



Contents

Edgar KELLENBERGER
Asenat. Why Have the Tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh
an Egyptian Ancestress? 1-11

Hryhoriy LOZINSKY
Theological Exegesis in LXX? Exod 24:9-11 as a Case in Question 12-39

Angela Maria LUPO
God's Curse in the Hanged Man. *Crux interpretum* in Deut 21:23 40-59

Jaroslav MUDROŇ
Hearer's Response to Jesus' Aramaic in Mark 60-75

Helena PANCZOVÁ
Greek Superscriptions of Psalms. Problem of the Linguistic
Interpretation of Isolated Elements 76-88

Abstracts and Reviews 89-103

Communications and References 104-106





Studia Biblica Slovaca je recenzovaný vedecký časopis zameraný na skúmanie Svätého písma Starého a Nového zákona predovšetkým zo stránky filologickej, historickej, exegetickej a teologickej.

Ročník X (2018), číslo 1

Vydáva Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave, Kapitulská 26, 814 58 Bratislava 1, IČO 0039786510.

Vedecké kolégium/Advisory board: Reimund BIERINGER (Leuven, B) – Georg BRAULIK OSB (Wien, A) – Peter DUBOVSKÝ SJ (Roma, I) – Pavol FARKAŠ (Nitra, SK) – Massimo GRILLI (Roma, I) – Leslie HOPPE OFM (Chicago, USA)

Šéfredaktor: Blažej ŠTRBA (Badín, SK)
Zástupca šéfredaktora: Jozef JANČOVIČ (Bratislava, SK)
Redaktor pre recenzie: František TRSTENSKÝ (Spišské Podhradie, SK)
Výkonný redaktor: Martina KORYTIAKOVÁ (Roma, I)

Redakčná rada /Editorial board: Jaroslav BROŽ (Praha, CZ) – Juraj FENÍK (Košice, SK) – Júlia Daniela ISKROVÁ OP (Ružomberok, SK) – Róbert JÁGER (Košice, SK) – Peter JUHÁS (Münster, D) – Branislav KEUSKA (Ružomberok, SK) – Róbert LAPKO (Košice, SK) – Libor MAREK (Detroit, USA) – Jaroslav RINDOŠ (Bratislava, SK) – Milan SOVA (Bratislava, SK) – Jozef TIŇO (Bratislava, SK) – Gabriela Ivana VLKOVÁ OP (Olomouc, CZ)

Za lektorovanie všetkých článkov zodpovedá redakčná rada.

Obálka: Martin Mičko

Na príprave publikácie sa podieľali Leonardo Giugliano, Federico Giuntoli, Lionel Goh OFM, Zuzana Očkajáková a Lucilla Mária Tongeľová SDR.

Príspevky v slovenčine, češtine a v angličtine (od zahraničných autorov) alebo knihy na recenziu prosíme poslať na adresu redakcie *Studia Biblica Slovaca*, Banská 28, 976 32 Badín (Slovakia), redakcia@biblica.sk.

Príspevky sa požadujú v elektronickej podobe, podľa možnosti v textovom editore Microsoft Word. Ak sú používané iné fonty písma pre hebrejštinu a gréčtinu ako v programe BibleWorks, tak upresniť aké, prípadne preposlať používaný font spolu s príspevkom. Príspevok typu štúdia, poznámka alebo reflexia musí byť doplnený abstraktom a jeho anglickou verziou, anglickým názvom príspevku, max. piatimi kľúčovými slovami v slovenčine/češtine a angličtine, zoznamom bibliografie a kontaktom na autora príspevku. Nevyžiadané rukopisy sa nevracajú. Redakcia si vyhradzuje právo upraviť titulok a vykonať potrebnú jazykovú a štylistickú úpravu prijatých príspevkov. Upresňujúce podmienky pre prispievateľov sú dostupné www.biblica.sk.

Články časopisu sú abstrahované v dvoch svetových periodikách: *Old Testament Abstracts* ISSN 0364-8591 a *New Testament Abstracts* ISSN 0028-6877.

S povolením Arcibiskupského úradu v Bratislave zo dňa 3. júna 2014
Prot. N. 2229/2014

Studia Biblica Slovaca
Printed in Slovakia, 6/2018.
Vychádza dvakrát do roka.
Cena: 6 €

ISSN 1338-0141
EV 3744/09

Obsah

Edgar KELLENBERGER Asenet. Prečo majú kmene Efraim a Manasses egyptskú pramatku?	1-11
Hryhorij LOZINSKY Teologický výklad v LXX? Diskutovaný prípad Ex 24,9-11 12-39
Angela Maria LUPO Prekliatie od Boha pre zaveseného na dreve. <i>Crux interpretum</i> v Dt 21,23 40-59
Jaroslav MUDROŇ Odozva u poslucháča na Ježišovu aramejštinu v Mk 60-75
Helena PANCZOVÁ Grécke nadpisy žalmov. Problém lingvistickej interpretácie izolovaných prvkov 76-88
Abstrakty a recenzie 89-103
Správy a oznamy 104-106



Asenat

Why Have the Tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh an Egyptian Ancestress?

Edgar Kellenberger

1 Introduction

When we find passages in the Old Testament whose informations do not conform to the other texts, the fundamental question arises: Can we find here a particularly old information which differs from later ideas? Or, on the contrary, are they very young formulations that only became possible towards the end of the canon formation? This problem can also be seen in the rare information about the Egyptian Asenat, who is mentioned as Joseph's wife and as the mother of Ephraim and Manasseh. Asenat is mentioned three times:

1. "Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphenath-paneah; and he gave him Asenat, the daughter of Potiphera priest of On as a wife." (Gen 41:45a)
2. A few verses later we read: "To Joseph were born two sons before the year of famine came, whom Asenat, the daughter of Potiphera priest of On, bore to him." (41:50) – This is followed by the naming of Manasseh and Ephraim by Joseph.
3. A few chapters later we read within a genealogical list of the descendants of Jacob: "To Joseph in the land of Egypt were born Manasseh and Ephraim, whom Asenat, the daughter of Potiphera, priest of On, bore to him." (46:20)

I wonder why Asenat is expressly mentioned as the daughter of an Egyptian priest, and yet three times – always including the entire title. The Egyptian city of On, better known by the Greek name Heliopolis, was an important cultic place. What does it mean that the important northern tribes Ephraim and Manasseh go back to a non-Israelite mother?

Strangely enough, the monographies about the tribal and genealogical contexts neglect this question¹. And even the modern Genesis commentaries show little interest. They are often satisfied with the short remark that a pre-exilic narrator had no difficulties with such a marriage, but that this marriage – initiated by Pharaoh – was glorious². The commentaries do not go into questions about the mother of the two Israelitic tribes.

2 The Hypothesis of a “Diaspora Novel”

The situation is quite different since Bernd Diebner and his pupil Thomas Römer. As early as 1992, they published the thesis that this narrative is a novel or a post-exilic midrash by the Egyptian diaspora. One of its goals is the legitimation of mixed Israelitic-Egyptian marriages. Diebner and Römer interpret the Joseph narrative as a deliberate polemic against the ban of mixed marriages, propagated in Jerusalem (as well as in the Mesopotamian diaspora).

This publication, in French and in a remote place³, was hardly noticed. Without knowing it, a decade later, Andreas Kunz from Leipzig came to similar conclusions about the intentions of the narrative and the marriage with Asenat⁴. Since then, Thomas Römer⁵ disseminated the thesis of his teacher and included it also in his German textbook of 2014.

Today it is no longer objectionable to date this narrative into post-exilic times. The arguments put forward seem to be plausible: The diaspora-friendly attitude, the elaborated form of a long novel, as well as the rare mention of the Joseph narrative outside Genesis, can best be explained by a late date. Nevertheless, many difficulties remain; I will discuss five points:

2.1 Dating

The problem of dating is connected with questions concerning the intentions of the novelist. Diebner proposed provocatively the end of the 2nd

¹ NOTH, *Personennamen*; NEEF, *Ephraim*; HIEKE, *Genealogien*; HENSEL, *Vertauschung*. The same deficit can be observed in the studies of Josef’s family by HUMPHREYS, *Joseph* and BRETT, *Procreation*.

² See, e.g., SEEBASS, *Josephgeschichte* and WILLI-PLEIN, *Genesis (ad locum)*; more prudent is EBACH, *Genesis*.

³ DIEBNER, *Joseph*; RÖMER, *Joseph*.

⁴ KUNZ, *Ägypten*, 215.

⁵ RÖMER, *Pentateuch*, 101-103.

century. His pupil Römer was more cautious and thought of the 6th or 5th century; today he favors the 5th or 4th century. Nearer to Diebner is Kunz, who found the concrete relations of the Ptolemaic 3rd century mirrored here. This broad spectrum of attempted datations points to the difficulty of a definable *Sitz im Leben*.

Since when is it conceivable that a diaspora in Egypt refers to non-Judaic eponyms such as Joseph, Ephraim, and Manasseh? Diebner and others postulate an exodus from the north on the occasion of the Assyrian annexation (722 BCE), or even a northern Israelitic foundation of the military colony of Elephantine. But all this is pure speculation without any textual or archaeological source⁶. The Elephantine papyri (5th century) mention indeed many personal names, but Joseph, Manasseh, Ephraim, and Asenat appear neither as contemporary figures nor as biblical persons.

The preparation of such a long novel demanded a period of maturation during a longer exile. But the later the Joseph narrative, the more difficult it is to explain the astonishingly skillful (though not seamless) embedding of this alien element into the Pentateuch. What speaks especially against a late date: The Greek and the Samaritan traditions⁷ follow here remarkably literally the Masoretic text. The later a text insertion occurs, the more varied is the still insufficiently stabilized text tradition⁸. Furthermore, we can ask why the (more recent) Greek novel *Joseph and Aseneth* presupposes Aseneth's conversion to the Jewish faith, whereas the Hebrew novel is not interested in it.

2.2 *The Language of the Narrative*

Even an archaizing text, written in an earlier style, reveals the author's later style here and there by the vocabulary and by the syntax⁹. In contrast to the Aramaic Elephantine papyri, it is noticeable that Aramaisms are absent in the

⁶ Additional speculations by DONNER, *Geschichte*, 415; SCHMID, *Josephs-Geschichte*, 111 and RÖMER, *Joseph Story*, 195.

⁷ Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum.

⁸ An example from the New Testament: The alien pericope "Jesus and the adulteress" is preserved by multiple textual variants in the manuscripts and put in divergent places: after John 7:52 or 7:36 or 21:24 or Luke 21:38.

⁹ The view that later authors were capable of imitating perfectly an earlier classical style is disproved by POLAK, *Storytelling*, 449-454.

Joseph narrative¹⁰. This is clearly in contrast to the books *Esther* and *Daniel*, also reflecting a diaspora situation. Moreover, the sentences are much shorter than in *Esther* and *Daniel* and syntactically not so overcharged. And if we can follow the sociolinguistic investigations by Frank Polak from Tel Aviv, we may presuppose a formulation of the Joseph narrative in the pre-exilic period¹¹.

2.3 Tribal History as Background?

In a late text, it would be understandable that the narrator is no longer interested in tribal eponyms, but freely creates literary figures. However, the question arises as to why the election of names fell precisely on Joseph, Ephraim, Manasseh (and Asenat). Is this a pure invention, or do older traditions lie behind? The same question also arises particularly when Jacob blesses his grandchildren and prefers the younger Ephraim (Gen 48): Is this merely a literary copy of the common motive of the “change of the firstborn right”, or may we suppose remembrances of ancient tribal history? These questions are even more acute, if the passages about Asenat are seen as late *Fortschreibung* of a text which knew nothing about this Egyptian figure¹².

¹⁰ It is true that REDFORD, *Study*, 54-65 wants to show late language by means of listed lexemes and idiomatic expressions, which are found especially in late literary works. But Redford can not find any real aramaisms in Gen 37–50. Against Redford’s comparison with post-exilic literature, it is also clear that typical grammatical phenomena of preexilic literature are common in the Joseph narrative but are very rare in typical post-exilic Hebrew. Based on the electronic database of accordance™, I give some examples by a comparison with the Book of Esther (half length of Gen 37–50): the *He locale* attached to a noun (53 × / Esth 0 ×), the accusative particle *'et* followed by a pronominal suffix (70 × / 7 × [= Esth 5:12; 8:7.11; 9:17.18.22.25; against 37 cases of verbal forms with pronominal suffix in all chapters in Esth]), the modal particle *nā'* (17 × / 0 ×), the *perf. consecutivum* after an imperative (4 × [= Gen 44:4; 45:9.19; 47:29] / 0 ×; in Esth command chains are always continued by further imperatives or by imperfects). Significant is also the shift in the use of the *infinitivus absolutus*: from the classical *figura etymologica* (14 × / 2 × [= Esth 4:14 and 6:13]) to the use as finite verb form within a chain of finite verb forms (1 × [= Gen 41:43] / 11 × [= Esth 2:3; 3:13; 6:9; 8:8; 9:1.6.12.16^{bis}.17.18]). And the preposition *'et* “with” (51 × / 3 ×) demonstrates a shift to *'im* (16 × / 11 ×).

¹¹ See particularly POLAK, *The Oral and the Written*, and POLAK, *Sociolinguistics*; he analyses the pre-exilic “plain classical style” of the Joseph narrative.

¹² See, for instance, recently GIUNTOLI, Ephraim, who claimed that Ephraim and Manasseh, in Genesis 41 and 48, were inserted by a late Judaic redactor, who wanted to reconcile the returners born in the Babylonian exile with the native population of Juda.

2.4 Egyptian Lokalkolorit?

The numerous efforts of Egyptologists and Old Testament scholars to prove the familiarity of the Joseph narrative with Egyptian life conditions gave a poor result¹³. Even the Egyptian names (Asenat, Potiphera, Zaphenat-paneach and others) allow no clear etymology. Thus, one must assume that the author(s) did not live in Egypt, but either in Israel or possibly in another diaspora.

2.5 Theological Remarks

Finally, a fundamental theological remark: The interpretations by Diebner, Römer and Kunz, praising the progressiveness of intercultural mixed marriages, confirm 1:1 their own liberal-humanist philosophy, deleting any irritation over the biblical text. In my opinion, however, the value of biblical texts lies precisely in the fact that we can learn from them new and irritating things, which resist the human desire for self-affirmation.

So, I remain skeptical against a smooth classification of the Joseph narrative as a young diasporic literature¹⁴.

3 Personal Names

My own small contribution, of course, cannot lead to a clear decision. However, my following observations point to tribal aspects which hitherto were rarely observed, and which can be helpful for comprehending the complex Joseph narrative. I see surprising connections between Egypt and Ephraim, which are found in the Old Testament as well as in inscriptional material. I must confess, however, that these observations are rather isolated mosaic stones from which can scarcely be derived a closed picture. But at least my observations point in a definite direction.

- a) Aaron's son, El'asar, is buried in the Ephraimite hill country at the place of his son and successor, Pinchas (Josh 24:33). With Pinchas we find a personal name of Egyptian origin. His maternal grandfather also bears an Egyptian name: Puṭiel (Exod 6:25).

¹³ Against VERGOTE, *Joseph*, see, for instance, REDFORD, *Study*, 187-243, and RUPPERT, *Genesis*, 44-47.

¹⁴ Other arguments for a pre-exilic north-Israelitic origin are presented recently by WEINGART – BLUM, *The Joseph Story*.

- b) Joshua is buried in his Ephraimite inheritance, at Timnat Cheres (Judg 2:9). Cheres probably goes back to the Egyptian god Horus¹⁵. That such a prominent person as Joshua has hereditary possessions in a place with an Egyptian name is surprising.
- c) A review of other Egyptian names in the OT is also revealing¹⁶. Surprisingly, the Egyptian names Pinchas and Pashchur are found among the temple staff: In Shilo – in the tribe of Ephraim! – are Hofni and his brother Pinchas¹⁷. The name Pinchas is a priestly name documented during many centuries: as grandson of Aaron, as son of Eli at Shilo, and up to the post-exilic period, where an El'asar ben Pinchas – probably also a priest – is mentioned for Jerusalem (Ezra 8:33). But, also on the Samaritan Garizim the priests named Pinchas often are documented in the Hellenistic period¹⁸.
- d) The name of Pashchur (“Son of Horus”) is documented during many centuries for priests (and also for other officials) in the Negev and in Jerusalem, but not in Ephraim/Samaria. At the end of the 8th century, the name is documented at Arad and Aroer¹⁹. In Arad eight ostraca were found near the temple district, one of which mentioned the name of Pashchur and one of the priesthood Meremot²⁰; these ostraca may be priestly lots²¹. At the end of the 7th century, we find in Jerusalem a Pashchur as priest and temple guardian, who made life difficult for the prophet Jeremiah²². In the books Ezra and Nehemiah, the name often occurs for priesthood²³.

These observations are surprising and irritating. In view of the strong economic and cultural Egyptian influence, it is astonishing that the region of

¹⁵ The variant Timnat Serach (Josh 24:30) is an israelitizing correction. Joshua is also an Ephraimite in Num 13:8.16 and 1 Chr 7:27.

¹⁶ See ZADOK, Namen, 392-395 and ZADOK, *Pre-Hellenistic Anthroponymy*, 175f. Of course, not all derivations from Egyptian are beyond doubt.

¹⁷ 1 Sam 1–4. A further activity of this priestly family is mentioned in 1 Sam 14:3.

¹⁸ MAGEN, *Mount Gerizim: inscriptions* nr. 24-25; 61; 384; 385.

¹⁹ RENZ – RÖLLIG, *Handbuch*, 163.168: Arad(8):50 and Ar(8):2.

²⁰ See Ezra 8:33; Neh 3:4.21; 10:6.36.

²¹ So, RENZ – RÖLLIG, *Handbuch*, 160 with bibliography.

²² More namesakes (probably non-priests) are mentioned in the Book of Jeremiah and in bullas of the 7th and 6th century; see RENZ – RÖLLIG, *Handbuch*, under nr. 1.22 and 11.39-43, as well as DAVIES, *Hebrew Inscriptions*.

²³ Ezra 2:38 (= Neh 7:41); 10:22; Neh 10:4; 11:12; compare 1 Chr 9:12.

Judah – being nearest to Egypt – knows Egyptian names exclusively for the temple staff, but otherwise is largely free from Egyptian onomastics. However, a more varied picture emerges for the north of Israel, especially for the tribe of Ephraim where also the non-priest Joshua has a connection to an Egyptian toponym. This ensemble of Egyptian onomastics cannot be accidental but must have a deeper reason (or more). The wide geographic spectrum of the temple staff with Egyptian names – from the south to the north – makes an explanation not easier. In view of the broad temporal spectrum, it seems impossible to explain the phenomena as a late development by intermingling of different traditions.

It is true that the reference to a Samaritan diaspora in Egypt, mentioned mainly by Flavius Josephus²⁴, would tempt to a Samaritan track. However, one can hardly assume that a Samaritan novel legitimizes a diaspora existence by the birth of Ephraim and Manasseh in Egypt. On the contrary, all Samaritan informations on Asenat are following literally the Masoretic text. Only the (non-Samaritan!) Targum Jerushalmi brings an extension to Gen 48:9 (Joseph presents his sons to the blessing Jacob), adding the common rabbinical interpretation that Asenat is the daughter of Dina: Asenat sprouted from the problematic connection with Shechem, then was expelled by Jacob under a bush, and finally adopted in Egypt by Potiphar²⁵. Such an israelitization of the Egyptian Asenat is, as far as I know, lacking in the Samaritan tradition.

In view of a possible late date, observations on 1 Chr are also interesting. Here, Asenat is completely lacking. This is all the more striking as 1 Chr 1–9 integrated many Canaanite and Aramaic family traditions into the citizens' lists of Israel, as the commentary by Thomas Willi has shown. In addition, Willi calls the tribe Ephraim the “most Egyptian of all tribes”²⁶. But the Egyptian names – Assir, Mushi, and Moses – are focused on the citizen list of the tribe Levi²⁷. Also here are striking connections to the temple staff.

²⁴ See HENSEL, *Juda*, 85-90: beginning of a Samaritan diaspora in Egypt in early Hellenistic time.

²⁵ See the index under Asenath in GINZBERG, *Legends*.

²⁶ WILLI, *Chronik*, 265 about 1 Chr 7:36.

²⁷ Compare WILLI, *Chronik*, 205. Also the names of Aaron and Mirjam may have an Egyptian origin.

4 Conclusion: Different Understanding Over the Centuries

For all these reasons, I remain skeptical about a late authorship of the Joseph narrative and its mention of Asenat and her sons. Instead, I suspect old relations between Egypt and Ephraim, which are however difficult to scrutinize. The fact that the text found new and changed relevance in later times does not speak against this. Above all, the evaluation of the narrated events changed, according to the different profile of the recipients. Pharaoh's marriage arrangement to Joseph with an Egyptian priest's daughter was initially regarded as an honour; but later on, this view was brought into the critique of those circles which were opposed to mixed marriages, as well as threatened by the rivalry with the former northern tribes.

Possibly Jacob's blessing of his grandsons Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 48) gives an apparent critique: Significantly, Asenat is no longer mentioned here, but Jacob embraces (or even usurps) his grandchildren as his legitimate descendants ("they shall be mine as Reuben and Simeon"; 48:5). That the two eldest sons are mentioned here, can be interpreted as a special honour. On the other hand, the book of Genesis also blames Reuben and Simeon (35:22; 49:5)²⁸.

Therefore, contrasting interpretations are possible:

- Either there is an Israelite "nostrification" of its Egyptian origin, as Jacob personally legitimates his grandsons; and Asenat is forgotten.
- Or the northern tribes are in the twilight of the rivalry between Jerusalem and Samaria. The association with Samaria is especially clear in v. 22: Jacob gives the Joseph line "a ridge" (*s^ekām 'aḥad*), which associatively points to the city of Shechem²⁹. In addition, the comparison with the sons of Reuben and Simeon can be interpreted as a clear defamation because of their misconduct: Benedikt Hensel³⁰ sees an anti-Samaritan denunciation by the rabbinic connection of Asenat with Simeon and the violent events in Gen 34, inasmuch as Ephraim and Manasseh owe their existence to the Canaanite Shechem who raped their grandmother Dina.

So, we can observe that the positive valuation of Asenat in the Book of Genesis gets lower and lower in the course of time.

²⁸ May we say that Ephraim and Manasseh should replace Reuben and Simeon, who receive only a theoretical role in the further course of tribal history?

²⁹ Manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch bring the feminine form *'aḥat*, clearly pointing to the city of Shechem.

³⁰ HENSEL, *Anti-Samaritan Denunciation*. E-mail communication.

Bibliography

- BRETT, Mark Gregory: *Genesis. Procreation and the Politics of Identity*, London: Routledge, 2000.
- DAVIES, Graham I.: *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions. Corpus and Concordance*, Cambridge: University Press, 1991.
- DIEBNER, Bernd J.: Le roman de Joseph, ou Israël en Egypte. Un midrash post-exilique de la Tora. In: Olivier Abel – Françoise Smyth (eds.): *Le livre de traverse: de l'exégèse biblique à l'anthropologie*, Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1992, 55-71.
- DONNER, Herbert: *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen* (GAT 4/2), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, ²1995.
- EBACH, Jürgen: *Genesis 37–50* (HThKAT), Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- GINZBERG, Louis: *The Legends of the Jews*, Vol. I-II, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003.
- GIUNTOLI, Federico: Ephraim, Manasseh, and Post-Exilic Israel. In: Federico Giuntoli – Konrad Schmid (eds.): *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch. New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (FAT 101), Tübingen: Mohr, 2015, 203-232.
- HENSEL, Benedikt: *Die Vertauschung des Erstgeburtssegens in der Genesis. Eine Analyse der narrativ-theologischen Grundstruktur des ersten Buches der Tora* (BZAW 423), Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- HENSEL, Benedikt: *Juda and Samaria. Zum Verhältnis zweier nach-exilischer Jahwismen* (FAT 110), Tübingen: Mohr, 2016.
- HENSEL, Benedikt: *Anti-Samaritan denunciation*. E-mail communication [January 2017]. E-mail: Benedikt.hensel@uzh.ch.
- HIEKE, Thomas: *Die Genealogien der Genesis* (HBS 39), Freiburg: Herder, 2003.
- HUMPHREYS, W. Lee: *Joseph and His Family. A Literary Study*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- KUNZ, Andreas: Ägypten in der Perspektive Israels am Beispiel der Josephsgeschichte (Gen 37–50), *BZ* 47 (2003) 206-229.
- MAGEN, Yitzhak – HAGGAI, Misgav – LEVANA, Tsfania: *Mount Gerizim Excavations*. Vol. I: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions (JSP 2), Jerusalem: Civil Administration of Judea and Samaria, 2004.
- NEEF, Heinz Dieter: *Ephraim. Studien zur Geschichte des Stammes Ephraim von der Landnahme bis zur frühen Königszeit* (BZAW 238), Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.
- NOTH, Martin: *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT 48), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928.
- NOTH, Martin: *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT 52), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930.
- POLAK, Frank: The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative, *JANES* 26 (1998) 59-105.
- POLAK, Frank: Sociolinguistics: A Key to the Typology and the Social Background of Biblical Hebrew, *HS* 47 (2006) 115-162.
- POLAK, Frank: Storytelling and Redaction. Varieties of Language Usage in the Exodus Narrative. In: Jan Gertz et. al. (eds.): *The Formation of the Pentateuch. Bridging the*

- Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America* (FAT 111), Tübingen: Mohr, 2016, 449-475.
- REDFORD, Donald B.: *A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph (Genesis 37–50)* (SVT 20), Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- RENZ, Johannes – RÖLLIG, Wolfgang: *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik*. Vol. I – II/2, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, ²2016 (= 1995, 2003).
- RÖMER, Thomas: Joseph approche. Source du cycle, corpus, unité. In: Olivier Abel – Françoise Smyth (eds.): *Le livre de traverse. De l'exégèse biblique à l'anthropologie*, Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1992, 73-85.
- RÖMER, Thomas: Der Pentateuch. In: Walter Dietrich – Hans-Peter Mathys – Thomas Römer – Rudolf Smend: *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ThWi 1), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014.
- RÖMER, Thomas: The Joseph Story in the Book of Genesis: Pre-P or Post-P? In: Federico Giuntoli – Konrad Schmid (eds.): *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch. New Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (FAT 101), Tübingen: Mohr, 2015, 185-201.
- RUPPERT, *Genesis: ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*, Teilband 4: Gen 37,1–50,26, Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2008.
- SCHMID, Konrad: Die Josephsgeschichte im Pentateuch. In: Jan Christian Gertz – Markus Witte – Konrad Schmid (eds.): *Abschied vom Jahwisten. Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (BZAW 315), Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002, 83-117.
- SEEBASS, Horst: *Josephgeschichte (37,1–50,26)*, Genesis. Bd. III, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000.
- VERGOTE, Jozef: *Joseph en Egypte: Genèse, Chap. 37–50 à la lumière des études égyptologiques récentes*, Louvain: Institut voor oriëntalisme, 1959.
- WEINGART, Kristin – BLUM, Erhard: The Joseph Story. Diaspora Novella or North-Israelite Narrative?, *ZAW* 129 (2017) 501-521.
- WILLI-PLEIN, Ina: *Das Buch Genesis. Kapitel 12–50* (NSK.AT 1/2), Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2011.
- WILLI, Thomas: *Chronik. 1Chr 1–10* (BKAT 24/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009.
- ZADOK, Ran: Die nichthebräischen Namen der Israeliten vor dem hellenistischen Zeitalter, *UF* 17 (1985) 387-398.
- ZADOK, Ran: *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography* (OLA 28), Leuven: Peeters, 1988.

Summary

Israelite identity is often defined by genealogy. Therefore, it is surprising that the tribes Ephraim and Manasseh derive from Joseph's wife Asenat, the daughter of an Egyptian priest residing at On (Heliopolis). The threefold mention in Genesis (41:45.50 and 46:20) excludes random information and lacks an explanatory comment or an intention to conceal an irritating information that is not mentioned in the other genealogies. What is the intention of these texts – in case they are late, and in case they are pre-exilic? This contribution examines possible relations between Ephraimitic and Egyptian traditions.

Keywords: Asenat, Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, Samaritans.

Zhrnutie

Identita Izraelitov sa často definuje pomocou genealógie. Je preto prekvapujúce, že kmene Efraim a Manasses pochádzajú z Jozefovej manželky Asenet, dcéry egyptského kňaza, žijúceho v meste Ón (Heliopolis). Trojnásobná zmienka v Knihe Genezis (41,45.50 a 46,20) vylučuje, žeby išlo iba o náhodnú informáciu a tiež absentuje vysvetľujúca poznámka alebo zámer skryť iritujúcu informáciu, že sa neuvádza v iných genealógiách. Aký je úmysel týchto textov – v prípade, ak sú z neskorého obdobia, a v prípade, ak sú predexilové? Tento príspevok skúma možné vzťahy medzi efraimskou a egyptskou tradíciou.

Kľúčové slová: Asenet, Jozef, Efraim a Manasses, Samaritáni.

Edgar Kellenberger
Passage 12
CH-4104 OBERWIL, Switzerland
kellenberger-sassi@bluewin.ch

Theological Exegesis in LXX?

Exod 24:9-11 as a Case in Question

Hryhoriy Lozinskyy

Introduction

The Greek Exod 24:9-11 contains a rather striking statement when it is compared with its Hebrew (hereafter MT) equivalent. In the latter, the leadership of Israel enjoys the vision of the God of Israel on the mountain. The former, however, states they see only the place where the God of Israel stood. The piece in question is only one small window into the masterpiece of the whole Septuagint (hereafter LXX) translation or, as an experienced scholar in this matter such as J. W. Wevers would state, “the earliest extant commentary on the Hebrew Bible by Hebrews themselves”¹.

The paper will be divided into three sections. First, textual-critical analysis will identify and consider several differences between MT and LXX. The second section will present three different approaches: the maximalist, the minimalist and the moderate approach to LXX hermeneutics that provide at least three possible ways to evaluate the many differences one finds between LXX and MT. Finally, I will present a number of observations that appear to be important for an understanding of this passage.

The issue has already been studied by some other authors² and recently by Wyckoff³. I would like to re-examine some divergences between the text in its Greek and Hebrew traditions in a wider textual context, position the research among several scholarly opinions, and finally provide some of my own considerations on the issue.

¹ WEVERS, *Two Reflections*, 21.

² NICHOLSON, *Interpretation*, 77-97; SKA, *Vision*, 165-183.

³ WYCKOFF, *Exegesis?*, 675-693.

1 *Status Quaestionis* on the Modification in the Greek Exod 24:9-11

1.1 *Textual-critical Analysis*

The first task is to examine MT and LXX Exod 24:9-11 in parallel⁴. This method will help to highlight the similarities, the differences and the nature of the latter. A list of all the elements which differ in both the texts will be drawn up. The list will concentrate on omissions, additions and differences in LXX against MT⁵. By studying the differences in LXX I do not intend at all to diminish the importance of the Greek version. Undoubtedly both textual traditions have to be treated with all due respect⁶. I will, however, focus on what the translators rendered in the Greek version, with the goal of understanding what caused such a different rendering from MT.

MT	LXX
<p>וַיַּעַל מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַאֲבִיהוּא וְשִׁבְעִים מִזְקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:</p>	<p>καὶ ἀνέβη Μωυσῆς καὶ Ααρων καὶ Ναδαβ καὶ Αβιουδ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα τῆς γερουσίας Ἰσραήλ,</p>
<p>וַיֵּרְאוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַתַּחַת רַגְלָיו כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה לְבַנְתַּת הַסַּפִּיר וְכַמַּעֲצָם הַשָּׁמַיִם לְטֹהַר:</p>	<p>καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον, οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔργον πλίνθου σαπφείρου, καὶ ὡσπερ εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῇ καθαριότητι</p>
<p>וְאֵל-אֶצְיָלִי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁלַח יָדוֹ וַיַּחֲזוּ אֶת-הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאכְלוּ וַיִּשְׁתּוּ: ס</p>	<p>καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶς· καὶ ὤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον.</p>

⁴ I will report the Hebrew text from *BHS* and the Greek from John William WEVERS (ed.): *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum*. II/1: Exodus, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

⁵ For such a methodology, see, among many others, TOV, *Exegesis*, 260; SOLLAMO, *Translation Technique*, 35-36. Cf. JOOSTEN, *Une théologie?*, 33.

⁶ Cf. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *La Bibbia*, 88.

1. The coordinative conjunction καὶ before Nadab is lacking in the Hebrew text (v. 9). The Samaritan Pentateuch and 4QpaleoExod^m (4Q22) make the list longer adding the names of other two sons of Aaron: Eleazar and Ithamar⁷;
2. γερουσία means “council of elders” and, thus, is a bit different from זקנים “elders” in the Hebrew text (v. 9);
3. According to MT, the whole group (cf. v. 9) “saw the God of Israel” whereas in LXX one finds the expression καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον, οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεός “and they saw the place where the God stood”. Thus, the object that the leaders saw is different (v. 10);
4. Neuter plural nominative article τὰ is found only in the Greek text (v. 10);
5. εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “appearance of the firmament of the sky” is different from what the Hebrew reports וכעצם השמים “as heaven itself” (v. 10);
6. LXX contains ἐπιλέκτων “chosen ones” for MT אצילים “chiefs”;
7. The Greek contains Ἰσραήλ and in Hebrew one finds בני ישראל “sons of Israel” (v. 11);
8. V. 11a is rendered differently: according to MT ואל-אצילי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו “God did not stretch out his hand against the chiefs”, meanwhile LXX contains καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶς “no one of the chosen ones of Israel failed”;
9. V. 11b differs in both the textual witnesses: ויחזו את-האלהים “and they beheld God” in the Hebrew, whereas one finds in the Greek καὶ ὤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ “and they appeared in the place of God”.

Comparing a mere three verses, thus, yields a striking collection of divergences. Not all of them are of the same nature. A good analysis of all the divergences can be found in other authors⁸. I will focus on the divergences that directly interest the topic of this paper: the fact of seeing God. Special attention will be paid obviously to the Book of Exodus, though several examples from the rest of the Pentateuch will be provided in this analysis as well. Since the Five Books of Moses were translated first, they constitute the original LXX. Moreover, in general, each book has to be perceived as having been made by

⁷ SANDERSON, *Scroll*, 337. Cf. HIMBAZA, *Voir Dieu*, 105. For Shigehiro, Nadab and Abihu are secondary additions, see SHIGEHIRO, *Elders*, 29-31.

⁸ LE BOULLUEC – SANDEVOIR, *L'Exode*, 246-247; WEVERS, *Greek Text*, 384-386; WYCKOFF, *Exegesis?*, 678-688.

different translators at different times⁹. It has to be added, of course, that the hands of multiple translators may be discovered both in smaller and larger literary contexts.

1.2 Analysis of the Divergences Pertinent to the Issue of Seeing God

The neuter plural nominative article τὰ has the function of the subject in v. 10. It corresponds to nothing in MT. In the Hebrew, it could translate אלה or אשר but they are not present in MT. Two nominative predicates refer to this subject: “work of sapphire slab” and “appearance of the firmament of heaven”. Occurrences of this neuter plural article are not so frequent in the Book of Exodus; however, two examples must be taken into consideration: Exod 4:16 and 18:19. In both passages, we find the expression τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν “the things pertaining to God”. In both texts, Moses has to become an intermediary between God and Aaron (4:16) and between God and the people (18:19). MT could be translated literally as follows: “and you will become God for him” (4:16) and “you will be for the people in front of God” (18:19). Reading these two passages together with 24:10b we could note that there is a similar issue at stake: the degree of man’s approach to God. The Greek text corresponding to MT has softened the possibility for human beings to appear close to God. In all three occurrences, the Greek renders “things”: Moses is an intermediary in the *things* pertaining God (LXX) but not in front of God (MT). This article also places emphasis on the things that have been seen in the same way in Exod 24:10a¹⁰.

Two objections could be made to this observation: (1) Neither in MT in v. 10b is it claimed that Moses and others saw God. Indeed, if v. 10a states they saw God, in v. 10b the objects that have been seen are described and not God Himself. One could remark that what is new in LXX is this emphasis on “things”, expressed by the article. In this way it clarifies the text more without leaving a doubt about the object of seeing. (2) There are just three examples reported here: Exod 4:16; 18:19; 24:10b. Probably one could not deduce from them the general tendency of toning down the notion of approaching God by employing this article. However, it seems that the use of the article removes the possibility

⁹ WEVERS, *Two Reflections*, 21. Cf. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *La Biblia*, 62-63; RÖSEL, *Towards a “Theology”*, 240; DE TROYER, *Hebrew Text*, 22; JOOSTEN, *To See God*, 287-299.

¹⁰ Wyckoff claims that τὰ is a relative pronoun. See WYCKOFF, *Exegesis?*, 687-688. I would, rather, affirm it is a neuter article with the function of a pronoun.

of confusion about the object of seeing. At first glance insignificant, the addition of τὰ makes clearer the object of seeing and could be interpreted as an attempt to tone down MT and to increase the distance between God and humans.

In v. 10b, MT reads וַיַּרְא מֹשֶׁה וְכָעֶצֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם which is usually translated in modern languages “the heaven itself”. Indeed, עֶצֶם besides its usual meaning “bones” also indicates “self”¹¹. Thus, the whole expression in the Hebrew text can be rendered literally as “like the sky itself”. The Greek text reports, however, a different rendering: “like the appearance of the firmament of the sky”. Could there be a significant difference between the two expressions? In MT, the object of seeing is the sky itself whereas in the Greek Moses and others see just the appearance of the firmament of the sky.

Throughout the Pentateuch, the firmament is always related to the sky¹². It seems that, for the Greek translator, there was not a difference between the sky and firmament; rather, these terms would occur together and would mean the same thing. However, the addition of “appearance” to the Hebrew “sky itself” looks significant. This rendering makes the aspect of comparison stronger and, thus, moves away from the reality of things: they do not see the sky itself but just its firmament¹³. Thus, the directness of the Hebrew expression goes against the comparative rendering employed by the translator in LXX.

The next divergence concerns the subject of the verb describing the potential death of the leaders of the people. According to MT, God is the subject even though he is not explicitly mentioned in v. 11. However, the preceding statement alludes to the agent responsible of the action of “stretching out”: “they saw the God of Israel” and God “did not stretch out his hand against the chiefs”. If one also reads other passages stating that whoever sees God will perish (Gen 16:13; Exod 19:21; 33:20-23; Lev 16:2; Num 4:20; Deut 5:24; Judg 6:22-23; 13:22-23; Isa 6:5) it is not said by the hand of whom one is going to die: these passages limit themselves by simply making explicit the disastrous consequences for those who would see God. But Exod 24:10-11 explains by whom death would

¹¹ Gen 7:13; 17:23; Exod 12:17.51; Lev 23:21; Deut 32:48; Ezek 24:2.

¹² For instance, in Gen 1:8 the firmament is called explicitly sky by God. Furthermore, the expression “the firmament of the sky” occurs five times in the Pentateuch. The Greek στερέωμα renders the Hebrew רָקִיעַ. In Deut 33:26, the Hebrew “clouds” is rendered by Greek “firmament”. It is a poetical text where a comparison is made between sky and clouds in the Hebrew text on one hand and sky and firmament on the other (*parallelismus membrorum*).

¹³ For instance, Dozeman claims that the Hebrew expression “like the very heaven for purity” here means that the veil between heaven and earth was lifted for the moment. See DOZEMAN, *Exodus*, 567.

be caused: “he (God of Israel) did not stretch out his hand against the chiefs of sons of Israel”. Durham cites Humbert’s affirmation that the expression “to stretch out the hand”, a human gesture throughout the OT, occurs five times with God as subject: Exod 3:20; 9:15; 24:11; Ezek 8:3; Ps 138:7¹⁴. This action is presented in all but one of these passages as punitive and, so, it also seems to be understood in Exod 24:11. However, Moses and the others do not die since they climb the mountain at God’s invitation. The Greek text does not mention God as the subject: “and from the chosen ones of Israel not even one perished”. Thus, God is not explicitly presented as the one who destroys the people. For Wevers, it is a paraphrase that avoids making God the subject of a disastrous activity¹⁵. However, in all the other passages mentioned above, in the Hebrew text where God is subject of the “stretching out the hand”, the Greek translator renders the Hebrew faithfully. The question remains: why did the translator not tone down God’s outstretched hand in the other passages? Most likely, this text has to be understood in its own textual context of Exod 24:9-11: the distance between God and the people is already emphasized in the Greek vv. 10a and 11b, v. 11a is, therefore, not the only occurrence of such a feature. It also seems that, in fact, the avoidance of the presentation of God as a subject of the disastrous activity has to be read within this general tendency – to underline the distance between God and earthly beings that can be seen throughout other the passages in LXX as well¹⁶.

The last two divergences are the most striking. The first concerns an issue that could hardly be perceived as an unconscious scribal oversight. I will take into consideration the evaluation of this modification in detail later on¹⁷ but here I intend to make some remarks concerning the translation of v. 10a itself. In both passages, the notion of God’s being seen is considerably toned down. The modifications concern the context. The Greek text translates literally the Hebrew *רָאָה*, however, the object of the seeing is the place and not God Himself. There have been attempts to emend here *רָאָה* into *רָאָה*, however, Nicholson has already precluded such effort¹⁸. For him, there are three reasons for judging such an emendation impossible:

¹⁴ DURHAM, *Exodus*, 345.

¹⁵ WEVERS, *Greek Text*, 385-386.

¹⁶ Cf. RÖSEL, *Towards a “Theology”*, 247-248.

¹⁷ See chapter 3.

¹⁸ NICHOLSON, *Interpretation*, 81-82.

1. Context – in v. 10b, there is the description of what was seen, that is to say there is an object of seeing;

2. In v. 11a, it is stated that God did not stretch out his hand against the chiefs which presupposes that they have seen God;

3. None of the ancient versions support the reading “and they feared”.

The choice of the term τόπος refers to the location of the theophany: they did not see God but just the place where the theophany took place, namely, where the God of Israel stood. Philo (*De somn.* I,62) also refers to Exod 24:10 and interprets the “place” in three different ways¹⁹. The Targumim Pseudo-Jonathan and Onkelos read “and saw the glory of the God of Israel”. Targum Neofiti adds also Shekinah and the divine name: “and saw the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord God of Israel”. Vetus Latina renders literally LXX, whereas the Vulgate translates faithfully MT as usually is the case. Aquila renders MT without modification and Symmacus adds “and saw in the vision the God of Israel”²⁰. In this way, the majority of the witnesses avoid the notion of God’s being seen.

The second most striking divergence again concerns the fact of the vision of God by the chiefs of Israel. LXX does not recount the fact of vision at all: “they appeared in the place of God”. Three observations should be made here. First, the Hebrew text states twice in 24:10-11 that Moses and others saw God. However, a shift of the verb of vision is registered here: in v. 10a ראה is employed, whereas in v. 11b one finds חזה. Secondly, the Greek translator rendered the Hebrew verb “to behold” in the passive. Thirdly, the expression already used in v. 10a τόπος τοῦ θεοῦ occurs in v. 11b as well. Concerning the use of חזה instead of ראה, some authors have proposed that the text is about prophetic vision: thus, the directness of the statement of the vision in v. 10a would be softened down by employing the verb חזה which usually indicates the prophetic vision. For instance, Childs considers this verb as technical for prophetic clairvoyance and it indicates a peculiar perception²¹. Robinson, however, states that there is no significant difference between ראה and חזה; they both refer to such an experience since they are used in tandem in several contexts (Amos, Zechariah, Daniel) and the shift could be explained as a matter of elegant variation²². The Greek translator rendered both Hebrew verbs with ὁράω. This is

¹⁹ Cf. PHILO ALEXANDRINUS, *On Dreams*, 328-329.

²⁰ For an analysis of the ancient witnesses, see EBERHART, *Beobachtungen*, 300-302.

²¹ CHILDS, *Exodus*, 507. See also HANSON, *Seeing God*, 559.

²² ROBINSON, *Theophany*, 167.

the normal rendering for the verb ראה as well as a common LXX rendering for חזו.²³ The striking fact, however, is the shift to the passive voice: in the Greek text, contrary to the Hebrew, it is the chosen ones who were seen or appeared in the place of God. In general, the phenomenon of the shift from active to passive and *vice versa* is common in the Greek text²⁴. Rösel explains it as a part of the general anti-anthropomorphism of the Greek Scriptures: when a verb of seeing is changed from active to passive the meaning of the latter becomes different and tones down the idea that somebody could see God²⁵. This modification changes the Hebrew text considerably. Thus, it fits well with the divergence made in v. 10a. This modification puts the Greek text in line with other passages, such as Exod 19:21; 33:20; Lev 16:2, where it is stated clearly that whoever sees God will die²⁶. At the same time, however, it creates another difficulty: if the chosen ones did not see God, why then is it said that nobody perished²⁷? In general, one has to see the point that in Exod 24:11b the passage from active to passive voice of the verb avoids the notion of God's being seen and this was probably the main concern. In this way, the scribes could simply "correct" the "striking" statement in Hebrew, while leaving the statement that no one perished intact. The Greek translator did not even keep the verb of prophetic vision which seems not to cause any problem elsewhere: Isa 1:1, Amos 1:1, Hab 1:1, Mic 1:1 where חזו has been rendered with ὀρώ in the active voice. The Targumim in this case rendered the same expression as in v. 10a: Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti claim that the chiefs saw the Glory of the Shekinakh of the Lord and Onqelos states they saw the Glory of the Lord. Some manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch contain ויאחזו instead of ויחזו.

²³ This verb occurs only randomly in the Pentateuch. It is, however, common in other books, see 2 Sam 24:11; Job 27:12; Ps 11:7; Isa 26:11; 33:17; Ezek 12:27; 13:7, Zech 10:2. In some cases, one finds a different rendering as well; see Exod 18:21; Job 19:27a; 23:9a.

²⁴ TOV, Text-Critical Use, 176.

²⁵ RÖSEL, Towards a "Theology", 247. See also FRITSCH, Greek Translation, 55. Fritsch also claims that specially in cultic act the verb "to see" is shifted from active to passive voice. (FRITSCH, Greek Translation, 54.)

²⁶ WYCKOFF, Exegesis?, 684.

²⁷ HIMBAZA, Voir Dieu, 102, 105-106.

1.3 Evaluating Notes on the Divergences

LXX text appears quite different from MT. The translator revising the Hebrew text did not confine himself just to the lexical choices which are inevitable in the work of the translation but he made also several modifications that concern the very meaning of the source text. Unfortunately, 4Q22 which contains Exod 24:6-11 is very fragmentary²⁸. A similar witness from Qumran would be useful in order to reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind LXX²⁹. In any case, it is clear that at least in two major points the Greek text diverges considerably from MT. An important issue is at stake here: was God in fact seen or not? In addition, MT does not limit itself only to one such a statement (v. 10a) but it repeats it again, even if employing a different verb in v. 11b. On the other hand, LXX corrects this statement not only once but in both the occurrences of its Hebrew parallel. LXX appears also to clarify the Hebrew in at least three other occurrences: by employing the neutral plural nominative article to specify the exact object of seeing; paraphrasing in v. 11a in order to avoid presenting God as the agent of destructive actions; and reducing the leadership's view of the sky to a view of its appearance. Thus, one can notice an accurate work of the translation behind only these three verses. The translator paid attention to the minimal details and a general tendency of the distance between God and the people could be identifiable behind the modifications.

2 Positioning the Research

2.1 Between Minimalist and Maximalist Scholars

The purpose of this paper is to explore the reasons that caused such a different rendering in LXX Exod 24:9-11. If one explains the different rendering on linguistic grounds, immediately a problem arises: how could such an important issue as the avoidance of the fact of God's being seen by man could be generated by the philological reasons even if the translator was modifying consciously? It would mean that the translator was aware of such an alternation and of its consequences while being guided by only philological factors. However, the nature of the modification itself makes such an explanation

²⁸ Cf. SANDERSON, Scroll, 337.

²⁹ DE TROYER, Hebrew Text, 16; SOLLAMO, Translation Technique, 39.

difficult. Theoretically and as a matter of principle, several reasons could play a role in this rendering but the question is to understand what exactly caused such a modification in LXX. Thus, on the other hand, one has to understand what kind of criterion led the translator in the rendering of Exod 24:9-11 as it appears in LXX.

A. Pietersma as well as other authors outline some guidelines within which this research could proceed. Current Septuagint hermeneutics is evolving between two groups of scholars, that is minimalists on one extreme and maximalists on the other³⁰. One of the main differences between these two groups is the consideration of the translator's role and consequently the differences made by him in the translation. For the minimalists, the translator has a lower degree of independence. Of course, he cannot be considered as a mere robot mechanically translating the text but, surely, he is not an author in his work of translation. His main aim is to reproduce the source text faithfully. Thus, he does not affect what he has on hand and many of the divergences between the Greek and the Hebrew have to be explained as due to linguistic reasons. On the other hand, there are maximalist scholars who grant the translator a much higher degree of independence in his literary work: he could not be a mere medium since in the translation he is also influenced by a certain theological view of which he is a bearer. In this way, the translator begins to approach the status of an author. In consequence, the differences between the source language and the target language have to be understood within this type of authorial consideration: his literary work is subject to influence such as historical context and the community of faith to which he belongs.

Wyckoff talks about a third group which has to be positioned between the two abovementioned ones³¹. For this group of scholars, a good degree of prudence has to be applied while considering the nature of divergences between the Hebrew and the Greek. They have to be explained by a wide spectrum of reasons. They have to be considered first of all for reasons other than theology; although the latter is also operative and, thus, can explain certain divergences, however, this criterion can be considered only among many others that determined the translator's work.

These three approaches give a good panorama of the methodological ground on which the research will be positioned. These guidelines represent good

³⁰ PIETERSMA, *Exegesis*, 35-36; SOLLAMO, *Translation Technique*, 40; COOK, *Interpreting*, 590.

³¹ WYCKOFF, *Exegesis?*, 676.

tracks in order to approach Septuagint hermeneutics and, so, I will make use of them to explore the divergences in Exod 24:9-11.

2.1.1 Maximalists

M. Rösel, asking himself in the first lines of his article “Towards a «Theology of the Septuagint»” whether it is possible to write a theology of the Septuagint, gives a positive answer³². Immediately after this statement, however, he makes a series of preliminary considerations being indeed aware of debates of the scholars in this field. In any case, his research is in favor of the possibility of such an undertaking.

Rösel’s survey represents the position of those who are called the maximalist scholars in Septuagint hermeneutics. Besides him, two other authors will be taken into consideration who concentrate on the theological innovations in the Greek Bible: J. Schaper and T. McLay³³. All of them argue in favor of the possibility of the theology of the Septuagint as a concept. Of course, only three authors do not exhaust the entirety of all the maximalist authors; however, their pivotal arguments will help to introduce hermeneutical maximalism and outline its main features.

While each author presents something that distinguishes him from other perspectives, I will try to outline the features that maximalist scholars have in common. First of all, as a matter of principle, every work of translating and transmitting the text implies an exegetical involvement³⁴. When the translator renders a statement from the source language he has to choose a word or expression in the target language. Therefore, the translation reveals a certain way of the translator’s understanding of the source language. Furthermore, since the scribes and translators were aware that they were dealing with authoritative scriptures, they paid more attention to the exegetical task they had to exercise. Thus, in the translation their decisions were most probably conditioned by their theological perception. In this way, in many if not all of the modifications LXX made to its Hebrew counterpart one has to affirm the influence of a theological view to which the translator subscribed.

One of the main principles that these maximalist authors sustain is the consideration of the Greek Bible as more than a mere translation. Although

³² RÖSEL, Towards a “Theology”, 239.

³³ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*; McLAY, *Theology?*, 607-620.

³⁴ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 24; McLAY, *Theology?*, 611; JOOSTEN, *Une théologie?*, 31.

J. Schaper dedicates his dissertation *Eschatology of the Greek Psalter* to the study of the Psalms as is clear from the title, he nevertheless claims in the introduction that the aim of his study is to demonstrate that Greek Bible is “a work displaying a new, distinct quality in the religious history of Judaism and Hellenism”³⁵. In this way, he confers on the Septuagint a status that exceeds the rank of mere translation. The Greek version exhibits theological features that are new in comparison with the Hebrew Bible. Their presence testifies a certain history of theological ideas from their birth until their reception into the new Hellenistic world³⁶. Thus, LXX version has to be considered interpretation rather than translation because of these new theological concepts present in this literary work³⁷. J. Schaper goes further claiming that his study would result in the writing of a commentary on the version itself³⁸. Although he limits such an enterprise to the Book of Psalms, he admits that it could be extended to the whole Greek Bible as B. Lindars has already stated³⁹. Whatever may be extent of Schaper’s study, it is clear from his statement that he attributes a high degree of independence to LXX in comparison with its original Hebrew Bible. In this way, LXX is treated on a level higher than translation.

The maximalist scholars also enter into debate concerning translation technique studies. This is the issue that has been studied extensively by the exegetical school at Helsinki⁴⁰ as well as by other scholars⁴¹. The translation technique could be defined as a special way of translation by the translator into the target language of given words and expressions of the source language or simply it is a matter of the relationship between the translation and original text as Aejmelaeus states⁴². In the work of translation, the translator has recourse usually to the same equivalents in the target language⁴³. Maximalist scholars first

³⁵ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 2.

³⁶ RÖSEL, Towards a “Theology”, 242.

³⁷ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 19.

³⁸ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 18.

³⁹ LINDARS, A Commentary?, 167.

⁴⁰ The authors that belong to the Helsinki school, such as I. Soisalon-Soininen, A. Aejmelaeus, R. Sollano and others, will be treated under the category “minimalist scholars”.

⁴¹ TOV, Translation Technique, 337-359; OLOFSSON, *The LXX Version*; TAUBERSCHMIDT, *Secondary Parallelism*; JOOSTEN, Elaborate Similes, 3-14.

⁴² AEJMELAEUS, Übersetzungstechnik, 225. For a more complete description of the term “Translation Technique”, see also in the same volume AEJMELAEUS, Translation Technique, 205-208.

⁴³ SOLLAMO, Translation Technique, 36.

of all dispute the weight that sometimes is given to the translation technique. It is rather a tool for other methods but not the goal of the research⁴⁴. Secondly, for these scholars it is erroneous to consider the translation techniques only on philological ground. The mere linguistic framework belittles the importance of the translation text because behind it there are also other factors: the theological perception and intentions of the translator, the community of faith to which he belongs⁴⁵, and the historical context. All these factors significantly influence the translation. The mere philological approach to translation technique runs the risk of being unhistorical⁴⁶. Thus, the differences in both the texts have to be examined by a wide range of factors of which philology is only one aspect among many others.

At this point, the translator's role could also be specified since numerous factors influence the translation. Such a translator could not be merely the medium⁴⁷. He could not just mechanically render the target text appearing thus as a non-historical character. When he was translating he was always a man of his time, with certain views both historical and theological. In the work of translation, he left the imprint of influences. Thus, the translator, in the maximalist's point of view, would be closer to the status of the author and not the medium as Pietersma presents it⁴⁸. That is to say, the material from the source language into the target language was changed deliberately and purposefully by the translator who is considered as author.

In the end, as the culmination of these authors' positions, it should be added that Rösel and McLay even propose the principles by which a theology of the Septuagint should be written⁴⁹. Such a theology would not be considered "less" theology than that of the Hebrew Bible. In fact, the Greek Jewish scriptures were the theological source for the early Church so the theology of the Septuagint should be written at least as a Christian theology⁵⁰. Rösel suggests that in the Septuagint several theological topics have to be noticed and then the comparison between the Greek and Hebrew text concerning these topics has to be made⁵¹.

⁴⁴ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 19.

⁴⁵ MCLAY, *Theology?*, 608.

⁴⁶ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 17.

⁴⁷ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 21; MCLAY, *Theology?*, 609.

⁴⁸ PIETERSMA, *Exegesis*, 36.

⁴⁹ RÖSEL, *Towards a "Theology"*, 251-252; MCLAY, *Theology?*, 616-620.

⁵⁰ MCLAY, *Theology?*, 616-617.

⁵¹ RÖSEL, *Towards a "Theology"*, 251-252.

Such an exploration of theological concepts has to develop on the level of individual books instead of emphasizing text-critical questions⁵².

2.1.2 Minimalists

As a matter of principle, these scholars try to attribute the differences between the Hebrew text and LXX to a different *Vorlage* on which the translation was realized on one hand or to the work of the translator on the other. The main authors of this approach are the members of the exegetical school of Helsinki: I. Soisalon-Soininen, R. Sollamo, A. Aejmelaesus, A. Voitila, S. Sipilä⁵³.

From the very first it should be stated that they do not exclude the theological interpretation made by the translator in the translation task. Such interpretation surely occurs but it cannot be sought behind every divergence between the source text and the target text. Thus, the criticism against these scholars that they see only philological features behind the divergences, or as Schaper states, “do not seem to see the wood for the trees”⁵⁴, has to be toned down.

There are several ways in which this technique appears useful for research. First of all, it is described by the scholars of Helsinki school as a method in order to sketch the syntax of the Septuagint⁵⁵. The translator would have recourse to his own way of translation determined by the use of certain words to translate words and expressions of the source language. The translation technique helps to understand the syntactical constructions the translator reproduced in the target language. Furthermore, it is useful in order to reconstruct the *Vorlage* on which the translation was based⁵⁶. In certain cases, as when there are numerous divergences inexplicable on philological grounds or as free renderings, one could conclude that behind this text there was a different *Vorlage*. At this point, by undertaking the reconstruction of the *Vorlage*, the translation technique could help to reproduce it. Since this technique is outlined as a special way of translation it is useful not only in order to know the characteristics of the

⁵² RÖSEL, Towards a “Theology”, 241.

⁵³ SOISALON-SOININEN, *Die Infinitive*; SOLLAMO, Translation Technique, 35-41; SOLLAMO, Prolegomena, 23-42; AEJMELAEUS, Participium Coniunctum, 385-393; AEJMELAEUS, Von Sprache, 265-293.

⁵⁴ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 22.

⁵⁵ SOLLAMO, Translation Technique, 35, 40.

⁵⁶ SOLLAMO, Translation Technique, 39; AEJMELAEUS, Übersetzungstechnik, 225. Also K. De Troyer goes in the same direction. See DE TROYER, Hebrew Text, 15.

translator better⁵⁷ but also to determine the words of the original text on which this technique was utilized and consequently the source text itself.

Another area of interest for translation technique studies concerns this study directly: namely, its relationship with theological interpretation⁵⁸. First of all, the translation technique is presented as an essential condition in order to determine the theology of LXX. Anyway, a rather moderate approach is adopted by these authors. A scholar first has to consider the philological features behind the differences in the target language. Only afterwards can the theological reasons be employed to explain these differences. So, the theological interpretation utilized by the author has a place in this approach but it has to be discovered and only after a series of other considerations that can explain the presence of differences between the original text and its translation.

Aejmaleus, in her turn, offers a good series of methodological considerations for treating the theology of LXX⁵⁹. Firstly, one cannot talk about theology in a verbatim translation where the translator uses the standard words to render the source text. Neither when the translator has recourse to free renderings must one necessarily talk about the theological reasons by which he was guided⁶⁰. Moreover, the divergences could appear because of the way the Hebrew *Vorlage* has been analyzed: the translator could read the consonantal text differently. Thus, the translation also depends on the translator's analysis of the original text. He could analyze the text employing only linguistic categories and, thus, not engage in theological interpretation at all. Finally, one can talk about LXX theology when the translator deliberately left a different rendering which does not appear clearly as a smoothing of possible Hebraisms but it is rather a different text in comparison with its original⁶¹. He could also operate in this manner in order to clarify the source text or to avoid a certain rendering. Moreover, a scholar has to ask whether the interpretation found in the target text is caused by the difficulty of the passage or the different rendering is caused

⁵⁷ VOITILA, *Septuagint Translators*, 183-196.

⁵⁸ SOLLAMO, *Translation Technique*, 40-41. In her paper, Sollamo talks about the *ideology* of the translator and then shifts to the theology. I will keep talking about the theology as suggested by many authors, both maximalists and minimalists. J. Cook gives a good panorama on terms "exegesis", "theology" and "ideology" used by different scholars as applied to the Septuagint. See COOK, *Interpreting*, 594-595; also AEJMELAEUS, *Übersetzungstechnik*, 230-239; AEJMELAEUS, *Von Sprache*, 265-293.

⁵⁹ AEJMELAEUS, *Übersetzungstechnik*, 231-235.

⁶⁰ Cf. AEJMELAEUS, *Übersetzungstechnik*, 232-244.

⁶¹ AEJMELAEUS, *Übersetzungstechnik*, 235-236.

instead by the translator's desire to reproduce the original text in clearer language so as to improve what the original text says.

It turns out that even for the scholars of the Helsinki school the translator is not the mere medium and there is also a place for theology. His involvement in the translation task includes reasoning, smoothing difficult passages, using his competence in order to translate better the text he had on hand. In certain cases, he would translate verbatim, in others he would employ rather free renderings. I would conclude quoting Sollamo whose statement reflects well the position of these authors regarding the theology behind the translation text: "theology needs to be demonstrated, not presupposed"⁶².

2.1.3 A Third Approach?

As stated above, Wyckoff suggests the existence of a third approach for dealing with the theology in LXX. He rates among these scholars, A. Pietersma, J. Cook and J. Joosten⁶³. This approach is distinguished by a good degree of moderation in evaluating the theological interventions in LXX. A scientific analysis has to be applied to the text in order to determine the nature of the divergences. Firstly, one has to examine the reasons other than theological tendencies behind the divergences. Only afterwards can the theological factor be taken into consideration.

However, I find difficult Cook's inclusion in this list. He himself speaks about the *theology* of the Septuagint and not just about some "potential theological changes"⁶⁴. It is true that he binds such a concept to the individual books. Thus, one has to talk about many theologies in the Septuagint; however, even examining the Book of Proverbs, he concludes his paper by stating that the attempt to outline the theology of LXX can also be applied to the other books⁶⁵. Moreover, in my view, E. Tov could also be considered as one who belongs to this third group of scholars. In his "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint", he offers some methodological considerations where he reveals his prudence concerning the presence of the theological exegesis though he affirms one has to recognize it at least in certain books of LXX⁶⁶.

⁶² SOLLAMO, *Translation Technique*, 41.

⁶³ WYCKOFF, *Exegesis?*, 676.

⁶⁴ WYCKOFF, *Exegesis?*, 676.

⁶⁵ COOK, *Interpreting*, 605-606.

⁶⁶ TOV, *Exegesis*, 257-269. See also TOV, *Textual Criticism*, 124-128.

In principle, one has to look for the translator's ideas and these could be accessible behind the divergences against the source text⁶⁷. These ideas could reveal the theological view of the translators. However, not every difference needs to be the bearer of such a view. Tov distinguishes between exegesis in general and theological exegesis in particular⁶⁸. The latter constitutes only one aspect of a much larger concept. In any case, if one looks for theological interpretation in LXX it is proper to examine these divergences at the outset so that they may serve as trails to guide further research. The standard equivalents, certain free renderings and those linguistic choices that can be explained by mere philological reasons can be set aside as not relevant to such research. This considerably narrows the field in which theological interpretation may be sought.

Furthermore, the extent of the concept of the theology of the Septuagint has to be restored to proper perspective. Tov speaks about some *theologoumena* and individual renderings but not about the *theology* of the Septuagint⁶⁹. The latter appears an unobtainable undertaking. Joosten, in his turn, underlying the fact of literalism and harmonisation that took place in the translators' work, states that such a theology has to be considered as a theology of the word. Thus, one ought not look for the theology in the large literary units in LXX against the source text. The translation was realized in a rather literal way by translators who were conscious of dealing with authoritative Scriptures⁷⁰. That is to say the modification could rather take place on the level of the word than on the level of big literal units. Pietersma also proceeds in a similar direction⁷¹. He stresses the fact that if one looks for the exegesis in LXX one has to start on word-level since the Septuagint translation is rather word-based. What is interesting about his approach is the fact that he takes into consideration the case of the Book of Psalms which is considered one of the more freely translated books.

In conclusion, these scholars recognize the traces of theological interpretation in the Septuagint though each of them employs different terminology⁷². The scholars taken into consideration share what Joosten calls

⁶⁷ JOOSTEN, *Une théologie?*, 33, 46; PIETERSMA, *Exegesis*, 45; TOV, *Exegesis*, 259-260.

⁶⁸ TOV, *Exegesis*, 258-259.

⁶⁹ TOV, *Exegesis*, 268.

⁷⁰ JOOSTEN, *Une théologie?*, 42-46.

⁷¹ PIETERSMA, *Exegesis*, 38-39.

⁷² Tov speaks about the theological exegesis, Pietersma generally about the exegesis and Joosten, in his turn, employs the term ideological exegesis.

“down-to-earth explanations”⁷³ for the divergences. Only after one examines these non-theological reasons, the way to the latter can be opened.

3 Evaluating the Modifications

3.1 *The Greek Exod 24:9-11 as A Result of Theological Interpretation*

Having presented three possible approaches it is time to make an evaluation of the divergence under discussion. What perception would be more suitable for the Greek Exod 24:9-11? It seems that in rendering into Greek the passage at hand the translator was guided by theological concerns to pay more attention to the transcendence of God and, thus, tone down the directness of possible anthropomorphisms. He avoided, at all costs, presenting God as the object seen by Moses and others on the mountain, still maintaining, however, the fact of the special proximity to the God of Israel they enjoyed because of their office as the leaders of the people⁷⁴. In any case, it is clear that the directness of the Hebrew statement was tempered in both occurrences: v. 10a and v. 11b. Since the group of the leaders of Israel saw only the *place* where God stood, the distance between Him and the people is underlined. This distance is further highlighted by the fact that the representatives, that is to say the leadership of the people, could see God according to what the Greek version states. I am aware that my position could appear as preaching to the saved since several scholars have stated it before⁷⁵. However, what I am determined to propose here is especially to take a closer look at the reasons themselves that seem particularly prominent in order to sustain the hypothesis of the theological interpretation behind the Greek Exod 24:9-11.

⁷³ JOOSTEN, *To See God*, 298.

⁷⁴ Cf. SKA, *Le repas*, 305-327; SKA, *Vision*, 165-183.

⁷⁵ Following there are some authors that sustain the theological interpretation behind the Greek Exod 24:9-11: WEVERS, *Two Reflections*, 36-37; WEVERS, *Text History*; AEJMELAEUS, *Von Sprache*, 272; HANSON, *Seeing God*, 559-560; TOV, *Exegesis*, 267-268; TOV, *Textual Criticism*, 128; SKA, *Il cantiere*, 117; CASSUTO, *Exodus*, 314; PIETERSMA, *NETS*, 47-48.

3.1.1 The Same Kind of the Shift in Other Passages

There is a series of passages where the notion of God's being seen has been avoided or toned down. Fritsch and Hanson make a list of all the occurrences where the verb "to see" has undergone some modifications in the Greek text⁷⁶. Among the passages listed by these scholars, I will underline firstly those examples where the translator has clearly avoided the notion of seeing God Himself: Exod 3:6; 4:24; 24:10.11; Num 12:8⁷⁷. Secondly, there are the passages where this avoidance is not marked so clearly as in the examples just mentioned but the notion of seeing God has been downplayed: Gen 32:31; Exod 19:21; Deut 31:15. As further evidence of toning down the notion of God's vision in the Greek version, I will list also some passages out of the Pentateuch where this phenomenon occurred: Job 19:26b.27a; 22:14; 33:26; Pss 16(17):15a; 33(34):6; 62(63):3a; Isa 17:7a; 38:11; Zech 9:14a; 2 Chr 26:5⁷⁸. Such examples show that this phenomenon was not a single occurrence but a modification made repeatedly by the translators. Thus, one can speak about a certain *tendency* to omit the notion of seeing God. Such a tendency reinforces the hypothesis of the theological interpretation behind the passage in question⁷⁹.

At this point, at least two objections should be raised. First of all, there are several passages where LXX maintained the notion of seeing God as it appears in MT: Gen 12:7; 17:1; 18:1; 22:14; 26:2; 35:1.9; 48:3; Exod 3:16; Lev 9:4; 16:2; Num 14:14⁸⁰. Fritsch claims there are at least twenty places where the Hebrew text was left unmodified⁸¹. Secondly, there seems to be even the tendency in LXX to introduce the notion of seeing God where it is lacking in the Hebrew text: Gen 16:13; 31:13; Exod 25:8; 33:13; Num 6:25; Deut 33:16⁸².

Several clarifications are proposed here in order to tackle these objections. Firstly, the different readings could be explained with different

⁷⁶ FRITSCH, Greek Translation, 51*-56*; HANSON, Seeing God, 557-568. See also JOOSTEN, To See God, 290-291.

⁷⁷ I confine myself, in the list, only to the passages in the Pentateuch.

⁷⁸ For E. Tov, among all the books of the Hebrew Bible especially Isaiah, Daniel, Job and Proverbs contain more substantial quantity of the theological exegesis. See TOV, Exegesis, 258.

⁷⁹ JOOSTEN, To See God, 299.

⁸⁰ Although in Gen 18:1 a shift from יהוה to Θεός took place.

⁸¹ FRITSCH, Greek Translation, 53*.

⁸² HANSON, Seeing God, 565-566; HAYWARD, Temple Service, 386-388; JOOSTEN, To See God, 291-295.

*Vorlagen*⁸³. Behind the passages where LXX seems to introduce the notion of seeing God it is more probable that the Greek translator did not have a Hebrew text where this notion was toned down or even omitted entirely. And, as a matter of principle, one has to try to reconstruct the *Vorlage* of the ancient translations in general in order to clarify the differences. It has to be stated that authors, such as J. W. Wevers, E. Tov, K. De Troyer, claim that there are relatively few differences between the Hebrew text behind the Old Greek and MT⁸⁴. However, the issue of the different *Vorlagen* can be used as a methodological tool that works in some cases and not in others rather than an exhaustive explanation of all the differences.

Secondly, the particularity of each biblical book has to be taken into consideration when studying the theological themes in each of them. I. Himbaza, in his essay on the theme of the vision of God in the Hebrew and the Greek Exodus, concludes: “La LXX se singularise par son refus catégorique de la possibilité pour l’homme de voir Dieu... Le texte d’Exode est comme un îlot au milieu de la LXX du Pentateuque”⁸⁵. For Himbaza, though, the notion of seeing God is rendered possible in other books of the Pentateuch: that man could see אלהים but not יהוה⁸⁶. Indeed, if one takes into consideration all the passages where LXX did not make any modification, one common feature appears clearly – in all the abovementioned passages the verb ראה recurs in the Niphal with the meaning “and God appeared”. Now, Genesis connects all these passages to God’s appearances to the patriarchs. Even the sole occurrence outside the Book of Genesis, that is Exod 3:16, recalls the patriarchs: that same God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob appeared also to Moses. Hayward claims that it is a particular feature of the Book of Genesis to present God as one who appears to the patriarchs⁸⁷. Indeed, there are no occurrences of God’s direct apparition in the

⁸³ Various scholars claim the differences can be attributed to *Vorlage* different from MT as we know it today: HANSON, *Seeing God*, 566; TOV, *Textual Criticism*, 121-124; SOLLAMO, *Translation Technique*, 35; HIMBAZA, *Voir Dieu*, 110.

⁸⁴ For instance, K. De Troyer claims: “the Old Greek of the most books of the Pentateuch was translated from a Hebrew text that was not that much different from the later Hebrew Masoretic text”. (DE TROYER, *Hebrew Text*, 19-20.) See also TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 39; WEVERS, *Greek Text*, xv.

⁸⁵ HIMBAZA, *Voir Dieu*, 108-109.

⁸⁶ However, out of Pentateuch: 1 Kgs 22:19; Amos 9:1; Isa 6:1.

⁸⁷ HAYWARD, *Temple Service*, 386-387.

Book of Exodus other than this kind of appearance⁸⁸. Finally, it seems that the statement “God/Lord appeared” looks less striking than “I saw the Lord” with a human subject as it occurs in 1 Kgs 22:19; Amos 9:1; Isa 6:1⁸⁹.

Thirdly, some of the passages where LXX seems to introduce the notion of seeing God could be explained as a usual way of translation of certain verbs by the translator. For Fritsch the phenomenon of the shift of the verb “to see” from active to passive voice is quite frequent⁹⁰. Joosten in his turn claims that the verb שׁוּב is usually translated by κατοικέω when the subject is man and by ὁράομαι “to be seen” when the subject is God as it occurs in Exod 25:8 and Deut 33:16⁹¹.

Fourthly, it has to be assumed, as a matter of principle, that in several passages the translator rendered the text merely literally. It could better explain those renderings where no modification appears in the Greek version. One probably cannot argue that LXX changed every single passage thus becoming a complete theological rewriting. Tov claims that it is not possible to talk about a systematic reworking of the Hebrew text but rather about individual passages that have been theologically motivated⁹².

3.1.2 What does the Hebrew text itself report?

I propose to point out three issues in Exod 24:9-11. First of all, the Hebrew Exod 24:10b specifies what Moses and his companions saw on the mountain. Even if it is claimed “they saw the God of Israel”, afterwards the exact object of their seeing is reported: “under his feet like a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heaven for clearness”. There is no description of God Himself but only of what was under his feet. In Isa 6 and Ezek 1 there is quite a considerable description of what these two prophets saw⁹³. Such a description, however, is lacking in Exod 24:10-11 and the only object reported as seen is other than God Himself. Although the prophetic visions have to be considered separately, the point is that v. 10b, specifying the object of the vision, downplays

⁸⁸ In the Book of Exodus, God appears in the cloud but it is not anymore direct appearance. See, e.g., Exod 16:10.

⁸⁹ Cf. ROBINSON, Theophany, 158.

⁹⁰ FRITSCH, Greek Translation, 51*.55*.

⁹¹ JOOSTEN, Une théologie?, 39-40.

⁹² TOV, Exegesis, 268.

⁹³ Although Amos 9:1 has less description than the other two, it, however, reports: “I saw the Lord staying beside the altar”.

the directness of the statement in v. 10a⁹⁴. Both Himbaza and Durham point out this fact and the latter states that “what Moses and his companions experience is a theophany of the Presence of God, not a vision of his person”⁹⁵. My main purpose here is to underline what v. 10b states. However, one could ask why v. 11a would say “and against the chiefs of the sons of Israel he did not stretch out his hand”. If this special group perceived only the presence and not God Himself, what is the reason of this last statement? It makes sense only if they saw God Himself. Exod 33:20 clarifies that no one can see God and live. Thus, one has to suppose that v. 10 reports the vision of God Himself. There are, in the Hebrew Bible, several examples of those who survived after having had such a vision: Jacob (Gen 32:31), Gideon (Judg 6:22-23), Samson’s parents (Judg 13:22-23), Isaiah (Isa 6:5). It seems Exod 24:11 could be read as one of these passages where one survives though the general principle that no one can see God and live is still maintained⁹⁶. Indeed, in all these occurrences the concern for the life of those who saw God is expressed. It seems their lives are rather spared by God or his messenger. Finally, it is also impressive to notice that even if Exod 33:20 clearly expresses that no one can see God and live, and this danger is underlined elsewhere as well, there is no concrete example anywhere in the Hebrew Bible of someone dying after seeing God. Hence what is impressive is that one finds several exceptions to this rule but no factual confirmation of the rule itself occurs in the text⁹⁷.

The second issue is the change of יהוה into Θεός instead of the more common rendering κύριος in ch. 24. It occurs four times throughout the whole chapter: vv. 2.3.5.16. This phenomenon could seem rather insignificant since the translator did not change all the occurrences into Θεός: vv. 1.4.7.8.12.17. At this

⁹⁴ At this point, I have to add that, for some authors, the seeing God was a fundamental experience for the leadership of Israel and for Israel itself. For instance, it shows the finality of the alliance. (See VINCENT, *Aspekte*, 15-20.) Meanwhile, Ska claims that the purpose of this scene is “the establishment of their authority (chiefs of Israel) and the legitimization of their function in the service of God”. (SKA, *Vision*, 174.) Robinson has a similar view, stating that the theophany in vv. 10-11 confirms the offices of prophets, priest and elders within the people. See ROBINSON, *Theophany*, 173.

⁹⁵ DURHAM, *Exodus*, 344. Although he advances the hypothesis that the description of God Himself could be deleted from the original version. See also HIMBAZA, *Voir Dieu*, 102.

⁹⁶ The examples are taken from SKA, *Vision*, 170-171.

⁹⁷ It is worth of noticing the Rashi commentary on Exod 24:10-11 for whom Nadab, Abihu and the elders are punished later with death because they perceived God. See CARASIK, *Exodus*, 209-210.

point, one has to take into consideration two observations. Firstly, the tetragrammaton never occurs as the object of seeing in the whole Pentateuch⁹⁸, meanwhile the general denomination Θεός/אלהים appears more often when describing a theophany. Secondly, also the same shift occurs in Exod 19, and it is a theophany scene too: vv. 3.7.8.18.21.23.24. It is possible then to consider these four shifts in ch. 24 as not occasional ones⁹⁹. Hence, the translator seems to downplay the notion of seeing God not only in vv. 9-11 but this tendency can be also noticed throughout the whole ch. 24.

The simple fact that this notion has been modified twice suggests that it is not an oversight but something important to which the translator paid attention. That the same modification took place twice within just two verses strengthens the case for ideological motivation on the part of the translator in vv. 10-11.

3.1.3 The Nature of the Divergence

What is striking about Exod 24:9-11 is that an important issue is at stake: whether God can, in fact, be seen or not. It is not a marginal question but, rather, a fundamental one. It is quite difficult to talk about an unconscious error in the case of an important issue.

For Tov, theological exegesis can be connected to several topics: the description of God, his acts, the Messiah, exile, and all religious experiences¹⁰⁰. Exod 24:9-11 can be ascribed to this latter category. According to the Hebrew text, the leadership of Israel participates in the vision of God. For the translator, however, such an idea had to be clarified since the shift of the object of seeing took place. Wevers claims what is stated in the Greek text is what the translator of the Hebrew text really meant. This clarification has been made in order to avoid a possible misunderstanding by the reader¹⁰¹.

What led the translator to soften two direct statements in Exod 24:9-11 was an anti-anthropomorphic or spiritualizing tendency in the Hellenistic world where the Jewish community of Alexandria lived. A good number of scholars

⁹⁸ HIMBAZA, *Voir Dieu*, 108.

⁹⁹ Cassuto and Wevers state that tetragrammaton יהוה is to be considered more protected than אלהים. (See CASSUTO, *Exodus*, 314; WEVERS, *Two Reflections*, 30-31.) Rösel, however, considers the difference between the terms as follows: κύριος is used for more merciful description of God, while Θεός recurs to indicate more powerful actions. These are the examples he quotes: Gen 13:10; 38:7 and 6:6-7; Exod 3:18; 10:11; 16:7-9. See RÖSEL, *Towards a "Theology"*, 245.

¹⁰⁰ TOV, *Textual Criticism*, 127-128; TOV, *Exegesis*, 259.

¹⁰¹ WEVERS, *Text History*, 147. See also NICHOLSON, *Interpretation*, 89.

underline the fact of this tendency, and not just behind the passage in question but rather as something widespread in contemporary Alexandrian culture¹⁰². Since Jewish religious thought was developing within the context of this Hellenistic culture it had consequences also on the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures for the needs of the Greek-speaking Jewish community. Allegory was in vogue at that time so the Scriptures were interpreted according to this current. Thus, several anthropomorphic passages were toned down and consequently also the theme of seeing God¹⁰³. However, one cannot claim that all the anthropomorphic passages have been changed in the Hebrew Bible. This tendency affected only some of them and hence cannot be drawn throughout the whole Bible. Indeed, it appears clearly in some instances from the examples of divine visions that have not been changed. This tendency, however, did affect several passages and one can talk, thus, about the partial anti-anthropomorphism¹⁰⁴.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Exod 24:9-11 in its Masoretic witness and LXX shows that, in the latter, the translator's work went beyond a mere literal translation. The probable criterion that caused such a modification was rather a theological one. According to the theology that asserts the transcendence of God, man cannot see Him directly and, thus, the translator interpreted the text in the manner he deemed to be more correct. In this way, interpretation and not merely translation of the text took place. The translator, in his turn, operated as a true exegete. This exegesis can be noticed not only in two major modifications in vv. 10a and 11b but also in another three divergences as shown in chapter 3. This interpretation could be defined as theological since it deals with God Himself and a religious experience of vision. In addition, the modification rendered the text smoother, avoiding the contradiction that could arise reading Exod 33:20. Even if one cannot talk about an omnipresent tendency to avoid the notion of God's being seen in LXX since there is a series of places where the Greek version maintains it, such a phenomenon did occur in several passages and it seems Exod 24:9-11 can be defined as one of these.

¹⁰² FRITSCH, *Greek Translation*, 51*-56*; VRIEZEN, *Exegesis*, 101; HANSON, *Seeing God*, 566; TOV, *Exegesis*, 267-268; SKA, *Il cantiere*, 117; RÖSEL, *Towards a "Theology"*, 247-248; ROBINSON, *Theophany*, 157-158.

¹⁰³ FRITSCH, *Greek Translation*, 51*-52*.

¹⁰⁴ TOV, *Exegesis*, 267-268; RÖSEL, *Towards a "Theology"*, 247-248.

Bibliography

- AEJMELAEUS, Anneli: Participium Coniunctum as a Criterion of Translation Technique, *VT* 32 (1982) 385-393.
- AEJMELAEUS, Anneli: Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation. Zur Methodik der Septuaginta-Forschung. In: Anneli Aejmelaeus (ed.): *On the Trail of the Septuaginta Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50), Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007, 223-239.
- AEJMELAEUS, Anneli: Von Sprache zur Theologie: Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta. In: Anneli Aejmelaeus (ed.): *On the Trail of the Septuaginta Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50), Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007, 265-294.
- AEJMELAEUS, Anneli: What We Talk About When We Talk About Translation Technique. In: Anneli Aejmelaeus (ed.): *On the Trail of the Septuaginta Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50), Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007, 205-222.
- CARASIK, Michael: *The Commentators' Bible: Exodus* (The JPS Miqra'ot Gedolot), Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2005.
- CASSUTO, Umberto: *A Commentary to the Book of Exodus*. Translated from the Hebrew by Israel Abrahams, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1967.
- CHILDS, Brevard Springs: *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL), Louisville, KY: Westminster Press, 2004.
- COOK, Johann: Interpreting the Septuagint – Exegesis, Theology and/or Religionsgeschichte? In: Wolfgang Kraus – Martin Karrer (eds.): *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008* (WUNT 252), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 590-606.
- DE TROYER, Kristin: The Hebrew Text Behind the Greek Text of the Pentateuch. In: Melvin K. H. Peters (ed.): *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010* (SBLSCS 59) Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013, 15-32.
- DOZEMAN, Thomas B.: *Commentary on Exodus* (ECC), Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.
- DURHAM, John I.: *Exodus* (WBC 3), Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- EBERHART, Christian: Beobachtungen zu Opfer, Kult und Sühne in der Septuagint. In: Wolfgang Kraus – Siegfried Kreuzer (Hrsg.): *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption: 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-20. Juli 2012* (WUNT 325), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014, 297-314.
- FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, Natalio: *La Bibbia dei Settanta. Introduzione alle versioni greche della Bibbia* (ISB.Supp 6) Brescia: Paideia, 2000.
- FRITSCH, Charles T.: A Study of the Greek Translation of the Hebrew Verbs “To See”, with Deity as Subject or Object, *ErIs* 16 (1982) 51*-56*.
- HANSON, Anthony Tyrrell: The Treatment in the LXX of the Theme of Seeing God. In: George J. Brook – Barnabas Lindars (eds.): *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Manchester 1990* (SBLSCS 33), Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1992, 557-68.
- HAYWARD, C. T. Robert: Understanding of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch. In: John Day (ed.): *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the*

- Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (LHBOTS 422) London – New York: T & T Clark, 2005, 385-400.
- HIMBAZA, Innocent: Voir Dieu. LXX d'Exode contre TM et LXX du Pentateuque. In: Dieter Böhler – Innocent Himbaza – Philippe Hugo (éds.): *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Etudes d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (OBO 214) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005, 100-111.
- JOOSTEN, Jan: Une théologie de la Septante? Réflexions méthodologiques sur l'interprétation de la version grecque, *RTP* 132 (2000) 31-46.
- JOOSTEN, Jan: To See God. Conflicting Exegetical Tendencies in the Septuagint. In: Martin Karrer– Wolfgang Kraus – Martin Meiser (eds.): *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006* (WUNT 219) Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 287-299.
- JOOSTEN, Jan: Elaborate Similes – Hebrew and Greek. A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique. In: Jan Joosten: *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond* (FAT 83) Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 3-14.
- LE BOULLUEC, Alain – Sandevor, Pierre: *L'Exode. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante* (BdA 2), Paris: Cerf, 1989.
- LINDARS, Barnabas: A Commentary on the Greek Judges? In: Claude E. Cox: *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23) Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987, 167-200.
- MCLAY, Timothy: Why Not a Theology of the Septuagint? In: Wolfgang Kraus – Martin Karrer (eds.): *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008* (WUNT 252), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 607-620.
- NICHOLSON, Ernest Wilson: The Interpretation of Exodus XXIV 9-11, *VT* 24 (1974) 77-97.
- OLOFSSON, Staffan: *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (CB.OT 30), Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990.
- PHILO ALEXANDRINUS, *On Dreams, That They are God-Sent (Quod a Deo mittantur somnia or more briefly De Somniis)*. In: *Philo*. Vol. V. With an English translation by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (LCL 275), Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press, William Heineman Ltd, 1949, 285-611.
- PIETERSMA, Albert: Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as A Case in Point). In: Wolfgang Kraus – R. Glenn Wooden (eds.): *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53), Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006, 33-45.
- PIETERSMA, Albert – WRIGHT, Benjamin Givens: *A New English Translation of the Septuagint. And the other Greek translations traditionally included under that title*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. (= *NETS*)
- ROBINSON, Bernard P.: The Theophany and Meal of Exodus 24, *SJOT* 25 (2011) 155-73.
- RÖSEL, Martin: Towards a “Theology of the Septuagint”. In: Wolfgang Kraus – Glenn R. Wooden: *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53) Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006, 239-252.
- SANDERSON, Judith E.: *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran. 4QpaleoExodm and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30), Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986.

- SCHAPER, Joachim: *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT II/76), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- SHIGEHRO, Nagano: The Elders of Israel in Exodus 24:9-11, *AJBI* 19 (1993) 3-33.
- SKA, Jean-Louis, Le repas de Ex 24,11, *Bib.* 74 (1993) 305-327.
- SKA, Jean-Louis: Vision and Meal. In: Jean-Louis Ska: *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions* (FAT 66) Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 165-183.
- SKA, Jean-Louis: *Il cantiere del Pentateuco*. Vol. 1: I problemi di composizione e di interpretazione (Biblica), Bologna: EDB, 2013.
- SOISALON-SOININEN, Ilmari: *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (STAT 132,1), Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965.
- SOLLAMO, Raija: Prolegomena to the Syntax of the Septuagint. In: Raija Sollamo – Seppo Sipilä (eds.): *Helsinki Perspectives On the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (SESJ 82) Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001, 23-42.
- SOLLAMO, Raija: Translation Technique as a Method, *BETL* 213 (2008) 35-41.
- TAUBERSCHMIDT, Gerhard: *Secondary Parallelism. A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs* (SBLAcBib 5) Atlanta, GE: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- TOV, Emanuel: Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint. In: Claude E. Cox: *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23) Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987, 337-359.
- TOV, Emanuel: Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in The Septuagint. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 257-269.
- TOV, Emanuel: *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis – Assen: Fortress Press, 2001.
- TOV, Emanuel: *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- VINCENT, Jean Marcel: Aspekte der Begegnung mit Gott im Alten Testament: Die Erfahrung der Göttlichen Gegenwart im Schauen Gottes, *RB* 103 (1996) 5-39.
- VOITILA, Anssi: What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Translators, *SJOT* 10 (1996) 183-96.
- VRIEZEN, Theodore Christian: The Exegesis of Exodus XXIV 9-11. In: Martinus Adrianus Beek (ed.): *The Witness of Tradition. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Woudschoten, 1970* (OTS 17) Leiden: Brill, 1972, 100-133.
- WEVERS, John Williams: *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30), Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.
- WEVERS, John William (ed.): *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum*. II/1: Exodus, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- WEVERS, John Williams: *Text History of the Greek Exodus*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- WEVERS, John William: Two Reflections on the Greek Exodus. In: Harold J. Ellens et al. (ed.): *God's Word for Our World*. Vol. 1: Biblical Studies in Honor of Simon John De Vries (JSOTSup 388), London: T & T Clark, 2004, 21-37.
- WYCKOFF, Eric John: When Does Translation Become Exegesis? Exodus 24:9-11 in the Masoretic Text and Septuagint, *CBQ* 74 (2012) 675-93.

Summary

Exod 24:9-11 is an exemplary case of study of the differences between MT and LXX. A mere three verses reveal how carefully the translation work has been conducted to deal with an important issue: did the leaders of Israel see God or not? This paper aims to clarify the possible reasons that lay behind such a different rendering in LXX as compared to MT. Exod 24:9-11 in both its Hebrew and Greek texts is witness of different theological approaches to the same problem.

Key words: seeing God, LXX theology, anti-anthropomorphism.

Zhrnutie

Ex 24,9-11 je jedným z tých príkladov, na ktorých je vidieť rozdielnosti medzi masoretským textom a textom Septuaginty. Tieto jednoduché tri biblické verše ukazujú, ako opatrne si grécky prekladateľ počínal pri svojej práci v prípade dôležitej otázky: Videli vodcovia Izraela Boha či nie? Cieľom článku je objasniť možné príčiny, ktoré stoja v pozadí rozdielneho textu v Septuaginte v porovnaní s masoretským textom. Vo svojich oboch verziách – hebrejskej i gréckej –, Ex 24,9-11 svedčí o odlišných teologických prístupoch k rovnakému problému.

Kľúčové slová: vidieť Boha, teológia LXX, antiantropomorfizmus.

Hryhoriy Lozinskyy
Kotovskoho 19/30
UZHHOROD 88017, Ukraine
hryhoriylozinskyy@gmail.com

God's Curse in the Hanged Man

Crux interpretum in Deut 21:23

Angela Maria Lupo

The Jewish people have had a lively awareness of having been chosen by God to live the special Covenant relationship with Him expressed in the imperative, “You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy” (Lev 19:2). Holiness, indicating a state of total belonging to God, is a requirement of the whole community and must manifest itself in all areas of life; it is associated with impurity, because both contain a mysterious and terrifying force that acts by contact and puts the person in a state of interdiction¹. Contact with unclean does not kill but weakens man, thus, “purity according to the book of Deuteronomy is not the prerequisite of holiness, but rather an obligation which holiness imposes upon the Israelite”².

The legislation in Deut 21:22-23 reveals intense meaning of covenant and obedience – in accord with 11:26: “See, I am setting before you today blessing and curse” – confessing that solely Yahweh is God and that only in Him is life, while outside of Him there is only death and curse. The condition for blessing in the land is obedience to “all these commandments” (v. 22), and indeed the curse is presented primarily in terms of the desolation of the land and death. Our investigation will focus primarily on 21:23, the real *crux interpretum* in this text, as we try to clarify its meaning. It will be seen that any act of the curse, which is a total separation from God, is connected with disobedience, inasmuch as the gift of the covenant hangs upon free human response. Therefore, I will point out that the central question in v. 23 is that the cadaver is God's curse not because it is hung on a tree, but that its being hung shows to all its state of being determinedly cursed from its transgression of the Law.

¹ SACCHI, *Sacro*, 60: “Come riprova dell'affinità esistente tra sacro e impuro si può osservare che l'impuro è una forza ostile all'uomo, analogamente al sacro. Ciò che lo distingue dal sacro è solo la sua minore pericolosità; l'impuro è, per così dire, un sacro diluito.”

² WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 228.

1 The Death Sentence

Deut 21:22-23 is located in the central part of the book of Deuteronomy, the so-called Deuteronomomic Law Code (chs. 12–26)³, which contains a number of agreements given by God to Moses for the people so that putting them into practice, they could live in peace in the land which they were about to enter. In these chapters, the following literary sequences may be highlighted⁴:

- Rules of worship (12:12–16:17);
- The appointment of public officials (16:18–18:22);
- Laws of life and death (19:1–21:23);
- Boundaries of the community (21:1–26:19).

The third sequence (Deut 19:1–21:23) deals with some issues that affect the purity of the land and the people, the unsolved murder, the rebellious children and the exposing of corpses. These chapters emphasize that life presents itself as an indefinite variety of cases and the law seeks to adapt to people's ever-changing lives, wanting to assert its ties with God, where there shall be a blessed and happy future⁵.

The main concern of ch. 21, where we find our text, is purity. It is a duty that flows from having been called by God to holiness: "Purity is not, in the first place, a question of spiritual attitude, but a quality of life bound to the fact that these people were set apart as God's people and are under His authority."⁶ In this chapter, we can see the following literary unit:

- The unidentified murderer (vv. 1-9);
- Marriage with woman captured in war (vv. 10-14);
- Social justice: right of firstborn in polygamous marriage (vv. 15-17);
- Family law: the rebellious son (vv. 18-21);
- Humanism: treatment of executed criminal's body (vv. 22-23).

Israel's community, called to live a special relationship with the Lord, should manifest in all spheres of its daily life such unique relationship that implied the elimination of anything that could constitute an obstacle. In fact, purity encompasses all moral life and implies the maintenance of order in the world given by God.

³ For a survey of works on Deuteronomy, see MAIES, *Deuteronomy*, 108-109; MILLER, *Deuteronomio*, 141ff.; ROFÉ, *Deuteronomy*, 55-77; WRIGHT, *Deuteronomio*, 24-25.

⁴ Cf. CLEMENTS, *Deuteronomy*, 55-117.

⁵ JACKSON, *Biblical Laws*, 86-101.

⁶ MILLER, *Deuteronomio*, 171.

In the last passage of ch. 21, we find a norm relating to the corpse of a man condemned to death. The text opens with a formulated norm in generic way, *וְכִי־יְהִי בְאִישׁ חַטָּא מִשְׁפַּט־מָוֶת*, “and if a man has committed a sin worthy of death”; the protasis includes the condemnation of a covenant’s transgressor and the verb in the third person singular introduces the case of a man guilty of a crime that deserves death⁷. The employed construction, *מִשְׁפַּט־מָוֶת*, refers to a type of death sentence; in fact, the word *מִשְׁפַּט* is a formed name with the prefix *מ-* and the root *שפט*, translated as “justice, judgment, law”. It points out a “deliberation, decision” of death in close connection with justice and law, “right as a normative principle also appears as a decision reached in a concrete situation”⁸.

The construction *מִשְׁפַּט־מָוֶת* is employed only 4-times in all OT; aside from Deut 21:22, it also appears in 19:6. It is preceded by the negation particle to point out that “not deserving of death”, *אִין מִשְׁפַּט־מָוֶת*, the one who unintentionally kills his companion in the woods, because the axe used for cutting the tree slipped from his hands. Since the killing is not motivated by hate, the avenger of blood should not pursue and catch the killer who took refuge in a city to save his life (cf. 29:5-6).

The other two recurrences are in Jer 26:11.16. In the first text, after the prophet Jeremiah finishes to report how much the Lord had communicated to him, i.e., that the temple would be reduced like Silo and the city of Jerusalem destroyed and be without inhabitants, “then the priests and the prophets spoke to the officials and to all the people, saying, «A death sentence for this man! (*מִשְׁפַּט־הַזֶּה לְאִישׁ הַזֶּה*), for he has prophesied against this city as you have heard in your hearing»” (v. 11). The text of Jer continues with a defense by the prophet that affirms he was sent by God and not to have prophesied of his own initiative: “The officials and all the people said to the priests and to the prophets, «No death sentence for this man! (*אִין־לְאִישׁ הַזֶּה מִשְׁפַּט־מָוֶת*), For he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God»” (v. 16).

The sentence of the chief priests and the assembly towards Jeremiah was an acquittal, since they recognized that he spoke in the name of the Lord⁹. In all these texts, the term *מִשְׁפַּט* is employed in a technical sense for pointing out the

⁷ CHRISTENSEN, *Deuteronomy*, 487: “The boundaries of the law on the hanging corpse (21:22-23) are marked with *šetimā*’ layout markers at the beginning and the end, and the *Numeruswechsel* in v 23 as restored from LXX and Tg. Ps.-J.”

⁸ JOHNSON, *מִשְׁפַּט*, 93.

⁹ Cf. WEISER, *Geremia*, 436.

death sentence, without specifying the type of judgment. Considering the legal texts contained in the Pentateuch, it emerges that the death penalty was foreseen for the following crimes¹⁰:

- voluntary homicide¹¹;
- a man's abduction to reduce it in slavery¹²;
- serious lacks against God: idolatry¹³, blasphemy¹⁴, profanation of the Sabbath¹⁵, prostitution of the daughter of a priest¹⁶, witchcraft¹⁷;
- severe faults against parents¹⁸;
- sexual abuse: adultery, incest, sodomy, bestiality¹⁹.

Israel's legislation limited the death penalty to the attacks against the purity of worship and against the holiness of life and its sources²⁰. Generally, the religious motive was explicit in the laws. The normative word intervened not only to impede the perversion of the covenant's gift, but also to keep open the possibility of its connectedness right in the moment when, paradoxically, it fails or comes short.

The death penalty of stoning was imposed upon the people who committed the crimes mentioned above. The condemned was led out of the city and the prosecution witnesses threw the first stones, followed by others until death came²¹. This punishment could be aggravated, exposing the death bodies of the condemned, as mark of infamy to warn others²². However, the law did not

¹⁰ Cf. DE VAUX, *Le istituzioni*, 165-166.

¹¹ Cf. Exod 21:12; Lev 24:17; Num 35:16-21; Deut 19:11-12.

¹² Cf. Exod 21:16; Deut 24:7.

¹³ Cf. Exod 22:19; Lev 20:1-5; Deut 13:2-19; 17:2-7.

¹⁴ Cf. Lev 24:15-16.

¹⁵ Cf. Exod 31:14-15.

¹⁶ Cf. Lev 21:9.

¹⁷ Cf. Exod 22:17; Lev 20:27; 1 Sam 28:3.9.

¹⁸ Cf. Exod 21:15.17; Lev 20:8; Deut 21:18-21.

¹⁹ Cf. Lev 20:10-17; Deut 22:22.

²⁰ DE VAUX, *Le istituzioni*, 165.

²¹ Cf. Deut 13:10-11; 17:5-7; 21:21; 22:21.24; Lev 24:14.23; Num 15:35-36.

²² MULDER, הַלְּקָה/אֲלָקָה, 669-670: "It is unlikely that hanging by itself ever served as a form of capital punishment in Israel. The relevant text appears to suggest instead that those who were condemned, above all blasphemers, were first killed and then hung up, so that hanging was more an additional punishment. [...] Hanging is a public exhibition of the condemned criminal, which only aggravates his punishment and disgrace"; MAYES, *Deuteronomy*, 305: "The purpose of such exposure is not certain. [...] There may also be present the idea of an unburied body as additional punishment for the executed criminal." WILLSON, "Cursed", 220-201: "The legislation of Deut 21:22-23 permits the public shaming of the condemned

specify cases where the condemned were supposed to be exposed in this way, thereby undergoing a double punishment.

2 Treatment of the Body of An Executed Criminal in OT

In Deut 21:22b, reference to the public exposition of the cadaver does not indicate the execution of the condemned by impalement or crucifixion. Instead, it gives reference to the exposition of one who already has been sentenced, “and you hang him on a tree” וְתָלִיתָ אֹתוֹ עַל-עֵץ. After a person deserving of punishment had been executed, as an admonition to others and to further humiliate the condemned, they proceeded to expose his body on a עץ which may indicate a “tree” or a “timber” pole²³. Some Scriptural references that implement this rule actually confirm such procedures.

In Gen 40:19, Joseph, locked in jail, explains to the chief baker the dream that he had, “within three more days Pharaoh will lift up your head from you and will hang you on a tree (וְתָלָה אֹתְךָ עַל-עֵץ); and the birds will eat your flesh off you”. In fact, the chief baker sentenced to death, was first killed and then his body was suspended from a pole²⁴:

<p>“But the chief baker he impaled, just as Joseph had predicted.” (Gen 40:22)</p>	<p>וְאֵת שֵׁר הָאֲפִים תָּלָה כְּאֲשֶׁר פָּתַר לָהֶם יוֹסֵף</p>
--	---

In Gen 41:13, the text that recalls the interpretation of Joseph's dream, one may infer that the act of “being hung” follows decapitation:

<p>“And it came about that just as he interpreted for us, so it happened; he restored me in my office, but he hanged him.”</p>	<p>וַיְהִי כְּאֲשֶׁר פָּתַר-לָנוּ בֶן הַיָּה אֶתִּי הִשִּׁיב עַל-בְּנֵי וְאֵתוֹ תָּלָה</p>
--	--

The biblical narrator uses תלה for “hang” in the following contexts: Joshua's execution of the king of Ai (Josh 8:29):

criminal by suspending his corpse to manifest his covenantal status as cursed, presumably to deter other from similar covenant transgression; this is penal suspension.”

²³ CHRISTENSEN, *Deuteronomy*, 489: “The phrase «hang him up on a gibbet» refers to exposing the body of the executed for public display.”

²⁴ WENHAM, *Genesis*, 384: “The baker will not simply be executed, but his corpse will be impaled and exposed. This treatment was designed to prevent his spirit from resting in the afterlife.”

And he hanged the king of Ai on a tree (תָּלָה עַל־הָעֵץ) until evening; and at the going down of the sun Joshua commanded, and they took his body down from the tree, and cast it at the entrance of the city gate, and raised over it a great heap of stones that stands to this day.

A recurring motive in victory accounts was the exemplary execution of the sovereign; these, captured alive (Josh 8:23), after killing all the inhabitants of Ai, were killed and as a mark of infamy they were “suspended from the tree”²⁵; however, according to the law in Deut 21:22-23, the body was removed before nighttime²⁶.

The destiny reserved for the King of Ai is similar to that of the five Kings reported in Josh 10. It deals with the punishment inflicted on the Amorite Kings, Adoni-Zedek, Oam, Piream, Iafia and Debir, who had attacked Gabaon, not accepting that its inhabitants had covenanted with the sons of Israel. Informed of this, Joshua fell upon them, inflicting severe defeat, and after having captured the five kings who had hidden in a cave near Makkeda, he ordered them to be killed and their bodies exposed as an extreme act of outrage:

²⁶ So afterward Joshua struck them and put them to death, and he hanged them on five trees (וַיִּתְּלֵם עַל חֲמִשָּׁה עֵצִים); and they hung upon the trees (וַיִּהְיוּ תְּלוּיִם עַל־הָעֵצִים) until the evening.²⁷ And it came about at sunset that Joshua commanded, and they took them down from the trees and threw them into the cave where they had hidden themselves, and put large stones over the mouth of the cave, to this very day.

This text also refers to the public exposure of the bodies, after the execution had been performed to provoke terror in others²⁷. On the other hand, while ch. 11 narrates the slaughters of the Canaanite kings, in v. 10b we read that Joshua, after having taken Cazor, “struck its king with the sword”; in v. 17b: “And he captured all their kings and struck them down and put them to death”, but nothing was added with regards to suspension on wood²⁸.

2 Sam 4:12a describes what David inflicted upon those who killed Is-Baal: “Then David commanded his young men, and they killed them, and cut off their hands and feet, and hanged (וַיִּתְּלוּ) them beside the pool at Hebron.” In such

²⁵ BALDI, *Giosuè*, 66: “Generalmente la sospensione al legno seguiva all’uccisione.”

²⁶ Cf. SOGGIN, *Josué*, 83; NELSON, *Deuteronomy*, 262: “Joshua scrupulously obeys this law.”

²⁷ BUTLER, *Joshua*, 118: “The land God is giving his people must not be defiled by a body hanging overnight (Deut 21:23). Joshua obediently takes the bodies down and buries them fittingly in the hole they tried to use for refuge. Now they have eternal refuge from life’s worries.”

²⁸ BOLING, *Joshua*, 286.

reference the formal verb יָתְלוּ points out not so much the suspension of the cut limbs but of the corpses.

Usually these accounts employ the *qal* of תלה and they indicate a “high degree of purpose” in action and “no resistance on the part of what is hung”. In Num 25:4 and in 2 Sam 21:6.9a, the form *hifil* of the verb יקע, “to hang”, it refers to the exposure of the corpse of one guilty of serious crime. In the first text, due to the idolatry of the Israelites who, after having been established in Sittim, abandoned God upon the enticement of the daughters of Moab and adhered to worshipping Baal-Peor, God commanded Moses (Num 25:4):

“Take all the leaders of the people	קח אֶת־כָּל־רְאֵשֵׁי הָעָם
and hang them up before the Lord	וְהוֹקַע אוֹתָם לַיהוָה
in broad daylight,	בְּגֵד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ
then the burning anger of the Lord will turn	וַיֵּשֶׁב חֲרוֹן אַף־יְהוָה מִשָּׂרָאֵל
away from Israel.”	

In 2 Sam 21 is narrated the killing of Saul’s descendants who are delivered to the Gibeonites to finish the curse that they had launched against Israel. The Gibeonites said to king David (v. 6a):

“Let seven men from his sons be given to us,	יִתְּנוּ־לָנוּ שִׁבְעָה אַנְשִׁים מִבְּנָיו
and we will hang them before the Lord	וְהוֹקַעְנוּם לַיהוָה
in Gibeah of Saul, the chosen of the Lord.”	בְּגִבְעַת שָׂאוּל בְּחִיר יְהוָה

David accepts the request of the Gibeonites deciding to save the lives of Merib-Baal (2 Sam 21:9a):

“Then he gave them into the hands of the Gibeonites,	וַיִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד הַגִּבְעוֹנִים
and they hanged them in the mountain	וַיִּקְיַעֵם בְּהָר
before the Lord,	לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
so they fell seven together.”	וַיִּפְּלוּ שִׁבְעָתָם

In Num 25 and 2 Sam 21, the hanged persons function representatively to some extent. The convicts were killed and then were hung from a pole or a tree, so that it would be an additional penalty that could serve as a sign of intimidation for spectators and also to taunt the person who had been killed²⁹. The Mosaic Law does not absolutely take into consideration the torture of the cross. In Deut 21:22, there is no mention of the suspension of a living man on wood in order to

²⁹ PAGANINI, *Deuteronomio*, 327: “L’essere appeso non è quindi una forma di esecuzione paragonabile alla crocifissione, ma un atto dissuasivo e deterrente.”

kill him, but that of a dead body³⁰. The legislation limits the practice demanding a timely burial. The use of the form *hophal* of the verb מוֹת, “he has been killed”, confirms that the offender’s death already preceded the suspension on wood and that the cause of death was not the suspension, as is crucial in crucifixion³¹.

The Babylonian Talmud in reference to Deut 21:22 declares that every mention of the cross is completely extraneous from this passage:

Our Rabbis taught: Had it been written, “If he has sinned, then thou shalt hang him”, I should have said that he is hanged and then put to death, as the State does. Therefore Scripture says, *And he be put to death, then thou shalt hang him* – his first put to death and afterwards hanged. And how is this done? – It [verdict] is delayed until just before sunset. Then they pronounce judgment and put him [immediately] to death, after which they hang him; one ties him up and another unties [him], in order to fulfil the precept of hanging.³²

From this text we deduce that the rabbis understood very clearly that the suspension of the body differs completely from the Roman crucifixion.

Midraš Sifre on Deut 21:22 briefly expresses the same opinion, “Can you think they would suspend him alive?”. The answer follows, “Therefore it has been said: He will be killed and you will suspend him to the wood”³³. The *Midraš* excludes any biblical base to the practice of the crucifixion, described more appropriately as a Roman practice³⁴.

The exception is the presence of the verb הָלַח in the book of Esther³⁵ which can dually mean, “to impale” and “to crucify”. These meanings are confirmed by the LXX which usually translates the verb הָלַח with the verbs κρεμάζειν, κρεμᾶν, κρεμᾶννόναι, while only in Esth 7:9 and 8:12 was it translated as σταυροῦν³⁶, referring to the punishment to which Aman was condemned. It is possible that

³⁰ TIGAY, *Deuteronomy*, 383: “The text does not mean that the criminal is executed by hanging, a method unknown in biblical and ancient Near Eastern Law.”

³¹ WILLSON, “Cursed”, 222: “The suspension of a corpse along the lines of Deut 21:22-23 signifies YHWH’s judgment against covenant violators, whether he judges Israelites who break the covenant or enemy kings who set themselves against his covenant people.”

³² *Sanhedrin* 46b, see DEL VALLE, *La Misná*, 735. (emphasis original)

³³ FINKELSTEIN, *Deuteronomy*, 175.

³⁴ Cf. WIEDER, *New Documents*, 71-76.

³⁵ The verb הָלַח appears 9 times in the Book of Esther.

³⁶ SCHNEIDER, σταυροῦ, 573.

these verses allude to the crucifixion since the story is set in Persia and probably influenced by the Mesopotamian culture that practiced this death penalty³⁷.

After the discovery of the Temple Scroll at Qumran, which postulates a different reading from that assumed by MT³⁸, a first study by Y. Yadin has tried to show that during the Hasmonean period of the Hellenistic epoch, crucifixion was the death penalty that ratified the crime of high treason. It assumed a religious character on the basis of Deut 21:23³⁹. The verb תלה is employed in 4QpNah 3-4 I, 7-8 (2-times): line 7 refers to hanging “living men”, תלה אנשים, and line 8 mentions those hung as living, לתלוי חי, thus “hanging on a tree” is transformed into a reference to crucifixion, while retaining the overall religio-political sense of Deut 21:22-23⁴⁰.

According to Yadin, even in 11QT^a 64,7-13⁴¹ the verb תלה is used to indicate the procedure of crucifixion, while death was conceived as a consequence of being hung⁴²; in fact, the phrase “hanging on a tree” is referenced three times (lines 8,9,10), emphasizing the hanging as *ante mortem*: the offender is hung on a tree and then dies, ותליתממה אותו העץ וימת, instead of

³⁷ The study of Hengel examines in great detail that the crucifixion was a form of “barbaric” execution of the utmost brutality, of Persian provenance, inflicted above all on high-ranking officials, military leaders and riot fomenters. Cf. HENGEL, *Crucifixione*, 5.

³⁸ ROSSO, Deuteronomio, 236: “Il *Rotolo del Tempio* LXIV, 9-11 fornisce la prova dell’antichità della variante contenuta in vari manoscritti; mentre l’esistenza di tale variante conforme alla lettura *qumranica* di Deut 21,22 prospetta altresì l’ipotesi di una rielaborazione del testo da parte dei settari, a sostegno della loro dottrina, di cui si sarebbe conservata traccia in margine alla tradizione manoscritta greca ed etiopica.”

³⁹ Cf. YADIN, *Pesher Nahum*, 1-12.

⁴⁰ REARDON, ‘Hanging on a Tree’, 413: “The allusion to Deut 21:22-23 in 4QpNahum colors the reader’s perception of the action. The knowledgeable reader draws connections between the two texts, appropriating emphases of the alluded text and reinforcing elements of the *Pesher Nahum*. Crucifixion entails a communal, shameful, cursed, religio-political punishment that invokes God’s wrath against fellow Jews who act as enemies of the people – here, the Pharisees who appeal to Demetrius to conquer Jerusalem.”

⁴¹ This text is palaeographically datable at the end of the first century; it is the longest among those found in the caves of Qumran and measures almost 8 meters. It is a legal corpus inserted in the narrative framework of the stipulation of the Sinaitic pact, based essentially on Deuteronomy.

⁴² This opinion is shared by FITZMYER, *Crucifixion*, 505: “4QpNah with its allusion to Deut 21:22-23 and its use of תלה meaning «crucify» makes it plausible that 11QTemple, which also alludes to Deut 21:22-23, understand תלה in the same sense, even without the mention of living person.”

MT והוֹמָת וְתָלִיתָ אֹתוֹ עַל-עֵץ. The fragment of *the Temple Scroll* may be considered as a real paraphrase of Deut 21:22b because replaces the MT use of the hophal והוֹמָת, “and he is put to death”, with the qal וימת, “and he dies”, which, when following the description of hanging, involves hanging as the means of death⁴³; it indicates that the sect understood that a man should be hanged alive⁴⁴.

Considering such references, according to the hypothesis of Yadin, the sect would approve the behavior of “Lion Furious”, identified with Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BC)⁴⁵, who had executed his adversaries “by hanging them alive”, as compliant to the dictates of law, according to sectarian exegesis⁴⁶.

Yadin’s reading was disproved the following year by Baumgarten, according to which 4QpNah I, 7-8 and 11QT^a 64,7-13 would allude to different punishments, that is, to crucifixion or death by hanging respectively⁴⁷. In his interpretation of the text of Nahum, the author narrowly condemns Alexander Jannaeus, applying the enigmatic words of the biblical text to crimes committed by him and his followers: “... [no such thing ever] was [happened] first in Israel, because he (the Furious Lion) thought that «hung» (Deut 21:23) meant «alive in a wood»”⁴⁸. The affirmation יתלה אנשים חיים, “to hang men alive”, would give reference to crucifixion and would justify the nickname “Furious Lion” given by the community to him who wrought such, inasmuch as that cruel action was not acceptable based on the exegesis of the text in Deut 21:22-23⁴⁹. On the other

⁴³ EVANS, Hanging, 491: “Whereas Deuteronomy 21:22-23 speaks of one put to death and then hanged, 11QTemple speaks of one hanged until dead.”

⁴⁴ PUECH, Quelques exemples, 561: “Il apparaît que la crucifixion n’était pas seulement une peine exclusivement romaine ou hellénistique, comme on l’écrit généralement, mais aussi une peine juive à l’encontre de juifs appliquée par les autorités juive.”

⁴⁵ Of the same opinion is GARCIA MARTINEZ, 4QpNah, 232: “La alusión a la crucifixión precisa el cuadro histórico en el que se sitúa el pesher y delinea en transparencia la figura de Alejandro Janeo bajo el apelativo «León Furioso», así como sus luchas con el partido fariseo a quien nuestro pesher (col. i, 2) hace responsable de la invasión de Demetrio III y receptor de la venganza posterior de Alejandro, que no sólo crucificó a unos 800 de sus enemigos, sino que descuartizó a sus familias ante sus ojos”. According to some other author, the “Furious Lion” would be Antiochus Epiphanes. See ROWLEY, 4QpNahum, 183-193.

⁴⁶ Cf. YADIN, Peshar Nahum, 11-12.

⁴⁷ BAUMGARTEN, Crucifixion?, 481.

⁴⁸ BAUMGARTEN, Crucifixion?, 481.

⁴⁹ It is known from Josephus that Alexander Jannaeus was the first Jewish ruler to condemn his opponents to the death penalty of crucifixion and therefore in the abovementioned text “to hang men alive” may entail the penalty of crucifixion (cf. *Bell. I, 97; Ant. 13,380*).

hand, it is more probable that the condemnation was based on crimes committed and not on exegetical questions.

The very need for such explication demonstrates that *tlh* by itself did not signify impalement on a cross, but a form of execution resulting in immediate death. [...] The object of the midrash is to exclude any possible exegetical basis for crucifixion which is unmistakably identified as a Roman practice.⁵⁰

Also in 11QT^a 64,6-13, the hanging is a death penalty. It deals with the hanging of men who delivered its people to a foreign nation or who committed a crime by cursing his own people in a foreign land: "They are to be hanged on a tree until they are dead. The corpses must not be left on the tree but must be buried on the same day"⁵¹; it follows the reference to Dt 21:22⁵².

In a significant study, L. Díez Merino considers that in the writings recovered at Qumran, when the verb תלה appears, the specification "alive men" is not necessary to clarify its meaning. This word would unequivocally indicate the crucifixion *ante mortem*. The reference shows that the Qumran community followed the traditional interpretation which excluded the crucifixion as a form of capital punishment; for this reason, "Furious Lion" is condemned, for he had committed such an abomination⁵³.

⁵⁰ BAUMGARTEN, *Crucifixion?*, 478; HALPERIN, *Crucifixion*, 43: "If certain Jews did indeed see in the Deuteronomic passage a prescription of crucifixion, the general language of its opening – «a sin deserving of death» – could easily imply explicitly specified by the Torah. The Roman use of crucifixion for a multitude of offences would have encouraged such an interpretation. We have here, I propose, the origin of the principle – repeated as a tradition long after its grounds had been forgotten – that any death penalty prescribed by the Torah without specification is necessarily strangulation."

⁵¹ MULDER, תלה/אלה, 671.

⁵² BAUMGARTEN, *Crucifixion?*, 481: "We consider Yadin's conclusion that the sect held the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things worthy of death for treason as quite plausible. His further inference, however, that crucifixion was in their eyes a form of execution in accordance with the Law of Moses is unsubstantiated. [...] Crucifixion was viewed with horror by the Qumran sectarians as totally alien to Jewish tradition."

⁵³ DÍEZ MERINO, *La crucifixión*, 14: "La posición de Qumrán se pudiera explicar de distinto modo: o bien porque polémicamente se oponían a la interpretación farisaica de Dt 21,22-23 (crucifixión *post mortem*), o bien era una interpretación exegetica normal en el Judaísmo de aquel tiempo; o la inversa: la posición farisea fue una reacción contra la interpretación qumránica, o una proposición aceptada por algún grupo dentro del Judaísmo polifacético, del Judaísmo que precedió al año 70 d.C."

3 The Hanged Man, A Curse of God?

We get to the central segment of v. 23, בִּי־קִלְלַת אֱלֹהִים תָּלִי, which explains why the body of someone who had been hanging was to be buried on the same day, “for a curse of God is one who is hanged”. In this construct, the locution אֱלֹהִים קִלְלַת is a real *crux interpretum*, since there are two syntactic readings, from the moment that the adjective קִלְלַת is found in construct state and the second noun can function as subjective genitive, “from God”, i.e. “accursed by God”, or as objective genitive, “a curse toward God”, i.e. “an affront to God”⁵⁴. The MT construction supports both an objective and a subjective reading of אֱלֹהִים קִלְלַת⁵⁵. In either case, the criminal’s suspension upon a tree expresses the curse and does not affect it. In fact, the corpse was hung because of the committed crime, “manifested the condition of the cursed person as that of a criminal”⁵⁶, and in this case it is a subjective genitive.

The Septuagint renders אֱלֹהִים קִלְלַת as a subjective genitive translating *κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου*, “cursed from God is anyone who is hanging on a tree”; in the passive construction the abstract word *κατάρα* is not present, which frequently translates קִלְלַת, but it employs the perfect passive participle *κεκατηραμένος* to declare a lasting state of curse and to denounce that the one who hangs is cursed⁵⁷, a public example of the law’s severity, in the sense that he is subject to the curse that the law commits against his transgressors. Second, the genitive “of God” in MT is replaced by the formula “from God”, and the adjective has been added, *πᾶς*, “anyone”, making the universal assertion⁵⁸; in that manner, hanging on a tree is a demonstration of curse accrued through committing a capital crime.

⁵⁴ The noun “curse” occurs eleven times in Deuteronomy: 11:26.28.29; 21:23; 23:6; 27:13; 28:15.45; 29:26; 30:1.19.

⁵⁵ PAPOLA, *Deuteronomio*, 243: “Secondo alcuni autori «di Dio» potrebbe anche essere interpretato come una forma di superlativo e indicare perciò il carattere tremendo della maledizione.”

⁵⁶ WRIGHT, *Deuteronomio*, 343.

⁵⁷ Cf. BERNSTEIN, Deut. 21:23, 24: “This exegesis of the text implies that since the hanged body is cursed, it should be taken down quickly to prevent the surrounding land from becoming tainted. The biblical syntax accepts such a reading smoothly, and if we accept the fact that the Greek is but a disambiguating transformation of MT, the exegesis of the clause is clear.”

⁵⁸ Cf. HOLZMEISTER, *De Christi crucifixione*, 19.

A normative Jewish source, the Targum Neofiti, maintains the subjective genitive in the reading of the construct and translates, לִיט קִדָּם ה' כָּל דְּצִלָּב, “is cursed before God whoever’s hanging”, it agrees with the LXX, transforming the noun קָלָת in a passive participle and adding כָּל, “anyone”, before the word “hung”. Although the phrase לִיט קִדָּם ה' is not literally equivalent to the form ὑπὸ θεοῦ that is present in the LXX, it is understood as the same concept because, according to the interpretation of this source, the curse is the result of being hung⁵⁹.

Pešitta’ instead interprets liberally the construct בִּי־קָלָלֶת אֱלֹהִים תְּלוֹי as if it were an objective genitive, מִטַּל דַּמֵּן דְּמַצַּחָא לְאֱלֹהָא נִזְדַּקָּף, “that whoever blasphemes God must be hanged”⁶⁰; in the same way *Targum Onqelos* (אֲרִי עַל) and Symmachus (ὅτι διὰ βλασφημίαν θεοῦ ἐκρεμάσθη) teaches that the blasphemer is to be hanged. These texts identify God as the object of the curse as the reason for hanging; we may translate: “You must bury him since he was hanged for blasphemy” and he should not therefore remain exposed. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads (v. 23):

לֹא תִלֹּן נִבְלָתוֹ עַל הָעֵץ כִּי קִבֵּר תִּקְבְּרֵנוּ בַיּוֹם הַהוּא כִּי קָלָלֶת אֱלֹהִים תִּלְאִי
לֹא תִטְמֵא אֶת אֲדַמְתְּךָ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ נַחֲלָה

His carcass is not put on the tree, but on that day, he will be buried in a sepulcher, because God’s curse will be lifted up. And you will not defile the land that the Lord your God has given you as an inheritance.

Certainly, as it was hanged, the corpse was a source of contamination and therefore its exposure was “a curse to God”. This second reading of the genitive focuses on the great desecration inflicted on the victim by highlighting that the way of proceeding towards the executed person was a real offense, an outrage and an insult in the eyes of God, since the victim was exposed naked in a well visible place, a square, a high ground or the same scene of the crime. The offense was not the exposure of the corpse, because otherwise such action would be prohibited, but by the prolonged exposure of the body. That is why there is a limit to this approach, “his corpse shall not hang all night on the tree (לֹא־תִלְוֶן נְבִלָתוֹ) (עַל־הָעֵץ), but you shall surely bury him on the same day” (v. 23a), since this is

⁵⁹ BERNSTEIN, Deut. 21:23, 25.

⁶⁰ Cf. BERNSTEIN, Deut. 21:23, 31: “According to Rashi, we perceive two analyses of תְּלוֹי אֱלֹהִים בִּי־קָלָלֶת – «blasphemy» and «an affront toward God»”.

the only case in which, as a result of a normal procedure, a corpse was deliberately exposed⁶¹.

Verse 23 proves that the curse is a consequence of the sin committed and renders the offender defiled; paradoxically, it also becomes evident that the sinner becomes a curse because he is condemned by the same law that could have been a blessing if it was well observed. Because of this curse, the offender has to be hanged in order to show everyone the danger that it constitutes⁶². In fact, the actions of one have repercussions that affect other people (cf. Deut 11:26-28). Assurance of God's blessing and its existence on earth is achieved by solely removing the curse. This curse is not a "detachable" force but calls into play forces that transcend man's development of his evil effects, "the curse calls forth the dreaded power of evil and sin, the inexorable logic which leads from evil to misfortune"⁶³. We can say the curse is reversed as the echo of the blessing which is the creative word of God; while the blessing is a mystery of election, the curse is a mystery of rejection (1 Sam 15:23; 2 Kgs 17:17-23; 21:10-15)⁶⁴. In Deut 21:23, the corpse is not God's curse because it is hanging from a tree, but it is hanging on a tree because it is cursed by God; in fact, death by execution was a formal separation and termination from the community of God's people, and suspension on a tree showed to all the state of separation that the convicted person finds himself in⁶⁵.

⁶¹ BRICHTO, "Curse", 194; WILLSON, "Cursed", 221: "Deut 21:22-23 enables the community to denounce such covenant transgressor. In this sense, the community reaffirms the covenant by ritually enacting the covenant curse, even as they honor the prescribed limits of this ritual enactment. To be hanged upon wood in accordance with Deut 21: 22-23 constitutes the epitome of shame within OT law."

⁶² WISDOM, *Blessing*, 194: "The curse falls on the one who has abandoned covenant loyalty and has turned to other gods. To be under the curse means to be placed outside the realm of covenant blessing. It means to be expelled outside the covenant."

⁶³ CORBON – GUILLET, *Curse*, 106.

⁶⁴ CORBON – GUILLET, *Curse*, 107.

⁶⁵ Cf. CHRISTENSEN, *Deuteronomy*, 489; CHERTOK, *Like a Tree*, 81: "The purpose of hanging the corpse on the tree is to impress an image on minds of all who see." REARDON, 'Hanging on a Tree', 409-410: "The purpose of *post mortem* suspension visibly demonstrates to the community the guilt and humiliation of the executed one."

4 The Prohibition On Contaminating the Land

The issue of land and its ritual purity is relevant to Deuteronomy (cf. 19:2; 22:1). The land of inheritance is a gift from God, and to live in it implies a certain type of behavior; it would make the land unclean, because it is the dwelling place of the Lord (Num 35:34) and “to defile the land means to profane the holy God”⁶⁶. In the event that the body of a person executed was exposed, it would make unclean the land, in violation of a rule:

So you shall not pollute the land in which you are (וְלֹא־תִחַנְּפוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ) (אֲשֶׁר אֶתְּמַם בָּהּ) for blood pollutes the land and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed on it, except by the blood of him who shed it. (v. 33)

Another norm in the Holiness Code warns the people not to contaminate with various abominations the country that God was about to give:

²⁷ For the men of the land who have been before you have done all these abominations, and the land has become defiled (וְתִטְמָא); ²⁸ so that the land may not spew you out, should you defile it (בְּטִמְאַתְכֶם), as it has spewed out the nation which has been before you. (Lev 18:27-28)

The possession of the land is conditioned by the observance of the commands given by the Lord, “And you shall do what is right and good in the sight of the Lord, that it may be well with you and that you may go in and possess the good land which the Lord swore to *give* your fathers” (Deut 6:18; cf. 8:1; 11:8; 15:4-6); we read, “If you are not careful to observe all the words of this law which are written in this book [...]. Moreover, the Lord will scatter you among all peoples, from one end of the earth to the other end of the earth” (28:58a.64a). These texts manifest a certain tension between generosity and requirement and have commands like norms for Israel’s life on earth to live. They are also set as a condition for them to be able to continue dwelling in it⁶⁷. For this reason, 21:23c explains why the corpse of the executed was to be buried on the same day:

“So shall you not defile the land	וְלֹא תִטְמָא אֶת־אֲדָמָתְךָ
which the Lord your God	אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
is giving to you as an inheritance.”	נָתַן לְךָ נַחֲלָה

⁶⁶ ANDRÉ, אֲמָר, 339.

⁶⁷ Cf. VANHOOMISSEN, *Cominciando da Mosè*, 229.

The body of a dead man was a source of contamination in terms of ritual impurity and allowing the body to decompose or be dismembered by birds and beasts would spread the impurity⁶⁸.

In *De specialibus legibus* (III, 205), Philo resuming the legislation of Moses regarding the impurity of the corpse, treats it as a moment of reflection on the due respect owed to life: whoever is alive feels guilty in some way, becoming impure and learning to respect life⁶⁹. In line with this motive, even someone who simply enters a house where there is a dead person has to go through purification. The basis of this principle is the idea that “impurity is a *res* produced by the withdrawal of the soul, the divine image, from the body. The loss of the divine produces impurity”⁷⁰, while purity was closely linked to holiness, understood as integrity and completeness. The earth being holy, it follows that the inhabitants were to be found pure. The land could be desecrated by impurities of various types that however hardly seemed to be: some pets, cultic order the woman after childbirth, skin diseases, mildew in the house, etc.⁷¹ It follows that the dominant categories leading to holiness are purity and impurity⁷², and the latter becomes something that prevents contact with the sacred, that is with God, and it is charged with negative values as a consequence of the transgression.

Conclusion

Deut 21:22-23 describes the epitome of the covenant curse against transgressors and in this text v. 23 plays one part in the whole OT matrix of preparing God’s people for the full revelation in Christ (cf. Gal 3:13; 1 Pt 2:24; Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:28-29)⁷³; the text showed that the contained norm in it does

⁶⁸ CLEMENTS, *Deuteronomy*, 99: “Just as unatoned killing would pollute the land, so also even the corpse of a justly executed murderer required proper burial. The conflict of principle between the value of a deterrent display as a public warning and the need to avoid polluting the land was resolved by setting limits to the former action.”

⁶⁹ Cf. PHILON D’ALEXANDRIE, *De specialibus legibus*, 187-189.

⁷⁰ SACCHI, *Sacro*, 201.

⁷¹ CAIRNS, *Word and Presence*, 193: “Yahweh is the living God; it is unbecoming, then, that signs of death should be flaunted on the face of the land which is Yahweh’s inheritance.”

⁷² SACCHI, *Sacro*, 32-33: “La categoria più caratteristica del pensiero ebraico, quella con cui gli ebrei interpretavano e classificavano il reale, è quella del «sacro/profano – impuro/puro». Fare la storia dell’evoluzione dei contenuti di questa categoria e del rapporto stesso dei termini di cui è composta, è un po’ fare la storia del pensiero ebraico.”

⁷³ Cf. WILSON, “Upon a Tree”, 47ff., examines the redundancy of the allusion to Deut 21:32 in Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:28-29 to outline four common functions of redundancy in

not have the purpose to condemn a particular kind of sin, but without specifying the type of crime in which a man had to die, imposed that his body be exposed. We have considered that the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls constitutes a great richness in biblical text studies and for Judaism of that period (4QpNah 3-4 I, 7-8; 11QT^a 64,7-13). However, it cannot be assumed that the verses refer to the punishment of crucifixion, because it was not the way of execution according to Jewish penal law. Biblical text speaks only of the cadaver's exposition. Such norm has for its aim the recognition of the dominion of God in the life of every man and contributes to our better understanding of the mysterious face of the God of the covenant. In fact, the purpose of every single law was to give to the people a concrete means to serve God in all areas of life and the power to remain in freedom. The law cannot be interpreted "outside of the sphere of Yahweh's chosen people, away from the spirit, and away from covenantal communion"⁷⁴.

A person who is guilty of a capital crime must be exposed, it is a "curse of God", it attests to the whole and total separation from God. The hanged man is a sign of the absolute estrangement of God from any complicity with evil, and the culprit needs to be publicly hanged in order to denounce the sin that breaks the covenant with God. The severity of the punishment clearly shows the seriousness of the sin. It very deeply attacks the root of the covenant, transforming the land given as an inheritance into impurity if the dead body is not buried before the end of the day.

Paradoxically, the one who hangs on the wood shows to everyone that he is accursed by God, and reminds others to faithfully live the covenant, remaining in its blessings. The death of the guilty serves to memorialize God's gifts where His people discover Him from whom Moses has defined these norms. In reality, He does not want death, but life.

narrative literature: redundancy for emphasis, redundancy for anticipation or retrospection, redundancy for coherence, redundancy for characterization.

⁷⁴ AUZOU, *De la servitude*, 280.

Bibliography

- ANDRÉ, Gunnel: **טָמֵא** *tāmē'*. In: *TDOT V* (1986) 330-342.
- AUZOU, Georges: *De la servitude au service: étude du livre de l'Exode* (ConBi 3), Paris: Editions de l'Orante, 1961.
- BALDI, Donato (ed.): *Giosuè*, Torino – Roma: Marietti, 1952.
- BAUMGARTEN, Joseph M: Does *tlh* in the Temple Scroll refer to Crucifixion?, *JBL* 91 (1972) 472-481.
- BERNSTEIN, Moshe J.: כִּי-קָלַלְתָּ אֱלֹהִים תְּלוּי (Deut. 21:23): A Study in Early Jewish Exegesis, *JQR* 74 (1983) 21-45.
- BOLING, Robert G.: *Joshua. A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (AB), New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- BRICHTO, Herbert Ghanan: *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible* (JBL.MS 13), Philadelphia: Society of Biblical literature and Exegesis, 1963.
- BUTLER, Trent C.: *Joshua* (WBC 7), Waco (TX): Word Books, 1983.
- CAIRNS, Ian: *Word and Presence. A Commentary On the Book of Deuteronomy*, Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans 1992.
- CHERTOK, Ted: He is Like a Tree Planted Beside Streams of Water... Reflections of Trees and Men in the Bible, *JBQ* 43 (2015) 73-82.
- CHRISTENSEN, Duane L.: *Deuteronomy 21:10–34,12* (WBC 6B), Nashville (TN): Nelson, 2002.
- CLEMENTS, Ronald Ernest: *The Book of Deuteronomy. A Preacher's Commentary*, Peterborough: Epworth Press, 2001.
- CORBON, Jean – Guillet, Jacques: Curse. In: Xavier Leon-Dufour: *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, Boston: St. Paul Books & Media, 1995, 106-108.
- DÍEZ MERINO, Luis: La crucifixión en la antigua literatura judía, *EstEccl* 51 (1976) 5-27.
- EVANS, Craig A.: Hanging and Crucifixion in Second Temple Israel: Deuteronomy 21:22-23 in the Light of Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: Jörg Frey – Carsten Clausen (eds.): *Qumran un die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, 481-501.
- FINKELSTEIN, Louis: *Sifre on Deuteronomy*, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A.: Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament, *CBQ* 40 (1978) 493-513.
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Florentino: 4QpNah y la Crucifixión. Nueva hipótesis de reconstrucción de 4Q169 3-4 i, 4-8, *EstBib* 37-38 (1980) 221-235.
- HALPERIN, David J.: Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshet, and the Rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation, *JJS* 32 (1981) 32-46.
- HENGEL, Martin: *Crocifissione ed espiazione*, Brescia: Paideia, 1988.
- HOLZMEISTER, Urbanus: De Christi crucifixione quid e Deut 21,22s. et Gal 3,13 consequatur, *Bib.* 27 (1946) 18-29.
- JACKSON, Bernard S.: Biblical Laws of Slavery: A Comparative Approach. In: Leonie J. Archer (ed.): *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour*, London – New York: Routledge, 1988, 86-101.
- JOHNSON, Bo: **מִשְׁפָּא** *mišpāt*. In: *TDOT IX* (1998) 86-98.
- MAYES, Andrew David Hastings: *Deuteronomy* (NCeB), London: Oliphants, 1979.
- MILLER, Patrick D: *Deuteronomio* (Strumenti 42), Torino: Claudiana, 1990.

- MULDER, Martin Jan: תָּלָה/תָּלָה' *tālā/tāla'*. In: *TDOT XV* (2006) 667-671.
- NELSON, Richard D.: *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL), Louisville (KY); London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- PAGANINI, Simone: *Deuteronomio. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento*, Milano: Paoline, 2011.
- PAPOLA, Grazia: *Deuteronomio. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Cinisello Balsamo (MI): San Paolo, 2001.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De specialibus legibus III et IV*. Introduction, traduction et notes par André Mosès (Les Œuvres de Philon D'Alexandrie 25), Paris: Édition du Cerf, 1970.
- PUECH, Émile: Quelques exemples d'apports des manuscrits de Qumrân à l'étude du Judaïsme ancien, *RB* 119 (2012) 543-563.
- REARDON, Timothy W.: 'Hanging on a Tree': Deuteronomy 21.22-23 and the Rhetoric of Jesus' Crucifixion in Acts 5.12-42, *JSNT* 37 (2015) 407-431.
- ROSSO, Liliana: Deuteronomio 21,22. Contributo del Rotolo del Tempio alla valutazione di una variante medievale dei Settanta, *RQ* 9 (1977) 231-236.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: The Arrangement of the Laws in Deuteronomy, *EThL* 64 (1988) 265-287.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: *Deuteronomy. Issue and Interpretation*, London: T & T Clark, 2002.
- ROWLEY, Harold H.: 4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness, *JBL* 75 (1956) 188-193.
- SACCHI, Paolo: *Sacro/profano impuro/puro nella Bibbia e dintorni*, Brescia: Morcelliana, 2007.
- SCHNEIDER, Johannes: σταυρόω. In: *TDNT VII* (1971) 572-584.
- SOGGIN, Alberto G.: *Le livre de Josué*, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1970.
- TIGAY, Jeffrey H.: *Deuteronomy [Devarim]: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- DEL VALLE, Carlos Juan (ed.): *La Mishná*, Salamanca: Sígueme, 1997.
- VANHOOMISSEN, Guy: *Cominciando da Mosè. Dall'Egitto alla terra promessa*, Bologna: Dehoniane, 2004.
- DE VAUX, Roland: *Le istituzioni dell'Antico Testamento*, Genova: Marietti, 1998.
- WEINFELD, Moshe: *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- WEISER, Artur: *Geremia*, Vol. II, Brescia: Paideia, 1987.
- WENHAM, Gordon J.: *Genesis 16-50* (WBC 2), Dallas (TX): Word Books, 1994.
- WIEDER, Naphtali: Notes on the New Documents from the Fourth Cave of Qumran, *JJS* 7 (1956) 71-76.
- WILLSON, Mary A.: "Cursed is everyone who is Hanged on a Tree": Paul's citation of Deut 21:23 in Gal 3:13, *TJ* 36 (2015) 217-240.
- WILSON, Benjamin R.: "Upon a Tree" Again and Again: Redundancy and Deuteronomy 21:23 in Acts, *Neotest* 47 (2013) 47-67.
- WISDOM, Jeffrey R.: *Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law. Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8-10*, Tübingen: Mohr, 2001.
- WRIGHT, Christopher J. H.: *Deuteronomio*, Roma – Chieti: GBU, 2009.
- YADIN, Yigael: Peshet Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered, *IEJ* 21 (1971) 1-12.

Summary

The analysis of Deut 21:22-23 demonstrates that the Mosaic Law relating to the public exposition of the corpse of a condemned man does not refer to the torture of crucifixion, but texts found at Qumran highlight that it was adopted from the Hellenistic epoch (4QpNah 3-4 I, 7-8; 11QT^a 64,6-13). Reference to intertestamental literature is fundamental in reading and understanding the complex syntagma that constitute the *crux interpretum* of the whole concept of “the curse of God in the person hanged”. Being hanged on the wood of a tree shows everyone that the person killed was God’s curse because the crime committed had rendered him such. It separated him from God. He is a sign of God’s absolute estrangement from whatever connivance there may be with evil and this is why he had to be hanged. It is necessary to publicly denounce the sin that breaks the covenant with God.

Key words: curse, hanging on a tree, purity, transgression.

Zhrnutie

Analýza Dt 21,22-23 ukazuje, že Mojžišov zákon týkajúci sa vystavenia tela odsúdeného nehovorí o umučení ukrižovaním, ale že bol prevzatý z helenistického obdobia, ako prezrádzajú texty nájdené v Kumráne (4QpNah 3-4 I, 7-8; 11QT^a 64,6-13). Odkaz na intertestamentálnu literatúru je dôležitý pre čítanie a porozumenie komplexnosti syntagmy, ktorá je *crux interpretum* celého konceptu “prekliatia od Boha pre osobu odvisnutú [na dreve]”. Fakt, že nejaký človek bol zavesený na dreve stromu, dáva každému najavo, že tento mŕtvy bol priekliatym od Boha, nakoľko ho takým urobil čin, ktorého sa daný človek dopustil. Svojím konaním sa odlúčil od Boha a stal sa znamením úplného Božieho odcudzenia sa od všetkého, čo mlčky súhlasí so zlom. Preto musel byť taký človek zavesený na drevo. Bolo teda nevyhnutné, aby hriech, ktorým sa narušila zmluva s Bohom, bol verejne odsúdený.

Kľúčové slová: prekliatie, visieť na strome, čistota, prehrešok.

Angela Maria Lupo CP
Pontificia Università Urbaniana
Via Urbano VIII, 16
00165 ROMA, Italia
a.lupo@urbaniana.edu

Hearer's Response to Jesus' Aramaic in Mark

Jaroslav Mudroň

The fact that the Gospel of Mark was written in vernacular Greek, called *Koine*¹, facilitated its accessibility to the large population of the Hellenistic culture, i.e. one of the widest possible audience in that time. The Gospel could be practically read or heard from Marseilles to Alexandria Eschate (modern Tajikistan) and from Caucasus to Egypt. Nevertheless, the Gospel has its “local color”, planted in the geographical and cultural settings of the narrated story. The umbrella term “Semitism”, eventually “Aramaism” or “Hebraism”, serves in the Biblical studies to label words and expressions foreign for the Greek language and Hellenistic culture as such, since they imply from a special LXX and NT Greek tradition, whose roots are found in the Hebrew Bible. This paper will focus on the way how the Gospel of Mark copes with combining these two cultural worlds for his audience and in which manner the evangelist leads his readers/hearers to understand the clear lexical Semitisms in his work. As a special case, three full Aramaic quotations, found in Jesus' mouth in Mark, will reveal a dramatic technique that is very rare, but not unknown to the art of Greek-Roman performances.

1 Strange Words

The names like Ἰησοῦς, Ἡσαΐας, Ἰωάννης, Ἰορδάνης and Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας at the beginning of the Gospel must have seemed enough unusual for a mediocre Greek-speaking inhabitant of Syracuse in Sicily in the first century AD. Our Syracusan, most probably, would understand – from the narrative context and from their grammatical-syntactical functions – that the first three words are personal names and the last two are place-names. In such a way, the ancient Greek recipient, who was not familiar with the geography and culture of Galilee and Judea, had to reconstruct in his/her imagination the unknown places and to figure out the character with the foreign names.

¹ Cf. BLASS – DEBRUNNER – FUNK, *A Greek Grammar*, §2.

Generally, there was no need to translate the proper nouns. For a better understanding, an author sometimes puts an attribution (“place”, “river”, “city” etc.) behind the foreign proper name, as Mark does in 1:5: ...ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα... ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνη ποταμῷ...

Among the proper nouns of the Gospel of Mark there are, however, two exemptions, when the author directly translates the names: Βοανηργές (3:17) and Γολγοθᾶ (15:22)². The latter term is translated “Place of Skull” and it completes the picture of the execution of Jesus. The former “nickname” of James and John seems to have a special literary-audible effect. The author creatively plays with similar sounds of Greek βοαν (“to shout”) and Semitic *bney-* (sons of)³.

Apart from the personal names and geographical terms, Mark as an author uses also several words which are clearly Semitic in their origin. Many of them can be considered loanwords, i.e. the foreign words that became a part of the language and thus they are not viewed to be “strange” any more. Mark does not explain the words: σάββατον (1:26 etc.), σατανᾶς (1:13; 8:33), ῥαββί (9:5; 11:21; 14:45), ῥαββουνί (10:51) and ὠσαννά (11:9.10). His audience is probably presupposed to know the meaning of these expressions and to have some basic knowledge about the Jewish religion, to which the terms are related.

On the other hand, there are different Hebrew-Aramaic words by which the author gives a hint to let the reader/hearer understand: The one who is not familiar with the term πάσχα in 14:1 can easily deduce that it deals with a feast, because in the next verse the high priests are afraid to arrest Jesus “during the festival (ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ)” (v. 2). Similarly, the enigmatic expression γέεννα is accompanied with the attribution τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον in 9:43, which indicates that the Semitic word refers to a place of a fire of punishment. In the same way, Βεελζεβούλ in 3:22 has its parallel expression ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαίμονιων at the end of the verse for those who do not know the Hebrew expression.

One can suppose that the Hebrew-Aramaic term גמא was well known from the liturgical usage among the first Christians and therefore it is not translated in Mark. Nevertheless, in the same Gospel, the Greek transcription αμην always appears with the expression λέγω ὑμῖν (3:28; 8:12; 9:1.41; 10:15.29;

² Another proper name Βαρτιμαῖος (10:46) creates a special case, because it is preceded by an explanation of the patronymic name: ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου, which also can be considered as a kind of the name translation, however in an indirect way, which I call a “hint” for understanding the Semitism.

³ The reconstructed Aramaic name for “sons of thunder” should be בני רגם, in Greek transcription βνερεγεμ or βονερεγεμ. See BUTH, Mark, 29-33.

11:23; 12:43; 13:30; 14:9.18.25; once with λέγω σοι in 14:30). Thus, in case anybody of the audience does not understand the meaning of “amen”, the additional expression will provide its affirmative and performative nuance.

A mere juxtaposition is found also in Jesus' appellative, αββα ὁ πατήρ (14:36), in his Gethsemane prayer. The connection of these two words, the first Aramaic and the second Greek⁴, seems to be fixed in the tradition of the first Christians, since Paul uses the very same expression in Rom 8:15 and Gal 4:6. Once again, if somebody was not familiar with the Aramaic appellative αββα, the second word would introduce him/her in its meaning and its literal function of intimacy and filial prayer.

Another group of the “strange” words in Mark's Gospel is created by Semitic expressions, which evidently need to be translated. Here, it is not enough for the author to give only a hint, an attribution in juxtaposition or a parallel expression, but he clearly provides the translation introduced by the formula: ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον (5:41; 15:22.34) or with a simple ὃ ἐστὶν (3:17; 7:11.34).

We have already mentioned the translation of two proper names Βοανηργές and Γολγοθᾶ. In both cases (3:17; 15:22) the formula is used. The translation is similarly required for the technical word κορβᾶν (7:11), which in the ritual terminology stands for a sacrificial gift (ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον). The term κορβᾶν sounds in the mouth of Jesus, when he makes objection against the tradition of the elders in 7:1-23, and in the same chapter the formula ὃ ἐστὶν introduces translation of another Semitic expression – εφφαθα (v. 34). In contrast to the previous Hebrew-Aramaic words, this one represents a clause, an independent proposition and not just a technical or proper loanword. Jesus is quoted in a foreign language – foreign to the Greeks – and probably in his own language. The translation, hence, serves to make access for the Greek audience to enter this “strange” world and to understand Jesus beyond a language barrier. This is true also of Jesus' sayings in 5:41 (ταλιθα κουμ) and 15:24 (ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι). The Aramaic quotes are necessarily translated after the formula ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον in both cases.

In the multi-lingual ancient society of the Roman Empire it is hardly imaginable that Mark had presupposed that nobody of his audience would have

⁴ The nominative case with article can be used as vocative. See BLASS – DEBRUNNER – FUNK, *A Greek Grammar*, §147.

understood Aramaic⁵. Nevertheless, his Gospel as a whole was addressed to a Greek-speaking audience. For those who knew both languages, the Aramaic quotes must have been a moment of a vivid surprise in which they could switch from one language to another. For those, however, who understood only Greek, the strange sounding words could present a moment of confusion, because of a momentary incomprehension. But the immediate translation should give them a possibility to reenter once again into the scene and to overcome this confusion.

Having identified four groups of the “strange” non-Greek words, i.e. (1) the untranslated proper names and (2) some loanwords, (3) the terms with a hint and (4) the expression with a clear translation, we can draw up the conclusion, that Mark as an author had in his mind a Greek-speaking audience, to whom he was writing the Gospel⁶, and for whom some basic Jewish-Christian terminology and conceptions (Sabbath, rabbi etc.) were not totally strange. The implicit and explicit translation of Semitic technical words and of the Aramaic clauses helps the audience to become familiar with the “non-Greek” side of Jesus’ story.

In the following paragraphs, we will focus our attention on the last group of the foreign words – on Jesus’ Aramaic quotes. What is their narrative function? Why was the author convinced to put them in the story? These stories would be meaningful also without *ταλιθα κουμ* (as is Matt 9:25 and Luke 8:53), *εφφαθα* (no in Matt 9:32-34 or Luke 11:14) and *ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι* (Luke 23:46 and John 19:28-29 offer another Scripture quotations, only in Greek). What kind of response should Mark expect of the audience to Jesus’ Aramaic words, when he inserted them in the story? Is this literary technique attestable in the Greek-Latin literature of that time?

2 Effective Words

Three Jesus’ Aramaic quotes are presented in three different narrative contexts: raising from death, healing, and prayer of dereliction. The first story, in which Jesus’ order *ταλιθα κουμ* is recorded, at the first glance resembles to other healing stories – starting with a petition (5:23) and ending with Jesus’

⁵ Still in the 4th century AD Christians would manage to organize themselves in Greek-Aramaic or even Greek-Latin-Aramaic communication. Cf. BIVILLE, *The Graeco-Romans*, 84-85.

⁶ See the detailed analysis of the Mark’s social-linguistics settings in Greek-Roman culture in BEAVIS, *Mark’s Audience*, 13-44. For a discussion about the audience and purpose of the Mark’s Gospel, see COLLINS, *Mark*, 96-102.

command not to tell anybody what happened (v. 43). The great difference, however, is that the healing intervention is postponed. The narrator delays the arrival of Jesus to the dying girl by the insertion of another healing story on the way to Jairus' house (vv. 25-34). The pace of narration is slowed down even to the point of the death of Jairus' daughter and a report is delivered to the poor father with the question, "Why trouble the teacher any further?" (v. 35).

The situation is unique in the Gospel. Jesus has already proven himself to be able to heal various illnesses (1:30.31.42) and handicaps (2:11-12; 3,5). Recently, he has demonstrated his power over "the wind and sea" (4:41) and over "the legion" of unclean spirits (5:9). Even more, his power (*δύναμις*) has been described as a force that emanates from him also without his control, if somebody touches him with faith (v. 30). Now, the question arises whether Jesus' power could restore a dead person into the life. The report of the girl's death, surprisingly, does not urge Jesus to act in hurry. The pace of narration slows down even more and it seems that the narration time is almost equal to the narrative time – every minute detail of Jesus' action is noted down: his encouraging words to Jairus, choosing three disciples to accompany him, entering the house, seeing the people weeping, reproaching them and their reaction, putting them out, taking the child's parents and his three disciples with him, entering the room, touching the girl's hand (vv. 40-41a). After this step by step description, we can imagine the audience hanging on the Jesus' next step. Finally, he is about to utter something to the girl (*λέγει αὐτῇ*), but from his mouth an enigmatic sentence comes out, *Ταλιθα κουμ*, which instead of a resolution brings a new confusion. A translation is required. It comes indeed, but once again in a very slow pace – introduced by the long formula: *ὁ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον* and with an insertion, *σοὶ λέγω*, between the appellation *ταλιθα* and the order *κουμ* (v. 41).

In such a way, the narrator manages to keep the audience in the longest possible expectation of the solution of the story's complication. From the point of view of the narration time, the Aramaic sentence serves to postpone the final resolution. This may be, however, not the only narrative function of the foreign words. The slow pace of the storytelling emphasizes the importance of Jesus' power to restore life. Using the Aramaic expression, the author might intend to create a mysterious and impressive atmosphere for such a powerful act⁷.

⁷ Cf. SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium*, 288; COLLINS, *Mark*, 286.

Some commentators argue that the Aramaic language could have alluded to magic spells or ritual formulas of the Middle East⁸. This can be true only to some extent, since the language Jesus used was first of all a regular and common tongue of the Syrian province, in which Greek and Aramaic existed side by side for centuries⁹. Hence, it would not sound odd that Jesus turns to the little girl somewhere by the Galilean sea in their local language.

On the other hand, the sentence is uttered in a very powerful moment of high narrative tension and it makes an effect of the strong impression on the audience. The Aramaic order together with the performative expression σοὶ λέγω underline Jesus' supremacy over human life. The "strange" words almost materialize the power of the protagonist in the ears of the audience. The translation, nonetheless, immediately explains the simple order "get up" – simple in the common human speech, but the most powerful for a dead person, if it is put in practice.

In conclusion, the last delay of the resolution of the story and the impression of the powerful moment in Jesus' ministry are embodied in the Aramaic expression *ταλιθα κουμ* with its translation. These two narrative strategies (delay and power) seem to be decisive for the narration and they can be applied in a smaller scale also to the next healing story in which another Aramaic quote is used (7:31-37).

We find many stories of Jesus healing either by a mere word (2:10; 3:5; 7:29) or by touching (1:31; 5:27; 6:5.56) or by both touching and speaking (1:41; 5:41). Listening to the accounts in ch. 7, the audience encounters a new type of healing – a twofold manual procedure for healing of a deaf and tongue-tied man¹⁰. The first step of Jesus consists of putting his fingers into the man's ears, spitting and touching the man's tongue (7:23). The next series of actions describe Jesus looking up to heaven, sighing and saying, *Εφφαθα*, that is (ὁ ἔστιν), "Be opened" (v. 34). From the narrative time point of view, the complicated procedure delays the expected resolution of the narrative tension. Though some people in v. 32 asked Jesus to "lay his hand" on the man, Jesus does not resolve the problem by a simple hand-laying. He takes the disable person "aside from the multitude in private" (v. 33) and starts with the "procedure" that is concluded by the Aramaic imperative *eḫḫāṭāḥ* (*εφφαθά*)¹¹.

⁸ Cf. IERSEL, *Mark*, 209; COLLINS, *Mark*, 286.

⁹ TAYLOR, *Bilingualism*, 319.

¹⁰ IERSEL, *Mark*, 253-254.

¹¹ Cf. MORAG, 'Εφφαθά, 198-202.

The relatively short Aramaic expression, followed by the brief translation formula (ὁ ἔστιν), does not bring a long delay in itself, but it takes part in the sequence of actions that together delay the expected result. The actions can be considered to create a staircase construction and, in this case, the Aramaic imperative with its translation stand at the top of the structure. Once again, though in a smaller scale, the Aramaic expression conveys a powerful impression about Jesus' performance.

Furthermore, the twofold healing of the deaf man has a parallelism with the two-step healing of a blind man in 8:22-26. The two-step progression is, therefore, considered a typical strategy of repetition in Mark with a special effect on the hearers, who remain in suspense and the desire to know (see and hear) what is going to happen¹². The story of the blind man in ch. 8, however, does not contain a non-Greek quote and so the Aramaic language is not a unique way to communicate the powerful climax of the healing narrative. It is rather one of the narrative techniques. Mark does not repeat the same healing stereotyped structure but uses various modes for telling the stories and for keeping the attention of the audience. Should we then consider the word εφφαθα as a pure embellishment of the healing account?

The enigmatic foreign word must have caused an extraordinary echo in the ears of the hearers. Jesus stands alone with the man, but the man is not yet able to hear Jesus' command, "Be opened". From an apocalyptic point of view the order could be addressed to the heavens, which should open and send a divine blessing on the man¹³. In light of the performance criticism, however, εφφαθα and its translation is uttered in respect to the hearers of the Gospel. In contrast to Jesus' disciples (6:52; 7:18; 8:17-21) and his opponents (7:1-13; 8:11-13), the audience should have ears open and the tongue untied. Two main actions of any performance of the Gospel are included in the story: to speak plainly and to listen. There must be someone speaking – reading aloud or performing the text of the Gospel in front of or among the audience and his/her task is to "speak plainly", i.e. in an understandable way. Others in the assembly need to have a good hearing. For these obvious reasons, Jesus' "opening" command serves as a vivid moment, in which the speaker/reader is motivated to perform the Gospel more "plainly" and the audience is encouraged to pay more attention.

Moreover, the fact that Jesus is alone with the deaf man, when he utters the Aramaic expression, is not without significance. In the ταλιθα κουμ story,

¹² Cf. RHOADS – DEWEY – MICHIE, *Mark*, 49.

¹³ Cf. LINCICUM, *Εφφαθα*, 652-653.

Jesus was also in a private condition – in an inner room of the house, without the mourning crowd, but only with three chosen disciples and with the parents of the girl. Such privacy, apart from the gesture of taking the girl's hand and calling her *ταλιθα*, creates a certain atmosphere of intimacy. One finds a similar solitary-private intimacy in our second story in which Jesus takes nobody with him but the deaf man alone. To hear Jesus speaking in a Semitic language – supposedly his mother tongue – does intensify the intimacy of the moment and draws the hearer into a close personal relationship with the main protagonist of the Gospel.

The healing story of *εφφαθα* order and the raising story with *ταλιθα κουμ* command are more or less of a similar vein and both belong to Jesus' public ministry. Nevertheless, the next account in which the last Aramaic words of Jesus are recorded differs in the context and usage of the foreign quotation. Jesus finds himself on the cross and quotes the opening verse of the Psalm 22 in Aramaic, *ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι* (15:34)¹⁴. His words are a cry of dereliction and not a powerful, tension-resolving, healing command. It is the last of Jesus' utterance in the Passion narrative and in the Gospel as a whole and it is addressed to God as a prayer similar to the prayer in Gethsemane in which Jesus calls God *Αββα, ο πατήρ* (14:36).

Notwithstanding the evident differences with *ταλιθα κουμ* and *εφφαθα*, the identified narrative technique of the last delay and the literary effect of a powerful moment and intimacy seem still helpful for analyzing this Jesus Aramaic cry.

It is properly between the challenging derision of the bystanders (15:29-32) and the faithful confession of the centurion after Jesus' death (vv. 37-39), where the last dereliction cry of Jesus is placed (vv. 34-36). The cry is characterized as “a load cry” *φωνή μεγάλη* and the same expression (*φωνήν μεγάλην*) describes Jesus' last cry before his death. Did Jesus cry twice? Or was it only one load cry during which the bystanders thought that he was calling for Elijah and after which he passed away? Finally, did Jesus breathe his last “by” giving a loud cry (contemporary aspect of *ἀφείς*) or “after” having given the cry (antecedent aspect)? It is difficult to answer the questions, but in any case, the content of Jesus' cry, its translation and the reaction of bystanders certainly prolong the narration time between the “crying” and “breathing the last”. The procrastination of the description of Jesus' death makes possible to the audience

¹⁴ Cf. BUTH, *The Riddle*, 395-396.

to stay longer with the main character in this most crucial moment of his passion and to contemplate his prayer of relinquishment.

The effect of suspense and escalated tension are clearly expressed in the reaction of the bystanders, “Wait (ἄφετε), let us see (ἴδωμεν) whether Elijah will come to take him down” (15:36). Naturally, the hearer of the Gospel is waiting with the open eyes as well, listening to this passage. The action of giving a sponge with sour wine to Jesus to drink evidently served for putting off his death in order to see an eventual intervention of Elijah from the heavens.

Though the bystanders are Jesus' fellow countrymen, they do not understand his Aramaic cry. They think that Jesus was calling Elijah, misinterpreting the word ελωι with 'elīāh¹⁵. The only ones, however, who understand Jesus' cry correctly are the hearers of the Gospel – due to the narrator's translation. Accordingly, the audience knows more than the eye-witnesses at Golgotha and this fact creates irony that the hearer/reader becomes indeed the “only genuine witness to the crucifixion”¹⁶. The exclusive understanding leads to the relation of intimacy and hence the Aramaic quote with the translation once again creates a space for the deep affection between the recipient of the Gospel and the main character.

Summing up, although the cry ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι has not the same literal healing function like ταλιθα κουμ and εφφαθα, it does have a comparable narrative effect – to express a powerful moment of high suspense and close intimacy. What is more, the last Jesus' Aramaic quote anticipates the confession of the centurion and prepares the audience for such declaration of faith. The prayer of dereliction claims for a response in the hearts and minds of the listeners. The response should be modeled on the centurion's confession.

The careful listener of the Gospel may make a connection between the Aramaic expressions of Jesus. His/her ears have been open (εφφαθα) to hear and understand Jesus' words properly, in contrast to the disciples, opponents and bystanders at the cross. He/she is not terrified by Jesus cry of dereliction (ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι) or by his death, because he/she knows that Jesus has power to restore into life (ταλιθα κουμ) and that God is his father (Αββα). Likewise, his/her tongue is untied (εφφαθα) to confess the faith together with the centurion and to enter the mystery of the final scenes of the Gospel.

¹⁵ For the Aramaic name ܐܠܝܐ ('elīāh) see the Targum Jonathan (2 Kgs 17:1 etc.). The vowel ā was pronounced like open /o/ in the Galilean Aramaic (cf. ROSENTHAL, *A Grammar*, §10), which makes understandable the shift from /eloi/ to /elio/. *Contra* BUTH, *The Riddle*, 403.

¹⁶ FOWLER, *Let the Reader Understand*, 109.

3 Performable Words

To use a foreign expression in Greek transcription with its translation is a phenomenon that we hardly find in the Greek-Hellenistic literature. The classical Greek authors were generally not interested in “barbarian” languages at all¹⁷. For example, in the *Histories*, Herodotus mentioned only some foreign technical terms, difficult to translate¹⁸. Even when the Greek tragedians wanted to induce a scene which should represent an alien culture, they used to insert so-called “heterophonic” words, i.e. the strangely sounded utterances which should make an impression of a foreign language without any real sense¹⁹.

The situation naturally changed after the rising and spreading of the Hellenistic Culture and the common Greek language Koine in which the influence of other languages and dialects was inevitable²⁰. Nevertheless, the contact between the Hellenistic literal Greek and other languages still remained on the level of loanwords and *γλωσσαι* without mixing up the languages²¹. Even in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures (Septuagint), we do not find a whole Hebrew quotation in Greek alphabet and afterwards followed by a translation. Instead, the Greek transcription of Hebrew words was used exclusively for proper nouns, technical terms and unknown rare expressions²². Hence, notwithstanding the multi-lingual situation of the Hellenistic-Roman world, the distinction between the Greek and non-Greek languages was respected. For example, among hundreds of bilingual Greek-Aramaic inscriptions in Palmyra, there is only one Aramaic dedicatory graffito written in Greek letters, written probably by a bilingual person who knew the spoken Aramaic, but was trained only in the Greek writing²³. Otherwise, it is very uncommon to find a meaningful non-Greek expression transcribed in the Greek alphabet as we find in the Gospel of Mark.

Does it mean that Mark invented a new literary figure of introducing a non-Greek quote in Greek transcription and with the translation after the formula ὁ ἔστιν (μεθερμηνευόμενον) in the Hellenistic literature? The lack of

¹⁷ Cf. HARRISON, *Herodotus' Conception*, 40-43.

¹⁸ Cf. HARRISON, *Herodotus' Conception*, 7, 44-45.

¹⁹ Cf. HALL, *Inventing the Barbarian*, 117-121.

²⁰ Cf. SCHIRONI, *Lexical Translation*, 268.

²¹ Cf. SCHIRONI, *Lexical Translation*, 282-284.

²² TOV, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 504-512.

²³ Cf. TAYLOR, *Bilingualism*, 318.

evidence in the Classical and Hellenistic works might suggest a great originality of Mark in doing so. Nonetheless, a somewhat similar literal technique had been already used by a Roman playwright, translator and adapter of the Greek New Comedy, Plautus (c. 254 – 184 BC)²⁴. In his comedy named *Poenulus* (The Little Carthaginian), the author makes Hanno, a father of two raptured Carthaginian girls, utter several sentences in the Punic language with a translation or rather a pseudo-translation. The introductory prayer of Hanno, at the beginning of the fifth act, consists of ten Punic verses transcribed in Latin alphabet, preserved in two versions, and followed by a Latin, more or less accurate translation²⁵.

In the next, second scene of the fifth act, however, the “translation” of Hanno’s speech becomes a matter of amusement. The Carthaginian, who speaks Latin very well, left his homeland in order to find his daughters. When he met a certain Agorastocles and his slave Milphio and after having overheard their dialogue about two raptured girls from Carthage, Hanno decided to enter into the conversation, but to do it first in the Punic language. Miphio, the Agorastocles’ slave, was also born in Carthage and similarly captured for slavery in his infancy. Though he doesn’t understand Punic any more, the slave offers himself to be a translator between his master and Hanno. The ludicrousness of the scene insists in the fact, that Milphio translates Hanno’s saying extremely freely according to the sounds, using homophones in Latin. When Hanno addresses him, “Donni”, that is “my lord” (*'dny* in Punic), the slave claims that he wants to give a “donation” to his master (“doni uolt tibi dare”, *Poen.* 998)²⁶.

Indeed, Milphio knows just to say “hello” in Punic “avo” and he understands only the introductory sentence of Hanno’s speech. The slave is not even able to recognize a stereotyped phrase, “Mechar bocca” (*Poen.* 1002) (more exactly: MKR BK) that can be translated as “a ware for you” and was used by Punic sellers to offer their merchandise²⁷. However, Milphio translates this obvious phrase as Latin, “Miseram... buccam” (*Poen.* 1003) (“a miserable... mouth”), drawing a conclusion that the Carthaginian is looking for a dentist. Since Hanno sees the nonsense of Milphio’s translation, he plays on their ignorance and keeps uttering some other sentences in his mother tongue – to the point in which Miphio’s phantasy becomes exhausted and the slave has to admit

²⁴ Cf. KENNEDY, *Oxford Companion*, 468.

²⁵ Cf. SZNYCER, *Les passages*, 108-109.

²⁶ Cf. FALLER, *Punisches im Poenulus*, 191.

²⁷ Cf. FALLER, *Punisches im Poenulus*, 192.

his incomprehension. After this confession, Hanno starts to speak Latin and he slowly reveals his business.

Apart from the entertaining using of the foreign language, Punic sounds once more at the stage in an impressive scene of a meeting between another Carthaginian slave-boy with his missing mother. Giddenis was a nurse of Hanno's daughter and she was captured with them. Now, Agorastocles sends for her to confirm the identity of Hanno. When she did so, a slave from Hanno's escort recognizes her and fell into her embrace saying, "Auomma silli" (*Poen.* 1141) ("Hi, my mother")²⁸. The nurse then gives an emotional and eloquent response in Punic, which is interrupted by Agorastocles' curious question, "What are they saying?" Here, it is Hanno who translates the foreign expressions, however, not verbatim but rather in a descriptive way, "He is greeting his mother, and she her son" (*Poen.* 1144)²⁹. The whole scene and the use of the "strange" words in it are to have a moving effect on the audience and to prepare them for the final and even more emotional meeting of Hanno with his daughters.

Summing up, the entire quotations in a foreign language with a (pseudo)translation are used in the Latin play *Poenulus* for three basic reasons: to show a devotion of Hanno to the gods (his introductory prayer), to create amusing situations (Milphio's mistranslation), and finally to create an emotional atmosphere (lost Giddenis and his son) shortly before the climax and the denouement of the plot.

How can we make a connection between Mark's Gospel and Plautus' comedy? It would be highly hypothetical to assume that Mark himself saw the comedy *Poenulus* and that he became inspired by it to use a somehow similar rhetorical technique in his Gospel. On the other hand, the analyses of the play reveal that Plautus did not invent the technique, but he rather took it from a Greek New Comedy author, either from Menander or from Alexis³⁰. This fact means that from a certain time the use of foreign quotation in the Greek literature ceased to be a taboo. On the contrary, at least in a lower genre of literature – such as

²⁸ The distorted Latin text was reconstructed by Schröder as "Hau' amma silli". Cf. FALLER, *Punisches im Poenulus*, 195, n. 140.

²⁹ Cf. Nixon's English translation: PLAUTUS, *The Little Carthaginian*, 113.

³⁰ Cf. ARNOTT, *The Author*, 252-62. Furthermore, Rosól demonstrated that the two versions of the same Punic prayer of Hanno result from a two stage redaction of the play. In the first phase, Plautus simply transcribed a Greek transcription of the Punic prayer into Latin alphabet, while the second version of the prayer comes from the pen of a later redactor who knew Punic and wanted to provide a more accurate text. Cf. ROSÓL, *Lingua Punica*, 55-68.

a comedy and probably also in other popular genres – it became a literary technique appreciated by the audience which naturally lived the intracultural and intralinguistic reality.

The literal style of Mark's Gospel obviously differs from that of the Greek-Latin authors of comedy. However, what Plautus and Mark have in common, is a clearly pronounceable transcription of the foreign sayings for a practical reason, having in view their audience. The transcriptions of both authors are not transcriptions of a Semitic text, but of living Semitic speech. Modern scholars are able to reconstruct the original Punic text behind Hanno's prayer in its form of an inscription³¹. But for Plautus it was not important to render an accurate transcription of the Punic consonantal inscription (e.g. 'T 'LNM W'LNTH). His actor playing Hanno had to be able to read it also without knowing the language and so Plautus rather wrote: *yth alonim ualonuth*, i.e. how it sounds in the ears of Latin listeners with the vowels. The scope of the transcription was to be read aloud and to be performable in front of an audience.

Similarly, in the Gospel of Mark, we find a fully phonetic transcription of εφφαθα and ταλιθα κουμ, which can be pronounced also by a reader who does not speak the Aramaic language. In the light of Plautus' work, the Markan Aramaic expressions do not bring about a visual effect, but rather an audible one. The words ταλιθα κουμ, εφφαθα, and ελωι ελωι are written in way to be pronounced, read aloud or even performed in front of an audience.

The audience of Plautus' play hears Hanno speaking in Punic and has an impression to encounter a real Carthaginian, who is searching for his lost daughters. The hearers of the Gospel of Mark listen to Jesus uttering three sentences in Aramaic and they can have a similar impression of authenticity of three crucial moments of Jesus' life: the raising from the dead, opening the ears and tongue and crying to God from the cross.

Judging from the very rare usage of the foreign dicta in the Greek-Roman literature, it is not impossible that Mark adopted the technique of non-Greek quotations from the antique theatrical world. The "strange" and "effective" words of Jesus are first of all "pronounceable". The reader can read them aloud – either for him-/herself or for the Greek audience. If the reader has an acting ability, he/she can even perform Jesus' speech with an appropriate gesture and

³¹ Cf. SZNYCER, *Les passages*, 108.

tone of voice, since the narrator informs about the significance of the Aramaic expressions. The words are “performable” and “authentic” for the audience³².

Conclusion

The performative quality of Jesus’ Aramaic quotes permits us to make a conclusion, shifting the accent from the reader to the hearer. The audience listens to the “strange” expressions uttered by Jesus and this experience draws them closely into the scene. Staying in a tensional suspense, they may conceive the powerful and authentic moment of the divine authority of Jesus and intimacy with him. Their attention rises with Jairus’ daughter, their perception and understanding open with ears and tongue of the healed man and their prayer of distress goes up to God together with Jesus’ last cry. The Aramaic of Jesus’ speech intensifies the hearers’ experience of the words of the Mark’s Gospel and helps them to take part more vividly and personally in the story. From among the NT writers, Mark remains an author who is exceptionally capable of enriching his simple storytelling line with a quality of an audible and performable plasticity in which the “strange” Semitic words in Jesus’ mouth became familiar and most effective for the audience.

Bibliography

- ARNOTT, William G.: The Author of the Greek Original of the Poenulus, *RMP* 102/3 (1959) 252-62.
- BEAVIS, Marry A.: *Mark’s Audience. The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11-12* (JSNTSup 33), London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- BIVILLE, Frédérique: The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin. A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism. In: James N. Adams – Mark Janse – Simon Swain (eds.): *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 77-102.
- BLASS, Friedrich – DEBRUNNER, Albert – FUNK, Robert W.: *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- BUTH, Randall: Mark 3:17 BONEPETEM and Popular Etymology, *JSNT* 10 (1981) 29-33.
- BUTH, Randall: The Riddle of Jesus’ Cry from the Cross. The Meaning of ηλι ηλι λαμα σαβαχθανι (Matthew 27:46) and the Literary Function of ελωι ελωι λειμα σαβαχθανι

³² “Authentic” in the sense of an “authentic experience” of the audience and their “impression of authenticity” as it has been explained above, without entering the inscrutable problematic of *ipsissima verba*.

- (Mark 15:34). In: Randall Buth – Steven R. Notley (eds.): *The Language Environment of First Century Judea*. Vol. II (JCPS 26), Leiden: Brill, 2014, 395-421.
- COLLINS, Adela Y.: *Mark. A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007.
- FALLER, Stefan: Punisches im Poenulus. In: Thomas Baier (ed.): *Studien zu Plautus' Poenulus*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2004, 163-202.
- FOWLER, Robert M.: *Let the Reader Understand. Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- HALL, Edith: *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (OCM), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- HARRISON, Thomas: Herodotus' Conception of Foreign Languages, *Histos* 2 (1998) 1-45. [Accessed 04-05-2018]. Available on: <https://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/1998.01HarrisonHerodotusConceptionForeignLanguages145.pdf>.
- IERSEL, Bas van M.: *Mark. A Reader-Response Commentary* (JSNTSup 164), Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- KENNEDY, Dennis (ed.): *The Oxford Companion to Theatre and Performance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- LINCICUM, David: Ἐφφαθά (Mark 7,34). An Apocalyptic Trope, *ETL* 91/4 (2015) 649-653.
- MORAG, Shomo: Ἐφφαθά (Mark vii. 34). Certainly, Hebrew, Not Aramaic?, *JSS* 17/2 (1972) 198-202.
- PLAUTUS, Titus Maccius: *The Little Carthaginian. Pseudolus. The Rope*. Edited and translated by Paul Nixon (LCL 260), Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press, William Heinemann, 1980.
- RHOADS, David M. – DEWEY, Joanna – MICHIE, Donald: *Mark as Story. An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2012.
- ROSENTHAL, Franz: *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (PLO 5), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- ROSÓL, Rafał: Lingua Punica – lingua comica. Głos w sprawie języka punickiego w Punijczyku Plauta, *SPhP* 20/1 (2010) 55-68.
- SCHIRONI, Francesca: Lexical Translation in the Papyri. Koine Greek, Greek Dialects, and Foreign Languages. In: Trevor V. Evans – Dirk D. Obbink (eds.): *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- SCHMITHALS, Walter: *Das Evangelium nach Markus. Kapitel 1–9,1*. Vol. I (ÖTBK 2), Würzburg: Echter, 1979.
- SZNYCER, Maurice: *Les passages puniques en transcription latine dans le Poenulus de Plaute* (EeC 65), Paris: Klincksieck, 1967.
- TAYLOR, David G. K.: Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia. In: James N. Adams – Mark Janse – Simon Swain (eds.): *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 298-331.
- TOV, Emanuel: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1999.

Summary

The shortest Gospel is known for its performable quality that makes it suitable to read cover-to-cover in front of an audience with a dramatic tone of voice. The performative nature of the work sheds light on some lexical Semitisms used in the Gospel as well. In many cases, Mark either gives a hint to the reader for understanding Hebrew-Aramaic terms or he translates them directly. Three of Jesus' Aramaic quotations, *ταλιθα κουμ*, *εφαθα*, and *λεμα σαβαχθανι*, play a special role among the Semitisms and their usage can be interpreted in terms of reader-response method, or rather, in this case, hearer-response method: By using a foreign language and translating it afterwards, the author intends to bring out an effect and a response in the hearers' acceptance of the story. A similar literary-rhetorical technique is found in Plautus's play *Poenulus* in which a foreign language with a (pseudo)translation is used in certain moments of drama, amusement, and excitement. In both works the mother tongue of the protagonist creates an impression of authenticity in order to create a more sympathetic and intimate relationship of the hearer to the main character of the story.

Key words: NT Aramaic, Mark, reader-response, Plautus, *Poenulus*.

Zhrnutie

Evanjelium podľa Marka vyniká spomedzi iných kníh NZ ako text vhodný na umelecký prednes pred publikom a v jeho celosti. Vo svetle tejto jeho dramatickej kvality možno lepšie porozumieť tomu, prečo a ako Marek využíva semitské slová v tomto gréckom diele. Evanjelista častokrát uvádza hebrejské či aramejské výrazy spolu s istou náповeďou pre poslucháča, respektíve cudzí výraz vzápätí prekladá. Tri Ježišove aramejské výroky, „Talitha kum“, „Effeta“ a „Heloi, heloi, lema sabakthani“, hrajú dôležitú rolu uprostred iných semitizmov a ich dôležitosť možno špecifikovať na základe metódy odozvy u čitateľa, v našom prípade odozvy u poslucháča: Autor využíva cudzí jazyk a následný preklad s cieľom vyvolať u poslucháča istú odozvu. Podobnú literárnu a rétorickú techniku nájdeme v Plautovej hre *Kartáginiec*, v ktorej sú cudzia reč a jej (pseudo-)preklad použité v niektorých dramatických, zábavných a dojímavých okamihoch. V oboch dielach slúži materinská reč hlavnej postavy na vyvolanie zážitku autentického stretnutia sa s hrdinom, ku ktorému si príjemca vytvára vzťah sympatie a dôvery.

Kľúčové slová: aramejčina NZ, Marek, odozva u čitateľa, Plautus, *Kartáginiec*.

Jaroslav Mudroň SJ
Pontifical Biblical Institute
3, Paul Emile Botta St. - Box 497
91004 JERUSALEM, Israel
jaroslav.mudron@gmail.com

Grécke nadpisy žalmov

Problém lingvistickej interpretácie izolovaných prvkov

Helena Panczová

Grécke nadpisy žalmov predstavujú značný interpretačný, a teda aj prekladateľský problém. V tejto štúdií sa budeme venovať iba jednej časti tejto komplexnej problematiky – izolovaným gramatickým prvkom, ktoré je ťažké interpretovať práve z dôvodu absencie vetného kontextu. Budeme sa usilovať nájsť vhodné riešenie pre typ prekladu, ktorý je v sérii slovenských komentárov k Biblii.

1 Náčrt problému

1.1 Prekladateľský prístup k LXX

Keď ideme prekladať Septuagintu, musíme si najprv ujasniť ktorú. Septuaginta má totiž veľa tvári a náš prístup závisí od toho, ktorá jej podoba nás zaujíma a ktorú chceme prezentovať našim čitateľom. Zaujímavosťou o hebrejskú Bibliu sa zaujímajú najmä o „prenatálnu“ Septuagintu, čiže o rekonštrukciu procesu od hebrejskej pôvodiny po text LXX. Kresťanská tradícia zase pracuje so Septuagintou, ktorá je už „plnoletá“, teda ktorá sa odpútala od hebrejského textu, ba občas aj od židovskej tradície¹. Ak ale chceme skúmať LXX ako dokument helenistického judaizmu, musíme sa pokúsiť o rekonštrukciu najranejšieho obdobia jej samostatnej existencie, práve keď vyšla z rúk prekladateľa a začala pôsobiť medzi židovskými čitateľmi, ktorí už neovládali hebrejštinu.

Prvý prístup sa uplatnil v anglickom preklade *New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)*, ktorý predstavuje anglickú verziu Septuaginty ako

¹ V jednom z našich predchádzajúcich článkov sme tieto dva prístupy k LXX označili ako „výsledok“ a „východisko“. Porov. PANCZOVÁ, *Technika prekladu* (3), 197-204. Marguerite Harl to vyjadruje ako možnosť ísť „hore prúdom“ alebo „dolu prúdom“. Porov. HARL, *Traduire la Septante en Française*, 33-42.

závislú paralelu prekladu z hebrejčiny *New Revised Standard Version*². Na druhej strane francúzsky projekt *Bible d'Alexandrie* je zameraný na recepciu³, a to aj kresťanskú. Pozíciu uprostred deklaruje Muraokov slovník⁴. To je aj prístup, ktorý je najvhodnejší pre slovenský komentárový preklad. Tam sa preklad LXX nachádza bok po boku s prekladom hebrejského textu a zároveň je východiskom pre patristické komentáre. Rekonštrukcia *helenistického* významu gréckeho textu *bez prihliadania* k hebrejskému pozadiu je zlatou strednou cestou. V textových poznámkach sa potom dajú riešiť otázky prekladateľskej techniky, ktorú použil grécky autor, a následne textová kritika. Takisto je tu priestor na vysvetlenie významových posunov, ktoré nastali medzi týmito obdobiami a dobou cirkevných otcov, prípadne ďalšia modifikácia významu v latinskom preklade.

Usilujeme sa teda o rekonštrukciu helenistického významu. No vyvarovať sa vnášaniu neskorších významov nie je vždy až také jednoduché. Tento problém riešili už nemeckí prekladatelia LXX a dospeli k názoru, že čisté riešenie nie je možné⁵. Niekedy totiž naozaj nevieme, čo daný výraz pre prekladateľa a jeho prvých čitateľov znamenal, a sme odkázaní na patristické vysvetlenia.

1.2 Grécke nadpisy žalmov

Grécke nadpisy žalmov predstavujú veľmi spleť komplex problémov. Je škoda, že v prvom zväzku slovenského komentára k Žalmom sa tejto otázke nikto teoreticky nevenoval⁶, čo v praxi, samozrejme, negatívne ovplyvnilo kvalitu prekladu⁷.

Grécke nadpisy žalmov sa v mnohých ohľadoch odlišujú od svojich hebrejských náprotivkov. Majú tri hlavné osobitosti: (1) Občas obsahujú prvky,

² Porov. PIETERSMA – WRIGHT, *To the Reader of NETS*, XV.

³ Porov. La Bible d'Alexandrie, 10.

⁴ MURAOKA, *Lexicon*, VIII.

⁵ KARRER, *Septuaginta Deutch (LXX.D)*, 105-118.

⁶ Údaje o tvorcoch komentára, ktoré sa nachádzajú v úvode, „Peter Dubovský – komentáre k nadpisom žalmov“ (HROBŇ, *Žalmy 51–75*, 19), sú trocha zavádzajúce. Vo zväzku sa totiž diskutujú výlučne hebrejské nadpisy žalmov.

⁷ Celkovú kritickú analýzu prekladu porov. PANCZOVÁ, *Technika prekladu* (4), 208-249.

ktoré v MT absentujú. Podľa znalcov prekladateľskej techniky niektoré z nich nepochádzajú ani od gréckeho prekladateľa⁸.

(2) Hebrejským hudobným termínom grécky prekladateľ pravdepodobne nerozumel – napokon my na tom nie sme oveľa lepšie – a interpretoval ich na základe etymológie (nie vždy správnej), napr.

מַשְׁכִּיל *maskíl* (typ poetickej skladby) = tvary slova σύνεσις *porozumenie, chápanie*⁹.

Niekedy týmto termínom aj rozumel, ale interpretoval ich gréckym výrazom, ktorého sémantické pole sa s hebrejským prekrývalo iba čiastočne, napr.

בְּנֵינָת *na strunových nástrojoch* = ἐν ὕμνοις *medzi hymnami* (iba v 4,1 ἐν ψαλμοῖς);

מִזְמוֹר *mizmór* = ψαλμός *žalm*¹⁰.

(3) Tretia skupina problémov sa týka tých nadpisov, ktoré tvoria izolované vyjadrenia mimo vetného a textového kontextu. Lexikálnej stránke týchto výrazov rozumieme, ale sémantika zvolenej gramatickej formy je pre nás občas záhadou. Máme tu osamotené slová v rôznych pádoch (nominatív, genitív, datív) a osamotené predložkové spojenia. Chýba nám vetný kontext, takže je veľmi ťažko určiť význam týchto gramatických foriem.

V nasledujúcej časti sa budeme venovať týmto izolovaným vyjadreniam. Rozčleníme ich podľa ich gramatickej formy a pokúsime sa definovať ich výklad na základe toho minimálneho kontextu, ktorý máme k dispozícii. Ide totiž o *nadpisy* žalmov.

⁸ Grécke nadpisy, v ktorých sa vyskytuje spojka ὅτε (Žalmy 92, 95, 96, čiastočne aj 46 a 143), vždy absentujú v MT a pravdepodobne nepochádzajú ani od gréckeho prekladateľa žalmov. Ako ekvivalent hebr. אֲשֶׁר s viazaným infinitívom grécky prekladateľ žalmov totiž používal buď spojku ὅποτε s časovou vetou, alebo predložku ἐν s infinitívom s členom. (PIETERSMA, David in the Greek Psalms, 18.)

⁹ Grécky prekladateľ toto slovo odvodzoval od שָׁכַל *chápat', rozumieť, byť rozumný*. (KARRER – KRAUS, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 132.)

¹⁰ Pri tomto výraze by bolo dobré explicitne poukázať na významový posun. V slovenčine (aj v iných moderných jazykoch) síce výraz *žalm* prebral význam svojho starovekého hebrejského náprotivku – teda označuje typ poetickej skladby –, ale staroveký výraz ψαλμός tento význam nemal. Označoval výlučne hru na strunovom nástroji. Tento význam mal aj v dobe prekladu LXX (porov. Am 5,23), aj u cirkevných otcov. Porov. PIETERSMA, *Septuagintal Exegesis*, 214-215.

1.3 Dedičstvo našich predchodcov

Ďalšiu komplikáciu situácie na Slovensku predstavuje už spomenutý prvý zväzok komentárov k Žalmom, či presnejšie preklad žalmov podľa LXX, ktorý sa v ňom nachádza a tvorí istý precedens. Pri našej analýze gréckych nadpisov sa budeme venovať aj prekladovým ekvivalentom, ktoré sa nachádzajú v tomto zväzku. (Ďalej o nich budeme hovoriť ako o sekcii Žalmov 50–74¹¹.) Pri tvorbe prekladu Žalmov 75–99 podľa LXX sme takmer vo všetkých prípadoch volili iné riešenia. Nasledujúce strany sú – okrem iného – aj vysvetlením nášho postoja.

2 Analýza izolovaných prvkov nadpisov

2.1 Izolovaný nominatív a nominatív s genitívom

Izolovaný nominatív je najmenej problematický. Ako pád podmetu a menného prísudku nám podáva stručnú definíciu takto nadpísaného hudobného či literárneho diela: *To, čo nasleduje, je ψαλμός žalm, ᾠδή pieseň, μαρτύριον svedectvo, προσευχή modlitba...*

Kombinácia ᾠδή ψαλμοῦ *žalмовá pieseň* (Ž 65, 82, 87, 107) – rovnako ako variant ψαλμός ᾠδῆς *piesňový žalm* (Ž 29, 47, 66, 86, 91) – je prekladom dvoch hebrejských výrazov *שִׁיר מְזֻמָּר*, ktoré sú v MT v juxtapozícii (syntakticky nezávislé). Nevokalizovaný text mohol prekladateľ interpretovať ako viazaný stav. Grécke spojenie teda označuje spev za sprievodu strunového nástroja¹².

Výraz αἶνος ᾠδῆς *piesňová chvála* (90, 92, 94) nemá paralelu v MT. V gréčtine ide o značne tautologické vyjadrenie: αἶνος je *chválospev* a ᾠδή *pieseň* (väčšinou *oslavná*). Je možné, že v hebrejskej predlohe boli dve juxtaponované substantíva a prekladateľ postupoval rovnakým spôsobom ako pri ψαλμός ᾠδῆς a ᾠδή ψαλμοῦ¹³.

Preklad nominatívu s adnominálnym genitívom je teda bezproblémový, aspoň pokiaľ ide o gramatický význam.

¹¹ Žalmy číslujeme podľa Septuaginty.

¹² Nie je to idiomatické grécke vyjadrenie – gréčtina má na to výraz ψαλμοῦδία –, no prekladateľ sa evidentne snažil o izomorfizmus – chcel zachytiť dve lexikálne jednotky originálu dvoma lexikálnymi jednotkami prijímateľského jazyka. PIETERSMA, Septuagintal Exegesis, 217-218.

¹³ PIETERSMA, Septuagintal Exegesis, 219.

2.2 Genitív

V zložitejšej situácii sa nachádzame, keď máme interpretovať samostatne stojaci genitív. V sekcii Žalmov 50–74 máme tri prípady, ktoré prekladatelia riešili nasledovným spôsobom:

συνέσεως z *porozumenia* (Ž 51, 52, 53, 54),
 ἀναστάσεως na *zmŕtvychvstanie* (Ž 65),
 υἱῶν Ἰωνάδαβ καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωτισθέντων *synov Jonadába a prvých, ktorí boli odvlčení do zajatia* (Ž 70).

Nie je jasné, prečo autori tohto prekladu interpretovali gramaticky identické výrazy takým rozmanitým spôsobom. Ba ani v poznámkach nenachádzame vysvetlenie.

Prekladateľ sa však musí aspoň pokúsiť o interpretáciu. Najviac materiálu na úvahu nám poskytuje genitív συνέσεως, preto začneme od neho. Ako sme už uviedli, hebrejský výraz מַשְׁכִּיל *maskil* sa v gréckych žalmoch interpretuje tvarmi slova σύνεσις, konkrétne genitívom συνέσεως (10-krát z 13 výskytov) a predložkovým spojením εἰς σύνεσιν (3-krát: Ž 41, 43, 44).

Grécka tradícia vykladala genitív ako vyjadrenie pôvodu: z *porozumenia*. Autor žalmu ho vraj zostavil na základe porozumenia božským veciam, ktoré mu bolo dané. Na druhej strane predložkové vyjadrenie εἰς σύνεσιν chápala účelovo na *porozumenie, aby sme (my čitatelia) porozumeli*. Tento variant sa vyskytuje iba v spojení s Koreho synmi a mohol budovať na udalostiach Nm 16, ktoré sa ich týkali a z ktorých sa dá získať porozumenie¹⁴... Toto sú však výklady recepcie, nie kompozície LXX. My by sme sa mali usilovať zistiť význam, ktorý týmto výrazom dával grécky prekladateľ.

Čo chcel autor povedať izolovaným genitívom v nadpise, to presne nevieme. (Predložkovému spojeniu sa budeme venovať nižšie.) No mohli by sme sa pokúsiť o interpretáciu na základe toho minimálneho vecného kontextu, ktorý tu máme. Ide o nadpis. V nadpise sú často explicitne vyjadrené substantíva ako ψαλμός, alebo si ich môžeme bez násilia na texte domyslieť. V takejto situácii by sa z izolovaného genitívu stal genitív adnominálny a interpretácia je hneď ľahšia. Vo vyjadrení tohto typu by najskôr šlo o objektový genitív: *žalm o niečom*. Teda (ψαλμός) συνέσεως by bol *žalm o porozumení*. To isté by sme mohli urobiť aj v prípade ostatných izolovaných genitívov.

¹⁴ PIETERSMA, Exegesis in the Septuagint, 236-238.

2.3 Datív

V nadpisoch sa často vyskytuje samostatne stojaci datív osoby (τῷ Δαυιδ, τῷ Ασαφ a pod.). Prekladatelia sekcie Žalmov 50–74 zvolili doslovný preklad slovenským datívom *Dávidovi, Asáfovi* [dĺžka sic]. Hoci o význame gréckeho datívu sa dá diskutovať, je nepochybné, že jeho preklad slovenským datívom v tomto kontexte je nevhodný. Slovenský datív v nadpise totiž vyjadruje dedikáciu – *mamičke z lásky, vlasti a múzam, Jemu Jedinému...* A vieme, že o dedikáciu v pôvodine isto nejde.

Grécky datív v nadpisoch sa dá vykladať v zmysle autorstva (*pripisovaný Dávidovi, Asáfovi*). Preto sa v textovej tradícii LXX v prípade Dávida vyskytuje aj sekundárna variácia s genitívom (τοῦ Δαυιδ), ktorou sa jednoznačnejšie vyjadruje autorstvo: *Dávidov žalm* a pod. Genitív preferujú aj Aquila, Symmachus a Theodotión. No datív je v LXX pôvodný a grécki autori trvali na zachovaní toho významu, ktorý je vlastný datívu¹⁵ – vyjadrenie nepriamej angažovanosti na deji: *týka sa Dávida, Asafa* a pod. Najmä v prípade najznámejšej osobnosti, Dávida, sú možné viaceré interpretácie v súvislosti s rôznymi okolnosťami jeho života¹⁶.

Preto na rozdiel od sekcie Žalmov 50–74 v našom preklade 75–99 používame tento preklad:

τῷ Δαυιδ (*týka sa*) *Dávida*,
 τῷ Ασαφ (*týka sa*) *Asafa*,
 τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορε (*týka sa*) *synov Koreho*,
 Αιμαν τῷ Ισραηλίτη (*týka sa*) *Aimana Izraelitu* (Ž 87),
 Αιθαν τῷ Ισραηλίτη (*týka sa*) *Aithana Izraelitu* (Ž 88).

¹⁵ Porov. vyjadrenie Didyma Slepého (Tura papyrus, Komentár k žalmom 24,1): ἄλλο... ἐστὶν τοῦ δαυιδ... καὶ ἄλλο τῷ δαυιδ. τοῦ δαυιδ λέγεται, ὅτ(α)ν ἢ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν [i.e. τὸν ψαλμὸν] πεποιηκὼς ἢ ψάλλον. αὐτῷ δὲ λέγεται, ὅταν εἰς αὐτὸν φέρεται. (PIETERSMA, David in the Greek Psalms, 15.)

¹⁶ V prípade Dávida môže vzniknúť zdanlivý problém: Ako sa nejaký žalm môže týkať Dávida, keď zjavne pochádza z neskoršieho obdobia? Exegéti tu však vedia nájsť súvislosť. Napr. Žalm 95 v gréckej podobe má nadpis: ὅτε ὁ οἶκος ὠκοδομεῖτο μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν· ὡδὴ τῷ Δαυιδ *Ked' sa staval chrám po (návrate zo) zajatia. Pieseň. (Týka sa) Dávida*. Súvislosť Dávida s týmto žalmom sa objavuje už v 1Krn 16,8-36, kde ide o jeho prenesenie archy. Grécky žalm v tejto udalosti ďalej vidí predprípravu pre vybudovanie poexilového chrámu. Podobne nadpis Žalmu 96: τῷ Δαυιδ ὅτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται (*Týka sa*) *Dávida. Ked' sa jeho krajina obnovuje*. LXX vzťahuje tento žalm na udalosti v 2Sam 5,1-6 (Dávidova korunovácia). (PIETERSMA, Exegesis and Liturgy, 174-176, 180-181.)

2.4 Predložka *ὕπερ* s genitívom

Pokiaľ ide o preklad nadpisových prvkov obsahujúcich predložku *ὕπερ* s genitívom, prekladatelia sekcie Žalmov 50–74 nám aj tu zanechali zmätené dedičstvo:

- ὕπερ μαελεθ na maelet* (Ž 52),
ὕπερ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ... μεμακρυσμένου pre ľud, ktorý je vzdialený... (Ž 55),
ὕπερ Ἰδιθουν nad Jedutínom (Ž 61) [transkripcia *mena sic*],
ὕπερ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων tým (veciam), ktoré sú rozdielne (Ž 68).

Predložka *ὕπερ* v biblickej gréčtine býva prekladom hebrejskej predložky/častice *לְעַד* – obe majú základný význam *nad*. V nadpisoch žalmov hebrejská predložka môže znamenať aj *podľa, na spôsob* a takéto predložkové spojenie pravdepodobne vyjadruje inštrukciu o spôsobe prednesu žalmu¹⁷. To bola asi filozofia za slovenským prekladovým variantom *na maelet*. Grécka predložka *ὕπερ* však uvedený význam nemá¹⁸. V kontexte nadpisov vyjadruje tému – *o čom, ohľadom čoho*. Tento význam treba v preklade gréckeho textu zachovať aj v prípadoch, keď hebrejský variant (pravdepodobne) hovorí o spôsobe prednesu. Grécki čitatelia dostávali informáciu o téme¹⁹:

- ὕπερ Ἰδιθουν ohľadom Idithúna* (Ž 76),
ὕπερ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου ohľadom Asýrčana (Ž 79),
ὕπερ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων ohľadom tých, ktorí budú zmenení (Ž 79),
*ὕπερ τῶν ληνῶν ohľadom vínnych kadi*²⁰ (Ž 80, 83),
*ὕπερ μαελεθ ohľadom maeleth*²¹ (Ž 87).

¹⁷ HROBŇ, *Žalmy 51–75*, 129 a 313.

¹⁸ O nesprávnej metodike práce s LXX, ktorá by gréckym slovám chcela dávať hebrejské významy, porov. PANCZOVÁ, *Technika prekladu* (4), 242-243.

¹⁹ Táto nezhoda medzi prekladom gréckeho a hebrejského textu zároveň poukazuje na hypotetickosť uvedeného výkladu hebrejskej predložky.

²⁰ Grécky prekladateľ odvodzuje výraz *תִּתְּנֵה לְעַד* *na gittit* od *לַ* *vínnu kad'a*, resp. *lis*, a prekladá izomorficky. Takýto nadpis mal značný metaforický potenciál, ktorý neskôr využila patristická exegéza. Grécky prekladateľ tu však nerobil interpretáciu, ale iba reprezentáciu. (PIETERSMA, *Septuagintal Exegesis*, 220-221.)

²¹ V spojení *ὕπερ μαελεθ τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι* grécky prekladateľ interpretoval hebrejské *תַּעֲנֵה לְעַד מַחֲלַל־לֵאנֹת* (v našom preklade hebrejského textu *na Machalat-leannót*) tak, že prvé substantívum transkriboval a druhé *תַּעֲנֵה* odvodil od slovesa *עָנָה* *odpovedať* ako infinitív

Pokiaľ ide o určenie významu predložky ὑπέρ v nadpisoch, sme na tom relatívne dobre. To môžeme využiť ako pomôcku v spornejších prípadoch. V gréckych nadpisoch žalmov totiž občas nachádzame identické substantívne prvky použité v rôznych konštrukciách. Otázka je, či ich na základe identity substantíva máme pokladať za synonymné, alebo treba trvať na odlišnom význame na základe odlišnej gramatickej konštrukcie. Správnu odpoveď nepoznáme. Pri našom súčasnom slabom stave znalosti filozofie prekladu gréckych nadpisov žalmov je však prvá cesta rozumnejšia – našu hypotézu môžeme budovať aspoň na význame substantív...

Takto hypoteticky teda môžeme postaviť vedľa seba výrazy:

ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου *ohľadom Asýrčana* (Ž 79) a
πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον *o Asýrčanovi* (Ž 75)²².

Ďalšia dvojica je

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων²³ *ohľadom tých, ktorí budú zmenení* (Ž 44, 68²⁴, 79) a

τοῖς ἀλλοιωθησομένοις (týka sa) tých, ktorí sa zmenia/budú zmenení (Ž 59²⁵).

Ak správne predpokladáme, že tieto dve dvojice výrazov majú synonymný význam, zachovali sme ho aj v slovenčine – a zároveň sme zachovali aj formálnu rozdielnosť použitím synonymných prekladových ekvivalentov: *ohľadom niekoho, o niekom, týka sa niekoho*.

2.5 Predložka εἰς s akuzatívom

V prípade prekladu nadpisových prvkov obsahujúcich predložku εἰς s akuzatívom nám prekladatelia sekcie Žalmov 50–74 takisto zanechali zmätené

s predložkou ἵ vyjadrujúcou účel. (PIETERSMA, Septuagintal Exegesis, 213, 216.) O význame *maeleth* porov. HROBŇ, *Žalmy 51–75*, 128-129.

²² LXX týmto dodatkom žalm zasazuje do historického kontextu. Pravdepodobne ide o obliehanie a záchranu Jeruzalema v r. 701 pred n. l. (PIETERSMA, Exegesis and Liturgy, 190.)

²³ Grécky preklad vychádza z inej vokalizácie konzonantického textu מְשִׁיבֵי (preklad hebrejského textu *na Šošanním-edút*), porov. HROBŇ, *Žalmy 51–75*, 501-502. Prekladateľ to odvodzuje od koreňa מָשַׁב *meniť* a vidí tu plurál participia maskulína. Prvé מְ, ktoré pokladá za vzťažné zámeno, interpretuje gréckym členom, a tak zachováva izomorfický vzťah prekladu s originálom. (PIETERSMA, Septuagintal Exegesis, 224.)

²⁴ Sekcia Žalmov 50–74 má chybný preklad *tým (veciam), ktoré sú rozdielne*.

²⁵ Sekcia Žalmov 50–74 má chybný preklad *pre tých, ktorí sa ešte zmenia*.

dedičstvo. Najčastejšie sa vyskytujúci výraz εἰς τὸ τέλος prekladajú *do konca*, no v iných prípadoch preferujú účelový význam, no ani ten neprekladajú konzistentným spôsobom:

εἰς διδασχὴν *na poučenie* (Ž 59),
 εἰς ἀνάμνησιν *na pripomenutie* (Ž 69),
 εἰς στηλογραφίαν *pre stĺpový nápis* (Ž 56),
 εἰς Σαλωμων *pre Šalamúna* (Ž 71).

Základná otázka je: Čo vyjadruje predložka εἰς v nadpise? Význam účelu, ktorý nadškrkli naši predchodcovia, sa najviac ponúka v tých žalmových nadpisoch, kde je uvedený deň týždňa.

2.5.1 Dni týždňa – účel?

Jediný žalm, kde aj MT má v nadpise deň týždňa, je 92 (MT), teda 91 (LXX) – sobota. Grécka tradícia LXX určuje ešte ďalšie: 22 (len v manuskriptoch) a 23 prvý deň, 47 druhý deň, 93 štvrtý deň, 80 (len v manuskriptoch) piaty deň, 92 šiesty deň, 37 sobota. Pozoruhodná je pestrosť ich gramatických konštrukcií.

Jedným z vyjadrení je aj konštrukcia s predložkou εἰς, napr. εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου (Ž 91). To sa dá interpretovať ako účelové vyjadrenie – liturgická smernica: *na deň soboty*. No hoci sa žalmy používali v židovskej liturgii, označenie žalmov LXX dňami týždňa nie je – podľa súčasného stavu septuagintového bádania – primárne liturgické, ale tematické²⁶. Teda v uvedenom prípade znamená *o dni soboty*.

Účelový význam však môžeme aj v prípade dní týždňa ľahko spochybniť. V Žalme 92 síce máme uvedený deň, ale z celej formulácie je zrejmé, že nejde o vyjadrenie účelu, či už liturgického, alebo iného. Je tu referencia do minulosti a predložkové spojenie s εἰς nám uvádza tému žalmu, *o čom* ten žalm je: εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου ὅτε κατόικισται ἡ γῆ *o dni pred sobotou, keď bola osídlená zem*. Grécky žalm sa týka dňa v prvom týždni stvorenia. V Žalme 37 máme zase jednoznačné vyjadrenie témy *περὶ σαββάτου o sobote*.

Ďalšie dni týždňa sú uvedené buď v podobe genitívu: τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων (Ž 23), alebo datívu: δευτέρῃ σαββάτου (Ž 47), τετράδι σαββάτων (Ž 93), πέμπτῃ σαββάτου (Ž 80). Môžeme azda predpokladať, že rôzne dni týždňa

²⁶ PIETERSMA, Exegesis and Liturgy, 194-201.

v nadpisoch žalmov budú mať rovnaký význam. Nevieme však, prečo autor gréckych nadpisov použil niekoľko rozličných výrazov na vyjadrenie (pravdepodobne) tej istej myšlienky. Pri datíve by sme mohli vidieť ten význam, ktorý sme uviedli vyššie: *týka sa (niečoho)*, ktorý je synonymný s predložkovým spojením vyjadrujúcim tému. Pri genitíve by sme mohli použiť tú hypotézu, ktorú sme načrtli vyššie, teda že sa myslí (*žalm*) *o niečom*, tu *žalm o prvom dni týždňa*.

V prípade dní týždňa je účelový význam predložky *εις* spochybnený a toto spojenie je pravdepodobne ďalší z prostriedkov na vyjadrenie témy. Tento význam by sme mali konzistentne uplatňovať aj pri iných výrazoch: *εις σύνεσιν o porozumení* (Ž 41, 43, 44), *εις ἐξομολόγησιν o zvelebovaní* (Ž 99), *εις Σαλωμων o Šalamúnovi* (Ž 71) a pod. Účelový význam by sme (v niektorých prípadoch) nevyklúčovali, ale *default translation* by – podľa nášho názoru – malo byť vyjadrenie témy.

2.5.2 Výraz *εις τὸ τέλος*

Nazdávame sa, že toto *default* riešenie je dobre použiteľné aj v prípade frekventovaného výrazu *εις τὸ τέλος*. To je štandardný preklad hebrejského *כִּי־יִגְמַל*, ktorého význam nie je celkom jasný (v komentárovom preklade *zbormajstrovi*). Prekladatelia sekcie Žalmov 50–74 ho interpretovali ako *do konca*. To však nie je najlepšie riešenie, ani pokiaľ ide o preklad substantíva, ani o preklad predložky.

Je pravda, že u niektorých cirkevných otcov nadpis *εις τὸ τέλος* (lat. *in finem*) vzbudzoval eschatologické konotácie o tom najvzdialenejšom *konci*. No eschatologický výraz isto nie je primárny²⁷, ba ani u cirkevných otcov nie je jediný. Gregor z Nyssy, jediný staroveký autor, ktorý sa venoval explicitne gréckym nadpisom žalmov, tu vidí význam *ukončenia, naplnenia* čohosi v bližšom časovom horizonte²⁸.

Pokiaľ ide o predložku, predpokladáme, že patrí do rovnakej skupiny ako *εις τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου o dni pred sobotou*, *εις σύνεσιν o porozumení* a *εις ἐξομολόγησιν o zvelebovaní*. Preto spojenie *εις τὸ τέλος* v Žalmoch 75–99 prekladáme ako *o naplnení*.

²⁷ PIETERSMA, Exegesis in the Septuagint, 240–241.

²⁸ Gregor z Nyssy, *In inscriptiones psalmodum* II.2.14 (GNO V,72).

2.6 Zhrnutie analýzy

V gréckych nadpisoch žalmov sa vyskytujú štyri izolované gramatické formy, ktoré spôsobujú isté výkladové ťažkosti: izolovaný genitív, izolovaný datív, predložka ὑπέρ s genitívom, predložka εἰς s akuzatívom. Jediný kontext, ktorý nám môže pomôcť v riešení problému s ich výkladom, je ten, že ide o nadpis. Pri genitíve by sme mohli predpokladať elipsu substantíva v nominatíve (*žalm a pod.*) a potom ho interpretovať ako objektový (*žalm o niečom*), datív by bol vyjadrenie osoby/veci vzdialenejšie zaangažovanej na deji (*týka sa niekoho*) a predložkové spojenie by vyjadrovali tému (*ohl'adom niečoho, o niečom*).

Ak je táto hypotéza správna, išlo by o viac-menej synonymné vyjadrenia. Zdá sa, že v prospech nej hovorí aj to, že autor gréckych nadpisov žalmov strieda rozličné gramatické formy pri rovnakých alebo podobných substantívach²⁹:

συνέσεως	–	εἰς σύνεσιν,
τοῖς ἀλλοιωθησομένοις	–	ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων,
ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου	–	πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον,
εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου	–	περὶ σαββάτου,
τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων	–	δευτέρα σαββάτου.

Uvedené riešenie prekladu izolovaných prvkov nadpisov je, samozrejme, hypotetické. V prospech tohto návrhu však možno uviesť, že je (1) komplexný, teda berie do úvahy nadpisy všetkých žalmov, a (2) vychádza z lingvistickej analýzy, nakoľko je možná v tom minimálnom kontexte, ktorý máme k dispozícii. Komentárový preklad má navyše tú výhodu, že ktorýkoľvek prekladový ekvivalent, pokiaľ je čo len trochu problematický, sa dá okomentovať v poznámkach.

²⁹ Za úvahu by stálo aj rozšírenie záberu výskumu na iných prekladateľov žalmov do gréčtiny. Napríklad uvedenému výrazu LXX εἰς τὸ τέλος zodpovedá u Aquilu datív τῷ νικοποῖῳ (*týka sa toho, ktorý tvorí víťazstvo*, u Symmacha nominatív ἐπινίκιον *víťazná pieseň* a u Theodotióna predložkové spojenie εἰς τὸ νίκος *o víťazstve*. Porov. Gregor z Nyssy, *In inscriptiones psalmorum* II.2.14 (GNO V,72). Identifikácia autorov je podľa Órigena (*Selecta in Psalmos*, [PG 12, 1133a-b]).

Zoznam použitej literatúry

- La Bible d'Alexandrie. La Genèse. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes par Marguerite Harl*, Paris: Cerf, 1986.
- HARL, Marguerite: Traduire la Septante en Française: Pourquoi et Comment? In: Marguerite Harl (ed.): *La Langue de Japhet: Quinze Études sur la Septante et le Grec des Chrétiens*, Paris: Cerf, 1992, 33-42.
- HROBŇ, Bohdan (ed.): *Žalmy 51–75 (KSZ 5)*, Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2017.
- GREGORII NYSSENI: *In inscriptiones Psalmorum. In sextum Psalmum*. In: Jacob McDonough S.J. – Paul Alexander (eds.): *Ecclesiasten homiliae (GNO V)*, Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- KARRER, Martin: Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D): Characteristics of the German Translation Project. In: Hans Ausloos – Johann Cook – Florentio García Martínez – Bénédicte Lemmelijn – Marc Vervenne (eds.): *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism (BETL 213)*, Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2008, 105-118.
- KARRER, Martin – KRAUS, Wolfgang: *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- MURAOKA, Takamitsu: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009.
- ORIGENIS: *Opera omnia: Ex variis editionibus et codicibus manu exaratis, Gallicis, Italicis, Germanicis et Anglicis collecta atque adnotationibus illustrata, cum copiosis indicibus, vita auctoris et multis dissertationibus*. Vol II (PG 12). Ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1862.
- PANCZOVÁ, Helena: Technika prekladu z biblickej gréčtiny (3): Septuaginta ako výsledok a ako východisko – príklad hebrejizmov vo Veľpiesni, *StBiSl* 6 (2/2014) 197-204.
- PANCZOVÁ, Helena: Technika prekladu z biblickej gréčtiny (4): Analýza nového slovenského prekladu žalmov 50(51)–74(75) podľa Septuaginty, *StBiSl* 9 (2/2017) 208-249.
- PIETERSMA, Albert – WRIGHT, Benjamin Givens (eds.): *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- PIETERSMA, Albert – WRIGHT, Benjamin Givens: To the Reader of NETS. In: Albert Pietersma – Benjamin Givens Wright (eds.): *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, XIII – XX.
- PIETERSMA, Albert: David in the Greek Psalms. In: Cameron Boyd-Taylor (ed.): *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma – Collected Essays on the Septuagint (BiTS 14)*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2013, 11-23.
- PIETERSMA, Albert: Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter. In: Cameron Boyd-Taylor (ed.): *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma – Collected Essays on the Septuagint (BiTS 14)*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2013, 171-201.
- PIETERSMA, Albert: Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (the Psalter as a Case in Point). In: Cameron Boyd-Taylor (ed.): *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma – Collected Essays on the Septuagint (BiTS 14)*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2013, 229-242.
- PIETERSMA, Albert: Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter. In: Cameron Boyd-Taylor (ed.): *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma – Collected Essays on the Septuagint (BiTS 14)*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2013, 203-227.

Zhrnutie

V gréckych nadpisoch žalmov sa vyskytujú štyri izolované gramatické formy, ktoré spôsobujú isté výkladové ťažkosti: izolovaný genitív, izolovaný datív, predložka *ὑπέρ* s genitívom, predložka *εἰς* s akuzatívom. Jediný kontext, ktorý nám môže pomôcť v riešení problému s ich výkladom, je ten, že ide o nadpis. Pri genitíve by sme mohli predpokladať elipsu substantíva v nominatíve (*žalm* a pod.) a potom ho interpretovať ako objektový (*žalm o niečom*), datív by bol vyjadrenie osoby/veci vzdialenejšie zaangažovanej na deji (*týka sa niekoho*) a predložkové spojenie by vyjadrovali tému (*ohľadom niečoho, o niečom*). Ak je táto hypotéza správna, išlo by o viac-menej synonymné vyjadrenia. Zdá sa, že v prospech nej hovorí aj to, že autor gréckych nadpisov žalmov strieda rozličné gramatické formy pri rovnakých alebo podobných substantívach: συνέσεως – εἰς σύνεσιν, τοῖς ἀλλοιωθησομένοις – ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου – πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου – περὶ σαββάτου, τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων – δευτέρᾳ σαββάτου.

Kľúčové slová: Septuaginta, prekladateľská technika, grécky Žaltár, nadpisy žalmov.

Summary

In Greek superscriptions of psalms, there are four isolated grammatical forms that are difficult to interpret: isolated genitive, isolated dative, preposition *ὑπέρ* with the genitive, preposition *εἰς* with the accusative. The only context that may help us to interpret these expressions is that it is a superscription. With the genitive, we may presume an ellipsis of a noun in the nominative (*psalm* etc.) and then interpret it as an objective genitive (*psalm about something*). The dative is a denotation of a person/thing indirectly connected with the action (*pertaining to someone*). Prepositional phrases express the theme (*about/on something, regarding something*). If this hypothesis is correct, all these expressions are roughly synonymous. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that the author of the Greek superscriptions interchanges various grammatical forms of the same or similar nouns: συνέσεως – εἰς σύνεσιν, τοῖς ἀλλοιωθησομένοις – ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου – πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου – περὶ σαββάτου, τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων – δευτέρᾳ σαββάτου.

Key words: Septuagint, translation technique, Greek Psalter, superscriptions of Psalms.

Helena Panczová
Teologická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity
Kostolná 1, P. O. Box 173
814 99 BRATISLAVA, Slovenská republika
helena.panczova@gmail.com

Abstrakty

Biblica 97 (2016)¹

(č. 3) 321-341: **J. Middlemas: The Prophets, the Priesthood, and the Image of God (Gen 1,26-27).** Podľa kňazského autora Gen 1,26-27 je obraz človeka najbližším vyjadrením Božej podoby. Middlemas analyzuje, ako sa tento človeku podobný Boží obraz odzrkadľuje v prorockých spisoch Ozeáša, Deutero-Izaiáša a Ezechiela. Napriek ráznemu odmietnutiu zobrazovať Boha (anikonizmus), proroci využívajú rôzne alternatívne symboly a prirovnania, ktoré dávajú do kontrastu s idolatriou. Do najväčšej miery „ľudský“ obraz Boha využíva Deutero-Izaiáš. Ezechiel takisto prízvukuje Božiu odlišnosť pomocou obrazu ohňa a dúhy. Avšak Ozeáš sa vyhýba hovoriť o Bohu ako o niekom s ľudskou podobou a radšej prirovnáva Boha k neurčitej forme rosy, choroby či rozkladu.

342-359: **K. Weingart: Eine zweite Chance für Israel? Gericht und Hoffnung in Hos 3,1-5.** Prorok Ozeáš je v tretej kapitole vyzvaný milovať nevernú ženu ako symbol Božej vernosti voči synom Izraela. Weingart dáva túto kapitolu do súvisu s historickými udalosťami dobytia Samárie v r. 720 pred n. l. Absencia kráľa, kniežat a obetných úkonov či predmetov, ktorá sa spomína v 4. verši, reflektuje situáciu Severného izraelského kráľovstva po asýrskej invázii. Nádej na obnovu a lepšiu budúcnosť plynie z obrátenia sa na YHWH a na Judské kráľovstvo. Táto kapitola nesie podobnosť s kapitolou 11, v kontraste s kapitolami 4–10, ktorých pôvod siaha pravdepodobne ešte pred rok 720.

360-374: **Ch. Blumenthal: Der höchste Gott und König Ptolemaios IV. Philopator. Beobachtungen zur erzählerischen Entfaltung des Gottesbildes in 3Makk.** Tzv. Tretia kniha Machabejcov opisuje snahu egyptského kráľa Ptolemaia Filopatora vstúpiť

¹ Č. 3 je ešte prístupné na <http://www.bsw.org/biblica/vol-97-2016/> [cit. 22-02-2018]. Nasledujúce, štvrté číslo, ako aj všetky predchádzajúce čísla sú digitalizované cez Peeters Online Journals (<http://poj.peeters-leuven.be>) a dostupné na viacerých predplatených stránkach digitálnych knižníc. Kto by mal záujem o niektorý z článkov, a nemá k nemu on-line prístup, môže sa obrátiť na: jaroslav.mudron@gmail.com.

do Jeruzalemského chrámu a jeho prenasledovanie egyptských židov. Blumenthal skúma formu a hlavné témy tohto diela, v ktorom identifikuje štyrikrát sa opakujúce hlavné rozprávačské klenutia (*Erzählbögen*): náčrt ťažkostí, obrátenie sa k Bohu, Boží zásah, zvrat, oslava Boha. Kráľ Ptolemaios je opísaný ako Boží protivník, ktorý nakoniec uzná vládu Boha Izraela.

375-394: **N. Neumann: Bewegungen im Dreieck: Heil als Begegnung im erzählten Raum des lukanischen Sonderguts.** Každý z evanjelistov má svoje osobitné črty a témy, ktoré rozvíja na základe svojho osobitného materiálu (nem. *Sondergut*). Neumann sa zameriava na Lukášovu svojráznosť, ktorá spočíva v dramatickom trojuholníku troch skupín postáv (Boh/Ježiš, hriešnici, farizeji) a v priestore medzi nimi. Hoci hriešnici stoja spočiatku ďaleko, ich spása sa uskutočňuje v priblížení sa a v stretnutí sa s Ježišom. Farizeji sa naopak od Ježiša oddiaľujú a sú preto vyzvaní učiť sa od hriešnikov a deliť sa o ich radosť z obrátenia.

395-420: **T. Tops: Whose Truth? A Reader-Oriented Study of the Johannine Pilate and John 18,38a.** Pilát, napriek jeho zodpovednosti za odsúdenie Ježiša, je v Jn na niektorých miestach opísaný ako zdráhajúci sa vykonať výrok nad Ježišom. Podľa Toppa je táto dvojznačnosť Pilátovej osoby zámerná a vyplýva z rozprávačských medzier evanjelia. Je preto na čitateľovi interpretovať Pilátov nejasný postoj a dať si odpoveď na jeho vážnu otázku: „Čo je pravda?“ (18,38a).

421-439: **T. B. Williams: Reciprocity and Suffering in 1 Peter 2,19-20: Reading χάρις in Its Ancient Social Context.** V 1Pt 2,19-20 sú utrpenie a bolesť predstavené ako „milosť“ (χάρις). Problémom však zostáva, v akom význame treba chápať tento široký pojem. Koncepcia „milosti“ ako Božieho daru a ľudského stavu omilostenia nezodpovedá úplne kontextu týchto veršov. Williams preto siaha po ďalšom význame slova χάρις v grécko-rímskom spoločenskom svete, t. j. χάρις ako reciprocita a výmena darov. V tomto kontexte sú adresáti listu pozvaní znášať utrpenie ako výraz vďaky Bohu za mnohé iné prijaté dobrodenia.

Animadversiones

440-453: **I. Himbaza: Critique textuelle et critique littéraire en 2 Samuel 6,2: une généalogie des témoins textuels.** Kráľ Dávid podľa opisu v 2Sam 6,2 preniesol Božiu archu „z júdskej Bály“ (מבעלי יהודה). Zmienka „Bála“ či jeho ženského ekvivalentu v zmysle bohyně (בעלה) nebola po vôli neskorším redakciám a gréckym prekladom, ako na to poukazuje Himbaza. Kumránsky rukopis 4QSam^a harmonizuje názov miesta s 1Krn 13,6 a stotožňuje Bálu s Kirjat-Jearím, podobne ako niektoré grécke preklady, hoci iné úplne vynechávajú názov miesta a interpretujú problematický termín ako ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων Ιουδα.

(č. 4) 481-491: **D. J. Fuller: Towards a New Translation of דבה in Genesis 37,2.** Mladý Jozef prináša otcovi Jakubovi „zlé správy“ (אֵת־דְּבַתָּם רעה) o svojich bratoch v Gn 37,2. Fuller prechádza lexikálnymi významami problematického slova דבה, ako sú zachytené v SZ, v apokryfoch a v Kumránskych zvitkoch, a opravuje nepresné glosy slovníkov BDB a TWOT. Podľa jeho štúdie Jozef zámerne podáva svojmu otcovi „zlomyseľnú správu“ o starších bratoch.

492-502: **T. R. Yoder: The Silence of the (Spotted) Lambs. Ovine Otherness in the Hebrew Bible.** Starozákonní autori používajú jedenásť rôznych termínov pre jahňatá

a ovce. Yoder klasifikuje tieto názvy podľa kategórií veku, pohlavia, využitia a pod. Spomedzi nich je najotáznejším termínom טל, ktoré sa vyskytuje v SZ len trikrát (1Sam 7,9; Iz 40,11; 64,25) a podľa slovného koreňa označuje fľakaté či inak farebne odlišené jahňa. Zvláštnosť tohto druhu je využitá v Iz 40-66, kde sa ním opisuje zvyšok ľudu, o ktorý má Boh-Pastier osobitný záujem.

503-526: **O. Sergi: The Omride Dynasty and the Reshaping of the Judahite Historical Memory.** Napriek mnohým politickým úspechom je Omriho dynastia vykreslená v historických knihách SZ vo veľmi negatívnom svetle. Podľa Sergiho je tento opis výsledkom protiomrijskej propagandy, ktorá začala ešte v Severnom izraelskom kráľovstve za vlády ďalšej dynastie Namsi a ktorú prevzali deuteronomistickí autori. Napriek snahám očistiť obraz judských kráľov z hľadiska kultu, niektoré opisy vojenských výprav (2Kr 14,8-14; 1Kr 22,1-38; 1Kr 3,4-27) svedčia o dobrovoľnej aliancii medzi susednými kráľovstvami.

527-536: **J. Banister: 'I Feared' or 'I Saw' in Habakkuk 3,2?** Niektorí biblisti navrhujú pozmeniť sloveso יראתי „bál som sa“ na ראיתי „videl som“ v Hab 3,2, pretože by to vytváralo harmonickejšiu paralelu so začiatkom verša: „Pane, počul som tvoju správu...“ Avšak Banisterová poukazuje na fakt, že takáto oprava nie je doložená v žiadnom zo starobylých prekladov a, naopak, dvojica slovies „počuť“ a „báť sa“ je dôležitá pre Knihu Deuteronomium, ktorá mohla ovplyvniť jej použitie v tomto prorockom spise.

537-551: **S. J. Jones: Psalm 1 and the Hermeneutics of Torah.** Žalm 1 nazýva blaženým človekom toho, kto v „zákone (בתורת יהוה) Pánovom má záľubu a o jeho zákone (ובתורתו) rozjíma dňom i nocou“. Na základe analýzy žalmu a jeho interpretácie v židovskej medzitestamentálnej literatúre a v raných cirkevných spisoch Jones dokazuje, že termín תורה v Ž 1 nemá za cieľ označovať nejakú konkrétnu zbierku spisov SZ. Týmto kľúčovým slovom sa skôr chce vystihnúť celá živá tradícia starého Izraela a skorého judaizmu.

552-563: **B. Mathew: The Syntax of John 13,1 Revisited.** Hoci sa Jn 13,1 pokladá za jeden z najdôležitejších veršov evanjelia, jeho vetná štruktúra zostáva nejasná. Podľa Mathewovej sú particípiá εἶδος a ἀγαπήσας cirkumstanciálne a počiatočný predložkový zvrät πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα sa vzťahuje na určité sloveso ἠγάπησεν. Jej preklad preto znie: „Pred Veľkou nocou Ježiš, vediac, že prišla jeho hodina odísť z tohto sveta k Otcovi, milujúc svojich, čo boli na svete, miloval ich úplne.“

564-580: **J.-N. Aletti: Exegesis of the Ecclesiology of the Pauline Letters in the XXth Century.** Na Pavlovo ponímanie Cirkvi možno hľadiť z teologického alebo spoločensko-historického hľadiska. Aplikujúc toto rozlíšenie, Aletti upozorňuje na skutočnosť, že v proto-pavlínskych a deuterio-pavlínskych listoch sa Pavol nesnaží nanútiť kresťanom vonkajší model Cirkvi, ale naopak rešpektuje charakter macedónskych cirkví ako náboženských asociácií a povahu „domácich cirkví“ v Korinte. Pavlova eklezológia je v prvom rade teologická a je na ďalších štúdiách zistiť, ako sa táto koncepcia Cirkvi zmenila v pastoračných listoch NZ.

581-605: **D. Batovici: The Apostolic Fathers in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus.** Dva zo štyroch najstarších kódexov obsahujúcich celé Sväté písmo, Sinajský a Alexandrijský, zahŕňajú v sebe takisto knihy, ktoré nepovažujeme za kánonické: Barnabášov list, Hermasov Pastier, Prvý a Druhý Klementov list. Batovici sumarizuje názory

raných cirkevných spisovateľov na takéto diela „apoštolských otcov“ a dáva ich do súvisu s paleografickými a kodikologickými údajmi oboch kódexov, v ktorých tieto diela nevystupujú iba ako „doplnok“, ale skôr ako odporúčaná literatúra druhého stupňa.

Jaroslav Mudroň SJ
Pápežský biblický inštitút
3, Paul Emile Botta St.
91004 Jeruzalem
Izrael

Liber Annus LXVI 2016

V ročenke Liber Annus XVI za rok 2016, ktorú v roku 2017 vydalo Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SBF) v Jeruzaleme, je spracovaných 17 vedeckých článkov (9-454) s ich abstraktmi (457-467). Na ďalších stranách nájdeme recenzie 4 vybraných knižných publikácií venujúcich sa tak Starému, ako aj Novému zákonu – M. Priotto: *Il libro della Parola. Introduzione alla Scrittura*; V. Lopasso: *Geremia. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*; D. Attinger: *Evangelo secondo Luca. Il cammino della benedizione*; B. R. Wilson: *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ. The Death of Jesus in Lukan Soteriology*; E. L. Vieyra: *L'Écriture dans la dynamique argumentative de 1 Corinthiens 1-4* (471-502). Po recenziách nasleduje zoznam publikácií, ktoré SBF nadobudlo (503-507). V závere ročenky je uvedená správa o licenčných tézach a jednej doktorandskej téze študentov SBF (509-512) a tiež index LA za obdobie 1981–2015 (513-524).

9-24: **David Volgger: Der Segen Gottes in der ersten Schöpfungserzählung Gen1,1-2,4a.** V prvom článku ročenky sa D. Vogler OFM, profesor biblickej teológie a Starého zákona na Pápežskej univerzite Antonianum, zaoberá konceptom „požehnanie“ v prvom opise stvorenia Knihy Genezis (Gn 1,1–2,4a). Boh nepožehnáva len živé tvory, konkrétne prvé zvieratá, ktoré sú dielom piateho dňa (1,22) a prvých ľudí, ktorých stvoril na šiesty deň (1,28-30); požehnáva aj siedmy deň, v ktorý si odpočinul od stvoriteľskej činnosti. Autor v štúdiu konštatuje, že živé stvorenia sa majú podieľať na realizácii cieľa stvorenia, avšak Gn 1,1–2,4 neobsahuje „správu“, ktorá by opisovala, ako sa stvorenie stáva aktívnym.

25-36: **Vincenzo Lopasso: La vocazione del sacerdote in Malachia 1,6–2,9.** V tomto príspevku sa profesor Lopasso zaoberá sporom, ktorý uvádza Kniha proroka Malachiáša (Mal 1,6–2,9). Ide o najdlhší spor, ktorý nájdeme v tejto knihe. Predmetom sporu je teologický profil kňazov, a to najmä vzhľadom na požiadavky, ktoré na nich kladie Pán. Štúdia porovnáva uvedený spor s inými časťami knihy (Mal 2,10-16 a 2,17–3,5) a tiež s ostatnými Malými prorokmi ako celkom. Napriek malému počtu zmienok v tejto sekcii sa autor snaží zavítať do pozadia kritiky namierenej voči kňazom a potreby obnovy ich života. Aj keď v jednej línii s tradíciou, predsa len kladie Malachiáš dôraz na iný aspekt než ostatní Malí proroci. Stáva sa to zrejším vo svetle záujmov, ktoré osvecuje jeho osobu a tiež historické pozadie jeho kázania. Kňaz je predovšetkým prostredníkom medzi Bohom

a ľuďmi, a to v oblasti bohoslužby a vyučovania Tóry. S takýmto ohľadom kult a vyučovanie Tóry dopĺňajú a obohacujú hypotézu prorok verus kňazský antagonizmus: jej históriu a pôvod. Kňaz vykonáva svoju službu vedomý si všetkého, čo pre neho koná Boh a vo vedomí jednoty medzi životom kultu a svojím vnútorným životom. Prorok tu taktó pripravuje teologické motívy, ktoré budú v judaizme viac rozvinuté v období predchádzajúcom kresťanstvu. Kňaz bude úplne ponorený do tzv. personalizačnej logiky Tóry a vyššieho duchovného rozmeru.

37-67: **Gregor Geiger: Wayyiqtol-Langformen der Verben III.h.** Článok sa zaoberá rozdelením dlhých a krátkych foriem *wajyiqtol* slovík III.h v biblickej (masoretskej) hebrejčine – 110 krátkych foriem vs. 2171 dlhých foriem. Neexistujú žiadne všeobecné pravidlá, ktoré by vysvetlili všetky dlhé formy slovík v biblickom texte. Existuje však množstvo pravidiel a javov, ktoré možno sledovať. Dlhé formy sú relatívne rozšírené 1) v prvej a druhej osobe singuláru, ako aj plurálu (niekoľko výskytov); 2) v Prorokoch, v poetických knihách, v Knihe Daniel, Ezdráš a Nehemiáš; 3) v prvej osobe najmä v Knihe Jozue, v Kráľovských knihách, u prorokov: Jeremiáš, Izaiáš, Ezechiel, Ozeáš, Jób, v Knihe prísloví, Kohelet, Daniel a v Knihách kroník; 4) v tretej osobe v Kráľovských knihách (zvlášť 1Kr 16–2Kr 13) a u Jeremiáša; 5) so slabými slovesami (okrem *hyh* a *lyh*); 6) v *hifil*, *piel*, a *hitpael*; 7) v severnej próze; 8) na konci vety; 9) pred priamym predmetom; 10) v apodosis – hlavnej vete podmieňovacieho súvetia; 11) pred laryngálou (okrem *h*). Dlhé formy slovík sa zriedkavo vyskytujú 1) v tretej osobe; 2) v Tóre (veľmi zriedka); 3) v Jozue – Samuel, Rút a Ester (bez výskytu) a v Kronikách; 4) v severnej poézii; 5) so slovesami I.h a I.h zvlášť *hyh* (bez výskytu v druhých a tretích osobách) a *lyh* (bez výskytu); 6) so slovesami I.lar a II.r (bez výskytu); 7) pred podmetom; 8) pred sykavkami, velármi (zadopodnebné hlásky), *h* a *r*. Dlhé formy v niekoľkých prípadoch vyjadrujú črtu, odlišnú od významu krátkych foriem: 1) v prvej osobe *hyh* (opis trvalého stavu); 2) v tretej osobe *bnh* (prestavať); 3) *s r' h* v Ezechielovi (dôraz na akt videnia skôr než na predmet, ktorý je videný).

69-79: **Matteo Munari: Fulfilling Every Act of Righteousness (Matt 3,15).** Profesor exegézy Nového zákona z SBF v Jeruzaleme sa v príspevku zaoberá kľúčovými prvkami v Ježišom poslaní – spravodlivosťou a naplnením. Oba prvky sú však podľa autora kontroverzné. Hovorí Ježiš o ľudskej alebo Božskej spravodlivosti? Je jeho krst symbolom jeho smrti? V Septuaginte je $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma + \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ použité pre označenie konkrétnych skutkov spravodlivosti alebo láskavosti a nie pre abstraktnú hodnotu spravodlivosti. U evanjelistu majú tieto Ježišove záhadné slová pravdepodobne rovnaký význam. Naplnenie každého skutku spravodlivosti je téma a spôsob, ako to robiť, je réma.

81-89: **Frédéric Manns: Zacharie, prêtre et prophète de la miséricorde de Dieu.** Francúzsky biblista sa venuje postave Zachariáša v Lukášovom evanjeliu. Zachariáš je predstavený ako kňaz a prorok. Ako kňaz konal službu v chráme a ako prorok mal za úlohu ohlásiť Božie milosrdenstvo. Zmluva, ktorú uzavrel Boh s ľuďmi, bola hriechom zrušená, ale obnovená Abrahámom. Táto zmluva bola novým stvorením a prekonala tú prvú, keďže vrchol nadobudla v znamení obriezky na ôsmy deň. Zachariáš je kňazom a prorokom, s ktorým sa môžu identifikovať žido-kresťania po krízovej situácii, ktorú spôsobilo zničenie Jeruzalemského chrámu. Z chrámu sú pozvaní pobrat' sa domov, aby študovali Písma, ktoré obsahujú zvesť o Božom milosrdenstve.

91-133: **Gustavo Martín-Asensio: Embedded Polarization in the Fourth Gospel: Overt Pronominal Subjects as a Rhetorical Summons to Take Sides.** Zaoberajú sa aktuálnou jánovskou problematikou – obsiahlou a nepreskúmanou témou jánovského jazyka a štýlu, skúma autor článku evanjelistom často a dôkladne použité otvorené zámenné podmety. Na rozdiel od posledných vedeckých diskusií na poli jánovského štýlu prehodnocuje Martín-Asensio použitie otvorených zámenných podmetov v lingvistike novozákonnej a modernej gréčtiny. Následne navrhuje interpretáciu, ktorá má na jednej strane súvis so súčasnou modernou gréčtinou a na druhej strane zdôrazňuje rétorické a ústne predstavenie týchto foriem vo štvrtom evanjeliu. Otvorené zámenné podmety (Overt Pronominal Subject – OPS) vo štvrtom evanjeliu pomáhajú „redefinovať“ podmet tým, že ho klasifikujú ako nový. Tieto OPS tak stoja v službe neustálej otázky a redefinície identity účastníkov vo vzťahu k Ježišovi, k pravde, k Mojžišovi a Abrahámovi, k zákonu a chrámu a k Bohu. Viac ako len zdôrazniť jeden alebo druhý podmet, šifrujú tieto OPS zámenu identít v priebehu a v konflikte štvrtého evanjelia a nabádajú k zaujatiu strany v tomto konflikte. Na záver venuje autor pozornosť rétorickému využitiu týchto OPS – v kontexte ústneho podania. V gréčtine, ako aj v iných jazykoch, výrazný alebo nový prvok vety je pri čítaní alebo písaní tónicky dôležitý, čo znamená, že výrazný prvok má prozodickú význačnosť. Takáto význačnosť by sa dala využiť pri ústnom podaní a poslucháčov štvrtého evanjelia by nútila zaujať stranu.

135-193: **Alessandro Cavichia: La Scrittura nel Quarto Vangelo: una tappa della storia della ricerca (1860-2004).** Profesor exegézy Nového zákona na SBF sa v článku zaoberá dejinami výskumu v rokoch 1885–2004, ktorého predmetom je použitie Písma v Jánovom evanjeliu. Perspektíva, ktorá sa tu použila, identifikovala štyri oblasti záujmu a metodologických prístupov. Prvá oblasť je sprevádzaná otázkou textového pôvodu Jánovho použitia Písma v súvislosti s antižidovským charakterom štvrtého evanjelia. Druhá oblasť sa zameriava na postupný posun od záujmu o textový pôvod smerom k oceneniu hermeneutiky a techník použitia Písma, zvlášť zo židovského uhla pohľadu. Tretia oblasť zdôrazňuje teologický a Kristologický charakter Jánovho použitia Písma. Pre štvrtú oblasť je charakteristický intertextuálny a sociologický prístup. A je to zvlášť sociologická analýza, ktorá sa zaoberá sektárskou a antižidovskou orientáciou štvrtého evanjelia. Autor zastáva názor, že jánovské použitie Písma sa javí ako bohaté, všestranné a nedá sa k nemu pristúpiť len z jedného uhla pohľadu. Vyžaduje pluralistický metodologický prístup, ktorý je schopný kombinovať textové, hermeneutické, teologické, historické a sociologické problémy. Židovské Sväté písmo, ktoré je takmer identické s kresťanským Starým zákonom, sa javí ako prameň božskej inšpirácie, ktorý ponúka usmernenia pre výklad Boha a dejín. Jánovské použitie Písma nepredpokladá protirečivé, „umensujúce“ alebo „znehodnocovacie“ stanovisko. Naopak, štvrté evanjelium poukazuje na plné zjavenie Slova, samotného Boha a ducha Písma v Ježišovi z Nazareta, ktorý je vtelený Logos a chápe Písma ako vrchol takejto tradície. Príspevok jasne ukazuje, že tradícia Písma a kresťanská viera sú aj naďalej kľúčovými prvkami v diskusii a poznávaní tajomstva Boha v priebehu storočí.

195-218: **Samuelle Salvatori: Un corpo per l'immortalità o per la resurrezione? Il percorso argomentativo ed esortativo di Paolo in 1 Corinzi 5–6, per un**

discernimento comunitario. V 5. a 6. kapitole Listu Korint'anom sa Pavol zaoberá záležitosťami komunitného života. V 5,1-13 zvlášť spomína incest; zdôrazní však hrdý postoj komunity voči takémuto správaniu. Náhla zmena témy poznačí pasáž 6,1-11; tentokrát apoštol karhá Korint'anov za to, že sa chodia súdiť k pohanom namiesto toho, aby vyriešili spor v rámci spoločenstva veriacich. V nasledujúcej časti 6,12-20 sa Pavol vracia k téme nemorálnosti, avšak viac na všeobecnej antropologickej úrovni. Rôznosť tém komplikuje definovať logiku pasáže ako celku a argumentatívny postup, ktorý prepája tieto tri textové jednotky. Tento článok má za cieľ ukázať, ako 1Kor 5–6 vytvára jednoliaty súhrn a povzbudenie, v ktorom apoštol čeliac problémom komunity, neprináša len riešenia, ale aj nabáda Korint'anov, aby si boli vedomí antropologických a ekleziologických dôsledkov svojej viery vo vzkrieseného Krista.

219-236: **Leonardo Giuliano: Gli antidoti nella periautologia di 1Cor 9: individuazione e funzione retorica.** Článok skúma rétorickú funkciu „antidot“ v argumentačnej časti 1Kor 9,1-27. Charakteristika tejto obrany je dôležitá pre určenie povahy a zámeru Pavlovej samochvály v rétorickom makrooddiel 1Kor 8,1–11,1. Tie tzv. „antidota“: a) chvála Pavla a jeho adresátov (dielo – pečať) sú prepojené (1Kor 9,1-2); b) Pavol pripisuje to, že je apoštolom Pánovi, ktorý je zdrojom jeho služby (1Kor 9,1). Pavlova apoštolská služba je dobrom pre jeho adresátov a nie pre neho samotného (1Kor 9,2); c) použitie antitézy medzi právom na finančnú podporu komunity a Pavlovým zrieknutím sa toho (1Kor 9,15-18); d) Pavol poukazuje na *ἀνάγκη* (1Kor 9,16); e) apoštolská služba je „zverenou úlohou“ (1Kor 9,17); f) použitie *epanorthōsis* alebo *correctio* (1Kor 9,15-18); g) poukázanie na namáhavú prácu, ktorou získal výsledky (1Kor 9,19-23); h) byť „predmetom Kristovho zákona“ (1Kor 9,21); i) námaha/prekážky v agonistickej metafore (1Kor 9,24-27); j) Pavol uznáva svoje limity (použitím *litotes* – básnickým druhom, pri ktorom sa klad vyjadruje záporom) a ukazuje na možnosť neuspenia v závode (1Kor 9,24). „Periautologia“ je vyjadrením Pavlovho *étosu*. Predstavuje „najsilnejší argument“ (Aristoteles, *Rhetorica* 1,2,1356a) v 1Kor 9 tak, že si podriadiuje *exemplum*. Takýto argumentatívny systém nekončí v Pavlovom zvýhodnení, ale slúži ako funkcia *mimesis* (1Kor 11,1): Pavlovým cieľom nie je v prvom rade jeho obhajoba, ako skôr predstavenie autentického významu slobody, ktorá prúdi z jeho bytia „v Kristovi“.

237-268: **Maurizio Girolami: L'apostolo Paolo: un esempio da imitare o un imprevisto da affrontare? La recezione della figura e dei testi di Paolo nie primi secoli cristiani.** Profesor na teologickej fakulte v talianskom meste Triveneto sa v príspevku vydáva po stopách apoštola Pavla so zreteľom na to, ako vnímali spočiatku iní ľudia jeho osobu a listy. Už keď sa zameriame na novozákonné spisy, hneď si všimneme, že vyvolával celé spektrum reakcií; kým niektorí ho chválili (Skutky apoštolov a pastorálne listy), iní si ho nevšimli (spisy apoštola Jána), a napokon ďalší mali výhrady voči nedorozumeniam, ktoré jeho listy vyvolávali, hoc ich pokladali za všeobecne záväzné (Druhý Petrov list). Názory sa rôznia aj počas druhého storočia, pričom sekta markionistov a gnostikov dáva Pavla do popredia, kým niektorí apologéti, ranní obhajcovia kresťanskej viery, ako napríklad Justín, mu nevenujú pozornosť, zatiaľ čo autor listov mylne pripisovaných sv. Klementovi ho považuje za nepriateľa viery. Pavol sa ku koncu štvrtého storočia považoval za vzor hodný nasledovania a zdroj teologickej inšpirácie v celom latinsky hovoriacom svete. Zvlášť sa

zameriame na Ireneja a jeho snahu zosúladiť rôzne náhľady na Pavla. Irenej nám zanechal nielen texty a príklady, ale aj kritériá, na základe ktorých možno určiť, čo pochádza naozaj od apoštolov.

269-300: **Yana Tchekhanovets: Spoils and Spoila: Large Marble Assemblage from Givati Excavations, Jerusalem.** Článok sa venuje rozboru veľkého mramorového diela, ktoré sa našlo počas záchranného archeologického výskumu v oblasti jeruzalemského náleziska Givati. Pod súčasným povrchom sa v pôvodných zásypoch, datovaných do byzantského až abbasidského obdobia, našlo v niekoľkých monokultúrnych vrstvách – vypovedajúcich o striedaní sa viacerých ľudských kultúr na danom území – približne 2 400 opracovaných a brúsených mramorových predmetov. Ide najmä o tabule a dyhy, ktoré svojho času mali už sekundárne využitie, čiže pôvodne slúžili inému účelu, než na aký ich neskôr ľudia používali. Rozbor tejto veľkej zbierky môže poslúžiť ako prípadová štúdia pri pochopení „cirkulácie mramoru“ v neskorom staroveku, teda procesu od vyvážania kameňov cez ich miestne opracovanie, uloženie a konečné využitie, odborne zvané *spolia*, až po ďalšie spôsoby použitia a spracovania toho istého mramoru na iné účely.

301-319: **Debra Foran – Annlee Dolan – Steven Edwards: The Second Season of Excavation of the Khirbat a-Mukhayyat Archaeological Project.** Druhá etapa archeologického projektu Khirbat a-Mukhayyat sa zamerala na vykopávky v dvoch oblastiach náleziska: na pole B – južne od akropoly a na pole C-západ, ktoré je lokalizované pozdĺž západného okraja náleziska, severne od akropoly. Výskum odhalil celkovo šesť celkov vykopávok v poli B a odkryl ďalšiu časť monumentálnej štruktúry, odkrývanej už v roku 2014. Pri výskume sa našlo aj niekoľko neporušených hrncov na varenie z neskorého helenistického obdobia. V poli C-západ výskumníci našli kamenný žliabok a niekoľko základných a sadrových inštalácií, ktoré spájajú s neskorým helenistickým mikvami.

321-349: **Győző Vörös: Bathing and Immersing in Machaerus: the Herodian Royal Bathhouse and the Four Ritual Purification Baths (Miqva'oth).** Jozef Flávius píše, že Jána Krstiteľa uväznili a zavraždili v pevnosti Machaerus, nachádzajúcej sa za Mŕtvym morom v oblasti Perey, ktorá bola súčasťou regiónu Judea. Jánovo uväznenie potvrdzujú aj všetky evanjeliá, pričom opis udalostí v nich sa zhoduje s Fláviovým, poprípade ho dopĺňa. Archeologické nálezy dokazujú, že počas Jánovho väznenia sa v pevnosti využívali minimálne tri očistné židovské kúpele mikve, z toho dve sa nachádzali v kráľovskom paláci tetrarchu Herodesa Antipasa (avšak nie v rámci honosných Herodesových kúpeľov) a ďalšie v obytnej štvrti dolného Herodesovho mesta. O uväznení Krstiteľa v pevnosti si môžeme spraviť lepší obraz, keď sa oprieme o zachované archeologické nálezy spolu s Fláviovým textom z prvého storočia: „...považoval za vhodné umyť sa (vo vode) v prípade, ak to bolo ľudom skutočne na prospech, nie(len) aby im boli zotreté (alebo odpustené) niektoré hriechy, ale aby si očistili (zároveň) telo za predpokladu, že si už predtým omyli svoju dušu v spravodlivosti. (...) Na základe toho ho uväznili vo vyššie zmienenej pevnosti Machaerus, kde ho Herodes nemohol podozrievať, a tam ho odsúdili na smrť.“ (*Antiquitates Judaicae* XVIII.5.2)

351-375: **Asher Ovadiah – Yinon Shvitiel: The Caves in the Cliff Shelters of Keziv Stream (Nahal Keziv) and the Relief of 'The Man in the Wall'.** Článok dvojice

autorov uvádza dve témy: a) V prvej téme sa najprv všeobecne rozoberá funkcia jaskýň v zraze nad potokom Keziv (Nahal Keziv) v západnej Galilei; a potom zvlášť zoskupenie 18 jaskýň, v rímskej dobe známych ako komplex „Chrámovej jaskyne“. Zdá sa, že najväčšia a hlavná jaskyňa tohto komplexu mala posvätnú úlohu – bola miestom kultu pre miestne božstvo. b) V druhej téme autori venujú pozornosť vpadnutému reliéfu vyrytému do nerovného skalného povrchu, ktorý prilieha ku spomenutému komplexu 18 jaskýň. Reliéf zobrazuje kráčajúcu mužskú postavu vojenskej povahy, tzv. „Muž na stene“. Táto postava vzbudila veľký záujem tak z ikonografického, ako aj z nábožensko-kultového uhla pohľadu. Keď porovnáme tento reliéf s inými štúdiami a zoberieme do úvahy ikonografické vlastnosti postavy, môžeme postavu hodnoverne identifikovať s božstvom neskoršej rímskej doby. Táto postava je potom pravdepodobne náznakom kultovej pohanskej aktivity v tejto bezvýznamnej a izolovanej oblasti v samom srdci prírody.

377-401: **Michele Voltaggio: La rete ecclesiastica di Gerusalemme nel periodo proto-islamico.** M. Voltaggio je odborníkom na kresťanskú archeológiu Svätej zeme a v článku sa pokúša stanoviť počet kostolov a kláštorov v Jeruzaleme, ako aj ich úlohu v období od druhej polovice siedmeho storočia až do začiatku jedenásteho storočia, teda raného arabského obdobia. Pri skúmaní využívaných cirkevných budov v danom časovom úseku zistíme, že jeruzalemská diecéza čelila značnej kríze a všimneme si tiež jej dopad na obyvateľov okolitých miest, dedín a osád.

403-411: **Maciej Waclawik: Bronze Steelyards from the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Jerusalem Archeological Museum.** Minciery boli staré závesné váhy a predavači ich bežne používali na agorách či fórach, teda na veľkých trhových námestiach počas rímskeho a byzantského obdobia. Vážili na princípe páky, ktorý spomína Aristoteles, hoc ten poznala spoločnosť pravdepodobne už skôr. Dva strieborné minciery sa nachádzajú v Jeruzalemskom archeologickom múzeu Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. Prvý z nich je príkladom kodanského typu a datuje sa medzi druhé až štvrté storočie po Kristovi. Druhý pochádza z kolekcie zberateľa Cesarea Colomba a jeho vznik sa kladie medzi prvé storočie a začiatok druhého storočia po Kristovi. Súčasťou zariadenia je aj malé závažie v tvare kanvičky s rúčkou, ktoré si zaslúži osobitý výskum, keďže rozbor, s ohľadom na historický vývoj keramiky, posúvajú dobu jeho vzniku do druhého storočia pred Kristom, čo by znamenalo, že minciery sa používali už v období helenizmu.

413-456: **Bruno Callegher: Nella ‘casseta di un raccoglitore’ di monete antiche: analisi di una collezione per venuta al Museo dello Studium Biblicum Franciscanum e ipotesi sulla sua formazione.** Numizmatická zbierka múzea SBF obsahuje mince, ktorých pôvod a archeologická lokalita nie sú úplne jasné. Kvôli množstvu týchto mincí bola podrobená výskumu len jedna zbierka. Na prekvapenie ide o kompletnú zbierku. Táto štúdia poukazuje na rovnaký fyzický a typologický charakter týchto mincí s mincami, ktoré sa našli v historickom regióne Palestíny. Numizmatická analýza len posilňuje súčasný výskum v posledných dekádach, ktorý vrhá nové svetlo na túto problematiku. A to nielen na kartáginckú a ostrogótsku numizmatiku, ale aj na numizmatiku arabsko-byzantskú. Je zrejmé, že všetky mince tejto zbierky majú svoj pôvod mimo sýrsko-palestínskeho regiónu. Táto numizmatická dokumentácia poskytuje nové údaje pre vedcov, zvlášť v používaní a nahradení *prutotu* (minca malej hodnoty) v hasmoneovsko-herodiánskom období,

poukazuje na vplyv Kartága v razení bronzových mincí, ktoré boli v obehu v 5. – 6. storočí, hoci len v limitovanom množstve a na prijatie peňažného obchodu alexandrijského *dodocanummia* a jeho napodobňovanie v priebehu 6. storočia.

Vavrínec Radoslav Mitro OP
Dominikánsky konvent
Mäsiarska 6
040 01 Košice
Slovenská republika

Recenzie

GIUNTOLI, Federico – SCHMID, Konrad (eds.): *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch. New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (FAT 101), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. 351 s. ISBN 978-3-16-153121-7.

Názov kolektívnej monografie *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch* jasne odkrýva, ktorým smerom sa ubera vedecký výskum predložený v tomto 101. zväzku známej tübingenskej edície *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*. Predznačuje postupné a definitívne vzd'alo vanie sa od tradičnej dokumentárnej teórie JEDP spojenej s menami ako J. Wellhausen, M. Noth a G. von Rad. Pentateuch je stredobodom pozornosti v tomto zväzku, a to z pohľadu jeho motívov a tém, ktoré sa spájajú s poslednými teologickými horizontmi a redakciami Mojžišovho zákona. Podtitul to vyjadruje jasne – monografia uvedie čitateľa do nových perspektív, ktoré sa týkajú posledných redakcií Pentateuchu. Nové perspektívy – ako ich opisujú v krátkom úvode dvaja editori Federico Giuntoli z Pápežského biblického inštitútu a Konrad Schmid z Univerzity v Zürichu – vychádzajú už z predpokladu mnohých odborníkov, že nie málo pasáží z Pentateuchu dostalo svoju finálnu podobu v perzskom či dokonca v helenistickom období. Z výsledkov výskumu za ostatné desaťročia vyplýva, že Pentateuch vo svojej finálnej podobe je ovocím poexilovej komunity, ktorá prevzala texty svedčiace o ich kultúrnom dedičstve a o ich starobylych naráciách a obohatila ich o úvahy, pričom vychádzala zo svojej skúsenosti (s. V). Takéto nastolenie problematiky nevyhnutne predpokladá nie iba detailné analýzy viacerých medzi sebou úzko prepojených textov, ktoré sú kľúčové pre post-kňazské redakcie, ale aj taký komplexný pohľad na narácie a zákony v Pentateuchu, ktorý má vyrovnaný prístup k hĺbkovým a špecifickým výskumom. K takýmto odborníkom, ktorí sú garantmi vedeckého progresu v uvedenej oblasti štúdia Pentateuchu, patrí jubilant, spomenutý 7-krát v úvode a profesor Pápežského biblického inštitútu Jean Louis Ska SJ, ktorému je tento zborník venovaný pri príležitosti jeho 70. narodenín. Jedným z jeho predmetov výskumu boli texty, ktoré nasledovali diachronicky až po kňazských textoch.

Všetkých 17 príspevkov v monografii (s. 1 – 341) – šesť v nemčine a jedenásť v angličtine – sa zaoberajú striktnou uvedenou problematikou. V závere knihy je zoznam prispievateľov (s. 343 – 344) a registre biblických citácií (s. 345 – 348) a moderných autorov (s. 349 – 351). Predstavíme niektoré príspevky a zoznam zvyšných uvedieme na konci.

Prvý príspevok „Von der Diaskeuase zur nachredaktionellen Fortschreibung. Die Geschichte der Erforschung der nachpriesterschriftlichen Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch“ od Konrada Schmida (s. 1 – 18) predstavuje stav výskumu zameraný na post-kňazskú redakciu Pentateuchu – tzv. Diskeuasú v reči Schmida. Začínajúc Wellhausenom a jeho teóriou Schmid urobil stručný historický prierez výskumom, aby ho zavŕšil súčasnými zástancami, ktorí rôzne obhajujú viacerých post-kňazských redaktorov – od jedného redaktora (J. Baden) až po šiestich (Ch. Berner). Podľa Schmida prieskum post-kňazskej redakcie je pole, ktoré potrebuje nevyhnutne ďalší hĺbkový prieskum i preto, že samotná redakcia závisí aj od kompozície celého Pentateuchu. Až by sa zdalo, že ide o rekapitulovaný pohľad na záverečnú podobu Pentateuchu.

Predpoklady týkajúce sa post-kňazskej redakcie rozpracúva druhý príspevok Davida M. Carra „Strong and Weak Cases and Criteria for Establishing the Post-Priestly Character of Hexateuchal Material“ (s. 19 – 34). Ako post-kňazské definuje texty Hexateuchu s charakteristikou nie-P a prezentuje silné (Ex 34,11-26; Nm 21,33-35) i slabé (Gn 14,15) prípady, aby stanovil post-kňazský charakter aj niektorých iných textov ako Gn 2,4 (!) a Joz 24,6-7*.³³ Okrem toho sa Carr domnieva, že mnohé z tzv. kňazských textov, ktoré sa objavujú len tak, ako keby boli prepierané kňazskou tradíciou („Priestly wash“) a kde-tu pridali čosi kňazského do textov (ktoré sú z) nie-P, a to až potom, čo texty P a nie-P boli zlúčené; v skutočnosti pochádzajú z nekňazských textov Hexateuchu, ktoré si zaslúžia označenie „post-kňazské“.

Reinhard Achenbach vo svojom príspevku „How to Speak about GOD with Non-Israelites. Some Observations about the Use of Names for God by Israelites and Pagans in the Pentateuch“ (s. 35 – 51) skúmal teologický motív – ako Izraeliti a Neizraeliti používajú meno *Elohîm* v Pentateuchu. Uzatvára, že v Kňazskom kódexe (P) teológia *Elohîm* predstavuje všeobecné formovanie izraelského náboženstva. Pisári zo začiatku obdobia Druhého chrámu boli presvedčení, že Neizraeliti mohli vyznávať Boha Izraela iba vtedy, keď boli v kontakte s Izraelitmi. Neskôr, podľa toho, ako to dokazujú texty Ex 12,38 a Dt 29,10-11, mohli dokonca vstúpiť do zmluvy s YHWH. Naproti tomu však, Kódex svätosti (H) predstavuje exkluzívnejšiu tradíciu, pretože využitie mena *Elohîm* sa nachádza vo formule zmluvy (porov. Lv 26,45) a pohanovia môžu byť iba svedkami exodu, keď sa pred ich očami YHWH rozhodol stať sa Bohom iba pre Izraelitov.

Štvrtý príspevok „The Formative Impact of the Hexateuch Redaction. An Interim Result“ od Rainera Albertza (s. 53 – 74) obsahuje konkrétne texty z Gn–Ex a Nm–Joz, ktoré podľa jeho teórie redakcie Hexateuchu (HexR) patria k tejto vrstve. Albertz navrhuje neskoré datovanie svojej HexR – ale ešte pred poslednou redakciou Pentateuchu (PentR), viditeľnou v Nm 25–36 – medzi 430 a 410 pred Kr. Táto HexR okrem iného zdôrazňuje nielen návrat a život v prisľúbenej krajine, ale aj výlučné uctievanie YHWH, poslušnosť Božiemu zákonu a dobré vzťahy s blízkymi susediacimi národmi.

Štúdiá Bernarda S. Jacksona „Ruth, the Pentateuch and the Nature of Biblical Law in Conversation with Jean Louis Ska“ (s. 75 – 111) o Knihe Rút, Pentateuchu a povahe biblického zákona je konverzácia so štúdiami oslávenca J. L. Sku. Jackson sa jedinečným spôsobom zaoberá otázkou intertextuality medzi Knihou Rút a Pentateuchom. Vzťah, ktorý skúma, nazýva skôr vzťahom medzi dvoma právnymi svetmi („two legal worlds“). Prieskum realizuje konvenčne v troch skupinách: 1. verejný stav (vzťah medzi náboženstvom a etnikom), 2. vykúpenie, levirát, manželstvo a dedičstvo a 3. genealógia. Na konci tejto zdĺhavej konverzácie o využiteľnosti biblických zákonov na judskom vidieku Jackson uzatvára, že za legislatívnymi tradíciami bol viac komplex etnika, náboženstva a domácich zvyklostí než koncept inštitucionálne stanoveného zákona. Dokonca sa zdá, že aj koncept *go'el* odráža skôr spoločenské chápanie ako právnu definíciu. Kniha Rút by tak ilustrovala prepracovanejším a neinštitucionálnym spôsobom využiteľnosť zákona v starovekom Izraeli. Nepochybne si čitateľ kladie otázku, či samotná spísaná legislatíva odráža ideál alebo skutočnosť.

Bernard M. Levinson venuje svoj príspevok „A Post-Priestly Harmonization in the Flood Narrative“ (s. 113 – 123) problematike dublet v príbehu o potope (Gn 6–9). Tvrdí, že posledný editor nebol pasívny, ale snažil sa zharmonizovať dublety tak, aby čo najviac zredukoval napätie medzi nimi. Gn 7,8–9 by bol príkladom textu post-kňazskej redakcie, v ktorom sa redaktor snažil vyriešiť problém napätia medzi dvoma predchádzajúcimi textami – prvý 6,17–22 (P) a druhý z 7,1–5 (nie-P). Levinson považuje tento typ editovania už za „vnútro-biblickú exegézu“.

Štúdiá Christopha Levina „Die Verheißungen an die Väter. Eine Bestandsaufnahme“ (s. 125 – 143) skúma redakčné využitie textov s motívom prisľubu daného patriarchom, ktoré sa nenachádzajú v Kňazskom kódexe. Cieľom Levina je dokázať tézu, ktorá je v rozpore s tvrdením Sku v anglickom vydaní jeho známeho Úvodu do čítania Pentateuchu¹. Levin argumentuje, že ani jeden

¹ SKA, Jean-Louis: *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006, 87–88. Prvé vydanie bolo talianske: *Introduzione alla lettura del*

z predmetných textov, s výnimkou tých, ktoré sú súčasťou vrstvy jahvistického diela, nemá redakčný význam, a to ani na úrovni dejín patriarchov a ani na úrovni post-kňazskej redakcie Pentateuchu. Zástanca jahvistického redakcie v prípade týchto textov (Gn 12,2-3.7a; 16,11; 18,10; 26,2*.3a; 28,13a.15a; 31,3; Ex 3,7*.8a) považuje za ne-kňazské (nie-P) texty Gn 13,14-15a (prísľub zeme) a Gn 15,5 (prísľub potomstva) až za post-kňazské.

Výskum Josepha Blenkinsoppa „The «Covenant of Circumcision» (Gen 17) in the Context of the Abraham Cycle (Gen 11:27–25:11). Preliminary Considerations“ (s. 145 – 156) vychádza z konsenzu, že Gn 17 pochádza z P. Autor tvrdí, že kapitola má kľúčovú úlohu v cykle o Abrahámovi a ukazuje, že je výsledkom redakčnej práce aspoň na troch úrovniach, z ktorých každá jedna dobre poznala jazyk a témy typické pre P. Zjavenie (vv. 1-7) patrí k základnej vrstve P neobabylonského obdobia, prísľub syna (vv. 15-22) je neskoršia prepísaná verzia 18,9-15 a nakoniec správa o obrízke (17,9-14.23-27) je ešte neskorším dodatkom, súvisiacim s P. Autor varuje, že vedci čelia nevedomosti o účele a definícii samotného P a o druhu skribálnej činnosti v období Druhého chrámu, čo samozrejme neľahčuje situáciu v oblasti výskumu.

Matthias Köckert vo svojom výskume „Gen 20–22 als nach-priesterliche Erweiterung der Vätergeschichte“ (s. 157 – 176) skúma post-kňazské rozšírenie v dejinách patriarchov. Tvrdí, že narodenie Izáka (21,1-7), ako aj vyhostenie Agar a Izmaela (21,8-21) sú post-kňazské. Na druhej strane mieni, že súvis príbehov o Abrahámovi a Sáře u Abimelecha (20,1-17) a o zviazaní Izáka (22,1-19) s P nemožno s istotou dokázať a texty odrážajú neskoršie perzské obdobie.

Alexander Rofé sa vo svojom príspevku „The Admonitions not to Leave the Promised Land in Genesis 24 and 26 and the Authorization in Genesis 46“ (s. 177 – 184) zaoberá motívom nezanechania prísľúbenej zeme, ktorý je prítomný v Gn 24 a 26, a tiež motívom dovolenia odísť z krajiny podľa Gn 46. Motív prítomný v troch textoch sa stal dôležitým v perzskom období a ich redakcia je súčasťou poslednej vrstvy príbehov o patriarchoch. Preto patria do post-kňazskej vrstvy Knihy Genezis.

Príbehom o Jozefovi v Knihe Genezis (Gn 37–50) sa zaoberá Tomáš Römer v príspevku „The Joseph Story: Pre- or Post-P?“ (s. 185 – 201). Pokladá ho za nezávislú novelu z diaspóry, skomponovanú počas perzského obdobia pravdepodobne v Egypte s cieľom odôvodniť život mimo krajiny Izrael. Nepovažuje ju za staršiu ako P, ba naopak, za mladšiu od P a vloženú do finálnej podoby Knihy Genezis až po vnesení textov P do Gn.

Ako posledný príspevok prezentujeme najdlhší so všetkých „Ephraim, Manasseh, and Post-Exilic Israel. A Study of the Redactional Expansions in Gen 48

Pentateuco. Chiavi per l'interpretazione dei primi cinque libri della Bibbia (Collana biblica), Roma: EDB, 1998.

Regarding Joseph's Sons“ (s. 203 – 232) – ide o výskum Frederica Giuntoliho, editora celého Festschriftu, ktorý sa zaoberal neskorými post-kňazskými dodatkami v Gn 48. Príspevku však nechýba jasnosť argumentácie, ako aj jedinečnosť témy, akými sa vyznačuje i jeho učiteľ, predchodca a oslávenec, ktorému tak Giuntoli vzdal hold. Giuntoli tvrdí, že k veľmi neskorým dodatkom Gn 48 patria verše 3-7 a 15-16. V nich neskorí redaktori odvážne uviedli bratov Efraima a Manassesa ako ikony exilových Júdovcov, a tak vlastne ako budúcnosť nového Izraela. Redaktori vychádzali z toho, že bratia sa narodili a žili v cudzine, v ktorej žili aj ich otcovia. Sú synmi Jozefa, ktorý žil v cudzine a ich matka je cudzinka. Redaktori využili minulosť, aby vysvetlili radostnú prítomnosť.

Monografia pokračuje piatimi štúdiami: Jan C. Gertz: „Zusammenhang, Trennung und Selbständigkeit der Bücher Genesis und Exodus im priesterlichen und nachpriesterlichen Pentateuch“ (s. 233 – 251), Ludwig Schmidt: „Der Stab des Mose in der vor- und nachpriesterlichen Redaktion des Pentateuch“ (s. 253 – 275), Hans-Christoph Schmitt: „Die «Sinai-Overtüre» in Ex 19,3b-9 als nachpriesterliche Verbindung zwischen Pentateuch und Vorderen Propheten. Mal'ak-, Hexateuch- oder Enneateuch-Fortschreibung?“ (s. 277 – 303), Christophe Nihan: „Leviticus 26:39-46 and Post-Priestly Composition of Leviticus. Some Remarks in Light of the Recent Discussion“ (s. 305 – 329), Eckart Otto: „The Integration of the Post-exilic Book of Deuteronomy into the Post-Priestly Pentateuch“ (s. 331 – 341).

Hoci nie všetky príspevky zdieľajú odborný pohľad oslávenca na neskoré redakčné poexilové vstupy pri tvorbe záverečnej podoby Pentateuchu, samotná monografia poskytuje jedinečný príklad rôznych prístupov a opodstatnených záverov o redakčných aktivitách Mojžišovho zákona, ktoré prebiehali v neskoršom poexilovom období.

*Blažej Štrba
Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta
Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave
Banská 28
976 32 Badín
Slovenská republika*

SPRÁVY A OZNAMY

Aktualizačný seminár pre vyučujúcich a študujúcich Sväté písmo, Rím (Taliansko)

Pápežský biblický inštitút (PBI) v Ríme v dňoch 22. – 26. januára 2018 organizoval už siedmy ročník seminára pre študujúcich a vyučujúcich Sväté písmo. Témy seminárov sú striedavo zamerané na knihy SZ a NZ, tento rok boli sústredené na historické knihy SZ.

Dopoludňajší program tvorili dve hlavné prednášky biblistov, odborníkov svetového významu v danej oblasti pre všetkých účastníkov, kým popoludňajší čas bol venovaný seminárom s menším počtom účastníkov, čo vytváralo väčší priestor pre vzájomnú interakciu a možnosť diskusie.

V prvý deň prof. Simone Paganini z Inštitútu pre katolícku teológiu pri Rýnsko-Vestfálskej technickej vysokej škole Aachen (RWTH Aachen University) predstavil vývoj chápania teórie o Deuteronomistickej histórii a komplexné textové a lingvistické otázky možného vplyvu Knihy Deuteronomium na Knihy Samuelove, ako aj otázky prítomnosti deuteronomistickej teológie v Knihách Samuelových, ktorá je dnes považovaná za veľmi nepravdepodobnú. Téma vplyvu deuteronomistickej tradície na Knihy Samuelove sa objavila aj na druhý deň v hlavnej prednáške španielskeho jezuitu José Luis Sicre SJ, často hosťujúceho profesora na PBI. Predstavil najnovšie výskumy v oblasti formácie Samuelových kníh, ako aj ich vzťah s históriou. Nechýbalo z jeho strany ani uvedenie najnovších výskumov Kníh Jozue a Sudcov z oblasti ich formácie, cieľov a interpretácie.

Profesorka Béatrice Oiry z Université Catholique de l'Ouest v Angers sa vo svojej prednáške *La storia come racconto: contributi di una lettura narrativa della storiografia biblica* venovala kategórii kauzalita, ktorá spája naráciu s históriou. Spôsob narácie, použité výrazové prostriedky a iné prvky vytvárajú istý typ histórie. Dynamická sila histórie sa nachádza v priesečníku Božieho projektu a ľudskej zodpovednosti.

Prvú a Druhú knihu kráľov a rôzne exegetické školy posledných desaťročí predstavil profesor Peter Dubovský SJ. Prehľadným a excelentným spôsobom

uviedol zmeny, ktoré nastali vo výskume v 20. – 21. storočí na úrovni rekonštrukcie histórie, diachronických i synchronických analýz textu a jeho recepcie.

Karmelitán a domáci profesor PBI Craig Morrison O.Carm. sa vo svojej hlavnej prednáške venoval interpretácii postavy kráľa Dávida a jeho príbehu. Na pochopenie a interpretáciu funkcie naratívnych techník v 1Sam 16–1Kr 2 sa zamerával počas svojho popoludňajšieho seminára, v ktorom analyzoval hlas rozprávača komentujúceho udalosti v Dávidovom príbehu.

Posledné dopoludnie profesor Claudio Balzaretto, odborník na orientálne jazyky a na Knihu Ezdráš a Nehemiáš, objasnil napríklad tradičné pohľady a nové hypotézy v poexilovej histórii z pohľadov exulantov i tých, ktorí zostali v Judei. V druhej časti svojej prednášky sa venoval hypotézam vzťahu knihy Kroník s Knihami Ezdráš a Nehemiáš.

V závere seminára profesor Paolo Merlo z Pápežskej lateránskej univerzity a PBI panoramatickým spôsobom predstavil niektoré historiografické texty starovekého Blízkeho východu vo vzťahu k starozákonným textom. Prednášajúci neopnechali bokom ani helenistické obdobie a obdobie Rímskej ríše – nastolenie otázky židovskej historiografie novým spôsobom v týchto obdobiach predstavila profesorka Cristina Termini.

Popoludňajšie semináre špecifikovali na konkrétnych biblických textoch historických kníh Svätého písma prvky interpretácie niektorých udalostí, naratívne techniky v službe vykreslenia jednotlivých postáv i osobností, či udalosti biblických dejín vo svetle nových archeologických údajov.

Direktor Združenia bývalých študentov PBI, profesor Pietro Bovati SJ, sa s účastníkmi rozlúčil krátkym zhrňujúcim prejavom a pozdravom vyjadrujúcim nádej na pokračovanie: „Budúci rok v Ríme.“

Slovensko malo na seminári tiež svoje zastúpenie, a to v osobe prednášajúceho prof. Petra Dubovského SJ, dekana Fakulty biblických vied PBI a medzi 145 účastníkov patrili: Monika Golianová FMA, Mykhaylyna Kľusková, Vladimír Peregrin SDB a Blažej Štrba. Seminár naozaj – v zhode so svojimi cieľmi – poskytol priestor a podnety, a to aj vo forme otázok pre aktualizáciu, rozšírenie obzorov, pre ďalšie vzdelávanie a zdieľanie skúseností v oblasti pedagogickej a vedeckej činnosti.

*Monika Golianová FMA
Kremnická 17
851 01 Bratislava
Slovenská republika*

25. výročie Katolíckeho biblického diela na Slovensku

Katolícke biblické dielo slávi v roku 2018 štvrtstoročie svojej existencie. Pri tejto príležitosti redakcia periodika *Studia Biblica Slovaca* praje svojmu bývalému vydavateľovi v rokoch 2006 – 2011 hojnosť Božej pomoci a inšpirácie v šírení Božieho slova na území Slovenska i v nasledujúcich rokoch.

Redakcia *StBiSl*

Libri ad directionem missi

ŠŮTOR, Lukáš (ed.): *Text v kontextoch. Text v interdisciplinárnych interpretáciách. Zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie Október 2016*, Košice: Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika, 2018. 310 s. ISBN 978-80-8152-594-0.

Liber Annuus LXVII 2017. Editor L. Daniel Chrupcała, Milano – Jerusalem: Edizioni Terra Santa – Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, 2018. 523 s. ISBN 978-88-6240-560-7. ISSN 0081-8933.

Old Testament Abstracts 40 (3/2017). Editor Christopher T. Begg, Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America. 437-749 s. ISSN 0364-8591.

Old Testament Abstracts 41 (1/2018). Editor Christopher T. Begg, Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America. 1-285 s. ISSN 0364-8591.