

Contents

Treaties

<i>Emanuel TOV</i> Some Major Israelite Figures in the Former Prophets in the Tradition of the Septuagint	1-23
<i>Peter DUBOVSKÝ</i> From Miracle-makers Elijah and Elisha to Jesus and Apocrypha	24-42
<i>Ladislav TICHÝ</i> Rahab the Prostitute in the New Testament	43-50
<i>Petr MAREČEK</i> Elijah: His Role and Importance in the Gospel of Luke	51-70
<i>Helena PANCZOVÁ</i> Allegorical Exegesis of the Greek Philosophers as Background of Hellenistic Biblical Exegesis: Literary-cultural Survey	71-102
Abstracts and Reviews	103-117
Communications and References	118-124



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 XII (2020), číslo 1

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

Redakčná rada/Editorial board:

Georg BRAULIK, OSB (Wien, AT)	Libor MAREK (Detroit, US)
Jaroslav BROŽ (Praha, CZ)	Helena PANCZOVÁ (Bratislava, SK)
Jeremy CORLEY (Dublin, IE)	Petr POKORNÝ (Praha, CZ, † 2020)
Peter DUBOVSKÝ, SJ (Roma, IT)	Jaroslav RINDOŠ, SJ (Bratislava, SK)
Pavol FARKAŠ (Nitra, SK)	Milan SOVA (Bratislava, SK)
Juraj FENÍK (Košice, SK)	Fides Iveta STREŇKOVÁ, CJ (Prešov, SK)
Massimo GRILLI (Roma, IT)	Jozef TIŇO (Bratislava, SK)
Leslie HOPPE, OFM (Chicago, US)	Emanuel TOV (Jerusalem, IL)
Peter JUHÁS (Münster, DE)	František TRSTENSKÝ (Spišské Podhradie, SK)
Branislav KLUŠKA (Ružomberok, SK)	Miroslav VARŠO (Košice, SK)
Róbert LAPKO (Košice, SK)	Ian YOUNG (Sydney, AU)

Šéfredaktor:	Blažej ŠTRBA (Badín, SK)
Zástupca šéfredaktora:	Jozef JANČOVIČ (Bratislava, SK)
Redaktor pre recenzie:	Július PAVELČÍK (České Budějovice, CZ)
Výkonná redaktorka:	Martina KORYTIAKOVÁ (Roma, IT)

Za recenzovanie všetkých článkov zodpovedá redakčná rada.

Obálka: Karol Hájiček

Na príprave publikácie sa podieľali: Veronika Černušková, Pavel Dudzik, Lionel Goh, OFM a Zuzana Očkajáková.

Príspevky v slovenčine, češtine a 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. Preferované fonty písma pre hebrejštinu a gréčtinu sú SBL Hebrew and SBL Greek. Príspevkov typu štúdiá, 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. Spresňujúce podmienky pre prispievateľov sú dostupné na www.biblica.sk.

Časopis je registrovaný a abstrahovaný v ATLA Religion Database, EBSCO, *New Testament Abstracts* ISSN 0028-6877 a *Old Testament Abstracts* ISSN 0364-8591.

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

Studia Biblica Slovaca
Printed in Slovakia, 6/2020
Vychádza dvakrát do roka.
Cena: 6 €

ISSN 1338-0141
e-ISSN 2644-4879
EV 3744/09

Obsah

Štúdie

Emanuel TOV

Niektoré hlavné postavy Izraela u Skorších prorokov
v tradícii Septuaginty 1-23

Peter DUBOVSKÝ

Porovnanie Eliášových a Elizeových zázrakov so zázrakmi
Ježiša Krista 24-42

Ladislav TICHÝ

Nevěstka Rachab v Novém zákoně 43-50

Petr MAREČEK

Eliáš. Jeho role a důležitost v Lukášově evangeliu 51-70

Helena PANCZOVÁ

Alegorická exegéza gréckych filozofov ako pozadie helenistickej
exegézy Biblie. Literárno-kultúrny prehľad 71-102

Abstrakty a recenzie 103-117

Správy a oznamy 118-124

Some Major Israelite Figures in the Former Prophets in the Tradition of the Septuagint

Emanuel Tov

This study examines the representation in the Septuagint of a few major Israelite figures featuring in the Former Prophets. The Septuagint is a translation, but the translators of the various books could have presented these figures differently from the MT; for example, the Greek translations could have preserved vestiges of ancient traditions that differ from those of the MT. We know that in the MT the figures of David and Solomon as found in Chronicles differ from those in Samuel and Kings. We also know that Josephus, Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and several Qumran writings present a different picture from that in the MT and, by the same token, the LXX could also reflect different Hebrew or Greek traditions.

It should be remembered that the LXX canon is composed of translations of different types and therefore biblical figures are presented in different ways. Thus, the Greek Joshua reflects only a few variant traditions about Joshua, while the Greek book of 1 Kgs reflects many variant traditions about David and Solomon. Again, the LXX of Chronicles reflects very few diverse traditions. Each translated book stands by itself.

The Greek form of 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms in the LXX) presents a rather unique situation. I would say that this is the exception rather than the rule. Thus, in an earlier study¹ I found that the picture of Moses in the LXX did not differ much from that in the MT. Philo, Ezekiel the Tragedian, and Josephus had much to say about Moses, but their Greek source, the LXX, had little interest in exegetical traditions regarding Moses. The results of that investigation thus were rather negative and this, in by itself, is a remarkable phenomenon. The Greek books of the Torah reflect unmistakable contextual, theological, and legal exegesis, but

¹ Tov, *Moses in the Septuagint*.

the person of Moses was not the focus of their interest². This is the case also with the other biblical figures as far as I have been able to see. However, in this paper, I deal with the exceptions.

The first sign of the lack of exegetical traditions in the LXX is found in a research tool that should be one's first step in locating theology, namely the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*³. This handbook is very excessive in its description of the theological background of Septuagintal and New Testament words that are not necessarily theological. At the same time, *TDNT* does not refer to the persons or names mentioned in the LXX, such as Moses⁴, Abraham, Joseph, Aaron, Israel, and Jerusalem. Some of the major figures relevant to the period of the Former Prophets are mentioned in *TDNT*, but their coverage does not include the period of the Hebrew Bible or the LXX⁵.

In what follows, I present evidence that I have been able to find of differences between the MT and the LXX relating to major figures in the Former Prophets. The greatest amount found pertains to 3 Kgdms. The discussion is necessarily fragmentary and haphazard. I cannot give a complete picture of Joshua or Solomon in the LXX, because such a picture would not be realistic as most of its details agree with the MT. Usually the LXX takes the description from its Hebrew source. My discussion is limited to the few instances in which the LXX differs from the MT, as they may point to a special reality. This type of analysis is often fragmentary.

1 Joshua

The figure of Joshua in the MT and the LXX is the same person even though their names differ and they have a different character after the appearance of Christianity. The Greek translation was probably produced in the second century BCE, when there was no Christian flavor to the equivalent יהושע – Ἰησοῦς. That equivalent undoubtedly did not reflect יהושע but the shortened יְהוֹשֻׁעַ.

² DOGNIEZ, *La figure de Moïse*, 62, reached a similar conclusion.

³ KITTEL – FRIEDRICH (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.

⁴ JEREMIAS, *Μωυσῆς*.

⁵ David is not covered but “son of David” is in LOHSE, *υἱὸς Δαυίδ*; Solomon in LOHSE, *Σολομών*; Joshua in FOESTER, *Ἰησοῦς*; Elisha in JEREMIAS, *Ἠλ(ε)ίας*.

such as found in the late books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah⁶. Indeed the same person was named both יהושע בן־יהוֹצָדָק הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (Hag 1:1) and יְשׁוּעַ בֶּן־יֹצָדָק (Ezra 3:2). In Christianity, the Old Testament figure Joshua – Ἰησοῦς is often equated with Jesus Christ.

a) Common to the traditions about Ἰησοῦς in the LXX is the wish to present Joshua as a person who is more important than Moses and as a law-abiding person. Such tendencies can be learned only from differences between the LXX and the other sources.

i. According to the tractate Abot 1:1, “Moshe received the Torah from Sinai and he handed it over to Joshua, and Joshua handed it over to the elders and the elders to the Prophets”. This tradition reflects Joshua’s elevated status in both the MT and the LXX. Already in Exod 24, Joshua is close to Moses, more so in the LXX than in the MT⁷.

Exod 24:13

MT	ויקם משה ויהושע משרתו ויעל משה אל־הר האלהים = SP
NRSV	So Moses set out with his assistant Joshua, and Moses <i>went up</i> into the mountain of God
LXX	καὶ ἀναστὰς Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ παρεστηκῶς ⁸ αὐτῷ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ θεοῦ.
NETS	And Moyses rose up and Iesous who assisted him, and <i>they went up</i> into the mountain of God.

Exod 24:13 attests to the various differences between the traditions in which Moses went up to the mountain, either alone or together with others⁹. The MT is contextually difficult since Moses and Joshua started out the journey together and only Moses arrived at the destination. The LXX solved the issue by changing the verb from the singular to the plural (while at the same time omitting the name “Moses”). The Greek version thus elevates Joshua’s position by making him also ascend the mountain of God¹⁰.

⁶ E.g., Ezra 2:2, 6; 1 Chr 24:11. The presentation of the shortened forms is also visible in the presentation of the theophoric names in 1QIsa^a. See KUTSCHER, *Isaiah Scroll*, 4.

⁷ See TOV, Textual Problems.

⁸ The equivalent of משרת, παρεστηκῶς, is rare (Num 11:28; Deut 21:5; 2 Sam 13:17).

⁹ Other traditions are found in Exod 19, 32, and 34. See TOV, Textual Problems.

¹⁰ Most striking is the juxtaposition of the similar vv. 12.13, in which v. 13 was changed and v. 12 was not (¹²The Lord said to Moses, “Come up to me on the mountain, and

ii. The Greek version of Josh 24:5 omits the mention of *Moses* in a central verse describing the history of the Israelites, and thus elevates Joshua to the higher position.

Josh 24:5-6

MT ⁵ וְאַתָּן לְעֵשׂוֹ אֶת־הַר שְׂעִיר לְרֵשֶׁת אוֹתוֹ וַיַּעֲקֹב וּבְנָיו יָרְדוּ מִצְרָיִם: ⁶ וְאַחַר הוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם: ⁶ וְאַחֲרַי אֶבְרַחְשִׁים יַם־סוּף וַיִּרְדְּפוּ מִצְרָיִם אַחֲרַי אֶבְרַחְשִׁים בְּרֶכֶב וּבַפָּרָשִׁים יַם־סוּף

NRSV I gave Esau the hill country of Seir to possess, but Jacob and his children went down to Egypt. ⁵ Then I sent Moses and Aaron, and I plagued Egypt with what I did in its midst; and afterwards I brought you out. ⁶ When I brought your ancestors out of Egypt, you came to the sea; and the Egyptians pursued your ancestors with chariots and horsemen to the Red Sea.

The LXX omits the half-verse mentioning Moses and Aaron, while also representing other details differently:

LXX καὶ ἔδωκα τῷ Ησαυ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σηιρ κληρονομησαὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ Ἰακωβ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ κατέβησαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἐγένοντο ἐκεῖ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ καὶ κραταῖόν. ⁵ καὶ ἐκάκωσαν αὐτούς οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, καὶ ἐπάταξεν κύριος τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐν οἷς ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξήγαγεν ὑμᾶς ⁶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ εἰσῆλθατε εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ἐρυθράν. καὶ κατεδίωξαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὀπίσω τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ἐν ἄρμασιν καὶ ἐν ἵπποις εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ἐρυθράν,

NETS And I gave to Esau Mount Seir for him to inherit. And Iakob and his sons went down into Egypt and became there a great and populous and mighty nation, ⁵ and the Egyptians afflicted them. And the Lord smote Egypt with things he did to them, and afterwards he brought you out ⁶ of Egypt. And you came into the Red Sea, and the Egyptians pursued after your fathers with chariots and with horses into the Red Sea.

wait there ...” ¹³ So Moses set out with his assistant Joshua, and Moses went up...). A consistent change of the context would have led to the addition of the figure of Joshua also in v. 12.

This verse, according to which Moses did not lead the Israelites out of Egypt, is similar to another, a plus to the LXX of Josh 24:31a, in which Joshua is said to have led the Israelites out of Egypt. In other words, according to the LXX of this book, Joshua and not Moses played a central role in that event. This unique tradition is in competition with the main biblical tradition that Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt. As Joshua was already mentioned in the Torah, he would have been old enough to accomplish this task.

Josh 24:31a

LXX ἐκεῖ ἔθηκαν μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ μνήμα, εἰς ὃ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ, τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας, ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Γαλγαλοῖς, ὅτε ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καθὰ συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς κύριος ...

NETS There they put with him, into the tomb in which they buried him, the flint knives with which he circumcised the sons of Israel in Galgala, *when he led them out of Egypt*, as the Lord instructed them ...

Reconstruction: ... בהוציאו אותם ממצרים ...

This plus refers to the story of the circumcision at Gilgal, and states that Joshua led the Israelites out of Egypt and to that location. It is in agreement with the tradition of 24:5, but I think that this tradition needs to be taken *cum grano salis*¹¹. It seems to me that a textual mishap took place in transferring the information to this position from 5:2-5, where the phrase “to leave Egypt” is mentioned five times in connection with the tradition about the circumcision at Gibeath-haaraloth. While in ch. 5 the Israelites leave Egypt, here the word refers to Joshua leading the people out of Egypt.

b) In two places, Joshua’s actions are reinterpreted as those of God; in ch. 4 regarding the erecting of the stones in the Jordan, and in ch. 9 regarding the ruse of the Gibeonites. Joshua is as important as Moses.

Josh 4:8

MT וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כִן בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה

NRSV The Israelites did as *Joshua* commanded.

¹¹ Differently in ROFÉ, Joshua, 23, 24: “This verse is most likely original.”; “Apparently, verse 31a was excised from MT.”; RÖSEL, Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches, 205.

- LXX καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ, καθότι ἐνετείλατο κύριος
τῷ Ἰησοῖ,
NETS And the sons of Israel did so, as the *Lord* commanded Iesusus.

Josh 9:3

- MT יִשְׁבִי גִבְעוֹן שָׁמְעוּ אֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לִירִיחוֹ וְלָעַי
NRSV But when the inhabitants of Gibeon heard what *Joshua* had done to Jericho and to Ai.
LXX Καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Γαβαων ἤκουσαν πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν κύριος τῇ Ἰεριχω καὶ τῇ Γαι.
NETS And the inhabitants of Gabaon heard all that the *Lord* did to Jericho and to Gai.

There is no clear contradiction between these different accounts since Joshua fulfilled the command of God, but the implication of the texts is different. In the MT of 4:8 and 9:3, Joshua gave the command, while in the LXX God was active behind the scene in 4:8, and Joshua took his place in 9:3. It is hard to know whether this is the translator's interpretation or whether this idea was already found in his *Vorlage*.

The phenomenon itself is known from various places in the Old Testament and the classical sources, and was named “double causality” by Isac L. Seeligmann in a now-classical study¹². Often the initial stories about heroes in the historical books tell of their brave activities, while the historiographer summarizes the situation by saying that it was God who brought about the victory without referring to the human agent¹³. Likewise, in the MT of 1 Sam 19:5, Jonathan says to Saul about David's killing of Goliath: “He took his life in his hands and killed the Philistine, and *the Lord* wrought a great victory for all Israel.” In the same verse, the human bravery is mentioned next to the divine intervention. However, the Peshitta, for reasons of its own, felt the need to emphasize the human factor by referring to David's actions in a small plus: “...wrought a great victory for all Israel through his (i.e., David's) hands”¹⁴.

¹² SEELIGMANN, *Menschliches Heldentum*.

¹³ See SEELIGMANN, *Menschliches Heldentum*, 151-152.

¹⁴ וַיִּשְׁבֹּחַ מְאֹד לַיהוָה לְעַלְיוֹתָא דְּכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיַד דָּוִד וַיִּשְׁבֹּחַ מְאֹד לַיהוָה לְעַלְיוֹתָא דְּכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיַד דָּוִד, “...wrought a great victory for all Israel through his (i.e., David's) hands”.

c) The LXX presents Joshua as a more law-abiding person than he is in the MT. LXX-Joshua contains several nomistic changes (changes in accord with the Torah), but it is hard to know whether they were inserted by the translator or his *Vorlage*.

According to Num 10:8-9, only priests could sound the trumpets when Israel would go to war. However, the same Joshua, who was told to follow the laws of the Torah day and night (Josh 1:8), also gave orders in the MT that nonpriests should be involved in sounding the trumpet during the encircling of Jericho (6:9.13). Remarkably, these texts were changed in the LXX on three occasions:

Josh 6:9b

MT	וְהַמְאִיִּם הָלְךְ אַחֲרֵי הָאָרוֹן הַלְלוֹת וְתִקְוֵעַ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת
NJPS	... and the rear guard marched behind the ark, with the horns sounding all the time.
LXX	καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ οὐραγοῦντες ὀπίσω τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου πορευόμενοι καὶ σαλπίζοντες.
NETS	... and the priests who bring up the rear, behind the ark of the covenant of the Lord, as they walk and trumpet.

Josh 6:13

MT	וְהַמְאִיִּם הָלְךְ אַחֲרֵי אָרוֹן יְהוָה הוֹלִיךְ [הַלְלוֹת] וְתִקְוֵעַ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת
NJPS	and the rear guard marched behind the Ark of the Lord, with the horns sounding all the time.
LXX	καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς ὄχλος ὀπισθε τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου· καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιγξι
NETS	and the rest of the crowd behind the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and <i>the priests</i> sounded with the trumpets.

Josh 6:20

MT	וַיִּרְעוּ הָעָם וַיִּתְקְעוּ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת
NJPS	So the people shouted when the horns were sounded.
LXX	καὶ ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιγξιν οἱ ἱερεῖς
NETS	And <i>the priests</i> sounded with the trumpets.

The last verse, Josh 6:20, is far from clear in the LXX, but it is evident that the priests have been added to the base text¹⁵. In the MT, the priests sound the trumpets in v. 9a, but not in vv. 9b.13.20, while they do so in the LXX (and in the Targum in vv. 9b.13). Furthermore, in v. 8, the horns have been transformed into sacred horns, so that only priests can sound them:

Josh 6:8

MT	וְשַׁבְעָה הַכֹּהֲנִים נֹשְׂאִים שִׁבְעָה שׁוֹפְרוֹת הַיּוֹבְלִים
NJPS	... the seven priests carrying seven rams' horns
LXX	καὶ ἑπτὰ ἱερεῖς ἔχοντες ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγας ἱεράς
NETS	... and seven priests holding seven <i>sacred</i> trumpets

In the LXX, the “trumpets made of rams’ horns” have been transformed into “sacred trumpets.” If there was a Hebrew source, it would have been שופרות הקודש (for MT שופרות היובלים), which is unattested in Hebrew Scripture. The textual relation between the LXX and the MT is unclear since the LXX also leaves out several elements in this passage, possibly because they were considered “verbose” (vv. 6:3b.4.6b.9a).

In a detailed analysis, Leah Mazor ascribes these nomistic changes to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, basing herself on internal analysis and on the external parallel of the Targum and Josephus¹⁶. However, Josephus may depend on the LXX. On the other hand, the nomistic changes, also partially reflected in the Targum, may reflect a theological midrash-like tradition of the LXX, similar to other instances in Josh¹⁷. I find it difficult to reach a decision¹⁸.

The traditions on Joshua developed in several directions, *inter alia* in extensive pluses in the LXX at the end of ch. 24, in 4QJosh^a, and in additional sources¹⁹.

¹⁵ The rear guard is rendered with different terms in vv. 9.13. *σὺραγέω* does not occur elsewhere in the LXX, while *σὺραγία* occurs in Deut 25:18 and Josh 10:19 in connection with the verb זנב.

¹⁶ MAZOR, Jericho Conquest.

¹⁷ See TOV, Midrash-Type Exegesis.

¹⁸ However, nomistic tendencies are found in all witnesses, also in MT. See, e.g., MT Josh 1:7 compared with the LXX. It seems to me that MT expanded an earlier short text, as in the LXX, stressing the importance of the Torah. On the other hand, according to VAN DER MEER, *Formation*, 210-222, the Greek translator abbreviated his parent text.

¹⁹ See my studies TOV, Literary Development; TOV, The Growth of the Book of Joshua; TOV, The Rewritten Book of Joshua.

2 Hannah

The ancient versions differ often in the Former Prophets, but only some differences pertain to the depiction of the personality of a figure in these books. Hannah is such a person who is depicted in a different way in the MT than in the LXX and 4QSam^a. Hannah is a central person in the first chapters of Samuel and she also has a close connection with the temple and its cult. However, in the LXX and the Qumran scroll, her task is more prominent than in the MT, and there is a strong suspicion that her task in the cult has been curtailed in the MT because it would have been inappropriate for a woman to fulfill such tasks.

a) On two occasions the MT removed Hannah's standing before the Lord in a cultic context in 1 Sam 1–2, while other noncultic references were left unchanged (1:12.15):

1 Sam 1:9

MT ותקם חנה אחרי אכלה בשלה ואחרי שתה (= T V)

NRSV After they had eaten and drunk at Shiloh, Hannah rose

LXX + και κατέστη ἐνώπιον κυρίου + (=S)

= + ותתיצב לפני יהוה + = and she stood before the Lord (cf. 1:26; 3:10; 10:23)

1 Sam 1:14

MT+ הסירי את יינד מעליך

NRSV Put away your wine

LXX + και πορεύου ἐκ προσώπου κυρίου +

= + וצאי מלפני יהוה + and go out from the presence of the Lord (cf. Gen 41:46)

b) 1 Sam 1:25

MT+ וישחטו את הפר ויביאו את הנער אל עלי

NRSV and they slaughtered the bull and brought the boy to Eli

LXX και ἔσφαξεν τὸν μόσχον και προσήγαγεν Αννα ἢ μῆτηρ τοῦ παιδαρίου πρὸς Ηλι

= וישחט את הפר ותבא חנה אם הנער אל עלי

NETS and he slaughtered the bull calf. And Hannah, the mother of the child, *brought it* to Eli

According to the MT, unnamed persons brought the boy to Eli while, according to the LXX, Hannah performed this task in a cultic context. The connection in the MT is problematic, since v. 26, referring to Hannah's conversation with Eli, is not connected to the previous verse, while LXX presents a smooth connection. It is not impossible that the original wording was changed in the MT in order to avoid mentioning another action of Hannah.

c) 1 Sam 1:28

LXX	4QSam ^a	MT (= T)
>	ותעזב[הו] שם ותשתח[ו] ליהוה ²⁰	וישתחו שם ליהוה

MT and he bowed low there before the Lord / 4QSam^a [and she left] him [there] and she bowed [before the Lord].

1 Sam 2:11a

LXX	4QSam ^a	MT+
ותעזבהו שם לפני יהוה ותלך ²¹ הרמתה	> ?	וילך אלקנה הרמתה על ביתו

MT+ And Elkanah went home to Ramah / 4QSam^a > ?/ LXX and she left him there before the Lord and she went to Ramah.

The main actions described in 1:28 and 2:11, leaving Samuel at the temple and the bowing before the Lord, are ascribed to different persons in the various textual traditions or are not mentioned at all (the bowing before the Lord is lacking in the LXX). According to 4QSam^a, Hannah prostrates herself before the Lord in the verse preceding the Song of Hannah, and at that point she leaves Samuel at the temple (1:28). On the other hand, according to the LXX, Hannah leaves Samuel at the temple *after* her song (2:11). LXX and 4QSam^a present an internally consistent and probably original version. In 1:28, the MT reflects a revision that shifts the action to Elkanah, though not formally identified in the text, a role that was originally ascribed to Hannah (LXX and 4QSam^a)²².

²⁰ An alternative reconstruction would be ותנח[הו] שם, based on the reconstruction of LXX 2:11 by WELLHAUSEN, *Samuelis*, 42.

²¹ Καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρμαθαιμ. For the two verbs, we follow (against Rahlfs) the text of manuscript B, disregarding the main evidence of the Greek tradition, which has plural forms κατέλ(ε)ιπον, ἀπῆλθον. See my study TOV, Hannah, 435.

²² For a full analysis, see TOV, Hannah.

d) 1 Sam 2:20

MT אשר שאל ליהוה (תחת השאלה) (= T)
 (in place of the loan) he(?) made to the Lord

4QSam^a השאל[ה] לי הוה [(DJD: ת] (השאלת)
 = NJPS (in place of the loan) *she* made to the Lord

LXX (ἀντι τοῦ χρέους) οὗ ἔχρησας τῷ κυρίῳ (= S V)

The reconstructed reading of 4QSam^a conforms to the earlier story: it is Hannah who promised Samuel to God in the very same words (1:27-28). While the MT is unclear, it seems that the figure of Hannah has been replaced with Elkanah as elsewhere in the context. LXX S V adapted the verb to the context (“you lent to the Lord”).

e) 1 Sam 1:23

MT אך יקם יהוה את דברו (= T V)
 May the Lord fulfill *His word*.

4QSam^a [אך יקם יהו]ה היוצא מפִּיךָ
 = NJPS [May the Lo]rd [fulfill] *that which comes out of your mouth*

= LXX ἀλλὰ στήσαι κύριος τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου

While the MT refers to the word of the Lord, 4QSam^a LXX refer to Hannah’s vow. The MT phrase occurs often elsewhere (e.g., Deut 27:26; 1 Kgs 2:4), while the alternative phrase occurs in Num 30:3 in a context of vows: **ל** יהוה יעשה **ל** יעשה מפיו יעשה ככל היצא מפיו יעשה, “he must not break his *word*, but must carry out all that has crossed his lips (literally: came out of his mouth)”. Probably the reading of 4QSam^a LXX was corrected by MT T V. The mentioning of the “word” of God reflects more reverence towards God than the vow of a mere mortal, Hannah. This understanding ties in with the mentioned changes.

In short, in the LXX and the Qumran scroll, Hannah’s task is more prominent than in the MT, and there is a strong suspicion that her task in the cult has been downplayed in the MT because it would have been inappropriate for a woman to perform such tasks.

3 David

One of the stories about David in the MT depicts him in a theological framework that fits the theosophical framework of the MT, but the story is not

included in the LXX. In 1 Sam 16–18, containing mainly the story of David and Goliath, two different literary strata are contained in LXX and the MT reflecting distinct tendencies and theologies.

The story of David and Goliath in the LXX is significantly shorter than that in the MT, including the omission of long sections, the largest of which is 17:12-31. While some scholars claim that the translator omitted these sections with the intention of smoothing over problems in the Hebrew text, most are of the opinion that he found before him a short version of the story representing a literary edition different from the MT (see below)²³.

Since there is no external evidence (such as ancient Hebrew texts) to support the assumed existence of a short Hebrew text, the nature of the LXX can be explained solely on the basis of an analysis of its translation character. According to Tov²⁴, this translation unit reflects a literal translation method and therefore one cannot attribute to the translator the intention of abridging his source to such a great extent, as was claimed by Pisano²⁵.

According to Barthélemy, Gooding, and Rofé, this short Hebrew text, translated faithfully by the LXX, was created at an earlier stage as an abridgement of a longer Hebrew text resembling the MT. On the other hand, according to Tov and Lust, the LXX reflects a short version of the story of the encounter between David and Goliath²⁶. This short version, found both in the LXX and the MT and called here ed. I, is more natural than the MT since it does not contain the double accounts of the latter version, ed. II. Ed. II (the additional verses in the MT) has been added to the story of ed. I. Both versions of the story of David and Goliath contain several parallel (double) elements that are not linked by what we would name cross-references²⁷.

The two layers reflect different theological tendencies. While in the encounter between David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 16–18, David is a well-known person in the LXX (= ed. I), the MT conveys the idea that God can bring victory to his people (ed. II, lacking in the LXX) even through unimportant figures

²³ See TOV, Composition.

²⁴ TOV, Composition.

²⁵ PISANO, *Samuel*, 78-86.

²⁶ For details, see TOV, Composition.

²⁷ David is introduced twice to Saul (16:17-23; 17:55-58), he is twice appointed as an officer in Saul's army (18:5.13), and on two occasions Saul offers the hand of one of his daughters to David in marriage (Merab, 18:17-19; Michal, 18:20-27). The two versions are not completely parallel, for ed. I is fuller than ed. II.

(17:12-31 MT). Likewise, that edition also stressed that David did not need a sword in order to defeat the Philistine (17:50 MT). See 1 Sam 17:50: “So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and a stone, striking down the Philistine and killing him; there was no sword in David’s hand.” These words and several of the surrounding verses in the MT are not found in the LXX. It seems that this theological message has been added in the text edition of the MT, and this is one of its major objectives.

4 Solomon

The book that contains the largest amount of exegesis of a biblical figure in the LXX as a whole, not only in the Former Prophets, is 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs in the MT). This book (Kgdms $\gamma\gamma$ = 1 Kgs 2:11–21:15 [?]) poses a greater challenge for the researcher than the other three books of the Greek Kingdoms (1–2, 4 Kgdms). Scholars assume that Kgdms $\beta\gamma$ and $\delta\delta$ reflect an early revision, *kaige*-Theodotion. The many problems discussed over the past half-century relating to the *kaige*-Theodotion revision in 2 and 4 Kgdms and the evaluation of the Hebrew text of 1–2 Sam in the wake of the Qumran discoveries are very complex. However, they are less complicated than the evaluation of the Greek text of 1 Kgs. From the many studies published in the last decennia, it follows that there is no consensus concerning the evaluation of that version.

The discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts resulted from changes made in either the MT or LXX and therefore they cannot be described in neutral terms. The 2005 monograph by Percy S. F. van Keulen described the features of 3 Kgdms as follows:

The student of 3 Regum is not only struck by the high rate but also by the diversity of differences vis-à-vis 1 Kings that are contained in the book. Pluses and minuses are frequent, as well as word differences. Some of the pluses in 3 Regum consist of duplicate renderings of passages appearing elsewhere in the translation. ... Another peculiar deviation from the MT, typical of the second half of 3 Regum, pertains to the chronological data for kings following Solomon.²⁸

²⁸ VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 1.

In evaluating the extensive differences between the two versions, scholars have determined that the LXX reflects either a Hebrew text like the MT²⁹ or forms a faithful translation of a Hebrew book very different from 1 Kgs. In the latter case, we are confronted with two different compositions rather than texts differing at the scribal level. I believe that the latter option is correct.

Some of the tendencies of the Greek version of 3 Kgdms, already recognized by Thackeray³⁰, were described well by Gooding and van Keulen. Gooding presents a simplified analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten around Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chs. 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chs. 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab³¹. For Gooding, 3 Kgdms takes the form of a Greek commentary of 1 Kgs³². Likewise, for van Keulen, one of the main features of the first part of this rewritten composition is the presentation of a more favorable picture of Solomon³³ and a rearrangement of the sequence of events (named "pedantic timetabling" by Gooding³⁴).

The researcher of 1 Kgs immediately realizes that this translation differs from the MT and the other ancient versions. Leaving aside for a moment the question of the *incipit* of the third book of the Greek Kingdoms, we note that in the middle of ch. 2, the LXX has two long additions, named Summaries 1 and 2 (or Miscellanies 1 and 2). After v. 35, the LXX has fourteen additional verses, traditionally denoted 35_{a-o}, and after v. 46 there are eleven additional verses, denoted 46_{a-l}. These summaries were analyzed long ago.

There is sufficient support for the assumption that the Greek translation of 1 Kgs was based on a Hebrew source³⁵ anterior or subsequent to the MT. Since the tendencies of the Greek 3 Kgdms are easily recognized, and since no overall

²⁹ In this case, the major differences between the Hebrew and Greek were created either by a Greek reviser (see below) or by a free translator. The latter option was embraced by WEVERS, *Exegetical Principles*. Wevers identified various tendencies in relatively small details in the LXX, but he did not suggest often that a different Hebrew text lay at the base of the LXX. Nor did he realize that the LXX reflects a completely different composition.

³⁰ THACKERAY, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 18. See also THACKERAY, *The Greek Translators*; THACKERAY, *A Grammar*, 9-10.

³¹ GOODING, *Text and Midrash*.

³² GOODING, *Text and Midrash*, 28.

³³ VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 300.

³⁴ GOODING, *Pedantic Timetabling*.

³⁵ See my analysis in TOV, *Three Strange Books*.

reverse theory has been suggested for corresponding tendencies in the MT³⁶, I accept Talshir's view³⁷ that the *Vorlage* of 3 Kgdms reworked a text resembling the MT. Polak expressed a similar view³⁸. Ultimately, this view is close to Gooding's theory of midrash exegesis, except that he believes that the rewriting activity was carried out by a Greek reviser and not in the Hebrew text used by the translator.

On the basis of the assumption that 3 Kgdms is based on a Hebrew source, we now focus on its nature. The techniques described in the previous paragraph leave no doubt regarding the direction of the changes. The content summaries in ch. 2 are very inappropriate in their context (see n. 34). They would not have appeared in one of the first stages of writing. Further, the tendencies of this rewritten composition are clearly visible. I therefore believe that, in the main, the MT represents an early layer in the composition of 1 Kgs, and that 3 Kgdms reflects later rewriting.

The reshaping in 3 Kgdms involves the addition, repetition, omission, reordering, and changing of large sections as well as small details. These techniques are similar to those used in other compositions in the biblical realm, both within and beyond Greek and Hebrew Scripture. In the past, the techniques of 3 Kgdms have been compared to those of the midrash³⁹, not only because the rewriting in 3 Kgdms sometimes resembles midrash techniques, but also because of specific parallels with rabbinic literature in subject matter located by Gooding. The Hebrew composition behind 3 Kgdms rewrote⁴⁰ a book resembling the composition contained in the MT.

³⁶ SCHENKER, *Septante*, 151, mentions some elements of supposed revision in MT, but they do not cover the large differences between the two versions.

³⁷ TALSHIR, *Image*, 302.

³⁸ POLAK, *Solomon's Reign*, 143-148.

³⁹ Thus, especially Gooding (note the name of his summarizing study "Text and Midrash"); PETERCA, *Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel*; TALSHIR, *Image*, 302, and TALSHIR, *Alternative Story*, 277-291, uses the same term.

⁴⁰ TALSHIR, *Image*, uses similar terms. The group of rewritten Bible compositions forms a category in its own right, described as follows by HARRINGTON, *Biblical Narratives*, 242: "Because they paraphrase the biblical text, they have been called targumic. Because these books interpret biblical texts, they have been seen as midrashic. But careful literary analysis has demonstrated that they are neither Targums nor midrashim."

The rewriting techniques of 3 Kgdms are illustrated by two text samples pertaining to the figure of Solomon⁴¹:

a) Solomon's wisdom as visible in the timing of his marriage

The wisdom of Solomon regarding his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is included in the main text of 3 Kgdms where the texts about this topic have been rearranged. Early in the story in the MT, Solomon makes the marriage arrangements in a text that is formulated in an unusual, almost clumsy way:

1 Kgs 3:1

MT וַיִּתְחַתֵּן שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַיִּקַּח אֶת־בַּת־פַּרְעֹה וַיְבִיאָהּ אֶל־עִיר דָּוִד עַד כִּלְתּוֹ לְבָנוֹת אֶת־בַּיִתֹּו וְאֶת־בַּיִת יְהוָה וְאֶת־חוֹמַת יְרוּשָׁלַם סָבִיב

NRSV Solomon made a marriage alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt; he took Pharaoh's daughter and brought her into the city of David, *until he had finished* building his own house and the house of the Lord and the wall around Jerusalem

LXX >

The implication is that Solomon married before he finished building his permanent palace (ch. 7) and the temple (ch. 6). The words "until he had finished building his own house", that is, until he had completed his religious duties, carry an almost accusatory tone against someone who wished to marry before completing his duty, and they probably were deemed unacceptable in the case of King Solomon. The verse is lacking in the LXX, but is adduced at a later point, in ch. 5, evincing the rearrangement of the text. This time the verse appears as an example of Solomon's wisdom, with the interpretation that Solomon made the marriage arrangements at a later stage in his life⁴². The verse appears in the middle of a long description of Solomon's wisdom.

1 Kgs 5:9

MT וַיִּתֵּן אֱלֹהִים חֲכָמָה לְשֹׁלֹמֹה וְתְבוּנָה הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד וְרוּחַב לֵב כַּחֹל אֲשֶׁר עַל־שֵׁפֶת הַיָּם

NRSV God gave Solomon very great wisdom, discernment, and breadth of understanding as vast as the sand on the seashore.

⁴¹ Solomon's wisdom is enhanced in the LXX beyond that of MT, and even more so in later Jewish and Christian sources; see LOHSE, *Σολομών*.

⁴² See VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 62-81.

The description of Solomon's wisdom is very extensive (5:9-14), followed by the following plus in the Greek translation:

3 Kgdms 5:14a Καὶ ἔλαβεν Σαλωμων τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν Δαυιδ ἕως συντελέσαι αὐτὸν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸ τεῖχος Ιερουσαλημ.

NETS And Salomon took the daughter of Pharaos for himself for a wife and brought her into the city of Daud until he finished the house of the Lord and his own house and the wall of Ierousalem.

The story of Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is more in place here than in MT 3:1, although also here the timing is too early. However, since this verse is adduced in the LXX as an example of Solomon's wisdom, we recognize here his planning regarding the lodging arrangements of his wife and, without changing the content of this verse, the LXX moved it to a better location.

Within the context of Solomon's wisdom, the LXX adds one additional example of his wisdom in the next added verse, v. 14b. That verse is also related to the marriage, and is out of place in MT 9:16 concerning Pharaoh's wedding gift to his daughter:

1 Kgs 9:16

MT פְּרָעָה מְלֶכֶת־מִצְרַיִם עָלָה וַיִּלְכְּדוּ אֶת־גָּזֵר וַיִּשְׂרְפֶהָ בְּאֵשׁ וְאֶת־הַכְּנָעֲנִי הַיֵּשֵׁב בְּעִיר הָרַג וַיִּתְּנָה שְׁלֹחִים לְבֵתוֹ אֲשֶׁר תַּשְׁלִימָה

3 Kgdms 5:14b τότε ἀνέβη Φαραω βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου καὶ προκατελάβετο τὴν Γαζερ καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν αὐτὴν καὶ τὸν Χανανίτην τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐν Μεργαβ, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὰς Φαραω ἀποστολὰς θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ γυναικὶ Σαλωμων, καὶ Σαλωμων ᾠκοδόμησεν τὴν Γαζερ.

NETS Then Pharaos king of Egypt went up and captured Gazer and burned it and the Canaanite who lived in Mergab and Pharaos gave them as send-off to his daughter, Salomon's wife, and Salomon built Gazer.

The actual move of Pharaoh's daughter to her permanent dwelling is repeated much later in the LXX, in 9:9a parallel with v. 24 of the MT:

1 Kgs 9:24

MT אַךְ בֵּית־פְּרָעָה עָלְתָה מְעִיר דָּוִד אֶל־בֵּיתָהָ אֲשֶׁר בְּנָה־לָּהּ אַזְ בְּנָה אֶת־הַמְּלוֹא

- NRSV But Pharaoh's daughter went up from the city of David to her own house that Solomon had built for her; then he built the Millo.
- 3 Kgdms 9:9a Τότε ἀνήγαγεν Σαλωμων τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω ἐκ πόλεως Δαυιδ εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ὃν ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῷ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
- NETS Then Salomon brought up Pharaoh's daughter from the city of David to his house that he built for himself in those days.

b) Chapter 11

The first eight verses of ch. 11 in the MT differ from the LXX. Both versions depict the sins of King Solomon in marrying foreign wives and being involved in idolatry, but the LXX makes that sin more acceptable to the reader. According to the LXX, the fact that he was married to foreign women in his old age made him more vulnerable and an easy prey for them and further, Solomon was a womanizer. In the MT, on the other hand, Solomon himself initiated idolatrous acts. The description of the sins in 1 Kings 11 was problematic also for the Chronicler who simply omitted the chapter in his account of Solomon.

1 Kgs 11:1

- MT מְהַלְלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה אָהֲבָה נָשִׁים נְכָרִיּוֹת רַבּוֹת וְאֵת-בְּתוּלַת-פְּרָעֹה מוֹאָבִיּוֹת עַמֹּנִיּוֹת אֲדָמִית צִדְדָנִית חִתִּית
- NRSV King Solomon loved many foreign women along with the daughter of Pharaoh: Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and Hittite women.
- 3 Kgdms 11:1 Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων ἦν φιλογύναιος. καὶ ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἄρχουσαι ἑπτακόσσιαι καὶ παλλακαὶ τριακόσσιαι. καὶ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκας ἀλλοτρίας καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω, Μωαβίτιδας, Αμμανίτιδας, Σύρας καὶ Ἰδουμαίας, Χετταίας καὶ Αμορραίας
- NETS King Salomon was a philogynist. And he had seven hundred ruling women and three hundred concubines. And he took foreign women, both the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians and Idumeans, Chettites and Amorrites.

The differences between the two versions (change of sequence, addition/omission of details) create a slightly different image of the king. In the MT, the king sins against the Torah (see next verses), taking only foreign women,

and thus transgressing the laws of Deut 7:1-4 and 17:17 (“And he [i.e., the king] shall not have many wives, lest his heart go astray”). In the LXX, on the other hand, Solomon’s main vice was that he loved women, only *some* of whom were foreign. Some of the words of the LXX derived from v. 3. It is understood that King Solomon sinned against the Torah, but these sins were made more acceptable in the LXX because of his old age.

1 Kgs 11:4

MT

וַיְהִי לְעֵת זְקֵנָת שְׁלֹמֹה נָשְׂיוּ הַטּוֹ אֶת־לְבָבוֹ אֲחֵרִי

אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וְלֹא־הָיָה לְבָבוֹ שְׁלֵם עִם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו כְּלֵבֵב דָּוִד אָבִיו

NRSV

For when Solomon was old, his wives turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not true to the Lord his God, as was the heart of his father David.

LXX

καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν καιρῷ γήρους Σαλωμων καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ αὐτοῦ καθὼς ἡ καρδία Δαυιδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ ἀλλότριαι τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω θεῶν αὐτῶν.

NETS

And it happened at the time of Salomon’s old age that his heart was not perfect with the Lord, his God, as was the heart of his father Daud, and his foreign wives turned away his heart after their gods.

In the MT, the wives make Solomon change his mind, while in the LXX the altered sequence of the words gives a different twist to the meaning of the verse. In that version, it is Solomon’s old age and the imperfection of his heart that made him vulnerable to the influence of his foreign wives⁴³.

The changes in the Greek 3 Kgdms with regard to King Solomon are part of an overall picture of changes inserted in that book either by the translator or his Hebrew source, I believe the latter.

Conclusion

In conclusion to this study, the books of the Former Prophets are rather diverse in the LXX as expected for a multitranslational collection. By the same token, the figures are depicted in different ways in accordance with the

⁴³ See further TALSHIR, 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms.

translation character of the book. We found some features regarding Joshua, Hannah, David, and Solomon, but these are but some of the remarkable features of these translations. The lesson to take away is one of diversity.

Bibliography

- DOGNIEZ, Cécile: La figure de Moïse dans la Bible grecque des Septante. In: Michael Sommer et al. (Hrsg.): *Mosebilder, Gedanken zur Rezeption einer literarischen Figur im Frühjudentum, frühen Christentum und der römisch-hellenistischen Literatur* (WUNT 390), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 35-62.
- FOESTER, Werner: Ἰησοῦς. In: *TDNT* III (1965, Reprinted 1995) 284-293.
- GOODING, David W.: Pedantic Timetabling in 3rd Book of Reigns, *VT* 15 (1965) 153-166.
- GOODING, David W.: Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns, *Textus* 7 (1969) 1-29.
- HARRINGTON Daniel J.: Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies. In: Robert A. Kraft – George W. Nickelsburg (eds.): *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (SBLBIM 2), Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, 242-247.
- JEREMIAS, Joachim: Ἡλ(ε)ίας. In: *TDNT* II (1964, Reprinted 1995) 928-941.
- JEREMIAS, Joachim: Μωυσῆς. In: *TDNT* II (1967, Reprinted 1995) 848-873.
- KITTEL, Gerhard – FRIEDRICH, Gerhard (eds.): *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Transl. by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964 – 1976.
- KUTSCHER, Eduard Yehezkel: *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1Q Isa^a)* (STDJ 6), Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- LOHSE, Eduard: Σολομών. In: *TDNT* VII (1971, Reprinted 1995) 459-465.
- LOHSE, Eduard: υἱὸς Δαυὶδ. In: *TDNT* VIII (1972, Reprinted 1995) 478-488.
- MAZOR, Leah: A Nomistic Re-Working of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in LXX to Joshua 6:1-20, *Textus* 18 (1995) 47-62.
- PETERCA, Vladimir: Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel zugunsten Salomos. 1 Kön 8, 12-13 – 3 Reg 8,53a, *BZ* 31 (1987) 270-275.
- PISANO, Stephen: *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984, 78-86.
- POLAK, Frank H.: The Septuagint Account of Solomon's Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension. In: Bernard Taylor (ed.): *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 61), Atlanta: SBL, 2001, 139-164.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: The End of the Book of Joshua According to the Septuagint, *Hen* 4 (1982) 17-36.
- RÖSEL, Martin: Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches. In: Heinz-Josef Fabry – Ulrich Offerhaus (Hrsg.): *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und*

- Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, Vol. 1 (BWANT 153), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001, 197-211.
- SCHENKER, Adrian: *Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CRB 48), Paris: Gabalda, 2000.
- SEELIGMANN, Isac Leo: Menschliches Heldentum und Göttliche Hilfe, die doppelte Kausalität im alttestamentlichen Geschichtsdenken, *ThZ* 19 (1963) 385-411.
- SEELIGMANN, Isac Leo: Menschliches Heldentum und Göttliche Hilfe, die doppelte Kausalität im alttestamentlichen Geschichtsdenken. In: Erhard Blum (Hrsg.): *Gesammelte Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel* (FAT 41), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004, 137-160.
- TALSHIR, Zipora: The Image of the Septuagint Edition of the Book of Kings, *Tarb.* 59 (1990) 249-302. (in Hebrew with English abstract)
- TALSHIR, Zipora: 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms – Origin and Revision, Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11), *Textus* 21 (2002) 71-105.
- TALSHIR, Zipora: *Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z* (JBS 6), Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1993.
- THACKERAY, Henry Saint John: The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings, *JTS* 8 (1907) 262-278.
- THACKERAY, Henry Saint John: *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Vol. I: Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- THACKERAY, Henry Saint John: *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (SchL 1920), London: British Academy, ²1923.
- TOV, Emanuel: Different Editions of the Song of Hannah. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 433-455.
- TOV, Emanuel: Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 153-163.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 333-360.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 385-396.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada. In: Emanuel Tov: *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 71-91.
- TOV, Emanuel: Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere. In: Emanuel Tov: *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 283-305.

- TOV, Emanuel: Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a. In: Emanuel Tov: *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Vol. 3* (VTSup 167), Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2015, 132-153.
- TOV, Emanuel: Textual Problems in the Descriptions of Moses' Ascent to Mt Sinai in Exodus 19, 24, 32, and 34. In: Evangelia G. Dafni (Hrsg.): *Gottesschau-Gotteserkenntnis: Studien zur Theologie der Septuaginta*, Bd. I (WUNT 387), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 3-18.
- TOV, Emanuel: Moses in the Septuagint. In: Géza G. Xeravits – Greg Schmidt Goering (eds.): *Figures Who Shape Scriptures, Scriptures That Shape Figures: Essays in Honour of Benjamin G. Wright III* (DCLS 40), Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter, 2018, 3-20.
- VAN DER MEER, Michaël N.: *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102), Leiden: Brill, 2004, 210-222.
- VAN KEULEN, Percy S.F.: *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (VTSup 104), Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- WELLHAUSEN, Julius: *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871.
- WEVERS, John William: Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43, *OS* 8 (1950) 300-322.

Zhrnutie

Táto štúdiá rozoberá niekoľko hlavných postáv Izraela, ktoré vystupujú v skorších prorokoch, a skúma ich predstavenie v Septuaginte. Septuaginta je preklad, avšak prekladatelia jednotlivých kníh mohli znázorniť biblické postavy odlišne od ich zobrazenia v MT; napr. v gréckych prekladoch sa mohli dochovať pozostatky starovekých tradícií odlišných od tých v MT.

Je potrebné pamätať na to, že kánon v LXX sa skladá z rôznych typov prekladov. Grécka verzia Knihy Jozue napríklad odzrkadľuje iba niekoľko odlišných tradícií o Jozuem, zatiaľčo v gréckej verzii 1Kr nachádzame veľa tradícií o Šalamúnovi odlišujúcich sa od tých v MT. Grécka verzia Knihy kroník zasa obsahuje len veľmi málo navzájom sa odlišujúcich tradícií. Preklad každej jednej knihy je teda osobitý.

Grécka forma 1Kr (3Kr' v LXX) však predstavuje skôr výnimočný prípad. Dá sa povedať, že ide skôr o výnimku než o pravidlo. Len ak sa opis postáv v gréckej verzii líši od toho v hebrejskom texte, môžeme získať informácie o ich opise v LXX. Grécky preklad Septuaginty zdôrazňuje Šalamúnovu múdrosť a zmierňuje jeho hriechy, tiež pozitívnejšie rozpráva o hriešnikoch, akými boli Jeroboam a Achab.

Kľúčové slová: masoretský text, Septuaginta, skorší proroci, hlavné postavy SZ, teologické zmeny.

Summary

This study refers to a few major Israelite figures featuring in the Minor Prophets, examining their representation in the Septuagint. The Septuagint is a translation, but the translators of the various books could have presented these figures differently from their presentation in MT; for example, the Greek translations could have preserved vestiges of ancient traditions different from those of MT.

It should be remembered that the LXX canon is composed of translations of different types. Thus, the Greek Joshua reflects only a few variant traditions about Joshua, while the Greek book of 1 Kgs reflects many traditions about Solomon that differ from MT, and the LXX of Chronicles reflects again very few deviating traditions. The translation of each book stands by itself.

Thus, the Greek form of 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms in the LXX) presents a rather unique situation. I would say that this is the exception rather than the rule. Only if the description of the Greek figures differs from that of the Hebrew ones do we have some information about their depiction in the LXX. The Greek translation emphasizes Solomon's wisdom and whitewashes his sins, and it presents a more favorable account of the sinners Jeroboam and Ahab.

Keywords: Masoretic Text, Septuagint, Former Prophets, Major Old Testament Figures, theological changes.

Emanuel Tov
Department of Bible
Hebrew University
91905 JERUSALEM, Israel
emanuel.tov@mail.huji.ac.il

From Miracle-makers Elijah and Elisha to Jesus and Apocrypha

Peter Dubovský

Introduction

Elijah and Elisha are probably the two best-known early prophets in the Old Testament and the interest in these figures has not diminished despite numerous books and articles published on them.

The Bible attributes to Elijah and Elisha various types of actions. They announced future events and they interpreted the current situation. They contested the kings, on the one hand; on the other hand, they anointed new kings. They were mystics but also fully involved in daily life. Seeing the large variety of deeds performed by these two prophets, let us, first, define upon which kind of deeds this paper focuses. In other words, before proposing a classification of Elijah's and Elisha's miracles, let us briefly review the definitions of a miracle.

Merriam-Webster dictionary gives three definitions of a miracle: 1) an extraordinary event manifesting divine intervention in human affairs; 2) an extremely outstanding or unusual event, thing, or accomplishment; 3) a divinely natural phenomenon experienced humanly as the fulfillment of spiritual law¹.

David Hume defined a miracle as “a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the deity, or by the interposition of some invisible agent”². His study has deeply influenced the perception of miracles and until now a miracle has been often regarded as an event that implied a breaking of natural law. However, several Christian thinkers have suggested that the idea of miracle does not have to be conceived in this way. Already Augustine defined miracles as unusual events that contradict our accustomed views of the course of nature but not necessarily nature itself³. From this viewpoint, as suggested by Wolfhart Pannenberg, it is sufficient to regard unusual occurrences as “signs” of God's

¹ Cf. Merriam-Webster Dictionary, Miracle.

² HUME, *Of Miracles*, 45.

³ For study of Augustinian concept, see PANNENBERG, Miracle, 759-762.

special activity in creation⁴. Along the same line, Friedrich Schleiermacher concluded that “every event, even the most natural and usual, becomes a miracle as soon as the religious view of it can be the dominant”⁵. This notion of miracles was adopted by the Catechism of the Catholic Church that understands the miracles as “the most certain signs of divine Revelation, adapted to the intelligence of all; they are motives of credibility which show that the assent of faith is by no means a blind impulse of the mind” (CCC § 156).

The studies of medieval hagiographies also showed that Hume’s definition is not sufficient to embrace the diversity of miracles attributed to the saints. Thus, it was suggested that, for example, Bede’s miraculous episodes can best be appreciated as signs that point to a meaning beyond the literal. Eogan Ahern concluded that

[i]t is imperative that we develop a more refined understanding of Bede’s conceptualization of the miraculous if we are to better comprehend the mechanics of his celebrated narrative of the English church.⁶

Applying to the Bible the notions of miracles exposed above, it can be noticed that the biblical miracles were not only those that violated natural laws, but the spectrum of biblical miracles is much larger. Therefore, the concept of miracles as presented by Augustine, Schleiermacher, Pannenberg, and Ahern fits the biblical miracles better.

Another point important for our investigation of the biblical miracles regards the religious premises of that period⁷. The main difference between the modern and ancient concept of miracles was that that the nations of the ancient Near East believed the gods were beyond most, if not all, events of history⁸. Without entering into details, let us present an example taken from the royal inscriptions of the region Suhu dated to the 8th cent. B.C. One of the kings, Ninurta-kudurri-usur, after having defeated local Aramean tribesmen wrote:

Anyone in the future who comes forward and says: “How [did] Ninurta-kudurri-ušur, the governor of the land of Suhu and the land of Mari [inflict] this defeat?” (should be told that) I did [not] inflict (this) [by

⁴ PANNENBERG, *Miracle*, 759.

⁵ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Second Speech*, 23.

⁶ AHERN, *Bede’s Miracles*, 282-303.

⁷ One of the first important theological studies on the topic represents KNIGHT, *Miracle*.

⁸ Cf. for example DUBOVSKÝ, *Boží hnev*.

my own power, (but rather) I inflicted this] defeat by the power of the gods Šamaš and Marduk, A[dad and Apla-Adad, the great gods], my lords. (RIMB 2 S.0.1002.2 ii 29-33)

This inscription shows that a belief that gods ruled the universe and history was deeply rooted in the ancient mentality.

Taking into consideration this religious background, which the biblical scribes shared with their ancient Near Eastern neighbors, it is obvious that the gods were the ultimate cause of any event of history and therefore any event could be classified as a miracle⁹. For this reason, it is necessary to add another criterion that might help us to distinguish between divine presence in history and nature, on the one hand, and the miracles, on the other hand.

To this aim it might be useful to realize that in some cases the divinity intervened directly, in others a human intermediary played an essential role in performing miracles. Using the terminology applied to ancient Near Eastern *omina*¹⁰, it might be helpful to distinguish between provoked and unprovoked miracles. The former presupposed a human action that “triggered” a miracle and this type of miracles will be the object of our study. Therefore, we can exclude from our research all miracles in which Elijah and Elisha were passive agents; thus, for example the miracle of the ravens who brought food to Elijah (1 Kgs 17:6), Elijah nourished by an angel (19:5-8), Elijah transferred by the spirit to another place (18:12; 2:16), or Elisha seeing the army of God (2 Kgs 7:13-16). In these episodes, the mediators of the miracles were other beings such as angels and ravens, or God performed the miracle without any intermediary. Similarly, we should exclude the theophanies such as the revelation of God to Elijah on Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19:9-18). In sum, God or other mediators were the active agents in these events, whereas Elijah and Elisha were the passive agents. On the contrary, there were cases when a miracle was triggered or provoked by Elijah’s and Elisha’s actions; for example, the parting of the river of Jordan (2 Kgs 2:8. 14), the healing of the sick (ch. 5), bringing down fire from heaven (1:9-12), etc.

⁹ Cf. for example GOODMAN, To Make a Rainbow.

¹⁰ The *omina* in the ancient Near East were needed to communicate with the gods. This communication could have been initiated by humans or by the gods. If initiated by the former, the communication was achieved by means of special inquiry techniques such as sacrifices, casting lots, etc. With the passing of time some of the techniques within this group acquired higher scientific and social status such as extispicy and others fell out of use such as *omina* derived from observation of smoke patterns or oil-pool shapes. The scholarly recognition gained the second group—the unprovoked *omina*; FREEDMAN, *If a city*, 1-2.

Finally, not all extraordinary events can be considered miracles. The encounter between Elijah and Obadiah (1 Kgs 18:1-15) can be taken as an illustrative example. Even though this meeting was totally unexpected, the reader is not led to conclude that it was a miracle. It can be considered an act of divine providence, but not necessarily a miracle. Consequently, another important characteristic of a miracle is that a miracle should lead a person to recognition of God's power and glory mediated through a human being. So, the widow recognized that God acted through Elijah when he resuscitated her dead son: "Now I know that you are a man of God, and that the word of the LORD in your mouth is truth." (17:24) What turns an extraordinary event into a miracle is a reference to divine power. This reference can be explicitly voiced, but sometimes it can be only implied.

The matter of biblical miracles becomes more complex since the biblical description of the miracles underwent multiple redactions. As the result of the redactional and editorial interventions, a reader has no longer access to Elijah's and Elisha's miraculous deeds nor to miracle-makers themselves, but to the literary presentation of the miracles and the biblical redactors' adaptation of the narratives for their audience. Consequently, the biblical accounts do not intend to describe what really happened, but it presents a theological elaboration of miraculous events. In sum, the miracles attributed to Elijah and Elisha reflect what the biblical authors and later editors considered miracles. So, this paper cannot engage the miracles really performed by Elisha and Elijah, but rather the literary description of what certain scribal groups considered more or less important miracles¹¹.

Despite these limits, the above presented theoretical overview can help us to understand which kind of miracles the authors and editors of the Bible considered authentic and important enough and attributed them to the miracle-makers, on the one hand. On the other hand, the elimination of some types of miracles points to other redactional tendencies, namely, the biblical authors and editors for some reasons considered some miracles inappropriate for the prophets, Jesus, or his disciples.

Taking into consideration these conclusions, let us list four points that will delimit the following study of biblical miracles:

¹¹ When we refer to the miracles worked by Elijah and Elisha in the following paragraphs or by other miracle-makers, we refer to the miracles that the biblical authors or redactors attributed to these figures.

1. The miracle-maker should be an active hero; in other words, the prophet utters a word or performs an action that “provokes” a miracle. Therefore, we are not going to focus on the episodes when the prophets are the passive recipients of divine intervention.
2. The miracles can be of various types, not exclusively those that transgress natural laws. Therefore, as argued above, we will use Augustine’s and Pannenberg’s not Hume’s definition of miracles.
3. The miracles described in the Bible and attributed to biblical heroes do not have to be taken at their face value since they reflect the theology of the biblical authors and editors.
4. For both the implied and the real audience the miracles are in one way or the other a manifestation of divine power in history.

Setting the Scene

Both the Old and the New Testament as well as apocrypha, pseudo-apocrypha, and the stories of saints report numerous miracles performed by the men of God, military leaders, prophets, Jesus, apostles, and saints that match the criteria listed above. The highest concentration of biblical miracles is in the Elijah-Elisha cycles and the Moses-Aron narratives. In the following paragraphs, we will present and classify Elijah’s and Elisha’s miracles that match the criteria mentioned above. Then we will compare the miracles attributed to Elijah and Elisha with the miracles attributed to other biblical figures. Finally, we will study which kind of miracles were attributed to Jesus in the canonical gospels and apocrypha.

Classification of Elisha and Elijah’s Miracles

Without entering into a detailed discussion of the composition of Elijah-Elisha cycles¹², let us divide the miracles presented in the Elijah narrative into two cycles: Cycle I (1 Kgs 17–19) and Cycle II (2 Kgs 1–2). There are nine miraculous events in Cycle I out of which five match the criteria listed above (in

¹² For the most recent studies, cf. MCKENZIE, *1 Kings*, 25-45; KNAUF, *1 Könige*, 127-150.

italics), especially, the criterion concerning the active involvement of the prophet¹³:

1. *Drought ordered by Elijah (1 Kgs 17:1)*
2. Elijah fed by the ravens (17:4-6)
3. *The multiplication of oil and flour (17:12-17)*
4. *Widow's son raised from the dead (17:17-23)*
5. Elijah (could be) transferred by a spirit (18:12)
6. *Sacrifice consumed by fire (18:38)*
7. *Rain in answer to Elijah's prayer (18:41)*
8. Elijah fed by angels (19:1-8)
9. God's revelation to Elijah in a cave (19:11-18)

Cycle II of Elijah's narrative presents four miraculous actions of which two matched the criteria established above (in italics):

1. *Captains destroyed by Elijah's command of fire (2 Kgs 1:9-12)*
2. *Jordan divided by Elijah's mantle (2:8)*
3. Elijah transported to heaven (2:11)
4. Elijah (could be) transferred by a spirit (2:16)

The type of miracles attributed to Elijah in Cycle I and II concerns four important areas: 1. Controlling celestial elements such as rain (Cycle I, nos. 1 and 7) and heavenly fire (Cycle I, no. 6; Cycle II, no. 1); 2. Food resource especially when lacking (Cycle I, no. 3); 3. Controlling life and death (Cycle I, no. 4); 4. Controlling the waters (Cycle II, no. 2).

The first sphere of Elijah's miracles (rain and fire) were normally under the control of gods in the ancient Near East and thus Elijah's capacity to unleash the forces, which were the prerogatives of gods, gave him a special status as a miracle-maker. The second sphere presents Elijah as the miracle-maker who could control the essential need of human beings, namely, food. The food miracles, however, bring forward a nuance regarding the addressees of Elijah's miracles. The beneficiaries were not the members of the royal court but the poor.

¹³ Chapter 1 Kgs 21 is not included in this list since Elijah only foretold a divine intervention of God but not triggered it.

The third sphere of Elijah's miracles – the raising of the widow's dead son – also shows that Elijah could perform the deeds that were reserved to God. Finally, the division of the Jordan river presents Elijah as a miracle-maker who had control over the incontrollable natural elements among which were the waters.

The list of Elijah's miracles presented above shows that the biblical scribes mixed together the negative and positive types of miracles. While some miracles had an explicitly positive character such as the multiplication of oil and flour for the poor widow or the raising of the dead son, others can be classified as negative, such as the fire coming down from heaven and consuming soldiers who were obeying the command of their king (2 Kgs 1:9-12), as well as the drought ordered by Elijah (1 Kgs 17:1). It seems that the authors and the editors of Cycle I and II had no or little concern for the ethical dimension of the miracles.

In comparison with Elisha, whose miracles amounted to fourteen of which thirteen match the criteria listed in the introduction (in italics), Elijah looks like a beginner. Some of Elisha's miracles are similar to those performed by Elijah, so some scholars think that they are duplicates¹⁴. Moreover, while Elijah's miracles are well integrated into a larger narrative, in particular, into Cycle I, Elisha's miracles are rather unconnected episodes called *legendae*¹⁵. Let us list Elisha's miracles:

1. *The division of the Jordan (2 Kgs 2:13-14)*
2. *The healing of the waters of Jericho (2:19-22)*
3. *The bears killing children (2:23-24)*
4. Water supplied for the army (3:16-20)¹⁶
5. *The multiplication of oil (4:1-7)*
6. *The raising of the dead son of the rich woman (4:18-37)*
7. *The healing of a poisoned potage (4:38-41)*
8. *The multiplication of bread (4:42-44)*
9. *The healing of Naaman (5:1-19)*
10. *The punishment of Gehazi's greed by leprosy (5:20-27)*

¹⁴ See for example AMIT, A Prophet Tested, 280-292.

¹⁵ ROFÉ, Storie di profeti.

¹⁶ This passage, like 1 Kgs 22, is a prophecy foretelling the future events, but there is no word or gesture of the prophet triggering the miracle.

11. *The ax head recovered (6:1-6)*
12. *The opening of the eyes of a servant (6:16-17)*
13. *The making blind and opening of the eyes of the Aramean army (6:18-20)*
14. *The raising of a dead man (13:20-21)*

As argued above Elijah's miracles showed his control over the uncontrollable elements of nature (celestial fire and rain), on the one hand; on the other hand, his miracles had also a deeply human dimension since he took care of the needs of the poor (multiplication of oil and flour) and raised the dead son of the poor widow. In sum, a miracle-maker according to the pattern of Elijah had to control celestial elements (celestial fire and rain), terrestrial elements (water), life-death, and take care of the needs of the poor.

Table 1 presented below shows that Elisha's miracles follow the pattern of those performed by Elijah yet with some differences. Elisha performed more healing miracles. Elijah, in fact, only raised the dead son of the poor widow, whereas Elisha's power also extended over other dimensions of human life. Thus, he not only raised the dead son of the rich widow, but also controlled the most contagious disease—leprosy, made persons see or become blind, and even commanded the inanimate objects. He performed more food miracles. His positive miracles were not restricted to the poor, but he helped the rich as well. He, like Elijah, controlled more indomitable elements of nature, such as water, as well as wild animals (bears). Finally, Elisha performed more negative miracles.

The major difference between Elijah's and Elisha's miracle concerned the control of the celestial elements, in particular, the heavenly fire and rain. Elisha never brought down fire from heaven or stopped rain. Table 1 shows that the focus of Elisha's miracles moved from the celestial sphere to terrestrial sphere. The absence of the celestial miracles can be interpreted in the light of the end of Elijah Cycle I. The composition of Cycle I shows that the last miraculous deed was the theophany on Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19:9-18), which was a passive miracle:

Now there was a great wind, so strong that it was splitting mountains and breaking rocks in pieces before the LORD, but the LORD was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the LORD was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire, but the LORD was

not in the fire; and after the fire a sound of sheer silence. When Elijah heard it, he wrapped his face in his mantle and went out and stood at the entrance of the cave. (1 Kgs 19:11-13; NRSV)

In fact, the conclusion of Cycle I challenges the pattern of Elijah's miracles. What is the meaning of the revelation on Mount Horeb? Is it an indirect prohibition of certain types of miracles? In other words, are the miracles concerning earthquake, wind and especially fire reserved to God and no human miracle-maker should use them, not even the greatest prophets on the earth such as Elijah?¹⁷ If this is the message, then Elijah did not understand it since in Cycle II he brought down fire from heaven. On the contrary, Elisha's not performing the celestial miracles made him a "correct" miracle-maker as intended by 1 Kgs 19:11-13. This view is later confirmed by Jesus who prohibited his disciples from bringing down fire from heaven (Luke 9:51-56). This suggestion can be also supported by the fact that after the revelation on the Mount Horeb, God no longer communicated with Elijah directly but only through his angel (cf. 2 Kgs 1:3.15). This might be a sign of a subtle critique of Elijah as miracle-maker in Cycle II by subversive scribes.

Table 1: Classification of Elijah's and Elisha's miracles

	Elijah cycle I	Elijah cycle II	Elisha
Celestial elements	Fire from heaven consumes the stones (1 Kgs 18:30-38) No rain (17:1) and rain as an answer to Elijah's prayer (18:41)	Fire from heaven consumes the soldiers (2 Kgs 1:9-16)	None
Water		The parting of the Jordan River (2 Kgs 2:8)	The parting of the Jordan River (2 Kgs 2:13-14)
Life-death	Raising the dead son of the widow (1 Kgs 17:17-24)		Raising the dead son of the rich woman (2 Kgs 4:18-37) Raising of the dead man touching the bones of Elisha (13:20-21)

¹⁷ For different proposals, see BRUEGGEMANN, *1 & 2 Kings*, 235-238; COGAN, *1 Kings*, 453, LEITHART, *1 & 2 Kings*, 140-142.

	Elijah cycle I	Elijah cycle II	Elisha
Curing leprosy/ producing it			The healing of Naaman struck by deadly sickness (2 Kgs 5:1-19) Punishment of Gehazi's greed - leprosy (5:20-27)
Sight miracles			Opening of the eyes of the servant to see the Lord's army (2 Kgs 6:16-17) Blindness and opening the eyes of the Aramean army (6:18-20)
Animals			Bears killing children (2 Kgs 2:23-24)
Food	Multiplication of oil and flower (1 Kgs 17:7.8-16)		Multiplication of oil (2 Kgs 4:1-7) Multiplication of bread (4:42-44) Healing of waters of Jericho (2:19-22) Water supplied for the army (3:16-20) Healing of a poisoned potage (4:38-41)
Inanimate objects			The ax head (2 Kgs 6:1-6)

Comparison with Other Biblical Miracle-markers

The Old Testament attributed miracles to prominent figures among whom were Abraham, Moses and Aron, Joshua, Manoah, Samson, Samuel, a man of God coming from Judah, Isaiah, Daniel, and the priest Azariah¹⁸. Table 2 lists the miracles conforming to the criteria presented in the introduction of this paper and shows that the highest number of miracles was attributed to Moses-Aron¹⁹. Comparing Moses' and Aron's miracles with those performed by Elijah and Elisha, we can notice that both performed similar miracles: both controlled celestial and earthly elements, had power to cure or to punish with leprosy, and both performed numerous food miracles. Nevertheless, the difference between

¹⁸ For a theological examination of the Old Testament miracles, see MARX, *Le miracle*, 35-43.

¹⁹ For a discussion of a theological nature of Moses' miracles, see LORKOWSKI, *The Miracles*, 181-188.

both groups is striking. Moses-Aron's most numerous miracles were those that aimed at punishing the adversaries using celestial and terrestrial elements. While Elijah and Elisha performed only five negative miracles out of twenty (25%), Moses and Aron performed fifteen negative miracles out of 24 (62.5%).

Even though Moses and Aron cured leprosy, they did not raise a dead person. As shown below the raising of a dead person became a normative miracle for Jesus and his disciples. In this view Moses and Aron did not qualify as top miracle-makers. Moreover, there is a new type of miracles introduced in the Moses-Aron narratives that did not occur in the Elijah-Elisha cycle, i.e. the transformation miracles. Comparing these two groups of miracle-makers, we suggest that the biblical tradition developed two models of miracle-makers: Elijah-Elisha and Moses-Aron. The former was focused mainly on positive miracles, the latter on the negative miracles. The former had more food miracles, the latter added transformation miracles. The former had a power to raise a person from the dead, the latter did not.

Table 2 also lists other Old Testament miracle-makers. The table indicates that the later prophets were not primarily miracle-makers, except Isaiah who performed two miracles. No miracle was ever attributed to a king. The miracle-makers were Joshua being a successor of Moses, the judges including Samuel, an unspecified prophet from Judah, and only the later tradition in the Chronicles attributed a miracle to a priest. Some types of miracles were similar to those performed by Elijah and Elisha, such as the control of the celestial and terrestrial elements and the healing of the sick. The miracle of the parting waters was repeated by Moses, Joshua, Elijah, and Elisha. The table, thus, demonstrates that even though other Old Testament figures performed miracles, Moses-Aron and Elijah-Elisha became the most important miracle-makers of the Old Testament (cf. Sir 45 and 48).

The result of this comparison allows us to create a profile of an Old Testament miracle-maker. The miracles that occurred in most narratives constitute four conditions *sine qua non* for becoming a respectable miracle-maker: 1) the control over celestial elements that was a prerogative of the gods in the ancient Near East, 2) the parting of the waters of a river or of a sea, 3) health miracles including raising a dead person and healing or infecting with leprosy, 4) food miracles.

Table 2: Comparison and Classification of the Miracles Described in Both Testaments and Apocrypha (the negative miracles are in italics)

General Reference to Miracles	Elijah & Elisha	Moses/Aron	Other OT Heroes	Elijah-Elisha Cycle Inter-biblical Reference	Direct References to Elijah-Elisha Miracles	Jesus' Miracles	After-Jesus' Death	Apocrypha (The Infancy Gospel of Thomas; Gr. Text A)
Celestial Elements	Fire from heaven consumes the sacrifice (1 Kgs 18:30-38) and the soldiers (2 Kgs 19-16)	Fire consumes sacrifice (Lev 9:22-24) <i>Thunder and Hail</i> (Exod 9:18-24)	Manoah: fire consumes sacrifice (Judg 13:20) <i>Samuel; Thunder destroys Philistines</i> (1 Sam 7:7-11) <i>Samuel; Thunder and rain coming from heaven</i> (1 Sam 12:18) <i>Three men delivered from fiery furnace</i> (Dan 3:19-27) <i>Joshua: Sun stood still</i> (Josh 10:12-14) <i>Isaiah: sundial miracle</i> (2 Kgs 20:11)	Gehazi was narrating the deeds of Elisha to the king (2 Kgs 8:4) <i>Elisha's marvelous deeds</i> (Sir 48:12-14) <i>Reference to fire coming down three times</i> (Sir 48:3)	Miracles by the seventy (Luke 10:17) <i>Miracles of Christ not recorded</i> (John 20:30; Acts 10:38-39)	Jesus refused to send fire from heaven (Luke 9:51-56)	Miracles by Paul (Acts 19:11-12)	
Water	<i>No rain</i> (1 Kgs 17:1) and rain as an answer to Elisha's prayer (1 Kgs 18:41)	The parting of the Jordan River (2 Kgs 2:8)	Joshua: The parting of the Jordan River (Josh 3:14-17)	<i>Reference to no rain as raining up the heavens</i> (Sir 48:3)	<i>Reference to no rain</i> (Luke 4:25; Jas 5:17-18; Rev 11:6)	Walking on water (Matt 14:25-33) <i>Tempest stilled in lake Galilee</i> (Matt 8:23-27)	Gathering the waters into pools (Inf. Gosp. II 1)	
Human Beings	Raising the dead son of the poor widow (1 Kgs 17:17-24) <i>Raising the dead son of the rich woman</i> (2 Kgs 4:18-37) <i>Raising of the dead man touching the bones of Elisha</i> (2 Kgs 13:20-21)	<i>First-born killed in Egypt</i> (Exod 12:29-30) <i>Korah and his gong swallowed by the earth</i> (Num 16:1-35) <i>Defeating the Amalekites</i> (Exod 17:9-13)	<i>Samsone: killing of hurly Philistines</i> (Judg 14:19)	<i>Reference to Elijah's and Elisha's raising of the dead person</i> (Sir 48:5.13) and <i>raising the dead man touching Elisha's bones</i> (Sir 48:14)	<i>Reference to Naanman's healing from leprosy</i> (Luke 4:27)	Widow's son raised in Nain (Luke 7:11-17) <i>Jairus' daughter raised from the dead</i> (Matt 9:23) <i>Lazarus raised from the dead</i> (John 11:38-44)	Doves restored to life (Acts 9:40) <i>Eutychus restored to life</i> (Acts 20:10) <i>Death of Ananias and Sapphira</i> (Acts 5:3.10)	Rich young man raised from the dead (Secret Gospel of Mark 1) <i>Raising a dead child</i> (Inf. Gosp. IX 1-3) <i>Raising a dead child</i> (Inf. Gosp. XVII) <i>Resurrected a dead man</i> (Inf. Gosp. XXVIII) <i>Healed a young man from blindness</i> (Inf. Gosp. VI 1) <i>Jesus' teacher dropped dead and then raised</i> (Inf. Gosp. XII-XIV)
Leprosy	Healing of Naanman (2 Kgs 5:1-19) <i>Gehazi's leprosy</i> (2 Kgs 5:20-27)	<i>Miriam's leprosy</i> (Num 12:10-15)	<i>Priest Azarjah: Uzziah hit by leprosy</i> (2 Chr 16:16-21)		Reference to Naanman's healing from leprosy (Luke 4:27)	Leper cleansed in Capernaum (Matt 8:1-4) <i>Ten lepers cleansed</i> (Luke 17:11-19)	Paul's sight restored (Acts 9:17-18) <i>Elymas blinded</i> (Acts 13:11)	<i>Jesus' accusers struck by blindness</i> (Inf. Gosp. V 1)
Sight Miracles	Opening of the eyes of the servant to see the Lord's army (2 Kgs 6:16-17) <i>Blindness and opening the eyes of the Aramean army</i> (2 Kgs 6:18-20)					Blind men healed (Matt 9:27-31) <i>Blind man healed</i> (Mark 8:22-26) <i>Two blind men healed</i> (Matt 20:29-34) <i>Blind man healed by Jericho</i> (Mark 10:48-52; Luke 18:35-45) <i>Two born blind healed</i> (John 9:1-7)		
Speech/Hearing						Deaf and dumb man healed (Mark 7:31-37)		

Direct References to Elijah's and Elisha's Miracles

Table 2 also lists the inter-biblical references to Elijah's miracles. The first reference to Elijah's miracles is in 2 Kgs 8:4, when the great deeds of Elijah are narrated to the king as past events. In the second temple period the miracles of Elijah and Elisha were treated as one group. In this phase of the development of the Bible, there is no difference between Elijah's cycle I and II, even though the Bible distinguishes between Elijah and Elisha, they form one tradition of miracle-makers as is demonstrated Ben Sirach 48²⁰ and Luke 4.

Another aspect to be noticed is that the later biblical texts refer to both negative and positive miracles of Elijah and Elisha. It seems that they did not prefer one or the other type of the miracles.

The Book of Ben Sirach concentrated on two types of miracles: controlling the celestial elements (fire) and the raising dead people. The direct New Testament references to Elisha and Elijah have different emphasis. The stories refer to healing the sick and feeding the hungry. The reference to the negative miracle—stopping the rain—does not occur in the canonical gospels but is mentioned in the Letter of James and Revelation²¹. Luke's gospel uses the stopping of the rain as a narrative background and it is in the passive form. In other words, the shutting down heaven is not directly attributed to Elijah. None of the Old and New Testament references to Elijah's and Elisha's miracles mention the miracle of the parting of the waters.

In sum, the direct inter-biblical references to Elijah's and Elisha's miracles brought forward five miracles, two negative (in italics) and three positive ones, that were considered prototypes of miracles that partially differ from the profile of the miracle-makers reconstructed above:

Profile of the Old Testament Miracle-maker	Inter-biblical References to Elijah and Elisha Miracles
Control of the celestial elements (fire) –	Fire from heaven Control of the rain
Parting the waters Life and death miracles –	Raising the dead Healing the sick, in particular, leprosy
Food miracles	Feeding the hungry

²⁰ Cf. CORLEY, *Elijah*.

²¹ BOTTINI, *Continuity*, 120-129.

Jesus as the Miracle-maker

Table 2 also presents the miracles performed by Jesus. A comparison between the Old Testament miracle-makers and Jesus shows that Jesus performed the same types of miracles as Elijah and Elisha, on the one hand²². On the other hand, some miracles were more emphasized, and others completely disappeared²³.

There are no miracles that would involve the celestial elements, namely, rain and fire. Verses Luke 9:51-56 show that Jesus explicitly forbid his disciples to bring down fire from heaven in order to punish the Samaritans. This was not only Jesus' momentaneous reluctance to activate the celestial elements, but rather a programmatic decision (cf. John 18:36) even though the Gospel of John attributes to Jesus this power (18:4-9). Moreover, the canonical gospels list no negative miracle, except the curse of the fig tree (Mark 11:12-14; Matt 21:18-19). The absence of the negative miracles during Jesus' public activities shows that according to the canonical gospels Jesus distanced himself from the miracle-makers as Elijah-Elisha or Moses-Aron who did not hesitate activating celestial and terrestrial elements to punish their adversaries. Jesus' only negative miracle afflicted a tree but no human being²⁴. Even in case of extreme emergency Jesus refused mobilizing natural or supernatural forces to punish the enemies and blasphemers (cf. for example Luke 22:50-51; John 18:36)²⁵.

Despite Jesus' reluctance to use celestial elements in his miracles, he showed his control about terrestrial elements, in particular, when he calmed down the sea storm (Matt 8:23-27). The miracle of walking on water (14:25-33) indicates that Jesus did not need to part the waters of the Jordan or of the Red Sea as Moses, Joshua, Elijah, and Elisha did in order to cross the river/the sea. Jesus simply walked on water. Thus, by means of the miracle "walking on water" the evangelists presented Jesus as a superior miracle-maker than those of the Old Testament.

²² There have been presented numerous parallels between the gospels and Elijah-Elisha cycles; see, e.g., BRODIE, Luke, 457-485; RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*; WILSON, Healer, 60-65.

²³ For a complete list of miracles repeated in the gospels, see GUILLAUME, Miracles, 21.

²⁴ Cf. ŠTRBA, Warum, 43-59.

²⁵ GUILLAUME, Miracles, 22.

The evangelists also conveyed Jesus' superiority by attributing to Jesus a higher number and a higher quality of miracles than the Old Testament miracle-makers did. Moses did not raise anyone from the dead, Elijah raised one, and Elisha two. Jesus raised three people: widow's son raised in Nain (Luke 7:11-17), Jairus' daughter (Matt 9:23), and Lazarus (John 11:38-44)²⁶. The last one had been dead four days when Jesus raised him.

Elisha was the only Old Testament miracle-maker who healed a leper. The gospels attributed to Jesus two miracles of healings of lepers (Matt 8:1-4; Luke 17:11-19). The lepers healed by Jesus amount to eleven. Moreover, Jesus never used leprosy to punish anyone.

The healing miracles are the most frequent miracles of Jesus. In fact, according to the canonical gospels, the healing miracles defined Jesus as a miracle-maker, while the Old Testament describes only two healings (Num 21:9; 2 Kgs 20:7).

Jesus performed less food miracles, but the numbers of people was much higher. Jesus also exercised in his miracles his control over the animals, but never in a negative way as it was in the cases of the Old Testament miracle-makers. Finally, Jesus made only one transformation miracle (John 2:1-11)²⁷.

In sum, the canonical gospels attributed to Jesus miracles similar to those performed by Elisha and Elijah²⁸. However, the profile of Jesus as a miracle-maker is different from that of Elijah-Elisha and Moses-Aron. Jesus' miracles, except one, are all positive and he refused to use the celestial elements to punish his adversaries. By raising a person from the dead, the evangelists linked Jesus with the Elijah-Elisha type of miracle-makers and not with the Moses-Aron type. Similarly, by attributing to Jesus three healings from leprosy, Jesus is linked more closely with the Elijah-Elisha type of miracle-makers. Putting the emphasis upon the healing miracles, other miracles, such as food²⁹ and transformation miracles, were moved to the background.

²⁶ For a new study on this type of miracles, see FENÍK, *Children*, 87-90.

²⁷ Elisha's miracle of floating axe's head might have a parallel in a miracle of tribute money found in the mouth of fish (Matt 17:24-27).

²⁸ Cf. LINDARS, *Elijah*, 61-79.

²⁹ Some scholars noticed that two multiplications of bread might have a parallel in two multiplication of oil and flour; GUILLAUME, *Miracles*, 22.

Acts and Apocrypha

The second temple Judaism and early Christian writers did not hesitate to attribute new miracles to famous ancient figures. Thus, for example Solomon became an esoteric king who performed numerous wonders (cf. *Testament of Solomon*)³⁰. The Acts of the Apostles continued with the tradition of the canonical gospels, in particular putting emphasis on the healing miracles and raising a person from the dead. However, the negative miracles started reappearing (Acts 5:5.10; 13:11).

While the Acts of the Apostles followed the pattern of miracles canonized by the gospels, some apocrypha, in particular the Infancy Gospel of Thomas, resumed the miracles of Elijah and Elisha³¹, others prefer the pattern of Moses-Aron (cf. Table 2). Thus, the negative miracles became more numerous and were used to punish the adversaries. The transformation miracles as well as the miracles involving the inanimate objects were employed to prove Jesus's special power.

Conclusion

Let us briefly summarize the results of this research. The short *legendae* narrating the wonderous deeds of Elijah and Elisha were gradually incorporated into larger narrative cycles. In the later tradition, the previous strata merged into one and Elisha and Elijah became prototypes of the miracle-makers. Other miracle-makers, such as Joshua, Samuel, Isaiah, etc., had to measure themselves with them. Besides the Elijah-Elisha model, the biblical tradition developed another model of miracle-makers, namely, that of Moses and Aron. Their miracles were partially similar, yet different. They introduced the transformation miracles, that did not exist in the Elijah-Elisha cycle, and they accomplished more negative miracles, etc. The Second Temple writings and the New Testament also referred to Elijah's and Elisha's miracles. Jesus, the miracle-maker of the canonical gospels, partially accepted the model of miracle-makers Elijah and Elisha yet changed it. He refused using the celestial elements to punish his adversaries. The healing miracles of Elijah and Elisha became the prototype of the New Testament and became the specific trait of Jesus as a miracle-maker

³⁰ Cf. TORIJANO, *Solomon*.

³¹ Cf. ZELYCK, *Elisha*, 149-156.

as well. The picture of Jesus as a miracle-maker in the apocrypha radically changed. The negative miracles became more prominent and the miracles became more spectacular.

Bibliography

- AHERN, Eogan: Bede's Miracles Reconsidered, *EME* 26 (2018) 282-303.
- AMIT, Yairah: A Prophet Tested: Elisha, the Great Woman of Shunem, and the Story's Double Message, *BibInt* (2003) 279-294.
- BOTTINI, Giovanni Claudio: Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Tradition Elijah from 1 Kgs 17-18 to Jas 5:17-18, *StBiSl* 11 (2019) 120-129.
- BRODIE, Thomas L.: Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation, *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-485.
- BRUEGGEMANN, Walter: *1 & 2 Kings*, Macon, GA: Smyth&Helwys, 2000.
- COGAN, Mordechai: *1 Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10), New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- CORLEY, Jeremy: Elijah among the Former Prophets in Hebrew Ben Sira 48:1-11, *StBiSl* 12 (2020). (forthcoming)
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: Boží hnev v mezopotámských kráľovských nápisoch a v Knihe Exodus, *StBiSl* 2 (2010) 112-122.
- FENÍK, Juraj: Children as Gift in the Gospel of Luke, *Neotest* 53 (2019) 79-100.
- FREEDMAN, Sally M.: *If a City Is Set On a Height. The Akkadian Omen series Šumma alu ina melé šakin*, Philadelphia: Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 1998.
- GOODMAN, Lenn E.: To Make a Rainbow: God's Work in Nature, *EJPR* 7 (2015) 137-156.
- GUILLAUME, Philippe: Miracles miraculously repeated, *BN* 98 (1999) 21-23.
- HUME, David: Of Miracles. In: David Hume: *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. A Critical Edition*. Edited and by Tom L. Beauchamp (The Clarendon edition of the works of David Hume), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006, 83-99.
- KNAUF, Ernst A.: *1 Könige 15-22* (HThKAT), Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2019.
- KNIGHT, Harold: Old Testament Conception of Miracle, *SJTh* 5 (1952) 355-361.
- LEITHART, Peter L.: *1 & 2 Kings*, Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2006.
- LINDARS, Barnabas: Elijah, Elisha and the Gospel Miracles. In: Charles F.D. Moule: *Miracles. Cambridge studies in their philosophy and history*, London: Mowbray, 1966, 61-79.
- LORKOWSKI, C. M.: The Miracles of Moses, *HeyJ* 50 (2009) 181-188.
- MARX, Alfred: Le miracle dans l'Ancien Testament, *FV* 108 (2009) 35-43.
- McKENZIE, Stephen L.: *1 Kings 16 – 2 Kings 16* (IECOT), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2019.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, Miracle [Accessed 01-04-2020]. Available on: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/miracle>
- PANNENBERG, Wolfhart: The Concept of Miracle, *Zygon* 37 (2002) 759-762.
- RINDOŠ, Jaroslav: *He of Whom It Is Written. John the Baptist and Elijah in Luke* (ÖBS 38), Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010.

- ROFÉ, Alexander: *Storie di profeti. La narrativa sui profeti nella Bibbia ebraica* (BSSTB 8), Brescia: Paideia, 1991.
- SCHLEIERMACHER, Friedrich: Second Speech. The Nature of Religion. In: Friedrich Schleiermacher: *On Religion. Speeches to Its Cultured Despirers*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner & Co., 1893, 23.
- ŠTRBA, Blažej: Warum steht in Lk 18,38 ἐβόησεν?, *BN* 128 (2006) 43-59.
- THE HOLY SEE: *The Catechism of the Catholic Church. Second Edition*, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops – Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Washington – Città del Vaticano, 2019.
- TORIJANO, Pablo A.: *Solomon the Esoteric King. From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition* (SJSJ 73), Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- WILSON, Walter T.: The Uninvited Healer: Houses, Healing and Prophets in Matthew 8.1-12, *JNT* 36 (2013) 53-72.
- ZELYCK, Lorn R.: Elisha Typology in Jesus' Miracle on the Jordan River (Papyrus Egerton 2, 2v.6-14), *NTS* 62 (2016) 149-156.

Zhrnutie

V tomto článku autor porovnáva Eliášové e Elizeové zázraky. Na základe tohto porovnania autor predložil profil proroka, ktorý robil zázraky. Tento profil je potom porovnaný s profilom iných postáv Starého Zákona, ktoré tiež robili zázraky ako aj s Ježišom tak v evanjeliách ako aj apokryfných spisoch.

Kľúčové slová: zázrak, Eliáš, Elizeus, apokryfy, Ježiš.

Summary

This paper will compare, first, the miracles performed by Elijah with those performed by Elisha. This comparison allows us to reconstruct “profiles” of both prophets. In the second part of this paper we will investigate which miracles made it into later texts, in particular, into the Second Temple writings and the synoptic gospels and which miracles were excluded from these writings. Based on this study we can reconstruct prototypes of miracle-makers and how they were transformed in the later periods.

Keywords: Miracle, Miracle-maker, Elijah, Elisha, Jesus.

Peter Dubovský, SJ
Piazza della Pilotta 35
00187 ROMA, Italy
dubovsky@biblico.it

Rahab the Prostitute in the New Testament

Ladislav Tichý

1 Rahab in the Old Testament

The main subject of the Old Testament Book of Joshua, which is the first book of the so-called “Former prophets”¹ in the Hebrew Bible, is the taking possession of the Promised Land, i.e. the land of Canaan, by the Israelites. During the conquering of the city of Jericho, a crucial part was played by a woman, whose name was Rahab. She was a prostitute by her profession. This Rahab received the Israelite spies who were sent to explore the land and Jericho into her house (Josh 2:1b). She disobeyed the order of the king of Jericho to bring these men out (v. 3). On the contrary, she hid these spies on the roof of her house (see vv. 4-6). From the spies she then solicited the oath to spare her and her whole family during the conquest of Jericho (see vv. 12-14). All of this then became a reality. The two Israelite spies kept the oath and Rahab and all who belonged to her had been brought out and spared (see 6:22-23) before the city of Jericho was burned down (v. 24). In a summarising manner, the Book of Joshua says that Rahab’s “family lived in Israel ever since. For she hid the messengers whom Joshua sent to spy out Jericho” (v. 25)².

2 Rahab in the New Testament

The Old Testament Rahab from the Book of Joshua is mentioned three times in the New Testament. It is in the Gospel of Matthew 1:5, in the Letter to

¹ The Hebrew Bible consists of three groups of books: the Torah (Pentateuch), the Prophets, and the Writings. The Prophets are then divided into “First” (according to the Hebrew term *rī’šōnīm*) or “Former” Prophets (Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings) and into Later Prophets, which are the “prophetic books” as considered by Christians (without the Book of Daniel, which has its place in the Writings). See, e.g., HARTMAN, *Prophetic books*, 766.

² For the texts that contain the narrative about Rahab in the Book of Joshua, see, e.g., the commentaries BUTLER, *Joshua*, 24-35.65-72; COOGAN, *Joshua*, 113-114.116-117.

the Hebrews 11:31, and in the Letter of James 2:25. It is true, that her name is not in the same word form in all three places. Matt 1:5 has the form Ῥαχάβ, but in Heb 11:31 and in Jas 2:25 the form Ῥάβ is to be found. However, we can say that there can hardly be a reasonable doubt that the same person, Rahab is meant in all three places. The form Ῥαχάβ in Matt 1:5 corresponds more to the Hebrew form³ רַחַב (Josh 2:1 etc.). The form Ῥάβ in Heb 11:31 and in Jas 2:25 is the form that is used in the Septuagint. The Hebrew name רַחַב has the meaning of the adjective “wide, broad”⁴. However, we can also be confronted with the opinion that רַחַב was “not originally a personal name; perhaps the designation of a clan which belonged to the *בֵּית רַחַב whore-house”⁵.

Let us now look at each of the New Testament passages in its context. We will maintain the order in which the books are traditionally placed in the New Testament because it is not possible to say for certain how the exact chronology of the Gospel of Matthew, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Letter of James was.

Matt 1:5 is a part of the genealogy (βίβλος γενέσεως, i.e. literally: “the book of origin”) of Jesus Christ, which is the first section of the Gospel of Matthew (1:1-17)⁶. The genealogy has a schematic structure with the repeating descending movement from “father” to “son”. This monotonous structure is “disturbed” by mention of four women (if we do not count the mother of Jesus at the end of v. 16). The four women mentioned are: Tamar in v. 3, Rahab and Ruth in v. 5, and “the wife of Uriah”, i.e. Bathsheba, in v. 6. Matt 1:5 mentions Rahab as the mother of Boaz, whose father was Salmon (according to Ruth 4:13, Boaz was the husband of Ruth). We do not know the source which this genealogical information about Rahab comes from. This at least can well correspond with Josh 6:25 that Rahab’s “family lived in Israel”⁷.

³ DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, 173, have the impression: “It may betray the redactor’s knowledge of the Hebrew”.

⁴ Cf. DANKER, *Lexicon*, 312.

⁵ HALOT II, 1212.

⁶ For the interpretation of this passage, cf. commentaries, e.g., SCHNACKENBURG, *Matthäusevangelium*, 17-19; GNILKA, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2-14; KEENER, *Matthew*, 73-81; FRANCE, *Matthew*, 26-45; DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, 149-188.

⁷ For Rahab’s place and evaluation in the later Jewish tradition, see STRACK – BILLERBECK, *Matthäus*, 20-23. According to this tradition, Rahab became a proselyte. In the Jewish literature, she was considered as the wife of Joshua. It is, however, in Christian literature where Rahab is given as an example. Beyond the New Testament, we can see it

The genealogy poses the question of what reason and meaning of the naming of the four women is. The answer to this question has been sought from Christian antiquity. We cannot see the answer in the necessity of salvation of the world as e.g. Hieronymus thought⁸ because at least for Ruth this explanation is not valid. What is common for these four women in genealogy of Jesus Christ is an irregularity of their origin. All these four women did not originally belong to the people of Israel⁹. We can see this presence of four originally pagan women in the genealogy of Jesus Christ as very important for the message of the Gospel of Matthew. No reader of this Gospel can overlook that this Gospel ends with the great commission of the risen Jesus to his disciples. Jesus is sending his disciples into the world with the words: “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations” (Matt 28:19). However, this final passage of the Gospel of Matthew could seem to average readers surprising because in the main body of this Gospel there are statements of Jesus that express a restricted mission of his disciples and of Jesus himself. So, in 10:5f., Jesus says to his disciples: “Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel”. And in 15:24, Jesus rejects the request of the Canaanite woman to heal her daughter with these words: “I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house Israel”. Rahab and the other three women show that the final passage of the Gospel of Matthew is not fully surprising, and that Israel is only selected as a vanguard of the salvation of all peoples. The four women in the genealogy

especially in 1 Clem 12:1-8, where not only Rahab’s faith and hospitality are praised, but also her prophecy (12:8). See the Greek text and the English translation by HOLMES, *Apostolic Fathers*, 58-61.

⁸ See GNILKA, *Matthäusevangelium*, 9.

⁹ This solution is not uncontroversial. See, e.g., BROWN, *Messiah*, 71-74.590-596. Brown would like to see the connection of the four women with Mary, namely in an irregular union of these women with their partners and the important role in God’s plan (73). Similar interpretation was held by SCHNACKENBURG, *Matthäusevangelium*, 18. Brown, however, does not fully exclude the explanation by the foreign origin of the four women (74). In my opinion, this solution is preferable because it seems to be the most convincing explanation even though the Gospel of Matthew does not say it explicitly. That is why according to FRANCE, *Matthew*, 38, “we cannot go beyond conjecture”. This cannot deny the best solution, though. Connecting Mary, mother of Jesus, with the four women in the previous text of the genealogy is at least doubtful and not fully convincing because the evangelist could not leave Mary unmentioned (due to the following passage in Matt 1:18-25) as was possible for the four women.

of Jesus are early signs of the fulfilment of the great commission of Jesus to his disciples at the end of the Gospel of Matthew¹⁰.

Heb 11:31 is part of chapter 11 which is dedicated to the theme of “faith”¹¹. At the beginning of this chapter (v. 1), the author of the letter gives some sort of a definition of faith and then he names a series of examples by listing persons from the Old Testament. It is not surprising that the author names such great Old Testament figures as Abraham (vv. 8-17) and Moses (vv. 23-24). It is interesting, however, that in v. 31 as the final example he also mentions “Rahab the prostitute”. She is the only woman besides Sarah (see v. 11) that is named in Heb 11. Heb 11:31 says: “By faith Rahab the prostitute did not perish with those who were disobedient, because she had received the spies in peace”. The faith of Rahab is clearly expressed in Josh 2:11 where she says to the Israelite spies: “LORD, your God, is God in heaven above and on earth below”. In Heb 11:31, Rahab’s profession “prostitute” is not avoided as we can see it, e.g., in Flavius Josephus (see *Ant.* 5.8 and 5.30, where Josephus speaks about Rahab’s inn [καταγώγιον], in which the spies sought their refuge and where they later rescued Rahab with her whole family¹²). The Letter to the Hebrews does not certainly approve Rahab’s profession (cf. the warning [accompanying the exhortation to honour marriage and keep the marriage bed undefiled] in Heb 13:4b: “God will judge sexually immoral people [πόρνοους]¹³ and adulterers”) ¹⁴, but Rahab can serve as a challenging comparison for the addressees of the Letter in this sense:

¹⁰ It is clear that also the narrative about the visit of the wise men from the East to Bethlehem in Matt 2:1-12 can be understood as expressing the idea of the salvation of the Gentiles.

¹¹ For the exegesis of this text with the illustrative examples of faith, see, e.g., ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 305-345; BACKHAUS, *Hebräerbrief*, 375-403; KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 458-511; MITCHELL, *Hebrews*, 227-256; THOMPSON, *Hebrews*, 232-243.

¹² See JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities*, 164-165, and 174-175. In note *b* on page 165 it is explained that Josephus follows the Targum on Josh 2:1, where the noun *pundekita* designating the profession of Rahab means “inn-keeper”.

¹³ The noun for the “profession” of Rahab πόρνη “prostitute” (see Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25) has the same etymological origin as πόρνος “fornicator, sexually immoral person”, even though the author of the Letter to the Hebrews certainly wanted to include diverse cases of sexual immorality.

¹⁴ The author of the Letter to the Hebrews undoubtedly agreed with the apostle Paul who “granted the propriety of sexual relations within marriage, but not outside it” (KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 565, n. 470).

if even a prostitute acted in faith, how could they be without faith¹⁵? The author of Heb mentions also another quality that accompanied the action of Rahab. It is “peace”: “she had received the spies in peace” (11:31). However, the narrative about Rahab in Josh does not mention the “receiving in peace”. Obviously, the author of Heb connects “peace” with “hospitality”. And Rahab undoubtedly showed hospitality. In 13:2, the addressees of the Letter are remembered that they should not “neglect hospitality”. Already in 12:14, they were instructed that “peace” must accompany their life: “Pursue peace with everyone”. How important the value of peace is for Heb we can also see from the formulation in 13:20, where the concluding prayer of the Letter for the addressees invokes “the God of peace” for help.

Jas 2:25 is part of the arguably most discussed passage of the Letter of James. Verses 14-26 treat the question of faith and works¹⁶. The whole passage is concluded with the statement in v. 26: “For just as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead”. In the preceding v. 25, the author of the Letter gives Rahab (after the example of Abraham in vv. 21-23) as an example of justification on the basis of works: “And similarly, was not Rahab the prostitute also justified by works when she welcomed the messengers and sent them out by another way?” There is no explicit mention that Rahab believed (unlike in the example of Abraham in v. 23 with the quotation of Gen 15:6: “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness”). However, the idea of faith follows from the context. This means that although Heb 11:31 speaks explicitly about the faith of Rahab and Jas 2:25 formulates that she was justified “by works” there is no contradiction between these two. From the context of Jas 2:25, we can conclude that Rahab had “living faith”. This is clearly confirmed by the statement in the following v. 26: “faith without works is dead”. If “faith without works is dead”, then faith that is visible in works must correspond to a living faith. We could perhaps ask whether Abraham in v. 24 is given as an example for Jews and Rahab in v. 25 as an example for pagans¹⁷.

¹⁵ See KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 505.

¹⁶ For the interpretation of this pericope, see commentaries, e.g., MUSSNER, *Jakobusbrief*, 127-157; JOHNSON, *James*, 236-250; MOO, *James*, 118-144; BURCHARD, *Jakobusbrief*, 109-133; HARTIN, *James*, 149-171; PHILLIPS, *James*, 82-93; ALLISON, *James*, 425-508.

¹⁷ Cf. MUSSNER, *Jakobusbrief*, 151, n. 7, who articulates this question. According to Mussner, the message would then be that faith must always “cooperate” with the works of love, regardless of whether a Christian is of Jewish or of pagan origin. Mussner sees this

Then the irrelevance of the origin from Jewry or from paganism for a Christian would be clearly expressed. However, this conclusion is certainly valid even without a clear positive answer to the formulated question concerning the relation of Abraham and Rahab. Moreover, this decisive connection of “faith” and “works” is fully in conformity with the position of the apostle Paul in his letters. We can see it very clearly, e.g., from the theologically very important formulation in Gal 5:6 where the apostle Paul says that “in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love”¹⁸.

Conclusion

The Old Testament woman Rahab from the Book of Joshua, who was a prostitute, but who helped and protected the Israelite spies during the conquering of Jericho, is mentioned three times in the New Testament (Matt 1:5; Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25). These mentions may seem only marginal and relatively unimportant. However, a summarising conclusion based on our analysis can say that all three places where Rahab the prostitute is mentioned in the New Testament can be seen as a clear supporting force to the essential theological message of the whole New Testament. On the one hand it is – at least according to the most convincing interpretation – the idea of the Gospel that is destined for all nations (Matt 1:5), and on the other hand, it is the essential importance of faith that must be active in works (Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25).

Bibliography

- ALLISON, Jr., Dale C.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James* (ICC), New York – London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- ATTRIDGE, Harold W.: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- BACKHAUS, Knut: *Der Hebräerbrief* (RNT), Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2009.

explanation as “worthy of consideration”. From another point of view, JOHNSON, *James*, 245, asks: “Is it accidental that the figures of Abraham and Rahab correspond to the needy «brother and sister» in 2:15?” We can in any case say that the author of the Letter wanted to give examples of both genders.

¹⁸ For the detailed interpretation of this verse, see, e.g., MUSSNER, *Galaterbrief*, 351-354.

- BROWN, Raymond E.: *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1993.
- BURCHARD, Christoph: *Der Jakobusbrief* (HNT 15/I), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- BUTLER, Trent C.: *Joshua* (WBC 7), Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983.
- COOGAN, Michael David: Joshua. In: Raymond E. Brown – Joseph A. Fitzmyer – Roland E. Murphy (eds.): *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1993, 110-131.
- DANKER, Frederick William: *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- DAVIES, William David – ALLISON, Jr., Dale C.: *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Vol. I (ICC), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- FRANCE, Richard Thomas: *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT), Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.
- GNILKA, Joachim: *Das Matthäusevangelium*. I. Teil, Freiburg: Herder, 1986.
- HARTIN, Patrick J.: *James* (Sacra Pagina 14), Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- HARTMAN, Louis Francis: Prophetic books of the Old Testament. In: Bernard L. Marthaler (ed.): *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 11: Pau–Red, Detroit etc.: Gale, ²2003, 766.
- HOLMES, Michael W. (ed.): *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, ³2007.
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy: *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 37A), New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- JOSEPHUS: *Jewish Antiquities: Books IV–VI*. H. Translated by St. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus (LCL 490), Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- KEENER, Craig S.: *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- KOEHLER, Ludwig – BAUMGARTNER, Walter: *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Vol. II, Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 2001.
- KOESTER, Craig R.: *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 36), New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- MITCHELL, Alan C.: *Hebrews* (Sacra Pagina 13), Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- MOO, Douglas J.: *The Letter of James*, Grand Rapids, MI.: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- MUSSNER, Franz: *Der Galaterbrief* (HThKNT 9), Freiburg: Herder, 1974.
- MUSSNER, Franz: *Der Jakobusbrief* (HThKNT 13/I), Freiburg.: Herder, ⁴1981.
- PHILLIPS, John: *Exploring the Epistle of James: An Expository Commentary*, Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2004.
- SCHNACKENBURG, Rudolf: *Matthäusevangelium 1,1–16,20*, Würzburg: Echter, 1985.
- STRACK, Hermann L. – BILLERBECK, Paul: *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München: C. H. Beck, 1922.
- THOMPSON, James W.: *Hebrews*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.

Shrnutí

Rachab, která byla nevěstkou v Jerichu (Joz 2,1) a ukryla dva izraelské zvědy (vv. 4-6), a proto byla uchráněna s celým svým domem před zkázou (6,17-25), je jmenována na třech místech v Novém zákoně: Mt 1,5; Žid 11,31 a Jak 2,25. Příspěvek se snaží tyto krátké zmínky analyzovat, vysvětlit a poukázat na teologický význam těchto textů. Pro teologické poselství Matoušova evangelia je výmluvné, že Rachab je jmenována mezi předky Ježíše Krista. A neméně významné jsou zmínky v listech. V nich je Rachab, přes své hříšné řemeslo, dána za příklad víry (Žid 11,31) a skutků (Jak 2,25). Mezi oběma texty neexistuje protiklad, třebaže je „víra“ v jednom a „skutky“ ve druhém, protože obojí patří k sobě, jak to např. vyjádřil apoštol Pavel ve svém teologicky velmi důležitém prohlášení v Gal 5,6: „rozhodující je víra, která se projevuje láskou“.

Klíčová slova: Kniha Jozue, Rachab, Matoušovo evangelium, List Židům, List Jakubův.

Summary

Rahab who was a prostitute in Jericho (Josh 2:1) and hid two Israelite spies (vv. 4-6) being therefore spared with her whole house (6:17-25) is mentioned three times in the New Testament (Matt 1:5; Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25). This contribution tries to analyze and explain these relatively short mentions and seeks to point out the theological significance of these texts. It is significant for the message of the Gospel of Matthew that Rahab is named among the ancestors of Jesus Christ. And the mentions in the letters seem to be especially important. There Rahab the prostitute, despite her sinful enterprise, is given as an example of faith (Heb 11:31) and of works (Jas 2:25). There is no real contradiction between these two texts (“faith” in one and “works” in the other) because both can be united as it was expressed, e.g., by the apostle Paul in his theologically very important proclamation in Gal 5:6: “the only thing that matters is faith working through love”.

Keywords: Book of Joshua, Rahab, Gospel of Matthew, Letter to the Hebrews, Letter of James.

Ladislav Tichý
Palacký University Olomouc
Sts Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology
Department of Biblical Studies
Univerzitní 22
771 11 OLOMOUC, Czech Republic
ladislav.tichy@upol.cz

Elijah

His Role and Importance in the Gospel of Luke

Petr Mareček

Elijah is one of the favourite Old Testament characters in the New Testament. After Moses (80 times), Abraham (73 times), and David (59 times) Elijah is the most frequently mentioned Old Testament figure in the New Testament (29 times). He was active in Northern Israel from around the middle of the 9th cen. B.C. and his activity is narrated in the stories of 1 Kgs 17–19; 21 and 2 Kgs 1–2¹. Elijah enjoyed great appreciation in early Jewish literature². Primarily, the people of Israel venerated him as a heavenly intercessor because of his mysterious disappearance from this world into heaven (2 Kgs 2:1.11 and Sir 48:9)³. Furthermore, he was held in great esteem, for, according to Mal 3:23–24, Elijah was a prophetic messenger connected with the eschatological Day of the Lord⁴. However, Malachi's prophecy in 3:23–24 does not require the expectations of Elijah in person, because the likewise articulated prophecies of the future David (e.g. Jer 30:9; Ezek 34:24; 37:24; Hos 3:5) distinctly relate to a David-like figure, not to David in person⁵. The story of Elijah has been recalled repeatedly in the Jewish tradition because of its spectacular content (cf. 1 Macc 2:58; 1 Enoch 89:52; 93:8; ApZeph 9:4–5). Josephus Flavius recounts this story in the most extensive way (*Ant.* 8,319–9,185; *Bell.* 4,460). In the *Lives of the*

¹ In addition to this prophet, three other bearers of this name appear in the Old Testament: 1) A Benjaminite, who is recorded among the clan chiefs in the Benjaminite genealogy provided by the Chronicler (1 Chr 8:27). 2) A priest, the son of Harim, who appears in the list of those who returned from the exile (Ezra 10:21). 3) A son of Elam, who is also listed among those who returned from the exile (10:26).

² See e.g. ZELLER, Elija.

³ Cf. STRACK – BILLERBECK, *Kommentar*, 765–779.

⁴ JEREMIAS, Ἡλ(ε)ίας; LAMBRECHT, Ἡλίας.

⁵ See RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 31–32.

Prophets (Vitae Prophetarum) additional legends are told about Elijah (*VitProph* 9:2-3; 10:6; 21:1-3; 22:1-3)⁶.

The New Testament invokes this famous Old Testament prophet in a variety of different contexts. The name Ἠλίας “Elijah”⁷ occurs in the New Testament, as we have already said, 29 times besides the *varia lectio* in Luke 9:54. It appears especially in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 9 times; Mark 9 times; Luke 7 times), but also in John 1:21.25; Rom 11:2 and Jas 5:17⁸.

Our study will focus on the character of Elijah in the Gospel of Luke, in which he is mentioned by name 7 times in total (1:17; 4:25.26; 9:8.19.30.33). Of all the Old Testament figures mentioned by Luke, Elijah is not the one referred to most times⁹, but he does play an important role in this Gospel. In examining this topic, one must also consider the numerous allusions to the figure of Elijah. In the Gospel of Luke it is possible to find the passages that are designed in a such way that it is reminiscent of a scene from the original Elijah stories (1 Kgs 17–19.21; 2 Kgs 1–2) or which incorporate a phrase that – strong or less strong – is reminiscent of Elijah from 1-2 Kgs or Mal 3:1.23-24. Although there is no final agreement on the number of allusions to Elijah in Luke, these can be considered as generally accepted: 1:76; 7:11-17.18-23.24-27; 9:51.54.61-62. According to some, the list may even be longer.

It has been proposed that the three-day search for the boy Jesus is to be connected with a three-day search for Elijah after he disappeared (Luke 2:45-46; cf. 2 Kgs 2:17)¹⁰. Jesus’ “forty-days” fast in the desert (Luke 4:1-2.10) is sometimes related to 1 Kgs 19:4-8¹¹, but it can be explicated as an allusion to Moses in Exod 34:28 or Deut 9:9. Some scholars see an allusion to Mal 3:1 in Luke 9:52 and

⁶ WIENER, *Elijah*, offers a wealth of material on the prophet Elijah extending from biblical records to contemporary Judaism, embracing also a study of his image in Christianity and Islam.

⁷ The name Elijah (Ἠλίας) has meaning: “Yah(u) is God”.

⁸ Elijah’s high rating in the early church is documented by some Christian writers. Jerome regarded Elijah as “noster princeps” (HIERONYMUS, *Epistola* 58,5 [PL 22, 583]). Tertullian calls Moses “informer populi” and Elijah “reformer populi” (TERTULLIANUS, *Adversus Marcionem* 4,22 [PL 2, 413]).

⁹ Abraham appears 15 times in the Gospel of Luke (1:55.73; 3:8[bis].34; 13:16.28; 16:22.23.24.25.29.30; 19:9; 20:37). David is mentioned 13 times in the Gospel of Luke (1:27.32.69; 2:4.11; 3:31; 6:3; 18:38.39; 20:41.42.44). Moses is stated 10 times in the Gospel of Luke (2:22; 5:14; 9:30.33; 16:29.31; 20:28.37; 24:27.44).

¹⁰ Cf. DABECK, *Siehe*, 184.

¹¹ Cf. DUBOIS, *La figure*, 171.

10:1¹², but the expression about sending messengers on ahead can simply remind the reader of 1:17. It can also bring to mind the formulation in Exod 23:20 which is reflected in the combined quotation together with Mal 3:1 in Luke 7:27. In Luke 9:52 and 10:1 the messenger are sent “before his face”, which corresponds with the formulation “before Your face” in Exod 23:20, while the prophecy of Mal 3:1 does not say that the sending is “before Your face”. The mention of the “ravens” in Luke 12:24 has been linked with 1 Kgs 17:1-7¹³, but this view is not convincing. The context is different: the ravens are instruments of God’s providence in 1 Kgs, while in Luke they are presented as its object. Finally “an angel from heaven” who strengthened Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane (Luke 22:43) is compared by some scholars with an “angel of the Lord” who touched Elijah and told him to eat (1 Kgs 19:5-7)¹⁴. In both events, the angel provides help from God, which is however a common motive in the Bible (cf. Gen 21:14-16).

Two Synoptic Gospels, Mark and Matthew, associate Elijah with John the Baptist¹⁵. Matthew is indeed explicit as it states Jesus’ assessment of John the Baptist: “he is Elijah, the one who is coming” (Matt 11:14)¹⁶. The third Synoptic Gospel, Luke does not connect Elijah only with one story character, unlike Mark and Matthew, but with two: John the Baptist and Jesus.

The purpose of this paper is to offer an interpretation of the texts that are about Elijah in the Gospel of Luke. The detailed exegesis of the texts where he is mentioned either explicitly (1:17; 4:25, 26; 9:8.19.30.33) or implicitly (7:11-16.18-23.24-28; 9:51.54-55.61-62) will help us to outline the main characteristics of the portrait of Elijah and to point out his role and importance in the Gospel of Luke. In this study, we will investigate the way in which Luke gives Elijah

¹² RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 15.

¹³ Cf. DABECK, *Siehe*, 183.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. WINK, *John the Baptist*, 44; DUBOIS, *La figure*, 171.

¹⁵ Scholars have vigorously discussed the question of whether or not there was in the time of Jesus a Jewish expectation that Elijah would come before the Messiah. E.g. FAIERSTEIN, *Why Do the Scribes Say*, and FITZMYER, *More about Elijah*, reject such a Jewish expectation and propose that it may be a Christian invention. On the other hand, e.g. ALLISON, *Elijah*, affirms it. For an overview, see ÖHLER, *Elia*, 1-30.

¹⁶ If we compare the first two synoptic Gospels (Matthew and Mark), which represent John the Baptist as Elijah, with the Gospel of John, we can notice the difference, since the fourth evangelist presents John the Baptist refusing to identify with Elijah (John 1:21). The testimony of John the Baptist in John 1:21 is influenced by the situation in the Johannine community. The historical John the Baptist might have understood himself as *Elijah redivivus* in his task of proclaiming judgment and salvation. Cf. GNILKA, *Johannesevangelium*, 17.

a place in his story, precisely because of the complex Elijah image in this third Gospel.

1 Elijah – Explicitly Mentioned by Name in the Gospel of Luke

1.1 The Heavenly Message about the Role of the Baptist (Luke 1:15-17)

In the Gospel of Luke, we meet Elijah for the first time in connection with the prediction of the birth of John the Baptist by the angel of the Lord (1:5-25), who announces his greatness (v. 15) and points to the importance of his work (vv. 16-17). The commission of John the Baptist is primarily to bring back “many of Israel’s sons to the Lord their God” (v. 16). In this way, John is inserted into the tradition of great preachers calling for repentance, who urged people to turn away from sin and to return to the Lord (cf. Jer 3:22; 18:11). John’s commission is then depicted as a prophetic mission, which is attributed to Elijah in Mal 3:23 (Luke 1:17). There is no actual quotation here, but an allusion to Old Testament places is made here. According to Mal 3:1.23-24, Elijah is a prophetic messenger who precedes the coming Lord with his judgment and whose task it is to prepare the people before his coming, lest the Lord of the Hosts comes and smites the earth with destruction (cf. Sir 48:10: “to calm the wrath”). Luke does not use some texts of Mark’s Gospel that place John close to Elijah (Mark 1:6 [cf. 2 Kgs 1:8 LXX]; 6:19-29 [cf. 1 Kgs 16:31; 19:10.14]) or identify them (Mark 9:11-13). In saying that “he will go in the spirit and power of Elijah”, it is made clear that John will have the same “prophetic equipment” as Elijah. Luke, probably, wants to state more precisely that John is not Elijah of 1-2 Kgs personally, but in his spirit fulfils the role of Elijah according to Mal 3. It is also clear that in Mark 9:12-13, Jesus’ intention is not to identify John with Elijah of 1-2 Kgs personally. John has his own name, and in Mark 9:4, Elijah appears as a completely different person. So John is not introduced as *Elijah redivivus*, but he is endowed with the same spirit and power as the Elijah of 1-2 Kgs was. He will have two main tasks. The first concerns a disturbed relationship between fathers and their children, which is to be rectified not only by fathers turning to children but by children being equally active (Mal 3:14). The second task is generally expressed as: the conversion of the disobedient. Through a change of hearts and minds, the eschatological people of God has to be prepared for the coming Lord. Although John is seen as the forerunner of God in this way, we can count on the fact that

Luke, in the formulation “to make ready a people prepared for the Lord”, thinks of Jesus, whom John precedes. The parallel arrangement of the story of John and Jesus in Luke 1:5–2:52 suggests that John goes before Jesus, who is also called “Lord” (1:43; 2:11). However, this is not explicitly stated here since Zechariah knows nothing about the birth of another child in God’s plan.

1.2 Jesus’ Preaching at Nazareth – the Example from the Scripture about Elijah (Luke 4:25-26)

Jesus’ preaching in Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30) is the second place where Elijah is mentioned in Luke (4:25-26). By moving this episode, which, according to the Gospel tradition, took place later, shortly before the end of Jesus’ public activity in Galilee (see Mark 6:1-6a; Matt 13:53-58), to the beginning of Jesus’ public activity, Luke gives it a programmatic character. Jesus’ public ministry is not only presented as the fulfillment of Scripture (Luke 4:17-21), but this scene also points to the outcome of his ministry: resistance from God’ chosen people, and salvation offered to the Gentiles (vv. 22-29). In Luke 4:25-26 the mission of Jesus is compared with that of Elijah and the widow of Sarepta (1 Kgs 17:1.8-16), together with that of Elisha and the Syrian Naaman (2 Kgs 5:1-14). When comparing 1 Kgs 17 with the wording of Luke we can see that in some cases, Luke updates the language (λιμὸς μέγας / λιμὸς κραταιὰ), while in other cases, exact phrases draw attention to an allusion (εἰς Σαρεπτα τῆς Σιδωνίας). The story of Elijah along with an episode of Elisha are examples from the history of Israel that are given to point out that the work of Jesus will also go beyond Israel and lead to pagans. These examples from the Old Testament provide a justification for the Christian mission to the Gentiles¹⁷. The double term “none” (Luke 4:26.27) in the emphatic position suggests Israel’s rejection (cf. 2:34-35; 3:8-9). Thus, at the very beginning of Jesus’ public ministry, the perspective is of the transition of the gospel to the Gentiles after being rejected by the Jews¹⁸.

¹⁷ TANNERHILL, *The Mission*, 60.

¹⁸ Luke informs us that the early Christian missionary activities always turn first to the Jews (Acts 9:20; 13:5.14.44; 14:1; 16:13; 17:1.10.17; 18:19) and then to the Gentiles (Acts 7–8; 13:46-49; 18,5ff; 19:8-10; 28:23-28).

1.3 Herod's Perplexity (Luke 9:7-9)

Another place in the Gospel of Luke where Elijah is mentioned is the unit 9:7-9, which depicts Herod's reaction to Jesus' reputation, which the evangelist takes over from Mark 6:14-16 (cf. Matt 14:1-2). Jesus' public activity causes people to evaluate his person. The three personalities with whom Jesus is compared all have a prophetic character.

Some people believed that John the Baptist had been raised from the dead. The idea of "reviving" John the Baptist presupposes that there had to be some resemblances between John and Jesus. Yet there remains a strange and unexpected popular belief in the "revival" of John and his "reincarnation" in Jesus. In addition, John the Baptist was not known to perform miracles (cf. John 10:41). There was also an opinion among the people about Jesus' activity that Elijah had appeared. Elijah, who was taken to heaven (cf. 2 Kgs 2:1-18), cannot be expected to awaken, but can only be revealed. The prophet Malachi (3:1.23) announces the coming of Elijah before the day of the Lord (Sir 48:10)¹⁹. The third group of people explains Jesus' appearance as one of the ancient prophets of the Old Testament period. The expectation of Elijah is witnessed in the time of Jesus (cf. Mark 9:11-12; John 1:21)²⁰; the expectation of Jeremiah or any other prophet is not clearly documented²¹. In Judaism, the resurrection of the dead was expected only at the end of time. In the course of history only those who did not die, i.e., who were taken into heaven (like Enoch, Elijah), could return. It is common to all three popular opinions that Jesus is seen as a prophet from the history of Israel who has returned. For all three it is assumed that only what has happened in the past and what is already known is possible²². However, Jesus is not a person who once existed in the world, but he is an expected person (cf. Luke 9:20; 22:67-67). By joining Jesus with a figure in the history of Israel, Jesus' messianic demand is also undervalued. This is also related to the misconception of the resurrection, which knows nothing of the necessity of previous suffering (9:22.43-44; 18:31-34)²³.

¹⁹ In rabbinic literature, Elijah is portrayed as one who brings pious comfort and salvation in distress and need. Cf. STRACK – BILLERBECK, *Kommentar*, 764-778.

²⁰ JEREMIAS, Ἡλ(ε)ίας, 933-936.

²¹ JEREMIAS, Ἱερεμίας.

²² BOVON, *Lukas*, 464.

²³ SCHÜRMAN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, I, 507-508.

Herod Antipas, who is introduced with the correct title “tetrarch” (in Mark 6:14 he is given the popular designation “king”), responds to these three popular opinions about Jesus with “perplexity” (Luke 9:7). He comments only on the first of these opinions. He considers it impossible for Jesus to be identified with John the Baptist, since he himself had John beheaded. For him, it is out of the question that someone dead can wake up to life. Other assumptions for him are not worth commenting on. But he is also not satisfied with the people’s judgments. He asks about the identity of the man he has heard so much about. His question had been already expressed many times before in the third Gospel (5:21 [scribes and Pharisees]; 7:20 [John’s disciples]; v. 49 [people at the table in the Pharisees’ house]; 8:25 [Jesus’ disciples]). It becomes a crucial question to be answered by Peter’s confession (9:18-20) and by God’s voice from heaven at the event of Jesus’ transfiguration (vv. 28-36). However, Tetrarch Herod is not aware of the fundamental nature of his question. Out of curiosity, he longs to know Jesus. He will get this opportunity in 23:8.

1.4 Peter’s Confession (Luke 9:18-21)

Another place in the Gospel of Luke where Elijah’s name appears is the event of Peter’s confession (9:18-21), which he draws from Mk 8:27-30 (cf. Matt 16:13-20; John 6:67-71) and which appears after the miraculous feeding the five thousand (Luke 9:10-17; cf. Mark 6:30-44). We can observe that Luke does not reproduce the text of Mark 6:45–8:26, which is usually referred to as the “great omission”. By omitting the text of Mark 6:45–8:26, Peter’s confession is closer to both the miracle of feeding the five thousand (Luke 9:10-17) and Herod’s question concerning Jesus’ identity (v. 9). The link between Peter’s confession and the event of feeding the five thousand is evident from John’s Gospel (John 6:1-15 and 6:66-69). People’s opinions about Jesus that Herod had heard about (Luke 9:7-9) appear in the disciples’ statements in v. 19. Jesus is regarded by some people as John the Baptist (without mentioning his resurrection), some people consider him as Elijah (without mentioning his revelation), and some people assume Jesus to be one of the ancient prophets (here is a verbal agreement with the formulation in v. 8). Based on popular evaluation, Jesus is not considered a messianic figure, but is ranked among the prophets. According to the testimony of John’s gospel, Jesus, after the miracle of feeding the five thousand, was considered by the people as a prophet whom they intended to come and take him by force to make him king (John 6:14-15). The three opinions of

people already mentioned in Luke 9:7-8 are stated here only in order to highlight the background to Peter's confession. Peter, in the role of the disciples' spokesman, utters a solemn confession that Jesus is God's messiah (v. 20). The title "Christ of God" is not entirely synonymous with the title "Christ" (= Messiah; the Anointed One), with which political expectations were associated. The addition of "God" expresses here, as in 23:35 (cf. 2:11.26), the special relationship of Jesus to God and thus a task that goes beyond human expectations. We can simply say that Peter's confession in 9:20 thus also provides an answer to Herod's inquiry in v. 9.

1.5 Transfiguration of Jesus (Luke 9:28-36)

The last place in Luke, where the name Elijah appears, is the event of Jesus' transfiguration (9:28-36). Luke presents this event in accordance with his source Mark 9:2-8 immediately after Jesus' instructions on discipleship (cf. also Matt 17:1-8). A peculiarity of Luke's depiction of Jesus' transfiguration is his conversation with two supernatural characters. Luke, unlike Mk 9:4, mentions Moses in the first place before Elijah (also Matt 17:3). In all likelihood, Luke understands the order of "Moses and Elijah" in the sense of the common formulation of "Moses and Prophets" (cf. Luke 16:29-31; 24:27; Acts 26:22)²⁴. Both Moses and Elijah were taken up to heaven according to Jewish tradition. For Elijah this is documented in 2 Kgs 2:11 and Sir 48:9²⁵. Popular belief about Moses developed gradually on this issue, with perhaps the earliest evidence coming from Josephus Flavius (*Ant.* 4,325-326)²⁶. Moses and Elijah appear as heavenly figures ("in glory"; cf. Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10)²⁷. They are presented in conversation with Jesus. The topic of the talk is Jesus' departure from Jerusalem as the fulfilment of the plan of salvation. This "departure" includes not only death (Luke 13:33) but also resurrection and exaltation (9:51). For Luke, "Jerusalem" is not only a city that kills the prophets (13:34), but also a city where the destiny of Jesus and the events set forth in God's plan of salvation are to be accomplished (24:26).

²⁴ SCHÜRMAN, Das Lukasevangelium, I, 557; WOLTER, Das Lukasevangelium, 352.

²⁵ Cf. 1 Hen 89:52; 93:8; Josephus Flavius, *Ant.* 9,28.

²⁶ Cf. also 2 Bar 59,3nn; *Sipre* Dt 34,5 § 357; *b. Sota* 13b; *Leqach tob* Dt 34,5 § 267b.

²⁷ For other options for interpreting the role of Moses and Elijah in the Transfiguration, see PELLEGRINI, *Elia*, 314-320.

2 Allusions to Elijah in the Gospel of Luke

2.1 Zacharias' Prophetic Word about the Task of His Son John (Luke 1:76)

The first allusion to Elijah in Luke can be found in the story of the birth of John the Baptist (1:57-80), when his father Zacharias, filled with the Holy Spirit, in his thanksgiving to God (vv. 68-79) prophesies to his son the task for which he was born. The agreement with the promise of the angel (vv. 16-18) is striking. His newborn son will be called the "prophet of the Most High" (v. 76a). This unique appellation, which does not appear in the Old Testament²⁸, serves to distinguish him from the "Son of the Most High" (v. 32), to whom he will be subordinate. By means of a formulation which comes from the use of Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3, the reader is told that John's task will be to prepare "ways" for "the Lord". These OT phrases were already related to John in the pre-Lucan tradition (see Mark 1:2-3). With the reference to Mal 3:1, Zacharias' prophetic word about the task of his son John is related to the prophecy about the coming of Elijah (cf. Luke 1:17). While the Jewish listener sees John as the forerunner and preparer for the coming of God, the Christian Gospel reader puts connects the title "Lord" with Jesus (cf. Luke 1:43). John's task as a preparer for the Lord is now further clarified, which, according to the angel's announcement, was primarily to convert people, i.e. to change the minds of people (vv. 16-17).

2.2 Jesus Raises the Widow's Son at Nain (Luke 7:11-17)

The story of the raising of the son of the Nain widow (Luke 7:11-17) is so formed that it resembles the Old Testament stories of the miracles of raising, especially the raising of the son of the widow of Sarepta by Elijah in 1 Kgs 17:8-24²⁹. Jesus comes to the city (Luke 7:11: Nain) as Elijah did (1 Kgs 17:10: Sarepta). He meets the widow (Luke 7:12; 1 Kgs 17:9.10.20) at the city gate (Luke 7:12: ἡ πύλη τῆς πόλεως; 1 Kgs 17:10: ὁ πυλῶν τῆς πόλεως) and the

²⁸ The title "prophet of the Most High" is found in T. Levi 8:15, used of a new king is descended from Levi. This title however does not have a messianic connotation. Cf. FITZMYER, *Luke*, 385.

²⁹ Cf. BRODIE, *Luke's Use*.

widow's only son is raised from the dead (Luke 7:15; 1 Kgs 17:22)³⁰. An explicit reference to 1 Kgs 17:23 is then made in Luke 7:15 (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ "and [he] gave him back to his mother"). This phrase is striking when we realize that it is found nowhere else in either testament except in these two accounts. The mention of Jesus as "a great prophet" in Luke 7:16 expresses the popular opinion that Jesus is a great prophet. This is probably a rather vague opinion regarding his identity. The title "great prophet" lacks an article, which does not support his identification with a particular prophet of their expectations. This title may refer to Elijah or one of the other prophets (cf. e.g. 9:8.19). Luke's Gospel repeatedly tells how Jesus is acknowledged as a prophet (cf. 7:39; 9:8, 19; 13:33; 24:19). A prophet like Moses was expected in the last days (cf. Deut 18:15.18; Acts 3:22-23; 7:37) and Elijah was a true prophet in continuity with Moses. Luke himself alludes to the Elijah of 1 Kgs 17. What is he pursuing? He probably wants to show that certain features of Jesus' activity are in accord with God's plan, i.e. that they remind of great prophets of the past like Elijah, as it indeed emerges from Luke 4:26 (in a similar way, Jesus' activity can be compared to Elisha in v. 27). With these allusions, Luke also wants to indicate that Jesus fulfils the expectations associated with the eschatological prophet in the line of Moses, as Elijah was indisputably, and could even take into account the views of those for whom *Elijah redivivus* was a typical Moses-like prophet³¹.

In Luke 7:11-17 Jesus proved himself the one who, like the Elijah of 1 Kgs 17, raises people from the dead. Such a miracle was expected in the Messianic era (cf. e.g. the deeds ascribed to "the Lord" in 4QApocMess 2 ii 1-12)³². This characterization cannot be applied to John the Baptist, about whose therapeutic activity (if any) the Gospel tradition is silent. However, Luke himself does not identify Jesus as Elijah and he never puts him directly into the role of the messenger according to the promise in Mal 3:1 as he does it concerning John the Baptist in Luke 7:27: "this is he of whom it is written", cf. 1:17.76. Luke identifies Jesus as "the Lord" here (7:13; the same is true in v. 19). Luke's procedure is very significant, since v. 13 contains the first occurrence of "the Lord" unambiguously applied to Jesus by the Luke himself. One can also notice the significant difference between the event of Jesus in Nain and the story with

³⁰ In the LXX, the widow has at least two children (1 Kgs 17:12: τοῖς τέκνοις μου), but in the Hebrew, she has only one son (אֶת־בְּרִיָּהּ).

³¹ Cf. RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 169-171, 203-204, 215.

³² Cf. RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 174-176, 210-211, 215.

Elijah in Sarepta, which suggests Jesus' superiority over Elijah. Jesus brings the widow's dead son to life by the command of his mighty word, which means that he raises someone from the dead by his own power, while Elijah had to cry out in prayer to God and bow three times over the child (1 Kgs 17:20-21). It is noteworthy that these details from the Elijah narrative appear in two resuscitation miracles in the Acts of the Apostles: where Peter raises Dorcas (Acts 9:36-42) and Paul raises Eutychus (20:7-12)³³.

2.3 John the Baptist's Question and Jesus' Answer (Luke 7:18-23)

The episode about the question of the imprisoned John and Jesus' answer (Luke 7:18-23), is in a shorter form in Matt 11:2-4, which is generally considered to represent the more original "Q" form. In Luke 7:18-23 John the Baptist appears as a questioner who is uncertain about the identity of Jesus. After the message of Jesus' public activity had reached John the Baptist through his disciples, he sends two of them to Jesus with the question: "Are you the one who is to come, or are we to wait for another?" (v. 19). The expression "the one who is to come" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) is used here as a title. This general sounding title probably draws on the announcement of the coming judge in 3:16-17³⁴. This judge recalls the Lord of Mal 3:1 (cf. "behold he is coming" and other allusions in Acts 13:24-25)³⁵ who is coming like fire of Mal 3:1-4.19, cf. Luke 3:9.16-17. Fire in Luke 3:16 is probably judging and saving power of the Holy Spirit and of the word of God, described also by another image in v. 17 (cf. "fire", "wheat" and "chaff" in Jer 23:28-29). Luke himself is convinced that the announcement by the Baptist are to be understood in relation to the Lord: The title "the Lord" (Luke 7:13.19) is the one Luke uses both for Yahweh who is coming and for Jesus. Luke also pays particular attention to be clear and coherent that *the*

³³ When raising Dorcas: "... they took him (Peter) to the room upstairs (ἀνήγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον; cf. 1 Kgs 17:19). Peter put all of them outside, and then he knelt down and prayed. He turned to the body and said, «Tabitha, get up.» Then she opened her eyes, and seeing Peter, she sat up." (Acts 9:39-40). When raising Eutychus: "Paul went down and fell upon him and after embracing him (cf. 1 Kgs 17:21), he said, «Do not be troubled, for his life is in him.» And when he had gone back up, and had broken the bread and eaten, he talked with them a long while, until daybreak, and so departed. And they took away the boy alive, and were greatly comforted." (Acts 20:10-12).

³⁴ KREMER, *Lukasevangelium*, 82.

³⁵ Cf. RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 206.

messenger will precede *the Lord*: 1:17.76; 3:4; 7:27. John the Baptist describes this coming Lord in a manner (taking off of sandals) that seems to recall the emblematic passage about Moses (the burning bush) marking the beginning of redemption (cf. Luke 3:16; Acts 13:25 and Exod 3:5; Acts 7:33)³⁶. In fact, Moses is called “redeemer” in Acts 7:35 and the disciples on the way to Emmaus after Jesus’ death had hoped that he was going “to redeem Israel” (Luke 24:19.21). According to Acts 3:24 all the prophets – and John was one of them (Luke 1:76; 7:26; 20:6) – announced the days of a prophet like Moses³⁷. In spite of the fact that the “coming” of various expected figures in pre-Christian Jewish tradition is known³⁸, it is therefore feasible that the title “the one who is to come” in Luke 7:19 refers to the judge Lord (vv. 13.19) of Mal 3:1, who makes his visitation as a Moses-like prophet, redeemer coming with his judging, kindling word of salvation and as the “Messiah” (since John’s announcement is a response to the expectations of the Messiah, Luke 3:15). Jesus does not provide direct answer to John’s question. Instead of accepting or denying that he is “the one who is to come”, he tells the two messengers to report to John what they have witnessed with their own eyes and ears. Jesus’ words summarize the prophecy of Isaiah on salvation, which is to be released from all suffering³⁹. Salvation now comes through Jesus’ words and actions. John’s disciples are not only eyewitnesses of Jesus’ deeds but also witnesses who personally heard his message.

2.4 Jesus’ Witness concerning John the Baptist (Luke 7:24-28)

Jesus’ testimony about John the Baptist in Luke 7:24-28 originates from “Q” and its counterpart is Matt 11:7-11, which has very similar wording. This speech of Jesus, which has a prophetic character, starts with three questions that look back to John’s baptismal activity. They are introduced stereotypically: “What did you go out to see?” The questions, which go back to a time when large crowds of people came to the desert following John (cf. Luke 3:1-20), suggest that John was indeed a prophet (7:24-26a). John was not “a reed swayed by the

³⁶ Cf. RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 131-132.

³⁷ Cf. RINDOŠ, *He of Whom*, 200-201, 204-207.

³⁸ Cf. FITZMYER, *Luke*, 666.

³⁹ Isa 61:1-2 (the proclamation of the good news to the poor, the recovery of sight to the blind); 29:18-19 (the healing of the deaf and the blind, the proclamation of the good news to the poor); 35:5-6 (the healing of the blind, the deaf, the lame, and the mute); 26:19 (the return of the dead to life).

wind” (v. 24)⁴⁰. Here is a reference to his attitude that brought him imprisonment and a violent death (cf. Mark 6:17-29). John was also not a “man dressed in beautiful clothes,” i.e. he did not live the life of a nobleman, but an ascetic life (cf. Mark 1:6). These two characteristics classify him as a great prophet.

What made people journey into the desert was the presence of a prophet (cf. Luke 20:6; Matt 14:5). However, people found “more than a prophet” in the desert. An explanation for this testimony of Jesus about John the Baptist is provided by the mixed quotation of Mal 3:1 and Exod 23:20, in which the announcement of the coming of the Lord became a declaration from God, coming through the Messiah’s forerunner about the Messiah. In conformity with Luke 1:76, by referring to the text of Mal 3:1, John the Baptist is directly defined by Jesus (Jesus says: “it is he of whom it is written”) as the promised Elijah-like messenger. The significance of John the Baptist, who is “more than a prophet,” is that, as Jesus’ predecessor, he prepared the people for Lord’s coming (cf. Luke 1:17.76; 3:4-6). He prepared the way for the Messiah Jesus, who did not come to bring judgment, but to offer redemption and salvation. Finally, in Luke 7:28, Jesus provides a fundamental explanation for the claim that John the Baptist is “more than a prophet”. John the Baptist is the greatest among all those born of earthly mothers. His greatness does not lie in his personal holiness but in the light of his place in the history of salvation, and in the light of the commission that put him on the threshold of the new era⁴¹. By the words: “the one who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he” (v. 28), Jesus is not emphasizing the small importance of John the Baptist, but the greatness of those in the coming Kingdom of God. Neither is he excluding John from the Kingdom. The new age is not comparable to the old one⁴².

2.5 Jesus’ Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51)

An important new section of the Gospel of Luke begins at 9:51, the so-called “travel account” (9:51–19:27). Jesus’ public ministry in this section of Luke is marked by his journey to Jerusalem. While this travel account does not explicitly provide an itinerary with precise details of the places visited, it is reiterated through editorial notes that Jesus and his companions are on the way

⁴⁰ The image is found in 1 Kgs 14:15 and is used for Israel.

⁴¹ ROSSÉ, *Luca*, 266. With regard to the place of John the Baptist within the history of salvation, see RINDOŠ, *The Place*.

⁴² SCHNEIDER, *Lukas*, 173.

(e.g. 9:51.52.53.57; 10:1.38; 13:22.33; 14:25; 17:11; 18:31.35). It is, however, only in 19:28 that he will finally reach the outskirts of the city.

In Luke 9:51, with the solemn introductory wording ἐγένετο δὲ “it happened” and the statement about fulfillment points to the fact that a significant event is coming (1:23; Acts 2:1), which is described by the mysterious expression ἀνάλημψις “taking up”⁴³. The Greek word ἀνάλημψις, which appears only here in the New Testament, is derived from the verb ἀναλαμβάνω, which Luke uses in Acts 1:11.22 for Jesus’ ascension (cf. Mark 16:19)⁴⁴. The language recalls those famous OT characters who had not died but had been taken directly up to heaven: Enoch (Gen 5:24 [μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός: God translated him / took him]), Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11 [ἀνελήμφθη: was taken up]) and, according to later tradition, Moses (Josephus Flavius, *Ant.* 4,326 [πρὸς τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι: he went to God]). However, in the Gospel of Luke ἀνάλημψις is a euphemistic reference to the end of Jesus, namely to his death, but it is also a reminder of his glorious resurrection and ascension (cf. Luke 9:22; 18:32-33)⁴⁵. Jerusalem, the place of death for the prophets (13:34), will become the place where Jesus’ journey reaches its destination. It is the place of Jesus’ death (v. 33), but at the same time the site of the resurrection and ascension (24:50-53: Bethany near Jerusalem), and where the missionary work will be based, which will focus on Jews and Gentiles (24:47-49; Acts 1:8).

2.6 Jesus Refuses to Be Identified with the Fiery Reformer (Luke 9:54-55)

The opening episode of the travel account (Luke 9:51–19:27) depicts Jesus setting out for Jerusalem, walking through Samaritan villages, and being refused a welcome in one of them (9:51-56). Just as Jesus’ public activity in Galilee (4:14–9:50) began with a story of rejection (4:16-30), so also “the travel account” (9:51–19:27) is introduced with the story of rejection (9:51-56). In this scene,

⁴³ The Greek word ἀνάλημψις, which appears only here in the New Testament, is derived from the verb ἀναλαμβάνω, which Luke uses in Acts 1:11.22 for Jesus’ ascension (cf. Mark 16:19). It may be understood in this way here, although this term includes the meaning of “death” (2 Bar 46:7; Ps 4:18; *Assumption of Moses* 10,12) and the context implies the idea of death (Luke 9:51b, 55).

⁴⁴ In Luke 24:51 is used the verb ἀναφέρω “to take up” to express ascension.

⁴⁵ WOLTER, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 369.

which has no counterpart in any of the other Gospels, the sons of Zebedee, James and John, make a clear allusion to 2 Kgs 1:10 or v. 12. It is not an exact quotation from the LXX because Luke uses ἀναλῶσαι instead of καταφάγειν in the LXX. The gloss “even as Elijah did” (ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν) that is added in some manuscripts (A, C, D, K, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, *f*^{1.13}, 33, 565, 700^c, 892 etc. – a not unimpressive list of witnesses)⁴⁶ makes it explicit. The absence of the addition, however, from such early witnesses as *P*^{45, 75}, *κ*, B (cf. also later witnesses as L, *Ξ*, 579, 700*, 1241, *it*^l, *syr*^s, *cop*^{sa, bo}) indicates that it is a gloss originated from some extraneous source, written or oral⁴⁷. Just as the Elijah motif appeared in Luke 4:25-26, so it is also found here (9:54). James and John want to share Jesus’ power to work a punitive miracle. However, Jesus does not accept this request. He rebukes them. Luke used the same sharp expression in connection with the silence commanded after Peter’s confession in 9:21. Jesus does not condemn the opposition of the inhabitants of the Samaritan village. He refuses to act as Elijah (2 Kgs 1) did. The God whom Jesus preaches is not God the avenger. Jesus does not travel to Jerusalem as a judge, but as a Savior⁴⁸. The disciples, who follow Jesus (“Jesus turned to them!” cf. Luke 10:23; 14:25), have to realize that in following him they must count on rejection and persecution.

2.7 The Cost of Following Jesus (Luke 9:61-62)

The last allusion to Elijah in Luke is found in 9:61-62, which is the third saying of Jesus addressed to would-be followers. The first two sayings (9:57-58, 59-60) are derived from “Q”, being found also in Matt 8:19-20, 21-22. The third saying (Luke 9:61-62) which has formally the same arrangement as the previous two, appears only in Luke. While it cannot be said with certainty whether it originates from the source “L” or the extended source “Q”⁴⁹, the influence of the narration on the calling of Elisha is undeniable. Though the text 9:61-62 has only a few phrases and words in common with 1 Kgs 19:19-21 (ἀκολουθέω “to follow”; ἄροτρον “a plough” / ἀροτριᾶω “to plough”; ὀπίσω “back” / ἐξόπισθεν “backwards”), the scene in Luke is similar to 1 Kgs with two elements: 1) the request of Elisha to Elijah: “Let me kiss my father and mother goodbye, and then

⁴⁶ ALAND et al. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 223.

⁴⁷ METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 124.

⁴⁸ SCHÜRMAN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, II/1, 28.

⁴⁹ Cf. WIEFEL, *Lukas*, 192; ERNST, *Lukas*, 247.

I will follow you” (1 Kgs 19:20); 2) the image of a plough: Elisha was ploughing when Elijah invited him to be a disciple. Unlike Elijah, Jesus permits no delay and neither does he literally toss his mantle over his followers. Elijah permits Elisha to return to his family and kiss them goodbye. Jesus permits no such expression of respect for the family; the kingdom of heaven has drawn near and it is time to take action, now and resolutely. Actually, the statement of Jesus about putting one’s hand to the plough and not looking back may also be related to Elisha. When Elisha returned from Elijah, the text says, he burned the ploughing equipment to cook the oxen. If this is the case, it could be that Jesus is saying to his followers that, like Elisha, they are to burn their bridges to their former lives and not look back as they turn to follow him, just as Elisha followed Elijah⁵⁰. It is possible that Luke 9:61-62 has been added as a comment on vv. 59-60 to make the unprecedented demand contained in Jesus’ answer (v. 60) comprehensible in the post-Paschal situation: the authority of the Lord exceeds that of Elijah. Jesus is not *Elia redivivus*; he is “more than Elijah”. His demands exceed those of the most outstanding representative of the prophets of the Old Testament. Jesus makes it clear that the proclamation of the Kingdom of God demands an urgent decision to follow him. He presents the image of a ploughman who can plough straight furrows when he looks forward and does not look back. Ploughing for the kingdom of God will not suffer any distraction. The invitation to discipleship goes beyond family ties and requires a firm, forward-looking view (cf. v. 51).

3 Conclusions

The image of Elijah in the Gospel of Luke is complex. In the episode about the Transfiguration, Elijah appears as an independent story character beside Jesus (Luke 9:30). Therefore, Jesus cannot be *Elias redivivus* of Mal 3:23-23, as assessed by some people (Luke 9:8.19). Jesus rejects the proposal of the disciples, James and John, who expect to act like Elijah and call down fire from heaven to consume the inhospitable Samaritan village (9:54-55; cf. 2 Kgs 1:9-16). John the Baptist is associated several times with Elijah, explicitly in Luke 1:17 (the prediction of the angel Gabriel) and implicitly in v. 76 (the prophecy of Zechariah) as well as in 7:27 where he is, however, directly defined by Jesus

⁵⁰ Cf. BLAIR, Putting One’s Hand.

(Jesus says: “it is he of whom it is written”) as the messenger of Mal 3:1 (the assessment of Jesus). By referring to Mal 3:23-24, the work of John the Baptist is linked to the promised Elijah. On the other hand, Jesus is also depicted with the features of the prophet Elijah. In his preaching at Nazareth, Jesus compares himself with Elijah, whose work transcended the borders of Israel (Luke 4:25-26; cf. 1 Kgs 17:18-16). The account of the resurrection of the widow’s son in Nain resembles the story of the raising of the son of the widow of Sarepta by Elijah (1 Kgs 17:8-24). Finally, Jesus’ action in the scene with the man who spontaneously offers himself as a disciple (Luke 9:61-62) reminds us of the calling of Elisha by Elijah in 1 Kgs 19:19-21. We can sum up that John the Baptist is associated with Elijah, as the forerunner and preparer of the way of the Lord (= Jesus) in the way Malachi speaks (3:1), while Jesus is not associated with the Elijah figure of Malachi, but with the Elijah of the Deuteronomistic cycle 1 Kgs 17 – 2 Kings 2. However, Jesus is not *Elia redivivus*, he is “more than Elijah”, he is the Lord. Jesus brings the widow’s son to life by the command of his mighty word, while Elijah had to call himself in prayer to the Lord and bow three times over the child (1 Kgs 17:20-21). In addition, Jesus’ demands for discipleship (Luke 9:62) exceed those of the most important prophet of the Old Testament (1 Kgs 19:19-21). Jesus is, in accord with Peter’s solemn confession, “the Christ of God”, who does not act as the fiery reformer, but who brings salvation.

Bibliography

- ALAND, Barbara et al. (eds.): *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ²⁸2012.
- ALLISON, Dale C., Jr.: Elijah Must Come First, *JBL* 103 (1984) 256-258.
- BLAIR, Hugh J.: Putting One’s Hand to the Plough: Luke ix. 62 in the light of 1 Kings xix. 19–21, *ET* 79 (1967-1968) 342-343.
- BOVON, Francois: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: 1. Teilband Lk 1, 1–9, 50* (EKK III/1), Zürich: Benziger – Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1989.
- BRODIE, Thomas Louis: Towards Unraveling Luke’s Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24, *NTS* 32 (1983) 247-267.
- DABECK, Paul: Siehe, es erschienen Moses und Elias, *Bib* 23 (1942) 175-184.
- DUBOIS, Jean-Daniel: La figure d’Elie dans la perspective lucanienne, *RHPPhR* 53 (1973) 155-176.
- ERNST, Josef: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT), Regensburg: Pustet, ⁶1993.
- EVANS, Craig A.: Luke’s Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election, *JBL* 106 (1987) 75-83.

- FAIERSTEIN, Morris M.: Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First?, *JBL* 100 (1981) 75-86.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A.: *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation and Notes (I-IX)* (AB 28A), New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A.: More about Elijah Coming First, *JBL* 104 (1985) 295-296.
- GNILKA, Joachim: *Johannesevangelium* (NEB 4), Würzburg: Echter Verlag, ⁴1983.
- HIERONYMUS: *Epistola* 58 (PL 22), ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, Paris: Migne, 1859, col. 579-586.
- JEREMIAS, Joachim: Ἡλ(ε)ίας. In: *ThWNT* 2 (1935) 930-943.
- JEREMIAS, Joachim: Ἱερεμίας. In: *ThWNT* 3 (1938) 218-221.
- KREMER, Jacob: *Lukasevangelium* (NEB 3), Würzburg: Echter Verlag, ²1992.
- LAMBRECHT, Jan: Ἡλίας. In: *EWNT* 2 (1981), col. 285-290.
- METZGER, Bruce M.: *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ²2000.
- ÖHLER, Markus: *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im Neuen Testament* (BZNW 88), Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- PELLEGRINI, Silvia: *Elija – Wegbereiter des Gottessohnes: Eine textsemiotische Untersuchung im Markusevangelium* (HBS 26), Freiburg – Basel – Wien, 2000.
- RINDOŠ, Jaroslav: *He of Whom It Is Written: John the Baptist and Elijah in Luke* (ÖBS 38), Frankfurt: Lang, 2010.
- RINDOŠ, Jaroslav: The Place of John the Baptist within Luke's Sacred History. In: Lorenzo De Santos – Santi Grasso (eds.): „Perché stessero con Lui“. *Scritti in onore di Klemens Stock SJ, nel suo 75° compleanno* (AnBib 180), Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2010, 269-286.
- ROSSÉ, Gérard: *Il Vangelo di Luca: Commento esegetico e teologico*, Roma: Città Nuova, ³2001.
- SCHNEIDER, Gerhard: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: Kapitel: 1–10* (ÖTKNT 3/1), Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn – Würzburg: Echter, ³1992.
- SCHÜRMAN, Heinz: *Das Lukasevangelium*, I (HThK III/1), Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, ⁴1990.
- SCHÜRMAN, Heinz: *Das Lukasevangelium*, II/1 (HThK III/2.1), Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 1994.
- STRACK, Hermann Leberecht – BILLERBECK, Paul: *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Bd. IV/2, München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.
- TANNEHILL, Robert C.: The Mission of Jesus according to Luke iv 16-30. In: Walther Eltester (Hrsg.): *Jesus in Nazareth* (BZNW 40), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972, 51-75.
- TERTULLIANUS: *Adversus Marcionem* (PL 2), ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, Paris: Migne, 1844, col. 239-524.
- WIEFEL, Wolfgang: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (ThHK 3), Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1988.
- WIENER, Aharon: *The Prophet Elijah in the Development of Judaism: A Depth-Psychological Study*, London – Henley – Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

- WINK, Walter: *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS 7), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- WOLTER, Michael: *Das Lukasevangelium* (HNT 5), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2008.
- ZELLER, Dieter: Elija und Elischa im Frühjudentum, *BiKi* 41 (1986) 154-160.

Shrnutí

Tato studie na základě výkladu textů Lukášova evangelia, kde je Eliáš uveden buď výslovně (1,17; 4,25.26; 9,8.19.30.33) nebo implicitně (7,11-16.18-23.24-28; 9,51.54-55.61-62), poukazuje na jeho roli a význam v tomto evangeliu. Obraz Eliáše v Lk je komplexní. Jan Křtitel je několikrát spojen s Eliášem: výslovně v Lk 1,17 (předpověď anděla Gabriela) a implicitně v 1,76 (proroctví Zachariáše) a v 7,27 (hodnocení Ježíše). Na druhou stranu je Ježíš zobrazen také s rysy proroka Eliáše: vystoupení v Nazaretě (4,25-26; srov. 1Kr 17,1.8-16), vzkříšení syna naimské vdovy (Lk 7,11-17; srov. 1Kr 17,8-24), scéna s člověkem, který se spontánně nabízí Ježíšovi za učedníka (Lk 9,61-62; srov. 1Kr 19,19-21). Jan Křtitel je spojen s Eliášem, jako předchůdcem a připravovatelem na Pána (= Ježíše) po způsobu proroctví Mal 3,1.23-24, naproti tomu Ježíš je spojen s Eliášem deuteronomistického cyklu 1Kr 17–2Kr 2. Ježíš však není *Elia redivivus*. On je „více než Eliáš“. On je „Boží Mesiáš“ (Lk 9,20), který nepůsobí jako horlivý reformátor, ale který přináší spásu.

Klíčová slova: Eliáš, Ježíš, Jan Křtitel, Lukášovo evangelium, Starý zákon.

Summary

On the basis of the interpretation of the texts of the Gospel of Luke, where Elijah is mentioned either explicitly (1:17; 4:25.26; 9:8.19.30.33) or implicitly (7:11-16.18-23.24-28; 9:51.54-55.61-62), this study points to its role and importance in this gospel. The image of Elijah in the Gospel of Luke is complex. John the Baptist is associated several times with Elijah: explicitly in Luke 1:17 (the prediction of the angel Gabriel) and implicitly in 1:76 (the prophecy of Zechariah) and in 7:27 (the assessment of Jesus). On the other hand, Jesus is also depicted with the features of the prophet Elijah: Jesus' preaching at Nazareth (4:25-26; cf. 1 Kgs 17:18-16), the raising of the widow's son (Luke 7:11-17; cf. 1 Kgs 17:8-14), the saying of Jesus addressed to would-be followers (Luke 9:61-62; cf. 1 Kgs 19:19-21). John the Baptist is associated with Elijah, as the forerunner and preparer of the way of the Lord (= Jesus) in the way Malachi speaks (3:1), while Jesus is not associated with the Elijah figure of Malachi, but with the Elijah of the Deuteronomistic cycle 1 Kgs 17–2 Kgs 2. However,

Jesus is not *Elia redivivus*, he is “more than Elijah”. He is “the Christ of God” (Luke 9:20), who does not act as the fiery reformer, but who brings salvation.

Keywords: Elijah, Jesus, John the Baptist, The Gospel of Luke, The Old Testament.

Petr Mareček
Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci
Cyrilometodějská teologická fakulta
Katedra biblických věd
Univerzitní 22
771 11 OLOMOUC, Czech Republic
petr.marecek@upol.cz

Alegorická exegéza gréckych filozofov ako pozadie helenistickej exegézy Biblie

Literárno-kultúrny prehľad

Helena Panczová

Staroveká alegorická exegéza si v 2. polovici 20. storočia začala získavať pozornosť vedcov viacerých vedných disciplín. Nepochybne to súvisí s rozvojom štúdia symbolov a ich interpretácie, ktoré podnietili objavy hĺbkovej psychológie¹. No v posledných rokoch priniesol pozoruhodné poznatky aj komparatívny výskum výkladovej tradície posvätných textov², ktoré sú základom tej-ktorej kultúry³.

Výklad náboženských textov je takmer taký starý ako tieto texty samotné. Platí to tak v prípade homérskeho eposu u Grékov, ako aj v prípade Biblie u Židov, hoci detaily vývoja sa, pravda, odlišujú⁴. Súdobosť kanonizácie náboženských textov a počiatkov ich interpretácie nie je náhodná. Kanonizované texty, ustálené v istej podobe, potrebovali nejaký prostriedok, ktorý by ich posvätný obsah vyjadroval jazykom zrozumiteľným pre neustále sa meniacu spoločnosť. A tak sa objavil výkladový komentár, ktorý je takýmto spojivom medzi starým textom a novou dobou.

Na nasledujúcich stranách poukážeme, ako sa grécki myslitelia vyrovnávali s dedičstvom svojich náboženských textov – s homérskeho eposmi. Pri výklade Homéra sa od najstaršieho obdobia používalo niekoľko interpretačných kľúčov, ktoré sa súhrnne nazývali „alegorický výklad“. Predstavíme jeho

¹ Porov. napr. FRYE, *Code*; FRYE, *Words*; GRANT, *The Letter*; BOYS-STONES, *Metaphor*.

² Porov. RUTGERS – VAN DER HORST – HAVELAAR – TEUGELS (eds.), *Sacred Books*; BRISSON, *Myths*.

³ Interpretácia literárnych diel tohto druhu úzko súvisí s inými druhmi interpretácie – s výkladom veštíeb a snov, ktoré mali vo východnom Stredomorí dlhú tradíciu, ako aj s výkladom diel výtvarného umenia a náboženských rituálov. Porov. STRUCK, *Symbol*. Týmto širším súvislostiam sa tu však nebudeme venovať.

⁴ Porov. FINKELBERG – STROUMSA (eds.), *Homer*; NIEHOFF (ed.), *Homer*.

jednotlivé typy, ako sa postupne objavovali v priebehu gréckych dejín. Nakoniec stručne načrtujeme niekoľko príkladov z alegorickej exegézy Biblie v helenistickej Alexandrii. Helenistickí Židia totiž boli *mutatis mutandis* v podobnej kultúrnej situácii ako grécki myslitelia a neváhali využiť intelektuálne riešenia, ktoré im ponúkala grécka filozofická tradícia, ľahko dostupná v tejto metropole gréckej kultúry a vzdelanosti.

1 Alegória – terminológia a pramene

1.1 Terminológia

Ohľadom pojmu „alegória“ vzniká mnoho nedorozumení, preto ho najprv terminologicky objasníme. V súčasnosti pod týmto pojmom rozumieme rečnícku alegóriu, nazývanú aj inotaj. Je to literárno-kompozičná metóda, pri ktorej sa abstraktné pojmy vyjadrujú pomocou zmyslovo názorných obrazov, najmä pomocou rozličných postáv (cnosti predstavované ako ženy s istými atribútmi) alebo zvierat (napr. v bájkach). Tento význam slova „alegória“ však pochádza až z neskorej antiky (a rozvinul sa v stredoveku), teda je sekundárny – odvodený od hermeneutickej alegórie.

Alegória ako hermeneutická metóda vychádza z predpokladu, že text má aj iný význam než len to, čo je zrejme z jeho bezprostredného významu, teda „hovorí niečo iné“ (*ἄλλα ἀγορεύει*). Opisované príbehy a obrazy transponuje na inú rovinu, na ktorej dávajú lepšiu, hlbšiu zmysel. Základným princípom alegorického výkladu je analógia, schopnosť vidieť podobnosti medzi javmi z rozličných oblastí ľudského života.

Pojem „alegória“ (*ἀλληγορία*) je relatívne neskorý. V ranej dobe sa na alegorický výklad používali výrazy *αἶνος*, *αἴνιγμα* „hádanka“, *αἰνίττεσθαι* „hovoriť v hádankách, naznačovať“⁵. U autorov klasického obdobia je doložený termín *ὑπόνοια* „pod-zmysel, skrytý zmysel“⁶. Výraz *ἀλληγορία* sa objavuje až u Plútarcha, ktorý o ňom hovorí ako o neologizme svojej doby⁷.

No je tu aj druhá črta terminologickej odlišnosti medzi starovekým významom alegórie a jej moderným chápaním. Alegorickým výkladom sa nazývali všetky postupy, ktoré videli v texte iný zmysel ako ten, ktorý je

⁵ Porov. FORD, Interpretation, 33-53.

⁶ Napr. Platón, porov. nižšie.

⁷ Porov. PLÚTARCHOS, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 4 (*Moralia* 19e).

očividný. Patrila sem prírodná, morálna, psychologická a mystická alegória, ale zarad'ovali sem aj historickú exegézu a etymologické bádanie⁸.

1.2 *Pramene*

Doklady o alegorickej exegéze môžeme čerpať z kompendií, ktoré zostavili autori na sklonku antiky a v stredoveku⁹. Z rímskej doby pochádza spis inak neznámeho Hérakleita (1. stor. pred n. l. alebo 1. stor. n. l.) *Quaestiones Homericae* „Homérske otázky“, ktorý zaznamenáva staršie tradície¹⁰. Podobným zdrojom je dielo *Theologiae Graecae compendium* „Príručka gréckej teológie“, v ktorej spracoval grécku mytológiu stoický filozof Cornutus (1. stor. n. l.). V Plútarchovom (1./2. stor. n. l.) rozsiahlom súbore diel *Moralia* sú kde-tu zachované mnohé výklady mýtov (a to nielen gréckych)¹¹. Výklad homérskeho mýtov je skoncentrovaný v spise *De vita et poesi Homeri* „O Homérovom živote a poézii“, ktorý sa tiež pripisuje Plútarchovi, ale asi neprávom¹². Cenným svedectvom sú aj staré scholiá k Homérovi¹³ – mnohé z nich zachoval solúnsky biskup Eustathios (12. stor.)¹⁴.

2 Alegorická exegéza gréckych mýtov

Na nasledujúcich stranách postupne prejdeme jednotlivé typy starovekej alegorickej exegézy približne v chronologickom poradí, ako sa objavovali na scéne a dostávali sa do centra pozornosti filozofov.

2.1 *Situácia v období orálnej a ranej literárnej kultúry*

V období orálnej kultúry boli mýty, ktoré sú obsahom eposov, pružné čo do formy aj obsahu a básnici si ich mohli adaptovať podľa aktuálnych potrieb. Básnik v predliterárnom období bol vnímaný ako prostredník medzi ľuďmi

⁸ Porov. FORD, *Criticism*, 72.

⁹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 66-78.

¹⁰ Porov. HÉRACLITE, *Allégories d'Homère*; ERACLITO, *Questioni omeriche*.

¹¹ Porov. napr. PLÚTARCHOS, *De Osiride et Iside* (*Moralia* 351C-438E).

¹² Porov. PLUTARCH, *Essay on the Life*.

¹³ Porov. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*; *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*.

¹⁴ Porov. EUSTATHII, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*.

a božskou sférou¹⁵. Jeho úlohou nebolo zachovávať starobylú tradíciu – a už vôbec nie zabávať –, ale náboženské pravdy, vyjadrené v mýtoch, udržiavať stále živými. Preto básnik mohol (a musel) svoj materiál neustále adaptovať¹⁶. Takto sa priebežne pri každom novom prednášaní mýtické príbehy postupne menili tak, aby vždy vyjadrovali kultúrne a morálne potreby aktuálnej spoločnosti.

Koncom predliterárneho obdobia začali homérske eposy strácať svoju pôvodnú fluiditu a ich znenie sa postupne kryštalizovalo vo viac-menej štandardizovanej podobe. Je to obdobie vývoja homérskeho eposu, keď na miesto kreatívnych pevcov, ktorých poznáme pod menom aoidovia (αοιδοί), nastúpili recitátori, rapsódi (ῥαψωδοί), ktorí prednášali tradovaný text, no nezasahovali doň. Toto štádium bolo zakončené za Peisistratovcov (v 6. storočí pred n. l.)¹⁷, keď boli homérske eposy písomne zaznamenané¹⁸.

Práve v období rapsódov sa objavujú prvé náznaky komentára k týmto básňam¹⁹. Rapsód Ión z rovnomenného Platónovho dialógu nielen prednáša básne, ale ponúka aj vysvetlenie ich významu²⁰. Eposy totiž petrifikovali vo forme, ktorá zodpovedala potrebám istej doby. Čím viac sa spoločnosť svojím vývinom od danej doby vzdäľovala, tým menej tieto eposy vyhovovali ako nábožensky normatívne texty. Preto sa práve v tomto období objavuje proces ich adaptácie na súdobú situáciu – alegorický výklad, hľadanie inej významovej úrovne.

Najstaršie doklady alegorického výkladu – no vlastne aj väčšina dokladov alegorického výkladu od počiatku až do konca staroveku – sú spojené s gréckymi

¹⁵ Porov. DETIENNE, *Les maîtres de vérité*. (Anglický preklad: *The Masters of Truth*.) WATKINS, *Dragon*, 68-93.

¹⁶ Porov. DÖRRIE, *Sinn*, 14; PYYKKÖ, *Die griechische Mythen*, 16-17.

¹⁷ Najstaršími svedkami tejto starovekej tradície sú CICERO, *De Oratore* III.137, a PAUSANIAS VII.26.13.

¹⁸ Toto ustálenie platí pre prostredie Attiky, no aj tu naďalej existovali isté textové variácie, ako môžeme usudzovať z citácií Homéra v dielach attickej literatúry. Ešte väčšie rozdiely nepochybne existovali v ostatných častiach gréckeho sveta. Keď Zénodotos v Alexandrii v 1. polovici 3. storočia pred n. l. pripravoval prvé „opravené“ vydanie Homéra, nechal si poslať verzie jeho básní zo všetkých gréckych miest a kolónií. Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 94, 110.

¹⁹ Najstarší zachovaný komentár v gréckej tradícii je komentár k orfickej teogónii nájdený v Derveni v Macedónii. Porov. BOYS-STONES, *Metaphor*, 179. Predaristotelovské komentáre k Homérovi sú zachované len v zlomkoch v dielach neskorších autorov. (Pramene sú uvedené v pozn. 12.)

²⁰ Porov. BOYS-STONES, *Metaphor*, 178.

filozofmi²¹. Čím viac sa spoločnosť vzdŕaľovala od doby kanonizovania eposov, tým viac sa zväčšovala vzdialenosť medzi ich náboženským obsahom a duchovnými potrebami novej doby. Filozofi ako intelektuálna elita svojej doby boli schopní alegorickou reinterpretáciou mýtov túto diskrepanciu odstrániť²².

2.2 *Prírodná alegória raného obdobia*

V centre pozornosti najstarších filozofov bola príroda, preto iste nie je prekvapujúce, že prvé doklady alegórie homérskych eposov sa týkajú „fyziky“ a tento druh alegórie sa nazýva „fyzikálna“. Myslitelia hľadali prvky, z ktorých pozostáva svet, a potvrdenie svojich názorov nachádzali u neomylného Homéra²³.

Thaletovo učenie o pralátke vode sa dá odvodiť z Homérovho výroku o Okeane, „ktorý je otcom všetkého“²⁴. Podobne Anaximenov základný prvok sveta, vzduch (ἀήρ), možno stotožniť s Diom, vládcom homérskoho panteónu. Hérakleitov oheň zodpovedá jasnému éteru (αἰθήρ), ktorý obklopuje zem vo vyššej vrstve ako vzduch, na úrovni hviezd. Empedoklove štyri elementy – oheň, vzduch, zem, voda – majú v homérskych eposoch mená Zeus, Héra²⁵, Hádes a Poseidón²⁶.

Najstaršie doklady alegórie sú pozitívne²⁷, nie negatívne, teda motívom týchto filozofov bola snaha o zosúladenie Homérovej autority z ich pokročilejším chápaním sveta. Veľmi skoro sa však alegória začala používať

²¹ Len na krátky čas v dobe klasických Atén dramatickí básnici oživilí staré mýty, lebo ich boli schopní interpretovať v duchu pozmenených ideálov mestského štátu. Porov. BRISSON, *Myths*, 2, 7-9, 30.

²² Porov. FRYE, *Code*, 6-10.

²³ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 81.

²⁴ HOMÉROS, *Ílias* XIV.246: ὅς περ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται.

²⁵ Stotožňovanie Héry s (nižším, hustým, temným) vzduchom (ἀήρ) urobil už Theagenés a je súčasťou celej gréckej filozofickej tradície (porov. PLATÓN, *Kratylos* 404c). Vychádza z ľudovej etymológie založenej na paronomázii HPA – AHP, s ktorou sa pohrával aj sám básnik (porov. *Ílias* 21, 6-7: „pred nimi Héré // hustú prestrela paru“).

²⁶ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 85-101. Najstaršie doklady fyzikálnej alegórie sa týkajú božstiev. Métrodóros z Lampsaku (5. stor. pred n. l.) v tomto zmysle vysvetľoval aj héroov: Agamemnón bol éter, Achillés slnko, Hektor mesiac. Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 35.

²⁷ Porov. TATE, *Greek Allegory*, 214-215; TATE, *Allegorism*, 105-114.

apologeticky – na obranu Homérovej autority voči tým, ktorí ju spochybňovali²⁸. Vyspelejšia časť spoločnosti totiž vnímala niektoré opisované udalosti ako morálne neakceptovateľné.

Jedným z problematických miest, ktoré sa dali vysvetliť fyzikálnou alegóriou²⁹, bol napríklad 20. spev *Íliady*, kde sa bohovia s Diovým súhlasom púšťajú do boja a užívajú si to. Podľa Theagena z Rhégia³⁰ je to obraz kozmického boja živlov. Keď sa Zeus a Héra venujú láskyplným objatiam na hore Ida a všetko okolo nich rozkvitá³¹, ide o opis zmiešania éteru (Zeus) so vzduchom (Héra), ktoré zúrodňuje zem³².

Stotožnenie Apollóna so slnkom pravdepodobne pochádza od pytagorovcov. Apollónove šípy sú slnečné lúče. Keď ich vysieľa, zvučia³³. To je jeden tón Pytagorovej hudby sfér, čiže harmonického zvuku, ktorý vydávajú hviezdy na svojej púti svetom³⁴. No práve táto úvodná scéna *Íliady*³⁵, keď po achájskom tábore lietajú bohove strely a hynú najprv psy a muly, no napokon aj muži, a to všetko ako trest za Agamemnónovu bezbožnosť, si vyžaduje komentár. Ako sa zhoduje s božou spravodlivosťou, aby za chybu jedného pykali druhí, celkom nevinní? Ak však ide o epidémiu moru, ktorú spôsobujú výpary z močiarov vo vrcholiacom lete, ide o prírodný jav, nie o teologický problém³⁶.

²⁸ V staršej literatúre sa vznik a rozvoj alegorickej exegézy zjednodušene vysvetľuje apologetickými dôvodmi. To však nezodpovedá skutočnosti. Porov. FORD, *Criticism*, 69; STRUCK, *Symbol*, 14-15. Apologeticky sa však nepoužívala len alegória, ale všetky interpretačné metódy, ktoré Gréci vyvinuli.

²⁹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 101-122.

³⁰ Theagenés z Rhégia (posledná štvrtina 6. stor. pred n. l.) je najstarší autor, o ktorom vieme, že sa systematicky venoval výkladu Homéra alegorickým spôsobom. Žil súčasne so Xenofanom, Homérovým racionalizujúcim kritikom, preto sa jeho aktivita tradične (no pravdepodobne nesprávne, porov. pozn. 20) vysvetľuje ako odpoveď na túto kritiku. Porov. FORD, *Criticism*, 68-72.

³¹ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* XIV.292-351.

³² Táto hierogamia bola jedna z vecí, ktoré pohoršovali Platóna (*Ústava* III.390b-c). Novoplatonici ju však rozvinuli do mystickej výšky, porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 544-548.

³³ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* I.49 (*κλαγγή γένητο*).

³⁴ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 187-195.

³⁵ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* I.8-56.

³⁶ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 195-200.

Ojedinelý príklad fyzikálnej alegórie je doložený aj u Aristotela³⁷. Ide o pasáž o stádach boha Héliosa³⁸. Hélios mal sedem stád kráv a sedem stád oviec, v každom bolo po päťdesiat kusov. Odysseus a jeho druhovia dostali varovanie ani sa ich nedotknúť, ak sa chcú vrátiť domov. No oni, samozrejme, neposlúchli... Podľa Aristotela číslo 350 označuje počet dní lunárneho roku (hoci ten má v skutočnosti 354 dní), Hélios je čas. Obrazom druhov zabíjajúcich Héliovie tučné stáda básnik vyjadruje dni premrhané ničnerobením³⁹. Implikácie tohto výkladu smerujú k morálnej alegórii, ale Aristoteles tu možno letmo naznačuje snahu interpretov zosúladiť lunárny a solárny kalendár (Hélios je boh slnka)⁴⁰.

V najstaršom období (po dobu Platóna a Aristotela) bol alegorický výklad všeobecne akceptovaný. Jedným z dôvodov mohlo byť aj to, že autorita Homéra ako básnika, „ktorý vie všetko“, nebola spochybnená. Ešte stále pretrvával archaický model vnímania básnika ako proroka, ktorý sprostredkúva hlbokú múdrosť. S touto citlivosťou voči rozprávaným príbehom pravdepodobne súvisí aj všeobecná kultúrna situácia, ktorá bola priaznivá voči intelektuálnej požiadavke byť schopný v príbehu rozoznať inú významovú úroveň okrem tej, ktorá bola očividná. Túto schopnosť predpokladal žáner, ktorý prekvital v archaickom a ranom klasickom období, zvaný *αἴνος*, doslova „hádanka“, ktorý označoval príbeh alebo výrok s morálnym ponaučením – patrila sem zvieracia bájka, príslovie, porekadlo a hádanka, akú napríklad položila Sfinga. S výrazom *αἴνος* etymologicky súvisia aj termíny, ktoré sa počas celého staroveku používali na opis alegorickej interpretácie – *αἰνιγμα* „hádanka“, *αἰνιττεσθαι* „hovoriť v hádankách, naznačovať“, *αἰνιγματώδης* „nepriamo hovoriaci, naznačujúci, alegorický“⁴¹.

2.3 Historická exegéza, Platón a Aristoteles

2.3.1 Historická exegéza

Iný spôsob výkladu mýtov sa nachádza u iónskych logografov a ich nástupcu historika Hérodota. Keď títo autori vo svojich dejinách spomínali

³⁷ Zlomok zachovaný v scholiách (ARISTOTELES, *Aporemata HomERICA* fr. 175).

³⁸ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* XII.127-141, 260-419.

³⁹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 243-245; GERMAIN, *Odyssée*, 195-196.

⁴⁰ Porov. CAMPBELL, *The Masks of God*, 162-163.

⁴¹ Porov. FORD, *Criticism*, 74-75.

„neuveriteľné“ mýtické príbehy, často ich vysvetľovali racionalizovaným spôsobom. Tento druh demytologizujúceho výkladu, ktorý sa snaží nájsť racionalistické, „reálne“ či historické jadro básnických príbehov, neskôr Eustathios pomenoval „historická exegéza“⁴².

Platón nám zachoval pekný príklad tohto druhu výkladu. V dialógu *Faidros* sa nachádza diskusia o mýte o Óreithyji, dcére aténskeho kráľa, ktorú uniesol Boreás, boh severného vetra, aby sa stala jeho ženou. Historická alegória – v Platónovej dobe sa alegória nazývala *ὑπόνοια* „skrytý význam“ – tu videla transpozíciu smutného príbehu o dievčati, ktoré prudký víchor strhol z útesu a zabil⁴³. (Keďže Boreás je tu stotožnený s vetrom, tento výklad má aj prvok fyzikálnej alegórie.) Platónov Sokrates takéto špekulácie odmieta⁴⁴.

2.3.2 Platón

O Platónovi sa traduje, že odmietal alegorickú exegézu. Pravda je však taká, že v pasáži z *Ústavy*, ktorá by to mala podopierať, Platón odmieta predovšetkým mýty samotné. No nebolo to preto, že by neobsahovali hlboké pravdy, ale preto, že ich pokladal za nevhodné z pedagogického hľadiska. Deti nie sú schopné rozoznať, že ide o obrazný príbeh, chápu mýtické príbehy doslovne, a tak nevyhnutne podliehajú klamu⁴⁵. Ak predchádzajúci filozofi tvrdili, že alegorickou exegézou sa mýty dajú zachrániť, tak Platón bol presvedčený, že sa nedajú. Teda aspoň v kontexte výchovy.

Platón však mal veľký zmysel pre obrazné vyjadrovanie⁴⁶ a rôzne úrovne významu⁴⁷. Neskorší novoplatonici, ktorí alegóriu bohato využívali, svoj postoj

⁴² Porov. BRODERSEN, „Das aber ist eine Lüge!“, 50-51.

⁴³ Porov. PLATÓN, *Faidros* 229b – 230a.

⁴⁴ Xenofontov Sokrates však vnímal alegóriu pozitívnejšie. O rapsódoch sa vyjadril v tom zmysle, že je to najhlúpejší kmeň ľudí, lebo nepoznajú vnútorný význam (*ὑπόνοια*) básní. Porov. XENOFÓN, *Symposion* 3, 5-6.

⁴⁵ Porov. PLATÓN, *Ústava* II, 377a, 378d-e.

⁴⁶ Sám robil aj čosi ako kompozičnú alegóriu, porov. napr. „mýtus“ o duši, ktorá stratila krídla, v dialógu *Faidros*, alebo zrodenie lásky v dialógu *Symposion*, alebo „mýtus“ o jaskyni v *Ústave*. Pochopiteľne, ide o literárne formy iného typu, ako sú tradičné mýty. No ukazuje sa v nich jeho zmysel pre obraznosť.

⁴⁷ Na viacerých miestach v jeho dialógoch sa vyskytuje diskusia o múdrych výrokoch básnikov, ktoré sú absurdné, ak ich chápeme doslova, no pri správnom uhle pohľadu odhaľujú hlbokú múdrosť. Neraz sa pohráva s pojmi *αἴνιγμα* „hádanka, temný výrok/obraz“ *αἰνιττεσθαι* „naznačovať“, ktoré – ako sme videli – patrili do základnej slovej zásoby

odvodzovali priamo od svojho učiteľa. V diskutovanej pasáži z *Faidra* Platónov Sokrates – podľa nich – odmieta uvedený alegorický výklad nie ako zo zásady chybný, ale preto, že mu nijako neosoží v jeho snahe „poznať sám seba“ podľa rady delfskej veštiarne. Teda – ako argumentovali novoplatonici, ktorí pestovali mystickú alegóriu – Platón v alegorickom výklade odmietal iba nesprávne aplikačné roviny, ktoré jeho doba preferovala, teda prírodu a históriu⁴⁸.

2.3.3 Aristoteles

Aristoteles sa prikláňal k historickému výkladu. V diele *Aporemata Homericæ*, ktoré sa zachovalo len v zlomkoch⁴⁹, ako aj v takmer celej 25. kapitole *Poetiky*, sa venoval viacerým problematickým miestam homérskych básní. Riešil ich jednak z historickej, jednak z literárnej perspektívy⁵⁰.

Z historického hľadiska vysvetľoval napríklad pohoršlivú scénu, keď hrdinský Achilles s krutosťou nehodnou héra vláčil Hektorovo telo okolo Patroklovej hrobky⁵¹. Platón túto scénu z morálnych dôvodov zavrhol⁵². Podľa Aristotela to bol thessálsky pohrebný zvyk, nie Achillovo ventilovanie osobnej nenávisti⁵³.

„Historická exegéza“ bola neskôr spojená s Aristotelovými nasledovníkmi z peripatetickej školy, predovšetkým s jeho žiakom Palaifatom. S takýmto prístupom možno v Odysseovom putovaní vidieť transpozíciu skutočných miest, vládcov a obyvateľstva starovekého Stredomoria. Napríklad mýtický Aiolos, boh vetrov, bol kráľ znalý meteorológie. Kirké, Sirény, Scylla a Charybda sú kurtizány, ktoré ničia či pohlcujú svoje obeť – no len metaforicky. Euhémeros (4./3. stor. pred n. l.) pokladal bohov gréckeho panteónu za zbožštených starodávnych, no plne ľudských vládcov⁵⁴.

alegorického interpreta. Porov. *Charmidés* 161b – 162a, *Lysis* 214a-d, *Ústava* I, 332b, *Theaitétos* 152a, *Alkibiadés* 2.147b-e, porov. aj *Faidón* 69c (o mystériách).

⁴⁸ Podľa Hermeiovho komentára k Faidrovi (HERMEIAS, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*), porov. BERNARD, *Dichtungstheorien*, 22-28.

⁴⁹ Predovšetkým u Porfýria. Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 69.

⁵⁰ Ako už bolo povedané, alegorický výklad nebol jediný prostriedok, ktorý Homérovi obrancovia používali na jeho obhajobu proti kritike. Aristoteles alegóriu používal ojedinele.

⁵¹ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* XXIV.14-18.

⁵² Porov. PLATÓN, *Ústava* III, 391b-c.

⁵³ Porov. NIEHOFF, *Jewish Exegesis*, 103-104.

⁵⁴ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 228-242, 245-248.

2.4 Filologický výklad – alexandrijská škola

Od Aristotela sa odvíjal aj interpretačný prúd zameraný na textovú kritiku a poetickú analýzu, ktorý priviedla k rozkvetu alexandrijská škola⁵⁵. Jej najznámejším predstaviteľom je Aristarchos zo Samothráky (*floruit* v polovici 2. stor. pred n. l.).

Aristoteles prišiel s novým chápaním básnika a básnického procesu. Básnik preňho už nie je prorok, sprostredkovateľ božskej múdrosti, ktorá ho presahuje, ako to bolo v dobe orálnej a ranej literárnej kultúry, ale je samostatným tvorcom, ktorý má plne pod kontrolou obsah aj formu básne⁵⁶. Činnosť básnika sa dá porovnať s filozofom⁵⁷, pokiaľ ide o obsah, a s rétorom, pokiaľ ide o formu básne.

No s predstavou básnika, ktorý by bol takýmto veľmajstrom, neladí fakt, že v homérskejších eposoch sú mnohé nejasné alebo protirečivé verše. Alexandrijská škola ich rieši filologicky a textovokriticky. V helenistickom období už bolo treba venovať väčšiu pozornosť jazyku starých básnikov, od ktorého sa súdobá reč prirodzeným vývojom stále viac vzdäľovala. Po vysvetlení základných jazykových nejasností nasledoval rétorický a vecný výklad. Tu mohli filológovia uplatňovať jednak svoju znalosť poetických pravidiel epického žánru, jednak svoje široké vzdelanie v historických reáliách.

Verše, ktoré sú nejasné alebo si protirečia, sa vysvetľovali v duchu zásady *Homerum ex Homero*, vysvetľovať Homéra na základe Homéra, ktorej formulovanie sa pripisuje Aristarchovi. Ak je báseň dielom jedného autora (o čom sa nepochybovalo) a ak básnik má poetický proces plne pod kontrolou (o čom sa aspoň v Alexandrii tiež nepochybovalo), tak dielo je vnútorne jednotné a nejasnosť na jednom mieste sa dá vysvetliť pomocou iného miesta.

Ak napriek všetkej snahe predsa zostali nejaké nezrozumiteľné alebo protirečivé miesta, boli pokladané za nepôvodné. Takéto verše alexandrijskí vedci z textu vylučovali (*athetovali*). Fyzicky ho síce ponechali na mieste, ale značkou *obelos* na okraji manuskriptu indikovali, že ho pokladajú za nepravý, neautentický (*spurius*)⁵⁸.

⁵⁵ Porov. STRUCK, *Symbol*, 63-71.

⁵⁶ Toto je postoj, ktorý, odhliadnuc od romantikov, vedecky spochybnili až objavy psychológie 20. storočia. No niektorí kritici sa ho stále pridŕžajú.

⁵⁷ Porov. ARISTOTELES, *Poetika* IX, 1451b, 5-7.

⁵⁸ Porov. NIEHOFF, *Jewish Exegesis*, 128.

2.5 Pergamon – etymológia

2.5.1 Alexandria a Pergamon

V dobe, keď sa Alexandria vyprofilovala ako centrum homérskeho bádania s filologickým prístupom, konštituovala sa aj škola v Pergame, ktorá sa od 2. stor. pred n. l. usilovala byť akousi konkurenciou školy v Alexandrii⁵⁹. Škola v Pergame⁶⁰, ktorej hlavným reprezentantom je Kratés z Mallu (2. stor. pred n. l.), pravda, nikdy nedosiahla veľkosť Alexandrie⁶¹, ani ich vzájomné postojne neboli striktné vyprofilované. No predsa je faktom, že v helenistickom období existovali dva hlavné prúdy prístupu k homérskeým básňam, ktoré sa v istých bodoch zásadne odlišovali.

Alexandrijský hermeneutický prístup k Homérovi sa dá charakterizovať ako literálny⁶² – vykladači sa držali doslovného znenia textu a snažili sa ho tým či oným spôsobom obhájiť. Ak všetky ich prostriedky (lingvistika, poetika, historické pozadie) zlyhali, zostávajúce nelogickosti a protirečenia sa riešili emendáciou textu. Alexandrijčania boli filológovia. V Pergame pod Kratétovým vedením prevládol filozofický, stoický prístup s alegorickým výkladom. Táto škola nadviazala na starobylé chápanie, že poetický text je *αἴνιγμα* „temný výrok/obraz“, ktorý treba dekódovať⁶³.

Obe školy mali zásadne odlišný postoj k otázke autorského zámeru. Aristotelovský prúd vnímal básnika ako majstra-remeselníka, ktorý vie, čo robí, a plne zodpovedá za obsah svojho diela. Stoici mali k básnikom a ich schopnostiam oveľa prezieravejší postoj. Mýtické básne síce obsahujú hlbokú múdrosť, ale básnici, ktorí reprodukovali tieto staré príbehy, ich múdrosť nie vždy pochopili a pravdu neraz prekrútili⁶⁴.

⁵⁹ Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 234-251; PONTANI, *Sguargi*, 52-54.

⁶⁰ S rozmachom tejto školy súvisí aj rozšírenie pergamenu ako písacieho materiálu. Je pravdepodobné, že zvýšenie produkcie pergamenu si vyžiadali potreby miestnej knižnice – dovoz papyrusu z Egypta bol asi príliš nákladný. Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 235-236.

⁶¹ Dá sa aj diskutovať, či išlo o školu v tom zmysle ako v Alexandrii. Tam totiž bolo niekoľko generácií učiteľov a žiakov, ktorí ich striedali. V Pergame bol vlastne iba Kratés a skupina jeho osobných žiakov.

⁶² Netreba zamieňať pojmy „literálny“ (angl. *literal*) a „literárny“ (angl. *literary*). Prvé adjektívum má význam „týkajúci sa doslovného znenia“, druhý „týkajúci sa literatúry“.

⁶³ Porov. NIEHOFF, *Jewish Exegesis*, 68, 143, 151.

⁶⁴ Porov. STRUCK, *Symbol*, 149-150, 279.

Exegéti aristotelovského prúdu prezentovali svoje výklady ako skutočný autorov zámer. Na druhej strane stoici sa radi dištancovali od básnikov, ktorí „zbabrali“ podanie mýtckej pravdy. Usilovali sa túto pôvodnú pravdu rekonštruovať a svoje výklady odvodzovali z etymológie, ktorá im odhaľovala zabudnutý pravý význam slov i textu⁶⁵.

Tento postoj súvisí aj s jazykovednou náukou. Aristoteles, predchodca modernej jazykovedy, zastával názor, že slová sú vecou „dohody“ (θέσει), „konvencie“ (νόμῳ), teda že nie je nijaká súvislosť medzi tým, čo nejaké slovo označuje, a tým, ako znie⁶⁶. Stoici boli, naopak, presvedčení, že pomenovania zodpovedajú prirodzenosti veci (φύσει). Preto venovali veľkú pozornosť etymológii, ktorou sa chceli dopátrať k pôvodnému významu slova a podstate veci.

2.5.2 Etymológia

K starovekej etymológii musíme uviesť niekoľko poznámok. Pod etymológiou sa v súčasnosti rozumie rekonštrukcia vývinu slov, pokiaľ ide o ich formu aj význam, a zistenie ich najstaršej podoby, ktorá sa dá porovnávacou jazykovedou odhaliť. Je to nevd'áchná disciplína, lebo na jednej strane si vyžaduje široké a hlboké vzdelanie, ale na druhej strane jej výsledky majú veľmi obmedzené použitie. V slovníkoch uvádzaný najstarší zistený význam slova je totiž pre používanie súdobého jazyka irelevantný.

Staroveké chápanie etymológie však bolo iné. Po prvé, títo bádatelia pochopiteľne nemali poznatky modernej lingvistiky a ich etymologické rekonštrukcie sú dnes často neakceptovateľné. To azda nikoho neprekvapí. No druhému rozdielu treba venovať osobitnú pozornosť. Výsledky starovekej etymológie mali oveľa väčšiu závažnosť. Verilo sa totiž, že to, k čomu sa dopátrali, je „pravý“, „skutočný“ význam slov (τὸ ἔτυμον), ktorý odhaľuje ich hlbokú podstatu, zdegenerovanú neskorším vývojom.

Budovanie výkladu na etymológii malo korene v poézii samotnej. Asonancia mien bohov a héroov so slovami bežného života sa používala na dosiahnutie básnického účinku, napr. meno hrdinu Odyssea, Ὀδυσσεύς, sám Homér dáva do súvisu so slovesami ὀδύρομαι „nariekat“ a ὀδύσομαι

⁶⁵ Porov. ALEXANDER, 'Homer the Prophet of All', 127-142.

⁶⁶ Výnimkou je onomatopoja.

„zanevrieť“⁶⁷. Najvyšší boh Ζεύς súvisí so „žitím“, ζῆν⁶⁸. Meno hrdinu Achilla, Ἀχιλλεύς, údajne vyjadruje, že tento muž spôsobil utrpenie, ἄχος, vojsku, λεώς. Meno boha Apollóna, Ἀπόλλων, zase vyjadruje jeho schopnosť ničiť, ἀπόλλυμι, napr. morou nákazou⁶⁹.

Tento exegetický postup používali aj filozofi (Hérakleitos, Démokritos), historici (Hekataios, Hérodotos či sofista Prodikos⁷⁰).

2.6 Stoická prírodná alegória

Stoici pokračovali v prírodnej, „fyzikálnej“ alegórii predsokratikov a bohato rozvinuli homérsku kozmologickú symboliku⁷¹. V 18. knihe Íliady Héfaistos ukuje Achillovi štít⁷². Kovy, ktoré majster používa – zlato, striebro, bronz a cín, predstavujú základné prvky – éter, vzduch, vodu a zem. Na tomto okrúhly štíte je zobrazený celý svet, na jeho okraji je prúd Okeanu. Jeho päť vrstiev zodpovedá piatim zemským zónam⁷³.

Kozmologické vysvetlenie sa dalo nájsť aj pre známu pohoršlivú epizódu o cudzoložnom vášnivom vzťahu boha vojny Area s bohyňou lásky Afroditou. Jej manžel Héfaistos ich pristihne a spúta ich. Ostatní bohovia sa prizerajú a smejú⁷⁴. Láska a nenávisť sú podľa Empedoklova učenia dva základné princípy sveta. Ak sa podarí ich spojenie, vo svete vzniká harmónia, preto bohovia, ktorí boli svedkami tejto mimoriadnej scény, mali dôvod na radosť⁷⁵.

Podľa stoického výkladu predstavuje mýtická postava Protea prechod od prvotnej (πρῶτος) nesformovanej hmoty k organizovanej harmonickej podobe kozmu. V príbehu ide o to, že kráľ Menelaos uviazol v bezvetří na egyptskom pobreží a na radu bohyne Eidothey sa chcel od tohto „morského starca“ dozvedieť prečo. No Proteus, aby ho odradil, sa začal premieňať na rôzne odstrašujúce podoby⁷⁶.

⁶⁷ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* I.62, XIX.407-409.

⁶⁸ Porov. AISCHYLOS, *Supplices* 584; PLATON, *Kratylos* 396b.

⁶⁹ Archilochos. Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 4-5.

⁷⁰ Porov. PFEIFFER, *Classical Scholarship*, 61-62.

⁷¹ V helenistickom období boli stoici jediní filozofi, ktorí pestovali fyzikálnu alegóriu.

⁷² Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* XVIII.468-617.

⁷³ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 155-165.

⁷⁴ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* VIII.266-369.

⁷⁵ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 168-172.

⁷⁶ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* IV.399-569, 456-458.

Podľa výkladu stoikov Proteove metamorfózy predstavujú štyri základné prvky – ohnivý lev symbolizuje éter, chtonické zviera drak zase zem, strom týčiaci sa do výšky predstavuje vzduch a tečúca voda je, samozrejme, voda. Demiurg najprv rozdelil hmotu na štyri základné prvky a potom formuje všetky mnohoraké bytosti tohto sveta. Eidothea, bohyňa formy, podoby (εἶδος), ktorá podnietila beztvárnu hmotu k sformovaniu, predstavuje Prozreteľnosť⁷⁷.

Do prírodnej alegórie sa zaraďuje aj výklad základného mýtu eleuzínskych mystérií v zmysle vegetačného mýtu. Únos Persefony do podsvetia je obrazom obilia, ktoré sa na istý čas stráca pod zemou⁷⁸.

2.7 Morálny výklad

Etický, morálny výklad je doložený už od najstaršieho obdobia a pestovali ho všetky filozofické školy. Základnou funkciou starých básní totiž bolo poučovať poslucháčov. Túto funkciu si homérske eposy zachovali na mnoho nasledujúcich stáročí – Homér sa stal „vychovávateľom Grécka“⁷⁹.

Ílias a Odysseia poskytovali pozitívne vzory správania (aj odstrašujúce príklady) a pravidlá života počínajúc zdravou mierou v jedle, pití, láske a bohatstve cez povinnosti vládca, návodov na rečnícku zdatnosť a vojenskú chabrosť až po delikátne etické a psychologické otázky⁸⁰. Súčasťou základnej rétorickej výchovy bola aj etická kritika – rétorika mala mladých ľudí naučiť rozlišovať medzi dobrými a zlými vzormi⁸¹.

No okrem takéhoto jednoduchého morálneho výkladu⁸², ktorý spočíval v predkladaní vzorov, sa už v ranom období objavujú náznaky morálnej alegórie. Métrodóros z Lampsaku (5. stor. pred n. l.) rozvíjal Anaxagorovo učenie, že „Homérove básne sú o cnosti a spravodlivosti“⁸³. Tento prístup sa však dostal do

⁷⁷ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 179-185.

⁷⁸ Porov. BOYS-STONES, *Metaphor*, 203-205.

⁷⁹ Porov. PLATÓN, *Ústava X*, 606e (τὴν Ἑλλάδα πεπαιδευκεν).

⁸⁰ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 323-365.

⁸¹ Porov. PLUTARCHOS, *De liberis educandis (Moralia 1-17c)*; *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat (Moralia 17d-37a)*.

⁸² Podľa Platóna je nebezpečenstvo mýtických rozprávání práve v tom, že každý príbeh necháva na duši poslucháča istý „odtlačok“, *typos* (PLATÓN, *Ústava II*, 377b) a má implicitne istý morálny výklad.

⁸³ Porov. BOYS-STONES, *Metaphor*, 181.

popredia až v helenistickom období⁸⁴, keď sa filozofia začala prednostne zaoberať etikou.

Príkladom morálnej alegórie môže byť spracovanie už spomenutej epizódy s Proteom. Meneláos chcel od neho získať potrebnú informáciu, no Proteus sa začal premieňať na rôzne odstrašujúce podoby. Keď sa mu nepodarilo hrdinu odradiť, až potom odpovedal. Tento obraz možno vysvetliť tak, že Proteus je duchovný učiteľ, ktorý si overuje, či adept je hodný toho, aby dostal odpoveď. Poznanie istých vecí totiž nie je vhodné pre každého, ale len pre tých, ktorí sú schopní ho zničiť⁸⁵. Iným variantom je výklad, ktorý tu vidí obraz prípravného štádia pred priateľstvom. Ľudí si treba najprv preveriť, až potom im dôverovať⁸⁶.

Mnohé výklady sa skoncentrovali okolo postavy Odyssea, vzorového ľudského hrdinu. Pre sofistov bol majstrom ľstivosti⁸⁷, pre kynikov vzorom trepezlivého znášania zla, pre stoikov a platonikov jeho víťazstvá nad mýtickými obludami a šťastlivé vyviaznutie z nebezpečenstiev symbolizovali víťazstvo mudrca nad vášňami⁸⁸.

Epizóda so Sirénami priťahovala osobitnú pozornosť. Na svojej plavbe sa Odysseus so svojimi druhmi priblížili k ostrovu Sirén, bytostí lákajúcich námorníkov svojím čarovným spevom. No tí, čo ich počúvajú a nasledujú, biedne zahynú – skončia ako hromada bielych kostí na brehu. Odysseus na radu Kirky urobil dve protiopatrenia – svojim druhom pri veslách zalepil uši voskom a sám sa nechal priviazať k sťažňu, aby síce počul spev Sirén, ale nemohol ho nasledovať. A tak sa všetci zachránili⁸⁹.

Putá, ktorými sa človek sám zaväzuje, sa vysvetľujú ako múdrosť filozofie, ktorou mudrc zabezpečuje svoju dušu. Iným obrazom filozofie je vosk, dielo pracovitých včiel. Ak je filozofia v našich ušiach, vábivý spev Sirén, reprezentujúcich vášne, k nám neprenikne⁹⁰. Spev Sirén však možno chápať

⁸⁴ Zo 4. stor. pred n. l. pochádza morálna alegorická interpretácia pytagorovských výrokov (Androkydes: *O pythagorovských symboloch*), ktoré v tomto období prestávali byť zrozumiteľné. Toto dielo malo veľký vplyv. Porov. GRANT, *The Letter*, 8.

⁸⁵ Porov. GERMAIN, *Odyssée*, 236.

⁸⁶ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 340.

⁸⁷ Porov. PLATÓN, *Hippiás Menší* 364c.

⁸⁸ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 365.

⁸⁹ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* XII.39-54, 156-200.

⁹⁰ V morálnom zmysle interpretovali túto epizódu aj kresťania – vábivý spev Sirén neublíži tomu, kto je pripútaný ku Kristovmu krížu. Porov. HIPPOLYT RÍMSKY, *Refutatio omnium haeresium (Elenchos)* VII.13 (GCS 26, 190-191), KLEMENT ALEXANDRIJSKÝ,

nielen ako vábenie vášní, ale aj ako príťažlivosť poézie, ktorá môže byť zhubná (podľa Platóna), ak človek neurobí rozumné protiopatrenia.

Spev Sirén môže označovať aj volanie túžby po poznaní⁹¹. Sirény sú múdre. Sľubujú, že ten, kto ich bude počúvať, sa vráti domov šťastnejší a múdrejší. Poznajú Odysseovo meno, vedia, čo sa stalo pri Tróji a čo sa deje po celom svete⁹². Odysseus ich chvíľu počúval, no potom preplával popri ich ostrove a zanechal ho za sebou. To je správny postoj voči štúdiu. Mudrc oceňuje štúdium a snaží sa z neho získať čo najviac, no nestrávi celý život čisto špekulatívnym spôsobom (na súši bezpečne, no mŕtvo), ale venuje sa aj aktívnej činnosti (plavbe po širom nebezpečnom oceáne)⁹³. Potešenie, ktoré prináša poznávanie, je dôverne známe každej duši oddanej múdrosti. Tomuto pokušeniu však treba odolať a nezabudnúť na svoje skutočné poslanie – návrat do vlasti. (Túto líniu neskôr bohato rozvinuli novoplatonici.)

2.8 Psychologická alegória

Psychologická (alebo antropologická) alegória je poddruhom morálnej alegórie a paralelou „fyzikálneho“ výkladu. Osoby a deje mýtických príbehov, v ktorých „fyzikálna“ alegória vidí opis vonkajšej prírody, psychologická alegória chápe ako nachádzajúce sa v mikrokozme ľudskej duše – ako psychické sily a procesy, personifikované cnosti a neresti. Tento posun sa potom vykladal z hľadiska správneho morálneho správania.

Už spomínané problematické miesto Íliady – boj bohov⁹⁴, ktorý sa dal fyzikálnou alegóriou vysvetliť ako obraz kozmického boja živlov, sa dá vysvetliť aj psychologickou alegóriou ako obraz boja cností a nerestí v ľudskej duši. Aténa a Hermés reprezentujú múdrosť a rozum, Ares a Afrodita zase iracionálne pochody, hnev a túžbu⁹⁵. V úvodnom speve Íliady „o hneve Achilla Péleovca“

Protrepticus XII.118.4 (SC 2, 188). O kresťanskej interpretácii Odyssea pripútaného k s'ražňu ako predobrazu Krista na kríži porov. RAHNER, *Antenna crucis*, 123-152.

⁹¹ Porov. CICERO, *De finibus bonorum et malorum* („O hraniciach dobra a zla“, V.49). Autor tu zrejme nasleduje Antiocha z Aškalonu, predstaviteľa akademického skepticizmu. Porov. GERMAIN, *Odyssee*, 382-390; BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 385.

⁹² Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* XII, 188, 184, 189-191.

⁹³ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 380-386.

⁹⁴ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* XX.

⁹⁵ Aj tento výklad sa pripisuje Theagenovi. Psychologicko-morálna alegória je teda pravdepodobne rovnako stará ako fyzikálna. Porov. DETIENNE, *Homère*, 65-67; BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 279-306.

z neba zostúpi Aténa, schmatne hrdinu za vlasy, prehovorí mu do duše a zastaví ho v úmysle zabiť Agamemnóna⁹⁶. Pre platonizujúcich komentátorov bolo toto miesto (Aténa zostupujúca z neba) navyše aj dokladom o tom, že ľudský rozum je iskrou univerzálneho božského rozumu⁹⁷.

Epizóda Odysseie s čarodejnicou Kirké a o Odysseovej záchrane vďaka Hermovi a bylina móly bola interpretovaná ako alegória rozumu (λόγος). Kirké premenila Odysseových druhov na zvieratá, no Odysseus, ktorý dostal od boha Herma ochrannú bylinu móly, zostal imúnny voči jej čarám a bol schopný druhov oslobodiť⁹⁸.

V najstaršej interpretácii tejto pasáže, ktorá pochádza od Kleantha (3. stor. pred n. l.), je symbolom rozumu (λόγος) bylina móly – vďaka rozumu vášne a pudy krotnú⁹⁹. Móly má čierny koreň a biely kvet¹⁰⁰. To znamená, že prvé kroky na ceste rozumnosti sú ťažké, ale ten, kto vytrvá, sa rozvinie do svetla¹⁰¹. Iný výklad (odvíjajúci sa pravdepodobne od Platónovho *Kratyla*) stotožňuje λόγος s bohom Hermom¹⁰².

Túto epizódu s obľubou citovali a v podobnom duchu interpretovali aj autori kresťanského zamerania – pre Šimona Mága je bylina móly symbolom gnózy¹⁰³, pre Klementa Alexandrijského zase predstavovala evanjeliovú zvesť a boh Hermés bol predobrazom Krista¹⁰⁴. Vo všetkých výkladových variantoch – dokonca aj v modernej jungovskej interpretácii¹⁰⁵ – autori vidia, že táto epizóda hovorí o prekonaní protikladu medzi animálnou a racionálnou časťou človeka.

Pokiaľ ide o personifikáciu cností a nerestí, najlepším príkladom je Herakles¹⁰⁶, neohrozený hrdina nasledujúci cnosť, ktorý musel vykonať dvanásť

⁹⁶ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* I.193-222.

⁹⁷ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 282-283.

⁹⁸ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* X.135-468.

⁹⁹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 150.

¹⁰⁰ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* X.304.

¹⁰¹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 292.

¹⁰² Porov. LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 41-42.

¹⁰³ Porov. HIPPOLYT RÍMSKY, *Refutatio omnium haeresium (Elenchos)* VI.15-16 (PTS 25, 220-221). Porov. aj KAISER, *Odyssee-Szenen*, 109-136, 197-224.

¹⁰⁴ Porov. KLEMENT ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Stromateis* VII.16.95 (SC 428, 286-290). Staroveký kresťanský výklad tejto epizódy porov. RAHNER, *Griechische Mythen*, 232-283.

¹⁰⁵ Porov. RUSSO, *Homer's Odysseus*, 251. Porov. aj EDINGER, *Drama*.

¹⁰⁶ Aj keď Herakles nie je homérsky hrdina, výklady o ňom sú zachované v Hérakleitových *Homérskych otázkach*, porov. HÉRACLITE, *Allégories d'Homère* 33, 39-40, 106-107.

ťažkých prác v službe kráľa Eurysthea¹⁰⁷. Tieto práce boli interpretované ako hrdinov zápas s nerestami: (1) nemejský lev, ktorého treba zabiť, predstavuje inštinktívnu náklonnosť ku zlu; (2) deväťhlavá hydra reprezentuje zmyselnosť; (3) Artemidina zlatá laň, ktorú treba polapiť, symbolizuje zbabelosť; (4) erymantský kanec predstavuje bezuzdnosť; (5) špina Augiášových chlievov označuje hrubosť; (6) stymfálske vtáky sú obrazom ilúzií; (7) skazu šíriaci krétsky býk symbolizuje iracionálne duševné pudy. Výklad ďalších štyroch prác – (8) ukradnutie Diomédoých kobýl, (9) získanie pásu kráľovnej Amazoniek, (10) získanie Geryónových stád a (11) ukradnutie jablák Hesperidiiek – sa nezachoval¹⁰⁸. Posledná práca, (12) polapenie Kerbera, trojhlavého psieho strážcu podsvetia, sa vysvetľuje ako vyvedenie troch častí filozofie (logika, fyzika, etika) na svetlo sveta.

2.9 Novoplatonici – mystická alegória

2.9.1 Mystická alegória

Od psychologickéj alegórie sa odvíja ďalší spôsob výkladu textu¹⁰⁹, ktorý sa venuje vzťahu človeka, resp. ľudskej duše, a transcendentného sveta. Tento

¹⁰⁷ Psychologický výklad je doložený v stoickej tradícii, ale Kleantés (tiež stoik) robil pravdepodobne fyzikálnu alegóriu, porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 377. Pytagorovci sa prikláňali k solárnemu mýtu a v týchto dvanástich prácach videli prechádzanie slnka cez dvanásť znamení zvieratníka, porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 576.

¹⁰⁸ Zoznam prác, ktorý uvádzame, je podľa Apollodóra (*Bibliotheca* 2.4.8 – 2.7.7).

¹⁰⁹ Rozdiel medzi mystickou alegóriou, ktorú pestovali novoplatonici, a fyzikálnou alegóriou, ktorú preslávili stoici, je taký výrazný, že podľa Bernarda (*Dichtungstheorien*, 1-69, 276-282) ide o dva metodologicky odlišné druhy alegorického výkladu, ktoré vychádzajú z odlišného filozofického pozadia (ontológia, gnozeológia). Fyzikálna a morálna alegória, ktoré preferovalo staršie obdobie, predstavujú „substitutívnu“ alegóriu: božstvá sú tu vykladané ako analogické obrazy abstraktných myšlienok (prírodné sily, duševné hnutia) – niečo stojí namiesto niečoho iného. Mystická alegória, ktorá sa objavila neskôr, predstavuje „dieretickú“ alegóriu: božstvá zostávajú samy sebou, pretože sú vykladané ako prejavy ideí vo svete predstáv – božstvo je akýmsi znakom vyššej reality. Rozdiel by sa dal vyjadriť aj tak, že v prvom prípade ide o obraz, v druhom o symbol (*Dichtungstheorien*, 19). Väčšina autorov, ktorí sa venujú starovekému alegorickému výkladu, však zastáva názor, že rozdiel medzi stoickou a novoplatónskou alegóriou je obsahový, nie metodologický. Odlišné filozofické východiská viedli starovekých exegétov k preferovaniu odlišných interpretačných posunov – stoici videli vo všetkom prejavy prírody, novoplatonici prejavy ideí –, no hermeneutické spracovanie básnického textu sa riadi tými istými pravidlami analógie. Otázka, kde bude exegéta hľadať analógie, závisí od jeho filozofického zamerania.

druh alegórie sa nazýva „metafyzický“¹¹⁰, „duchovný“¹¹¹ alebo najčastejšie „mystický“¹¹². Mystickou alegóriou homérskych eposov sa preslávili novoplatonici na sklonku antiky, ktorí sa snažili ukázať, že v Homérových básňach je skryté poznanie o osude duší a o štruktúre reality, ktoré je v súlade s ich náukou. No tento druh výkladu má dlhšiu prehistóriu – korene mystickej alegórie treba hľadať u pytagorovcov¹¹³.

Pokiaľ ide o autorský zámer, novoplatonici v princípe prijali Aristotelovo stanovisko, že autor má svoj text pod kontrolou, a tak sa na základe analýzy textu dá zistiť jeho skutočný zámer. No v psychológii literárnej kreativity predpokladali na ľudskom diele aj účasť božskej inšpirácie (podobne ako sa v modernej dobe predpokladá súčinnosť vedomých a nevedomých podnetov). Preto svoju komplexnú analýzu textu mohli vydávať za zámer samotného autora¹¹⁴.

2.9.2 Jednotlivé príklady z homérskych eposov

Jednou otázkou týkajúcou sa osudu duše bolo prevteľovanie, ktoré mali spoločné pytagorovská a platónska tradícia. Toto učenie nachádzalo podľa novoplatonikov podporu v niektorých miestach homérskych eposov – hrdinovia sa rozprávajú so svojimi koňmi, Odysseus prísne zakazuje zabiť zvieratá z Héliových stád. No o kolobehu duší hovorí predovšetkým epizóda s čarodejnicou Kirké (Κίρκη)¹¹⁵, ktorej meno znamená „kruh“ (κύκλος). Skutočnosť, že Kirké je dcéra boha Hélia¹¹⁶, ešte posilňuje význam cyklu – slnko, ktoré večer mizne a ráno sa znovu objavuje, je paralelou života, smrti a znovuzrodenia. Názov ostrova, na ktorom býva, Aiaiá, znie ako výkrik strachu a zúfalstva (gr. citoslovce *ai*, *ai* vyjadruje bolesť), ktoré zachvacuje človeka po smrti, keď sa ocitne na neznámych miestach. Kirké premenila nevedomých Odysseových druhov na zvieratá – po smrti v ľudskej podobe majú život, aký si

¹¹⁰ Porov. BERNARD, *Dichtungstheorien*, 59, 183, 283.

¹¹¹ Porov. PÉPIN, *Mythe*, 477.

¹¹² Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 393-394.

¹¹³ Porov. LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 1, 33, 54, 73. Novopytagorovci Núménios a jeho žiak Kronios (2. stor. n. l.) mali nepochybne veľký vplyv na novoplatonikov – Plótína, Porfýria (3. stor.) a Prokla (5. stor.). No alegorická interpretácia tohto druhu pravdepodobne patrila už do ranej pytagorovskej tradície.

¹¹⁴ Porov. COULTER, *The Literary Microcosm*, 106.

¹¹⁵ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* X.135-468.

¹¹⁶ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* X.138.

zaslúžili. Keď Odysseus vstúpil do jej príbytku, vďaka byline móly od Herma (teda vďaka rozumu) neutrpel ujmu, ba aj druhov oslobodil¹¹⁷.

Dušu uväznenú v putách tela videli novopytagorovci a novoplatonici jasne vyjadrenú v dvoch homérskych scénach – Kalypsó väzniaca Odyssea a Ares spútaný s Afroditou. Kalypsó väznila Odyssea v jaskyni na svojom ostrove porastenom stromami (ὄλη znamená „stromy“ aj „hmota“) a prepustila ho až na príkaz od bohov, ktorý jej priniesol Hermés, symbolizujúci rozum¹¹⁸. Odysseus, ktorý doteraz len sedával na brehu mora a plakal, sa konečne vydá na cestu do svojej vlasti, kde ho čaká Penelopa, reprezentujúca filozofický život¹¹⁹. Podobne mýtus o Afrodite, bohyni lásky, a Areovi, bohovi vojny, ktorých spútal Héfaiastos¹²⁰, rozpráva o duši zviazanej s „krvavým“ telom putami, ktoré ukoval demiurg¹²¹.

Porfyrios (234 – 305) v spise *De antro nympharum* („O jaskyni nýmfa“) ¹²² rozoberá Homérov opis jaskyne, neďaleko ktorej sa Odysseus prebudil po návrate na Itaku¹²³. Jaskyňa predstavuje svet. Má dva vchody – jeden pre ľudí, druhý pre bohov. Duše z hviezdnej výšky totiž môžu vstúpiť do tohto sveta len na dvoch miestach, bránami obratníkov – v súhvezdí Raka na severe a v súhvezdí Kozorožca na juhu. „Ľudia“ tu predstavujú duše, ktoré sa majú vteliť. Nymfy na kamenných krosnách tkajú purpurové rúcha, čiže okolo ľudských kostí tkajú „krvavé“ telo. Duše, ktoré opúšťajú tento svet, sa nazývajú „bohovia“, lebo to už nie sú ľudia, ale sú skôr podobné bohom¹²⁴.

Spev Sirén platonici stotožňovali s harmóniou sfér¹²⁵. Táto lahodná hudba je od zeme príliš vzdialená, takže sa tu nedá zachytiť (jedinou výnimkou bol Pytagoras). Ale keď sa duša oddelí od tela a blúdi v priestore medzi zemou

¹¹⁷ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 500-520.

¹¹⁸ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* I.48-87, V.44-147.

¹¹⁹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 461-464.

¹²⁰ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* VIII.266-369.

¹²¹ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 464-466.

¹²² Anglický preklad *De antro nympharum* porov. PORPHYRY, *The Cave*. Francúzsky preklad porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 597-616. Porfyrios je aj autorom diela *Quaestiones Homericae*, kde pri výklade Homéra používa aj iné postupy (napr. textovú kritiku) okrem mystickej alegórie, ktorá dominuje v *De antro nympharum*.

¹²³ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odyseia* XIII.102-112.

¹²⁴ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 419-459; LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 119-132, 318-324.

¹²⁵ Homérove dve Sirény (porov. *Odyseia* XII.52 a 167 – Σειρήνοῖν je duál, takisto v 185 – ναῦτέρην) sa u Platóna rozmnožili na osem (*Ústava* X, 617b).

a mesiacom, môže počuť tento lákavý spev. V tomto „vzdušnom oceáne“ hrozí veľa nebezpečenstiev a duša môže podľahnúť a utopiť sa v ďalšej reinkarnácii. Ak však počúva Sirény, zabudne na pozemské veci a už sa nikdy nevráti do svojho domu, k žene a deťom, ako vraví básnik¹²⁶. No aby duša mohla postúpiť vyššie, musí sa vzdať všetkých väzieb na telo, netúžiť po novom vtelení. Preto je okolo Sirén hromada kostí¹²⁷. V platónskom podaní teda celá epizóda získava pozitívny význam, celkom opačný ako v tradičnom morálnom výklade.

Dráma s volaním Sirén sa však odohráva aj tu na zemi. Aj tu možno počuť slabú ozvenu hudby sfér. Je ňou učenie filozofie. Voči tomuto volaniu je citlivá iba duša mudrca, ale jeho telo sa zmieta v putách, priviazané k s'ťažňu. Tí, čo majú uši zapchaté telesnými vášňami, si spokojne plnia svoje životné povinnosti, veslujú ďalej a nechápu mudrcovo utrpenie¹²⁸.

2.9.3 Kontinuálna mystická alegória

Keď sa na starovekú alegorickú interpretáciu pozeráme z hľadiska požiadaviek súčasnej literárnej kritiky, musíme konštatovať – okrem uznania na mnohých frontoch – jeden veľký nedostatok, ktorý charakterizuje takmer všetku starovekú alegóriu. Bola ním „nekonzistentnosť“ v tom zmysle, že autori spravidla podávali izolovaný, čiastkový výklad jednotlivých epizód.

Ak by niekto hľadal kontinuitu vo výklade tak, ako ju nachádzal v slede epického rozprávania, bol by sklamaný. To je však problém len z nášho pohľadu, lebo my od analýzy literárneho diela očakávame zmysluplný výklad tohto diela ako celku. Starovekí autori tomu pozornosť nevenovali¹²⁹ – nesnažili sa podávať výklad diela, ktorý by bol vnútorne konzistentný, ale postupovali verš po verši. A tak v komentárových dielach neraz nachádzame rôzne druhy výkladu vedľa seba – ba mohli si aj protirečiť.

Novoplatonik Porfyrios pri analýze Platónových dialógov ponúkal viacero vysvetlení toho istého textového materiálu bez toho, aby sa priklonil k jednému

¹²⁶ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* XII.42-43.

¹²⁷ Porov. HOMÉROS, *Odysseia* XII.45-46.

¹²⁸ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 467-481. Autor sleduje prevažne výklad, ktorý podáva PLÚTARCHOS, *Quaestiones convivales (Symposiaca)* 14.6 (*Moralia* 745d-746b).

¹²⁹ O absencii pojmu jednoty literárneho diela, ako ju chápeme v súčasnosti, v gréckej literatúre porov. HEATH, *Unity in Greek Poetics*.

z nich alebo aby ukázal, ako rôzne výklady spolu súvisia¹³⁰. Tento postoj však nebolo Porfyriovo osobné unikum – bol to štandard žánru komentára¹³¹.

Zásadnú zmenu v tomto smere urobil jeho žiak Iamblichos (245 – 325). Vo svojej práci zdôrazňoval, že literárne dielo má svoju vnútornú jednotu – sleduje jeden cieľ (σκοπός). To treba rešpektovať aj pri výklade diela¹³².

No požiadavka rešpektovať hermeneutickú jednotu sa dala zachovať, až keď sa rozvinula mystická alegória – prírodná, historická ani morálno-psychologická transpozícia sa nedala realizovať v prípade celého diela. Ale mystická alegória v rukách novoplatonikov to dokázala.

Z homérskych eposov sa postupne stali básne o duši v exile na tomto svete, vzdialenej od svojej skutočnej vlasti. Základná dejová línia Íliady¹³³ získala takýto výklad: Helena stelesňuje všetku krásu tohto sveta – síce preludnú, no príťažlivú. Ilion predstavuje svet hmoty (ύλη), Trójanania sú duše, ktoré lipnú na materiálnej kráse. Gréci sú duchovné duše. Nechali sa síce zviest' krásou, opustili svoj domov a vstúpili do takého spôsobu existencie, pre ktorý je vojna najvhodnejšou metaforou, ale nakoniec, keď prekonajú desať rokov (platónsky cyklus desiatich milénií), sa predsa vrátia do svojej pravej vlasti¹³⁴.

Odysseovo putovanie však bolo oveľa vhodnejšie na takúto transpozíciu¹³⁵. Táto dlhá a nebezpečná cesta domov cez more, univerzálny symbol plodnosti¹³⁶, ktoré reprezentuje svet hmoty, bola vysvetľovaná ako obraz duše, ktorá sa postupne oslobodzuje od materiálneho sveta a vracia sa domov, do vyšších sfér, do sveta ideí¹³⁷. Už koncom 3. storočia bola táto metaforika v platónskych kruhoch celkom bežná¹³⁸ a ovplyvnila aj vzdelaných kresťanov.

¹³⁰ Porov. COULTER, *The Literary Microcosm*, 80.

¹³¹ Tým argumentoval aj Hieronym (*Contra Rufinum* I.16). Autor komentára nepodáva vlastnú mienku, ale súbor názorov druhých a zostáva na inteligentnom čitateľovi, aby si vybral ten správny.

¹³² Porov. COULTER, *The Literary Microcosm*, 81-85.

¹³³ Novoplatónsky výklad Íliady zachovali vo svojich komentároch k Platónovi Proklos (*In rempublicam* 1.175-176) a Hermeiás z Alexandrie (*In Phaedrum* 77).

¹³⁴ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 410-413; LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 199-200.

¹³⁵ Porfyrios zachováva Númeriovo podanie v diele *De antro nympharum*, zlomky tejto interpretácie Odysseie sú aj v niektorých Proklových komentároch.

¹³⁶ Porov. ELIADE, *Die Religionen*, § 60 – § 73.

¹³⁷ Porov. BUFFIÈRE, *Les mythes d'Homère*, 413-418; LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 42.

¹³⁸ Porov. LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 132-133.

Mystický prístup a snaha o kontinuálny výklad dominovali v neskoršej antike. Môžeme ho pozorovať aj pri autoroch komentujúcich latinský materiál. Takými bol Macrobius (5. stor.) so svojím výkladom *Scipiónovho sna*¹³⁹ a Fulgentius (5./6. stor.), komentátor Vergíliovej *Aeneidy*¹⁴⁰, ktorému sa pripisuje aj autorstvo komentára k Statiovej *Thébaide*¹⁴¹.

3 Alexandria – židovská exegéza Biblie

Alegorická exegéza Biblie sa po prvýkrát objavila v Alexandrii, ktorá sa v helenistickom období stala domovom pre kvitnúcu komunitu židov. Žiaľ, z práce predchodcov veľkého Filóna Alexandrijského (25 pred n. l. – 42 n. l.) sa zachovali iba žalostné zlomky¹⁴². No predsa aj z týchto fragmentov, ako aj z Filónovho monumentálneho diela¹⁴³ môžeme usudzovať, že vzdelaní alexandrijskí židia neváhali preberať metódy svojich pohanských kolegov a aplikovať ich na Bibliu¹⁴⁴.

Alegorická exegéza (v užšom, modernom zmysle) mala v Alexandrii mimoriadnu dôležitosť. Židia tu totiž boli v dennodennom kontakte s veľmi

¹³⁹ *Somnium Scipionis* sa nachádza v Cicerónovej VI. knihe *De re publica*. Macrobius prezentuje tento text ako novoplatónske rozprávanie o osude dobrých po smrti. Porov. *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*.

¹⁴⁰ Porov. *Fabii Planciadii Fulgentii V.C. Opera*. Anglický preklad: *Fulgentius the Mythographer*. Fulgentius sa od svojich predchodcov Servia a Donata, ktorí tiež vykladali Vergília alegoricky, odlišuje práve snahou o kontinuitu – snaží sa prezentovať samotnú poetickú následnosť ako logický postup ľudského života. Porov. WHITMAN, *Allegory*, 108-110.

¹⁴¹ Tento komentár sa tiež pripisuje Fulgentiovi (možno neprávom). Autor tu vykladá epos *Thébaïs* ako rozprávanie o postupnom rozvoji ľudskej duše.

¹⁴² Zlomky helenistickej židovskej exegézy sú zachované v *Aristeovom liste* a u kresťanských autorov Eusébia a Klementa Alexandrijského, ktorí spomínajú zopár autorov, ich diel a názorov. Poprednými alexandrijskými židovskými vzdelancami boli historici Démétrios (3. stor. pred n. l.), Artapanos (3./2. stor. pred n. l.), Eupolemos (2./1. stor. pred n. l.) a filozof Aristobúlos (2. stor. pred n. l.).

¹⁴³ Jeho zachované spisy sú obsiahnuté v 36 zväzkoch modernej edície (*Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*).

¹⁴⁴ V septuagintovom bádani sa často cituje skutočnosť, že alexandrijskí židia podľa všetkého neváhali na Septuaginte uplatňovať metodiku textovej kritiky. Autor *Aristeovho listu* totiž vehementne predstavuje Septuagintu ako inšpirovaný text, v ktorom nie sú nijaké chyby. To je zrejme reakcia na prax niektorých židovských exegétov, ktorí v súlade s homérovskou textovokritickou praxou athetovali (vylučovali) isté verše Biblie, lebo ich pokladali za neautentické. Porov. NIEHOFF, *Jewish Exegesis*, 19-37, 112-129.

odlišnou kultúrou. Alegorická exegéza im poskytovala nástroj, ktorý im veľmi uľahčoval medzikultúrnu komunikáciu a zvyšoval hodnotu ich vlastnej kultúry voči majoritnej a prestížnej gréckej¹⁴⁵.

Najstarší príklad biblickej alegorickej exegézy sa nachádza v *Aristeovom liste*¹⁴⁶ (polovica 2. stor. pred n. l.). Pomocou morálnej alegórie sa autor pokúšal vysvetliť židovské príkazy o „nečistých“ zvieratách, ktoré by inak boli pre gréckych čitateľov nepochopiteľné¹⁴⁷.

Prírodná alegória sa vyskytuje len ojedinele – ide o kozmologický výklad stoického typu. Prvý príklad nachádzame v deuterokánonickej biblickej *Knihe múdrosti* (1. stor. pred n. l.). Podobne ako stoici vysvetľovali Achillov štít ako obraz vesmíru, tak aj autor tejto knihy prezentuje symboliku veľkňazovho odevu v tomto zmysle (Múd 18,24).

U Filóna Alexandrijského¹⁴⁸ nachádzame ďalšie príklady¹⁴⁹. Obrazom sveta¹⁵⁰ je aj jeruzalemský chrám samotný (1Kr 6–7), ale túto exegézu nachádzame aj pri výklade videnia svätostánku, ktoré sa dostalo Mojžišovi na Sinaji (Ex 25–27; 30)¹⁵¹.

Na iných miestach zase štyri farby a materiály, ktoré sa nachádzajú na chrámovej opone (Ex 26,31)¹⁵² a na veľkňazovom efóde (28,6-12)¹⁵³, reprezentujú štyri základné prvky vesmíru: ľan pochádza zo zeme, purpur z vody¹⁵⁴, modrá je farba vzduchu a karmín pripomína oheň.

No nielen efód, ale aj všetky ostatné súčasti veľkňazovho odevu (Ex 28) pre Filóna symbolizovali rôzne aspekty vesmíru. Dvanásť vzácnych kameňov na pektoráli (vv. 15-30), po tri v štyroch radoch, predstavuje dvanásť súhvezdí

¹⁴⁵ Porov. SIMONETTI, *Lettera*, 18; LAMBERTON, *Homer*, 48.

¹⁴⁶ Porov. *Aristeov list* 150-154.

¹⁴⁷ Porov. PÉPIN, *Mythe*, 223-224.

¹⁴⁸ Komplexnú analýzu jeho exegézy porov. CHRISTIANSEN, *Die Technik*.

¹⁴⁹ Porov. PASCHER, *Η ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ΟΔΟΣ*, 37-48.

¹⁵⁰ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De specialibus legibus* I.66-67.

¹⁵¹ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* II.51-106. Podrobnú analýzu celej interpretačnej tradície ohľadom týchto kapitol Exodu porov. CONWAY-JONES, *Gregory of Nyssa's Tabernacle Imagery*.

¹⁵² Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De vita Mosis* II.88; *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* II.85.

¹⁵³ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De specialibus legibus* I.94; *De vita Mosis* II.117-135.

¹⁵⁴ Purpur sa vyrábala z morského slimáka – πορφύρα „nachovec“.

zvieratníka rozdelených podľa štyroch ročných období¹⁵⁵. Kamene sú zasadené do zlata práve tak, ako sú súhvezdia obklopené éterom¹⁵⁶. Pektorál teda symbolizuje hviezdnu výšku. Pod ňou je svet vzduchu, ktorý reprezentuje veľkňazova modrá tunika (vv. 31-32)¹⁵⁷. Ozdoby na jej okraji – kvietky, granátové jablká a zvončeky (vv. 33-35) – predstavujú zem, vodu, a harmóniu medzi nimi¹⁵⁸. Všetky tieto prvky dovedna vyjadrujú myšlienku, že celý vesmír je Božím odevom¹⁵⁹.

Svätostánok a veľkňazov odev, ktoré sú v *Exode* podrobne opísané, sú hlavné biblické témy, ktoré dostali výklad v kozmologickom zmysle. No Filónovi pri exegéze ide väčšinou o psychologický význam. Biblické udalosti a postavy vysvetľuje ako obrazy vnútorného života človeka. Takýto výklad nachádzame napríklad pri epizóde, keď Mojžiš prišiel do Madiánu a pomohol Jethrovým dcéram (Ex 2,16-19). Jethro¹⁶⁰ je duch (νοῦς), dcéry predstavujú zmysly. Starajú sa o ovce svojho otca, čiže podľa aristotelesovej noetiky zabezpečujú spojenie ducha s vonkajším svetom vnímateľným zmyslami. Zlí pastieri chcú odvrátiť zmysly od ich správneho používania a odcudziť ich duchu. Ale potom prichádza Mojžiš ako zachraňujúci rozum (λόγος) a tíši ich smäď¹⁶¹. Manželstvo Mojžiša so Seforou (v. 21) symbolizuje jeho spojenie s múdrosťou¹⁶² a cnosťou¹⁶³.

Mystickú alegóriu, ktorá vidí v biblickom texte naznačený vzťah medzi ľudskou dušou a Bohom, nachádzame pri výklade epizód o vode zo skaly (Ex 17,1-6) a o manne (16,2-30). Voda tryskajúca zo skaly predstavuje Božiu múdrosť (σοφία), jediný prostriedok na utíšenie smädu duše, ktorý spôsobili vášne¹⁶⁴.

¹⁵⁵ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* II.112.

¹⁵⁶ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* II.113.

¹⁵⁷ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* II.117.

¹⁵⁸ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De specialibus legibus* I.93; *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* II.119-120.

¹⁵⁹ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De vita Mosis* II.117.

¹⁶⁰ Vlastné mená uvádzame v znení podľa LXX.

¹⁶¹ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De mutatione nominum* 110, 112, 113.

¹⁶² Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De posteritate Caini* 78.

¹⁶³ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De cherubim* 47.

¹⁶⁴ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Legum allegoriae* II.86.

Manna je vo Filónovej interpretácii obrazom Božieho Slova (Λόγος), ktoré živí dušu¹⁶⁵.

Na záver ešte spomeňme motív putovania Izraela z Egypta do Zasl'úbenej krajiny¹⁶⁶, ktorý interpretoval ako obraz putovania ľudskej duše k Bohu¹⁶⁷. Tento motív je akási červená niť, ktorú Filón vidí v Biblii a ktorá dáva jeho exegetickým dielam istú jednotu.

4 Záver

Vzápätí po tom, ako boli homérske eposy kanonizované, objavil sa ich komentár. Zafixované posvätné texty už totiž nemali možnosť pružne reagovať na súdobé otázky, ako to bolo v čase orálnej kultúry. No v alegorickej exegéze filozofi objavili prostriedok, ktorý im umožňoval adaptovať obsah týchto eposov na meniacu sa situáciu bez toho, aby trpeli kognitívnou disonanciou.

V priebehu starovekých gréckych dejín sa objavilo niekoľko interpretačných prístupov k homérske eposom, ktoré spája to, že v týchto textoch vidia „niečo iné“. Hybnou silou alegorického výkladu je analógia. Jej aplikačné roviny môžu byť rôzne¹⁶⁸. Pri prírodnom výklade osoby a deje mýtov predstavujú transpozíciu prírodných javov, historický výklad ich vysvetľuje ako transformáciu historických udalostí, morálny výklad v nich nachádza vzory správania, pri psychologickom výklade ide o transpozíciu psychických procesov s dôsledkami pre morálku a mystický výklad tu nachádza vyjadrený vzťah ľudskej duše a transcendentného sveta (čo má opäť následky pre morálku).

Rôzne historické obdobia preferovali rôzne postupy. V najstaršom období prevládala záujem o prírodu, teda, pochopiteľne, dominovala prírodná alegória. Keď sa do centra záujmu gréckych filozofov dostala ľudská spoločnosť, objavil sa historický výklad a do popredia sa dostal už dávnejšie existujúci morálny

¹⁶⁵ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 79; *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 118.

¹⁶⁶ Porov. FILÓN ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *De migratione Abrahami* 25.

¹⁶⁷ Je možné, že išlo o vplyv (novo)platónskeho výkladu Odysseovho putovania, ktorý sme už spomenuli, no motív cesty ako vyjadrenie morálneho napredovania je univerzálny. Je možné, že alexandrijskí Židia túto symboliku objavili nezávisle. Porov. BERTHELOT, Philo, 170-172.

¹⁶⁸ Fyzikálnu, morálnu/psychologickú a mystickú alegóriu spája to, že implicitný význam, ktorý tu exegéti odhaľujú, je vždy *abstraktnejšia* myšlienka – historická exegéza sa od nich v tomto zmysle výrazne odlišuje.

a psychologický výklad. Nakoniec prichádza dominancia záujmu o ľudskú dušu a jej kontakt s transcendentnom pri mystickom výklade.

Náš prehľad gréckej alegorickej exegézy sme ukončili pohľadom na situáciu u helenistických židov v Alexandrii. Tunajší vzdelanci totiž neváhali použiť metodiku gréckych filozofov aj na výklad Biblie. Aj v ich prípade alegória slúžila na premostenie priepasti medzi znením starých textov a novou kultúrnou situáciou helenizovaných židov.

Zoznam použitej literatúry

Pramene

- AISCHYLOS: *Supplices* 584 [cit. 25-04-2020]. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0015%3Acard%3D582>
- APOLLODÓROS (*Bibliotheca* 2.4.8 – 2.7.7) [cit. 25-04-2020]. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0022%3Atext%3DLibrary%3Abook%3D2%3Achapter%3D4%3Asection%3D8>
- Aristeas (Aristeov list)*. In: Zdeněk Soušek (ed.): *Knihy tajemství a moudrosti I. Mimobiblické židovské spisy: pseudepigrafy*, Praha: Vyšehrad, 1998, 19-77.
- ARISTOTELES: *Poetika. Rétorika. Politika*. Preložil Miloslav Okál a Peter Kuklica, Bratislava: Tatran, 1980.
- ARISTOTELES: *Poetika*. Preložil František Groh. Podľa vydania z roku 1929, Praha: GRYP, 1993.
- ARISTOTELÉS: *Rétorika. Poetika*. Přeložil a poznámkami opatřil Antonín Kříž, Praha: Rezek, 1999.
- CICERO: *De finibus bonorum et malorum* („O hraniciach dobra a zla“, V.49) [cit. 25-04-2020]. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2007.01.0036%3Abook%3D5%3Asection%3D49>
- CICERO: *De Oratore* III.137 [cit. 25-04-2020]. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0120%3Abook%3D3%3Asection%3D137>
- CLÉMENT D'ALEXANDRIE: *Les Stromates. Stromate VII. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Alain Le Boulluec* (SC 428), Paris: Cerf, 1997.
- CLÉMENT D'ALEXANDRIE: *Le Protreptique. Introduction, traduction et notes par Claude Mondésert. Avec la collaboration de André Plassart* (SC 2bis), Paris: Cerf, 2004.
- ERACLITO: *Questioni omeriche. Sulle allegorie di Omero in merito agli dèi*. A cura di Filippomaria Pontani (Il Mito. Testi e saggi 1), Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2005.
- EUSTATHII: *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, Vol. I – IV. Curavit Marchinus van der Valk, Leiden: Brill, 1971, 1976, 1979, 1987.
- FULGENTIUS: *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V.C. Opera. Accedunt Fabii Claudii Gordiani Fulgentii V.C. De aetatibus mundi et hominis et S. Fulgentii episcopi Super Thebaiden*. Recensuit R. Helm, Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1898.

- Fulgentius the Mythographer*. Translated from the Latin with Introductions by L. G. Whitbread, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1971.
- HÉRACLITE: *Allégories d'Homère. Texte établi et traduit par Félix Buffière*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962.
- HIPPOLYTUS: *Werke. Dritter Band. Refutatio omnium haeresium (Elenchus)*. Herausgegeben von D. Dr. Paul Wendland (GCS 26), Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1916.
- HIPPOLYTUS: *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Edited by Miroslav Marcovich (PTS 25), Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 1986.
- HOMÉROS: *Ílias*. Preložil Miloslav Okál, Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1962.
- HOMÉROS: *Odyseia*. Preložil Miloslav Okál, Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1966.
- MACROBIUS: *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*. Edidit Iacobus Willis, Leipzig: Teubner, 1970.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *Legum allegoriae I – III*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Claude Mondésert S.J. (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 2), Paris: Cerf, 1962.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De Cherubim*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Jean Gorez (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 3), Paris: Cerf, 1963.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De mutatione nominum*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Roger Arnaldez (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 18), Paris: Cerf, 1964.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De migratione Abrahami*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Jacques Cazeaux (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 14), Paris: Cerf, 1965.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Irène Feuer (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 5), Paris: Cerf, 1965.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Marguerite Harl (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 15), Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De vita Mosis I – II*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Roger Arnaldez, Claude Mondésert, Jean Pouilloux, Pierre Savinel (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 22), Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De posteritate Caini*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Roger Arnaldez (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 6), Paris: Cerf, 1972.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *De specialibus legibus I et II*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Suzanne Daniel (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 24), Paris: Cerf, 1975.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim I et II e versione Armeniaca*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Charles Mercier (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 34A), Paris: Cerf, 1979.
- PHILON D'ALEXANDRIE: *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum I et II e versione Armeniaca et fragmenta Graeca*. Introduction, traduction et notes par Abraham Terian (Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 34C), Paris: Cerf, 1992.
- PLATÓN: *Faidros*. Preložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1993.
- PLATÓN: *Faidón*. Preložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1994.
- PLATÓN: *Kratylos*. Preložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1994.
- PLATÓN: *Charmidés, Lachés, Lysis, Theagés*. Preložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1995.
- PLATÓN: *Theaitétos*. Preložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1995.

- PLATÓN: *Alkibiadés I, II, Hipparchos, Milovníci*. Přeložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1996.
- PLATÓN: *Hippias Větší, Hippias Menší, Ión, Menexenos*. Přeložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1996.
- PLATÓN: *Ústava*. Přeložil František Novotný, Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1996. (Slovenský preklad: PLATÓN: *Ústava*. Přeložil Július Špaňár, Bratislava: Pravda, 1980.)
- PLATÓN: *Štát*. Přeložil Július Špaňár, Bratislava: Kalligram, 2007.
- Pausanias VII.26.13* [cit. 25-04-2020] Dostupné na internete: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0160%3Abook%3D7%3Achapter%3D26%3Asection%3D13>
- PLUTARCH: *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*. Edited by J. J. Keaney and R. Lamberton, Atlanta, GA: Scholarss Press, 1996.
- PLÚTARCHOS: *De liberis educandis. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat. De auditu. Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur. Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus*. In: *Plutarch's Moralia in fifteen volumes*, Vol. 1 (1a – 86a). With an English translation by Frank Cole Babbitt, London – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- PLÚTARCHOS: *Quaestiones conviviales (Symposiaca). Erotikos*. In: *Plutarch's Moralia in fifteen volumes*, Vol. 9 (697c – 771e), London – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- PLÚTARCHOS: *De Osiride et Iside. De E apud Delphos. De Pythiae oraculis. De defectu oraculorum*. In: *Plutarch's Moralia in fifteen volumes*, Vol. 5 (351c – 438e). With an English translation by Frank Cole Babbitt, London – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- PORPHYRY: *The Cave of the Nymphs in the Odyssey*. Edited by L. G. Westerlink (Arethusa Monographs 1), Buffalo: State University of New York, 1969.
- Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*. 7 vol. Edited by H. Erbse. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969 – 1988.
- Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*. 2 vol. Edited by W. Dindorf, Oxford: Oxford University, 1855.
- XENOFÓN: *Symposion 3, 5-6* [cit. 25-04-2020]. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0211%3Atext%3DSym.%3Achapter%3D3%3Asection%3D5>

Sekundárna literatúra

- ALEXANDER, Ph. S.: 'Homer the Prophet of All' and 'Moses Our Teacher'. Late Antique Exegesis of the Homeric Epics and of the Torah of Moses. In: Leonard Victor Rutgers – Pieter Willem van der Horst – Henriëtte W. Havelaar – Lieve Teugels (eds.): *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 1998, 127-142.
- BERNARD, Wolfgang: *Spätantike Dichtungstheorien: Untersuchungen zu Proklos, Herakleitos und Plutarch*, Stuttgart: De Gruyter, 1990.

- BERTHELOT, Katell: Philo and the Allegorical Interpretation of Homer in the Platonic Tradition (with an Emphasis on Porphyry's *De antro nympharum*). In: Maren Niehoff (ed.): *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012, 155-174.
- BOYS-STONES, George R.: *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- BRISSON, Luc: *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- BRODERSEN, Kai: „Das aber ist eine Lüge!“ Zur rationalistischen Mythenkritik des Palaiphatos. In: Raban von Haehling (Hrsg.): *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005, 44-57.
- BUFFIÈRE, Félix: *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956.
- CAMPBELL, Joseph: *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology*, New York: Viking Press, 1964.
- CHRISTIANSEN, Irmgard: *Die Technik der allegorischen Auslegungswissenschaft bei Philon von Alexandrien*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1969.
- CONWAY-JONES, Ann: *Gregory of Nyssa's Tabernacle Imagery in Its Jewish and Christian Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- COULTER, James A.: *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists*, Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- DETIENNE, Marcel: *Homère, Hésiode et Pythagore: Poésie et philosophie dans le pythagorisme ancien*, Bruxelles: Latomus, 1962.
- DETIENNE, Marcel: *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*, Paris: Maspero, 1967. (Anglický preklad: *The Masters of Truth in Ancient Greece*, New York: Zone Books, 1996.)
- DÖRRIE, Heinrich: *Sinn und Funktion des Mythos in der griechischen und römischen Dichtung*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1978.
- EDINGER, Edward F.: *The Eternal Drama: The Inner Meaning of Greek Mythology*, Boston – London: Shambala, 1994.
- ELIADE, Mircea: *Die Religionen und das Heilige: Elemente der Religionsgeschichte*, Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag, 1994.
- FINKELBERG, Margalit – STROUMSA, Guy G. (eds.): *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- FORD, Andrew: Performing Interpretation: Early Allegorical Exegesis of Homer. In: Margaret Bessinger – Jane Tylus – Susan Wofford (eds.): *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 1999.
- FORD, Andrew: *Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- FRYE, Northrop: *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- FRYE, Northrop: *Words with Power. Being a Second Study of 'The Bible and Literature'*, San Diego – New York – London: Mariner Books, 1992.

- GERMAIN, Gabriel: *Genèse de l'Odyssee: Le fantastique et le sacré*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954.
- GRANT, Robert M.: *The Letter and the Spirit*, London: SPCK, 1957.
- HEATH, Malcolm: *Unity in Greek Poetics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- KAISER, Erich: Odyssee-Szenen als Topoi, *MH* 21 (2/1964) 109-136.
- KAISER, Erich: Odyssee-Szenen als Topoi, *MH* 21 (4/1964) 197-224.
- LAMBERTON, Robert: *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 1986.
- NIEHOFF, Maren R.: *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*. Cambridge, 2011.
- NIEHOFF, Maren (ed.): *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012.
- PASCHER, Joseph: *H ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ΟΔΟΣ. Der Königsweg zu Wiedergeburt und Vergottung bei Philon von Alexandria*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 1931.
- PÉPIN, Jean: *Mythe et allégorie: Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*, Paris: Aubier, 1958.
- PFEIFFER, Rudolf: *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Era*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- PONTANI, Filippo Maria: *Sguargi su Ulisse: la tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2006.
- PYYKKÖ, Vappu: *Die griechische Mythen bei den großen Kappadokiern und bei Johannes Chrysostomos*, Turku: Turun Yliopisto, 1991.
- RAHNER, Hugo: *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, Zürich: Rhein Verlag, 1945.
- RAHNER, Hugo: Antenna crucis. I. Odysseus am Mastbaum, *ZKT* 65 (1941) 123-152.
- RUSO, Joseph: A Jungian analysis of Homer's Odysseus. In: Polly Young-Eisendrath – Terence Dawson (eds.): *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 240-254.
- RUTGERS, Leonard Victor – VAN DER HORST, Pieter Willem – HAVELAAR, Henriëtte W. – TEUGELS, Lieve (eds.): *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 1998.
- SIMONETTI, Manlio: *Lettera e/o Allegoria: Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Roma: Institutum Patristicum „Augustinianum“, 1985.
- STRUCK, Peter T.: *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts*, Princeton – Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- TATE, Jonathan: The Beginnings of Greek Allegory, *CIR* 41 (1927) 214-215.
- TATE, Jonathan: On the History of Allegorism, *CQ* 28 (1934) 105-114.
- WATKINS, Calvert: *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- WHITMAN, Jon: *Allegory. The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Zhrnutie

V čase orálnej kultúry grécke eposy boli schopné reagovať na súdobú situáciu. No keď boli kanonizované, túto možnosť stratili. Grécki filozofi však v alegorickej exegéze objavili prostriedok, ktorý im umožňoval adaptovať obsah týchto eposov na meniacu sa situáciu. V priebehu starovekých gréckych dejín sa objavilo niekoľko interpretačných prístupov, ktoré spája predpoklad, že básnický text „hovorí niečo iné“ (*ἄλλα ἀγορεύει*). Alegorický výklad buduje na analógii. Dá sa aplikovať na rôzne aspekty ľudskej skúsenosti, a tak je niekoľko typov výkladu: prírodný, historický, morálny, psychologický a mystický. Helenistickí Židia v Alexandrii boli v podobnej kultúrnej dileme. Pri jej spracovávaní sa nechali inšpirovať gréckymi filozofmi. Aj pri výklade Biblie alegória slúžila na premostenie priepasti medzi znením starých textov a novou kultúrnou situáciou helenizovaných židov.

Kľúčové slová: staroveká alegorická exegéza, Homér, helenistický judaizmus, Filón Alexandrijský.

Summary

In the era of oral culture the Greek epic poems could flexibly react to contemporary situation. This ability was lost after their canonization. Greek philosophers, however, found in the allegorical exegesis a means that allowed them to adapt the content of the epics to the changing situation. In the course of the Ancient Greek history there appeared several interpretive approaches that share the assumption that the poetic text “says something different” (*ἄλλα ἀγορεύει*). Allegorical interpretation works on the basis of analogy. It may be applied to various aspects of human experience, so there are several types of interpretation: physical, historical, moral, psychological, and mystical.

Hellenistic Jews in Alexandria were in a similar cultural dilemma. In dealing with it they took inspiration from the Greek philosophers. In the exegesis of the Bible, too, allegory served as a bridge over the gap between the letter of the old texts and the new cultural situation of Hellenized Jews.

Keywords: ancient allegorical interpretation, Homer, Hellenistic Judaism, Philo of Alexandria.

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

ABSTRAKTY

Biblica 99 (2018)¹

(č. 1) 1-18: J. Grossman: Who are the Sons of God? A New Suggestion. V Gen 6,2-4 nachádzame kurióznou zmienku o Božích synoch, ktorí splodili s ľudskými dcérami obrov, hrdinov dávnych čias. Grossman prechádza viacerými teóriami, ktoré vysvetľujú titul „Boží synovia“ v zmysle vládcov, Setových potomkov, Božích služobníkov, nebeských bytostí či anjelov. Najvhodnejším vysvetlením je podľa neho identifikácia „Božích synov“ s istým druhom mýtických bytostí – obrov, ktorý sa však nemusí zhodovať s označením Nefilim, spomínaným vo v. 4. Tieto verše treba čítať v spojení s príbehom o potope ako jeho krátky úvod.

19-28: J. Makujina: Pudic Revisionisms of Scripture Revisiting the Heel as a Euphemism in Gen 25,26 and Hos 12,4. Podľa biblického opisu sa Jakub pri pôrode rukou držal Ezauovej päty, čím si vyslúžil meno odvodené od כַּפַּי „päta“. Makujina spochybňuje Smithovu interpretáciu, podľa ktorej je כַּפַּי eufemizmom pre mužské genitálie. Kľúčom k takejto interpretácii by mal byť podobne použitý výraz v Jer 13,22 „... odhalili ti vlečku, zmocnili sa tvojej päty“. Avšak v tomto verši, ako aj v neskoršej rabínskej tradícii, je „päta“ zjemňujúcim výrazom pre zadnú časť ženského tela, a preto narážka na Ezauovu mužskosť, ktorej sa už od pôrodu mal zmocniť Jakub, nemá opodstatnenie v biblickom rozprávaní.

29-49: M. A. Awadby: The Holiness Composition of the Priestly Blessing. Áronovo požehnanie (Nm 6,24-26) je v SZ jedinečné svojím štýlom a vyjadrením. Na jeho podobnosť s chetickými, akkadskými a ugaritskými textami upozorňuje Awadby. Najmä prvé dva verše požehnania nápadne pripomínajú hebrejské nápisy z predexilových čias. Pretože sa toto požehnanie odlišuje od tradície Pentateuchu, ktorá sa odvodzuje od kňazského prameňa (P), za jeho začlenením do Nm stoja pravdepodobne pisatelia Kódexu svätosti (H).

¹ Dostupné na: Peeters Online Journals (<http://poj.peeters-leuven.be>). Kto by mal záujem o niektorý z článkov, a nemá k nemu on-line prístup, môže sa obrátiť na: jaroslav.mudron@gmail.com.

Jeho formulácia bola najskôr prevzatá zo všeobecne používanej listovej formy pozdravu požehnania a po prepracovaní sa stala súčasťou materiálu predošlej P tradície.

50-59: **D. Lanzinger: Wer baute das Schiff? Göttliches und menschliches Wirken in Weish 14,1-10.** Kniha múdrosti v kap. 14 prirovnáva zhotovovanie modelov k výrobe lodí. Druhá časť verša 2, „... zhotovil ju (loď) umelecký dômysel“, pritom môže byť chápaná dvojako: ako šikovnosť človeka alebo ako Božia múdrosť, ktorá je ďalej opísaná v nasledujúcich veršoch. Lanzinger sa nakláňa k druhej možnosti a argumentuje tým, že pojem σοφία lepšie odpovedá Božej aktivite. Taktiež celkový tón Mud 14,1-10 vyznieva v prospech Božieho konania, ktoré je postavené do protikladu s ľudskou činnosťou. Tvorivosť človeka vedie k modlárstvu a márnemu kultu, pričom Božia sila umožňuje dreveným lodiam prekonať nástrahy na mori.

60-74: **M. Settembrini: Loyal to the Text and to the King? A Commentary on Dan 11,6-9 OG.** V Dan 11,6-9 nachádzame proroctvo o tom, ako sa dcéra kráľa z juhu spojí s kráľom severu, a hoci obaja zostanú porazení, jej potomok nakoniec ovládne sever. Hebrejská verzia textu sa však líši od tej gréckej. Kráľovskou dcérou je podľa historikov Berenika z rodu Ptolemajovcov, ktorá sa vydala za kráľa Antiocha II. z dynastie Seleukovcov. Keďže grécky pred-LXX preklad nahradil „dcéru kráľa z juhu“ postavou „kráľa Egypta“, Settembrini predpokladá, že táto úprava bola dôsledkom kráľovskej propagandy Ptolemaja III., pod vplyvom ktorej bola pravdepodobne aj samotná judejská komunita v Alexandrii.

75-92: **B. J. Koet: Conflict Management in Corinth. A Comparison between the Openings of 1 and 2 Corinthians.** Úvod do Prvého listu Korint'anom sa podobá Druhému listu, adresovanému tej istej cirkevnej komunite. Ich podobnosť a výrazové odlišnosti analyzuje Koet. Oba úvody majú výrazné črty prorockej reči, akú nachádzame v Deuteroizaiášovi a v Tritoizaiášovi. V Prvom liste však Pavol kladie väčší dôraz na „povolanie“ (κλητός, ἐπι-καλέω) Korint'anov k posväteniu sa v Kristovi. Ústredným motívom úvodu Druhého listu je zasa „útecha“ (παρά-κλησις, παρα-καλέω) pre veriacich. Tieto malé rozdiely tak svedčia o zmene v stratégii listovej komunikácie a v celkovom Pavlovom prístupe k miestnej cirkvi.

93-108: **D. Seal: Jude Delivered.** Júdov list je jedným z najkratších spisov NZ a ako aj ostatné neskoré diela kánonu sa vyznačuje presvedčivosťou a varovným tónom. Seal si všima rétorické kvality Listu v kategóriách teórie a praktiky prednesu v antických dobách. Tento pastoračný list je bohatý na emotívne prejavy v škále od hnevu nad bludármi až po zľutovanie sa nad zblúdencami. Je vhodný pre dramatický prednes, keďže autor sa opakovane obracia na publikum zámenom „vy“ v kontraste s „oni“, čo je v súlade s pravidlami klasickej rétoriky. Nie je ťažké predstaviť si živo gestikulujúceho prednášateľa, ktorý moduláciou hlasu pri hlasitom čítaní Listu vyvoláva v poslucháčoch dojem prikláňa ich na stranu autora.

Animadversiones

109-116: **J. Kaplan: יובל, a New Proposal.** V Lv 25 sa viackrát spomína „jubilejný rok“, ktorý je odvodený od hebrejského slova יובל. Podľa Kaplana je tento výraz polysemitský a ako taký spája v sebe štyri významy slovného koreňa יבל. V prvom rade má základ v slovese „viest', privádzať“ a v odvodenom podstatnom mene יבל „poľnohospodárska plodina“. Dôležitým významom je aj alúzia na rovnako znejúce יבל „baraní roh“, pretože trúbením na

roh sa ohlasuje začiatok sviatku či výnimočného obdobia. Nakoniec v Lv 25 slúži יבל ako synonymum pre דרור „ohlásenie slobody“, a preto ho možno chápať ako technický výraz pre „obdobie poľnohospodárskych úľav, ktorý sa úradne začína trúbením na roh“.

117-118: **T. V. Muraoka: Truth or the Truth?** V Pilátovej otázke „Čo je pravda?“ je grécke slovo ἀλήθεια uvedené bez určitého člena. Muraoka z toho vyvodzuje záver, že Pilát sa pýtal na povahu pravdy všeobecne a nenadväzoval priamo na „tú pravdu“, o ktorej Ježiš hovorí v predošlom verši: „Ja som sa na to narodil a na to som prišiel na svet, aby som vydal svedectvo pravde (τῆ ἀληθείᾳ).“ Toto rozlíšenie je rovnako možné v aramejčine a hebrejčine, ale nie v latinčine, ktorá nepoužíva určitý člen. Francúzsky preklad *La Sainte Bible* do Pilátovej otázky určitý člen vkladá a tým môže zmýliť čitateľa. Pilátova otázka je skôr výrazom hlbavého zamyslenia sa nad pravdou a nie cynickým znevážením pravdy, ktorú Ježiš zvestuje.

(č. 2) 151-165: **J. J. Krause: Circumcision and Covenant in Genesis 17.** Prísľub večnej zmluvy s Abrahámom a jeho potomstvom má svoje spečatenie v úkone obriezky, ktorá je nariadená po prvýkrát v Gn 17. Podľa klasickej teórie prameňov je táto kapitola dielom kňazskej tradície (P) a odráža sa v nej teológia „samotnej milosti“ a nepodmienečnej zmluvy. Krause analyzuje teologické črty Gn 17 z diachronického a synchronického hľadiska. Hoci zo strany Boha možno hovoriť o nepodmienečnej vernosti zmluve, zo strany Abrahámovho potomstva je táto zmluva podmienená vykonávaním obriezky. Opakom výrazu „pamätať na zmluvu“ nie je jej zabudnutie, ale porušenie.

166-188: **J. M. Tebes: The Southern Home of YHWH and Pre-Priestly Patriarchal/Exodus Traditions from a Southern Perspective.** Zrekonštruovanie vzniku a formovania kultu YHWH si vyžaduje dôsledné porovnanie biblických údajov s dátami z mimobiblických prameňov a z archeologického výskumu. Tebes porovnáva tieto dostupné informácie a dokazuje, že kult má pôvod v južnej oblasti púšte Negeb, odkiaľ sa pravdepodobne rozšíril a získal dominantné postavenie v období Šaulovho panovania. Kontakt s obyvateľmi Edomu, Negebu a Sinaja v železnej dobe postupne formoval príbehy o patriarchoch, dávajúc do popredia vzťah Jakuba s Ezauom a mesto Beér-šebu ako stredobod vtedajších udalostí.

189-201: **A. Leproux: La «piété» du patriarche Jacob selon Sg 10,10-12.** Jakubov cyklus (Gn 27–32) je zhrnutý v troch veršoch Knihy múdrosti (10,10-12). Leproux chápe tento krátky text ako výsledok dvojakého procesu helenizácie biblických patriarchov. Po prvé, ľstivý Jakub sa stáva vzorom múdrosti, akýmsi ideálom gréckej koncepcie *paideia*. Po druhé, motív „bázne pred Bohom“, ktorý je inak hlavným motívom v biblickej múdroslovej literatúre, je v Knihe múdrosti nahradený termínom *eusebeia* – nábožnosť. Tento termín v neskoršej gréckej filozofii vyjadroval harmóniu medzi božským a ľudským svetom. Jakub týmto spôsobom predstavuje model nábožnosti.

202-225: **B. Rossi: Conflicting Patterns of Revelation. Jer 31,33-34 and its Challenge to the Post-Mosaic Revelation Program.** Jeremiášovo proroctvo o dňoch, v ktorých sa bratia nebudú vzájomne poučovať vo veciach zmluvy, lebo všetci budú poznať Pána (Jer 31,34), stojí v protiklade s Dt 31,9, kde Mojžiš odovzdáva zákon kňazom a starším, aby o ňom učili ľud. Rossi podrobne rozoberá štylistické podobnosti a teologické odlišnosti

týchto statí. Podľa jej záverov je Jer 31,33-34 pod vplyvom poexilových debát nad redakciou Pentateuchu. Kým autori Dt budovali koncepciu Tóry na úlohe Mojžiša ako sprostredkovateľa, redaktori Jer dávali do popredia prostredníctvom samotnej zmluvy pri odpustení a zmierení.

226-246: **Ch. Blumenthal: Vorbildhaftes Gottvertrauen. Der matthäische Jesus zwischen tödlicher Ohnmacht und königlicher Macht.** Matúš zdôrazňuje kráľovsko-Dávidovskú identitu Ježiša viac než ostatní evanjelisti a rozvíja tento motív v priebehu celého rozprávania. Blumenthal sa sústreďuje na opis Ježiša ako kráľovskej postavy počas jeho cesty do Jeruzalema (Mt 16,21–20,34). Osobitne dôležitým hľadiskom je pritom povaha moci a bezmocnosti, na ktorých evanjelista buduje svoje teologické náhľady. Postava Ježiša slúži ako model pre matúšovskú komunitu: v spojení s ním a s Bohom je táto komunita povolávaná zakladať nebeské kráľovstvo tu na zemi.

247-264: **B. Carrier: The Triumphal Echo of Psalm 24 in the Gospel According to Matthew.** V Žalme 24 zaznieva jasot zo slávnostného vstupu Pána do chrámu a v Mt 21,1-17 vstupuje Ježiš do Jeruzalema za mohutného jasotu zástupu. Carrier porovnáva tieto biblické texty uplatňujúc Hayovu metódu echa (*Hays' Echo Criterion*), ktorá slúži na odkrytie vnútorného prepojenia textov skrze ich jazykovú blízkosť a tematickú príbuznosť. Okrem výrazného motívu slávnostného vstupu sú obidve state vystavané na dialógu zúčastnených, ktorý vedie k otázke: „Kto je ten?“ (Ž 24,8.10 // Mt 21,10). Ďalším dôležitým echom v Mt 21,1-17 je pravdepodobne Malachiášovo proroctvo o poslaní anjela zmluvy do chrámu (Mal 3,1).

265-280: **F. Bianchini: 1 Giovanni e la retorica. L'argomentazione di 1 Gv 1,5-2,28.** Prvý Jánov list sa svojou štruktúrou a štýlom líši od ostatných listov NZ. Bianchini vidí kľúč k pochopeniu logiky a obsahu listu v rétorickej analýze, ktorú sám aplikuje na jeho prvé dve kapitoly. Vo svetle rétorickej analýzy identifikuje v 1Jn 1,5-7 tzv. *propositio* – predstavenie ústrednej témy, ktorou je spoločenstvo s Bohom za predpokladu, že kráčame vo svetle. Nasledujúce verše obsahujú *probatio* – dokazovanie predstavenej témy, prebiehajúce v štyroch bodoch: oslobodenie sa od hriechu (1,8–2,2), bratská láska (2,3-11), neláska voči svetu (2,12-17) a vyznanie pravej viery, ktorá sa vyvaruje jej odporcov (2,18-28).

Animadversiones

281-284: **T. Muraoka: Justification by Faith. Paul and Qumran.** Všeobecne sa prijíma názor, že Pavlove starozákonné citácie pochádzajú zo Septuaginty. Ako žiarivý príklad slúži citácia Gn 15,6 v Rim 4,6. Muraoka sa zamýšľa, na základe čoho preložili LXX a Pavol hebrejský výraz *אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם* „a (Boh) mu (Abrahámovi) ju (spravodlivosť) započítal“ do trpného rodu *δικαιοσύνην* „sa (mu to) počítalo“. Biblické citácie nájdené v kumránskych spisoch a Pavlovo parafrázovanie Hab 2,4 v Rim 1,17 vedú autora článku k záveru, že takáto zmena slovesného rodu a malé preformulovanie citácie boli vo vtedajšej dobe prijateľným literárnym postupom.

(č. 3) 311-333: **Ch. H. J. Van der Merwe: The Polysemous Relationships between the Senses of the Verbal Root קָח.** Sloveso קָח je bežne používaným slovesom v SZ a vystihuje viaceré významy sily a moci. Van der Merwe chce vnieť prehľadnosť do lexikálnych definícií slovesa. Pomocou kognitívnej sémantiky identifikuje jeho tri prototypy: (1) fyzickú, vojenskú a politickú silu v rámci konfliktov (44-krát v SZ), (2) mentálnu silu pri fyzických sporoch (40-krát) a (3) fyzickú snahu uchopiť a zmocniť sa niečoho či niekoho

(42-krát). Každý z týchto troch prototypov rozvíja sloveso v rozličných figuratívnych odtieňoch a vo významovom prelínaní, napr. výraz „zatvrdiť srdce“ patrí do podskupiny metafor prvého prototypu.

334-350: **A. T. Abernethy: The Ruined Vineyard Motif in Isaiah 1–39. Insights from Cognitive Linguistics.** Obraz spustošenej vinice je často sa opakujúcim motívom prorociev Protoizaiáša (Iz 1–39). Abernethy používa metódu kognitívnej jazykovedy, aby lepšie porozumel tomuto motívu. Na základe kategórií pohybujúceho sa objektu (*trajectory*), mílnikov (*landmarks*) a premeny (*transformation*) opisuje proces Božieho pretvorenia vinice v bodľače skrze negáciu činnosti obrábania. Nové víno je dané do protikladu s vyschnutou úrodou. Celá táto metaforickosť je umocnená skutočnosťou, že ju prorok rozvíja v spoločnosti, pre ktorú boli vinica a produkcia vína hlavným poľnohospodárskym výnosom.

351-372: **D. Rom-Shiloni: Prophets in Jeremiah in Struggle over Leadership, or Rather over Prophetic Authority?** Jeremiáš musel čeliť ostatným prorokom, ktorí neustále protirečili jeho výrokom. Rom-Shiloni sa venuje tomuto zápasu o vedúce postavenie, či lepšie povedané, prorockú autoritu. Novým prínosom Jeremiášovho prorokovania bola jeho teológia zakotvená v tradícii Pentateuchu, v protiklade s víziami a snami ako metódy nadobudnutia prorocstva. Božia úloha vo víťazstvách či v prehrách sa podstatne líši od ľudských pohľadov. Aby Jeremiáš získal autoritu proroka, využíval k tomu techniku rétoriky a písaného slova, čo bola všeobecne sa rozvíjajúca prax na Blízkom východe koncom siedmeho a začiatkom šiesteho stor. pred Kr.

373-392: **A. P. Rasmussen: Forms of Esther. Hebrew Satire and Greek Novella.** Grécka verzia Knihy Ester obsahuje viaceré doplnenia a dodatky k hebrejskej pôvodine, ako napr. zmienky o Bohu, modlitby a vysvetlenia nejasného textu. Rasmussenová zisťuje, nakoľko sa tieto dve verzie od seba líšia z hľadiska ich žánru. Aby to zistila, porovnáva kapitoly 1–3 a 8–10 hebrejského a gréckeho textu, neberúc do úvahy grécke dodatky. Hebrejská verzia má črty satiry a na mušku si berie perzskú vládnucu vrstvu. Stará grécka verzia ide skôr v línii napínaveho románu, zdôrazňujúc úlohu Ester a úlohu Mardocheja pri záchrane života Židov.

393-413: **K. F. Zawadzki: „Keiner soll die Lektüre der Schrift durcheinanderbringen!“ Ein neues griechisches Fragment aus dem Johanneskommentar des Cyrill von Alexandrien.** Kódex Pantokratoros z 8. stor. po Kr. obsahuje okrem iného aj úryvky zo stratenej, ôsmej knihy Komentára nad Evanjeliom podľa Jána od Cyrila Alexandrijského. Zawadzki vôbec po prvýkrát ponúka kritickú publikáciu týchto gréckych úryvkov a ich dôkladné porovnanie so sýrskym prekladom, ktorý sa nám zachoval. Textová a jazyková analýza je následne doplnená o rozbor teologických tém úryvkov. Tie v podstate poskytujú exegetickú interpretáciu verša 2Kor 5,19 v kontexte Kristovho božstva a témy zmierenia medzi Bohom a svetom.

414-430: **D. Hee Jung: Barbarian and Scythian in Col 3,11. Greek Ethnocentric Reasoning.** Pavlova vízia nového stvorenia v Kristovi prekonáva etnické a sociálne rozdiely, ktoré sú v Kol 3,11 zhrnuté v dvojiciach: Grék-Žid, obrezaný-neobrezaný, barbar-Skýt, otrok-slobodný. Hee Jung skúma identitu Skýtov a barbarov. Táto dvojica nie je protikladná, ale komplementárna. Skýti predstavujú obyvateľstvo krajného severu z pohľadu vtedajších Grékov, ktorí ich považovali za divokých a nekultúrnych ľudí, podobných ostatným barbarom.

Arogantný postoj Grékov voči Skýtom a barbarom sa podobá povýšeneckému prístupu Židov voči Nežidom. Úlohou kresťanov v Kolosách je vykoreniť túto aroganciu z ich komunity.

431-446: **D. H. Wenkel: The Paradox of High Christology in Hebrews 1.** Autor Listu Hebrejom musel v prvom rade vysvetliť, že viera v Kristovo božstvo neprotirečí monoteizmu. K tomuto cieľu je v Liste použitá figúra paradoxu, ktorá má zaraziť poslucháča a vyvolať v ňom hlbšiu reflexiu. Pri rozbere prvých štrnástich veršov prvej kapitoly odkrýva Wenkel paradoxy kristológie, vsadené do rámca jednoty Boha v reči, v sláve a v pluralite. Literárna jednota celého Svätého písma umožňuje chápať vieru v jej štyroch dimenziách: kristologickej, etickej, eschatologickej a ekleziologickej. Úlohou viery nie je prekonať paradox, ale ho v sebe integrovať a dokonca z neho čerpať, napr. pri prijímaní paradoxu bolesti a smrti.

(č. 4) 471-483: **Sh. Gesundheit: Proto-Midrash in the Biblical Ancestor Narratives.** Midraš ako metóda rabínskeho výkladu SZ sa vyznačuje anachronizmom, t. j. vysvetľuje biblické postavy z hľadiska neskorších zvykov a práva. To, že táto metóda nebola cudzia ani pre samotných biblických autorov, odkrýva Gesundheit pri čítaní cyklu patriarchov v Knihe Genezis. Abrahám a Jakub sú v ňom jemne vykreslení ako verní nasledovníci učenia Tóry a Abraháмова cesta do Egypta predchádza a pripravuje príbeh exodu. Navyše, niektoré textové varianty a *ktib-qrib* úpravy rovnako svedčia o snahe vnieť do textu interpretáciu, ktorá je v zhode s neskorším celkovým vnímaním Tóry a vytvára tak počiatky midrašu.

484-506: **D. Flanders: A Thousand Times, No. אלף does not Mean “Contingent” in the Deuteronomistic History.** Vysoké čísla počtu bojovníkov v historických knihách SZ, rátajúce častokrát státisíce Izraelitov, viedli niektorých biblistov k domnienke, že slovo „tisíc“ (אלף) označuje v tomto prípade „vojenskú jednotku“ a nie jej počet. Proti takémuto uvažovaniu sa stavia Flanders, ktorý tvrdí, že ani biblické, ani mimobiblické pramene vtedajších čias neumožňujú tento výklad. Hebrejský výraz אלף, podobne ako akkadské slovo *līmu*, môže okrem čísla „tisíc“ vystihovať aj „kmeň“ alebo „čriedu“. Jednako vo vojenskej terminológii sú oba výrazy používané len pre „tisíc“ ako obsah vojenskej jednotky *šar/kišru*.

507-524: **F. M. Macatangay: Raphael's Instruction to “Write Everything Down” in the Book of Tobit.** V závere Knihy Tobiaš anjel Rafael nariaďuje Tobimu a jeho synovi, aby napísali všetko, čo sa im prihodilo (12,20). Macatangay zisťuje, čo stojí za týmto príkazom a aké je jeho sociálno-historické pozadie. Hlavným zámerom napísania Knihy je vzdávanie chvály Bohu za všetko, čo vykonal. Tento štýl sa odráža v niektorých verejných monumentoch starého Blízkeho východu a v ďakovných žalmoch. Nariadenie písať knihu, ktoré sa nachádza v samotnej Knihe, vytvára literárnu figúru *mise en abyme*, t. j. miniatúrny obraz v obraze, ktorý je v harmonickom súlade s úvodným veršom: „Kniha príbehov Tóbiho *atd.*“ (1,1)

525-543: **T. Milinovich: Once More, with Feeling. Rom 8,31-39 as Rhetorical Peroratio.** Po rozvitej úvahe nad životom podľa Ducha a podľa tela v Rim 8,1-30 sv. Pavol prekvapuje sériou otázok: „Čo teda na to povieme?... Kto je proti nám?... Kto nás odlúči od Kristovej lásky?“ a pod. Milinovich hodnotí záver ôsmej kapitoly Listu Rimanom ako *peroratio*, t. j. epilóg, v ktorom autor zhrňuje predošlé argumenty (*recapitulatio*) a vyvoláva v publiku emocionálnu odpoveď na rétorické otázky (*adfectus*). Podobný štýl nachádzame

u klasických autorov, napr. u Cicera, ako aj v niektorých statiach NZ. Každá z rétorických otázok v Rim 8,31-39 má svoju odpoveď v predošlých veršoch kapitoly, na ktoré sa tematicky odvoláva.

544-566: **R. Fellows: Paul, Timothy, Jerusalem and the Confusion in Galatia.**

Napriek tomu, že v Gal 2,3 Pavol opisuje, ako Títus nebol nútený k obriezke, podľa Sk 16,1-3 Pavol sám obrezal Timoteja. Fellows považuje Timoteja a Títa za tú istú historickú osobu a rekonštruje, čo mohlo byť dejinným pozadím celej udalosti. Pavlova argumentácia v Gal naznačuje, že ho židovskí agitátori predstavovali ako zástancu obriezky práve kvôli prípadu Timoteja-Títa. Pavol ho síce obrezal v Galácii navzdory svojím názorom na slobodu v Kristovi, ale následne v Jeruzaleme zistil, že táto obriezka nebola nevyhnutná. Dokonca apoštoli, ktorých spomína v Gal 2, súhlasili s Pavlovými pohľadmi a odobrili jeho misiu medzi pohanmi.

567-591: **P. Basta: Only the One Who Works Enters into Rest. The Homiletic Logic of Heb 3,7-4,11.** Viacerí komentátori rozpoznali v Hebr 3,7-4,11 midraš, t. j. rabínsky homiletický spôsob výkladu SZ. Basta rozvíja túto teóriu a nachádza v stati tri základné midrašské časti: (1) otvorenie (*peticha*), započaté citáciou Ž 95 v Hebr 3,7-11; (2) predstavenie ústrednej témy (*injan*), ktorou je pozvanie vojsť dnes do Božieho pokoja v 3,12-4,8; (3) záverečné potvrdenie (*chatima*), ktoré zhrňuje argumentáciu v 4,9-11 a vzbudzuje nádej. V poslednej časti sa používa metóda *gezera šava*, ktorou autor prepája dvojice citácií zo SZ a dáva nimi do protikladu Boží odpočinok na siedmy deň s neschopnosťou neposlušného ľudu vstúpiť do tohto pokoja.

Animadversiones

592-599: **R. Van Wingerden: Horizontal or not? The Patibulum in Sallust, Hist.**

3 Frg. 9. Niesol Ježiš celý kríž alebo len jeho priečne rameno? Kým grécky termín *σταυρός* môže označovať celý kríž alebo časť z neho, latinčina rozlišuje medzi *crux* a *patibulum*. Wingerden prispieva do diskusie v oblasti štúdií ukrižovania a na základe Sallustovho latinského fragmentu upresňuje význam výrazu *patibulum*. V námornickej terminológii označovalo ono slovo drevené brvno, ktoré bolo pripevňované na sťažň v horizontálnej polohe. Navyše na rozdiel od prenosného *patibulum* nikde v klasickej literatúre nenachádzame zmienku o tom, že by sa niesol kríž ako celok (*crux*).

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

RECENZIE – REVIEWS

ARCANGELI, Davide: *Tipologia e compimento delle Scritture nel Vangelo di Giovanni. Analisi di alcuni racconti del Quarto Vangelo* (SRivBib 66), Bologna: EDB, 2019. p. 280. ISBN 978-88-1030-256-9.

This volume constitutes the publication of the author's doctoral thesis, defended at the Theological Faculty of Emilia Romagna. The preface describes some essential elements of the research path, including the introduction to the method by J.-N. Aletti and the guidance of qualified scholars such as M. Marcheselli and M. Crimella. The title of the book already guides the reader's attention towards typology and fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel. Aletti took up the topic in an article on Christological studies in which he states that the typological reading "is not only recommended but also necessary [...] must be evaluated, exploited, studied"¹.

After obtaining the Licentiate at the PBI by presenting a paper on typology in the Johannine passion, Arcangeli's doctoral research is presented to the public as one of the few experiments in the application of typological reading to the Fourth Gospel. First of all, the courage and novelty of this approach must be underlined, which do honor to the author. As far as we can verify, it is necessary to go back to the 1950s to find a monograph dedicated to the typology in the Gospel of John². Furthermore,

¹ Jean-Noël ALETTI, *Esegesi e cristologia, Problemi e proposte*, *Path* 11 (2012) 160. All the translations are made by the reviewer.

² See Harald SAHLIN, *Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums* (AUU 4), Uppsala – Leipzig: Lundequistska bokhandeln, Harrassowitz, 1950. For a critical review, see Joseph BONSIVERN, *Rec. SAHLIN Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums*, *Bib* 33 (1952) 536-537. After Sahlin's unconvincing monograph, studies focused mostly on the typology of the Exodus, without however achieving a clear vision. See Jacob E. ENZ, *The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John*, *JBL* 76/3 (1957) 208-215; Robert H. SMITH,

the studies that proposed typological interpretations have been evaluated not positively, as they offered forced, speculative, and finally, unconvincing parallels (see REIM, Anhang A: Typologie, 267-268). In the study of the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and Scripture, typology has been taken as an example of an equivocal understanding of the term (see Marion MOSER, *Schriftdiskurse im Johannesevangelium*, 2014, 43).

For these reasons, significant premises were necessary to propose a research on typology, which is, in a certain way, pioneering in the context of recent critical studies on the Fourth Gospel.

The research begins with a chapter on 1 Cor 10:1-13, which arouses interest because of the language linked to typology and allows for the exposition of the methodological and hermeneutical problems connected to typology. In v. 6, Paul states that the events narrated in Exodus are “types” (gr. τύποι) for the community of Corinth. Such events happened for them “as an example” (gr. τυπικῶς), and were written for the admonition of the Corinthians, who experienced the particular condition of being at the end of time (cf. v. 11). Despite the explicit use of the term, the author concludes that in this passage it is not a matter of true typology, but of a *synkrisis*, a comparison for pedagogical purposes. He subsequently presents a preliminary description of typology and of the conditions for detecting it (see pp. 20-25).

The second chapter lays the foundations for defining the research methodology. The *status quaestionis* opens by mentioning the scarce consideration of typology in the context of modern exegesis, since it is considered to promote a “prejudicial and dogmatic” interpretation (p. 27). Arcangeli presents five authors who undertook academic research on typology. Goppelt’s merit is to have re-presented typology in the academic circle. With regard to the Fourth Gospel, Goppelt had identified typological elements in the great sphere of creation and the renewal of the institutions of Israel. Arcangeli’s critical attention towards Goppelt’s

Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel, *JBL* 81/4 (1962) 329-342; Édouard COTHENET, Typologie de l’Exode dans le IV^e évangile. In: Édouard Cothenet: *Exégèse et liturgie, Vol. II* (LeDiv 175), Paris: Cerf, 1999, 179-191. For a non recent *status quaestionis*, see Günter REIM, Anhang A: Typologie im Johannesevangelium – Grenzen und Möglichkeiten. In: Günter Reim: *Jochanan: Erweiterte Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*, Erlangen: Ev.-Luth. Mission, 1995, 262-282. For a more recent one, see Matteo CRIMELLA, Tipologia. Un Osservatorio bibliografico, *RivBib* 63 (2015) 587-605. Arcangeli published a short preview of his research in 2016: Davide ARCANGELI, Punto di vista e compimento tipologico in Gv 6. In: Maurizio Marcheselli (ed.): *Israele e Chiesa nel Vangelo di Giovanni: compimento, reinterpretazione, sostituzione?* (EpP 14), Bologna: EDB, 2016, 95-109.

contribution is mainly in the methodological context due to the lack of rigorous criteria and conditions for identifying parallels that can constitute typology (see pp. 28-29). The contribution of N. Frye (*The Great Code*, 1981) is presented for having categorized typology according to time, space and story, with the risk, however, of imposing a preconceived frame on the texts analyzed (see pp. 29-30). Von Rad (Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament, *Interpretation* 15 [1961] 174-192) deals with Old Testament typology and highlights the relationship between the Beginning and the End of time with a heavy historical interest. Typological relationships do not identify a cyclical repetition, but a real historical path and find their essential model in prophecy. Even Von Rad, however, seems to overlook the methodological dimension of the typological interpretation (see pp. 30-31). M. Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 1986) finally presents the first methodological criteria. Typology is considered a literary as well as historical phenomenon, detectable through the recognition of precise recurring formulas. Typological relationships can be identified in historical-cosmological, historical, spatial and biographical models (see pp. 31-33). The rich and complex research of P. Beauchamp (*L'un et l'autre Testament*, 2 vol., 1976 – 1990) finds a key aspect on the phenomenon of rewriting, inventing the neologism of *deuterosis*, through which each part of the First Testament — Law, Prophets and Writings — “returns to itself”. However, this path, far from being an end, constitutes an itinerary open to a finality expressed in the Apocalyptic, and open to what will become the New Testament, in many ways already present in the Old. The type in the Bible is characterized by “autonomy” and “circularity”, which result in the “eclipse” proper to the cross of Christ (see pp. 33-35).

After describing some studies that applied these results to the New Testament, Arcangeli focuses on J.-N. Aletti (*Le Jésus de Luc*, 2010), explicitly mentioned as a point of reference for his research. His study on Luke 17:11-19 gathers the methodological elements to be applied to the Fourth Gospel (see pp. 41-43).

Consequently the third chapter offers a definition of typology:

By typology we mean the identification of one or more Old Testament “figures” (types), represented by characters (single or collective), events, institutions, which are placed by the text in connection of fulfillment with elements of the story itself (antitypes). (p. 47)

Such a definition distinguishes typology from *synkrisis* through the element of fulfillment, that is, as “internal and reciprocal relationship of discontinuity in continuity, which implies a «more»” (p. 47), especially concerning a revelatory meaning.

The description of the three methodological steps to identify typology follows, making use of narrative analysis, intertextuality and analysis of the typological fulfillment. The first contribution defines the narrative limits of the composition, through the usual criteria of space, time and characters. The analysis of the plot has the function of highlighting whether the resolution plot is primarily at the service of a revelatory one. The study of the effect of the story on the reader reveals the process of identification with the figures of the disciples and the invitation to faith. Particular attention is paid to the analysis from the point of view of the characters, but above all of Jesus and the narrator³. The point of view has the function of manifesting the value orientation of the text, whether ideological or theological, which becomes significant in order to understand what attitude the narrative assumes in the Old Testament background (see pp. 48-51). The use of intertextuality guides the lexical and thematic comparison between the two texts distinguishing, according to the classifications of G. Genette (*Palinsesti: la letteratura al secondo grado*, 1997), D. C. Allison (*The New Moses: A Matthean typology*, 1993) and R. B. Hays (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 1989), the explicit, implicit citations, allusions and echoes. The criteria for the analysis of intertextual references are taken from Hays (see pp. 51-54). The process offers material on which to compare between the recipient text and the received text. More specifically, the analysis of verbs, temporal particles, parallels, and fulfillment citations may show if the plot of the story presents a relationship of continuity and discontinuity with elements of the story. The analysis of the plot, of the “voices”, and the related points of view constitutes the step of the research that will distinguish a simple *synkrisis* from a typology (see p. 55). A final paragraph clarifies that the use of typology does not arrive at supersessionist concepts (see pp. 55-56). Arcangeli emphasises how his research has a “heuristic” foundation, in the sense that the conditions that must be fulfilled for the typology to be demonstrated were previously described (see pp. 24-25).

³ Arcangeli presents a synthesis of the main explanations of the “point of view”: cf. Robert ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, New York: Basic Books, 2011; Boris USPENSKY, *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*, Berkeley, CA – Los Angeles, CA: University of California, 1983; Gérard GENETTE, *Figure III. Discorso del racconto*, Torino: Einaudi, 2006; Alain RABATEL, L'introuvable focalisation externe, *Littérature* 107 (1997) 88-113; Daniel MARGUERAT, *Il punto di vista: sguardo e prospettiva nei racconti dei vangeli* (Sguardi 39), Bologna: EDB, 2015; Daniel MARGUERAT – Yvan BOURQUIN, *Per leggere i racconti biblici: La Bibbia si racconta. Iniziazione all'analisi narrativa*, Roma: Borla, 2001; Gianni TURCHETTA, *Il punto di vista*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1999; James L. RESSEGUIE, *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John* (BiInS 56), Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Chapter 4 analyzes John 2:1-11 according to the methodology described. The first step of the narrative analysis presents the delimitation of the passage. The resolution plot highlights a transition from a lack/void to a transformation/filling, through the material element of the water and the stone jars. The study of the characters and the point of view highlights the role of Jesus, his mother and the disciples who have an eminently Christological function. The narrator's intervention in 2:11 particularly highlights the disciples' recognition of the Jesus' glory. The plot of revelation shows the Christological sense of the water transformed into wine, of the narrator's interventions regarding the stone jars for purification and the origin of the wine (see pp. 57-75).

The study of the Old Testament background leads Arcangeli to recognize allusions to the exodic-legal background of Exod 16-17; 19:8; 24:3 and to the laws of ritual purity in Lev 11:31-38. Allusions to sapiential texts related to the theme of the banquet are also noted (see Prov 9). The theme of Wisdom is considered significant above all for its presence in the Johannine macro-story (see John 1:1-18; 6). Allusions to prophetic passages are also connected to the theme of the eschatological banquet (see Isa 25:6; Zeph 1:12; etc.) and espousal with relation to Hos 2:17-24 (see pp. 75-85). This analysis leads Arcangeli to reject a typological connection to the figure of Moses and to the theme of Yhwh as husband of Israel. The author rather recognizes as a background a "type" that recalls "the set of Old Testament institutions (Law, worship) reunited in the broader reinterpretation operated by the theology of wisdom" (see p. 90). The detected typology therefore can be defined as "institutional" (see pp. 75-93).

Chapter 5 deals with John 4:4-42. The global resolution plot encompasses, through the passage from lack to fullness of water and food, both the itinerary of the woman from mistrust to her testimony, and the path of the Samaritans who come from a distance to faith in Jesus (see pp. 99-103). The analysis of the Old Testament backgrounds moves from the mention of Jacob to the gift of the shoulder of the mountain to Joseph (see Gen 48:22) and to the wider context of the patriarchal story. Arcangeli deems the narratives of a meeting at the well to be more significant (Gen 24:1-67; 29:1-14; Exod 2:11-22). These passages show a type-scene, whose differences with the Johannine account become more significant. The typology of the passage must be found in the theme of water and the well, which in light of the biblical and extra-biblical backgrounds has elicited a reference to the legal and cultural institutions of Israel: Jesus, sent by the Father, is the place of eschatological worship, the place where worshipers in spirit and truth encounter the Father; the temple-body of Jesus, "placed in connection with the well of Jacob, is the fulfillment of the cultic institutions of Israel and at the same time the truth to which the Spirit leads" (p. 127).

Chapter 6 deals with John 6:1-71. Analysis of the space-time elements and characters shows that Jesus is the protagonist who appears through all the scenes. The sequence of self-revelation and misunderstanding is characteristic of the dialogues: they follow one another marking the progression of the unbelief of the crowd (see vv. 25-34.36-40) and of the Jewish group (see vv. 25-34.35-47.48-57.58; see pp. 132-142). The plot of resolution entails the transition from lack of bread to overabundance; the nourishment that must not be lost is the bread that gives eternal life and recalls the passage from death to life in relation to the interlocutor's response (see pp. 142-146). The plot of revelation can be identified in the progressive revealing of the identity of Jesus as the bread descended from heaven that gives eternal life, recalling the Logos' pre-existing identity in the prologue. Beyond the progressive refusal of Jesus' revelation by his interlocutors, only a small group among the Twelve manifests the acceptance of faith in him (see pp. 155-156). Based on the accumulation of terms, the analysis of the scriptural backgrounds focuses on three thematic areas: Mosaic-exodic, deuteronomic-prophetic, and legal-sapiential. The figures of the eschatological prophet and of Moses represent more the point of view of the crowd who does not reach an adequate knowledge of Jesus, than the point of view of the narrator (see pp. 168-172). The latter shows an "institutional" typology of the manna/bread of life, which is identified with Jesus (see John 6:35.48.58). In this relationship there is continuity in the sign of bread, and discontinuity in the identification of true bread with Jesus himself, who is able to always satiate (see v. 35) and to offer life beyond death (see vv. 48.58; pp. 172-177).

Chapter 7 deals with John 19:16b.42. The analysis of the narrative sequence shows a division into seven scenes. At the center of the plot is the crucified Jesus who is symbolically enthroned. The plot of resolution is seen in the progressive dispossession of Jesus which reaches death and which is paradoxically narrated as a free-willed surrender of himself (see pp. 180-190).

The analysis of the scriptural background of the first scene (see John 19:23-24) focuses on the description of the garments that present numerous references to the Tent of Meeting and its furnishings (see Exod 36:29; 38:24; 1 Kgs 7:17; Ezek 40:47). Together with the broader plot of the Johannine macro-story, a reference is made to the temple-body of Jesus, without excluding an ecclesiological reference (see pp. 207-210). The analysis of the fourth scene (see John 19:25-27) presents a symbolic elevation of the figures of the mother and disciple to recall the maternal role of Zion-Jerusalem (see Isa 49:18; 54:6; 66:7-11; Ezek 23:2). In light of the Johannine macro-story, the role of the mother of Jesus in Cana and the mention of the dispersed children in John 11:52 are significant, highlighting the ecclesiological key of the passage (see pp. 207-214). In scene V, Arcangeli identifies the allusion to Ps 69(68):22 in John 19:28-29 as the key of the righteous sufferer with a paschal-

sacrificial background, according to the subsequent context (see John 19:31-37). The first explicit quotation in John 19:36 is explained as a reference to the paschal lamb (see Exod 12:10 [LXX].46; Num 9:12) and to the righteous sufferer of Ps 34(33):21. Through the second quotation, i.e. Zech 12:10, Arcangeli believes that the offering of the life of Jesus for the salvation of men is recalled. This, connected with the symbolism of water and blood, is interpreted in the light of the Johannine macro-story especially John 7:37-39, and therefore in the key of the eschatological cult (see pp. 214-224).

The analysis of the plot of revelation in 19:16b-42 shows the progressive establishment of the kingship of Christ in terms of the preserved integrity of his body (see 2:19-22) and of the paradoxical transformation of despoiling and death up to the delivery (of the Spirit). Consequently, the typological analysis in 19:16b-42 reveals the institutional fulfillment of the figures of the lamb and the temple in the body of Jesus, seen in the light of the unity of passion and resurrection. Through this main typological reading, the typology of Zion-Jerusalem applied to the mother and the nascent messianic community can also be affirmed (see pp. 226-234).

The last chapter offers general considerations on the research, reiterating the discovery of the institutional typology connected to the spousal and sacramental themes in the passages analyzed and in the context of the Johannine macro-story. A final paragraph highlights the “non-supersessionist” character of the Johannine typology. Arcangeli reinterprets the term “supersessionism” in a literary perspective, without ignoring the ecclesial consequences of the question. The fulfillment of the Johannine typology can be understood in the light of the prologue, in which the Word, existing and coming from the origin which is God himself, is present in the institutions of Israel and is incarnated in Christ. “The fulfillment is therefore characterized by an integration, that is, by a full maturation of those characteristics that the *Logos*, so to speak, had already placed in the historical type” (p. 252). Consequently, the overcoming must be not understood in a quantitative sense, but qualitative, as the prefigurations are not on the same level of the fulfillment; the relationship between type and antitype therefore gathers origins, history and eschaton in a continuous process. This concept of the typology finally makes possible the existence and autonomy of the type with respect to the anti-type. In this way, the institutions of Israel are not absorbed and canceled by the Christological fulfillment, but they lose their character of absolute necessity (see pp. 237-258; M. MARCHESELLI, *Il motivo del tempio in Gv 2-4*, 2016, 65).

The research is conducted in a clear and easily readable Italian style. The author makes use of the mainly classic commentaries (Barrett, Brown, Moloney, Léon-Dufour, Schnackenburg, etc.), some in Italian (Fabris, Grasso, etc.), and

numerous studies, especially in Italian, English and French. The use of German-language literature is limited.

Among the various analyzes carried out in the text, the narrative one is probably the most accurate and the one addressed by the author with greater confidence, therefore also being the most convincing. Instead, perplexities arise in the application of the intertextual method, asserted to be in accordance to the criteria of Hays. However these are not always clearly and explicitly detectable in the text. In parallel, the Old Testament passages are not dealt with separately and in depth, and are sometimes combined with interpretations from extrabiblical literature (see, for example, pp. 157-160; 166; etc.). In the analysis of the background of John 19:23-34, Ps 22 (21) quoted by the evangelist with an introductory formula, is simply mentioned. The author made preferential use of the Greek text of the LXX, mostly leaving aside the Hebrew background. Perhaps the choice to study four very demanding passages of the Johannine text necessarily required the sacrifice of deepening the scriptural background. The risk is that numerous decontextualized biblical references remain in the work. Probably a less extensive choice of the texts analyzed would have allowed research to pay greater attention to this aspect. This feature, if on the one hand shows the limits of research at an academic level, on the other is an advantage for a wider public, less interested in purely linguistic details.

With his research Arcangeli has had the merit of entering into an exegetical environment that did not appear to be credible. The author was able to transfer in the Johannine research the significant re-presentation of the typological analysis that Aletti applied to Luke-Acts. We must therefore note the qualitative leap in considering typology. What had been assessed as vague and unproven has now found a clear definition and a rigorous and verifiable methodological process. Despite the above-mentioned limits and despite some individual passages that can arguably be assessed differently — especially regarding the application of the intertextual method for the analysis of the scriptural background —, Arcangeli's research deserves a special commendation in the context of Johannine studies.

*Alessandro Cavicchia, OFM
Studium Biblicum Franciscanum
Facultas Scientiarum Biblicarum et Archaeologiae
4 Via Dolorosa
P.O.B. 19424
9119301 Jerusalem
Israel*

Konferencia Proroci v Badíne 13. – 15. decembra 2019

V polovici decembra minulého roka (2019) sa v Badíne konala biblická konferencia s medzinárodnou účasťou. Samotná jej téma: *Vnútrobiblická interpretácia skorších prorokov* sľubovala netradičný pohľad do vnútra Biblie. Pod skoršími prorokmi sa rozumejú prorocké postavy z bloku kníh Joz–2Kr, známe osobnosti ako Jozue, Samuel, Eliáš, Elizeus, ale i menej známe postavy Achiju, Chuldy, Debory, či Gáda. Proroci a prorokyne priťahovali už samotných autorov starozákonných a neskôr aj novozákonných spisov a možno povedať, že sa výrazne podieľali na formovaní biblického kánona. Zameranie na odhaľovanie intertextuálnych vzťahov biblických textov zaručovalo napínavý priebeh konferencie zodpovedajúci prorockému duchu otvorenému na posúvanie hraníc poznania Boha a dejín, ale aj výkladu, rozšíreniu či korekcii textov považovaných za posvätné.

Organizátorovi konferencie, redakcii časopisu *Studia Biblica Slovaca*, sa v spolupráci s Katedrou biblických vied RKCMBF UK v Bratislave podarilo osloviť výnimočných odborníkov na Písma. Samy za seba hovoria zvučné mená hlavných prednášateľov, Jeremyho Corleya z Írska (Maynooth), Petra Dubovského z Talianska (Rím) a Emanuela Tova z Izraela (Jeruzalem). Triáda naslovovzatých expertov pritiahla množstvo odborníkov z rôznych krajín, aby prezentovali výsledky svojho najnovšieho výskumu v ôsmich sekciách, z ktorých dve a dve prebiehali paralelne.

Jednotlivé bloky sekcií vždy otvoril jeden z hlavných hosťujúcich odborníkov. Prvý blok uviedol emeritný profesor Hebrejskej univerzity v Jeruzaleme Emanuel Tov témou, v ktorej sa celý život profiloval a pokladá sa za jedného z najuznávanejších odborníkov textovej kritiky vo svete. Jeho prednáška niesla názov *Major Israelite Figures in the Tradition of the Septuagint*. V gréckom texte Prvej knihy kráľov odhalil odlišný pohľad na Šalamúna. Na rozdiel od hebrejského textu zdôrazňuje grécka verzia Šalamúnovu múdrosť a ututľáva jeho hriechy. Rovnako čiastočne napráva mienku o známych hriešnych vládcov Jeroboámovi a Achábovi. Druhý deň konferencie otvoril slávnostným vstupom profesor Pápežského biblického inštitútu v Ríme Peter Dubovský prednáškou *Eliha's and Elisha's Miracles*. Dvoch z najvplyvnejších prorokov čo do napodobnenia ich

skutkov v Novom zákone predstavil najprv v ich starozákonnom kontexte, aby potom porovnal ich vnímanie z pohľadu novozákonných textov. Posledný blok prednášok uviedol profesor kolégia sv. Patrika Pápežskej univerzity v Maynoothe Jeremy Corley prednáškou *The Depiction of Elijah in Hebrew Ben Sira 48:1-11*. Aj v tomto prípade bol hlavným objektom štúdia Eliáš, prorok ako oheň. V Knihe Sirachovca sa mu dostáva viac pozornosti ako Mojžišovi, s ktorým ho deuteronomistické texty často spájali.

V prvej sekcii s anglickým jazykom boli ústrednými postavami Samuel, Eliáš a Elizeus. Prvý príspevok Daniely De Panfilisovej *Not Only a Prophet: The Numerous Faces of Samuel* predstavil postavu Samuela v neskorších spisoch SZ a v NZ. Samuleovi sa nedostávalo veľa priestoru, ale ak ho už biblické texty spomenuli, tak seriózne rozoznali komplexnosť postavy hlavne z hľadiska úloh jeho poslania. Oseagwina Ituah príspevkom *The Vocalization of אֵלִיָּהוּ in MT 1 Kgs 19:3: Issues and Considerations* demonštroval prácu s textom vo fáze porovnávania a vyhodnocovania textových verzií z pohľadu masoretskej interpretácie posvätných textov, ktorá v tomto prípade nebola dostatočne preskúmaná. Jan Rückl v záverečnej prednáške sekcie *Form and Function of Short Miraculous Narratives about Elisha* prezentoval metódu morfolologickej práce na textoch o Elizeovi podľa knihy V. J. Proppa (*Morphology of the Folktale*, 1968). Aplikovaním tejto literárnovedeckej metódy dospel k záveru o integrácii elizeovského materiálu do Kníh kráľov v relatívne neskorej fáze ich vývoja.

V paralelnej sekcii so slovenským jazykom tematicky vystihnutej postavami Debory a Eliáša sa Mária Kardis venovala prorokyni Debore príspevkom *Osobnosť Debory – paradigma ženského profetizmu?* V analýze textu Sdc 4–5 vyzdvihla jedinečné prepojenie prorockého a sudcovského úradu ženy – Debory, ktorú popri prorokyni Chulde vníma ako jednu z Mojžišových legitímnych nástupkýň v izraelských dejinách. Anton Tyrol sa v príspevku *Eliáš. Cesta v tichu a námahe s pokrmom zhora* venoval vyhodnoteniu množstva textov opisujúcich komplexnú osobu proroka Eliáša pomocou štúdia literárno-štruktúrálnej stavby jednotlivých úryvkov a komparáciou ich vzájomného vzťahu. Cieľom bolo dopracovať sa k skutočnému zámeru autora opisujúceho Eliáša v prvotných textoch. V neskorších textoch (Sir, Mal, NZ) skúmal vnútrobiblické interpretácie tejto postavy s úmyslom rozpoznať teologických ťažísk a spirituálnych konzekvencií pre súčasných kresťanov. Záverečným príspevkom sekcie s názvom *Starozákonný prorok Eliáš a jeho nanebovystúpenie* predstavil Alexander Cap najdôležitejšie udalosti v živote Božieho služobníka Eliáša, jeho uchvátenie z pozemského života a Božie plány spojené s druhým príchodom Spasiteľa na zem z pohľadu biblistov, teológov, judaistov, cirkevných otcov, Koránu a z pohľadu Pravoslávnej cirkvi.

Druhý deň konferencie otvoril anglickú sekciu venovanú interpretácii postáv prorokov v Knihách kroník s názvom *Elijah, Gad in Chronicles* Jozef Jančovič príspevkom *Elijah as a Writing Prophet in 2 Chr 21:12-15*. Interpretáčny problém, ktorý predstavuje Eliášov list kráľovi Jorámovi, je problematické zladíť s chronológiou Eliášovho života. Autor sa v príspevku pokúsil nájsť nielen schodné riešenie, ale analýzou literárneho žánru a posolstva načrtnol adaptáciu Eliášovej prorockej služby v nových historických podmienkach vzniku textov Kníh kroník. Mykhaylyna Klusková v príspevku *The Portrayal of Gad in 1 Ch 21* prezentovala svojráznu interpretáciu Dávidovho dvorného proroka Gáda v 1Krn 21 podmienenú literárnymi stratégiami autorov pôvodného (1Sam 24) a interpretovaného textu (1Krn 21).

Štvrtú, česko-anglickú sekciu *Prophecy, Prophets, Joshua* vystihuje vyhodnocovacia abstrakcia fenoménu prorocstva. Jíří Hoblík v príspevku *Proroctví jako prostředek interpretace dějin* cestou rekonštrukcie textu (odhaľovaním jeho viacvrstvovosti) poukázal na niektoré aspekty hebrejského dejinného myslenia. Aj príspevok *Choosing and Depicting Charactes from the Former Prophets in Deuterocanonical Literature* prednesený Vasilom Babotom sa držal línie teoretického výskumu. Porovnal myslenie autorov z grécko-rímskeho obdobia a autorov deuterokanonickéj literatúry. V interpretatívnej činnosti oboch skupín autorov identifikoval kritériá používané v neskorom období Druhého chrámu na vykreslenie charakterov. Blažej Štrba aplikoval literárnovedeckú metódou intertextuality na hľadanie odpovede na problém *Why Mattathiah Appeared like Joshua in 1 Macc 2*. Prínosom tohto moderného prístupu skúmania vzájomného vplyvu textov na seba, prostredníctvom náznakových odkazových prostriedkov, bolo objavenie menej známych stránok vysoko vyvinutej literárnej kultúry biblických autorov. Autor príspevku upozornil na dôležitosť vnímania recepcie textov z Knihy Jozue v Knihách Makabejcov pre objasnenie črt a pochopenie konania jej hrdinov.

Nasledujúce sekcie sa venovali podielu starozákonných prorockých charakterov na tvorbe novozákonného kánona. Tento posun sa odrazil v názve piatej sekcie: *Elijah in Gospels*. Prvý príspevok Branislava Klusku *Elijah and the Identity of Jesus in the Narrative of the Gospel accordig to Mark* sa zaoberal postavou Eliáša v najstaršom evanjeliu. Skúmaním evanjeliových textov s odkazom na Eliáša odkryl spoznávanie Ježišovej identity prostredníctvom starozákonných textov o Eliášovi tradovaných v čase Ježišových súčasníkov. Aj nasledujúci príspevok Petra Marečka *Elija: His Role and Importance in the Gospel of Luke* sústredil svoju pozornosť na vplyv starozákonných rozprávání o Eliášovi na formovanie textov opisujúcich Ježiša, jeho činnosť a učenie v Lukášovom evanjeliu. Autor zvolil cestu výkladu jednotlivých textov o Eliášovi v Lukášovom evanjeliu, čo mu umožnilo konkrétne a plasticky vykresliť spôsob práce novozákonného autora. Maurizio Marceselli

predniesol v taliančine príspevok *Portata e ruolo del riferimento a Elia nel vangelo di Giovanni*. Skúmal dve zmienky o Eliášovi v Jánovskej narácii prvého dňa Ježišovho pôsobenia (Jn 1,21.25), kde prorok vystupuje medzi charaktermi Mesiáša a proroka. Okrem toho si všimol odkaz v 4,50 a 20,22 v podobe participia „ho erchomenos“, ktoré Eliáša posúva do symboliky mesiášskeho charakteru. Avšak konečná identifikácia Ježiša s Eliášom si vyžaduje vyhodnotenie titulu „kyrios“ (1,23), ktorý grécka verzia SZ používa na preklad tetragramu.

Šiestu sekciu otvoril Štefan Novotný príspevkom *Skúška ohňom a vodou. Eliáš a Ježiš v Lk 12,49-50*. Súvisiace starozákonné a novozákonné texty skúmal z pohľadu typológie použitím princípov metódy intertextuality. Zdôraznil dôležitosť nového významového prínosu plynúceho zo vzájomného porovnania textov pre ich pochopenie pred jednoduchým poukázaním na spoločné prvky typológie alebo len lineárny posun významu od obrazu k symbolu. Juraj Feník sa vo svojom príspevku *Symbolika šiat v cykle Eliáša a Elizea a v Jánovom evanjeliu* zameril na fenomén antropologického symbolizmu, konkrétne symboliku šiat v starozákonných rozprávaniach a v Jánovom evanjeliu. Riešil otázku vykreslenia charakteru osoby za pomoci symboliky šiat a porovnal využitie a možnosti tohto druhu symboliky v uvedených textoch v ich vzájomnom prepojení. Sekciu uzavrelo vystúpenie Leventa Balása Martosa s príspevkom *Prophet and Remnant, Crisis and Renewal: Paul's Use of the Elijah Story in Romans 11*. Príspevok poukázal na skutočnosť, že skúsenosť s krízou a vyhorením nie je iba novodobý fenomén. Zdôraznenie psychologického aspektu biblických príbehov aktualizuje a novým spôsobom približuje paradigmatické texty zastreté aurou posvätnosti a ich často nereflektovanej znalosti.

Predposlednú, 7. sekciu s názvom *David and Elijah* otvoril Stanisław Hałas prednáškou *Il motivo dell'amore paterno di Dio in 2 Sam e 1 Cr. Sviluppo tematico*. Skúmal spracovanie motívu otcovskej lásky z 2Sam 7,14 v 1Krn. Dospel k záveru, že tu dochádza nielen k aktualizácii témy, ale k jej podstatnému rozšíreniu o koncept vyvolenia dávidovského kráľa, čo zodpovedá rastúcim mesiášskym očakávaniam doby. I keď Giacomo Claudio Bottini ospravedlnil svoju absenciu, poslal príspevok o vnútrobiblickej interpretácii Eliášovho prorockého pôsobenia *Elijah's Prayer in James 5:17-18: Continuity and Novelty in the Biblical Tradition*, ktorý bol prečítaný. Autor v ňom poukázal na celú paletu textov, ktoré v konečnom dôsledku prispeli k jeho interpretácii, pričom vplyvné texty nemuseli mať vždy pôvod len v biblickom kánone. Nové prvky oproti pôvodným textom mohli pochádzať zo širšieho fondu textov ako Pseudoepigrafy, Targúmy, rabínska literatúra či Starožitnosti od Jozefa Flávia a podobne. Jakubov list ponúka zaujímavé rozšírenie rozprávania o Eliášovej modlitbe (Jak 5,17-18) alebo o Ráchabe (2,25). V literárnom priestore Jakubovho listu, dokonca v rovnakej pasáži ako predchádzajúci príspevok, ostala aj prednáška Júliusa Pavelčíka *Eliáš v Jakubovom liste*, tentoraz z perspektívy kontextuálnej

interpretácie v rámci Jakubovho listu. Výsledkom bolo vnímanie eschatologického aspektu Eliášovej modlitby v rozmedzí biblickej teológie. Oba príspevky tak výborným spôsobom ukázali obohatenie, aké prináša voľba odlišnej metódy výkladu rovnakého textu.

Záverečná sekcia venovaná okrem Jozueho aj rozporuplným starozákonným ženám: *Rahab, Joshua and Jezabeel*, príspevkom Ladislava Tichého *Rahab the Prostitute in the New Testament* zvýraznila elitné miesto prostitútky Ráchab z Jericha v textoch Nového zákona. Autor rozobral tri novozákonné texty klasickou textovou analýzou, aby z nej vyvodil teologický význam vzťahu viery a skutkov. Jaroslav Brož v príspevku *Theological Implications of the Joshua/Rest Typologies in Hebrews 3 and 4* podrobil typologickej analýze meno „Jesus“ v Liste Hebrejom (4,8). Uvedené meno mohlo označovať Ježiša a rovnako aj Jozueho, oboch Mojžišových nástupcov. Kontext kap. 3–4 ukazuje, že autor Listu Hebrejom zámerne pracoval s typologickým vzťahom Jozue/Ježiš. Vystúpenie Francesca Piazollu s referátom *The Re-reading of Jezabeel and Elijah Characters in the Book of Revelation* príznačne uzatvorilo sekciu štúdiom starozákonných charakterov v poslednom novozákonnom spise, v Knihe zjavenia. Kniha zjavenia ponúka reлектúru a interpretáciu biblických postáv zrkadliacu aktuálnu teologickú perspektívu novozákonného autora.

Záver medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie zďaleka neznamenal jej ukončenie. Večer druhého dňa konferencie sa niesol vo sviatočnej a slávnostnej atmosfére vytvorenej otvorením výstavy *Proroci v ikonách*. Vzácné ikony pochádzali z osobnej zbierky Ing. Milana Urbaníka, ktorý ich poskytol výstave po dobu celého jedného mesiaca od jej otvorenia. Ikony boli vystavené nielen na nazeranie, ale aj priblížené odborným slovným a vizuálnym výkladom PhDr. Jozefa Matulu, PhD., sprevádzaným pôsobivým vystúpením internej doktorandky Vysoké školy múzických umení v Bratislave – flautistky Mgr. art. Kataríny Turčinovej. Samotné otvorenie výstavy bolo pohladením duše s črtami liturgie, do ktorej voviedol prof. Emanuel Tov prednesom hebrejského textu o Eliášovi. Nasledujúci deň bol venovaný spoznávaní blízkych kultúrnych pamiatok, zámku v Slovenskej Ľupči a historického centra mesta Banská Bystrica za asistencie odborných lektorov.

Nemožno nevyjadriť veľú vďaku organizátorom konferencie za jej vynikajúcu prípravu nielen čo sa týka organizácie, ubytovania, informácií o konferencii i o navštívenom priestore, poskytnutia liturgického priestoru a času, technického zabezpečenia a funkčnosti konferenčných priestorov, ale i za mnohé detaily ohľadom komfortu, ktoré skôr prislúchajú rekreácii ako pracovnej konferencii. Za mnohé tu možno spomenúť vynikajúcu kuchyňu, kávu prvotriednej kvality podávanú profesionálmi z firmy Cipolla caffè, občerstvenie. To všetko vytvorilo neopakovateľnú atmosféru, ktorá podnietila okrem množstva osobných

zážitkov u jednotlivých účastníkov konferencie aj vzájomné stretnutia, spomienky a nové zoznámenia.

Dr. theol. Miroslav Varšo
Spoločenskovedný ústav CSPV SAV
Karpatská 5
040 01 Košice

Umrel biblista a teológ prof. Petr Pokorný

Redakcia *StBiSl* so zármutkom prijala správu, že 18. januára 2020 do večnosti odišiel prof. ThDr. Petr Pokorný, DrSc., dr.h.c (1933 – 2020). Profesor Pokorný bol uznávaný dlhoročný profesor novozákonnej teológie nielen na Evanjelickej teologickej fakulte Karlovej univerzity v Prahe (ETF UK), kde pracoval od r. 1968. Ako hosťujúci alebo zastupujúci profesor pôsobil na viacerých zahraničných univerzitách (Pittsburgh, Tübingen, Petrohrad) a bol tiež členom viacerých vedeckých organizácií (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft für Theologie, Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Učená spoločnosť České republiky). Prof. Pokorný bol aj zakladateľom (1998) i riaditeľom (2001 – 2010) Centra biblických štúdií Univerzity Karlovy a Akademie vied České republiky.

Práca prof. Pokorného sa sústreďovala na interpretáciu synoptických evanjelií a deuteropavlovských listov, zvlášť Listu Kolosanom a Efezanom. Publikoval však aj komentár k apokryfnému Tomášovmu evanjeliu a z jeho pera tiež vyšli tak prehľadové diela o Novom zákone ako aj monografie o kristológii¹.

Citujúc z nekrológu, ktorý napísali kolegovia prof. Pokorného, jeho odchodom do večnosti, nielen ETF UK ale aj biblický svet, stráca „podnikavého badateľa mezinárodného vŕhlasu a neúnavného organizátora vedecké práce, ktorý hlbokou erudíci v biblistice, teológii, filológii i filozofii spjoval s přátelsky otevřenou určitostí svědka křesťanské víry.“²

¹ Len v príručke ŠTRBA, Blažej: Bibliografía biblických vied slovenskej a českej proveniencie (1989 – 2013). Bibliography of biblical sciences of Slovak and Czech provenance (1989 – 2013) (*StBiSlSup*), vlastným nákladom: Badín, 2014, možno nájsť zadokumentovaných až 55 diel prof. Pokorného.

² Dostupné online na: <https://biblica.sk/download/nekrolog-prof-petr-pokorny/>

Redakcii *StBiSl* je preto ct'ou, že v roku 2019 bol prof. Petr Pokorný súčasťou Redakčnej rady *StBiSl*. Kiež jeho vedecké skúmanie Svätého písma zostáva inšpiráciou pre ďalšie generácie biblistov a teológov.

Redakcia StBiSl