

Biblical Feasts and Jesus

Critical Research Audit

The Living Word • Founder review edition • 14 September 2026

The biblical appointed times do form a defensible, collective Christological pattern. The strongest warrant is not a modern seven-feast chart but the New Testament itself: Paul relates the sacred calendar to Christ, identifies Christ with Passover and calls the risen Christ the firstfruits; Acts locates the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost; Hebrews interprets the annual atonement rites through Jesus' accomplished work. The larger movement toward God dwelling with His people is also substantial. These connections warrant a measured expansion of Foreshadowing Jesus. They do not establish a sequence of seven precisely dated future events.¹

The most important correction to the popular spring/autumn model is that an autumn observance, the Day of Atonement, already receives explicit Christological interpretation in Hebrews. Its fulfillment cannot be postponed entirely to a future repentance of Israel. Conversely, the absence of an explicit Yom Teruah-rapture equation does not erase the Bible's strong association of trumpets with divine appearing, resurrection and gathering. The propositions must be kept distinct.

The existing research materially underrepresents the collective calendar, Firstfruits, Pentecost and the Sukkot trajectory. It already treats Passover, tabernacle/priesthood and annual atonement substantially. Preserve the eight movements and expand selected encounters, rather than replacing the Journey with a prophetic calendar. No website, Blueprint, baseline report or existing evidence ledger has been changed.²

1. Method, classifications and limits

This is a targeted completeness audit, not a new theology of every Jewish holy day. Leviticus 23 is read first as instruction for Israel's covenant life. Later biblical development is then distinguished from historical practice, Christian canonical interpretation, later Jewish devotion and modern speculation. A genuine historical custom can illuminate a passage without proving that the passage predicts a particular event.

Two scales are necessary. The A-F scale below grades proposed Christological relationships. The separate eight-status scale in the claim ledger evaluates the truth and presentation of claims made by the videos. For example, ancient new-moon observation is historically illuminating (D), while the assertion that it establishes a particular future rapture date is unsupported. One label should not be used to smuggle the second conclusion into the first.

Grade	Meaning and threshold
A	Explicit canonical connection: the New Testament directly establishes this particular relationship.
B	Strong canonical pattern: substantial converging biblical evidence, without an explicit fulfillment formula for the whole proposal.

¹ [COL] Colossians 2:16-23; [PASS] 1 Corinthians 5:6-8; [FRUIT] 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, 50-58; [ACTS] Acts 2; [HEB] Hebrews 9.

² [BASE] Foreshadowing Jesus Research and Journey Recommendations; [TASK] Biblical Feasts Completeness Audit and Research Expansion.

Grade	Meaning and threshold
C	Plausible canonical echo: defensible resonance, insufficient for strong doctrinal assertion.
D	Historically illuminating: contextual information that does not itself establish fulfillment.
E	Speculative: possible proposal with insufficient evidence.
F	Rejected: contradicted, demonstrably erroneous or materially misleading when stated as established fact.

Grade the narrow claim, not its most impressive neighbour. Christ as resurrection firstfruits is A; identifying the precise Levitical sheaf ceremony behind every aspect of Paul's metaphor is a separate B claim; establishing a particular Nisan date requires still further evidence. Several C, D or E steps do not combine into an A conclusion simply because their story is coherent.

The transcripts are research leads only. Claimed appearances of Jesus, private words, dreams and sensations receive zero evidentiary authority. Autobiographical details are excluded except where they establish the argument's timing. The narrator labels Hannah and Rebecca are convenient identifiers, not authenticated identities. Neither original video URL nor publication metadata was supplied. Transcript 2 explicitly invokes 2025; Transcript 1 does not supply a year and must not be silently assigned that year.³

Ancient texts and accessible primary passages were read; source records identify where only an indexed official record, substantive abstract or excerpt was available. This is not a claim to have searched every manuscript or read every cited scholar's full monograph. In particular, failure to locate an ancient idiom is a bounded negative finding, not proof that no person ever uttered similar words.

2. Leviticus 23 before the Christian synthesis

The chapter concerns the LORD's appointed times, מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה (mo'ade YHWH), proclaimed as sacred assemblies, מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ (miqra'e qodesh). מוֹעֵד (mo'ed) denotes an appointed time or meeting in context; it does not intrinsically mean a prediction of the Messiah's schedule. חַג (ḥag), a festival or pilgrimage celebration, is related but not interchangeable with every use of mo'ed. The calendar orders work, rest, worship, sacrifice, remembrance and dependence on God's provision.⁴

The weekly Sabbath stands at the beginning, before the annual sequence is introduced again in verse 4. Passover and Unleavened Bread recall deliverance; grain offerings acknowledge the harvest; the seventh-month observances bring solemn assembly, purification and rejoicing in provision and wilderness remembrance. Leviticus 23:22 deliberately includes provision for the poor and resident alien amid its harvest instructions. Deuteronomy 16 likewise draws families, servants, Levites, foreigners, orphans and widows into the community's celebration. A prophetic reading that ignores these obligations is incomplete.

³ [T1] Pasted markdown (2).md; [T2] Pasted markdown (3).md.

⁴ [\[LEV\] Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917.](#)

“Seven annual feasts” is a useful conventional grouping, not a divinely supplied numbered table of seven predictive events. The first sheaf is a commanded rite within the annual sequence, not introduced with a separate formal festival title equivalent to every other item. The Sabbath and the eighth-day assembly also need accounting for. Philo's first-century treatment uses a different enumeration, including daily observance and new moons. This does not make the usual sevenfold grouping wrong; it prevents its arithmetic from carrying more authority than the text supplies.⁵

Likewise, “spring” and “autumn” are convenient regional summaries. Weeks belongs at the conclusion of the grain-harvest count, approximately May/June in modern calendar terms. These labels are not universal climatic seasons or biblical names for two comings of Christ. Hebrew months and Gregorian months do not coincide: the seventh biblical month is not simply September.

3. The appointed times, examined individually

Sabbath: rest received and shared

Text and covenant setting. שַׁבָּת (shabbat), with שַׁבַּת שַׁבְּבוֹתֵינוּ (shabbat shabbaton), introduces weekly cessation and sacred assembly in Leviticus 23:3. Exodus 20 connects it with creation; Deuteronomy 5 connects it with rescue from slavery. Its social force includes rest for dependants and animals. It should not disappear from the audit merely because a modern chart needs seven annual entries.⁶

Canonical development. Hebrews 3–4 joins creation rest, Israel's wilderness failure, Joshua and the continuing promise of entering God's rest. Its σαββατισμός (sabbatismos, Sabbath rest/celebration) in 4:9 belongs within that argument about believing, persevering and entering rest. Jesus' lordship over the Sabbath and His gift of rest add substantial Christological context (Mark 2:27–28; Matthew 11:28–12:8).

Assessment. Hebrews' rest argument is explicit (A); its integration with the entire feast architecture is B. This does not settle every Christian dispute about Saturday, Sunday or present observance. Later liturgical customs are context, not the basis of the connection. Preserve the existing Joshua/rest encounter and cross-reference it rather than creating a new Sabbath controversy.⁷

Passover: deliverance centered in Christ

Text and covenant setting. פֶּסַח (pesah) occurs on the fourteenth day of the first month, toward evening (Leviticus 23:5). Exodus 12 supplies the deliverance narrative, the blood-marked households, the meal and its remembrance. The animal could be from sheep or goats (Exodus 12:5); an exclusively woolly-lamb reconstruction should not replace the wording of the law. The later pilgrimage setting develops in Deuteronomy 16.⁸

Canonical connection. Paul directly identifies Christ as the sacrificed Passover in 1 Corinthians 5:7 (A). The Gospel passion narratives place Jesus' death in the Passover setting, and John 19:36 draws on the unbroken-bones language, alongside its possible Psalm 34 resonance. The Lord's Supper adds covenantal remembrance. The connection is stronger than a comparison of two interesting symbols: the apostolic text explicitly makes it.⁹

5 [PHILO] *The Special Laws II*, §§41, 145–214.

6 [LEV] *Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917*.

7 [HEB] *Hebrews 9*; [BASE] *Foreshadowing Jesus Research and Journey Recommendations*.

8 [LEV] *Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917*.

9 [PASS] *1 Corinthians 5:6–8*.

Chronological limit. The Synoptics present the final meal as Passover (Mark 14:12–16 and parallels); John's preparation language and meal references generate a genuine chronological debate (John 18:28; 19:14). Harmonizations exist, but neither the shared theological meaning nor a preferred harmonization independently proves that all the Gospel clocks establish death at the exact minute the Temple lambs were killed. Preserve Passover fulfillment without pretending that every chronological issue has disappeared.

Public use. Keep C11 central. Retain the original communal and ethical dimension, not just protection from judgment. No hidden cross-shaped blood pattern is needed, and no modern household rite follows automatically from Exodus 12.

Unleavened Bread: a delivered people learning sincerity

Text and covenant setting. חַג הַמַּצּוֹת (ḥag hammaṣṣot) lasts seven days from the fifteenth of the first month, with assemblies and offerings. Exodus 12 and Deuteronomy 16 connect the bread with departure and the memory of affliction. Leviticus 23 distinguishes the celebration from the preceding Passover while placing them together.¹⁰

Canonical connection. Paul's Passover argument continues with removal of the old leaven and celebration in sincerity and truth (1 Corinthians 5:6–8). This is an explicit ethical use of festival imagery (A). Christ's sinlessness supports a broader association with purity, but Paul primarily addresses the community's conduct here. A one-for-one equation “Unleavened Bread predicts Jesus' burial” is not established by this passage (E). Burial during the festival is a historical setting, not proof of the proposed typology.¹¹

Safeguard. Leaven is not an invariant biblical code for sin: the Weeks loaves are leavened (Leviticus 23:17), and Matthew 13:33 uses leaven in a kingdom comparison. Context controls its meaning. Keep this material beside Passover; a second long encounter would duplicate the apostolic argument.

Firstfruits: Christ's resurrection begins the harvest

Text and covenant setting. Leviticus 23:10 calls for עֹמֶר רֵאִשִׁית קְצִירָכֶם (ʿomer re'shit qeṣirkhem), a sheaf of the first of the harvest. The priest presents it before the LORD, with accompanying offerings, before the new grain is eaten. Its covenant meaning is thanksgiving, dependence and dedication of the harvest. The chapter later calls the Weeks offering firstfruits too; “firstfruits” does not name only one unique object throughout Scripture.¹²

Canonical connection. In 1 Corinthians 15:20, 23, ἀπαρχή (aparchē) describes the risen Christ in relation to the later resurrection of those who belong to Him (A). Firstfruits are the beginning of a harvest, not an isolated recovery with no relation to what follows. Relating that explicit image to Israel's firstfruits rites is strong (B), while acknowledging the word's wider biblical uses, including people and the Spirit (Romans 8:23; 16:5; James 1:18).¹³

Date dispute. “The day after the Sabbath” in Leviticus 23:11, 15 generated different readings. Josephus explicitly places the offering on Nisan 16; a weekly-Sabbath reading places it on Sunday. Frankel argues for a historical development behind the differing biblical presentations, while traditional readings seek a consistent legal account. The dispute is ancient in substance; a modern calendar chart should not erase it.¹⁴

¹⁰ [LEV] Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917.

¹¹ [PASS] 1 Corinthians 5:6–8.

¹² [LEV] Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917.

¹³ [FRUIT] 1 Corinthians 15:20–28, 50–58.

¹⁴ [JOSEPHUS] Antiquities of the Jews 3.10.5–6, especially §§250–252; [FRANKEL] Counting the Omer Began at Harvest.

Assessment. Jesus' resurrection on the first day of the week is clear in the Gospels. Whether that was the sheaf day under the calendar and passion chronology being used is a separate question. The explicit firstfruits claim survives the failure to demonstrate an exact ceremonial date. Add a short resurrection-harvest treatment to the Journey; put competing date reconstructions in research notes.

Weeks / Shavuot / Pentecost: harvest and the gift of the Spirit

Text and covenant setting. שבועות (shavu'ot, weeks) is the name in Deuteronomy 16:10 and Exodus 34:22. Leviticus 23:15–21 commands seven complete weeks and a fiftieth-day celebration, with new grain, two leavened loaves and multiple offerings. Numbers 28:26 calls it the day of firstfruits. Πεντηκοστή (pentēkostē) means fiftieth. Harvest gratitude, generosity and shared joy are original features.¹⁵

Canonical connection. Acts 2 explicitly places the Spirit's outpouring at Pentecost and explicitly attributes the gift to the risen, exalted Jesus (A). Peter interprets it through Joel and speaks of repentance, forgiveness, the Spirit and a widening promise. Calling it a decisive inauguration of the Spirit-empowered messianic community is justified. Saying God had no people, or the Spirit did no work, before this day would be false. A harvest-of-peoples synthesis is strong (B), but Acts does not explain the two loaves as Jews and Gentiles (E for that particular symbolic assignment).¹⁶

Sinai and covenant. Jubilees 6 provides genuinely pre-Christian evidence linking Weeks with covenant renewal. It would be wrong to dismiss every covenant association as a late rabbinic invention. It would also be wrong to infer from that literary witness a universally practiced first-century Jerusalem commemoration of the Sinai lawgiving. Leonhard explicitly challenges the move from literary connections to assumed ritual practice. Acts' sound, fire and divine speech support comparison with Sinai, but Acts 2 itself identifies Joel, not a detailed feast reenactment. Grade the broad covenant/Spirit pattern B and the proposed precise Sinai-festival staging C.¹⁷

Public use. Add a restrained Pentecost connection after the resurrection-harvest explanation. Avoid treating Israel as an obsolete prop or making the coming of the Spirit a warrant for the videos' unverified dreams.

Trumpets / Yom Teruah: assembly, alarm and an unproven date

Text and covenant setting. Leviticus 23:24 describes זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה (zikhron teru'ah), a memorial/reminder associated with a blast or shout; Numbers 29:1 calls it יוֹם תְּרוּעָה (yom teru'ah). It is the first day of the seventh month, a day of rest, assembly and offerings. Leviticus does not explain it as the date of a rapture, nor does its term by itself mean resurrection.¹⁸

Language and imagery. תְּרוּעָה (teru'ah) describes a sound, which can be a shout or instrumental alarm. שׁוֹפָר (shofar) is a horn; חֲצֻצֹת (ḥaṣṣoṣerot) are the metal trumpets of Numbers 10. They are not three interchangeable Hebrew names for one future event. Biblical blasts accompany revelation, war, assembly, kingship and worship. Philo interprets this observance through Sinai and the contrasts of war and peace, offering direct first-century Jewish context without supplying a hidden rapture equation.¹⁹

Canonical assessment. The Lord's return, the resurrection and gathering have explicit trumpet associations (A: Matthew 24:31; 1 Corinthians 15:52; 1 Thessalonians 4:16–17). Isaiah 27:13 supplies an especially relevant

¹⁵ [LEV] Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917.

¹⁶ [ACTS] Acts 2.

¹⁷ [JUB] Chapter 6, especially the Weeks/covenant passage (commonly 6:17–22); [LEON] Shavuot, Covenant Renewal and Pentecost.

¹⁸ [LEV] Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917.

¹⁹ [LEXH] Hebrew lexicon entries: teruah; [PHILO] The Special Laws II, §§41, 145–214.

earlier gathering trumpet. Relating Yom Teruah to this family of themes is a plausible echo (C). Saying the New Testament identifies this particular feast as the date or exclusive prototype is not demonstrated (E; F if presented as an established date). The difference is developed in section 6.²⁰

Later tradition. The familiar Rosh Hashanah framework of new year, kingship and judgment is significant Jewish interpretation, but each component needs historical dating. The alleged “day or hour” designation fails the requested evidentiary test; section 5 explains precisely what was and was not found.

Day of Atonement: Christ's accomplished sacrifice and access to God

Text and covenant setting. יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים (yom hakkippurim) is the tenth day of the seventh month (Leviticus 23:27). Affliction of self, cessation from work and solemn purification belong together. Leviticus 16 details the high priest's entry, incense, blood rites, purification of the sanctuary and removal of Israel's sins. The bull for the priest's own sin, the sacrificed goat and the sent-away goat must not be flattened into one interchangeable image.²¹

Language. כִּפָּר (kipper) is conventionally rendered make atonement; its ritual force must be interpreted from its object and context. In Leviticus 16 the sanctuary as well as the people requires purification. Explaining everything as merely “covering” sin from a proposed root meaning is inadequate. The identity or reference of Azazel remains debated; the entire rite can illuminate Christ without claiming that the New Testament separately identifies every action of both goats with Him.

Hebrews. Its contrast is between repeated earthly priestly service and Jesus' decisive self-offering and access to God's presence. He is not another sinful priest needing a sacrifice for Himself. Hebrews 9:7–14, 24–28 and 10:1–18 ground the connection in what He has accomplished, not only in what He might do on a future Jewish calendar date. The cross and heavenly priesthood are one coherent saving work, not rival explanations of fulfillment. This annual-atonement connection is A.²²

Future dimension. Hebrews 9:28 also expects Christ to appear again for the salvation of those awaiting Him. Accomplished atonement therefore has future consummation; “already” does not mean “nothing remains.” But a future national repentance precisely on Tishri 10 is not stated. Romans 11:25–32 and Zechariah 12:10–13:1 raise substantial questions about Israel, mercy and cleansing; Christian interpretations differ. Their connection to a specific Yom Kippur date remains a further inference, not an explicit biblical equation.

Public use. Preserve and clarify C17. This is a decisive reason not to use the autumn calendar as an entirely unfulfilled block. Do not reopen the broader Israel/church debate in order to manufacture a seven-step symmetry.

Booths / Tabernacles / Sukkot: provision, presence and final dwelling

Text and covenant setting. חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת (hag hassukkot) begins on the fifteenth of the seventh month. Israel dwells in booths, סֻכּוֹת (sukkot), rejoices with gathered produce and branches, remembers wilderness dwelling and holds the concluding assembly. Deuteronomy 16 emphasizes harvest and inclusive joy; Nehemiah 8 joins renewed observance with the reading of the law. This is both remembrance and glad dependence, not simply a prediction disguised as an agricultural holiday.²³

²⁰ [MATT] Matthew 24–25; [FRUIT] 1 Corinthians 15:20–28, 50–58; [THESS] 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11.

²¹ [ATONE] Leviticus 16.

²² [HEB] Hebrews 9.

²³ [LEV] Leviticus 23, Hebrew and JPS 1917.

Prophetic development. Zechariah 14:16–19 explicitly depicts surviving nations coming to worship the King and keep Booths. Its water, kingship and universal worship themes give substantial grounds for a future feast trajectory. How its topography and cult relate to the millennium or new creation is disputed. Ezekiel 37:26–28 contributes the covenantal promise of God's dwelling among His people.²⁴

John. John 7:2 gives the festival setting; 7:37–39 explicitly interprets Jesus' living-water invitation in relation to the Spirit. Mishnah Sukkah preserves water-pouring and brilliant festival-lamp traditions associated with the Temple. They can illuminate the setting, with the qualification that their surviving compilation is later than Jesus. Köstenberger's water reading usefully considers the broader scriptural temple and life-giving-water background as well. No single late ritual detail needs to carry the argument.²⁵

John 8:12 is relevant to light, but care is needed about the literary transition: John 7:53–8:11 has a disputed textual history and is absent from important early witnesses. One should not use the intervening narrative to establish the exact ceremonial timing of Jesus' light saying. John 1:14 uses ἐσκήνωσεν (eskēnōsen), dwelt/tabernacled, and glory language. This strongly evokes God's dwelling presence; it does not say Jesus was born during Sukkot. A proposed birth date remains speculative.

Revelation. Revelation 7 brings palms, shelter and living water together; specific feast allusions are plausible within the stronger canonical pattern. Revelation 21:3 explicitly presents God's dwelling with humanity, while 21:22–23 identifies God and the Lamb as the city's temple and light. These are not identical to a simple restoration of the old sanctuary. Final divine dwelling is A; a Sukkot-to-Christ-to-new-creation synthesis is B, without an explicit statement that every earlier rite has a one-to-one future counterpart.²⁶

Reception and public use. Methodius already interpreted Tabernacles in relation to resurrection and bodily restoration in late antiquity. That demonstrates that eschatological Christian Sukkot reading is not wholly a modern invention; his further chronological speculations remain his interpretation. Add a concise final-dwelling connection near the Journey's conclusion and link it to C15's existing tabernacle material.²⁷

4. Does the calendar work as a whole?

Yes, within carefully stated limits. The calendar forms Israel in received deliverance, holy living, dependence on life and provision, assembly, cleansing and joy in God's presence. The New Testament's treatment of these institutions is not a collection of unrelated coincidences: it repeatedly locates their meaning in the same Christ, His saving work and the community He forms.

Colossians 2:16–17 provides explicit collective warrant by connecting festivals, new moons and Sabbaths with shadow and Christ. Σκιά (skia) means shadow; σῶμα (sōma) means body, with the contrast directing readers to Christ as the substantial reality. The point also resists coercive judgment over observance. It does not provide a detailed seven-event concordance. The explicit collective statement is A; the fuller redemptive synthesis is B.²⁸

The proposed progression “deliverance → holiness → resurrection/life → Spirit → gathering → atonement → dwelling” expresses real biblical themes. It must not be presented as a chronological order of fulfillment. Christ's atonement precedes the Pentecost outpouring and the final gathering; His presence and kingdom are

²⁴ [ZECH] Zechariah 14.

²⁵ [JOHN] John 7; [SUK] Sukkah 4:9 and 5:2–4; [KOST] Rivers of Living Water (John 7).

²⁶ [REV] Revelation 21.

²⁷ [METHOD] The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, Discourse 9, chapters 1–5; [BASE] Foreshadowing Jesus Research and Journey Recommendations.

²⁸ [COL] Colossians 2:16–23.

already active before the final consummation. A recurring annual calendar is not automatically a one-pass eschatological stopwatch.

An overlapping pattern is therefore better supported than a rigid schedule: Christ delivers and cleanses; His resurrection opens the harvest of life; He gives the Spirit and forms a holy people; He will gather and raise His people into enduring fellowship with God. These are related dimensions of one saving work, with anticipation, accomplishment and consummation crossing the seasonal boundary. The pattern's strength rests on explicit apostolic connections and converging biblical themes, not on giving seven uncertain links a collective promotion.

The spring/autumn model tested

Proposed equation	Judgment
Passover → Christ's sacrifice	A. Explicit; exact Temple-minute synchronization remains a separate disputed claim.
Unleavened Bread → sincerity and truth in Christ's people	A. Paul's own application. Burial equation E; sinlessness association needs qualification.
Firstfruits → risen Christ and coming resurrection	A for Paul's metaphor; B for the specific ritual background; exact ceremonial date not demonstrated here.
Pentecost → Spirit given by the exalted Jesus	A. Precise Sinai reenactment C; two loaves as two ethnic groups E.
Trumpets → resurrection/gathering	A for trumpet imagery generally; C for this feast as a particular echo; fixed return date E/F.
Atonement → future Israel only	F as an exclusive account. Hebrews' accomplished Christological connection is A; a further dated national scenario is unproven.
Tabernacles → divine dwelling and consummation	B as a feast trajectory; A for final dwelling itself; one obligatory millennial chronology is disputed.

Some evangelical and Messianic interpreters use the spring/autumn arrangement as a devotional overview; others treat its symmetry as a predictive timetable. GotQuestions gives a representative version and acknowledges that future autumn fulfillment is believed by many interpreters. This audit accepts several of its Christological connections while rejecting the move from partial correspondence to mandatory exact-date fulfillment. The model is useful only if its weaker links and Hebrews' cross-season fulfillment are made visible.²⁹

5. The alleged “day or hour” idiom

The claim under test is specific: not merely that ancient Jews observed a new moon, but that Matthew 24:36 uses a recognized Jewish designation for Yom Teruah, thereby disclosing the season of the bridegroom's return. Those are two different historical propositions.

²⁹ [\[GQ\] How did Jesus fulfill the meanings of the Jewish feasts?](#)

What ancient evidence establishes. The Mishnah describes witnesses reporting the moon, a court determining the month, communication arrangements, and consequences when witnesses came late. Rosh Hashanah 4:4 includes a Temple-period memory involving the Levites' song. These traditions support actual observational and administrative uncertainty. Their compilation around 200 CE still needs distinguishing from the periods they describe. Philo supplies a first-century feast discussion but no instance of the alleged Matthean designation.³⁰

How much uncertainty? In an observational lunar system the issue is generally whether the month is sanctified after twenty-nine days or completed to thirty, together with communication and ritual consequences. This is bounded calendar uncertainty, not ignorance of every possible season or year. Communities and periods also differed; Stern's historical overview cautions against projecting the fully calculated later calendar, or one uniform observational procedure, across all of Second Temple Judaism.³¹

Later rabbinic material. Rosh Hashanah 8b interprets the festival at which the moon is covered in connection with the new year and judgment. This is an actual later rabbinic witness, not the phrase "no one knows the day or hour." The underlying Psalm 81 expression has translation questions; a covered-moon homily cannot silently become a first-century name for the feast. No ancient text inspected supplies the claimed exact designation or explains Jesus' words that way.³²

Traceable modern witness. The assertion is explicitly present in Eddie Chumney's *The Seven Festivals of the Messiah*, chapter 7, in the consulted electronic text of a work published in 1994. The relevant passage treats the Gospel wording as an idiom for the feast but supplies no primary ancient citation for that assertion. This is a located modern witness, not proof that Chumney invented the idea or that the wording is demonstrably present in every printing of the first edition. A physical first-edition collation and exhaustive earlier-print search were outside the accessible evidence.³³

Finding. Ancient observational practice: D and supported with chronological qualifications. Recognized ancient feast idiom: UNSUPPORTED. A historical proof that Jesus thereby disclosed a Trumpets rapture: rejected as an established argument (F). It remains possible to make a devotional association between watchfulness and a feast of sounding, but that is not the historical claim made by the transcript.

Matthew's own context stresses unexpected arrival, preparedness and faithful service. Mark 13:32–37 reinforces this, and Acts 1:7 includes times and seasons within what the disciples are not authorized to know. Debate about the scope of individual eschatological sayings does not supply permission to manufacture a particular September. An exact-hour disclaimer does not neutralize a month-and-year prediction.³⁴

6. Trumpets, resurrection, gathering and the rapture

The events are not being rejected. First Thessalonians 4:16–17 promises Christ's descent, the resurrection of the dead in Christ and the gathering of believers to Him; ἀρπάζω (harpazō), used in the passive form "will be caught up," underlies the term rapture. First Corinthians 15:51–52 speaks of transformation at the last trumpet. Matthew 24:31 connects a great trumpet with the gathering of the elect. These are explicit canonical relationships, not inventions of modern prophecy teachers.³⁵

30 [MRH] Rosh Hashanah 2; [PHILO] *The Special Laws II*, §§41, 145–214.

31 [STERN] *Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd Century BCE–10th Century CE*.

32 [BRH] Rosh Hashanah 8b.

33 [CHUM] *The Seven Festivals of the Messiah*, chapter 7, Yom HaKeseh.

34 [MATT] Matthew 24–25.

35 [THESS] 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11; [FRUIT] 1 Corinthians 15:20–28, 50–58; [MATT] Matthew 24–25.

The feast identification is the unproven step. None of these texts names the first day of the seventh month. Isaiah 27:13 offers a gathering background; Exodus 19 supplies divine appearing; Numbers 10 supplies assembly; Joel 2 supplies alarm and the day of the LORD. Leviticus 25:9 even places a Jubilee shofar on the Day of Atonement. Trumpet symbolism is shared across several contexts, so its presence cannot uniquely identify Yom Teruah.

Nor does Paul's "last trumpet" automatically mean the hundredth blast of a later Rosh Hashanah service or Revelation's seventh trumpet. Such proposals require evidence of literary dependence, shared referent and relevant historical practice. Similar vocabulary alone does not establish these. Revelation's trumpet series announces judgments; its relation to Paul's eschatological trumpet is interpreted differently by Christians.

Dispensational pretribulationism commonly separates a catching up of the church from a later public return and connects the interval with a future Danielic week. Other premillennial interpreters unite resurrection and gathering with Christ's public return after tribulation. Amillennial readings generally relate these promises to the one final coming and resurrection while reading apocalyptic sequences less linearly. These are competing syntheses, not three different lexical meanings of teruah. The feast alone cannot adjudicate them.

Public judgment: retain the certain hope of Christ's return, resurrection and gathering. If Trumpets appears in the main Journey, give it only a qualified sentence within the wider calendar account. A detailed rapture chart belongs neither there nor in a deceptively authoritative language panel.

7. Elul: genuine tradition with a history

Elul is a genuine Jewish month, named in Nehemiah 6:15. That verse records the completion of Jerusalem's wall; it does not command a special Elul fast, a thirty-day rapture countdown or a wedding-garment season. Biblical repentance is foundational, but the later concentration of penitential customs in Elul needs its own evidence.

Claim or practice	Earliest relevant evidence located and responsible use
Return / repentance	Biblical calls to return, using שׁוּב (shuv); later תְּשׁוּבָה (teshuvah) is standard Jewish repentance language. Meanings must be selected by context.
Elul preparation and shofar	Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer 46, an early medieval work, links Moses' ascent at the beginning of Elul with shofar. Tur OC 581, fourteenth century, records month-long custom and differing penitential practices.
Earlier penitential practice	Abudarham reports earlier Geonic/medieval authorities and different starting points. A medieval witness to an earlier practice is not a directly surviving first-century enactment.
Elul acronym from Song 6:3	Attested in Abudarham. The Hebrew initials form ליל א. This is a homiletic association, not the month name's biblical etymology or a demonstrated saying of Jesus' audience.
The king in the field	Familiar Elul form associated with Shneur Zalman of Liadi; related accessible-imagery occurs in earlier Hasidic teaching. Its identifiable setting is eighteenth-/early nineteenth-century Hasidism, not the Second Temple period.

Claim or practice	Earliest relevant evidence located and responsible use
Wedding garments before Trumpets	Song of Songs supplies love poetry; the New Testament supplies Christ/bride imagery. A universal ancient Jewish Elul wedding-dress countdown to a Trumpets bridegroom was not established.

The surviving textual layers matter. Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer is attributed to an early rabbi, but its composition is generally placed much later, with dating debated. Its forty-day Moses chronology should be labelled as tradition rather than read back into Exodus as an explicit Elul date. Tur and Abudarham show real variation, not one unchanging practice for every Jewish community.³⁶

Maimonides interprets the shofar as a summons to moral awakening. That is a genuine medieval Jewish theological interpretation. It does not make “resurrection” the dictionary meaning of teru‘ah. Likewise, the king-in-the-field teaching can express divine accessibility beautifully without proving that Jesus' disciples knew an Elul code for His future appearing. Earlier related king analogies caution against claiming a single inventor, but do not establish the video's first-century premise.³⁷

Language caution. The transcripts' forms “tshoua,” “UI” and “IL” appear to represent teshuvah and Elul, but no audio was supplied for linguistic verification. Teshuvah can mean return, repentance or answer in different contexts. It does not mean all of these simultaneously in every sentence, still less guarantee a mother's family's physical safety. The distinct Hebrew word often transliterated teshu‘ah means salvation/deliverance; spelling and context matter. The audit corrects the argument, not the speaker's accent.³⁸

Thirty days. In the present fixed calendar Elul has twenty-nine days. Its two-day Rosh Chodesh includes 30 Av and 1 Elul, which helps explain devotional descriptions of thirty days of preparation. Historical observational months were not governed by every later fixed-calendar rule. The transcript nevertheless makes a concrete 2025 assertion, so the modern dates can and should be checked.³⁹

8. Calendar, contemporary events and Daniel 9

The dates the transcripts actually require

Event	Verified date or arithmetic	Consequence
1 Elul 5785	Daytime Monday 25 August 2025; begins sunset 24 August	August 20 is not the start of Elul in the video's explicit 2025 scenario.
Rosh Chodesh Elul 2025	Sunset 23 August to nightfall 25 August; includes 30 Av	The two-day observance must not be confused with the length or start of Elul itself.

³⁶ [PRE] Chapter 46; [KEIM] Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer: Structure, Coherence, Intertextuality; [TUR] Tur, Orach Chayim 581; [ABU] Rosh HaShanah, Prayers, section 8.

³⁷ [MAIM] Mishneh Torah, Repentance 3:4; [FIELD] The King in the Field; [FIELDH] The King is in the Field: The Wanderings of a Hasidic Teaching.

³⁸ [JAST] Dictionary entry: teshuvah.

³⁹ [EL25] Rosh Chodesh Elul 2025; [HC25] Rosh Hashana 2025.

Event	Verified date or arithmetic	Consequence
Rosh Hashanah 2025	Begins sunset 22 September; first daytime date 23 September	August 20 to September 22 is 33 elapsed civil days, not 30; to September 23 is 34.
UN Summit of the Future	22–23 September 2024	The named summit is not the 2025 two-state conference.
Rosh Hashanah 2024	Begins sunset 2 October	The 2024 summit was not on the feast's opening date. "Near" is not an exact alignment.
UN two-state conference continuation	22 September 2025	A real event close to the 2025 feast opening, but a different meeting. Coincidence does not establish fulfillment.
Ottoman calculation	$1535 + 490 = 2025$	Correct addition; no established biblical authorization for this starting point or second clock.

Dates are reported with sunset conventions so that civil dates and Jewish days are not mixed. The calendar results are independently checkable; the elapsed-day arithmetic uses ordinary civil date subtraction. The transcripts' missing publication metadata prevents a precise judgment about every "this September" reference, but it does not rescue the explicit false Elul date or the conflation of different UN events.⁴⁰

Political claims. The 2025 conference and recognition developments were real. Neither the event name nor diplomatic use of "peace and security" identifies the event as Daniel 9:27. Joel 3:2 names the valley of Jehoshaphat; the valley of decision is named later in 3:14. Scattering God's people, dividing the land and human trafficking appear in the surrounding indictment. Reducing it to one automatic test for a modern diplomatic plan loses the passage's context. A two-state discussion is not unprecedented merely because a particular conference is new.

Technology claims. Revelation 13:16–17 connects economic restriction with the beast's mark and the wider issue of worship and allegiance. It does not name CBDCs, a digital identity scheme or artificial intelligence. These technologies and policy experiments exist, but a claim that one global system is complete and awaiting one switch is not established. The BIS's 2024 survey, published in August 2025, reports varied exploration and development rather than uniform deployment. This is evidence against the video's categorical infrastructure claim, not proof that technology could never participate in oppressive control.⁴¹

⁴⁰ [\[EL25\] Rosh Chodesh Elul 2025](#); [\[HC25\] Rosh Hashana 2025](#); [\[HC24\] Rosh Hashana 2024](#); [\[UN24\] Summit of the Future programme and Pact for the Future](#); [\[UN25\] 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York: opening day](#).

⁴¹ [\[BIS\] Advancing in tandem: results of the 2024 BIS survey on central bank digital currencies and cr....](#)

Temple Mount shofar. A late-August 2025 advocacy post and contemporary reports concern shofar blowing on the Mount. That is sufficient to identify a researchable reported event, not to authenticate the supplied video's scene or prove an unbroken two-thousand-year silence. Exact location, legality, number of participants and historical priority require separate evidence. The well-known 1967 Western Wall shofar must not be casually relabelled "on the Temple Mount." Retrospective accounts also describe activity in the Mount's vicinity; these complicate sweeping claims but do not remove the need for precise topography. Classify the recent event as partly supported as reported, and "never once in two thousand years" as unsupported.⁴²

Even an authenticated first occurrence would not make Joel 2:1 a prediction of that particular event. Joel's summons to alarm is not a rule that every subsequent shofar on Zion starts a final countdown. Three assertions sharing a prophetic frame are not three independent confirmations of that frame.

Daniel 9 safeguards retained

No genuinely new Hebrew, chronological or canonical evidence from this feast audit requires reopening Daniel 9. The prior distinction remains: a substantial Christological trajectory and a conditional broad chronology must not be collapsed into demonstrable exact-day precision. The latest reassessment recommended B, a qualified public treatment, rather than restricting everything to research. This audit records that recommendation without silently treating it as an implemented or newly approved alteration to the baseline.⁴³

The Ottoman claim fails independently. Suleiman's rebuilding is historical, but "the walls were rebuilt in 1535" compresses an order, a programme and construction into one date. The museum dates one commemorative inscription to 1535–1538; historical accounts usually place principal surviving-wall construction in 1537–1541. Even granting an initiating order in 1535, Daniel does not identify it as a second divinely mandated terminus.⁴⁴

There is also an internal numerical problem. In an uninterrupted seventy-week model, 490 years brings the whole seventy weeks to completion; the seventieth week begins after 483 years. Starting at 1535 gives 2018 for that latter point, not 2025. Introducing a gap would require a separate argument and would destroy the claimed simple addition. The assertion that every prophecy always has a second end-times fulfillment is not a biblical rule. A genuine canonical pattern does not authorize unlimited chronological restarts.

Revelation 3:3 does call its audience to watchfulness. A 3:00 a.m. clock display is not evidence that this verse supplies a contemporary prophecy; neither the modern chapter/verse label nor that display convention comes from the original wording. Seven can function symbolically in Scripture, but seven Gregorian months from February are not thereby the seventh biblical month.

9. Pastoral claims that must not travel with the feast material

Both transcripts contain sound calls to repentance and true statements about Christ's death and resurrection. Those should be acknowledged independently of the unsupported chronology. Biblical watchfulness is not dismissed because a video uses it badly.

The family-protection argument is different. Noah's eight-person rescue, the Passover households and Rahab's gathered family are genuine biblical narratives (Genesis 7; Exodus 12; Joshua 2 and 6; 1 Peter 3:20).

42 [\[TMPOST\] Sounding the shofar on the Temple Mount](#); [\[TMNEWS\] Report on shofar blowing and Palestinian Authority objection](#); [\[GOREN\] An eyewitness account of rabbis at war in 1967](#); [\[GOREN2\] Retrospective account of Rabbi Goren's 1967 shofar](#).

43 [DAN] Daniel 9 Critical Audit and latest Messianic reassessment.

44 [\[WALL\] Building inscription commemorating the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, IAA 1942-265](#); [\[EJ\] Jerusalem, Ottoman-period account](#).

They do not establish that every praying parent receives immunity for every family member from every judgment, illness, persecution or economic disruption. Hebrews 11 includes faithful people who suffered; Acts 12 places James' death and Peter's rescue side by side. Firstborn judgment at Passover should not be paraphrased into an unrestricted guarantee for all children in every later crisis.

Prayer for children and loving encouragement toward faith are appropriate. A twice-daily blood-invocation procedure producing an angelic household seal is not commanded or promised by the cited texts. A parent's faith is not an automatic substitute for the response of every relative. The promise that every sincere prayer will produce a particular warmth in the chest is also unsupported; sensory intensity is not the measure of saving faith.

Transcript 1 combines material from Zephaniah 3:17 and 3:20 while introducing it under 3:17. The restoration context matters, and a request in prayer should not be treated as a fulfilled guarantee simply because it is emotionally compelling. Transcript 2 correctly remembers that all ten bridesmaids sleep, but "no oil" needs the qualification that the foolish lack adequate provision: their lamps are going out (Matthew 25:8). The parable calls for readiness; it does not identify Elul's end as an annually closing door of grace.

10. Why responsible interpreters differ

The disagreements are not merely between people who believe the Bible and people who do not. They arise from different judgments about genre, historical reconstruction, ritual background, typology and the relationship of Israel's institutions to Christ.

Jay Sklar's conservative Christian treatment foregrounds the calendar's teaching function and covenant obligations. Köstenberger's evangelical reading of John emphasizes the scriptural water/temple context. These approaches support Christological interpretation while showing why a date-chart alone misses important dimensions. GotQuestions represents a more schematic spring/autumn model. The question is whether the proposed seasonal symmetry can bear the predictive weight assigned to it.⁴⁵

Jewish and historical-critical approaches rightly require the festivals' agricultural, covenantal and legal histories to be heard in their own setting. Frankel's account of the omer count is a historical reconstruction, not a neutral transcription of Leviticus, and traditional interpreters contest such developmental readings. Stern's calendar history warns against assuming uniform practice across communities and centuries. Neither point by itself disproves a Christian canonical fulfillment; it constrains claims about what happened on a particular ancient date.⁴⁶

Jubilees establishes that covenantal reflection on Weeks existed before Christianity. Leonhard nevertheless questions whether a commonly assumed Sinai/covenant-renewal celebration was an enacted ritual background for Pentecost. This disagreement turns on the move from literary association to social practice, not merely on willingness to notice parallels. Because only his substantive abstract was accessible, this audit uses the challenge narrowly rather than claiming to have refuted his entire argument.⁴⁷

45 [\[SKLAR\] Israel's Calendar Was a Classroom](#); [\[KOST\] Rivers of Living Water \(John 7\)](#); [\[GQ\] How did Jesus fulfill the meanings of the Jewish feasts?](#).

46 [\[FRANKEL\] Counting the Omer Began at Harvest](#); [\[STERN\] Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd Century BCE–10th Century CE](#).

47 [\[JUB\] Chapter 6, especially the Weeks/covenant passage \(commonly 6:17–22\)](#); [\[LEON\] Shavuot, Covenant Renewal and Pentecost](#).

Philo and Josephus are primary Jewish witnesses near the New Testament period; the Mishnah is later testimony that can preserve earlier practice. Medieval and Hasidic texts speak directly for their own traditions, not automatically for first-century hearers. Methodius demonstrates ancient Christian interest in Tabernacles and resurrection, while also showing that antiquity alone does not make a chronological elaboration authoritative.⁴⁸

The Christian judgment here is openly canonical: Jesus' saving work is read through the completed Christian Scriptures. A Jewish scholar need not share that theological premise for their linguistic or historical analysis to be valuable. Conversely, canonical confidence does not entitle Christians to invent ancient Jewish idioms or erase unresolved historical questions.

11. Answers to the fifteen Founder questions

1. Do the biblical feasts collectively foreshadow Jesus?

Yes. Colossians provides explicit collective Christ-centered warrant (A), and the larger deliverance, holiness, life, Spirit, cleansing and dwelling synthesis is strong (B). A predetermined seven-event timetable is a separate, unproven claim.

2. Which connections are explicitly established?

Christ as Passover; Paul's unleavened sincerity/truth application; Christ as resurrection firstfruits; Pentecost's Spirit outpouring through the exalted Jesus; Hebrews' annual-atonement interpretation; and the calendar/shadow relationship to Christ. Final dwelling and eschatological trumpet events are explicit too, but their identification with particular feast rites must be graded separately.

3. Which additional connections are strong?

The firstfruits ritual background, Pentecost within a harvest-and-people-of-God pattern, and Sukkot's movement through prophetic hope and Jesus' water/presence imagery toward final divine dwelling. Their strength does not depend on a precise date chart.

4. Which popular connections are merely plausible?

Yom Teruah as a particular echo of final gathering; a carefully stated Sinai resonance in Acts 2; and some specific festival allusions in Revelation 7. Each needs qualification rather than a fulfillment label.

5. Which popular claims fail?

The demonstrated ancient "day or hour" idiom; a mandatory Trumpets rapture date; August 20 as 1 Elul 2025; Elul as invariably thirty days in the current calendar; the 1535 + 490 prophetic restart; the claim that all prophecy requires a second end-times fulfillment; and assigning guaranteed physical family protection to the proposed prayer ritual. Unleavened burial, two ethnic loaves and a Sukkot birth date remain unestablished, rather than becoming certain through repetition.

48 [PHILO] *The Special Laws* II, §§41, 145–214; [JOSEPHUS] *Antiquities of the Jews* 3.10.5–6, especially §§250–252; [MRH] *Rosh Hashanah* 2; [METHOD] *The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, Discourse 9, chapters 1–5*.

6. Is spring fulfilled / autumn future demonstrable?

No, as an exclusive or exact-date system. Hebrews explicitly gives an autumn observance an accomplished Christological fulfillment. A loose teaching overview may retain value if that major qualification and the disputed links are visible.

7. Does Yom Teruah relate defensibly to return or resurrection?

As a plausible thematic echo, yes (C). Trumpet-linked resurrection and gathering themselves are explicit (A). No passage establishes this feast as their required date.

8. Is “no one knows the day or hour” a demonstrable feast idiom?

No primary ancient evidence for that designation was located. New-moon observation is genuine context; the exact designation is traceable here in modern Christian teaching. This is an unsupported historical claim, not a sound foundation for interpreting Matthew.

9. How much modern Elul teaching reflects first-century Judaism?

The month, lunar calendar, repentance, sacred assembly and shofar have ancient roots. The particular package of month-long penitential customs, acronym, king-in-field teaching and wedding countdown spans later periods. A first-century version of that whole package has not been established.

10. How does Hebrews affect Yom Kippur?

It makes Jesus' accomplished self-offering and heavenly access central, while retaining a future appearance for final salvation. It rules out treating the feast's Christian significance as wholly postponed.

11. Does Sukkot lead meaningfully toward final dwelling?

Yes, strongly (B), through wilderness remembrance, prophetic nations/worship, Jesus' water and presence language, and Revelation's final dwelling. Not every ritual detail or millennial timetable follows from that trajectory.

12. Was the existing research materially incomplete here?

Yes, in collective treatment and in sustained Firstfruits, Pentecost and Sukkot development. No, in the sense of having omitted Passover or annual atonement: those are already substantial and should be preserved.

13. Should the architecture change?

Expand content within the existing eight movements. No new movement, feast-driven replacement structure or predictive calendar is warranted. Proposed placements are specified in the separate integration recommendation.

14. What belongs in the main Journey?

The collective Christ-centered principle; a short extension of Passover into unleavened sincerity; resurrection firstfruits; Pentecost and the Spirit; the already approved Hebrews atonement connection; and a restrained Sukkot-to-final-dwelling close. Trumpets needs at most a qualified sentence in this overview.

15. What belongs in optional panels or research notes?

Two or three brief language clarifications can protect the main reading. Calendar disputes, the ancient-idiom investigation, dated Elul traditions, competing eschatological systems, disputed ceremonial details and modern-video corrections belong in the research layer. The videos themselves should not determine the Journey's emotional tone.

12. Recommendation and remaining limits

Approve a targeted feast expansion, with the existing eight-movement structure intact. The accompanying integration document gives provisional placements and a limited word budget; the Look Closer document distinguishes recommended panels from optional historical notes. The corrective list identifies which baseline conclusions remain sound and which areas need expansion or qualification. These are proposed changes only.

The central conclusion is robust despite bounded uncertainties: some calendar details remain disputed, the original videos were not authenticated, the precise priority of the recent Mount event is not established, and the idiom search does not identify an indisputable inventor. Some scholarly comparisons rely on substantive abstracts rather than full books or chapters, as disclosed in the source record. None of these limits requires either rejecting the New Testament's feast connections or promoting speculative chronology.

The Living Word can present the feasts as part of the coherent biblical witness to Jesus with confidence and restraint. It should invite readers to see the breadth of His saving work, while making no promise that decoding a festival calendar reveals the month of His return. Founder review is the next step; implementation remains paused.

Sources and access record

Source keys match the footnotes and the accompanying claim ledger. Scripture references name the primary evidence; ESV text was consulted alongside Hebrew/Greek and selected public-domain translations. Exposition is principally paraphrase. Online material was checked in September 2026. Access limitations are recorded rather than hidden.

[LEV] Canonical Scripture. Leviticus 23. Hebrew and JPS 1917; compare Exodus 12: 23:14–17; 34:18–23; Numbers 28–29; Deuteronomy 16. Ancient primary text. Chapter read; Hebrew terminology checked. Biblical references in the report identify additional primary passages; English exposition is principally paraphrase.

[PASS] Canonical Scripture. 1 Corinthians 5:6–8. Ancient primary text. Explicit Passover identification and ethical application of unleavened imagery.

[FRUIT] Canonical Scripture. 1 Corinthians 15:20–28, 50–58. Ancient primary text. Resurrection harvest and trumpet; primary text read.

[COL] Canonical Scripture. Colossians 2:16–23. Ancient primary text. Collective calendar/shadow/Christ statement in its anti-coercion context.

[ACTS] Canonical Scripture. Acts 2. Ancient primary text. Pentecost, Joel, the exalted Jesus and the Spirit.

[HEB] Canonical Scripture. Hebrews 9; compare Hebrews 4: 7–10; 13:11–13. Ancient primary text. Annual entrance, Christ's self-offering, heavenly ministry and future appearance.

[ATONE] Canonical Scripture. Leviticus 16. Ancient primary text. Annual purification of sanctuary and people; compare Leviticus 23:26–32.

[JOHN] Canonical Scripture. John 7; compare John 1:14; 2:19–22; 8:12. Ancient primary text. Feast context and water/Spirit interpretation explicit in 7:2, 37–39.

[ZECH] Canonical Scripture. Zechariah 14; compare Ezekiel 37:26–28; Zechariah 12:10–13:1. Ancient primary text. Future nations and Tabernacles; interpretive relation to new creation assessed separately.

[REV] Canonical Scripture. Revelation 21; compare Revelation 7: 13; 19–22. Ancient primary text. Final dwelling, God and the Lamb as temple, divine light.

[THESS] Canonical Scripture. 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11. Ancient primary text. Return, resurrection and gathering; chapter 5 continues the same pastoral argument.

[MATT] Canonical Scripture. Matthew 24–25. Ancient primary text. Great trumpet, unknown timing and faithful readiness; compare Mark 13:32–37 and Acts 1:7.

[PHILO] Philo of Alexandria. The Special Laws II, §§41, 145–214. First century CE; C. D. Yonge translation. Primary feast discussions read, including §§188–192 on trumpets. Not a uniform account of every Jewish community.

[JOSEPHUS] Flavius Josephus. Antiquities of the Jews 3.10.5–6, especially §§250–252. Late first century CE; William Whiston translation. Primary witness to Nisan 16 firstfruits and the subsequent fifty-day count.

[JUB] Book of Jubilees. Chapter 6, especially the Weeks/covenant passage (commonly 6:17–22). Second century BCE; traditional English translation. Full chapter retrieved through Sefaria's text API; numbering varies by edition. A literary covenant connection, not proof of universal Temple practice.

[MRH] Mishnah. Rosh Hashanah 2: 3:1; 4:4. Compilation c. 200 CE, with traditions concerning the Temple period. Chapters 2–4 retrieved through text API. Court/witness traditions must be distinguished from their compilation date.

[BRH] Babylonian Talmud. Rosh Hashanah 8b. Late antique compilation, conventionally fifth–sixth centuries CE. Hebrew/Aramaic and English retrieved through text API; covered-moon homily is not the alleged Matthew idiom.

[SUK] Mishnah. Sukkah 4:9 and 5:2–4. Compilation c. 200 CE; traditions depict Temple water and lamp celebrations. Chapters 4–5 retrieved through text API; later compilation does not automatically invalidate Temple memory or prove every detail first-century.

[PRE] Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer. Chapter 46; compare chapter 31. Early medieval work, commonly eighth–ninth centuries CE; precise dating debated. Hebrew/English retrieved through text API. Attribution to Rabbi Eliezer does not date the whole composition to his lifetime.

[KEIM] Katharina E. Keim. Pirgei deRabbi Eliezer: Structure, Coherence, Intertextuality. Brill, 2017. Accessible introductory discussion of dating consulted; not a claim to have read the entire monograph.

[TUR] Jacob ben Asher. Tur, Orach Chayim 581. Fourteenth century. Primary text retrieved through API: PRE citation, month-long shofar custom and differing penitential practices.

[ABU] David Abudarham. Rosh HaShanah. Prayers, section 8. Fourteenth century, work completed c. 1340. Hebrew read through API; Elul acronym and reports of earlier Geonic/medieval penitential practices. Attestation, not proof of invention.

[MAIM] Moses Maimonides. Mishneh Torah, Repentance 3:4; Sanctification of the New Month 1. Twelfth century. Primary text retrieved through API; ethical awakening is interpretation of shofar, not the lexical meaning 'resurrection'.

[FIELD] Chabad.org, presenting Shneur Zalman of Liadi. The King in the Field; citing Likkutei Torah, Reeh 32b. Modern presentation of a Hasidic teaching associated with Shneur Zalman (1745–1812). Direct contemporary Jewish source for its own tradition, not a first-century historical witness.

[FIELDH] Sefaria community source sheet. The King is in the Field: The Wanderings of a Hasidic Teaching. Modern collection of older primary excerpts. Excerpts include earlier Hasidic accessible-king comparisons associated with the Maggid of Mezeritch. No claim that Shneur Zalman invented every related motif.

[CHUM] Eddie (Edward) Chumney. The Seven Festivals of the Messiah, chapter 7, Yom HaKeseh. Work published 1994; consulted reformatted electronic text, PDF p. 62. Exact modern idiom assertion located. This mirror was not collated against a physical first edition; no ancient source for the exact expression is supplied in the passage.

[GQ] GotQuestions.org. How did Jesus fulfill the meanings of the Jewish feasts?. Modern evangelical popular exposition; accessed 14 September 2026. Representative spring/autumn model; distinguishes some positions as beliefs of many interpreters, though other claims are categorical.

[STERN] Sacha Stern. Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd Century BCE–10th Century CE. Oxford University Press, 2001. Publisher's substantive abstract and bibliographic record consulted, not full book. Used for diversity and gradual calendar development only.

[FRANKEL] David Frankel. Counting the Omer Began at Harvest: Once Shabbat Was Instituted, It Started Sunday. TheTorah.com, 16 May 2025. Historical-critical argument consulted; its reconstruction is identified as a proposal, not canonical fact.

[LEON] Clemens Leonhard. Shavuot, Covenant Renewal and Pentecost. 2017, pp. 311–330; DOI 10.1163/9789004347083_016. Author/institutional substantive abstract consulted; full paywalled chapter not read. Used to flag the difference between literary association and enacted festival ritual.

[KOST] Andreas J. Köstenberger, interviewed by Shane Rosenthal. Rivers of Living Water (John 7). Biblical Foundations, 2019. Interview read; evangelical account of the water/Spirit and Old Testament temple context.

[SKLAR] Jay Sklar. Israel's Calendar Was a Classroom. Desiring God, 6 May 2026. Article read; conservative Christian account of the festivals' covenant, ethical and Christological teaching.

[METHOD] Methodius of Olympus. The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, Discourse 9, chapters 1–5. Late third/early fourth century CE; Ante-Nicene Fathers translation. Primary early Christian Sukkot/resurrection interpretation; its speculative chronological elaborations are not endorsed.

[HC25] Hebcal. Rosh Hashana 2025. Calendar calculation for 2025. Sunset 22 September through nightfall 24 September; first daytime date 23 September.

[EL25] Hebcal. Rosh Chodesh Elul 2025. Calendar calculation for 2025. Sunset 23 August through nightfall 25 August: 30 Av followed by 1 Elul; month itself starts sunset 24 August.

[HC24] Hebcal. Rosh Hashana 2024. Calendar calculation for 2024. Sunset 2 October through nightfall 4 October.

[UN24] United Nations. Summit of the Future programme and Pact for the Future. Summit held 22–23 September 2024. Official indexed programme/date record; some UN pages denied full retrieval. Pact: <https://www.un.org/pga/wp-content/uploads/sites/109/2024/09/The-Pact-for-the-Future-final.pdf>

[UN25] Presidency of the French Republic. 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York: opening day, 22 September 2025. Full official event account/speech read. Corroborating UN record: <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/ga-meeting-coverage-22sep25/> (indexed; full retrieval denied).

[BIS] Anamaria Illes, Anneke Kosse and Peter Wierts. Advancing in tandem: results of the 2024 BIS survey on central bank digital currencies and crypto. BIS Papers No. 159, August 2025. Official substantive summary read: 85 of 93 respondents exploring CBDCs; varied stages, not one completed global switch.

[WALL] Israel Museum / Israel Antiquities Authority. Building inscription commemorating the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, IAA 1942-265. Museum dating: Ottoman period, 1535–1538. Official indexed collection record; page body not exposed. Museum date range does not establish completion of all walls in 1535.

[EJ] Encyclopaedia Judaica, reproduced by Jewish Virtual Library. Jerusalem, Ottoman-period account. Modern historical reference work. Historical account and dated inscriptions consulted; principal construction commonly dated 1537–1541. Order, individual inscriptions and completion must be distinguished.

[TMPOST] **The Temple Institute.** Sounding the shofar on the Temple Mount. Facebook video post, 25 August 2025. Indexed advocacy post located; original clip not independently authenticated or geolocated. Evidence of a public claim, not proof of 'first in 2,000 years'.

[TMNEWS] **JNS / The Jewish Chronicle.** Report on shofar blowing and Palestinian Authority objection. 26 August 2025. Contemporary reported event, with attributed political claims; exact site, permissions and exhaustive historical priority not independently established.

[GOREN] **Menahem Hacoheh.** An eyewitness account of rabbis at war in 1967. The Jewish Chronicle, 18 April 2008. First-person retrospective account. Temple Mount visit and Western Wall shofar scene must not be collapsed into the same location.

[GOREN2] **Greer Fay Cashman.** Retrospective account of Rabbi Goren's 1967 shofar. The Jerusalem Post, 31 May 2025. Describes blowing in the vicinity of the Temple Mount before arrival at the Western Wall; a retrospective report, not exact-site authentication.

[BASE] **The Living Word.** Foreshadowing Jesus Research and Journey Recommendations; accompanying evidence ledger. Existing working baseline inspected 14 September 2026. Read-only local baseline: 52 encounters; C11, C15–17, C21 and C45 are especially relevant. No existing file has been revised by this audit.

[DAN] **The Living Word / Founder conversation.** Daniel 9 Critical Audit and latest Messianic reassessment. September 2026. Prior safeguards retained. Original research-layer placement and later recommendation B must be distinguished; no approval or implementation of that later recommendation is inferred here.

[T1] **Founder-supplied transcript; narrator label Hannah.** Pasted markdown (2).md. Publication year and original video URL not supplied. Timestamped text audited in full. Identity, recording, editing and personal experiences not independently authenticated.

[T2] **Founder-supplied transcript; narrator label Rebecca.** Pasted markdown (3).md. Refers explicitly to 2025; original video URL not supplied. Timestamped text audited in full. Calendar checks use its explicit 2025 claim; awkward sequencing in the transcript is not silently harmonized.

[TASK] **Founder.** Biblical Feasts Completeness Audit and Research Expansion. Pasted text(20260914-063936).txt. Controlling scope and evidence hierarchy for this research-only addendum.

[LEXH] **Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs.** Hebrew lexicon entries: teruah; moed; kipper. BDB, 1906; hosted lexical text. BDB entries and biblical occurrences, not the host's separate unsourced topical essays. Related entries: <https://biblehub.com/hebrew/4150.htm> and <https://biblehub.com/hebrew/3722.htm>

[LEXG] **Joseph H. Thayer.** Greek lexicon entries: aparche; ephapax. Historical Greek lexicon; hosted text. Lexical entries checked against contextual NT usage, not the host's topical essays. Additional entry: <https://biblehub.com/greek/2178.htm>

[JAST] **Marcus Jastrow.** Dictionary entry: teshuvah. Dictionary, 1903; Sefaria digital edition. Lexical entry; distinguishes repentance and answer/response senses. Glosses do not all apply simultaneously.