the New Testament itself there is no evidence that the authors of reports that lie behind the synoptic gospels adhered to a calendar at variance with the standard one of the time and certainly no evidence that they had adopted either the 364-day calendar known from Qumran or the supposed modifica-

⁴⁰ Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper*, 165, n. 11. G. R. Driver, who approved of Jaubert's solution to the chronological problem in the gospels, echoed her way of avoiding the issue of sabbath travel (Driver, G. R. *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*, 330–5. New York, 1965). Brown ("Problem of Historicity," 216) found her evidence for the dating of the Bethany anointing "truly striking" but points out that the synoptics do place the event *after* Palm Sunday, not before as in her reading.

⁴¹ On this and parts of the preceding point, see LaSor, W. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 204–5. Grand Rapids, 1972. It is worth citing LaSor's negative verdict because, while some conservative scholars did indeed endorse aspects of the Jaubertian solution (see the summary statement in Fitzmyer, J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*, 186. Atlanta, 1990; rev. ed.), obviously not all of them did. After all, a solution positing that all four gospels were wrong seems unlikely to appeal to conservatives.

⁴² According to Milik, in the two calendars the festival of passover would fall in the same week about once in thirty years (Milik, *Ten Years*, 112).

tion of it which retained only the liturgical days of the week. So, Jaubert needed some form of the Essene calendar to be able to claim that there were divergent calendars at the time, but in any form of that calendar passover had to be on Tuesday. This left her with the need to find some trace of a Tuesday passover and she was able to locate it only in sources considerably later than the New Testament gospels.

The simplest solution to the problem of passion chronologies in the gospels remains a more theological one that has often been expressed. The synoptic gospels, using more of an Exodus typology, present Jesus as celebrating a passover meal with his disciples before his saving death, while John pictures him as the passover lamb who was slaughtered on behalf of others at the time prescribed for the ritual. No less an authority than R. Brown offered a simple explanation:

We suggest then that, for unknown reasons, on Thursday evening, the 14th of Nisan by the official calendar, the day before Passover, Jesus ate with his disciples a meal that had Passover characteristics. The Synoptists or their tradition, influenced by these Passover characteristics, too quickly made the assumption that the day was actually Passover; John, on the other hand, preserved the correct chronological information. Of course, both the Synoptic and Johannine traditions were interested in the theological possibilities stemming from the Passover context in which Jesus died. If the fourth evangelist does not identify the day itself as Passover, he still has Jesus condemned to death at noon on Passover Eve (xix 14), the very hour at which the priests began to slaughter the paschal lambs in the temple area.⁴³

Whether this is correct we do not know, but at least a solution of this sort has the advantage of not having to appeal to divergent calendars and third-century sources.

While the series of objections to Jaubert's creative reading of the gospel evidence is a formidable one, they are confined to one small topic. That is, her proposals very likely do not explain either the original chronology of passion week or how the chronologies in the synoptics and John arose, but this should not be taken to mean that no aspects of the 364-day calendar survived in early Christianity. It appears that they did, as she and others have shown. As a result, even though she did not provide a solution to the discrepancies in the passion chronologies, Jaubert did succeed in opening a fascinating new avenue into early Christian literature.

⁴³ Brown, R. *The Gospel According to John*, vol. 2, 556. The Anchor Bible, 29A. Garden City/New York, 1970.

INDEX DES AUTEURS MODERNES

- Aaron, D. H., 137, 138
Afinogenov, D., 125
Aitzetmüller, R., 16
Albani, M., xxxi, xxxii, 11, 103, 116, 119
Alexandre, M., xxii
Alliata, E., 40
Amusin, I. D., 4, 36, 38
Andersen, F. I., 1, 3, 17
Anderson, G. A., 47
Ashbrook Harvey, S., 56
Atchley, E. G. C. F., 56
Audet, J. P., 106, 117, 118
Avachvilli, Z., 40
Bagatti, A., 40
Baillet, M., 135
Barankova, G., 16
Bardy, G., 174
Barkhudarov, S. G., 19
Barthélemy, D., 179
Bauckham, R., xxxi, 39, 49, 55
Baumgarten, J. M., 70, 169
Baumstark, A., 108
Bayan, G., 97
Beall, T., 188
Beckwith R. T., 61, 66, 69, 71, 105, 107
Beit-Arié, M., 41, 46
Benz, E., 83
Berthold, H., 142, 147
Bertrand, D. A., 89
Bezold, C., 40
Bickerman E. J., 58
Black, M., 2, 52, 119, 189
Blackman, P., 104
Blinzler, J., 187, 190, 191, 192
Bloch, R., 136
Bogoljubov A. N., 16
Bonwetsch, G. N., 27, 28, 33, 34
Botte, B., 108, 125, 171
Böttrich, C., 2, 5
Bovon, F., 102
Brady, R. E., 61, 63
Brock, S., 137, 139, 141, 150
Brook, K., xxxix
Brooke, G. J., 123, 144
Brown, R. E., 61, 67, 108, 182, 187, 190, 192, 194
Budge, E. A. W., 40, 48
Burchard, C., 167
Burmester, O.-H.-E., 126
Cabié, R., 126, 175
Camelot, P. T., 173
Cantalamessa, R., 110, 112
Caquot, A., 49, 116
Carmignac, J., 106, 189
Charles, R. H., xxx, 15, 19, 27, 33
Charlesworth, J. H. L., xv, xix, xxx, 28, 108, 135, 170, 176
Coats, G. W., 136
Collins, J. J., 136
Collins, N. L., 129, 132
Coquin, R.-G., 40, 125
Couilleau, G., xxxviii
Crouzel, H., 83, 89, 95
Crum, W. E., 124

- Danieli, M.-I., 84
 Danielou, J., xxxiii
 Daniélou, J., xxxiii, 189
 Daniélou, M., xxxv
 Davies, Ph. R., 104
 De Conick, A., 137, 139, 141
 Denis, A.-M., 17
 Der Nersessian, S., 97
 Derrett, J. D. M., 61
 Deselaers, P., 126
 Desprez, V., 142
 Diekamp, F., 111
 Díez Macho, A., 138
 Dimant, D., 148
 Dindorf, L., 100
 Dinekov, P., 3
 Dobrinsky, H. C., 129
 Dockx, S., 107, 110
 Dorival, G., xxii, 83, 91, 93
 Dörries, H., 142, 145, 146, 148, 149
 Dov Schwartz, M., xxxix
 Dunaev, A., xxxviii
 Dupont-Sommer, A., xxiii, 116
 Elier, R., xxxix
 Elizarova, M. M., 37
 Endres, J., 131
 Evans, C. A., xxxiii, 135
 Fabry, H.-J., xxxii
 Falk, D. F., 49, 135
 Falk, D. K., xxxii
 Fauth, W., 38
 Fehrenbach, E., 56
 Feldman, L. H., 188
 Ferreira Lages, M., 109
 Finegan, J., 66
 Fishbane, M., 136
 Fitzmyer, J. A., 105, 106, 150, 193
 Fletcher-Louis, C. N. T., 136, 148
 Flint, P. W., 2, 4, 121
 Forbes N., 27, 33
 Fossum, J., 136, 137, 139, 140
 Freedman, H., 139, 140
 Frey, J., 103
 Frishman, J., 143
 Fritsch, E., 125
 Galbiati, E., 40
 García Martínez, F., 135, 136, 143, 144, 148, 149
 Gaster, T. H., 33
 Gaylord, H. E., 19
 Gibson, M. D., 40
 Ginzberg, L., 54, 64, 138
 Girod, R., 83, 84
 Gleßmer, U., xxxii
 Glickler Chazon, E., 135, 143
 Golitzin, A., 147, 149, 150
 Gottstein, A. G., 138, 139, 140
 Grébaud, S., 40
 Greenfield, J. C., 4
 Grelot, P., xxiv, xxv, xxvii
 Grossfeld B., 138
 Guillaumin, M.-L., xxii
 Guri, I., 29
 Hafemann, S. J., 136
 Hagner, D. A., xxxiii
 Halévy J., 40
 Halperin, D. J., 54
 Hanhart, R., 126, 127
 Hanson, R., 89
 Haran, M., 148
 Harl, M., xxii
 Harlow, D. C., 3, 18, 20, 24, 53
 Hartom, A. S., 131
 Hawting, G. R., xxxix
 Hogan, L. P., 60
 Holl, K., 165
 Horowitz, W., 4
 Hovsepian, L., 100
 Hruby, K., xix
 Jacobsen, H., 137
 James, E. A., 13, 19
 James, M. R., 53
 Jaubert, A., xi, xiii, xvii, xxii, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxviii, xxxix, 4, 39, 69, 70, 83, 97, 98, 99,

- 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109,
110, 111, 113, 114, 131, 132, 133,
153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159,
160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168,
169, 170, 172, 174, 175, 176, 177,
179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186,
187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194
- Jellinek, A., 140
Jeremias, J., 182, 190
Jervell, J., 140
Jones, H. S., 118
Jonge, H. J. de, xxxi
Jonge, M. de, xxxi, 17
Juynboll, G. H. A., xxxix
Kahana, A., 12
Karpov, A. Yu., 4
Kerremans, M.-L., 128
Kiley M., 135
Klein, M. I., 138
Klijn, A. F. J., 89, 90, 91, 92, 93
Klostermann, E., 83, 85, 86, 142,
145, 146, 148, 149
Knohl, I., 55
Knoll, I., xxxi
Kočev, N., 16, 17
Kosmala, H., 61, 62, 63, 64, 65
Kourcikidze, C., 40
Krasnosel'tsev, N. F., 3, 21, 25
Kroeger, M., 142, 145, 146, 148, 149
Kuhn, K. G., 135, 176
Kuhn, T., xxxiv
Kuhn, T., xxxiv
Kurz, J., 12, 37
La Bonnardière, A.-M., xxii, xxvii
Lagrange, P., 63
Lakatos, I., xxxiv
Lampe, G. W. H., 12, 111, 118
Lange A., 103
Lange, A., xxxii
LaSor, W., 193
Latter, C., 60, 62
Le Boulluec, A., 93
Le Déaut, R., xix
Lepelley, C., xxii
Leroux, J.-M., xxii
Leslau, W., 40
Lewy, H., 169
Lewy, J., 169
Lichtenberger, H., xxxii
Liddell, H. G., 118
Likhachev, D. S., 6
Lindeskog, G., xxxiii
Lomiento, G., 83
Lourié, B., xiii, xxxi, xxxiv, xxxvi,
xxxviii, xxxix, 97, 103, 125, 130
Macdonald, J., 139
Mahé, J.-P., 40
Maher, M., 138, 146
Malharbe, A. J., 56
Malingrey, A.-M., xxii
Maloney, G. A., 142, 143, 144, 145,
146, 147, 148, 149, 151
Manns, F., 40
Maraval, P., 166
Markus, J., 150
Marrou, H. I., xxii, xxiii
Mayo, C. H., 60
McGuckin, J. A., 150
McNamara, 138
Meeks, W. A., 137
Méhat, A., xxii
Meier, J., 189, 192
Melia, E., 125
Meshchersky, N. A., 37
Meslin, M., 84
Milgrom, J., xxxii
Milik, J. T., 2, 22, 192, 193
Miltanova, A., 109
Mimouni, S. C., 171
Mingana, A., 40, 41, 44
Moore, C. A., 46, 126
Morfill, W., 15, 19, 27, 33
Mosna, C. S., 112
Muraviev, A., 125
Murmelstein, B., 138
Nägele, S., 123

- Nau, F., 169
 Nautin, P., 84, 117
 Neugebauer O., 11, 52, 119
 Neusner, J., 137
 Neusner, R., xxxiv
 Newsom, C. A., 148
 Niederwimmer, K., 160, 190
 Nitzan, B., 135
 Nodet, É., xxxix
 Nolland, J., 68
 Norman, H. W., 16
 Norris, F. W., 56
 Oesterley, W. O. E., xxx
 Ohijenko Ilarion (Metropolitan), 34
 Olson, D. T., 135
 Orlov, A., 135, 137, 150
 Painter, J., xxxi
 Perler, O., 173
 Perrin, N., 167
 Petit, M., xiii
 Petkanova-Toteva D., 3
 Philonenko, M., 37, 49, 116
 Picard, J. C., 17
 Pietri, Ch., xxii
 Pietri, L., xxii
 Pitra, J. B., 20
 Popov, A. N., 2, 3, 21, 22
 Potin, J., 130
 Prigent, P., 122
 Propp, W., 148
 Puech, É., 136
 Quacquarelli, A., 95
 Rafferty, I., 154, 180, 183
 Ramsay, W. M., 60, 63, 66
 Rappaport, U., 148
 Rassart-Debergh, K., 101
 Ray, W. D., xxxvi, 153, 169
 Renoux, Ch., 126, 158, 166, 169
 Ri, S.-M., 41
 Richardson, C. C., 174
 Ries, J., 101
 Rietz, H. W. L., 135
 Rius-Camps, J., 83
 Robbins, F., 16
 Robinson, S. E., 39, 41, 42, 43, 45
 Rondeau, M.-J., xxii
 Rowland, C., xxxviii
 Rowland, Ch., xxxv
 Rücker, A., 126
 Ruckstuhl, E., 188
 Ryle, H. E., 71
 Samir, Kh., 101
 Sanders, J. A., 121
 Schalit, A., 137
 Schaller, B., 167
 Schiffman, L. H., xxxix, 148
 Schneemelcher, W., xxxv, 89, 92
 Schultz, J. P., 137
 Schwant, B., 189
 Scognamiglio, R., 84
 Scott, J. M., 135
 Scott, R., 118
 Sed, N., xxxix
 Senina, K., xiii
 Sé rigné, G. de, xxiv, xxv, xxvii
 Simon, M., xxxiv
 Simon, M., 139, 140
 Singer I., 54
 Skehan, P., 109, 189
 Smith Lewis, A., 169
 Sokoloff, M., 4
 Sokolov, M. N., 13, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27
 Spanneut, M., xxii
 Sperber, A., 138
 Sreznevskij, I. I., 12, 26, 30, 31, 32, 35
 Staerk, W., 138
 Stendahl, K., 176
 Stone, M. E., 40, 41, 47
 Strobel, A., 106, 107, 191
 Strugnelli, J., 148
 Talley, T. J., 159
 Talmon, Sh., 120, 121
 Tapkova-Zaimova, B., 109
 Thompson, J. W., 56
 Thrall, M. E., 150

- Tigchelaar, E. J. C., 135, 136, 143,
144, 148, 149
Till, W., 124
Tromp, J., 137
Troupeau, G., 40
Trumpp, E., 8
Turdeanu, E., 13
Uhlig, S., 125
Unger, G. F., 66
Vaillant, A., 5, 9, 11, 14, 15, 22, 23,
28, 31, 36
van den Broek, R., 21, 23
van den Hoek, A., 93
van der Horst, P. W., 136
van der Lingen, A., 33
van Esbrœck, M., xxxvi, xxxvii, 97,
98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 113, 133,
158
van Goudoever, J., 128
Van Henten, J. W., xxxi
Van Rompay, L., 143
VanderKam, J. C., 2, 4, 103, 104,
106, 153, 157, 179, 180, 192
Vardaman, J., 107
Vassiliev, A., 22, 25
Vatev, J., 17
Viaud, G., 109
Vinatier, J., xxvi, xxvii
Vogt, E., 189
Vogt, H. J., 84, 89, 95
Volz, P., xxx
Vööbus, A., 161, 169, 174, 184
Vyazemsky, P. P., 3, 21
Wacholder, B. Z., 4, 105
Wacholder, Sh., 105
Walker, N., 189
Walther, J., 189
Wansbrough, J., xxxix
Wick, P., 55
Wilken, R. L., 173
Wilson, R. McL., 89
Wise, M. O., 144
Yamauchi, E. M., 107
Yonge, C. D., 37
Zanetti, U., 125