

THE THREE CALENDARS OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

Author(s): JULIAN MORGENSTERN

Source: *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 1924, Vol. 1 (1924), pp. 13-78

Published by: Hebrew Union College Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43301980>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/43301980?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Hebrew Union College Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hebrew Union College Annual*

JSTOR

THE THREE CALENDARS OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

By JULIAN MORGENSTERN,
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.

I

THE PROBLEM

THE BIBLE furnishes ample evidence that, at different periods in ancient Israel, three different festival calendars and calendar systems were employed. The first of these may well be called the Canaanite Calendar, and for convenience may be designated as Calendar I. The second calendar, which may be labelled Calendar II, is characterized by the fact that it refers to the months by number instead of by name, and so speaks of the first month, the second month, and the like. The third calendar used the Babylonian names of the months. It may be referred to as Calendar III.

It is generally taken for granted, without any question at all being raised, that these three calendars were identical in all essential respects, and that all that took place when Calendar II superseded Calendar I was that the numbers of the months were substituted for the old Canaanite names, and that similarly, when Calendar III superseded Calendar II, the newly borrowed Babylonian names of the months supplanted the older month numbers. Particularly with regard to the transition from Calendar II to Calendar III is this simple and non-significant process generally assumed. The *Talmud*¹ records the tradition that the exiles, returning from Babylonian captivity, brought back with them and introduced into Palestinian practice the

¹ *Jer. R. H.* I. 1.

Babylonian month names. Were this tradition historically correct it would indicate that the use of the Babylonian names of the months began very soon after the exiles began to return from Babylon, near the beginning of the post-exilic period. We shall soon see, however, that such is not the case, and that, therefore, the tradition attests no more than that the rabbis of the *Talmud* were fully aware that the names of the months which are still used in the Jewish calendar were borrowed from the Babylonian calendar.

A further indication of Babylonian influence upon Calendar III, it is usually held, may be found in the fact that although in this calendar *Roš hä-Šanah*, the New Year's Day, falls on the 1st of Tishri, in the fall, none the less this was counted only as the seventh month, and Nisan, in the spring, was counted as the first month. This brought about the rather anomalous condition that the New Year's Day, the official beginning of the new year, fell, not upon the 1st of the first month, but upon the 1st of the seventh month. It is usually explained that this was because the Babylonian year began in the spring, and so in the Babylonian calendar Nisan was the first month, whereas the old Canaanite calendar year began in the fall. When the Babylonian month names were introduced, the calendar of religious festivals and other similar seasonal institutions was not altered thereby, and thus it came about that in Calendar III the New Year's Day is celebrated on the 1st of the seventh month instead of the 1st of the first month. But a reminiscence of Babylonian practice and influence may be seen in the fact that even though the official New Year's Day was fixed by Calendar III for the 1st of Tishri, still the 1st of Nisan continued for many centuries to enjoy a certain consideration as a kind of secondary New Year's Day.² This, in brief, sums up the generally accepted belief in regard to the transition from Calendar II to Calendar III.³ And from this it can easily be seen how gratuitous the whole conclusion is.

Certainly, it does not follow necessarily that the three

² *Mishna R. H.* I. 1; cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities* I. 3. 3.

³ Cf. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*¹ 198—201; Winckler, *KAT*³, 330 ff.

calendars agreed in all essential respects, except in the manner by which they indicated the month. In fact common sense suggests that if all that took place was merely a change from calling the months by their old Canaanite names, to a new-fangled system of indicating them by number, and then some time later, a substitution of a new set of month names borrowed from the Babylonian calendar, for the former designation by number, there would have been no need of any change, and the old Canaanite month names could have continued to function with complete satisfaction down to this very day; for, surely, between names of Canaanite origin and names of Babylonian origin ancient Israel could have had little preference. This consideration suggests the probability that these two changes of the manner of designating the months in ancient Israel may have been due to causes of considerable importance, and may have been accompanied by internal revision of the entire calendar system of more than passing significance.

For example, it may well be that not only did the months in the three calendars differ in names, but they may also have differed in far more essential matters. We do know that the months of Calendar III are lunar in character, as is the year also. But the months of either or of both of the other two calendars may have been solar, and, in such case, the year as well. And in such case both months and years of either or both Calendars I and II would have been of different lengths than the months and years of Calendar III. They would have begun and ended at different moments, and would undoubtedly have employed different systems of intercalation. And not impossibly also, the festivals and other like institutions may have come at different relative moments in the respective calendars. Nor does it follow that Calendar II must have agreed in all essential details except the manner of designating the months, with either Calendars I or III. In other words, the most probable hypothesis is that the existence of these three systems of designating the months in the Bible implies that there were three different calendars employed at different times in ancient Israel, and that the transition from the one system of designating the months to the second system, and from this

in turn to the third system, implied two revisions of the calendar, each in all likelihood, of a thorough-going nature.

Such is the hypothesis. It is the purpose of this paper to test this hypothesis, and in the process thereof to gather numerous by-products, interesting and valuable information bearing upon the life and religious belief and practice of ancient Israel.

The first task is to determine, as exactly as possible, when the two transitions from Calendar I to Calendar II and again from Calendar II to Calendar III took place.

II

THE TIME OF THE TRANSITION FROM CALENDAR I TO CALENDAR II.

But four of the old Canaanite month names are preserved in the Bible, Abib, Ziv, Ethanim and Bul. Of these, Abib is mentioned six times,⁴ Ziv twice,⁵ and Ethanim⁶ and Bul⁷ each once. The three latter names are all mentioned in the same connection, in the account in I Ki. of the building and dedication of Solomon's Temple. Abib, on the other hand, is also always mentioned in only one connection, as the month in which the Passover-festival is to be celebrated. Abib and Ziv are called the first and second months respectively, and Ethanim and Bul the seventh and eighth months respectively. We shall see later that these numbers are only of secondary import. But this much is certain that Abib and Ziv came in the spring and Ethanim and Bul in the fall. Of these three, Ziv, Ethanim, and Bul have been found in North-Semitic inscriptions.⁸ This would warrant the inference that this Canaanite and early Israelite calendar was the same as that employed in this early period among the Phoenicians and other neighbors of Israel in Western Asia, and that, were it necessary for any reason, the names of the months

⁴ Ex. 13. 4; 23. 15; 34. 18 (twice); Deut. 16. 1 (twice).

⁵ I Ki. 6. 1. 37.

⁶ I Ki. 8. 2.

⁷ I Ki. 6. 38.

⁸ Cf. Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik* I. 412.

of Calendar I might be filled out by the names of additional months found in these inscriptions.

It will be noted that the latest passages of the Bible in which these names are used are in I Ki. and, therefore, are the product of the early part of the Babylonian Exile. But it is quite probable that the use of these names here is somewhat archaic, due in all likelihood to the fact that the author was drawing upon some other source for his information, and this older source undoubtedly employed these older names. In each case, either the author himself, or what is far more probable, some later glossator felt constrained to give the equivalent of the Canaanite month name in the numerical order of Calendar II.

Unquestionably, the latest contemporaneous reference to these Canaanite month names is found in Deut. 16. 1; and there no equivalent in the numerical designation of the months of Calendar II is given. This would seem to indicate that these Canaanite month names, and consequently also Calendar I, were employed in ancient Israel as late as the time of the composition of the Deuteronomic Code proper, or D I.

This conclusion is corroborated by a careful consideration of those passages of the Bible in which the months are cited not by their old names, but by number, i. e. where Calendar II is employed. The oldest references to this system are found in Jeremiah. Throughout this book, the months are cited by number alone, and not in a single instance by name. But, as Kuenen has correctly pointed out,⁹ everyone of these references, without exception, are probably the work, not of the prophet himself, but of his editors, and are, therefore, the product, in all likelihood, of the early part of the Babylonian Exile and practically contemporaneous with similar references in Deut. 1. 3, in Kings, and in Ezekiel.

This does not mean, of course, that Calendar II could have been introduced only in the early part of the Babylonian Exile. It may have been in use some time before our first literary reference to it was composed. But it is reasonable to suppose that the date of its introduction could not have long preceded

⁹ *Onderzoek* 2² (1889). 255 ff.

such reference. This accords fully with the fact just noted that the latest contemporaneous reference is found in Deut. 16. 1. And this justifies the inference that Calendar I was employed in Israel as late as 621 B. C. By 586 B. C. or very soon thereafter, Calendar II, it seems, had completely supplanted Calendar I. Therefore, the moment of the transition from Calendar I to Calendar II must fall sometime between these two dates. We shall see later that Calendar II exhibits certain marked affinities with the Babylonian calendar, and that it differed in certain very essential respects from Calendar I. We can hardly suppose that a calendar based largely upon Babylonian antecedents would have been adopted during the life time of Josiah. But we do know that almost immediately after the death of that king in 608 B. C., a reaction against the rigorism and iconoclasm of the Deuteronomic Code set in,¹⁰ and the influence of Babylonian culture and religion became stronger, it would seem, than ever before in all the history of Israel. It is quite reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the introduction of Calendar II could not have taken place before 608 B. C. Between this date and 586 B. C. or very soon thereafter at the very latest, the transition from Calendar I to Calendar II must have been made. As was just intimated, the transition was in all likelihood the result of the ascendancy of Babylonian culture and religion. The extent to which the festivals and other calendar institutions were affected thereby will be determined later.¹¹

¹⁰ Cf. Jer. 7. 17 ff. and 44.

¹¹ It is interesting and even significant to note that in the pre-Deuteronomic literature, reckoning by months plays practically no role at all. In all of the J and E codes of the Hexateuch, and in Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah the expression "month" is not used a single time to convey the idea of a fixed moment in the year, but only to indicate duration of time (so. Gen. 29. 14; Num. 11. 20 f.; Hos. 5. 7 one month; Jud. 11. 37 ff. two months; II Sam. 24. 13 three months; Jud. 19. 2; 20. 47 four months; I Sam. 6. 1 six months, and the like). On the other hand the moment in the year was indicated in this literature usually by reference to the season, as in I Sam. 12. 17 ("at the time of the wheat-harvest"), II Sam. 21. 9 ff. ("at the time of the barley-harvest", and "from the beginning of the harvest season until the water was poured down from heaven"); I Sam. 2. 1 ("at the time of the 'turning of the year', i. e. the equinox, at the time when the messengers [?] go forth"). Even the time of the festivals

III

THE TIME OF TRANSITION FROM CALENDAR II
TO CALENDAR III

If the Talmudic tradition were trustworthy, that the exiles returning from the Babylonian Captivity brought the Babylonian names of the months back with them, we would expect to find these names commonly employed in the post-exilic literature, say from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah on, and on the other hand the system of indicating the months by number gradually falling into disuse and eventually disappearing altogether. But such is not at all the case.

The system of indicating the months by number continued to be used throughout the entire post-exilic Biblical literature, and is even employed in the majority of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings. On the other hand the Babylonian month names are used only sparingly in both the Bible and Apocrypha, as the following table will show:¹²

Nisan—Neh. 2. 1; Esth. 3. 7

Sivan—Esth. 8. 9

Elul—Neh. 6. 15; I Mac. 14. 27

Kislev—Zach. 7. 1; Neh. 1. 1; I Mac. 4. 52; II Mac. 1. 9, 18;
10. 5

Tebet—Esth. 2. 16

Shebat—Zach. 1. 7; I Mac. 16. 14

Adar—Ezra 6. 15; Esth. 3. 7, 13; 8. 12; 9. 1, 15, 17, 19, 21;
I Mac. 7. 43, 49; II Mac. 15. 36; Esdras 7. 5.

All told, these Babylonian names of the months are found in only seventeen passages in the entire Bible and in only ten in the Apocrypha. Moreover, of these seventeen Biblical passages, all scholars are agreed, two Zach. 1. 7 and 7. 1, are late glosses. We shall have convincing proof later that, despite the

it would seem was fixed in this manner, cf. Ex. 23. 16 (the festival of ingathering, at the end of the year "when thou gatherest in thy produce from the field"). The one exception in this practice seems to be the fixing of the Passover-festival "in the month of Abib". But, as we shall see, it is quite probable that this expression is used in a technical and not a literal sense.

¹² Borrowed from Woods. art. Calendar (Hebrew), Hastings *ERE*. III. 109.

opinion of some scholars, Ezra 6. 15 is also late, not earlier at the most than near the very close of the 4th century B. C. The remaining fourteen Biblical passages are all found in only two Biblical books, Nehemiah and Esther. Of these, only three occur in Nehemiah and the remaining eleven in Esther. Both of these books are late, in fact among the very latest in the entire Bible. Nehemiah, a part of the work of the Chronicler, is in all likelihood the product of the 3rd century B. C., while Esther was probably composed in the 2nd century B. C. Furthermore, it is significant that Esther employs the older system of numbering the months nine times, almost as often as it cites them by the Babylonian names; and in seven of the eleven passages in which the Babylonian month name is used, it is accompanied by the numerical name of the month; in only four passages in Esther are the Babylonian month names used independently. And Nehemiah employs the older system of numbering the months far more frequently than the Babylonian names. Such being the case, despite the Talmudic tradition, we must conclude that the Babylonian names of the months did not even begin to be used in Palestine much before the close of the fourth century B. C., if even at that time; that for several centuries after that, the older system of indicating months by number continued to be generally employed; and that it was supplanted only very slowly and gradually by the Babylonian month names.¹³ Even the author of II Mac. 15. 36, writing probably near the end of the 1st century B. C., when giving the date of the Nicanor festival, felt constrained to explain that it came on the 13th of the twelfth month, "which is called Adar in the Syrian language".¹⁴ Accordingly, the only historic truth in the Talmudic tradition is the consciousness that the

¹³ In fact Woods *op. cit.* holds that the Babylonian names of the months did not come into regular use in Israel until after the destruction of the Temple by the Romans in 70 A.D.

¹⁴ Probably the oldest work in which only the Babylonian names of the months are employed is *M:gillat Tā 'ānūt*, composed in all likelihood near the commencement of the 1st century A. D. (cf. Lauterbach, in *JE* - 427).

In this connection it is interesting, and not without a certain significance, to note that in the Elephantine papyri the Babylonian names of the months are

names of the months in Calendar III were of Babylonian origin, and no more.

All this implies that the introduction of the Babylonian month names was a slow and gradual process, that began in Palestine at the very earliest but little before the end of the fourth century B. C. or perhaps even somewhat later than that. Therefore, insofar as the introduction of these Babylonian month names represented the formulation and adoption of a new calendar system, with whatever internal changes and modifications with regard to the festivals and other like institutions that may have become necessary, we may expect to find some indications thereof in the literature and practice of this period.

Having thus determined the time when Calendar I was superseded by Calendar II, and when, in turn, Calendar II gave way, or began to give way to Calendar III, we are now prepared to carry this investigation one step farther, and a

used quite generally and from a period much earlier than that in which they began to be used in Palestine. In the two oldest papyri (Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus Elephantine*, nos. 30 and 25, dated 494 and 483 B. C. respectively) only the Egyptian month names are used. But a papyrus dated the 14 (15?)th year of Xerxes, i. e. 471 (470?) B. C. (Sayce and Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri A*), gives the double reckoning, the 17 (18?)th of Elul = the 27 (28?)th of Pachon. From this time on this double system of dating according to both the Egyptian and Babylonian month names is employed in all the texts published by Sayce and Cowley, and in one of the texts published by Sachau (no. 28). In three of the texts published by Sachau (nos. 1, 6 [the so-called Passover papyrus] and 8) only the Babylonian month names are used, and in six texts (nos. 10, 13, 25, 27, 29 and 30) only the Egyptian month names are used.

From this evidence it is clear that although the Babylonian names of the months were introduced into Egypt at a much earlier time than into Palestine, still they do not seem to have ever come into general use there. With the revival of the Egyptian national spirit in the closing years of the 5th. century B. C. the Babylonian month names probably ceased gradually to be used. That these Babylonian month names were introduced into Egypt so much sooner than into Palestine was probably due to the fact that at this time, seemingly to a far greater extent than Judea, Egypt was a Persian province, non-autonomous, but under Persian military administration, and, therefore, in all likelihood subject to more direct and urgent Babylonian cultural influence. Not impossibly, also, the considerable proportion of Aramaeans in the population of Syene may have materially furthered the employment of the Babylonian names of the months in these documents.

considerable step it is, and consider the question, to what extent were the festivals and other similar seasonal institutions affected by these two revisions of the calendar.

IV

THE DATE OF THE ŠÜKKÔT-NEW YEAR'S FESTIVAL

The key to the solution of this problem is furnished by the consideration of the time of the celebration of the New Year's Day and the *Šükkôt* festival in the different periods of Israel's history.

In a former paper,¹⁵ I have shown that in the period immediately preceding the Babylonian Exile, the *Šükkôt* festival was celebrated from the third through the ninth of the seventh month, and the New Year's Day was celebrated on the tenth of that month, on the day immediately following the conclusion of the seven days of the *Šükkôt* celebration. Actually, however, there was no break in the festivities, and the New Year's Day was regarded in practice as an integral part of the *Šükkôt* celebration, its conclusion, and climax, and some of the characteristic rites of the *Šükkôt* festival, such as, for example, the dances of the maidens in the vineyards, were naturally transferred to it. Therefore, in actual practice the *Šükkôt* festival, culminating on the New Year's Day, consisted of eight full days of celebration, with this eighth day in theory an independent festival, but in practice intimately and inseparably associated with the *Šükkôt* festival.

The proof of all this is simple and convincing. The Mishna¹⁶ states that in ancient times in Israel, the maidens of Jerusalem used to go out to dance in the vineyards on the 15th of Ab and *Yôm Kippûr*. Certainly such dances in the vineyards do not agree at all with the spirit of *Yôm Kippûr* as a day of fasting, self-affliction, repentance and atonement. But we can easily comprehend their import as essential rites of the celebration of the *Šükkôt*

¹⁵ Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals, *JQR* (new series) 8 (1917), 31-54.

¹⁶ *Ta'an*. IV. 8.

festival, particularly if in the text of the *Mishna* we substitute for the name *Yôm Kippûr*, the simple date, the tenth of the seventh month. Jud. 21. 19 ff. tells that dances, apparently similar in every respect, even to the fact that through them the girls succeeded in winning husbands, were participated in by the maidens of Shiloh in the vineyards as a part of the celebration of the *Häg* or *Šükkôt* festival. The same conclusion is to be inferred from Jeremiah's description¹⁷ of the maidens of Israel going out to dance in the vineyards at the time of the celebration of what is apparently a pilgrimage festival held in connection with the vintage. Moreover, the fact that the *Mishna*¹⁸ provides that every vineyard must have a *maḥôl*, etymologically a "dancing place", i. e. an open space 12 to 16 cubits wide, according to the divergent opinions of Beth Hillel and Beth Shammai, surrounding it, in which no vines might be planted, proves that at one time in ancient Israel the dances in the vineyards were a common and regularly established institution observed in every vineyard.¹⁹ These facts indicate that in preexilic Israel, as late at least as the time of Jeremiah, i. e. until the Babylonian Exile, the dances of the maidens in the vineyards were celebrated in all parts of the land, in addition to at least one other occasion in the year, as the concluding rite of the great annual vintage festival, *Šükkôt*. And in Jerusalem, at least, instead of being celebrated on the 9th of the 7th month, the last of the seven days of the feast proper, they were celebrated on the next day, the tenth of the month.

That at this time the *Šükkôt* festival was celebrated from the 3rd of the seventh month on, is proved by the account of the murder of Gedaliah b. Aḥikam in Jer. 41. Tradition has fixed the date of the murder of Gedaliah upon the 3rd of the seventh month, and there is no reason to question the correctness thereof. In the Jewish religious calendar the 3rd of the seventh month, Tishri, is celebrated as a fast day commem-

¹⁷ Jer. 31. 1-5.

¹⁸ *Kil.* IV. 1-3.

¹⁹ Of course, by the time of the composition of the *Mishna*, the original nature and purpose of the *maḥôl* had been long forgotten, and only the unexplained custom survived of leaving this portion of the vineyard bare of vines.

orating the murder of Gedaliah. But it is difficult to conceive why this event should have been commemorated in this manner, since it was of little or no import at all for the subsequent history of Israel. Moreover Zach. 7. 5 and 8. 19 mention the fasts in the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months together, as if they had a common character. And although tradition has associated these fasts with incidents of the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadrezzar, still as is shown in the above mentioned paper, the fast on the 9th of the fifth month, Ab, had only an accidental and remote coincidence with the destruction of the Temple, and had been celebrated from more ancient times as the first day of an important seven day agricultural festival, which, precisely like the *Šūkkôt* festival, began with a fast day and culminated in the dances of the maidens in the vineyards on the 15th of Ab.

Similarly the fast mentioned by Zachariah in the seventh month must have been this fast of Gedaliah on the third day of the month. And that the 3rd day of the seventh²⁰ month was the beginning of the seven days of the *Šūkkôt* festival and that, precisely like the 9th day of Ab, it too had been celebrated as a day of mourning and fasting from of old, long before the murder of Gedaliah, is borne out by the story in Jer. 41. For this tells that on the day after the murder, i. e. on the 4th of the seventh month, and before the murder was as yet known to any one, eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria came to Mizpah, on their way up to the sanctuary, or rather to the ruins thereof, carrying a sacrifice with them, and obviously participating in the regular pilgrimage of the *Šūkkôt* festival. These men have their beards shaven, their garments rent and incisions in their flesh. These are all characteristic rites of mourning explicitly forbidden in Lev. 19. 27 ff.; 21. 5; and Deut. 14. 1 ff., obviously for the reason that they were rites of an idolatrous, non-Yahwistic origin. We know from manifold evidence that they were rites of mourning for Adonis or Tamuz, the god of vegetation in the pre-Israelite religion

²⁰ So also the *Gemara*, R. H. 18 b.

of Canaan and adjacent lands,²¹ and that the Adonis festivals began always with fasting and mourning for the dead god, and culminated with wild rejoicing and merrymaking at the end of the seven days.²²

Both the festival from the 9th through the 15th of Ab and *Šūkkōt* were borrowed forms of these Adonis festivals, and both, therefore, began with a day of fasting and self-affliction, and culminated in the joyful dances of the maidens in the vineyards on the 15th of Ab and the 10th of Tishri. Accordingly the fact that the eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, who came to Mizpah on the day after the murder of Gedaliah, i. e. on the 4th of the seventh month, in the course of their pilgrimage up to Jerusalem to offer sacrifices at the sanctuary, had subjected themselves, to idolatrous rites of mourning, and this undoubtedly on the preceding day, i. e. the fast day beginning the festival, is convincing proof that this festival was celebrated in 586 B. C. from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month.

This fact is confirmed by the legislation in Ex. 23. 16 and 34. 22. The latter passage provides that the *Šūkkōt* festival or, as it is called there, the 'Asîf festival be celebrated at the "turning-about" of the year, at the equinox, i. e. the fall equinox, and the former passage provides even more explicitly that the festival be celebrated at the "going-out" of the year, i. e. at the very end of the year.²³ This expression can have

²¹ Cf. Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun*, index, under Adonis, 2, Klage, Trauerfeier; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 3 Adonis, Attis, and Osiris, index.

²² Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, par. 6.

²³ *Targum Onkelos* to Ex. 34. 22 renders תקופת השנה by במפסק רשתא, "at the going-out of the year", just as in 23. 16. Singularly enough LXX renders תקופת השנה by μεσοῦντος τοῦ ἔνιαυτου, i. e. "in the middle of the year". Presumably by this rendering LXX means no more than "within the year", i. e. after the year has begun, and, therefore, not immediately at the end of the old year, nor at the beginning of the new year (cf. also Ibn Ezra to both Ex. 22. 16 and 34. 22 and *Nejinah Lager* to Ex. 23. 16). It probably arrived at this rendering because of the legislation in Lev. 23. 34 and Num. 29. 12-39, which fixes the date of the *Šūkkōt* festival as the 15-22nd of the seventh month, two weeks after the beginning of the new year. But such being the case, the very fact that LXX consciously departs from what can be the only possible meaning of תקופת השנה, obviously in order to conform with this, as we shall show, late and secondary date of the *Šūkkōt* festival, the result of the late postexilic revision of the

only one meaning; according to it, the festival must have marked the close of the old year, and must have immediately preceded the New Year's Day. And just this was the condition in the pre-exilic period when the *Šukkkôt* festival was celebrated from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month, and the New Year's Day was celebrated on the very next day, the 10th of the month.

Further corroboration of this fact is furnished by the following consideration. Deut. 31. 10 commands that at the end of seven years, at the time of the Sabbatical year, when the people gather to celebrate the *Šukkkôt* festival, the Law shall be read publicly. *Mishna, R. H. I. 1* states explicitly that the 1st of Tishri is the New Year's Day for ordinary Sabbatical and Jubilee years. Accordingly the *Gemara*²⁴ very correctly raises the question, "How can the text speak of the *Šukkkôt* festival at the end of the seventh year as being still within the Sabbatical year? Would it not rather be in the eighth year, since, according to the late Biblical and the rabbinical calendar the new year begins on the first of Tishri and the *Šukkkôt* festival comes two weeks later?" The question is indeed significant. Of course, the *Gemara* raises it only to answer it and harmonize the obvious contradiction as best it can. But its answer is, of course, unconvincing, and serves no purpose other than to emphasize the difficulty.

The *Mekilta*, too, is conscious of the same difficulty when it correlates the three Biblical passages, and remarks (Deut. 31. 10) שנאמר מקץ שבע שנים במועד שנת השמטה בהג הסכות ואומר וחג האסיף בצאת השנה (Ex. 23. 16) וחג האסיף תקופת השנה (Ex. 34. 22) זה הוא האמור לך לשנים לשמיטים וליובלות²⁵. For if the 1st of Tishri marks the beginning of the year and *Šukkkôt* commences two

calendar, is in itself clear indication that the date implied by the term תקופת השנה can be only the end of the year, as in Ex. 23. 16 and in the *Targum* to this passage.

²⁴ *R. H. 12 b* (bottom).

²⁵ *Mekilta, Pisha*, par. I (near end). For this reading, agreeing with the manuscript, but differing from and more exact than the manifestly incorrect edition of Weiss, as well as for the entire reference with its unmistakable implication, I am indebted to my friend and colleague, Professor Jacob Z. Lauterbach.

weeks later, then how can *Šukkkôt* come, as all these three Biblical passages clearly state that it does, at the end of the year?

Of course the only real solution of this problem is that in the time when these three passages were composed the *Šukkkôt* festival came on the last seven days of the year and so immediately preceded the New Year's Day. Therefore Deut. 31. 10 could still speak very correctly of the *Šukkkôt* festival at the end of the seven years, and still within the seventh or Sabbatical year, and not in the eighth year, as the *Gemara* suspected. And, inasmuch as this reference is from Deuteronomy, we have additional evidence that even as late as a very few years before the Babylonian Exile, if not during the Exile itself, the old calendar was still in effect, and that, therefore, the *Šukkkôt* festival must have still been observed from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month and *Roš hä-Šanah* must have come on the 10th of the month.

And finally, that the 10th of the seventh month was actually observed as the New Year's Day is established by the bald statement in Ezek. 40. 1 and by the additional fact that Lev. 25. 8 ff. provides that the proclamation of the fiftieth year as the Jubilee year be made upon this day. True, v. 9 b. adds the note that this is the Day of Atonement. But it is equally certain that this is a harmonistic gloss, and not a part of the original text. Certainly, to proclaim the fiftieth year as the Jubilee year ten days after the year had had its official beginning, would have been an impracticable and senseless procedure.²⁶ Such a

²⁶ The Rabbis of the Talmud felt the inconsistency of having the year begin on the 1st of the seventh month but the proclamation of the Jubilee year and the freeing of the slaves not until the 10th, and sought to remove the difficulty as best they could. R. Ishmael b. Jochanan b. Beroqa accordingly asserted that slaves did become free in theory on the 1st of the seventh month, but were not permitted to return to their homes until the 10th. However, during this period they were no longer subject to their former masters, but spent these ten days in eating, drinking, and merry-making and with crowns upon their heads. Then on the 10th, when the *Bet-Din* had had the trumpet blown, they returned to their homes, and fields reverted to their original masters [*R. H.* 8 b (bottom)]. Again, this attempted harmonization does no more than emphasize the problem. But its true solution can lie only in the direction we have indicated. Not im-

proclamation could have had force and purpose only if made on the New Year's Day, itself. And so it follows that the authors of the Holiness Code, of which this passage is a part, just as Ezekiel, must have regarded the 10th day of the seventh month as the New Year's Day.

Such, in brief, is the argument advanced in the above-mentioned paper. It proves conclusively that down into the Babylonian Exile, as late in fact as the time of Ezekiel and the composition of the Holiness Code, the New Year's Day was celebrated on the 10th of the seventh month, and the *Šukkkôt* festival on the seven days immediately preceding, from the third through the ninth of the month.²⁷ And such being the case, the question arises, "Is it possible to fix more exactly the time when the festival calendar was changed and the New Year's Day was shifted to the 1st of the seventh month, *Šukkkôt* to the 15th through the 21st or the 22nd of the month, and the 10th of the month, the old New Year's Day, was reconstituted as *Yôm Kippûr*, the Day of Atonement?" We believe that further investigation will throw considerable light upon this weighty question.

V

THE ŠUKKÔT — NEW YEAR'S FESTIVAL AT THE TIME OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH

The incident recounted in Neh. 8 has been discussed oft-times and its significance clearly indicated. It has been correctly pointed out that the passage relates in considerable detail the

possibly, however, this tradition preserves a significant reminiscence of an ancient festival procedure of Saturnalian character, to which we shall have occasion to refer later (cf. below, note 95).

²⁷ It is true that Ezek. 45. 25 fixes the *Šukkkôt*-festival as beginning on the 15th of the seventh month and continuing for seven days, i. e. through the 21st of the month, almost as does the Priestly legislation in Lev. 23. 34 and Num. 29. 12 ff. But we shall prove later that this passage can not possibly have been an integral part of the prophet's book, but must have been appended to the chapter by some much later Priestly writer.

incidents attendant upon the celebration of the *Šukkôt* festival in Jerusalem at the beginning of the seventh month; and since no mention is made anywhere of *Yôm Kippûr*, the inference is drawn, and undoubtedly correctly, that *Yôm Kippûr* could not as yet have been instituted at this time. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that Neh. 9.1 ff. tells of a great fast on the 24th of this same month.²⁸ Regardless of whether this fast was held only upon this one occasion or was perhaps in that period celebrated as an annual affair, it would be difficult indeed to account for such a fast on the 24th if *Yôm Kippûr*, a great annual, national fast day had been celebrated on the 10th, only two weeks before. Manifestly *Yôm Kippûr* was not yet instituted in the days of Nehemiah. Such is the usual, and in the main, certainly the correct conclusion drawn from the analysis of this passage. But this by no means exhausts its import, nor, in fact, touches upon the most significant feature thereof.

The passage states that the people had been dwelling in their villages outside of Jerusalem. But as the seventh month drew near (7.73) they went up to Jerusalem and on the 1st day of the seventh month they gathered together in the open square near the Water-gate. There Ezra began to read to them the book of the Law. He read from sunrise until noon (8.3). The day, itself, was a sacred day, upon which the people were inclined to give themselves over to mourning and weeping, ostensibly because they were hearing the Torah read, presumably for the first time. But it is inconceivable that this cause should have induced mourning and weeping. The true cause thereof,

²⁸ Of course if with Torrey [*ASL* 25 (1908—9), 276—311] we regard Neh. 9 as out of place here and originally following Ezra 9 and 10, it would follow that the month here referred to was not the seventh but the ninth month; and in such case the account in Neh. 9 of the great fast upon the 24th of this month would have no bearing upon the question of whether *Yôm Kippûr* was observed at this time or not. But cf. Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 49 f. for a discussion of Torrey's hypothesis. And it must be kept in mind that at the most the proof drawn from Neh. 9 is only incidental and not primary, and that consequently even if it may not be applied to the question of the observance of *Yôm Kippûr* at this time, none the less the latter question and its solution are not affected one whit by the withdrawal of this evidence.

if the incident have any historical basis at all, must have been something quite different. At any rate the passage states that Nehemiah, Ezra, and the Levites attempted to turn the people from their mourning and weeping by the thought that this day was sacred to Yahwe, and that they should instead eat and drink and rejoice and send gifts to the poor, but under no conditions must they grieve. This last statement (v. 11) would indicate that the mourning and weeping were not occasioned by rejoicing over hearing the Torah read. For while we may conceive of one weeping because of a joyful event, we can hardly conceive of one mourning and grieving therefor.

Then, on the second day, i. e. the 2nd of the month as well as the second day of the festival celebration, Ezra proceeds with the reading, and in the course of this day's reading he reaches the passage at present found in Lev. 23. 39-41, commanding the preparation of and the dwelling in booths as an indispensable, and the most characteristic rite of the *Šukkkôt* celebration. Immediately thereupon the command is given to all the people, both those in Jerusalem and those in the villages round about, to go to the mountains and there gather olive, palm, and myrtle branches and other materials prescribed for the construction of booths, in order that they might celebrate the *Šukkkôt* festival properly. The people obey with alacrity. The booths are erected upon the roofs and in the courtyards of the houses, and in the courts of the Temple, and the people dwell in them during the seven days of the *Šukkkôt* festival. And then the note is added that *Šukkkôt* had never been celebrated in this manner before from the days of Joshua down to that day. In other words this was apparently an altogether new and novel manner of celebrating the festival.²⁹ And the

²⁹ Cf. the similar statement with regard to the celebration of the Passover in the eighteenth year of Josiah, in II Ki. 23. 21 ff. There, too, as has long been recognized by scholars, the implication is that this was an altogether new method of celebrating the Passover, of course in accordance with the prescriptions of Deut. 16. 1-8. In the same way this statement here undoubtedly implies not only a novel manner of celebrating the *Šukkkôt* festival, but also the hearing by the people for the first time of a new corpus of law, and their acceptance of it, and likewise the celebration of the festival in accordance with the pre-

reading of the Law goes on without interruption during all the seven days of the festival. They celebrate the festival for seven days and on the eighth day an *'Āzēret* in the prescribed manner.

Here the question arises: If this *Šūkkôt* was celebrated as Lev. 23.34 and Num. 29.12 ff. prescribe, and as scholars generally hold,³⁰ from the 15th through the 22nd of the seventh month, why should the preparations for the festival, and particularly the gathering of the branches of the olive, palm, and myrtle, have been begun on the 2nd of the month? For assuredly, long before the beginning of the festival on the 15th, to say nothing of its conclusion on the 22nd, these branches would have withered and dried up and become totally unfit for the use for which they had been gathered, and it would have become necessary to replace them by new branches. It is impossible to conceive of these preparations having been made already two weeks before the actual beginning of the festival.

scriptions of this law. Of course, this corpus of law, read by Ezra and accepted by the people on this occasion, could have been only the so-called *Grundschrift* of the Priestly Code, with, necessarily, the Holiness Code, or at least certain portions thereof (since Lev. 23.39-41 belongs to the Holiness Code), incorporated therein.

What was novel in this celebration of the *Šūkkôt* festival was probably the elimination, or at least the suppression, of certain characteristic non-Yahwistic features of the old, pre-exilic *Šūkkôt* celebration, such as the mourning and self-affliction on the opening days. This may be inferred from the emphasis laid in the Biblical narrative upon the urgent efforts of Nehemiah, Ezra, and the Levites to dissuade the people from grieving and mourning, but instead to celebrate the entire festival with rejoicing and merry-making. Possibly the ceremonies of the "water-drawing" and the dances of the maidens in the vineyards, both rites the non-Yahwistic origin of which is self-apparent, were likewise suppressed, at least for this occasion. For the complete silence of Biblical legislation with regard to these rites may well be interpreted as indicating an unfavorable and even hostile attitude toward them. But if so, then their suppression could have been only temporary, as the legislation of the *Mishna* with regard to the rite of the "water-drawing" shows (*Šūkk. V. 1-5*). On the other hand, the dwelling in booths, which in the pre-exilic celebration was obviously only one of the characteristic rites, seems to be made here, as well as in Lev. 23.39-41, the sole ceremony of primary significance.

³⁰ Cf. Baentsch, *Leviticus*, 382; Siegfried, *Ezra u. Nehemiah*, 104; Bertholet, *Ezra u. Nehemiah*, 72; Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 363.

This difficulty, however, is easily solved. The *Šukkot* festival here, too, just as in the period before the Exile, must have been celebrated from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month, with the 10th of the month also observed as a sacred day. Such being the case, we can understand why the people gather their palm branches and other materials and erect their booths on the 2nd of the month, and why the reading of the Law, begun on the 1st of the month and continued on the 2nd, goes on without interruption throughout the seven days of the festival i. e. from the 3rd through the 9th of the month. Manifestly, still in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah the calendar was as yet unrevised and the festivals were still observed on precisely the same dates as in the pre-exilic period.

The conclusion is confirmed by a parallel account of the proceedings in Jerusalem at the beginning of the seventh month, found in two slightly varying versions in Ezra 3.1-7 and Esdras 5.27-54. Both versions tell that at the approach of the seventh month, the people from the country round about assemble in Jerusalem to celebrate the *Šukkot* festival, and they celebrate it in the manner prescribed in the Law. This gathering furnishes the occasion for the rebuilding of the altar on the site of the former altar of the pre-exilic Temple. The offering of the sacrifices on this altar, presumably the festival sacrifices, begins with the first day of the seventh month. Obviously here, too, the *Šukkot* festival was celebrated at or close to the beginning of the month, i. e. in all likelihood from the 3rd through the 9th or 10th of the month, certainly not as late as from the 15th through the 22nd.

Moreover the version in Esdras 5.47 adds the note that this gathering took place in the open court at the former eastern gate of the Temple. This is undoubtedly the same spot as the court near the Water-gate, where the people likewise assembled for the same occasion in Neh. 8.1. This fact is probably further indication, if such be needed, that this festival, celebrated at the beginning of the seventh month, was *Šukkot*. For the *Mishna*³¹ records the significant fact that in the

³¹ *Šuk. V. 4.*

ceremonies of the "waterdrawing", an important part of the folk-celebration of the *Šukkot* festival, one of the regular rites was the solemn procession of priests and Levites to the eastern gate of the Temple. When they reached the gate they would turn their backs towards the gate and their faces toward the west and say, "Our fathers who were in this place had their backs to the Temple and their faces toward the east, and they used to prostrate themselves eastward toward the sun, but as for us, our eyes are towards Him". This is not the place to enter into a full discussion of this interesting and significant rite, even though it has an important bearing upon our subject, for such a discussion would far transcend the limits of this paper. The account in the *Mishna* suffices, however, to show that the eastern gate, or as Esdras 5.47 puts it, the former eastern gate, i. e., the eastern gate of the first Temple, now in ruins, with the court-yard adjacent, played an important role indeed in the ceremonies of the *Šukkot* festival. The fact, therefore, that the people gather in the courtyard at the former eastern gate of the Temple at the beginning of the seventh month may well be regarded as further indication that this festival celebrated at the very beginning of the seventh month was *Šukkot*.

Moreover, the very reading of the Law by Ezra at this time, beginning on the 1st of the seventh month and continuing on the 2nd and thence during the entire seven days of the festival, is significant. For it conforms fully to the prescription of Deut. 31.10 that during the *Šukkot* festival of every Sabbatical year the Law should be read publicly to the people gathered at the central sanctuary. What the origin of this custom and of the injunction in Deut. 31.10-13 may have been, it is difficult to determine. But certainly in the fact that Ezra reads the Law to the people assembled in the court of the Temple from the 1st of the seventh month on, further proof may be found that the *Šukkot* festival is here represented as being celebrated on the very opening days of the month, and not from the 15th through the 22nd thereof.³²

³² This consideration would point to the conclusion that the incident recounted in Neh. 8 transpired in a Sabbatical year. This fact may help

Now it is noteworthy that in all three passages, Ezra 3. 1-7, Esdras 5. 47-54, and Neh. 8 nowhere is it stated that the first day of the seventh month is *Roš hä-Šamah*, the New Year's Day. This complete silence with regard thereto is significant. Particularly in Neh. 8. 9-11 the holiness of the first day of the seventh month is insisted upon, and the people are therefore charged not to weep nor mourn nor grieve, but instead to rejoice and make merry, to eat well and to send gifts to the poor. None the less the day is not once called the New Year's Day. Its sanctity must, therefore, have been due to some altogether different cause. But certainly the first day of the seventh month could not yet in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, here spoken of, have been celebrated as the New Year's Day.

Furthermore, Neh. 8 concludes with the statement that after celebrating the *Šukkkôt* festival proper for seven days, the people celebrated on the eighth day an '*Āžerēt*' in the prescribed manner. The latter reference is of course to Lev. 23. 36 and Num. 29. 35-38, which command the observance of the eighth day, the day following the close of the seven days of the *Šukkkôt* festival proper, i. e. therefore, the 22nd day of the seventh month as an '*Āžerēt*', a day of abstention from work and of bringing sacrifice. The observance of this rather non-descript eighth day is easily comprehensible in connection with the later calendar of Lev. 23, but is altogether unaccountable in the calendar which, we have seen, lies at the bottom of the festival celebration in Neh. 8.

For, as has been said, the reading of the Law, it is expressly stated, began on the 1st of the seventh month and continued on the 2nd. In the afternoon of this day, after the conclusion of the day's reading, the people made their preparations for the celebration of the *Šukkkôt* festival. This began, therefore, on the 3rd of the seventh month. The seventh and

somewhat to fix the date of the occurrence since the precise date of three Sabbatical years is known (cf. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4, 326 a), and from these it is a simple matter to compute backward to the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, regardless of whichever of the various present-day hypotheses with regard to Ezra and his time may be most acceptable.

last day of the festival proper would, therefore, be the 9th of the month. Accordingly, this eighth day of celebration would be the 10th of the seventh month. It follows then that the 10th of the seventh month was actually celebrated in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. But again the fact that this 10th of the seventh month is here called only 'Āzēret, but not called *Yôm Kippūr* proves that this peculiar supremely sacred observance of this day had not yet been instituted at this time, for had *Yôm Kippūr* been observed at this time, the name would surely have been used here.

But it is equally certain that it could not have been the colorless and unexplained *Š: minî 'Āzēret* of the later calendar, for this day is mentioned nowhere in the Bible except in connection with the dating of the *Šūkkôt* festival from the 15th through the 22nd of the seventh month. It could have been only one thing, viz. *Roš hä-Šanah*, the New Year's Day, just as Ezek. 40.1 calls it. In other words, the second half of this verse must have read originally somewhat in this manner: ויעשו (ה)חג שבעת ימים וביום השמיני ראש השנה. Then at a time considerably later, and in order to harmonize this narrative with the later calendar and the supposed ancient Mosaic authorship thereof, as recorded in Lev. 23, the original text was altered to the present reading.³³

All this evidence, cumulative and convincing, proves beyond any possibility of doubt that in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the calendar was not yet revised, and that *Šūkkôt* was still celebrated from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month, and *Roš hä-Šanah*, therefore, on the 10th of the month just as in the preexilic period and at the time of Ezekiel. And *Yôm Kippūr* was, of course, as yet unknown.

33 I. e. the original ראש השנה was changed to עזרת and כמשפט was added, in order to imply the reference to the legislation in Lev. 23. 36 and Num. 29. 35-38. Likewise the article in החג was dropped, to convey the impression that this festival, celebrated on the opening days of the seventh month, was not the *Šūkkôt* festival proper, but merely a festival, an incidental festival, celebrated only on this one single occasion, and that the real *Šūkkôt* was celebrated, as prescribed in Lev. 23. 34-36 and Num. 29. 12-38, from the 15th through the 22nd of the month.

VI

THE DATE OF THE DEDICATION
OF SOLOMON'S TEMPLE

This far-reaching conclusion is further corroborated, and additional light is shed upon the problem of the post-exilic calendar and its revision by still another important consideration.

I. Ki. 8.2 and 65 f. tell that Solomon dedicated the Temple at the *Šukkot* festival. The dedication celebration lasted for seven days, obviously coincident with the seven days of the festival, and culminated and concluded with the dismissal of the people on the eighth day.

The reason for the selection of this festival as the occasion of the dedication is easy to comprehend. In this early period the eighth day, the day after the conclusion of the festival proper, was, of course, the New Year's Day. This was indeed, for many reasons, the most appropriate moment in the year for such dedication ceremonies. For, in addition to the natural significance and sanctity of the day as the New Year's Day, it was also regarded in ancient Israel and among the Canaanites from whom the concept was borrowed, as the day of the fall equinox and of the annual descent of fire from heaven upon the altar of the sanctuary, just as still today in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem on the afternoon preceding Easter Sunday each year the holy fire is thought to descend into the sacred tomb.³⁴ This in itself was sufficient reason, not merely to suggest, but actually to compel the dedication of the Temple at this time. For this fire that descended, or was

³⁴ Of the origin, meaning, and history of this extremely interesting tradition and ceremony, I have treated in great detail in another, as yet unpublished paper. For the present, however, and until the publication of this paper, the reader may refer very profitably to von Raumer, *Palästina*², 321 ff.; Dowling "The Great Fire in the Church of the Resurrection, Jerusalem", in *PEF* (1908) 151—153; Wiedemann, "Zum Wunder des heiligen Feuers", *ZDPV* 40 (1917), 247 ff.; and especially Charlier, "Ein astronomischer Beitrag zur Exegese des Alten Testaments", *ZDMG* 58 (1904), 386—394. With the great majority, and certainly with the most important, of Charlier's conclusions I agree completely, although upon entirely different and independent grounds.

thought to descend, upon the altar upon the New Year's Day, in time developed into the concept of the *K:ḥôd Yahwe*, the fiery apparition which symbolized Yahwe's presence, as found in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code.³⁵ And I Ki. 8. 3-11 and II Chron. 5. 14 and 7. 1-3 tell explicitly that the entrance of the *K:ḥôd Yahwe* into the sanctuary was the crowning feature of its dedication.

Now it is interesting and significant to note that a late gloss in I Ki. 8.65f. tells that actually there were fourteen days of continuous celebration, viz. the seven days of the dedication of the sanctuary proper, and then the seven days of the *Šükkôt* festival, and on the eighth day, i. e. the day after the close of the festival, Solomon dismissed the people to their homes. That this is a gloss, and that it is undoubtedly late may be inferred from the fact that LXX knows nothing at all of these fourteen days of celebration, but speaks only of the seven days of dedication, coincident with the seven days of the *Šükkôt* festival.

The parallel account in II Chron. 7. 9f. adds two other and most significant bits of information. It tells explicitly that Solomon first celebrated the dedication of the Temple for seven days, and then the *Šükkôt* festival for an additional seven days. Then upon the eighth day he celebrated an *'Azërêt*, and finally on the 23rd of the month, i. e., of course the seventh month, he dismissed the people to their homes. The two significant added details here are (1) the celebration of the eighth day, and the day after the conclusion of the *Šükkôt* festival proper, as an *'Azërêt*, and (2) the exact dating of the dismissal of the people to their homes.

This eighth day of celebration here is, of course, the same as that prescribed in Lev. 23. 36 and Num. 29. 35 ff., as the eighth and concluding day of the *Šükkôt* festival. That it is mentioned in II Chron. 7. 9 but not in I Ki. 8. 65 indicates that the passage in Chronicles is later than the gloss in Kings, and that at the time of the composition and insertion of the latter into its present position, the *Šükkôt* festival was celebrated for

35 Cf. my "Biblical Theophanies", *ZA* 25 (1912), 141 ff.

only seven days, from the 15th through the 21st of the seventh month, and that the celebration of the additional eighth day had not yet been introduced.

From this it follows that the revision of the calendar after the Exile must have been a slow and gradual process. In the first place, *Roš hä-Šanah* was transferred from the 10th of the seventh month to the 1st, the new moon day of that month. It was probably at the same time that the seven-days celebration of the *Šükkôt* festival was shifted to a later date than when it had been celebrated formerly, and its beginning was fixed at the full moon of the seventh month, so that now the celebration of the festival fell upon the 15—21st of the month. But the recollection persisted in the mind of the people that in the period before this stage of the revision of the calendar, there had actually been an eighth day of celebration, independent of and only loosely connected with the *Šükkôt* festival proper, yet none the less in actual practice indissolubly linked with the observance of the *Šükkôt* festival, and so, in all likelihood for this reason, the observance of an eighth day as a kind of inexplicable, traditional appendage to the seven-days *Šükkôt* festival was instituted. But since, divorced from its original connection with the New Year's Day and the fall equinox, it had no other characteristic form of celebration, this eighth day of the festival came to be observed in a purely formal and colorless ritual manner as an '*Āzēvēt*', a day of mere conventional abstention from work and offering of sacrifice. That, however, no direct reminiscence of a development of this sacred day out of the original New Year's Day can be perceived anywhere, would indicate that this development was a slow and gradual process, and that this *Š:mînî 'Āzēvēt* was not instituted until quite sometime after the date of the *Šükkôt* festival proper had been fixed on the 15—21st of the seventh month.³⁶

³⁶ This entire conclusion would seem at first sight to be invalidated by the fact that Ezek. 45. 25 fixes the date of the *Šükkôt* festival very exactly for the seven days beginning on the 15th of the seventh month, i. e. from the 15th through the 21st. It should be noted at the same time that the passage makes no mention of an eighth day of celebration. Now, if this passage were

Furthermore, it is clear that not only in II Chron. 7.8 but also in the gloss in I Ki. 8.65 the seven days of the *Šūkkôṭ* festival proper fell on the 15—21st of the seventh month. Such being the case, according to both these accounts, the seven days of the independent celebration of the dedication of the Temple immediately preceding the seven days of the *Šūkkôṭ* festival must have fallen upon the 8—14th of the month. In other words, the 10th of the seventh month came during this supposed week of the dedication festival. Now, if the celebration of *Yôm Kippûr* upon this day had already been instituted by the time of the composition of either or both of these passages, undoubtedly some reference thereto would have been made in them; or, on the other hand, had it been felt that the spirit of the dedication festival was incompatible with that of the Day of Atonement, as it certainly was, either some provision would have been made therefor, or, what is far more likely, the authors of the gloss in I Ki. 8.65 and of II Chron. 7.8 would never have conceived of a festival of dedication of the Temple that extended over *Yôm Kippûr* and its importance transcended that sacred day to such an extent that it completely abrogated the celebration of *Yôm Kippûr* for that year, and even rendered unnecessary any mention of its omission. In other words the absolute silence of I Ki. 8.65 and II Chron. 7.8 with regard to *Yôm Kippûr* is conclusive and irrefutable proof

actually the work of Ezekiel, it would follow that the observance of the *Šūkkôṭ* festival for seven days beginning on the 15th of the seventh month, which is clearly the practice recorded in early secondary strata of the Priestly Code and in the gloss to I Ki. 8.65, and which must have been the regular practice in the period intervening between the first post-exilic revision of the calendar and the introduction of *Š:mini 'Āzərēṭ*, was instituted, or at least proposed, by Ezekiel, and must, therefore, in all likelihood, have been known to Ezra. But inasmuch as the evidence is ample and convincing that in Ezra and Nehemiah, *Šūkkôṭ* is still celebrated from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month, the only conclusion possible is that Ezek. 45.25 can not be an integral part of the prophet's book, but must have been added by some Priestly glossator, who, however, since he makes no mention of *Š:mini 'Āzərēṭ*, must have written before the final stages of the revision of the calendar, as recorded in the very latest strata of the Priestly Code (cf. below, p. 40). This is likewise the implication of the fact that Ezek. 40.1 fixes *Roš hā-Šanah* on the 10th of the seventh

that at the time of the composition of these two passages *Yôm Kippûr* had not yet been instituted.³⁷

All this evidence points to the conclusion that the institution of *Yôm Kippûr* was not only post-exilic and late, but very late, indeed; that it was, in fact, one of the very latest of the religious institutions recorded in the Pentateuch, that it probably followed, and not impossibly by quite a considerable time, even the institution of *Š·mîni 'Azêrêt*; and that it could scarcely have been instituted much before the latter half of the 4th century B. C. or perhaps even somewhat later than that.

In other words, the evidence indicates that there were three distinct and successive steps in the revision of the calendar of the festivals after the Exile, or more exactly, after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. First, *Roš hä-Šanah* was transferred from the 10th of the seventh month to the 1st, and *Šukkkôt* from the 3—9th to the 15—21st of the month. Then, an additional eighth day of celebration, *Š·mîni 'Azêrêt*, was instituted on the 22nd. And finally *Yôm Kippûr* was instituted on the 10th, the old pre-exilic New Year's Day.

What probably happened was this. Even after the first stage of the revision of the festival calendar, when *Roš hä-Šanah* was transferred to the 1st of the seventh month and

month. For, as we have just seen, the transfer of *Roš hä-Šanah* to the 1st of the seventh month must have gone hand in hand with the transfer of *Šukkkôt* from the 3rd through the 9th to the 15th through the 21st of the seventh month. Therefore, it follows with absolute certainty that since Ezek. 40. 1 still fixes *Roš hä-Šanah* on the 10th of the seventh month, 45. 25 must be the work of a late priestly glossator.

³⁷ That the Rabbis were conscious of this difficulty is proved by the tradition found in *Šab.* 30 a and *Num. Rab.* par. 17, and in fullest detail in *Berêš. Rab.* par. 35. This tells that after the completion of the seven days of celebration of the dedication of the Temple, the people became conscience-stricken because they had violated the Sabbath of that week by eating, drinking, merry-making, and kindling lights on it, and also because they had neglected to observe *Yom Kippur* with the prescribed self-affliction. But a *Bät-Kôl* quieted their fears with the assurance that their entire celebration had been pleasing to God, and that, therefore, they were destined to enjoy future life.

Of course, like so many rabbinical explanations of Biblical problems, this merely calls attention to and emphasizes the difficulty, without, however, solving the problem.

Šukkkôṭ to the 15—21st, the memory persisted in the mind of the people that the 10th of this month had once been a day of particular sanctity and peculiar celebration. Of course, with the transfer of the concept of the New Year's Day to the 1st of the month, the term *Roš hä-Šanah* ceased to be applied to the 10th, and in time it was completely forgotten that this had been originally the New Year's Day, and it was remembered only that it had been a day sacred for some now unknown reason. Moreover, certain rites, such as the blowing of the trumpets, characteristic of the New Year's Day, were naturally transferred to the celebration of the New Year's Day on the 1st of the month, while other rites, particularly characteristic of the *Šukkkôṭ* festival, such as the entire ceremony of the "water-drawing" or that of the dwelling in booths, were naturally transferred with the festival to the 15th—21st of the seventh month. But certain other ceremonies, closely linked with the 10th of the month itself, and therefore not easily transferred to any other moment in the month, continued to survive in the folk-practice of the people, particularly the ceremony of the goat of Azazel³⁸ and the dances of the maidens of Jerusalem in the vineyards, and perhaps also the entrance of the chief priest into the holy of holies. The idolatrous, non-Yahwistic character of these ceremonies was particularly apparent, and the priests and the religious leaders of the people would in all likelihood have gladly abolished them if they could. But many of these rites were too deeply rooted in the practice of the people to be suppressed completely and permanently. They persisted despite the unquestioned opposition of the religious authorities, and continued to survive in folk-practice for many generations, in fact until the very destruction of the Temple by the Romans in 70 A. D., even without the sanction of Pentateuchal legislation. Such unsanctioned ceremonies were the afore-mentioned dances of the maidens of Jerusalem in the

³⁸ Volz (*Das Neujahrsfest Yahwes*, 16) also seems to hold that this ceremony of the goat of Azazel was originally a New Year's Day rite, although, strangely enough, he maintains that it was of desert origin, presumably for no reason other than that it deals with a goat sent out into the desert.

vineyards on the 10th of the seventh month and the complex institution of the "waterdrawing" on *Šūkkôt*.

Other ceremonies, however, undoubtedly because of the prime importance which the people attached to them, the priests and scribes were compelled to sanction and legalize by proper provision in their corpus of ritual law. Such was the ceremony of the goat of Azazel. Unquestionably, this old persistent New Year's Day rite, with its purifactory significance, constituted the nucleus of the *Yôm Kippûr* idea and ritual. It requires but little study of Lev. 16 to conclude that the priests would probably have abrogated this particular rite if they could. But, unable to do so, they reduced its original non-Yahwistic character as much as possible.

With this was combined the old equinoctial New Year's Day rite of the withdrawal of the curtain that separated the innermost sanctuary of the Temple, wherein the ark upon which the Deity was thought to dwell, was deposited, so that at this one moment of the year He might be made visible to all the people. The original equinoctial character of this ceremony³⁹ held it fast to this one day, and forbade its transfer to the new New Year's Day on the 1st of the month. But now the original ceremony was of necessity modified quite considerably. As is clear from the antianthropomorphic character of the Deity characteristic of the Priestly Code, the priestly leaders of the congregation of Israel in the post-exilic period must have conceived of Yahwe as altogether too transcendental to sanction the idea that He might be gazed upon directly and immediately by the mortal and impure eyes of the people themselves, even once a year. Accordingly the old, anthropomorphic rite was modified in typically priestly manner. The curtain was no longer drawn back so that all the people might look directly into the holy of holies and behold the Deity. Instead, the high-priest, as the representative of the people, and the recognized mediator between them and Yahwe, alone entered into the holy of holies behind the curtain, or rather now the two overlapping curtains, and there stood in the very

³⁹ Into which, however, lack of space forbids our going here.

presence of the Deity. But even this ceremony had to be modified considerably. August and sacrosanct though he was, even the high-priest was not fit nor able to stand in the immediate presence of Yahwe and behold him face to face. Upon the dazzling radiance of the *Kîhôd Yahwe* even the high-priest on *Yôm Kippûr* could not gaze directly; and so it was provided by proper legislation that the high-priest must enter the holy of holies with his burning censer in his hand, so that the smoke of the incense might fill the shrine, and the Deity be beheld through this only dimly, veiled, as it were, by the cloud that, according to the Priestly Code, always enveloped the *Kîhôd Yahwe*. And then, after laying his petition, in a most literal sense, at the very feet of the Deity, the high-priest could return to the people, like one escaped from death, safe and unharmed, with the happy assurance that he and the people had been forgiven. This modified and intensified form of the old New Year's Day rite tended to emphasize and dignify the role of the high-priest, and this, of course, fitted in well with the priestly program. For this reason it was most natural that this modified form of the old New Year's Day ceremony should find a central place in the priestly ritual for *Yôm Kippûr*.⁴⁰

With these two ancient New Year's Day rites, and the addition of proper sacrifices, in accordance with the characteristic principles of sacrifice laid down in the Priestly Code, the ritual of *Yôm Kippûr* was practically complete.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Cf. *Mishna, Yoma*.

⁴¹ In all likelihood Isa. 58. 1-12 is a prophetic protest directed against the observance of the 10th of the seventh month, in its newly acquired priestly garb, as *Yôm Kippûr*. (Agreeing with Michael Sachs and D. Hoffmann against Cheyne; cf. the latter's *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, II, 77.) For certainly the scathing denunciation here is directed, not against a single fast-day, especially proclaimed for one particular occasion, but against some annually recurring and punctiliously observed fast-day, with a quite elaborate ritual of self-affliction and supplication for pardon of sins of ritual character; and it is difficult to conceive of any institution, other than *Yôm Kippûr*, in all the religious practice of Israel, to which this description and this scathing denunciation, so characteristic of the prophetic spirit, could apply even remotely. Probably the author of Isa. 58. 1-12 would have preferred a complete abrogation of all celebration of this day, or

VII

THE DATE OF THE DEDICATION
OF THE TABERNACLE IN THE WILDERNESS

Still further information bearing upon our problem can be gained from yet another consideration.

Ex. 29.30 and 35 prescribe that the ceremonies of consecration of Aaron and his sons shall last for seven days, while vv. 36 ff. command that the ceremonies of the purification and dedication of the altar of the tabernacle in the wilderness shall endure for a like period.⁴² The continuation of this narrative, recounting the carrying out of the commands, it is recognized by all scholars, is found in Lev. 8. There we have the detailed account of the consecration ceremonies of Aaron and his sons during these seven days. Lev. 9 then describes the crowning events of the consecration of Aaron and his sons and of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness upon the eighth day, the day after the completion of the seven days of preparation and purification proper, and presumably, therefore,

failing that, its continued observance as a mere harmless, almost meaningless folk-practice or folk-superstition. In other words, if only it were possible to fix the date of Isa. 58. 1-12 exactly, we would have a fairly sure *terminus ad quem* for the institution of *Yôm Kippûr*. And inasmuch as, as we have just seen, the institution of *Yôm Kippûr* on the 10th of the seventh month was undoubtedly the very last step in the revision of the festival calendar, we would have then the *terminus ad quem* for the revision of the entire calendar as well. But it is impossible to date Isa. 58. 1-12 with any certainty. Cheyne, Duhm, and Marti agree in fixing the date of the passage as about 445 B. C., somewhat before the time of Nehemiah; but their arguments are altogether gratuitous. Certainly, at this early date the passage could not refer to *Yôm Kippûr*; nor do we know of any annual institution of that period to which the passage might apply; and on the other hand there is nothing at all in their argument, nor in the passage itself, to invalidate the argument of a date considerably later than 445 B. C. Such being the case, however, it is impossible to make any safe deduction from this passage with regard to the institution of *Yôm Kippûr* and the completion of the revision of the festival calendar.

⁴² These verses are, however, probably secondary; cf. the commentaries to the passage. None the less their implication is quite the same as if they had been written by the original author.

the day when Aaron and his sons begin to function as priests. The culminating detail of the ceremonies of consecration and dedication that followed immediately after the blessing of the people, seemingly Aaron's first official act as high-priest, was the appearance of the *K:ḥôd Yahwe*. And then a flame came forth from this fiery apparition, from the very presence of Yahwe, Himself, and consumed the sacrifice upon the altar, and presumably also kindled the sacred flame upon the altar.

Then, impliedly still upon the same day, Nadab and Abihu, the two sons of Aaron attempted to offer sacrifice in an improper manner, with the result that once more fire came forth from the presence of Yahwe and consumed them. Their crime was merely this, that in the performance of their priestly duties of this day, they had put into their censers strange fire, i. e. fire which had not been taken from off the altar, from the sacred fire that had been kindled by the flame emanating from the *K:ḥôd Yahwe*, but fire kindled apparently in ordinary human manner. It was a ritual transgression, pure and simple, committed undoubtedly, the tradition means to imply, unintentionally, through inexperience and ignorance. Yet, it was a sufficiently heinous violation of the taboo or sanctity of Yahwe to occasion their death.⁴³

The immediate continuation of this narrative, again so recognized by all scholars, is found in Lev. 16. There we read that after the death of the two sons of Aaron, in other words presumably still upon the eighth day, Yahwe reveals to Moses the detailed and complex ritual, in conformity with which not subordinates like Nadab and Abihu, but only the high priest himself shall draw near unto the Deity within the innermost part of the sanctuary once in each year, on the 10th of the seventh month. This is, of course, the ritual for *Yôm Kippûr*, even though the name *Yôm Kippûr* is used nowhere in this chapter.

The question arises here, why should the legislation for *Yôm Kippûr*, or rather, since *Yôm Kippûr* is not mentioned, the legislation for the annual purification of the sanctuary, the

⁴³ Cf. the quite similar innocent ritual transgression of Uzzah, and his consequent death, in II Sam. 6. 6 f.

priesthood and the people upon the 10th of the seventh month, follow immediately upon the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and the death of the two oldest upon this day, unless it be that this day, the 10th of the seventh month, was the very day of the culmination of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the eighth day of the consecration and dedication ceremonies?

Several considerations confirm this conclusion. It has long been recognized by scholars that the description of the tabernacle in the wilderness, contained in the Priestly Code, was to a large extent patterned after the first Temple. Such being the case, it is natural to suppose that the account of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness, and with it necessarily the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests of the tabernacle in the wilderness, would be modelled after the account of the dedication of the Temple in I Ki. 8.⁴⁴ And inasmuch as, according to the very oldest

⁴⁴ That the dedication of the Temple in I Ki. 8 was regarded by the writers of the Priestly school as an event of transcendent importance in the religious history of Israel is proved by the extent of Priestly emendation and revision of the original narrative. For the following passages in I Ki. 8. 1-11 are certainly, in their present form at least, of Priestly authorship:

- v. 1. ואת כל ראשי המטות נשיאי האבות לבני ישראל (not in LXX)
- 2 b. הוא החדש השביעי (not in LXX)
- 3 b. וישאו הכהנים את הארון (in LXX; but 3 a omitted)
4. The entire verse except the opening words, ויעלו את ארון יהוה, (these words are omitted in LXX but 4 a β is retained)
5. עדת and הנועדים עליו (not in LXX)
6. אל קדש הקדשים; וקני ישראל הכהנים, substituted for the undoubtedly original

Vv. 7-11 likewise have apparently undergone far-reaching Priestly revision, as is evidenced by the conspicuous role played by the priests, the cloud and the *K'bd Yahwe* in them. But the actual extent of this revision it is difficult to determine, since, seemingly, it involved an almost complete rewriting in the Priestly spirit of this portion of the original text.

Moreover, this record of this crowning moment of the dedication of the Temple has been displaced from its original position. For logically the account of the descent of the sacred fire upon the altar, obviously the culminating act of the dedication, as the natural indication of Yahwe's pleasure in the entire procedure, should have followed Solomon's prayer, instead of preceding it as it does. The correctness of this inference is proved by the parallel account in

tradition, as we have learned, the Temple was dedicated during the seven days of the *Šukkot* festival, and the dedication ceremonies culminated on the eighth day, the New Year's Day, it is quite likely that the Priestly authors of Pg likewise regarded the seven days of the purification of Aaron and his sons, and with this the seven days of the purification of the sanctuary, as having coincided with the seven days of the *Šukkot* festival.⁴⁵ The eighth day of the dedication of the Tabernacle, just as of Solomon's Temple, referred to in Lev. 9. 1, upon which the culminating ceremonies of the consecration of Aaron and his sons took place, would then be the old New Year's Day, the 10th of the seventh month. And upon this day, too, in connection with the dedication of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, just as on the same day in connection with the dedication of Solomon's Temple, the descent of the sacred fire from heaven occurred.⁴⁶

II Chron. 5 ff. For there the detailed description of the descent of the sacred fire is found in 7. 1, immediately after Solomon's prayer. However, an anticipatory and purely formal reference thereto is found in II Chron. 5. 13b and 14, in relatively the same position as its parallel in I Ki. 8. 10 f. Obviously II Chron. 5. 13b and 14 is a late insertion into the text, and probably the work of the same editor who revised I Ki. 8. 10 f. and removed it from its original position, in all likelihood immediately after v. 62. (63a may be an editorial insertion to take the place of the removed passage.)

⁴⁵ Possibly, a reminiscence of these seven days of purification before the consecration of Aaron, on the New Year's Day on the 10th of the seventh month, may be seen in the seven days seclusion and purification of the high-priest in the second Temple in preparation for the celebration of *Yôm Kippûr* on the same day (cf. *Mishna, Yoma* I. 1).

⁴⁶ In this connection it is significant that I Chron. 21. 26 likewise tells of the descent of fire from heaven upon the altar which David erected in the field of Arauna, the Jebusite, when the first sacrifices were offered upon it, i. e. at the moment of its consecration.

As has been said in a previous note, this matter of the descent of the sacred fire from heaven upon the altar is of too great extent and import to be treated in this paper. Suffice it to say here that abundant evidence proves conclusively that this was in ancient Israel a regular feature of the New Year's Day celebration upon the 10th of the seventh month. This was also the day of the fall equinox, and the ceremony of the descent of the sacred fire, or its equivalent in the post-Ezekiel literature, the coming of the *K:bôd Yahwe*, was of equinoctial origin and character. This matter will be developed fully in

Such being the case, the reason for the legislation of Lev. 16 for the ritual observance, not yet of *Yôm Kippûr*, since that term is not used here, but rather for the 10th of the seventh month, following in Pg immediately upon the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons and the death of two of the latter for coming improperly before the Deity, is readily apparent. The entire ceremony was that of the old New Year's Day on the 10th of the seventh month, and the ceremonies prescribed in Lev. 16, particularly those of the sending forth of the goat of Azazel, and the entrance of the chief priest into the holy of holies were undoubtedly, as has already been intimated, important elements of the ancient ritual of this day.

Such being the case, we may regard it as established that Pg told that the consecration of Aaron and his sons and the dedication of the Tabernacle in the wilderness took place during the seven days of the *Šūkkôt* festival, celebrated as in the pre-exilic period from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month, and culminated in the peculiar rites of the New Year's Day on the 10th of the month, when Aaron officiated for the first time in his new capacity as high-priest.⁴⁷

another paper. But it is important that this conclusion be kept constantly in mind in the consideration of the rest of the argument of this paper.

⁴⁷ Ezekiel, too, it may be inferred, intended that the temple, for which he made such elaborate provision in his book, should be dedicated at this same time and on this same occasion. In 43. 26 f. he provides that the dedication ceremonies proper shall continue for seven days and shall culminate with the commencement of the regular functioning of the priests on the eighth day. In this he agrees fully with the prescription of Pg. It is true that nowhere, at least in the present text of his book, does Ezekiel state explicitly the time of the year when the dedication ceremonies should be held. But since in 43. 1 ff. and 44. 1 ff. the completion of the building of the temple, its inspection, and its dedication are inseparably associated with the coming of the *K'hôd Yahwe* from the east, its solemn entrance through the eastern gate into the temple, and its taking up its permanent abode therein, this may well point to the *Šūkkôt*-New Year's festival with its equinoctial rite of the descent of the sacred fire from heaven, as the moment and occasion selected by the prophet for the dedication of his temple.

It is interesting and significant to note also that the original Church of the Holy Sepulchre, erected by Constantine on the site of Golgotha, and completed in the year 335 A. D. was dedicated on September 14th, and that

But it is significant to note that P 2 fixes the time of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness as the first eight days of the first month. The dedication ceremonies begin on the 1st of the first month and culminate on the 8th.⁴⁸ Moreover, the context seems to imply that no sooner was the *Miškan* set up and the 'Ohel spread over it, than the *K:ḥôd Yahwe* took up its abode within the *Miškan* and the cloud covered the entire tabernacle, not at the close and as the culmination of the dedication ceremonies, but at their very beginning, on the 1st of the first month. It is clear that P 2 has transferred the date of the dedication of the tabernacle from the 3rd through the 10th of the seventh month to the 1st through the 8th of the first month, and has likewise taken certain liberties with the details of the account of the dedication ceremonies. What could have occasioned this radical change?

A late Babylonian inscription dated at Erech in the year 244 B.C.⁴⁹ i. e. in the Seleucid era, tells of the dedication of a temple of Anum and Antum. As a part, and probably

the dedication festival lasted eight days. This date was chosen because it was the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, or *Šūkkôl*, and the dedication of Constantine's Church was fixed for this festival in imitation of Solomon's dedication of his temple. For many years after that time the anniversary of this occasion was celebrated by the Church as an eight-day festival. Upon its initiation by baptism was administered, and the people from every region under the sun resorted to Jerusalem to visit the sacred places [cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* IV. 43—47; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* II. 26; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* I. 29; Athanasius, *Apol. contr. Arian* 84; *Pilgrimage of St. Silvia of Aquitania* (in *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society* XVI. 76)]. This occasion is still celebrated by the orthodox Greek Church as the Festival of the Cross on Sept. 13th (Greek calendar).

But the evidence is ample that this Festival of the Cross is nothing but a superficially Christianized form of the ancient pre-Israelite *Šūkkôl*-New Year's festival, and that the celebration of this festival throughout Palestine and Syria had never been interrupted even during the period of the Roman dominion, but had been continuous up to the time of Constantine. In all likelihood, therefore, the full reason for the emperor's selection of this festival for the dedication of his great church, certainly regarded as the fitting successor of Solomon's Temple, was not only because Solomon had dedicated the Temple then, but also because throughout the East this must have been recognized as the proper and divinely appointed moment for the dedication of temples and churches.

⁴⁸ Ex. 40. 2, 17.

⁴⁹ Clay, *Miscellaneous Babylonian Inscriptions*, etc. no. 52, pp. 81 ff.

as the culminating act of the dedication, the two deities enter their sanctuary on the 8th of Nisan. Apparently the dedication ceremonies had begun some days before, presumably on the 1st of the month.

But this custom of dedicating temples at the beginning of the year can be traced in Babylonia back to remote antiquity, in fact to the time of Gudea, the great temple-builder in the middle of the 3rd millennium B. C. In Cylinder B he describes with much detail the dedication of a magnificent temple to Nin-girsu. The dedication is celebrated at the time of the great New Year festival, *Zag-muk*, at the close of the old year and the beginning of the new, in the first month, called explicitly ITÚ-É-BA, "the month of the temple". The festival lasts for seven days. It is a festival characterized by seemingly Saturnalian rites; slaves are equal to their masters and class distinctions are abolished; no evil words are spoken and no injustice is practiced; apparently certain ceremonies dealing with the kindling or rekindling of new fire are likewise performed. Undoubtedly the festival, together with the dedication ceremonies, began on the 1st of the month and culminated with the chief ceremonies, including the entrance of Nin-girsu, or better of Nin-girsu and Nina or Bau, his consort, into their new abode.⁵⁰

Likewise in a text engraved upon a statue,⁵¹ Gudea describes the dedication ceremonies of a temple of Nin-girsu. Whether this is the same temple as that, the dedication of which is described in Cylinder B, is not certain. There, too, the dedication ceremonies come at the beginning of the year and last for seven days. During this festival, too, servants are equal to their masters and class distinctions are abolished, no injustice is practiced, no one is beaten and the mother does not punish her child; all work ceases; no corpse is buried and no mourning

⁵⁰ Gudea; Cylinder B, III. 5 ff. (Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königsinschriften. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek* I. 1, pp. 124/5 and XVII. 18 ff., *op. cit.* 138/9; Zimmern, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*³, 516, note 2.

⁵¹ Statue B VII. 26—36 and VIII. 11 ff. (Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* 68—73; Jensen, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* III. 30—33 and 40/1).

dirges are sung; and all courts of law are closed and judicial practice halts. Furthermore, there seems good reason to believe that the eighth day of the first month, Nisan, or else the entire period from the 8th through the 10th or 11th of the month was the crowning moment of the *Zag-muk* festival,⁵² that, in other words, the entire celebration of the *Zag-muk* or New Year festival endured for the period of eight days, or even somewhat longer, beginning on the 1st of Nisan.⁵³

But it was not only in Babylonia that the first eight days of Nisan were regarded as a period of particular sanctity and festivity. The same practice was observed in other parts of the Semitic world as well. Among the Sabaeans of Haran the year began on the 1st of Nisan, and an important festival period, that seems to have been practically a continuous New Year festival, was celebrated, extending over the first eight days of the month. This period was sacred chiefly to their goddess Balthi, and sacrifices were offered to her and also to the moon-god.⁵⁴ Moreover, on the 30th of Adsar, i. e. the day preceding the New Year's Day on the 1st of Nisan, the marriage of the gods and goddesses was celebrated.⁵⁵ This festival was undoubtedly an integral part of the New Year's Day celebration, and probably partook to a considerable extent of the nature of the kindred ceremony of the Babylonian ritual of the entrance of Anum and Antum, and also of Nin-girsu and Bau into their temples.⁵⁶

⁵² Cf. Zimmern, *op. cit.* 514 f.; Meissner, *Die gegenwärtigen Hauptprobleme der assyriologischen Forschung*. ZDMG 76 (1922), 93 f.

⁵³ According to Ezra 8. 31. Ezra and the returning exiles began their journey back to Palestine on the 12th of the first month. If this date be historically correct, and there seems to be no reason to question it, it probably means that Ezra waited to set out until the close of the *Zag-muk* festival with all its attendant rites and customs. Ezra 7. 9 gives the date of the commencement of the journey as the 1st of the first month; this is unquestionably an artificial and unhistorical attempt at chronology, as all the commentaries agree.

⁵⁴ Chwolson, *Die Sabier und der Sabismus*, II. 22 f. (quoting En-Nadim, *Fihrist*, IX. 5. 1).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 36.

⁵⁶ For a discussion of the subject of the marriage of the gods and goddesses in Babylonia, cf. Jastrow "Sumerian Myths of Beginnings", *AJSL* 33 (1917), 112 ff. That the *Zag-muk* was not only the New Year's Day, but likewise was regarded

Likewise in Edessa, we are told, a great festival was celebrated on the 8th of Nisan. On this day "the whole city was gathered together by the great altar, which was in the middle of the town. All the gods were brought together, and decorated, and sitting in honor, both Nebu and Bel together with their followers".⁵⁷ Here we have a form and undoubtedly an actual survival of the old Babylonian ceremony of the procession of the gods, likewise an important rite of the ancient *Zag-muk* festival celebration.⁵⁸

However, for our subject the most significant bit of evidence of all is this: *M:gillät Tã'änit*⁵⁹ states explicitly that the period from the 1st to the 8th of Nisan was regarded in Israel as one of particular significance, during which it was forbidden to afflict one's self or to mourn. The reason given for this is that in these days the question of the daily offering was settled. According to the *Gemara*⁶⁰ this refers to an important and disturbing difference of opinion in the interpretation of the Biblical law of the daily sacrifice.⁶¹ But it is altogether beyond belief that a matter of this kind, regardless of its ritual importance, should have become the occasion for such a celebration, and particularly a celebration extending over a period of eight days. The *Gemara*,⁶² itself, seems to feel the insufficiency of this reason for this observance of these eight days, and raises

as the wedding-day of Nin-girsu and Bau, is to be inferred from the numerous references to the "marriage presents" of Bau in the Gudea inscriptions (Statue D II. 13—III. 2 Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* 76/7; Jensen, *op. cit.* 50—53; Statue E, v. 1-3; VII. 15; Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* 80/1; Statue G, II. 1—7; IV. 18 f. Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* 84/5; Jensen, *op. cit.* 58/9 and 62/5), and also from the detailed description of the entrance of Nin-girsu and Bau into the marriage chamber of the newly built temple (Cylinder B, II. 21—III. 1; v. 1-18 Thureau-Dangin, 122—127). The seven days of the *Zag-muk* festival are therefore likewise the customary seven days of the marriage celebration.

⁵⁷ *The Acts of Sharbil*, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VII. 676.

⁵⁸ Cf. Zimmern, *op. cit.* 514.

⁵⁹ L. 2; *Tã'än.* 17 b and 18 a; *Men.* 65 a; cf. M. Schwab, *La Meghillath Taanith ou "Anniversaires Historiques"*, in *Actes du XI^e congrès international des orientalistes*, 1898.

⁶⁰ *Men.* 65 a; cf. Rashi to *Tã'än.* 17 b (bottom), and Schwab, *op. cit.* 235 f.

⁶¹ Num. 28. 4.

⁶² *Tã'än.* 17 b.

the pertinent question. Why should it have been necessary to single out the 1st of Nisan in this manner, since the fact that the 1st of the month was the new moon day would of itself forbid all self-affliction and mourning upon it? Therefore, the *Gemara* suggests that the statement of *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ* should have read properly, "from the 2nd of the month and until the 8th, etc."

In a way the *Gemara* is correct in its contention. But if then, despite this fact, *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ* reads, "From the 1st of the month and until the 8th", the inference must be drawn that it regarded these eight days as together constituting a single period or unit of celebration. This would indicate that at one time in Israel, at a period probably antedating but little the destruction of the Temple, the first eight days of Nisan were regarded as a period of peculiar sanctity, during which it was forbidden to afflict one's self and to mourn.

Apparently the real origin of the observance of this period had been forgotten and a new and altogether unhistorical tradition had grown in its place to account for this observance of these days, or else *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ*, aware of the true, non-Israelite origin of the institution, consciously sought to obliterate this by suggesting another reason therefor.⁶³ But in either case it is surprising, indeed, if not even significant,

⁶³ In all likelihood, both hypotheses have a certain foundation. For on the one hand *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ* does not know the origin of all the sacred periods which it mentions. Thus it records merely that the 7th of Kislev and the 2nd of Shebat are holy days upon which it is forbidden to mourn or afflict one's self, but it gives no reason at all for such a celebration of these two festival days, assuredly because it knew none (cf. Schwab, *op. cit.* 233 f. and 243 f.). And on the other hand it accounts for the observance of the 3rd of Tishri as a day upon which self-affliction was forbidden, because on it the use of the name of the Deity in legal documents had been abolished. Not only is there no mention here of the old Fast of Gedaliah on this day, but the very prohibition of self-affliction here indicates a form of celebration the very opposite of the old mourning and fasting on this day, as evidenced in Jer. 41. Here, therefore, it would seem, there was a conscious effort to supplant the celebration of an old non-Yahwistic ceremony on this day by a new and contrary celebration of patently artificial and purely Yahwistic character (cf. also the discussion by the rabbis of this very question why *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ* makes no mention of the Fast of Gedaliah on the 3rd of Tishri, *R. H.* 18 b and 19 a).

that neither *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ* nor the *Gemara* correlated this observance of the first eight days of Nisan with the eight days of the celebration of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness according to the revised date of P 2.

At any rate this much may be regarded as certain, that the statement of *M:gillät Tā'āniṯ* proves conclusively that at one time in Israel, and that, too, undoubtedly in the late exilic period, the first eight days of Nisan were regarded as possessing a certain measure of sanctity, and that, furthermore, this sanctity was probably traceable to some foreign, non-Yahwistic origin, since the observance of these days was not included in the official festival calendar of the Priestly Code. Such being the case, the most natural and probable inference is to correlate the joyful observance of these first eight days of Nisan with the celebration of these same days as the *Zag-muk*-New Year festival in Babylonia and Haran, and apparently likewise in Edessa, and probably also in other parts of the Semitic world.⁶⁴

This points strongly to the conclusion that the transfer made by P 2 of the date of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness from the *Šūkkôt*-New Year festival in the

⁶⁴ Charlier has shown (*Ein astronomischer Beitrag zur Exegese des Alten Testaments*, *ZDMG* 58 [1904], 386—394) that in the Biblical period the 1st of Nisan must have marked the spring equinox, and the 10th of the seventh month the fall equinox. (According to the Talmud, however, the equinoxes came on the 1st of Nisan and the 1st of Tishri. Cf. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, II. 417, and the references cited there). In other words, the Babylonian calendar began the year with the spring equinox. The seven-or eight-days Babylonian *Zag-muk* and the Haranian New Year festival were equinoctial festivals, just as was the seven-or eight days Canaanite-Israelite *Šūkkôt*-New Year festival. This fact may possibly help to account for the acknowledged sanctity of the first eight days of Nisan in Israel in the late post-exilic period. It would likewise have facilitated somewhat the transfer of the traditional date and occasion of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness from the original equinoctial *Šūkkôt*-New Year festival in the seventh month to the corresponding equinoctial period in the first month.

However, this matter is too complex and its implications too far-reaching, particularly in such matters as the relation of the equinox to temple-dedications, to permit presentation here otherwise than as for the present, a plausible hypothesis.

seventh month to the first eight days of the first month, was due primarily to the influence of the parallel Babylonian institution of dedicating temples at the *Zag-muk*-New Year festival during the first eight days of Nisan. It implies deliberate rejection by P 2 of the old Palestinian tradition and calendar, and may have gone hand in hand with the beginning of the attempt to introduce Calendar III and the consequent observance of the 1st of Nisan as the New Year's Day.⁶⁵

Certainly for the secondary Priestly author of Ex. 40 the New Year's Day was no longer celebrated on the 10th of the seventh month, with the *Šikkôṭ* festival immediately preceding it. Whether he was acquainted with and accepted the entire festival calendar, as we find it in other secondary strata of the Priestly Code⁶⁶ or whether he accepted and attempted to establish a basis and sanction for the Babylonian practice of observing the New Year's Day on the 1st of the first month, i. e. Nisan, can not, of course, be determined with any certainty, for lack of sufficient evidence. If the first alternative be correct, then it follows that this P 2 writer at least had divorced the idea of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness from any connection with the New Year's Day and its observance, and had fixed upon the date, the 1st through the 8th of the first month, for this dedication in imitation of the Babylonian practice of dedicating temples at just this time. But in such case, it would have been much more natural for him to transfer the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness to the 1st of the seventh month, instead of to the 1st of the first month, since the 1st of the seventh month was now the Jewish New Year's Day, and he must have known that it was the fact that the 1st of Nisan was the Babylonian New Year's Day that marked it off as the time for the dedication of temples.

If the second alternative be correct, and it seems to have much in its favor, that this P 2 author's redating of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness was the expression of a tendency in Israel to adapt the Babylonian calendar to

⁶⁵ Cf. below p. 58.

⁶⁶ Lev. 23 and Num. 28 and 29.

a fuller extent than the mere acceptance of the Babylonian names of the months, then it would follow that in addition to this an attempt was made to reckon the year in every respect from the spring, and so to fix the actual New Year's Day on the 1st of Nisan. The fact that I Maccabees seems to have reckoned the year from the 1st of Nisan,⁶⁷ and apparently the Book of Jubilees also,⁶⁸ may perhaps indicate that at one time in the late post-exilic period, at least in certain circles, the year was actually reckoned from the 1st of Nisan instead of the 1st of Tishri.^{68a} Insufficient evidence, however, renders any final and certain answer to this question impossible.

At any rate, the fact that P 2's transfer of the date of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness from the 10th of the seventh month to the 1st of the first month, was not the result of a mere caprice on the part of the author, but altogether the result of a definite movement or tendency, is proved by a significant bit of evidence. Ezra 6.15 states that the second Temple was completed on the 3rd of Adar. It is noteworthy in the first place that the Babylonian month name Adar is used here. This fact in itself would almost suffice to indicate that the passage is not contemporaneous, but relatively late.⁶⁹ And this conclusion is confirmed by another consideration. For if the Temple was completed on the 3rd of Adar, it is reasonable to presume that the dedication was not long deferred. Vv. 19-22 imply very clearly that the dedication preceded the

⁶⁷ Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*⁴, I. 32-38.

⁶⁸ Cf. Kohler in *JE* VII. 303, and the references cited there.

^{68a} Perhaps the statement of Ex. 12. 2 that the month, or more exactly the "new moon", of the Passover festival should be the head, or the first, or the beginning of the months, or of the new moons, likewise has in mind the celebration of the New Year's Day on the 1st of the first month. This passage is most probably the work of P 2 (cf. below, p. 63). It is noteworthy, too, that according to Jub. 7. 1 ff. Noah celebrates a festival somewhat Saturnalian in character on the 1st of the first month. And the *Mishna* states that the 1st of Nisan was the New Year's Day for festivals (*R. H. I. 1*). Perhaps in this a reminiscence of this calendar of I Maccabees may be seen.

⁶⁹ Batten (*Ezra and Nehemiah*, 155 ff.), seemingly alone of all the commentators, ascribes an early date, viz. during the reign of Cyrus, to the passage. His argument, however, is anything but convincing.

celebration of the Passover beginning on the 14th of the 1st month. It is difficult, therefore, to escape the conclusion that the passage implies that the dedication of the second Temple took place upon the 1st of the first month, or what is more likely, since, as we have seen, all dedication ceremonies seem to have extended over eight days, it lasted from the 1st through the 8th of the first month.⁷⁰ Obviously, therefore, the author of Ezra 6. 15 followed the P 2 author of Ex. 40 in fixing the date of the dedication of the second Temple at the same time that the new tradition had fixed the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness.⁷¹ This evidence is sufficient to show that the transfer of the date of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness from the 10th of the seventh

⁷⁰ This is confirmed by Esdras 7. 5 which fixes the date of the completion of the Temple not upon the 3rd, but upon the 23rd of Adar. This date undoubtedly implies that the day of the completion of the Temple likewise marked the beginning of the seven-days celebration of the dedication of the Temple on the last seven days of Adar, with the culmination thereof on the eighth day, the 1st of Nisan. Quite similarly rabbinic tradition told that the tabernacle in the wilderness likewise was dedicated during the eight days from the 23rd of Adar to the 1st of Nisan, with the culminating ceremonies on the latter day (*Num. Rab.* XII. 18 and XIII. 2 and 8; cf. *Jer. Yoma* I. 1). In a way this date Adar 23-Nisan 1 for the dedication of both the second Temple and the tabernacle in the wilderness, seems to be the result of a process of harmonization. For Ex. 40. 1 and 17 mention only the 1st of the first month as the day upon which the tabernacle was set up, and impliedly as the day upon which the *K:hôd Yahwe* took up its abode within the tabernacle. But, although the natural implication is that the 1st of Nisan marked the beginning, rather than the end, of the eight days of the dedication period, and that this therefore extended through the 8th of Nisan, as was shown above, this is nowhere in the chapter stated explicitly. On the other hand, as we have seen, Pg told that the culmination of the dedication ceremonies with the manifestation of the *K:hôd Yahwe* took place on the eighth and last day of the dedication festival. Quite probably, therefore, in order to harmonize these divergent accounts of Pg and P 2, Esdras 7. 5 and the later rabbinic tradition told that the period of dedication began on the 23rd of Adar and culminated on the 1st of Nisan, and that, therefore, the manifestation of the *K:hôd Yahwe* came on the eighth day of the dedication festival, as Pg told, and not on the first day thereof, as the account of P 2 in Ex. 40 seems to imply.

⁷¹ Unless the reverse be more correct, that the P 2 author of Ex. 40 followed the author of Ezra 6. 15. This is, however, less probable. But in either case, the relationship of the one to the other is certain.

month to the 1st of the first month, was the result of a definite tendency in Israel to adopt Calendar III with its Babylonian month names and all its further implications with regard to the dates of the various festivals and the events related to them.

It is true that P 2 does not himself employ the Babylonian month names, but still indicates the months by number, in accordance with the system of Calendar II. But the fact that Ezra 6.15 uses the Babylonian month name, Adar, is quite indicative. In other words, the evidence seems quite sufficient to prove that the adoption of Calendar III was a slow and gradual process, that for a long time, several centuries in fact, the months continued to be indicated by number as well as by name, and that the former system gave way to the latter completely only at a comparatively late date. But already with P 2 the revision of the festival calendar, with its change of the dates of many of the festivals had been made. And apparently one P 2 author at least, and with him likewise the author of Ezra 6.15 fixed the New Year's Day, not upon the 10th of the seventh month, nor yet upon the 1st of the seventh month, but upon the 1st of the first month, precisely as in the Babylonian calendar.

And this evidence from P 2 and Ezra 6.15 corroborates our previous conclusion that the beginning of this revision of the calendar, culminating in the final fixing and adoption of Calendar III as we now have it in Jewish practice, could not have been made much before the end of the 4th century B. C., i. e. the beginning of the Greek period.

VIII

THE DATE OF THE PASSOVER FESTIVAL

One more question of importance that must be considered concerns the date of the Passover festival in the period before the final revision of the festival calendar. Was the date of this festival changed at a somewhat earlier time, or was the present date of this festival, viz. the 14—21st of the first month, fixed at the time of the final revision of the festival calendar, which we have just considered?

The earliest codes date this festival למועד חדש האביב.⁷² It has been suggested that this means “the new moon of Abib”, and that, therefore, in the earliest period of Israel's history the Passover was celebrated at the very beginning of the month of Abib.⁷³ Certainly, the Hebrew admits of this interpretation. Yet important considerations lay this hypothesis open to serious doubt. For, as has been previously intimated, there is reason to believe that in the Canaanite and early Israelite period the Passover, or rather the *Māzzôt* festival, had much the same relation to the spring equinox that the *Šukkôt*-New Year festival had to the fall equinox,⁷⁴ and that, therefore, not so much the new moon as the spring equinox was the primary factor in determining the time of celebration of the *Māzzôt* festival in this early period.

Moreover, as I have shown elsewhere,⁷⁵ there were actually eight days of celebration at the *Māzzôt* festival, just as at the *Šukkôt* festival. For the day after the close of the festival, the מחרת השבת of Lev. 23. 11 and 16 was the day of the cutting and bringing of the first sheaf to the local shrines as the taboo-sacrifice of the new grain. This important event of the agricultural year, for which the seven days of the *Māzzôt* festival were actually only the preparation, must have been observed with fitting and solemn ceremony. Actually, this eighth day must have been the culmination and conclusion of the *Māzzôt* festival, and must have borne much the same relation to the seven days of the festival proper as did the eighth day, the New Year's Day, to the seven days of the *Šukkôt* festival. It is, therefore, not an improbable assumption that this eighth day was the day of the spring equinox, just

⁷² Ex. 23. 15; 34. 18; 13. 4.

⁷³ Luther, in Meyer-Luther, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 170 ff.; Ehrlich, *Ramdglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, I. 312 (to Ex. 12. 4); so also K. Kohler (verbal communication).

⁷⁴ It was a moot question in the early Christian Church whether Passover might precede the spring equinox. It was finally decided at the Council of Nice that Passover must always follow the equinox, cf. Boyle, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius*, addendum, 22 f. to VII. 32; also Epstein, סקדמוניות היהודים, 7 f. and 15.

⁷⁵ *The Origin of Māzzôt and the Māzzôt Festival*, *AJS* 21 (1917), 275—293.

as the New Year's Day was the day of the fall equinox, that, in other words, the seven days of the *Māzzôṭ* festival proper may have been the last seven days before the equinox. Then the day of the cutting and sacrifice of the first sheaf would have been the day of the equinox, itself.⁷⁶

This entire assumption would accord well with the facts previously noted, that in the early Christian Church the relation of the Passover festival to the equinox was a matter of such moment that it threatened to cause a schism in the Church, and that still today in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem the descent of the sacred fire from heaven takes place on the Saturday afternoon before Easter Sunday. It has been stated that there is good reason to believe that this ceremony of the descent of the sacred fire was an equinoctial rite, usually observed in Palestine, it would seem, at the fall equinox. But this one important survival would indicate that occasionally the same ceremony was observed in Palestine at the spring equinox. As we have seen, also, there is reason to suppose that among the rites of the Babylonian *Zag-muk* festival, the descent of sacred fire, or at least the kindling of new fires, played an important role. With this, of course, the descent of the sacred fire in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the extinction of the old fire and lights there, and the kindling of new fires and lights from the sacred flame, would have to be correlated. All this points to the equinoctial character of these rites, and of the festival of whose complex ritual they were and are an important part, as an equinoctial festival.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ So also in part, though on entirely different and independent grounds, Haupt, *Elul und Adar*, *ZDMG* 64 (1910), 705. Haupt correctly calls attention to the fact that ITÚ-ŠE-KIN-KUD, the Sumerian equivalent of Adar, designates it as "the month of the grain-harvest". If this assumption be correct that the *Māzzôṭ*-festival came on the seven days immediately preceding the spring equinox, then the word מועד, seemingly used in both Ex. 23. 15 and 34. 18 in a technical sense, designating a fixed and exact moment of the year, would mean "equinox", and מועד חרש האביב would be "the equinox of the month of Ahib", i. e. spring equinox. But this interpretation of this expression would refute the interpretation of חרש as "new moon", since only occasionally would the day of the equinox be coincident with the day of the new moon.

⁷⁷ Josephus, too, seems to have held that Passover was always celebrated

Still in Deut. 16. 1-8 the Passover is celebrated in the month of Abib, as we have already noted, and neither the exact day nor period of the month when the festival falls is indicated. The same condition obtains in the account in II Ki. 23. 21 f. of the celebration of the Passover in the eighteenth year of Josiah, at the time of the finding of the book of the Law in the Temple. There, too, no exact date of the month is given for the festival, but only the statement is made that the Passover was celebrated in accordance with the prescriptions contained in the book of the Law, i. e. in accordance with Deut. 16. 1-8.

Seemingly, therefore, the earliest reference to the revised date for the Passover-festival is found in Ezek. 45. 21. There we read that the Passover should be celebrated beginning with the 14th of the first month and continuing for seven days. But the authenticity of this statement is open to serious question. Inasmuch as, as we have seen, v. 25, which fixes the date of the *Šūkkôt* festival for the 15th—21st of the seventh month, is certainly a late addition to the book of Ezekiel, it is reasonable to suppose that the same is true with this dating of the Passover. Moreover, the dating of the festival from the 14th instead of from the 15th is somewhat suspicious, as the commentators have noted.⁷⁸ Moreover, the present Hebrew text is certainly awkward. For the expression *הג שבועת ימים*⁷⁹, as it stands here, can be construed only as in explanatory apposition with the preceding word *הפסח*. But in such case, the connection with the following *מצות יאכל* is difficult in the extreme. LXX is closer to the original when it connects *הג* with the preceding word *הפסח*, and makes it the last word in the first half of the sentence, instead of the first word in the second half, as MT does. But the expression *הג הפסח* is, of course, impossible in Hebrew. In view of all these facts, we may conclude with reasonable certainty that v. 21 read originally *בראשון חג הפסח*

after the spring equinox, for he states (*Antiquities*, III. 10. 5) that it came in the month of Nisan, equivalent to Xanthicus of the Greek calendar, when the sun was in Aries.

⁷⁸ Cf. the commentaries of Cornill, Bertholet, and Kraetzschmar to the passage.

⁷⁹ With LXX for the *שבועת* of MT.

יהיה לכם שִׁבְעַת יָמִים מִצּוֹת יֵאָכֵל. In other words, with his Passover legislation, just as with his *Šukkot* legislation in vv. 23 ff., the prophet was concerned only with prescribing the festival sacrifices and not at all with fixing the exact dates of the month of the two festivals; and the present awkward text of v. 21 is due entirely to the bungling effort of the late glossator to insert the exact date of the month for the beginning of the Passover festival, in accordance with the calendar of the later Priestly Code.⁸⁰ Such being the case, we must conclude that Ezekiel still held fast to the old traditional time of celebrating the Passover, just as he did for the *Šukkot*-New Year festival, and that the redating of the Passover festival, just as of the *Šukkot* and New Year festivals was entirely the product of the post-exilic period.

Ezra 6. 19-22 fixes the date of the celebration of the Passover by the exiles who returned to Palestine in the days of Cyrus from the 14th through the 20th or 21st of the first month. But, as we have seen,⁸¹ this passage is undoubtedly late, since it accords with P 2 in dating the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness and of the second Temple on the 1st of the first month.

Consequently, we are forced to conclude that it is only the Priestly Code and writings later than and dependent upon it, that fix the date of the Passover festival from the 14th or 15th through the 21st of the first month. It would be well, indeed, if we could determine with absolute certainty whether any of the passages that give this date for the Passover festival belong to Pg, or whether all are secondary strata of the Priestly Code. Actually, the only passage in which this date is given for the Passover and concerning which there is any uncertainty, whether it is Pg or P 2, is Ex. 12. 3-20.⁸² Practically all scholars assign this passage to Pg, without any question and almost as a matter of course, due to the fact that the

⁸⁰ ביום ההוא of v. 22 is undoubtedly the work of the same glossator.

⁸¹ Above, p. 56.

⁸² Practically all scholars are agreed that Lev. 23. 5-8; Num. 9. 2-5; 28. 16-25; 33. 3 f. and Josh. 5. 10 are the work of P 2.

entire legislation here seems to be consistent and homogeneous, and, therefore, no adequate indications of secondary authorship are discernible. But it may just as well be, since the whole passage is manifestly a literary unit, that it is the work of P 2 instead of Pg. The fact that the sacrifice and the complete festival celebration, as provided for here, are confined to the home and the family, instead of centering in the Temple, may well point to P 2 authorship.⁸³

In other words, it would seem that the fixing of the date of the Passover festival on the 14—21st of the 1st month was the work of P 2 legislators. It must, therefore, have been the product of the period after Ezra and Nehemiah, and a result of the same process of revision of the festival calendar which fixed the date of *Roš-hä-Šanah* on the 1st, and of *Šukkkôt* on the 15—22nd of the seventh month. Moreover,^{83a} it is clear that in this revised festival calendar Passover and *Šukkkôt* bear a reciprocal relation to each other, since they begin at the full moon of the first spring and fall months respectively, just six months apart, and each continues for approximately the same period of seven days. But in this final festival calendar each has been completely divorced from its original equinoctial association.

A further stage in the revision of the festival calendar is marked by the introduction of the institution of the second Passover from the 14th through the 22nd of the second month for all those who chanced to be unclean at the time of the celebration of the main Passover, or upon a journey, and therefore, were prevented from observing it. The legislation for this second Passover is found in Num. 9.6-14, and is recognized by all scholars as belonging to P 2. The *terminus ad quem* for the establishment of this institution is fixed by II Chron. 30. There we read that Hezekiah celebrated the Passover in the 2nd month (v. 2). The reason for its celebration at this time was that at the proper moment in the 1st month the priests had been unclean and the people had not yet

⁸³ Cf. my *The Sources of the Creation Story*; Gen. 1. 1-2. 4, *AJSL* 36 (1920), 208—212.

assembled in Jerusalem (v. 3), in other words, were as if on a journey. Unmistakably this is a "second Passover", which complies in every respect with the prescriptions for this institution recorded in Num. 9. 6-14. This indicates that, by the time of the Chronicler, the second Passover was an established institution, and that accordingly the revision of the calendar, so far at least as the Passover festival was concerned, was practically completed by the close of the 4th century B. C., i. e. by the beginning of the Greek era.⁸⁴

IX

THE SOLAR CHARACTER OF CALENDAR I

One question still remains to be answered, viz. as to the character of the three calendars. Calendar III is, of course, a lunar calendar in every respect, and need not be considered further. But the nature of Calendars I and II must still be determined, so far as this is possible.

We have already noted that in Calendar I the critical moments of the year were the two equinoxes. In Palestine, as we have seen, the day of the fall equinox marked the beginning of the new year, while in the Babylonian and Haranian calendars the year began with the spring equinox. The evidence is ample, although, as has been said, lack of space forbids its discussion here, that among the Canaanites and in early Israel both equinoctial days were observed with elaborate festivals and appropriate rites. From this it follows

⁸⁴ Unless Ex. 12. 1-20 and 43-50 be still later. For it is noteworthy that the legislation for the second Passover, as stated in Num. 9. 6-14 and amplified by the account in II Chron. 30 knows only of the celebration of the Passover at the Temple in Jerusalem, since II Chron. 30. 3 states that one of the reasons for celebrating the second Passover instead of the first was that at the time of the former, the people had not yet assembled in Jerusalem. Clearly it implies that at the time of the first Passover, the people were still at their homes in the villages, and that it was improper to celebrate the Passover there or in any place except in the Temple at Jerusalem. But the Passover legislation in Ex. 12 seems to imply the perfect propriety of celebrating the Passover in the

that Calendar I must have been purely solar in character; and inasmuch as it observed the two halves of the year so precisely, it is reasonable to suppose that it divided the year into twelve solar months of thirty days each, each month, of course, marked by the passage of the sun into the next constellation of the zodiac. The year would then have been completed by the addition of the remaining five and occasionally six days of the solar year, or perhaps by the addition of four days regularly each year, with some system of intercalation at fairly frequent intervals to regulate the consequent discrepancy of approximately one and a quarter days in each year.

It is significant that despite the adoption of Calendar II and its observance for practically three full centuries, and then the adoption of Calendar III, the memory of and regard for Calendar I did not completely die out in Israel. For a calendar that approximated very closely what Calendar I must have been is presented in considerable detail in both Enoch and the Book of Jubilees.⁸⁵ There the year consists of three hundred and sixty-four days, i. e. of twelve months of thirty days each,

homes of the people, i. e. in the villages outside of Jerusalem. This may then be a later stage of the Passover legislation than even that for the second Passover in Num. 9. 6-14. This would confirm our previous conclusion that Ex. 12. 1-20, and with it, of course, vv. 43-50 are late and the work of P 2 rather than of Pg.

⁸⁵ Enoch 72-75; Jubilees 6. 23-38. The author of Jubilees is particularly zealous in his championship of this solar year as opposed to the lunar year. He says (vv. 36-38). "There will be people who will observe the moon exactly; but this confuses the time and advances ten days each year. Therefore years will come for them in which they will miscalculate the Day of Testimony (the *Š:ḥūōē* festival), and will make it a profane day, and a profane day they will make the day of the festival; and they will confuse everything, the sacred with the profane days and the profane with the sacred; for they will disregard months and weeks and festivals and jubilees. Therefore, I command you and charge you to charge them; for after your death your children will act corruptly, in that they will no longer reckon the year as consisting of three hundred and sixty-four days. For this reason they will miscalculate new moons and seasons and sabbaths and festivals, and will eat flesh with blood". Manifestly the zeal of the author of Jubilees for his solar calendar led him to regard the observance of the lunar calendar current in Israel in his day, as a sin as heinous as the eating of blood.

plus four additional days. These four additional days are added, at four different moments in the year, on the 1st of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months respectively, i. e. at the two solstices and the two equinoxes.⁸⁶ Moreover, Enoch 75. 1 states that these four days are not included in the reckoning of the years. This means undoubtedly that they are not included in the months, but are regarded as additional, extra-monthly days, i. e. between the 30th of the twelfth month and the 1st of the first month, a day fell that was accounted to neither month; and similarly between the 30th of the third and the 1st of the fourth month, the 30th of the sixth and the 1st of the seventh month, and the 30th of the ninth and the 1st of the tenth month.

The Priestly Code, it seems, was also not unacquainted with this calendar. For it tells that the flood began on the 17th of the second month of the six hundredth year of the life of Noah, and that it ended completely on the 27th of the second month of the six hundred and first year of Noah.⁸⁷ It may be, of course, that the Priestly author is seeking merely to tell that the flood lasted exactly a solar year. But it is difficult to conceive of any reason for his so doing, unless it be that he was acquainted with an actual solar calendar. And that this calendar reckoned the solar year at three hundred and sixty-four days is clear from the fact that it is only ten days longer than the lunar year; in other words, as Jubilees 6. 36 says, the lunar year "advances ten days" over this solar year.

The Montanists, an early Christian sect, it seems, also employed this same calendar and reckoned the Passover according to it. For of them Sozomen says,⁸⁸ "The Montanists, who are called Pepuzites and Phrygians, celebrate the Passover according to a strange fashion, which they introduced. They blame those who regulate the time of observing the feast according to the course of the moon, and affirm that it is

⁸⁶ Cf. Enoch 75. 1 f. with 72 and Jub. 6. 23.

⁸⁷ Gen. 7. 11 and 8. 14.

⁸⁸ *Hist. Eccles.* VII. 18.

right to attend exclusively to the cycles of the sun.⁸⁹ They reckon each month to consist of thirty days, and account the first day after the vernal equinox as the first day of the year, which, according to the Roman method of computation, would be called the ninth day before the calends of April They compute this to have been the day of the creation of the sun. They always celebrate the Passover on this day, when it falls on the day of the resurrection; otherwise, they celebrate it on the following Lord's day; for it is written, according to their assertion, that the feast may be held on any day between the 14th and the 21st."⁹⁰

From all this evidence, it is clear that a calendar which must have resembled Calendar I in most essential principles was known to Israel and adjacent peoples long after the introduction of both Calendars II and III. However, in one respect, Calendar I, it would seem, differed slightly from the calendar of Enoch and Jubilees. For, if it took cognizance of both equinoxes, as seems to have been the case, it could not have divided the year into two equal halves, since in the northern hemisphere, the period from the spring equinox to the fall equinox is somewhat longer than the period from the fall equinox to the spring equinox. Possibly Calendar I added the four extra days at some time in the summer half of the year. This would have equalized the difference between these two halves of the year fairly satisfactorily. This is, however, it must be admitted, only an unsupported hypothesis and nothing more.

However, the following considerations will throw some additional light upon Calendar I. In connection with the account of the building and dedication of Solomon's Temple, I Ki. 6. 38 tells that the Temple was completed in the month of Bul. To this a glossator adds the note that this was the eighth month. But I Ki. 8. 2 tells that the people assembled for the dedication

⁸⁹ Evidently these Montanists felt as strongly about this matter as did the author of Jub. 6. 36, 38.

⁹⁰ Translation of Hartranft, in Schaff and Wace, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, II. 389.

of the Temple upon the *Šukkkôt* festival in the month of Ethanim; to this passage, too, a glossator, perhaps the same one as in I Ki. 6. 38 adds the note that this was the seventh month. As various scholars have perceived,⁹¹ it is difficult to imagine that the Temple would have been dedicated in the seventh month, if it was not completed until the eighth month. Therefore some scholars would infer that the Temple was not only completed but also dedicated in the eighth month, and that consequently in the time of Solomon the *Šukkkôt* festival came in the eighth and not in the seventh month, and that the entire statement of I Ki. 8. 2 is an error. Their inference seems confirmed by the statement of I Ki. 12. 32 f. that Jeroboam celebrated at Bethel in the eighth month a festival⁹² similar to the festival which was celebrated in Judah.

However, this inference is not justified. For I Ki. 8. 2 says explicitly that the people assembled for the dedication of the Temple on the *Šukkkôt* festival in the month of Ethanim; and this statement deserves quite as much credence as does that of I Ki. 6. 38 that the Temple was completed in the month of Bul. Therefore, the apparent difficulty must be solved in some other way. Such a solution lies ready to hand.

As was intimated earlier in this paper, it is not necessarily the case that Calendar I coincided in every respect, or for that matter in any respect, with Calendar II or with Calendar III. In fact, it is reasonable to suppose that they differed in certain very essential matters. One of these may well have been that the Canaanite months began at a different moment than did the months of the other two calendars.

Accordingly, neither does it follow at all that because, as we have seen, the *Šukkkôt* festival in the period immediately preceding the Babylonian Exile, but after the adoption of Calendar II, was celebrated from the 3rd through the 9th of the month, with *Roš-hä-Šanah* on the 10th, that these two joint festivals in the days of Solomon must have come on the

⁹¹ Cf. the full discussion with the references cited, in Kittel, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 71.

⁹² Or "the festival", i. e. the *Šukkkôt* festival.

3rd through the 10th of Ethanim, apparently said by the glossator of I Ki. 8.2 to have been the seventh month in Calendar I. On the contrary, the seven days of the *Šukkôt* festival may just as well have come on the last seven days of Ethanim, with *Roš-hä-Šanah* on the 1st of Bul, according to the glossator of I Ki. 6.38, the eighth month.

The condition would comply in every way with all the Biblical data. For in that case, just as I Ki. 8.2 states, the people would have assembled in Jerusalem for the celebration of the *Šukkôt* festival and the dedication of the Temple in the month of Ethanim. And the ceremonies both of the *Šukkôt* festival and of the dedication of the Temple would have reached their climax in the New Year's Day ceremonies on the 1st of Bul. Therefore, as I Ki. 12.32f. states, it could be truly said that the festival was celebrated in the eighth month, i. e. Bul, for although the first seven days of the festival would have come in Ethanim, the most important, culminating and characteristic, rites would have been celebrated on the 1st of Bul.⁹³

And in such case, the statement of I Ki. 6.38 would be equally true, that in the eighth month, Bul, the Temple was completed in all its details and specifications; for this term *כלה*, "completed", could very naturally and properly include the dedication ceremonies as an integral part of the business of construction.

Moreover, if, as Kittel suggests,⁹⁴ the festival which Jeroboam celebrated at Bethel in the eighth month, in imitation of the great festival celebrated in Judah, was the festival of the dedication of his new national sanctuary at Bethel, we would have here still another instance of the dedication of a Temple on the *Šukkôt*-New Year festival.

If this hypothesis be correct, and it must be borne in mind that it alone accounts satisfactorily for all the Biblical data, it would follow that the 1st of Bul was the New Year's Day of

⁹³ It is needless to state that the words *בחמשה עשר יום לחדש* in I Ki. 12.32, and *בחמשה עשר יום* in v. 33 are late glosses. This is clear both from syntactical considerations and also because these dates are based upon the late, revised post-Ezra calendar.

⁹⁴ Cf. Kittel, *op. cit.* III.

Calendar I, and the day of the fall equinox, and therefore equivalent to the 10th of the seventh month of Calendar II. And the last seven days of Ethanim, the last seven days of the year, must then have been the days of the *Šukkkôt* festival proper. This agrees exactly with the statement of Ex. 23. 16 and 34. 22 that the *Šukkkôt*, or rather the 'Ašif festival, came at the end of the year and at the equinox.⁹⁵

Bul would then have been the first month of the Canaanite year and of Calendar I, Abib the seventh month, Ziv the eighth month, and Ethanim the twelfth and last month.⁹⁶ And the

⁹⁵ The *Gemara 'Ab. zār.* 6a and 8a) states that the Saturnalia began on the eighth day before the equinoxes or solstices. Unquestionably, merely the name here is of Roman origin, but the festival itself must be of Semitic origin and character. These Saturnalia festivals must have been observed by the ancient Canaanites and their neighbors and have been borrowed by the early Israelites. They survived in the Syro-Hellenic religion of the Seleucids, and many traces of them still survive in the folk-religion of the natives of Palestine today.

Not only the *Šukkkôt* festival, but also the Babylonian *Zag-muk*, the Haranian New Year's festival and the Canaanite-Israelite *Mazzôl* festival in the spring, immediately preceding the vernal equinox, the Babylonian Saccaea and a corresponding West Semitic festival, immediately preceding the summer solstice, and the Syrian-Jewish *Hänukkah*, or "Festival of Lights" (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. 77), immediately preceding the winter solstice (cf. Mordtmann in *ZDMG* 29, 1875, 101, and Clemen in *ARW* 17, 1914, 141), were festivals of this character. Almost the only things which they had in common with the Roman Saturnalia were the merry-making, license, abolition of class distinction and the temporary complete reversal of the social conditions and business of normal life. But this one coincidence probably sufficed to suggest the name Saturnalia, which the *Gemara* gives to these festivals. A full discussion of this important subject must be reserved for treatment elsewhere (cf. also above note 26).

⁹⁶ In this case, of course, if Ethanim was the month preceding the fall equinox, the usual interpretation given to the name, viz. "the month of strong rains", would not hold at all, and the other common interpretation, "the month of perennial streams" (cf. Gesenius, *HWB*¹³, 36 to the word, but given up in the 17th edition), would apply only in the sense that it refers to that hottest season of the year, corresponding to our August, when the only streams containing water would be those that were perennial. But it must be admitted that this last interpretation fits the case most aptly. For that month in which only the perennial streams contained water, and all others were completely dried up, would be called much more appropriately, "the month of perennial streams" than that month in which the rainy season began and consequently all streams were full, and no distinction could be noticed between those that were perennial and those that were not.

fact that the Bible calls Abib the first month,⁹⁷ Ethanim the seventh, and Bul the eighth month, would not designate the order of these months in the ancient Canaanite calendar, but the equivalent of these months in Calendar II. Abib of Calendar I would be, in the main, equivalent to the first month of Calendar II. Ethanim would be equivalent to the seventh month and Bul to the eighth month.⁹⁸

This much it seems possible to determine about Calendar I.

X

THE LUNI-SOLAR CHARACTER OF CALENDAR II

As we have seen, Calendar II was introduced into Israel in the period immediately preceding the Babylonian Exile, probably between 608 and 586 B. C. In this period Babylonian cultural influence was paramount, and Calendar II was unquestionably the result of this Babylonian cultural influence, if not borrowed directly from a Babylonian original. This is to be inferred from the fact that it began to number the months from the spring.⁹⁹ Certainly the Babylonian original, upon which Calendar II was based, celebrated its New Year's Day at the vernal equinox at the beginning of the first month. But in this one respect Calendar II did not follow its model, but, as we

⁹⁷ Ex. 12. 2.

⁹⁸ *Targum* to I Ki. 8. 2 tells that the ancients called Ethanim the first month. In all likelihood, however, it came to this conclusion because it identified Ethanim, the month in which the *Sūkkōt* festival occurred, with Tishri, in which month both *Sūkkōt* and *Roš-hā-Šanah* occur. Therefore it probably inferred that Ethanim, too, must have been the month of *Roš-hā-Šanah*. Moreover, it probably felt a certain lack of logic in beginning the new year with the seventh month instead of the first. Undoubtedly it knew that Calendar III was of late and foreign origin, and that furthermore, in this calendar Nisan was counted as the first month. Therefore, it probably inferred, and correctly, that the custom of beginning the year in the fall was of an origin earlier than this calendar; and so it inferred further that the ancients who, as it thought, celebrated *Roš-hā-Šanah* in Ethanim, must have counted this as the first month of their calendar.

⁹⁹ Cf. Schiaparelli, *Astronomy in the Old Testament*, 108 ff.

have seen, still continued to celebrate the New Year's Day at the fall equinox.

There is no evidence at all bearing upon the system of intercalation of this calendar. Nowhere in the Bible is an extra intercalary month referred to. Yet there must have been some system of intercalation, and in all likelihood this was by means of insertion of an extra month. Probably this month was inserted, just as in certain of the various Babylonian calendars, at irregular intervals, determined by the priests or other proper authorities, as the result of simple astronomical observations.

Thus far, the evidence shedding light upon the character of Calendar II is altogether negative and inferential. But one fact of positive significance points to the conclusion that the year of Calendar II was luni-solar in character. As we have seen, the Priestly Code recorded that the flood began on the 17th of the second month of the six hundredth year of the life of Noah, and ended on the 27th of the same month of the following year.¹⁰⁰ It is almost certain that the Priestly author meant to tell by this no more than that the flood lasted exactly one solar year. In other words, the calendar year of Calendar II must have been just ten days shorter than a solar year; and if, as in Enoch and Jubilees, we reckon the solar year as consisting of three hundred and sixty-four days, then the calendar year of Calendar II must have consisted of three hundred and fifty-four days. These were probably divided into twelve months of thirty and twenty-nine days alternately.¹ In other words, the calendar year itself of Calendar II must have been lunar. But certainly there must have been some system of reconciling this lunar year with the solar year, by which, as we have seen, still in the period after the Exile, and even after Ezra and Nehemiah, in which Calendar II was in vogue, the festivals were determined, and likewise the economic, agricultural life must have been regulated. Therefore, it follows that

¹⁰⁰ Above, p. 66.

¹ The highest reckoning of the days of the month of Calendar II in the Bible is the 27th; Gen. 8. 14; II Ki. 25. 27.

Calendar II, whatever its system of intercalation may have been, must have been luni-solar in character.

Perhaps, just here we have the explanation of what is in a way a vexing problem. It seems altogether illogical that the New Year's Day should have been celebrated on the 10th rather than on the 1st of the seventh month. We have accounted for its celebration in the seventh month, by recognizing that the old custom of reckoning the New Year from the fall equinox, instead of from the spring equinox, persisted even after the introduction of Calendar II; and the fall equinox came in the seventh month of Calendar II. But logic and propriety, it might seem, would demand that the New Year's Day come on the 1st, and not upon the 10th of the month. But if we remember that the solar year of Calendar I was ten days longer than the luni-solar year of Calendar II, that, as we have seen the author of Jubilees puts it, the lunar year "advances ten days" over the solar year, we can understand that the religious New Year's Day, determined, as we have seen, entirely by solar considerations, would fall upon the 10th day after the actual close of the lunar year. Of course, in the following year there would be a discrepancy of twenty days, and in the third year of thirty days. But the insertion of the extra, intercalary month would reconcile this discrepancy, and once more the religious New Year's Day would fall on the 10th day after the close of the lunar year, and ultimately it might tend to be fixed for this day. This consideration tends to confirm our conclusion that Calendar II, just as its Babylonian antecedent, was luni-solar in character.

XI

THE RELATION OF CALENDAR III TO CALENDAR II

Calendar III, still employed by the Jewish people for all religious purposes, is of course luni-solar in character. Apparently it differs from Calendar II in two prime characteristics, (1) in its use of the Babylonian names of the months, instead of indicating them by number, and (2) in a more exact system

of intercalation by the insertion of an extra month of twenty-nine days at regular intervals, viz. seven times in a cycle of nineteen years.²

In this last respect in particular Calendar III represents a decided cultural advance over Calendar II. Whatever the system of intercalation of the latter may have been, it could not have been altogether satisfactory. Not improbably, therefore, the decided advantage of Calendar III over Calendar II in its system of intercalation may have been one of the contributing factors that caused Calendar III gradually to supplant Calendar II.

Furthermore, as we have seen, in the period after the time of Ezra, and apparently at about the beginning of the Greek period at the end of the 4th Century B. C. the festivals of *Šükkôt*, of *Roš-hä-Šanah*, and of Passover were transferred from their original moments of celebration as determined by purely solar considerations, to altogether new dates. And since *Roš-hä-Sanah* was now celebrated at the time of the new moon on the 1st of the seventh month, and both the Passover and the *Šükkôt* festivals began on the full moon day of the first and the seventh months respectively, exactly a half year apart, it is clear that this transfer of the dates of these festivals was due in part to the influence of a lunar or a luni-solar system of calendation.

It is quite likely that this transfer of the dates of these festivals may have contributed materially toward the introduction of Calendar III. And a further contributing cause may well have been the tendency toward increased ritualism manifest in certain parts of P 2, which expressed itself in the effort to provide most punctiliously for the proper observance of these festivals. This would demand, among other things, that all the festivals be observed at exactly the right moment of both month and year. And this demand would naturally make for as exact a system of intercalation as possible.

Other forces too, such as the growing Hellenic influence

² For the essential details cf. *JE* III. 501 ff., article Calendar. According to Ed. Mahler (*ZA* XXXIV [1922], 69) this nineteen year cycle system of intercalation was employed in Babylonia already in the 6th century B. C.

in the Seleucid era, may have contributed to the gradual supplanting of Calendar II by Calendar III.

But, as we have seen, it was a slow process indeed, and for several centuries Calendar II, or at least the designation of the months by number instead of by their Babylonian names, continued in use, perhaps even down to the very destruction of the Temple.

Moreover, as we have noticed, apparently during the Maccabean period, or perhaps beginning even before this, an attempt was made to introduce in Israel, still another calendar, or at least another system of reckoning the months from a New Year's Day on the 1st of Nisan. Such a calendar was apparently actually employed by the author of I Maccabees, and seemingly was not unknown to P 2. But this calendar gained little recognition, and was eventually discarded entirely, leaving almost no trace behind it.³

And so in time Calendar III became the sole calendar of Judaism.

XII

SUMMARY

The results of this investigation can be easily summarized, and a bird's-eye view of the history of the calendar in ancient Israel gained thereby.

When the tribes of Israel entered the land of Canaan and settled down to an agricultural life, among the many elements of the Canaanite agricultural civilization which they borrowed were the Canaanite calendar and the Canaanite agricultural religious festivals. This calendar was apparently in vogue not only among the Canaanites, but among the Phoenicians, and

³ Possibly the reference in Dan. 7, 25 to Antiochus' attempt to change "times and religion" (וּפְנִין דְּתִיבָה) may refer to a revision of the calendar such as this. For the fixing of the New Year's Day upon the 1st of the first month would necessarily affect both the calendar itself and also the dates, and not improbably even the manner of celebration of the festivals; hence the significant expression, "times and religion".

probably among other neighboring, kindred peoples as well. It was a purely solar calendar, consisting in all likelihood of three hundred and sixty-four days, divided into twelve months of thirty days each, with four intercalary days inserted at appropriate moments, probably during the summer half of the year. This calendar took direct cognizance of the two equinoxes. It celebrated the New Year's Day at the fall equinox, and reckoned the year from that moment. It celebrated two important cognate festivals on the seven days immediately preceding these two equinoctial days. And apparently the day of the spring equinox marked the beginning of the season of the grain harvest, when the first sheaf of the new grain was cut and sacrificed with proper solemn ceremony.

This calendar continued to be used in Israel, with little or no modification that can be noticed, until shortly before the Babylonian Exile. Then, at some time between 608 and 586 B. C. an altogether new calendar was introduced. This calendar was apparently based upon a Babylonian model, and its adoption was undoubtedly due to the dominant Babylonian cultural influence of the period. It was a luni-solar calendar of three hundred and fifty-four days, probably divided into twelve months of alternately thirty and twenty-nine days each, and it probably had a rather loose system of intercalation, consisting of the insertion of an extra month of twenty-nine or thirty days at whatever time and whatever moment of the year the authorities might deem proper.

The beginnings of the months of this calendar were not, of course, coincident with the beginnings of the months of Calendar I. The names of the months of the old Canaanite calendar were discarded entirely, and the months of Calendar II were indicated by number instead of by name. But the solar agricultural festivals of the old calendar continued to be observed in the ancient manner and at relatively the same critical moments of the agricultural year. Therefore, under Calendar II, the New Year's Day was celebrated on the 10th of the seventh month, with the *Šukkot* festival on the seven days immediately preceding, viz., the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month. And the *Mazzot* festival, together with the

day of cutting and sacrificing the first sheaf of the new grain, was celebrated on the first eight days of the first month.

This calendar continued to be employed in Israel for approximately three centuries, certainly until some time after Ezra and Nehemiah, and in all probability down until the beginning of the Greek period at the end of the 4th Century B. C.

Shortly before this time, however, but likewise later than the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the dates of the festivals began to be shifted, and the manner of their celebration greatly modified. The New Year's Day was transferred to the 1st of the seventh month, the new moon day, and the *Šuk্কôṭ* festival to the 15th through the 21st of that month. At the same time the Passover festival was transferred from the first eight days of the first month to the 15th through the 21st. Both the *Šuk্কôṭ* and the Passover festivals now began on the full moon day of the first and seventh months respectively, exactly six months apart, and obviously bore a reciprocal relation to each other. Some time later, an eighth day was added to the seven days of the *Šuk্কôṭ* festival. This was undoubtedly the result of the persistent recollection that originally there had been actually eight days of celebration at the time of the *Šuk্কôṭ* festival. This additional eighth day was called by the rather colorless title *Š:mini 'Azēvēt*, and the manner of its celebration was purely artificial and formal. It was observed on the 22nd of the seventh month. But the memory survived in the folk-practice of Israel that the 10th of the seventh month had been from of old a day of marked sacredness and peculiar observance. A few of the ancient peculiar ceremonies of the day, such as the sending forth of the goat to Azazel and the dances of the maidens in the vineyards had continued to be observed almost without interruption. Eventually the priests, forced, it would seem, by popular demand, legitimized again the religious observance of this day. They relegated some of the old rites, that still survived, to a secondary position, developed a highly complex ritual of sacrifice, purification and priestly functioning and thus called into being *Yôm Kippūr*, the Day of Atonement, as the most sacred day of the entire Jewish religious year. Probably at about the same time or shortly

before the institution of the "second Passover" from the 15th through the 21st of the second month was inaugurated. The festival calendar of Judaism was thus practically completed.

Shortly after the beginning of the Greek period, near the end of the 4th century B. C., a new calendar was introduced. It differed from Calendar II primarily only in that it employed the Babylonian names of the month for the old system of indicating the months by number, and in that it seems to have had a far more exact system of intercalation. This made it possible among other things to fix the dates of the festivals, the Sabbaths, and other similar religious occasions with exact precision, something which, apparently, the growing ritualism of the time demanded. Calendar III supplanted Calendar II only very slowly and gradually, and did not come into universal use, it would seem, until at the very earliest, about the beginning of the Christian era, or perhaps even a little later than that, but certainly before the destruction of the Temple by the Romans in 70 A. D. From that time on, it has been the official, religious calendar of Judaism.

Such, in brief, is the history of the calendar in ancient Israel.