

Contents

Treaties

Maurizio GIROLAMI

Hellenistic Interpretation of the Hebrew Text of Prov 8:22-31 up to the Beginning of the Christian Era 127-156

Stefan M. ATTARD

Self-Portrayal as a 'Fence around Torah': An Ethical Critique of Eleazar's Martyrdom in 2 Maccabees 6:18-31 157-179

Kenneth L. WATERS Sr

Jesus and the Passover in Mark 14:1-12: A Chronological Confusion? 180-210

Július PAVELČÍK

The Book of Acts 12:25 – A Contextual Interpretation 211-230

Notes

Blažej ŠTRBA

Traces of the "Spirit of Wisdom" in the Old Testament 231-250

Abstracts and Reviews 251-261

Communications and References 262-268



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 XIV (2022), číslo 2

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

Redakčná rada/Editorial board:

Georg BRAULIK, OSB (Wien, AT)	Róbert LAPKO (Košice, SK)
Jaroslav BROŽ (Praha, CZ)	Adam MACKERLE (České Budějovice, CZ)
Núria CALDUCH-BENAGES (Roma, IT)	Libor MAREK (Detroit, US)
Jeremy CORLEY (Dublin, IE)	Helena PANCZOVÁ (Bratislava, SK)
Peter DUBOVSKÝ, SJ (Roma, IT)	Jaroslav RINDOŠ, SJ (Bratislava, SK)
Pavol FARKAŠ (Nitra, SK)	Milan SOVA (Bratislava, SK)
Juraj FENÍK (Košice, SK)	Jozef TIŇO (Bratislava, SK)
Massimo GRILLI (Roma, IT)	Emanuel TOV (Jerusalem, IL)
Leslie HOPPE, OFM (Chicago, US)	František TRSTENSKÝ (Spišské Podhradie, SK)
Peter JUHÁS (Münster, DE)	Miroslav VARŠO (Košice, SK)
Branislav KLUSKA (Ružomberok, SK)	Ian YOUNG (Sydney, AU)

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

Za recenzovanie všetkých článkov zodpovedá redakčná rada.

Obálka: Karol Hájiček

Na príprave spolupracovali: Alessandro Cavichia, OFM, 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. Príspevok typu štúdia, poznámka alebo reflexia musí byť doplnený abstraktom a jeho anglickou verziou, anglickým názvom príspevku, max. piatimi kľúčovými slovami v slovenčine/češtine a angličtine, zoznamom bibliografie a kontaktom na autora príspevku. Nevyžiadané rukopisy sa nevracajú. Redakcia si vyhradzuje právo upraviť titulok a vykonať potrebnú jazykovú a štylistickú úpravu prijatých príspevkov. 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, 12/2022
Vychádza dvakrát do roka.
Cena: 9 €

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

Obsah

Štúdie

Maurizio GIROLAMI

Helenistický výklad hebrejského textu Prís 8,22-31 až po začiatok kresťanského obdobia 127-156

Stefan M. ATTARD

Sebapredstavenie ako „ochranný plot okolo Tóry“. Etická kritika Eleazarovho mučeníctva v 2 Mach 6,18-31 157-179

Kenneth L. WATERS Sr

Ježiš a Pascha v Mk 14,1-12. Chronologický zmätok? 180-210

Július PAVELČÍK

Kniha Skutkov 12,25 – Kontextový výklad 211-230

Poznámky

Blažej ŠTRBA

Stopy „ducha múdrosti“ v Starom zákone 231-250

Abstrakty a recenzie 251-261

Správy a oznamy 262-268

Hellenistic Interpretation of the Hebrew Text of Prov 8:22-31 up to the Beginning of the Christian Era*

Maurizio Girolami

1 Introduction

The attention of scholars to the poetic text of Prov 8:22-31 has already highlighted the stylistic and semantic difference between the Hebrew version and the Greek version of the LXX. This present paper will briefly recall some of these important differences in order to underline the high degree of elaboration of the Greek translation. The main aim of the investigation is to study the earliest receptions of the text between the 2nd century B.C. and the beginning of the 1st century A.D. In fact, the re-readings of the Hebrew and Greek text of Prov 8 through this period gives useful perspectives that enrich current exegesis and helps to better understand the development of wisdom's idea close to the Christian era. The possible references to the text in Hellenistic Judaism will be analysed, with special attention to Philo of Alexandria and to the paratestamentary Jewish literature.

Among the most influential theological aspects of Prov 8:22-31 on Jewish, Hebrew and Greek literature is the original and unprecedented presentation of the personification of Wisdom as a feminine being (חֵכְמָה in Hebrew is feminine)¹: she is a more precious treasure than any earthly good (Prov 8:11.19), she preaches the truth (vv. 7-9), and she is the first creature to assist God in the organisation of the world (v. 22). This last aspect, concerning the presence, more

* This study is a shorter English elaboration of the Italian paper presented in Madrid in the occasion of the XVIII Jornadas de estudio “La Filiación en los inicios de la reflexión Cristiana” promoted by the University of San Damaso (November, 15-17, 2021).

¹ חֵכְמָה is also feminine in Hebrew and is sometimes directly related to the word חֵכְמָה: cfr. Gen 41:38-39; Exod 31:3; Deut 34:9: see CONTI, *La sapienza personificata*, 127-152.

or less active, of Wisdom in God's creative act, is understood in different ways: according to Job 28 LXX, the inaccessibility to the Wisdom is reaffirmed, in contrast to the idea of a divine mediation of her; according to Sir 24 and Bar 3:9-4:4, Wisdom, while dwelling in the whole world, manifests a particular closeness to Israel (Sir 24:8) and the Torah is considered a personification of Wisdom (24:23), as the beginning of the rabbinic text of Genesis Rabbah also argues; 1 Enoch (42:1-2) emphasises her rejection by humanity; her most extensive characterisation occurs in the book of Wisdom, where her being present in the act of creation is taken up (Wis 9:9). Last but not least, in the earliest Christian texts one can see an attribution of the sapiential connotations of pre-existence in the world to the Christ figure, of active participation in the creation and ordering of the cosmos. Of great importance is text's use during the Arian crisis with all its theological repercussions.

2 Textual differences between MT and LXX and the particular interpretation of the Greek versions of Prov 8:22-31

We briefly present the textual differences between the Hebrew and the Greek text of Prov 8:22-31, because in such textual differences the different interpretations of Wisdom are rooted². It is not known whether the Greek translators had a different Hebrew text in their hands from the one we have received³.

Various linguistic arguments have been put forward to date the Greek translation of Proverbs⁴. Some of them as early as the first half of the 2nd century B.C.⁵ under the reign of Ptolemy VI Philomethoros (181–145 B.C.). Others no earlier than the 1st century B.C. due to the concomitance with Greek translations

² GERLEMAN, *Studies*, 5 affirms that the differences are not due to a different Hebrew text than the Masoretic one, but to the way of working of the translator.

³ FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 326-327; COOK, *A Theology*, 1-11.

⁴ CIMOSA, *Proverbi*, 34-36; FOX, *A Profile*, 3-17.

⁵ On the influence of Plato's *Timaeus* (34-41), HENGEL, *Judentum*, 292-295. LELIÈVRE – MAILLOT, *Commentaire*, 240-248 see an influence of Prov 8 in the 2nd cent. B.C. already.

of the book of Job, although none of these are conclusive⁶. The influence of Prov LXX on the book of Wisdom, at the end of the 1st century B.C., places the Greek translation in an earlier time⁷. Scholars agree in considering Alexandria the place of origin, but also the Palestinian context has been hypothesised⁸.

Table: The Text of Prov 8:21a-31

MT ⁹	Verse	LXX ¹⁰	NETS ¹¹
	21a	ἐὰν ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν γινόμενα, μνημονεύσω τὰ ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀριθμηῆσαι.	If I report to you the things that happen daily, I will remember to enumerate the things of old.
יְהוָה קִנְנִי רֵאשִׁית דְּרָכָיו קִדְּם מִפְּעֻלָּיו מֵאֶז:	22	κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ,	The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways, for the sake of his works.
מֵעוֹלָם נִסְכַּחְתִּי מֵרֵאשִׁית מִקְדָּמֵי־אַרְצָה:	23	πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέν με ἐν ἀρχῇ,	Before the present age he founded me, in the beginning.
בְּאִין־תְּהוֹמוֹת חוֹלְלָתִי בְּאִין מְעִינֹת נִבְבְּדֵי־מַיִם:	24	πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τὰς ἀβύσσους ποιῆσαι, πρὸ τοῦ προελθεῖν τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων,	Before he made the earth and before he made the depths, before he brought forth the springs of the waters,
בְּטָרֵם הַרִים הִטְבְּעוּ לִפְנֵי גְבְעוֹת חוֹלְלָתִי:	25	πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἐδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με.	before the mountains were established and before all the hills, he begets me.
עַד־לֹא עָשָׂה אֶרֶץ וְחוֹצוֹת יְרֵאשׁ עֲפָרוֹת תְּבָל:	26	κύριος ἐποίησεν χώρας καὶ ἀοικήτους καὶ ἄκρα	The Lord made countries and uninhabited spaces and the habitable heights

⁶ GERLEMAN, *Studies*, 58-63.

⁷ CHARLES, *The Apocrypha*, 520; YODER, *Proverbs*, 906.

⁸ GAMMIE, *The Septuagint*, 14-30; COOK, *The dating*, 383-399; COOK, *The Septuagint*; COOK, *Were the LXX*, 129-156.

⁹ ELLIGER – RUDOLPH, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.

¹⁰ All Greek texts of Septuagint are taken from RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*.

¹¹ English version of all texts is taken from PIETERSMA – WRIGHT, *A New English Translation (NETS)*.

<p>בְּהַכִּינּוֹ שָׁמַיִם שָׁם אֲנִי בְּחֻקוֹ חָגַגְתִּי עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹמֹת</p>	27	<p>οἰκούμενα τῆς ὑπὸ οὐρανῶν. ἤνικα ἠτοίμαζεν τὸν οὐρανόν, συνπαρήμην αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅτε ἀφώριζεν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ θρόνον ἐπ' ἀνέμων·</p>	<p>of what is under heaven When he prepared the sky, I was present with him, and when he marked out his own throne on the winds.</p>
<p>בְּאַמְצָן שְׁחֻקִים מְמַעַל בְּעִזּוֹ עִינּוֹת תְהוֹמֹת:</p>	28	<p>ἤνικα ἰσχυρὰ ἐποίησε τὰ ἄνω νέφη, καὶ ὡς ἀσφαλεῖς ἐτίθει πηγάς τῆς ὑπὸ οὐρανόν, Ἐν τῷ τιθεναὶ αὐτὸν τῇ <u>θαλασσῇ ακριβασμῶν</u> <u>αὐτοῦ</u> <u>Και ὑδάτα οὐ</u> <u>παραλευσεται στομα</u> <u>αὐτοῦ</u></p>	<p>When he made strong the clouds above and when he made secure the springs</p>
<p>בְּשִׁמּוֹ לַיָּם חֻקוֹ וּמִיָּם לֹא יַעֲבְרוּ-פְּנֵי בְּחֻקוֹ מוֹסְדֵי אֲרֶץ:</p>	29	<p>καὶ ἰσχυρὰ ἐποίησε τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς.</p>	<p>of what is under heaven, when he made strong the foundations of the earth,</p>
<p>וְאֶהְיֶה אִצְלוֹ אִמּוֹן וְאֶהְיֶה שְׂעֵשְׁעִים יוֹם יוֹם מִשְׁחֻקֹת לְפָנָיו בְּכָל-עֵת:</p>	30	<p>ἦμην παρ' αὐτῷ ἀρμόζουσα· ἐγὼ ἦμην ἧ προσέχαιρην. καθ' ἡμέραν δὲ εὐφραϊνόμενη ἐν προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ,</p>	<p>I was beside him, fitting together; it is I whom he took delight. And each day I was glad in his presence at every moment,</p>
<p>מִשְׁחֻקֹת בְּתֵבֶל אֲרֶץ וְשְׂעֵשְׁעִי אֶת-בְּנֵי אָדָם: פ</p>	31	<p>ὅτε εὐφραίνετο τὴν οἰκουμένην συντελέσας καὶ ἐνευφραίνετο ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων.</p>	<p>when he rejoiced after he had completed the world and rejoiced among the sons of men.</p>

2.1 Additions and Omissions in Prov 8:22-31 LXX

The Greek LXX¹² adds v. 21a as a connection between the text of Prov 8:21 and 8:22. The second stich of v. 23 in the Hebrew text is the beginning of v. 24 LXX followed by the conjunction *καί*.

In v. 24 and v. 25, the verb הוֹלִלְתִּיח, “to beget” (in the *polal* “to be given birth”), is translated only in the v. 25 with the present tense γεννᾷ¹³. In the v. 24 the translation of הוֹלִלְתִּיח is missing but LXX adds ποιῆσαι at the mention of earth/depths.

At the beginning of v. 26 the LXX introduces the noun κύριος, missing in the MT but already present in v. 22 as the translation of יהוה, moreover the Greek resolves the Hebrew word לַבַּיִת with τῆς ὑπ’ οὐρανόν.

In v. 27, the statement אֲנִי שֵׁשׁ is interpreted with the compound verb συναρμήμην and the personal pronoun αὐτῶ. The Greek expression συναρμήμην αὐτῶ concretises the presence of Wisdom at the Lord (αὐτῶ vs שֵׁשׁ). Furthermore, the statement הוּם עַל-פְּנֵי is reinterpreted as τὸν ἑαυτοῦ θρόνον ἐπ’ ἀνέμων¹⁴.

In contrast to the three stanzas in v. 29 MT, the LXX reads only the third one¹⁵, while the first two are given in the apparatuses of critical editions¹⁶.

Due to the stylistic and poetic considerations, the Hebrew and Greek texts of Prov 8:22-31 are not in a strict synopsis. While the former has its turning point at the end of v. 26 (vv. 22-26; vv. 27-31)¹⁷, the latter at v. 25 (the presence of κύριος in vv. 22-26; the preposition πρό that is employed in vv. 23-25 and the καὶ ὅτε/καὶ ὡς that appears in vv. 27-31). The two sections, vv. 22-25 and vv. 26-31, of the Greek text are proportionally balanced: in the first part, consisting of six verses (vv. 22-25), Wisdom’s presence is emphasised prior to God’s creative act: Wisdom is created/begotten (the parallel expressions ἔκτισέν με // γεννᾷ με frame

¹² RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*, II, 196-197.

¹³ In the third singular person, γεννᾷ, occurs in Ps 2:7; 44:17; Job 38:21, then in John 1:13; Heb 1:5; 5:5.

¹⁴ PASSONI DELL’ACQUA, *La sapienza*, 132; D’HAMONVILLE, *Les Proverbes*, 129 affirms that the idea of “throne”, as the top of the cosmos, is not present in the MT, but only in the LXX.

¹⁵ COOK, *The Septuagint*, 209.

¹⁶ See RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*, 197; and also PASSONI DELL’ACQUA, *La sapienza*, 132.

¹⁷ ALETTI, *Proverbes*, 25-37.

the entire section of vv. 22-25); while the second section, made up of twelve verses (vv. 26-31), focuses on the joy of Wisdom in creating the universe at the Lord's side, and the frame of vv. 26 and 31 is visible in the use of the words with the *οικ-* stem: *ἀοικήτους, οἰκούμενα* (v. 26) // *οἰκουμένην* (v. 31).

Stylistically, vv. 22 and 26 share the same subject (*κύριος*) and the verb in the aorist (*ἔκτισεν* and *ἐποίησεν*), both belonging to the semantic field of creation¹⁸.

2.2 *The Two Semantic Novelties of the LXX Greek Translation*

Several points in the Greek text show that the translation was a free work of interpretation. Since antiquity, two main philological questions have kept the scholarly attention. The first issue is found in v. 22: the Hebrew verb *הָנִיחַ* is rendered by the LXX with *ἔκτισεν*, while Philo, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion attest *ἐκτίσατο*. *הָנִיחַ*, in fact, can be translated as “create”, “generate” or “acquire”¹⁹. Only the latter meaning was chosen by Philo and the Greek translators of the 2nd century A.D. Whereas the meaning “to create” implies a relationship of strict dependence of Wisdom on God, because she is his creature, and she is the beginning of all his works, the meaning “to acquire” indicates that Wisdom has its own autonomous identity independent of God and she is at His side from the beginning in the ordering of the world.

The second semantic issue that is particularly difficult to resolve is the Greek participle *ἀρμόζουσα* in v. 30, as the translation of the noun *יִמְנָס*, which can refer either to the activity of an architect or to that of a “harmonising bond”²⁰. Theodotion and Symmachus translate *παίζουσα* and *ἐστηριγμένη*, “who plays” and “leans”, while Aquila *τιθηνομένη*, “nurturer”, “she who nourishes”, “cares”. A. Passoni dell'Acqua suggests that LXX follows criterion of assonance: a Greek

¹⁸ D'HAMONVILLE, *Les Proverbes*, 89.

¹⁹ Cfr. LIPINSKI, *qānā*, 1018-1026.

²⁰ COOK, *Septuagint*, 230-231; LELIÈVRE-MAILLOT, *Proverbes*, 242-243; MURPHY, *Proverbs*, 52-53; OESTERLEY, *Proverbs*, 64-65; ROGERS, *Meaning*, 208-221.

word has been chosen whose sound is similar to the sound of the Hebrew word. She also presents the opinion of G. Gerleman²¹: it was borrowed from Stoicism²².

3 Texts and Themes of Prov 8:22-31 in Hellenistic Judaism

The Greek text of the Jewish Scripture was the Bible of Diaspora Judaism. Also, the first Christian authors used this Greek version for the composition of the first memories of Jesus. After the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. and the separation between Judaism and the Christian movement, at the end of the 1st century already, the Greek texts – both translations and those written directly in Greek, such as Wisdom – were progressively marginalised from the religious life of Judaism. In this part we examine some works of Hellenistic Judaism that speak of the personification of Wisdom, inspired by Prov 8²³. We begin with Aristobulus' works, whose fragments have come mostly through Eusebius of Caesarea, the philosopher who first attempted to harmonize the biblical tradition within the Alexandrian philosophical context. He will be followed by Philo. Aware of the difficulty of specifying the correct chronology of the texts, the Greek versions of Job, Baruch, Sirach and the Book of Wisdom will be presented next, without neglecting the important testimony of the Book of Jubilees. The Qumran texts, which were-also affected by the climate of the Diaspora, will be also included in this section. Our investigation on Prov 8 in the Hellenistic

²¹ PASSONI DELL'ACQUA, La sapienza, 134: "alcuni pensano – e ci sembra un'ipotesi assai probabile – che sui LXX abbia influito – qui come altrove – il criterio dell'assonanza: essi cioè dovettero scegliere una parola greca che suonasse in modo uguale – o simile – al termine ebraico che dovevano tradurre. G. Gerleman, invece, ritiene che la scelta del traduttore sia stata influenzata dalla filosofia stoica, che vede nella Sapienza la 'creatrice di armonia', l'accomodatrice".

²² See Chrysippus (ed. VON ARNIM, *Stoici*), *Frag.* 459 (pp. 576-577); 719 (pp. 686-687); 1130 (pp. 930-933).

²³ Although Flavius Josephus knows the existence of the book of Proverbs, he never mentions it, nor there is any reference to the text of Prov 8:22-31. According to CHARLESWORTH, *Pseudepigrapha*, II, 499, other texts of post-biblical Judaism that refer to Prov 8:22-31 are: *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* 5,3 (II–III A.D.) [to whom refer the *Apostolic Constitutions* 7,36,1-7]; *Odes of Solomon* (41,9 and passim); *Ahiqar* (V B.C.–II A.D.) 94. A brief excursus on reception of Prov 8 can be found in LOADER, *Proverbs*, 367-375; CLIFFORD, *Proverbs*, 98-99.

witnesses can help us to understand not only the reception, but also to re-read the Hebrew and Greek text of Prov 8 with perspectives that enrich current exegesis.

3.1 *Aristobulus*

An allusion to the text of Prov 8:22-31 LXX can be found in the work of the Alexandrian author Aristobulus, whose literary activity flourished during the reign of Ptolemy Philomethor VI (181–145 B.C.)²⁴. We know some fragments of his work through Eusebius of Caesarea, the *Praeparatio Evangelica* (13,12,9-12):

⁹ To this, after an interval, he adds what follows: With this it is closely connected, that God the Creator of the whole world (ὁ θεός, <δς> τὸν ὅλον κόσμον κατεσκεύακε), has also given us the seventh day as a rest, because for all men life is full of troubles: which day indeed might naturally be called the first birth of light, whereby all things are beheld.

¹⁰ The same thought might also be metaphorically applied in the case of wisdom, for from it all light proceeds. And it has been said by some who were of the Peripatetic School that wisdom is in place of a beacon-light, for by following it constantly men will be rendered free from trouble through their whole life.

¹¹ But more clearly and more beautifully one of our forefathers, Solomon, said that it has existed before heaven and earth; which indeed agrees with what has been said above²⁵. But what is clearly stated by the Law, that God rested on the seventh day, means not, as some suppose, that God henceforth ceases to do anything, but it refers to the fact that, after He has brought the arrangement of His works to completion, He has arranged them thus for all time.

¹² For it points out that in six days He made the heaven and the earth and all things that are therein, to distinguish the times, and predict the order in which one thing comes before another: for after arranging their order, He keeps them so, and makes no change. He has also plainly declared that the seventh day is ordained for us by the Law, to be a sign of that

²⁴ CLEMENS OF ALEXANDRIA, *Stromata* 5,14,97 identifies Aristobulus of 2 Macc 1:10 with the author of philosophical writings.

²⁵ From 10 to 11 (first part) is the fr. 1 quoted by EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 7,14,1.

which is our seventh faculty, namely reason, whereby we have knowledge of things human and divine²⁶.

According to Aristobulus, Wisdom existed before the creation of heaven and earth and the book of Wisdom was composed by Solomon who was traditionally considered the author of the books of Proverbs, Qohelet and Song of Songs in the Jewish and Christian world²⁷. After quoting the Peripatetics, the Alexandrian philosopher argues that the son of David wrote about Wisdom in a “clear and appropriate manner” (σαφέστερον δὲ καὶ κάλλιον²⁸): she accompanies God’s creative work not only in its beginning, but also in the preservation of the order of creation, that is conceived as a continuation of the creative act. The context of the passage concerns the explanation of Sabbath rest and the meaning of work, compared to the creative act of God, who worked for six days and rested on the seventh. It should be noted that Wisdom is compared to the seventh day, which is also the “first” day, as the “generation of light”: in fact, all light comes from her.

The allusion to Prov 8:22-31 does not allow us to conclude anything about Aristobulus’ possible reading of the Hebrew text: it confirms that the source of the Alexandrian author was probably the Greek text of the LXX. Following Aristobulus’ argumentation, it is interesting that he claims the temporal priority of the Jewish Scripture over the Greek philosophers²⁹, according to the principle that what is before is more important than what comes after. Moreover, he adds that the agreement (σύμφωνον³⁰) between Greek philosophers and Bible should be noted as an expression of the reliability of the Bible itself, because Word of God inspires the philosophers through time.

²⁶ EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 13,12,9-16 (Eng. trans. E.H. Gifford, 1903).

²⁷ Even Pss 72 and 127 are attributed to him: see TORIJANO, Solomon, 1237-1238.

²⁸ DENIS, *Fragmenta*, ll. 87-88.

²⁹ Aristobulus is the first witness of the idea of a temporal and theological priority of the Law of Moses over the Greek philosophers. This conviction had a long reception in Jewish authors (see PHILO, *Mos.* 2,2-3; JOSEPH FLAVIUS, *Contra Apionem* 2,168) and also in Christian authors (see the idea of the “theft from the Greeks”). Cfr. BOWLEY, Aristobulus, 378-379.

³⁰ DENIS, *Fragmenta*, ll. 91.

3.2 Job 28 LXX

The LXX Greek text of Job, shorter than the Hebrew one, is not free of textual uncertainties. Some scholars suggest the existence of another Hebrew *Vorlage* as the origin of the Greek translation³¹. Origen, composing the *Hexapla*, integrated the text with the translation of Theodotion, using the appropriate diacritical marks we find in the *Hexapla*. The Greek version is closer to be a paraphrase than a translation. Since Job 28 LXX could have been composed in the same period as Prov, one should note, on the one hand, the creative context of the preciousness of divine Wisdom, and, on the other hand, her strong ethical dimension which is an indispensable quality for being in the correct relationship with the mystery of God. The spirit of balance and measure that governs the universe is the reason to refer to his divine mystery, not to conceive Wisdom like an entity alongside God.

¹² “But wisdom—where was it found? / And of what sort is the place of knowledge?”

¹³ No mortal knows its way, / nor will it ever be discovered among human beings.

²⁰ “But wisdom (ἡ δὲ σοφία) – where was it found? And of what sort is the place of knowledge?”

²¹ It has escaped notice by any human (λέληθεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον), [²¹*³²and it was hidden from birds of the air.

²² *Destruction and death (ἡ ἀπώλεια καὶ ὁ θάνατος) said.]²² but we have heard of its renown.

²³ “God has established well its way, and he himself knows its place (ὁ θεὸς εὖ συνέστησεν αὐτῆς τὴν ὁδὸν / αὐτὸς δὲ οἶδεν τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς).

In Job Wisdom is hidden from man and accessible only to her source, God; this idea is contrary to that of Prov 8:31, where Wisdom is described rejoicing among men and with Him in creation.

³¹ See BAKON, Two hymns, 222-230; COOK, Were the LXX, 129-156.

³² Since the Old Greek was shorter the Hebrew, in the Hexapla Origen marked with the asterisk the Greek text taken typically from Theodotion, in order to make it the same length as the Hebrew (NETS, 669).

The terminological contacts between Job 28 and Prov 8:22-31 are weak (ἐν ἀνθρώποις of Job 28:12 and Prov 8:31³³; τὴν ὁδὸν of Job 28:23³⁴ and Prov 8:22) but the sapiential reflection on the “first of God’s works” is clear. If in Prov Wisdom is a relational being who dwells with God, inhabits the world and rejoices among men (Prov 8:31), in Job it completely belongs to the mystery of God. Man does not have access to Wisdom and he has to seek it as a reality more precious than gold and gems by cultivating the fear of God, the only possible virtue for every truly wise man: “Behold, the fear of the Lord, this is wisdom; avoiding evil, this is intelligence” (Job 28:28). Thus, the book of Job keeps distinct two meanings: on the one hand, creative Wisdom remains unknowable, because it belongs to the mystery of God, unreachable by any human effort; on the other hand, the fear of the absolute primacy of God’s action towards the world is the only wisdom granted to man.

3.3 *Baruch 3:29–4:4*

The book of Baruch cannot be dated before the 2nd century B.C.³⁵ The Greek redaction has similarities to the book of Sirach, whose Greek version was written in the same period. In Bar 3:38, there is the idea that the Wisdom of God came down from heaven and dwelt among men. These clues tend to place Baruch in the middle of the second century or a few decades later.

- ²⁹ Who has gone up into the sky and taken her and brought her down from the clouds?
³⁰ Who has crossed over the sea and found her and will bring her in exchange for choice gold?
³¹ There is no one who is familiar with her way, nor one who thinks much about her path.
³² But he who knows all things is familiar with her; he discovered her by his intelligence; he who equipped the earth for all time, he filled it with quadrupeds.
³³ He who sends the light, and it goes – he summoned it and it obeyed him, with a shudder,

³³ RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*, 316.

³⁴ RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*, 316.

³⁵ SCHÖKEL – SICRE DIAZ, *I Profeti*, 1506; WRIGHT, *Baruch*, 148.

- ³⁴ but the stars shone in their watches and were glad (εὐφράνθησαν);
³⁵ he called them, and they said, “We are present!” They shone with gladness for him who made them.
³⁶ This is our God; no other will be reckoned with him.
³⁷ He discovered the whole way of knowledge (ἐξεῦρεν πᾶσαν ὁδὸν ἐπιστήμης) and gave her to his servant Iakob (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν Ἰακώβ) and to Israel who was loved by him (τῷ παιδί αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ).
³⁸ After this she appeared on earth (μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη) and associated among humans (καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη).
^{4.1} She is the book of the decrees of God (αὕτη ἡ βίβλος τῶν προσταγμάτων τοῦ θεοῦ) and the law that remains forever (καὶ ὁ νόμος ὁ ὑπάρχων εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).
 All who seize her are for life (πάντες οἱ κρατοῦντες αὐτῆς εἰς ζωὴν), but those who forsake her will die (οἱ δὲ καταλείποντες αὐτὴν ἀποθανοῦνται).

Baruch 3:29-30 are an echo of Deut 30:12 and Job 28:12-20 LXX. In Bar 3:34 there is the verb εὐφράνθησαν which occurs three times in Prov 8:30-31. Baruch 3:38 clearly has the idea that Wisdom has appeared and dwelt among men³⁶. In radical contrast to Job’s transcendent view, the book of Baruch affirms the presence of Wisdom in the cosmic order and the historical people of Israel. Baruch 4:1 is likened to Sir 24:23: Wisdom is compared to the book of the covenant³⁷. The idea that wisdom as source of life is condensed into a book may have been preceded by the notion of the “book of the living” (Ps 69:29 MT); we find a development of this metaphor in the “book of life” in the New Testament (Phil 4:3; Rev 3:5; 20:15)³⁸.

³⁶ This text inspired John 1:3 and 1:14. IRENAEUS, *Expositio* 12 and 97 (and *Adversus Haereses* 4,20,4) opportunely takes up the text of Baruch as a forerunner of the incarnation of the Word of God.

³⁷ Sir 24:23: ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ Ὑψίστου, νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο Μωυσῆς κληρονομίαν συναγωγᾶς Ἰακώβ.

³⁸ FABBRI, *Baruc*, 78.

3.4 *Sirach*

According to Sirach, Prol. 27, the translation of the book into Greek took place in the “thirty-eighth year of King Evergetes” (132 B.C.), and had an amplified rewriting in the second half of the 2nd century A.D. In Sir 50:27 we read that Ben Sira wrote the book in Hebrew, probably before the not-mentioned Maccabaic revolt around 200–180 B.C. His nephew then arrived in Alexandria in 132 B.C. and translated into Greek, considering it a work of great pedagogical value for the Jews of the diaspora. Following Baruch, Ben Sira too underlines the closeness between Law and Wisdom³⁹. The historical character of the Mosaic Law is raised to the level of divine revelation, thus the normative value of the books of the Pentateuch is extended universally and cosmologically⁴⁰. Sirach reaffirms the superior and universal character of the particular law given to Israel.

The existence of Wisdom as the first of God’s works is affirmed at the beginning of the book (Sir 1:4):

Before all things wisdom has been created (προτέρα πάντων ἔκτισται σοφία), and understanding of prudence is from eternity (καὶ σύνεσις φρονήσεως ἐξ αἰῶνος).

The impossibility to know the secrets of the cosmos, and those of God and his Wisdom, is a known argument, as we read in Job 28. Only Wisdom was present at the moment of the creation of the world and therefore only she can know the deep order that governs the universe⁴¹. The theological passive ἔκτισται⁴² should be noted because it denotes the absolute primacy of God in all divine creative action.

The juxtaposition of Wisdom with Torah is the most remarkable contribution of Sirach’s reflection expressed in Sir 24:3-9:

³⁹ BONNARD, *De la Sagesse personnifiée*, 117-149; SKEHAN, *Structures*, 365-379.

⁴⁰ PALMISANO, *Siracide*, 15: “Ben Sira dedica inoltre particolare attenzione alla relazione esistente tra sapienza e Legge. Quest’ultima è intesa come insegnamento derivante dalla storia che in Sir 24 ha carattere inclusivo giungendo a comprendere l’intera rivelazione divina, superando quindi i confini del Pentateuco. La Legge poi non si identifica con la sapienza, come avviene nella tradizione giudaica, ma ne rappresenta l’espressione migliore”.

⁴¹ PALMISANO, *Siracide*, 42-43.

⁴² PALMISANO, *Siracide*, 42.

- ³ I came forth from the mouth of the Most High (Ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος Ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον),
and like a mist I covered earth (καὶ ὡς ὀμίχλη κατεκάλυψα γῆν).
- ⁴ I encamped in the heights (ἐγὼ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατεσκήνωσα),
and my throne was in a pillar of cloud (καὶ ὁ θρόνος μου ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης).
- ⁵ A circle of sky I encircled alone (γῦρον οὐρανοῦ ἐκύκλωσα μόνη),
and in the deep of abysses I walked (καὶ ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιεπάτησα).
- ⁶ In the waves of the sea and in all the earth (ἐν κύμασιν θαλάσσης καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ),
and in every people and nation I led (καὶ ἐν παντὶ λαῷ καὶ ἔθνει ἐκτησάμην).
- ⁷ With all these I sought repose (μετὰ τούτων πάντων ἀνάπαυσιν ἐζήτησα),
and in whose inheritance I would settle (καὶ ἐν κληρονομίᾳ τίνος ἀυλισθήσομαι).
- ⁸ Then the creator of all commanded me (τότε ἐνετείλατο μοι ὁ κτίστης ἀπάντων),
and he who created me put down my tent (καὶ ὁ κτίσας με κατέπαυσεν τὴν σκηνήν μου)
and said, 'Encamp in Iakob (καὶ εἶπεν Ἐν Ἰακώβ κατασκήνωσον),
and in Israel let your inheritance be' (καὶ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κατακληρονομήθητι).
- ⁹ Before the age, from the beginning, he created me (πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέν με),
and until the age I will never fail (καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπω).

The terminological similarities between Sir 24:3-9 and Prov 8:22-31 are several (such as the case of the ὁ θρόνος in Sir 24:4; the verb κτίζειν in Sir 24:8 [ὁ κτίστης/ὁ κτίσας] and 9 [ἔκτισεν]), but the statement in Sir 24:9, which declares the "creation" of Wisdom from the beginning, stands out⁴³. In Sir 24:23 Wisdom

⁴³ PALMISANO, *Siracide*, 231: "il v. 9 inizia a includere nel discorso, dopo la dimensione spaziale, anche quella temporale del suo agire e rivelarsi".

is assimilated to the Law, the Torah of Israel but it goes too far if we think of an equation between the Law and Wisdom; rather it is an invitation to search for Wisdom in the Torah of Moses. The books of Moses are an always accessible way for Israel to receive divine Wisdom (Sir 24:23):

All these things are the book of the covenant of the Most High God (ταῦτα πάντα βιβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ Ὑψίστου),
a law that Moyses commanded us (νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο Μωυσῆς),
an heritage for the gatherings of Iakob (κληρονομίαν συναγωγαῖς Ἰακώβ).

Sirach 24 expresses Wisdom in a universalistic way, because she inhabits the world, and in a “nationalistic” way because she has chosen to dwell in Israel⁴⁴. In comparison to Job 28, there is a step forward: to the ethical dimension a cosmological and liturgical vision of Wisdom has been added⁴⁵. In comparison to Bar, Wisdom is both the universal law that sustains the universe, and the book of the Law of Moses entrusted to the people of Israel⁴⁶. In comparison with Prov 8:22-31 we note the same idea of Wisdom’s presence by God before the creation and his work with God of ordering the world. Moreover, the idea of the throne (Prov 8:27 and Sir 24:4) in the heavens is a topic of the divine power on the creation.

3.5 *Book of Jubilees*

The text of the Jubilees was probably written between the middle and the end of the 2nd century B.C. and describes itself as “a revelation made to Moses during the forty days he passed on Sinai”⁴⁷. According to Flavius Josephus and Philo it can be considered belonging to the “Essene” movement. As in the Book of the Watchers (Enoch), Jubilees tells the story of the fall of the angels in the context of the first week of creation and highlights the dialectical tension between time and eternity. The text seems to share the idea of the doctrine of the *creatio ex nihilo* of 2 Macc 7:28 (οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός) because it places the angels on the same level as light, created both on the first day, but without any

⁴⁴ In m. ’Abot 6,10, quoting Prov 8:22, Wisdom is identified with the Torah, like in Ben Sira. See GATHERCOLE, *Wisdom*, 1339.

⁴⁵ TOY, *The Book of Proverbs*, 171-179.

⁴⁶ LOADER, *Proverbs*, 368-369; SKEHAN, *Structures*, 365-379.

⁴⁷ SACCHI, *Introduzione*, 79.

task of ordering or mediation, as we read in some later Gnostic texts (cfr. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1:23,5 [Menander]; 24:1 [Saturninus]; 24:3-4 [Basilides]). The reference to creative wisdom is found in the passage in Jub. 2:2: (the angels) “whom He prepared with the wisdom of His heart”⁴⁸ attests the presence of wisdom/intelligence with God at the moment of creation⁴⁹, without explicitly attributing to it any active role.

3.6 Book of Wisdom

The Book of Wisdom is only known in Greek and can be dated between the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D.⁵⁰ In Wis 7 and 9 we find the idea of the personification of Wisdom from the creation on the model of Prov 8:22-31.

3.6.1 Wis 7:17-21

¹⁷ For he himself gave me an unerring
knowledge of the things that exist,
to know the constitution of the world
and the activity of the elements,
¹⁸ the beginning and end and middle of
times,
the alterations of the solstices and
the changes of the seasons,

¹⁷ αὐτὸς γάρ μοι ἔδωκεν τῶν ὄντων
γνώσιν ἀψευδῆ,
εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου καὶ
ἐνέργειαν στοιχείων,
¹⁸ ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος καὶ μεσότητα
χρόνων,
τροπῶν ἀλλαγὰς καὶ μεταβολὰς
καιρῶν,

⁴⁸ SACCHI, *Apocriphi*, 222.

⁴⁹ *Jubeles*, 2,2: in SACCHI, *Apocriphi*, 222 n. *ad loc.*: “il *Targum* Neophiti e il *Frammentario* inseriscono l’espressione «con la sapienza» nello stesso primo versetto del *Genesis*. Il fondamento scritturistico di questa idea antica fu trovato dai rabbini nell’uguaglianza tra «principio», «Legge» e «Sapienza». בראשית è interpretato per mezzo del *rešit* (principio) «Dio creò» e l’interpretazione di *rešit* si ha da *Prov.* VIII,22, dove la sapienza dice di sé: «Yahweh mi ha posseduta come principio della sua opera». Dunque il principio è la sapienza; cfr. *Berešit Rabba*, I,1. Si noti come una parte degli angeli, quelli inferiori, presieda ai fenomeni naturali”.

⁵⁰ D’ALARIO, *Sapienza*, 22-24. We don’t have information about the author of Wis. As the author of Wis, Solomon is mentioned in Wis 6:22–9:18. The philological analysis permits to date the book of Wisdom in Augustean period, after 30 B.C., when Romans conquered Alexandria. SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, I, 21-22 and WINSTON, *Wisdom*, 23, instead, think about the period of Caligola (37–41 A.D.).

- ¹⁹ the cycles of the year and the constellations of the stars,
²⁰ the natures of animals and the tempers of wild animals, the violent forces of spirits and the thoughts of human beings, the varieties of plants and the powers of roots,
²¹ and all things, both what is secret and what is manifest, I learned,
²² for she that is the fashioner of all things.
- ¹⁹ ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλους καὶ ἀστρων θέσεις,
²⁰ φύσεις ζώων καὶ θυμούς θηρίων, πνευμάτων βίας καὶ διαλογισμούς ἀνθρώπων, διαφορὰς φυτῶν καὶ δυνάμεις ῥιζῶν.
²¹ ὅσα τέ ἐστὶν κρυπτὰ καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἔγνων·
²² ἢ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία.

In Wis 7:21, Wisdom is defined as the “maker of all things” (ἢ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις). The word τεχνίτις is one of the possible translations of תַּיָּמָן of Prov 8:30⁵¹ and it recurs three times in the book of Wisdom (7:21; 8:6 and 14:2) with the sense of “craftsman”, of one who possesses an art (τέχνη; cfr. Deut 27:15; Sir 9:17). According to Philo⁵² and Epictetus⁵³, every work reveals the skills of its craftsman. Therefore, according to these elements, we could suppose as a misleading to read τεχνίτις as synonymous of “creator” of the world⁵⁴. Wisdom has an active role in creation, for she is intelligent, has knowledge and is prepared for any work. Through the works she performs can be seen her skills. Wisdom instructed the king and wise Solomon (ἐδίδαξέν με, Wis 7:21), who in fact needs to be educated, because he is unable to deduce from the contemplation of the work the stature of the craftsman: “technique and intelligence enable man to know and possess the secret riches of the earth, but to find wisdom is the gift of

⁵¹ SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, II, 60-62; PINTO, *Sapienza*, 170-171.

⁵² PHILO, *Migr.* 40-42; *Plant.* 71; *Leg.All.* 3:99; *Imm.* 30-31. According to *Ebrietate* 88 Wisdom is the art of arts.

⁵³ EPICTETUS, *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* 1,6,7.8 (ed. SOUILHÉ, 25).

⁵⁴ The feminine τεχνίτης is used several times (Deut 27:15; 1 Chr 22:15; 29:5; Cant 7:2; Wis 13:1; 14:18; Sir 9:17; 45:10; Jer 10:9; 24:1; 26:2). See CAVALLI, *Salomone e Sapienza*, 104. About the word τεχνίτις (in Wis 7:21; 8:6; 14:2, of all 12 times in LXX) Cavalli affirms which it indicates a person or a group of people skilled in certain arts (Deut 27:15 and Sir 9:17). The feminine word “non comporta necessariamente per la Sapienza un ruolo attivo nella creazione, caratteristica peculiare di Dio nella bibbia, ma indica che ella è esperta ed è capace di realizzare ogni cosa perché era presente durante la creazione (Pr 8,22-31)”.

God”⁵⁵. The following verses (vv. 22-24) describe Wisdom as a spirit that penetrates all things, an idea not far from that of the Stoic Logos that binds all things together as a unified whole and, further on (vv. 25-29), describes its relationship with God, of whom it is “breath” (v. 25), “emanation” (v. 25), “reflection” and “image” (v. 26).

3.6.2 Wis 9:9-11

⁹ With you is wisdom, which knows
your works
and was present when you made the
world
and understands what is pleasing in
your eyes
and what is right according to your
commandments.

¹⁰ Send her out from the holy heavens,
and from your glorious throne send
her,
that, being present with me,
she may labor with me
and that I may learn what is well-
pleasing before you,

¹¹ for she knows all things and
understands them
and will guide me prudently in my
actions and guard me with her glory.

⁹ καὶ μετὰ σοῦ ἡ σοφία ἢ εἰδυῖα τὰ
ἔργα σου,
καὶ παροῦσα ὅτε ἐποίεις τὸν κόσμον
καὶ ἐπισταμένη τί ἄρεστον ἐν
ὀφθαλμοῖς σου
καὶ τί εὐθές ἐν ἐντολαῖς σου.

¹⁰ ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτήν ἐξ ἁγίων
οὐρανῶν,
καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης σου πέμψον
αὐτήν,
ἵνα συμπαροῦσά μοι κοπιάσῃ,
καὶ γνῶ τί εὐάρεστον ἐστὶν παρὰ
σοί.

¹¹ οἶδε γὰρ ἐκείνη πάντα καὶ συνίει,
καὶ ὀδηγήσει με ἐν ταῖς πράξεσί μου
σωφρόνως.
καὶ φυλάξει με ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς.

In Wis 9:9-11 the terminological similarities with the text Prov 8:22-31 are frequent: “works” (ἔργα) (Wis 9:9 and Prov 8:22)⁵⁶; the presence of Wisdom at

⁵⁵ SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, II, 61.

⁵⁶ SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, II, 226: “quali siano queste «opere» è difficile immaginare, dato che sono nominate prima della creazione del cosmo e prima della creazione non ci furono «opere». “Works” is about the salvific plan of God, in fact *Vulgata* translates “*semitae*” or “*viae*”, to indicate the intention, the project and the thinking of God (according to the polysemic meaning of טַד). See also PINTO, *Sapienza*, 190-191.

the moment of creation *παροῦσα*⁵⁷, *συνπαροῦσα* (Wis 9:9.10 and Prov 8:27 [also in v. 30 the verb *εἰμί*, “to be”, is used, combined with the preposition *παρά*]); the verb *ποιέω* (Wis 9:9 and Prov 8:26.28.29); the theme of the “throne” (Wis 9:10; Prov 8:27).

The hymn of Prov 8 is written in the first person, but in Wis it becomes a direct speech addressed to God concerning the presence of Wisdom in the creating and ordering act of the world⁵⁸. Wisdom does not create, nor does it shape, like the Logos in Philo, but is simply present and assists the only God in his creative act. All that He has created is done with wisdom, but it is not wisdom that creates things. She is invoked to inspire Solomon so that he can have the same skill in conducting his works as God did in creation. She can be sent to become close to a man and support his work: “He stands in the heavens (against the Stoics) and takes care of human affairs (against the Epicureans), but like the God of the Stoics, the God of the Hebrews also built, indeed created, the world”⁵⁹. The breath that came out of God’s mouth to create the world, now becomes the companion of man’s work, so that the wise king be guided by God’s outpouring (7:25: *ἀπόρροια*) and may conduct his works with the same goodness with which the Creator composed the universe.

3.7 Qumran

The line traced by the book of Sirach, in which Wisdom is juxtaposed with the Torah, finds echoes in the few Qumran fragments concerning the book of Proverbs. In particular there are two texts where the feminine personality of

⁵⁷ D’ALARIO, *Sapienza*, II, 137: in Greek literature the term *παροῦσα* denotes the closeness of the gods.

⁵⁸ SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, II, 228: “la Sapienza è presente alla creazione del mondo, ma non bisogna immaginare che abbia un ruolo particolare, il suo modo di partecipare alla creazione non va fatto coincidere con la partecipazione attribuita al Cristo nella teologia neotestamentaria dove del Cristo è detto che la creazione si attuò soltanto per mezzo di lui (cfr. *Io* 1,3)”. Philo thinks the Logos as an instrument of creation: *De migratione Abrahami* 6: *ὅτε ἐκοσμοπλάσσει χρησάμενος ὄργάνῳ τούτῳ*.

⁵⁹ SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, II, 230: “sta nel cielo (contro gli Stoici) e si occupa delle cose umane (contro gli Epicurei), ma come il Dio degli Stoici, anche il Dio degli Ebrei ha costruito, anzi creato, il mondo” (my transl.).

Wisdom appears clearly: 4Q185 (4QSapiential Admonitions)⁶⁰ and 4Q525 (4QBeatitudes)⁶¹. In these texts Wisdom's discourse is linked with the ethical behaviour of the believer, without any clear explanation about the theme of creation⁶².

In 4Q185 the believer is exhorted to seek Wisdom, which could be identified with the Law. In 4Q525 the value of acquiring wisdom is expressed with the literary genre of Psalmic literature, the blessedness (see Ps 1:1). However, explicit references to Prov 8:22-31 are to be taken with due caution, because of the fragmentary nature of the Qumran texts and because some lexemes and stylistic devices are common to the Deuteronomic and Psalmic literatures, which are well present in the Qumran library⁶³.

3.8 Philo

Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, who was literary active between 20 B.C. and 45 A.D., is a privileged witness of the fruitful dialogue between Jewish literature and the Hellenistic culture. He developed the allegorical reading of Scripture and placed the Jewish tradition within the Medio-Platonic philosophical horizon, influencing later Christian literature, especially that of the 3rd century. Philo's references to the hymn of Prov 8 mainly concerns Prov 8:22 with textual variants and different interpretations compared to the earlier Judaic-Hellenistic tradition.

⁶⁰ 4Q185, fr 1-2 col II, 9-15; see VERSEPUT, *Wisdom*, 691-707.

⁶¹ 4Q525, fr 2 col II, 3-5.

⁶² UUSIMÄKI, *Turning Proverbs*, 146 n. 321: differently from Ps 19 (Prov 8:22-31; 11Q 26,9-15), 4Q525 doesn't attest the creation' theme. GOFF, *Wisdom Literature*, 1340-1341: "this corpus, like the Dead Sea Scrolls in general, contains no portrait of Lady Wisdom as lengthy and developed as those of Proverbs 8 or Sirach 24. Many Qumran wisdom texts, such as 4QInstruction, 4Q298, the Book of Mysteries, and 4Q424, show no interest in personified wisdom whatsoever. Several Dead Sea wisdom compositions do, however, reflect some knowledge of this tradition. 4Q185 e 4Q525 constantly use feminine language in their exhortation to acquire wisdom".

⁶³ UUSIMÄKI, *Turning*, 117: "Despite the great influence, the overall orientation of 4Q525 is not exhausted by Proverbs".

3.8.1 Indirect references

An early reference to Prov 8:22 is found in Philo's treatise *Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet* 54, where Philo states:

If, therefore, each of these things, the outward sense and the mind (*αἴσθησις τε καὶ νοῦς*), receive the honour which I have been describing, then it follows of necessity that I, who use them both, must derive advantage from them. But if, carrying your language away a long distance from the mind and from the outward sense, you think your father, that is to say, the world which produced you, and your mother, wisdom, by means of which the universe was completed, worthy of honour (*ἐὰν δὲ πόρρω τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ νοῦ καὶ αἰσθήσεως ἀπαγαγὼν πατέρα μὲν τὸν γεννήσαντα τὸν κόσμον, μητέρα δὲ τὴν σοφίαν, δι' ἧς ἀπετελέσθη τὸ πᾶν, τιμῆς ἀξιώσης*), you yourself shall be well treated; for neither does God, who is full of everything, nor sublime and perfect knowledge (*ἡ ἄκρα καὶ παντελής ἐπιστήμη*), want anything. So that he who is inclined to pay proper attention to them, benefits not those who receive his attentions and who are in no need of anything, but himself most exceedingly.⁶⁴

God, the creator of the cosmos, is compared to the father and the cosmos compared to the children. Philo is not afraid to call wisdom (the feminine gender both in Hebrew and in Greek) a mother. However, he does not attribute her the role of creator, but she brings things to the completion so that they reach their end (*ἀπετελέσθη τὸ πᾶν*). As Radice observes⁶⁵, Philo takes the metaphor of father and mother from the fourth commandment and applies it to two different hermeneutical levels: the psychological one, where the father is the intellect and the mother is sense; and the theological one, where the father is the Creator and the mother is Wisdom. Also, in *De Virtutibus* 62 Philo affirms the presence of Wisdom as being more ancient than the world itself, but only in an ethical role and not a cosmological one⁶⁶.

⁶⁴ Eng. trans. by C.D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo*.

⁶⁵ Eng. trans. by C.D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo*. On the theme of Wisdom in Philo, see MACK, *Logos und Sophia* and WOLFSON, *Philo*, 253-282.

⁶⁶ σοφίαν δὲ πρεσβυτέραν οὐ μόνον τῆς ἐμῆς γενέσεως ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς οὔσαν οὔτε θέμις οὔτε δυνατόν ἄλλω τῷ κρίνειν ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς ἀδόλως καὶ καθαρῶς καὶ γνησίως αὐτῆς ἐρῶσιν (PHILO, *De virtutibus* 62 [ARNALDEZ, *Les oeuvres*, 65]).

Legum Allegoriae 1:43 is another interesting text where Wisdom is considered in the same way as the Logos:

And God planted a paradise in Eden, in the east: and there he placed the man whom he had formed (Gen 2:8)”: for he called that divine and heavenly wisdom by many names; and he made it manifest that it had many appellations; for he called it the beginning, and the image, and the sight of God (τὴν μετάρσιον καὶ οὐράνιον σοφίαν πολλοῖς ὀνόμασι πολυώνυμον οὖσαν δεδήλωκε: καὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴν καὶ εἰκόνα καὶ ὄρασιν θεοῦ κέκληκε). And now he exhibits the wisdom which is conversant about the things of the earth (as being an imitation of this archetypal wisdom), in the plantation of this Paradise (ταύτης δ’ ὡς ἂν ἀρχετύπου μίμημα τὴν ἐπίγειον σοφίαν νυνὶ παρίστησι διὰ τῆς τοῦ παραδείσου φυτουργίας). For let not such impiety ever occupy our thoughts as for us to suppose that God cultivates the land and plants paradises, since if we were to do so, we should be presently raising the question of why he does so: for it could not be that he might provide himself with pleasant places of recreation and pastime, or with amusement.⁶⁷

Wisdom is referred to as the “principle”, “image”, “vision” of God and is to be considered on two distinct levels: the heavenly level, on divine terms, and the earthly level, which is, the “copy of the archetype” according to the Platonic approach to reality. The proximity to *De Confusione linguarum* 146⁶⁸ leads one to believe that Wisdom and Logos to Philo are synonyms, consistent with the doctrine of the Logos with many names (πολυώνυμος), also characteristic in Wis 7:22. However, in this case, although there is a direct reference to Prov 8:22 through the important word ἀρχή, it is possible to deduce only an ethical

⁶⁷ Eng. trans. by C.D. Yonge. About the discussion on the relationship between *Legum Allegoriae* 1:43 and *Quaestiones in Genesim* 1:6 see the comment in FILONE DI ALESSANDRIA, *La filosofia mosaica*, 343-345.

⁶⁸ “And even if there be not as yet any one who is worthy to be called a son of God, nevertheless let him labour earnestly to be adorned according to his first-born word, the eldest of his angels, as the great archangel of many names; for he is called, the authority, and the name of God, and the Word, and man according to God's image, and he who sees Israel”. (κἂν μηδέπω μέντοι τυγχάνη τις ἀξιόχρεως ὦν υἱὸς θεοῦ προσαγορεύεσθαι σπουδαζέτω κοσμεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἀγγέλων πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἂν ἀρχάγγελον, πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα: καὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴ καὶ ὄνομα θεοῦ καὶ λόγος καὶ ὁ κατ’ εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ὄρων, Ἰσραήλ, προσαγορεύεται). Eng. trans. by C.D. Yonge.

characterization and not a cosmological one. This view of Wisdom is also reflected in *De Ebrietate* 31 where Philo explicitly refers to the text of Prov 8:22.

3.8.2 The Explicit Reference

Prov 8:22 is quoted by Philo only in *De Ebrietate* 31, in which we read *ἐκτήσατο*, instead of *ἐκτίσεν* as in the LXX.

De Ebrietate 31

Accordingly wisdom is represented by some one of the beings of the divine company as speaking of herself in this manner: “God created⁶⁹ me (*ἐκτήσατό με*) as the first of his works, and before the beginning of time did he establish me.” For it was necessary that all the things which came under the head of the creation must be younger than the mother and nurse of the whole universe.⁷⁰

Philo comments on Gen 9:21 and draws a monothematic treatise on drunkenness. He begins to list the multiple meanings of drunkenness (paragraphs 1-10), exemplifying it with delirium and madness, then he analyses its causes including disobedience to parents, a spirit of rebellion, and squandering goods on feasts and banquets. In paragraphs 30-34 he examines the allegorical meaning of the terms “father” and “mother” and mentions a list of four different types of children. “Father” and “mother” are symbols of God and Wisdom, because the universe came to existence and took form from them. Scholarly opinions are divided on the use of the parental metaphor⁷¹, because it seems that Philo

⁶⁹ It is not clear why Yonge translated “created” meanwhile the meaning of *κτάομαι* is “acquire”.

⁷⁰ Eng. trans. by C.D. Yonge. (30) πατὴρ δὲ καὶ μητὴρ κοινὰ μὲν αἱ κλήσεις, διάφοροι δ’ αἱ δυνάμεις. τὸν γοῦν τόδε τὸ πᾶν ἐργασάμενον δημιουργὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ πατέρα εἶναι τοῦ γεγονότος εὐθὺς ἐν δίκῃ φήσομεν, μητέρα δὲ τὴν τοῦ πεποικηκότος ἐπιστήμην, ἣ συνὼν ὁ θεὸς οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρε γένεσιν. ἡ δὲ παραδεξαμένη τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ σπέρματα τελεσφόροις ὠδίσι τὸν μόνον καὶ ἀγαπητὸν αἰσθητὸν υἱὸν ἀπεκύησε, τόνδε τὸν κόσμον. (31) εἰσάγεται γοῦν παρὰ τινι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ θείου χοροῦ ἡ σοφία περὶ αὐτῆς λέγουσα τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον· ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίσατό με πρωτίστην τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με· ἦν γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς μητρός καὶ τιθήνης τῶν ὅλων πάνθ’ ὅσα εἰς γένεσιν ἦλθεν εἶναι νεώτερα.

⁷¹ RADICE, *Migrazione*, 463 n. 18 lists seven hypotheses of the origin of the idea of σοφία as “mother” and “nurse”.

suspends the rigid Judaic monotheism and a Platonic approach⁷². In fact, Wisdom is presented as the “mother” and “nurturer” of all creation and Philo attributes to her the characteristics of Plato’s ὑλή/“the stuff”, “material” (see *Timaeus* 49a and 52d).

As V. Nikiprowetzky has already noted, in this context, the term σοφία has no other meaning than in the reference to purely abstract relations, so that “mother” must be considered the universal substratum of all that is sensible⁷³. Thus, the quotation of Prov 8:22 in *Ebrietate* 31 does not take up the metaphysical and cosmological challenge of recognising in Wisdom a creation of God, nor a divine force capable of participating in the divine creative action. Rather, she represents an abstract relationship strictly linked with the idea of the Logos, with many names, as the all-embracing mediator of the relationship between God and the world.

4 Brief Summary

The reception of the Hebrew text of Prov 8:22-31 began with the Greek translation of the LXX. Wisdom is present in the creative act of God. It remains uncertain whether Wisdom should be considered coeternal with God himself, or whether she is the “first” of God’s works to which He was inspired for ordering of the world. Did Wisdom exist “Before” time began? The notion of pre-existence, prior to creation, affirmed by Proverbs is not questioned by later authors: Aristobulus identifies her with the first day of creation from which all light derives; even the book of Jubilees, which places the creation of angels on the same level as light, thinks of pre-existing wisdom. The book of Baruch recognizes the pre-existing Wisdom as “eternal law” of God that governs the whole universe, as if it were a book in which all the rules for the existence of things are written. Sirach identifies the “eternal law” with the Torah herself that is seen on the same level of pre-existence as Wisdom (24:23). Just as we find in Job LXX, the book of Wisdom reaffirms the absolute transcendence of God with respect to the pre-existence of Wisdom, defined as a “craftsman”, whose skills and arts are recognized through the harmony of his works. Therefore, although contemplated through her activities, Wisdom is not accessible, because she

⁷² RADICE, *Migrazione*, 463.

⁷³ NIKIPROWETZKY, *Le commentaire*.

belongs to the mystery unattainable for man, in fact she has her origin in God himself.

The encounter between allegorical exegesis and the Platonic hermeneutic in Philo of Alexandria transforms Wisdom into one of the many names of the Logos, which possesses every capacity for mediation of the possible relationships between God and the world. However, with respect to the biblical text considered, the contexts in which Philo appeals to Prov 8:22 do not address metaphysical issues or questions of theological constitution, but are mostly ethical treatments, designed to build those virtues that make man able to reach the divine perfection. In Philo's works we read *ἐκτήσατο* as a translation of the Hebrew *הָקַדְ*, unlike the LXX which translates with *ἔκτισεν*. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, on the contrary, will prefer *ἐκτήσατο*⁷⁴. The translational choice implies that divine Wisdom is acquired by God as a skill in the construction of the world. With this reading or interpretation it becomes more difficult to recognize the hypostatization of Wisdom, unlike the proposal of the LXX which suggests in the *ἔκτισεν* a not divine identity.

5 Conclusion

It can be concluded that regarding to the idea of creative Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31, there are two intertwined interpretative lines which are difficult to be separated: a philological line that moves between *ἐκτήσατο* and *ἔκτισεν*, in respect to the Hebrew *הָקַדְ*, and the *הָקַדְ* with many possibilities of translation; and a hermeneutic line that on the one hand makes wisdom an ethical virtue that can be purchased, both by man and God, as an artistic ability, leaving it implied whether this ability has been always possessed or occurs over time; on the other hand, Wisdom is a being "created" by God. But the latter option is more difficult to explain in relation to the temporal or ontological meaning we give to "beginning" (*תְּחִלָּה/ἀρχήν*, v. 22). These lines of interpretation help us to understand the difficulty that arose both in the earliest Christological reflection that attributed sapiential qualities to Christ, and in Arian interpretation that regarded the created being (*ἔκτισέν με*, v. 22) as a generated being (*γεννᾷ με*, v. 25). It was not just a matter of an exegetical problem, but of thinking of

⁷⁴ FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 326.

Wisdom as personified. This study demonstrates that the difficulties start from the possible interpretations of the text already present in the Second Temple period and which the Christian authors inherited.

Some lines of investigation remain in order to deepen the meaning of the text and its reception through history. First of all, we should ask whether the idea of creation in Gen 1:1-2:4a precedes or derives from the cultural environment in which Prov 8:22-31 was formed⁷⁵. Furthermore, the literary use of the female personification of a being who assists and/or participates in the creative act by God should be investigated. Should the femininity of Wisdom be understood only as a literary fiction, or the existence of a female entity who can be placed side by side with God in the way a “mother” is next to the “father” (Philo)⁷⁶? The pre-existence of Wisdom in Prov 8 and her being present to God in his action for the universe require a further effort to rethink the formation of the idea of monotheism in the Jewish Second temple period.

Bibliography

- BALENTINE, Samuel Eugene: *Prayer in The Hebrew Bible: The Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue* (OBT), Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- ALETTI, Jean-Noël: Proverbes 8,22-31: Étude de structure, *Bib* 57 (1976) 25-37.
- ARNALDEZ, Roger (ed.): *Philo, De Virtutibus* (Les oeuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 26), Paris: Du Cerf, 1962.
- BAKON, Shimon: Two hymns to wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Job 28, *JBQ* 36 (2008) 222-230.
- BAUKS, Michaela: Im Anfang war...? Gen 1,1ff und Prov 8,22-31 im Vergleich, *BN* 71 (1994) 24-52.
- BONNARD, Pierre-Émile: De la Sagesse personnifiée dans l’Ancien Testament à la Sagesse en personne dans le Nouveau. In: Maurice Gilbert (ed.): *La sagesse de l’Ancient Testament*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990, 117-149.
- BOWLEY, James E: Aristobulus. In: John Joseph Collins – Daniel C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids MI – Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2010, 378-379.
- CAVALLI, Stefano: *Salomone e Sapienza in Sap 6-9: sfondo antico testamentario. Dissertazione per il dottorato. Moderatore Alviero Niccacci - SBF*, Gerusalemme 2011.

⁷⁵ According to BAUKS, Im Anfang, 24-52, Prov 8 is later than Gen, but against is MCAFFEE, Creation, 31-57. See also LANDES, *Creation*, 279-294.

⁷⁶ Cfr. CAZELLES, *La Sagesse*, 51-57; COLLETT, *A Place to Stand*, 166-183.

- CAZELLES, Henri: La Sagesse de Proverbes 8:22 peut-elle être considérée comme une hypostase?. In: Achille Triacca – Alessandro Pistoia (eds.): *Trinité et liturgie*, Rome: C.L.V. Edizioni Liturgiche, 1984, 51-57.
- CHARLES, Robert Henri: *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- CHARLESWORTH, James Hamilton (ed.): *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. II, New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- CIMOSA, Mario (ed.): *Proverbi*, Milano: Paoline, 2007.
- CLIFFORD, Richard J.: *Proverbs: A Commentary*, Louisville – London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.
- COLLETT, Donald: A Place to Stand: Proverbs 8 and the Construction of Ecclesial Space, *SJTh* 70 (2017) 166-183.
- CONTI, Marco: La sapienza personificata negli elogi veterotestamentari (Pr 8; Gb 28; Sir 24; Bar 3; Sap 7), *Antonianum* 2 (2001) 127-152.
- COOGAN, Michael D. (ed.): *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version Bible Apocrypha: An Ecumenical Study Edition*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- COOK, Johann: The dating of Septuagint Proverbs, *EThL* 69 (1993) 383-399.
- COOK, Johann: *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?: Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs*, Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- COOK, Johann: Were the LXX Versions of Proverbs and Job Translated by the Same Person?, *HS* 51 (2010) 129-156.
- COOK, Johann: A Theology of the Greek Version of Proverbs, *HTS* 71 (2015) 1-11.
- D'ALARIO, Vittoria (ed.): *Sapienza*, Cinisello Balsamo MI: San Paolo, 2018.
- D'HAMONVILLE, David-Marc (ed.): *Les Proverbes*, Paris: du Cerf, 2000.
- DENIS, Albert-Marie: *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca* (PVTG 3), Brill: Leiden, 1970, 217-228.
- ELLIGER, Karl – RUDOLPH, Wilhelm (ed.): *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Editio quinta, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1997.
- FABBRI, Marco Valerio (ed.): *Baruc-Lettera di Geremia*, Cinisello Balsamo MI: San Paolo, 2020.
- FIELD, Friedericus: *Origenis Hexaplorum*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1964.
- FILONE DI ALESSANDRIA: *La filosofia mosaica. La creazione del mondo secondo Mosè. Le allegorie delle Leggi*. Edited by Claudio K. Reggiani and Roberto Radice. Milano: Rusconi, 1987.
- FILONE DI ALESSANDRIA: *La migrazione verso l'eterno. L'agricoltura – La piantagione di Noè – L'ebrietà – La sobrietà – La confusione delle lingue – La migrazione di Abramo*. Edited by Roberto Radice. Milano: Rusconi, 1988.
- FOX, Michael V.: A Profile of the Septuagint Proverbs. In: Nuria Calduch-Benages (ed.): *Wisdom for Life*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014, 3-17.
- GAMMIE, John G.: The Septuagint of Job: its poetic style and relationship to the Septuagint of Proverbs, *CBQ* 49 (1987) 14-30.

- GATHERCOLE, Simon: Wisdom. In: John Joseph Collins – Daniel C. Harlow (eds.): *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids MI – Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2010, 1339.
- GERLEMAN, Gillis: *Studies in the Septuagint*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1956.
- GOFF, Matthew: Wisdom Literature. In: John Joseph Collins – Daniel C. Harlow (eds.): *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids MI – Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2010, 1340-1341.
- HENGEL, Martin: *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2 Jh.s v. Chr.*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973.
- LELIEVRE, André – MAILLOT, Alphonse: *Commentaire des Proverbes*. Vol. III: Chapitres 1-9, Paris: Labor et Fides, 2000.
- LANDES, George M.: Creation Tradition in Proverbs 8:22-31 and Genesis 1. In: Howard N. Bream – Ralph D. Heim – Carey A. Moore (eds.): *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in honor of Jacob M. Myers*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974, 279-294.
- LIPIŃSKI, Edward: qānâ. In: *Grande Lessico dell'Antico Testamento*. Vol. VII, Brescia 2007, 1018-1026.
- LOADER, James Alfred: *Proverbs 1-9*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014.
- MACK, Burton L.: *Logos und Sophia. Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im hellenistischen Judentum*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- MCAFFEE, Matthew: Creation and the Role of Wisdom in Proverbs 8: What Can We Learn?, *Southeastern Theological Review* 10 (2019) 31-57.
- MURPHY, Roland E.: *Proverbs*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998.
- NIKIPROWETZKY, Valentin: *Le commentaire de l'Écriture chez Philon d'Alexandrie: Son caractère et sa portée. Observations philologiques*, Leiden 1977.
- OESTERLEY, William Oscar Emil: *The Book of Proverbs*, London: Methuen & Co, 1929.
- PALMISANO, Maria Carmela (ed.): *Siracide*, Cinisello Balsamo, MI: San Paolo, 2016.
- PASSONI Dell'Acqua, Anna: La sapienza e in genere l'elemento intermedio tra Dio e il creato nelle versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento. Analisi delle divergenze tra testo ebraico e versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento: Pr 8, *EL* 98 (1984) 97-147.
- PIETERSMA, Albert – Wright, Benjamin G.: *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*, Oxford University Press: Oxford – New York, 2007.
- PINTO, Sebastiano: *Sapienza*, Milano: Paoline, 2022.
- RADICE, Roberto (ed.): *Stoici antichi. Tutti i frammenti*, Bompiani: Milano, 2002.
- RAHLFS, Alfred (ed.): *Septuaginta*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, Stuttgart 1979.
- ROGERS, Cleon L, III: The Meaning and Significance of the Hebrew Word amown in Proverbs 8,30, *ZAW* 109 (1997) 208-221.
- SACCHI, Paolo: *Introduzione agli apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento*, Brescia: Paideia, 2011.
- SCARPAT, Giuseppe (ed.): *Libro della Sapienza*, 2 vols., Brescia: Paideia, 1989–1996.
- SOUILHE, Joseph (ed.): *Epictète. Entretiens*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1948.

- SCHÖKEL, Luis Alonso – Sicre Diaz, Josè Luis: *I Profeti*, Roma: Borla, 1989.
- SKEHAN, Patrik W.: Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24, *CBQ* 41 (1979) 365-379.
- TORIJANO, Pablo A.: Solomon. In: John Joseph Collins – Daniel C. Harlow (eds.): *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids MI – Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2010, 1237-1238.
- TOY, Crawford H.: *The Book of Proverbs*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.
- UUSIMÄKI, Elisa: *Turning Proverbs Towards Torah: An Analysis of 4Q525*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016.
- VERSEPUT, Donald: Wisdom, 4Q185, and the Epistle of James, *JBL* 117 (1998) 691-707.
- YODER, Christine Roy: Proverbs. In: Michael D. Coogan (ed.), *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version Bible Apocrypha: An Ecumenical Study Edition*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2018, 905-944.
- YONGE, Charles Duke (ed.): *The Works of Philo. Completed and Unabridged. New Updated Edition*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.
- WINSTON, David: *The Wisdom of Solomon*, New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- WOLFSON, Harry Austrin: *Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, I, Cambridge MA – London, England: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- WRIGHT, J. Edward: Baruch, Books of. In: Craig A. Evans – Stanley E. Porter (eds.): *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2000, 148-151.

Summary

The study explores the relationship between the Hebrew text and the Greek version of Prov 8:22-31 and examines the texts of Hellenistic Judaism that were inspired by the theme of personified Wisdom creating the world with God. The Alexandrian philosophers Aristobulus and Philo frame the period under consideration. In this frame some themes of Prov 8 are taken by Job, Baruch, Sirach and Wisdom. We find the feminine characterization of Wisdom also in the paratestamentary literature of the Book of Jubilees and Qumran.

Keywords: Prov 8, Wisdom, reception, Septuagint, Hellenistic Judaism.

Zhrnutie

Štúdia sa zaoberá vzťahom medzi hebrejským textom a gréckou verziou Prís 8,22-31 a skúma texty z obdobia helenistického judaizmu, ktoré boli inšpirované témou personifikovanej múdrosti tvoriacej svet spolu s Bohom. Literárna činnosť alexandrijských filozofov Aristobulusa a Filóna stanovuje časový rámec skúmania. V ňom sú niektoré témy z Prís 8 prevzaté Knihou Jób, Knihou proroka Barucha, Knihou Sirachovcovou a Knihou múdrosti. Ženskú charakteristiku múdrosti sme tiež objavili v paratestamentárnej literatúre ako je Kniha jubileí a Kumrán.

Kľúčové slová: Prís 8, múdrosť, recepcia, Septuaginta, helenistický judaizmus.

Maurizio Girolami
Piazza San Bartolomeo 18
33082 CORVA DI AZZANO DECIMO (PN)
Pordenone, Italy
girolamimaurizio@gmail.com
 0000-0001-5564-4397

Self-Portrayal as a ‘Fence around Torah’

An Ethical Critique of Eleazar’s Martyrdom in 2 Maccabees 6:18-31

Stefan M. Attard

Introduction and General Background of the Text

2 Maccabees 6:18-31 concerns persecution related to dietary laws and its main protagonist is an elderly scribe called Eleazar. The problem of persecution appears before 2 Macc 6, but the beginning of this chapter furnishes the precise framework in which the enemies of the Jews were operating (2 Macc 6:1-2a). This reference to the various kinds of flagrant profanities committed by the Greeks and tortures to which Jews were subjected if they refused to follow Greek customs introduces 2 Maccabees 6–7. From 6:18 onwards, the focus is on pagan ritual meals and how Jews were forced to participate in such unlawful sacrifices and to eat pork meat which was forbidden by Torah¹.

Prior to these accounts, vv. 12-17 constitute a redactional note wherein the author offers an explanation of the unfolding events². This parenthetical interjection deals with theodicy and interprets persecution as an anticipated form of suffering which Jews must bear. This suffering is not punishment for sin, as is the case with other nations, but discipline before sin reaches its full measure (v. 15). Though this theological position falls short of outrightly claiming that God’s people were without sin, it surely militates in favour of their innocence, particularly their resolve to abide by divine law in the Jewish tradition.

In the entire Old Testament, it is only in 2 Macc that the scriptures are referred to collectively as “the holy book” (τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον, 8:23). By then, the

¹ Lev 11:7-8 and Deut 14:8, as well as Isa 65:4; 66:17; see DORAN, *2 Maccabees*, 152, on issues related to swine flesh and pig offerings.

² The redactor took the story of Eleazar from the five volumes of Jason of Cyrene; SCHOENBERG, *Maccabees*, 9-10: “It is difficult to determine whether the religious teaching and purpose of 2 Maccabees is also that of Jason of Cyrene, or whether such observations as 6:12-17; 12:43b-45 are added by the epitomist, thus reflecting his particular intent.”

Pentateuch and the Prophets were already identifiable corpuses such that Torah-consciousness was likely at its highest³. 2 Macc makes several references to the Law, employing different nominal or adjectival forms: νόμος (law); πρόσταγμα (ordinance, command); νομοθεσία (legislation); νομίμως (adv. lawfully); and their antonyms παράνομος and ἀθέμιτος (unlawful)⁴. In the initial salutations, an opening of the heart to God's Law and his ordinances is listed as one of the wishes that the author expresses (1:4). That the various mores mentioned, particularly dietary customs referred to in 6:18 and 7:1, are directly related to God's divine law and shaped by it can be inferred from the numerous references to it: 6:1.5.21.23.28; 7:2.9.11.23.30.37. It becomes evident that the religious and cultural mores of the Jews to which the narratives refer are embedded in divine law.

Within the larger scheme of the book, Eleazar's account belongs in the narrative concerning the onslaught on the Temple and the faithful that appear at the centre of the book⁵:

- I. Letter to the Jews in Egypt (1:1–2:18)
- II. Author's Preface (2:19-32)
- III. Heliodorus' Attempt to Profane the Temple (3:1-40)
- IV. *Profanation and Persecution* (4:1–7:42)
- V. Victories of Judas and Purification of the Temple (8:1–10:8)
- VI. Renewed Persecution (10:9–15:36)
- VII. Epilogue (15:37-39)

2 Maccabees 6–7 is a parallel narrative to 1 Macc 1:41-64, where king Antiochus is seen persecuting the Jews⁶. The former is an amplified narrative that further explains the latter, where it had been said that any scrolls of the Law

³ The majority of the texts of the Pentateuch and the Prophets seem to reflect an early period due to the presence of Archaic Biblical Hebrew, Classical Biblical Hebrew, and Transitional Biblical Hebrew; see Appendix I in HENDEL – JOOSTEN, *How Old Is the Hebrew Bible?*, 127-133. After perusing several documents, TREBOLLE BARRERA, *Origins*, 132-133, concludes that a tripartite structure of the scriptures already existed at the beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE, that is roughly before the accounts recounted in 1–2 Maccabees.

⁴ Among the pedagogical aims that can be gleaned from the book, SIMKOVICH, *Greek Influence*, 294-295, mentions the thirty-three references that are made to divine law as being one of them. One may also include the term ἔθος which, in 11:25 refers to a way of life in accordance with Jewish customs.

⁵ The Catholic Study Bible, 585.

⁶ See SCHOENBERG, *Maccabees*, 12.

were burnt and those possessing them put to death (1:56)⁷. Hence, the historical context can be compared to the later despicable events surrounding the persecution endured by Christians who, as a result, had to muster all the skills needed in order to preserve the sacred scriptures⁸. Concerning the importance of the already existent New Testament canon, E. Ferguson states: “Little attention has been paid to the factor of persecution in the history of the canon, but William R. Farmer has called attention to how suitable the New Testament canon was for strengthening Christians facing martyrdom”⁹. Eleazar’s martyrdom centuries earlier was an identical situation where persecution was courageously endured despite the destruction of already recognized canonical texts. This article seeks to gauge the relationship between the depiction of Eleazar’s martyrdom and the importance of Torah. Of particular interest here is the effect such accounts of persecution could have had on augmenting the way Torah was guarded by the faithful. It will be argued that this account of the destruction of a faithful individual through persecution – with due attention given to his impeccable moral character – was a means by which Torah itself was preserved from destruction, hence serving the same purpose as the later custom of creating laws that would function as a fence that safeguards Torah.

1 Analysis of the Text Proper

The structure of the text under investigation can be divided as follows:

- | | | |
|-----------|------------|---|
| a | v. 18 | Description of Eleazar and of the problem he faced. |
| b | vv. 19-20 | Eleazar’s noble reaction based on honour in relation to what is unlawful. |
| c | vv. 21-22 | <i>A way out</i> offered him concerning what was “prescribed by the king”. |
| b’ | v. 23 | Eleazar’s decision based on dignity in relation to what was “established by God”. |
| c’ | vv. 24-28a | Eleazar’s declaration against pretence based on how he would be viewed |

⁷ The narrative of Eleazar’s martyrdom is amplified further in 4 Macc 1:8; 5:1–7:25.

⁸ FERGUSON, Factors, 317, cites Eusebius who described how the sacred books were burnt at the imperial order.

⁹ FERGUSON, Factors, 316-317.

- by the young, his awareness of ultimate judgement (that is, *no way out*), and the venerable and holy laws.
- d** vv. 28b-30 His death is described, including his final words.
- e** v. 31 Narrator's remark about his nobility and virtue.

Eleazar's qualification as scribe (*γραμματεὺς*, v. 1) highlights his teaching role¹⁰. His behaviour in the story that unfolds will determine how suitably or otherwise he fits this role. He is described as being "already advanced in years" (v. 18), and mention is made of "the dignity of his great age and the well-earned distinction of his grey hairs" (v. 23) as well as his "old age" (v. 25). His behaviour contrasts sharply with that of a minor protagonist who appears at the beginning of the chapter, namely the *elderly* Athenian officer who enforces the king's command to violate Jewish laws¹¹. That Eleazar enjoyed good standing in the community is made further evident from the way he was treated by his eventual persecutors who offered him what seemed to them a justifiable means of escape. Their intention was to prevent him from dying (v. 22), rather than to set him as an example to be emulated by deceived fellow believers.

Two extant Coptic documents are "The Martyrs of the Jews Who Lived Under Antiochus the King", which is part of a Coptic document called the Crosby-Schøyen codex ms 193, and ms C of the Bibliothèque nationale Copte 135. They correspond to 2 Macc 5:27–7:41 and 5:27–7:21 respectively, though the latter may have included up to v. 41¹². The very fact that these texts existed as a separate tractate within a document and as a separate scroll respectively suggests that the genre of martyrdom played a somewhat significant role in early Judaism. Because ms 193 is not a formal translation of the Septuagint, there is some possibility that it points to a different Greek tradition, in which case variant readings would be particularly interesting. This is being pointed out because ms 193 has a slight but not insignificant conflation concerning the beauty of Eleazar's form. The text adds a reference to his height as follows:

¹⁰ Several New Testament texts point to the teaching role of scribes, e.g. Matt 2:4; 13:52; 23:2.34; Mark 1:22; Luke 5:21; 1 Cor 1:20.

¹¹ The noun *γέροντα* in v. 1 is a predication of Ἀθηναῖον with which it accords in its accusative case. NJB reads *γέροντα* as a proper noun: "Gerontes the Athenian". Here, we partly follow the NRSV interpretation which reads the Greek term as an adjectival noun: "an Athenian senator", though the notion of old age should be retained. See 4 Macc 8:2; 16:17; Sir 25:2 for an identical reading (i.e. "aged man").

¹² See MELTZER – BETHGE, *The Jewish Martyrs*, 83.

Eleazar was one of <the> great sages (γραμματεὺς), a man who waxed great in his age, *who was tall* (ἄλλος), who was beautiful in his form of his face...¹³

Tallness of stature is added in order to enhance his gravitas and to grace his demeanour. In another context related to food that was not permissible, Daniel and his friends refused to eat food from the king's table and this led them to look fairer in their appearance and stouter in their bodily form (see καλός and the comparative of ἀγαθός in Dan 1:15)¹⁴. In both accounts, obedience to Torah is shown to bear on one's physical appearance¹⁵. Moreover, in v. 23 Eleazar's reasoning and decision to obey the Law are described with the adjective ἀστεῖος which, when used of bodily appearance, points to aspects of beauty, charm and gracefulness¹⁶. The appeal mentioned concerning Eleazar's physical appearance is now ascribed even to his thoughts. In 4 Macc 8:4, the beauty (κάλλος) of the young Jewish men is acknowledged by Antiochus himself who admired them whilst wanting to dissuade them from imitating the old scribe.

Given the propagandistic intentions of the book in favour of divine legislation, a curious feature of 2 Macc 6:18-31 is the imbalance between the references to Eleazar and the ones to the Law. Table 1 below lists the lexemes which are used to describe both and they are shown in the order in which they appear in the account so as to express how they relate to each other in the narrative itself.

¹³ MELTZER – BETHGE, *The Jewish Martyrs*, 99. Italics added. ἄλλος = altus, sublimis: PARTHEY, *Vocabularium*, 248.

¹⁴ See SCHOENBERG, *Maccabees*, 4-5, for the links between 1–2 Macc and Daniel.

¹⁵ Also see 1 Macc 1:26 which states that the women's beauty (κάλλος) faded due to Antiochus' onslaught on the city by which he forced merciless restrictions with regard to faithfulness to the Law.

¹⁶ LIDDEL – SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 260.

Table 1: Lexemes describing Eleazar and the Law¹⁷

Eleazar	Divine Law
v. 18 πρωτεύω (to be the first) ¹⁸	
v. 18 καλός (handsome)	
v. 19 εὐκλεια (good repute)	
v. 19 αὐθαιρέτως (voluntarily)	
v. 20 ὑπομένω (persevere)	
v. 23 ἀστεῖος (noble [decision])	
v. 23 ἄξιος (worthy)	
v. 23 ὑπεροχή (prominence)	
v. 23 ἐπιφανής (distinction) ¹⁹	
v. 23 καλός (good)	
	v. 23 ἅγιος (holy)
	v. 23 θεόκτιστος (established by God)
v. 24 ἄξιος (worthy)	
v. 25 μύσος (defilement) and κηλὶς (dishonour) shunned	
v. 27 ἀνδρείως (bravely)	
v. 27 ἄξιος (worthy)	
v. 28 γενναῖος 2× (suitable to one's nobility by birth)	
v. 28 προθύμως (willingly)	
	v. 28 σεμνός (venerable)
	v. 28 ἅγιος (holy)
v. 31 γενναιότης (nobility)	
v. 31 ἀρετή (moral excellence)	

As can be seen from the above table, the reader's attention is guided towards the very person of Eleazar. Though the ultimate purpose of the text is to

¹⁷ The most conspicuous of these are mentioned in this Table, though the text has other expressions which portray the scribe in a positive light, e.g. his *quick* (ταχέως, v. 23) declaration that would lead to his *good death* (ἀπευθανατίζω, v. 28), which he went to *immediately* (εὐθέως, v. 28) whilst *gladly* (ἡδέως, v. 30) enduring pain.

¹⁸ His being one of the scribes in a high position probably refers to his rank, but a nuance of dignity cannot be excluded. See LIDDEL – SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1544.

¹⁹ In v. 27 we find the related verb φαίνω which the author has a penchant for using with the meaning "to appear". However, given its close proximity to ἐπιφανής, its other meaning, namely "to shine", cannot be excluded.

uphold the holiness of the divine laws, for which one should be willing to lay down one's life irrespective of the cost, only three different adjectives are employed to describe them. Of these, the positive quality of θεόκτιστος ("established by God", v. 23) is only augmented because of its contrast to the phrase "prescribed by the king" in the preceding verse. As shown in the structure given, the core of the text is v. 23 and vv. 24-28a. In both cases, the Law is mentioned as though in passing, nearly as an afterthought, being heavily outweighed by references to Eleazar's noble character which precede it. However, this mention is important, for it is, in the last analysis, the reason why the text was written in the first place. Hence, though the general focus is on the persona of the elderly scribe, this is all subservient to the higher value attached to the Law itself. The same is true of v. 30 where his final words express the reason why he faced martyrdom, namely his fear of the Lord (διὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ φόβον). The underlying reference to Torah cannot be missed, given the relation between fearing God and keeping his commandments in texts such as Deut 31:12-13; Sirach 1:26-27; 19:20; and Qoh 12:13²⁰.

Hellenistic authors, among others, furnish us with numerous lists of virtues and vices. The Hebrew Bible generally lacks such lists, but later Jewish literature shows a marked tendency to include them²¹. Among these, 4 Macc 1:18-19 is particular for the fact that it identifies the most important quality: "And the forms of wisdom are prudence, and justice, and manliness, and temperance. The leading one of these is prudence; by whose means, indeed, it is that reasoning bears rule over the passions"²². Though prudence heads the list, one cannot hold that the first to be mentioned is always the leading virtue. In fact, 2 Macc 6:23 states "and above all according to (μᾶλλον δὲ... ἀκολούθως) the holy God-given law." In my opinion, though 2 Macc 6 does not exhibit a typical virtue list as such, v. 23 does pile up the factors that led to Eleazar's hard-earned esteem, concluding with a consideration of divine law. Interestingly, within a different context, 2 Enoch 9:1 has a list of virtues that includes enduring suffering and making right judgements, finally ending with one's faultless life vis-à-vis the Lord. It is as though the last aspect to be mentioned crowns all the previously mentioned personal qualities and puts them in perspective.

²⁰ Also see Ezra 10:3. See MURPHY, *The Tree of Life*, 55-56, 78-79.

²¹ A long list of references can be found in FITZGERALD, *Virtue/Vice Lists*, 857-858.

²² Also see Wisdom 8:7 for a similar list.

At the end of the text, as at the beginning, the narrator's remarks make no mention whatsoever of the Law, but squarely highlight the scribe's outstanding qualities, namely his nobility and his virtues.

This was how he died, leaving his death as an example of nobility and a record of virtue (or moral excellence) not only for the young but for the greater part of the nation. (2 Macc 6:31)

The figurative 'parting from' the ways of the Law (see *μεταβαίνω*, v. 1) which was enforced on all was boldly overcome by Eleazar's approaching (*προσάγω*, v. 19) the rack and rushing towards it (*ἔρχομαι*, v. 28). Schiffman points out that despite differing witnesses for v. 28, "he went" (to the rack) must be chosen over and against "he was dragged"²³. Not only, as Schiffman correctly states, is the latter found in a few texts, but it is also noteworthy that those texts are later ones in relation to the older LXX witnesses which bear the word ἦλθεν ("he went"). The verb *ειλκετο* ("was dragged") is found in two Greek mss, and various Latin and Syriac witnesses²⁴. The rendering "he went" stresses Eleazar's heroism, whilst "he was dragged" focuses on the ferocity of the persecution, and the latter is only found in significantly later translations. It stands to reason that the earlier texts more faithfully reflect the author's original intention to emphasize Eleazar's courage and willingness to give up his life for his beliefs. Rather than succumbing to external pressure, he made a clear ethical choice in favour of Torah.

2 Tamar and Eleazar – Torah and Ethical Considerations

To further explore the significance of Eleazar's actions, it will be helpful to turn our attention to another account that displays striking similarities to 2 Macc 6:18-31, namely Gen 38 which recounts Tamar's enticement of Judah. This comparative analysis is pertinent on several counts. Firstly, this is perhaps the only other biblical text that merges deception directly with the observance of

²³ See SCHIFFMAN, Commentaries, 906.

²⁴ The Greek mss are V (*Codex Venetus*; 9th cent.) and 55 (10th cent.); the Latin is represented notably by LA^{LV} (Lyon; 9th cent.) [Latin renditions are *trahebatur*, or *ducebatur*, or (*de*)*ductus est*]; and Syriac (2nd millennium). Armenian versions follow ἦλθεν; see HANHART, *Maccabaeorum liber II*.

some specific Torah legislation that impacts the protagonists directly²⁵. Another text in which both aspects feature is the account of the two elderly judges and Susanna, where Daniel overcomes the deceit of the former in order to save the latter (see Dan 13). However, this case is different to those of Eleazar and Tamar for Daniel himself is not involved in using trickery. Rather, he seeks to expose it. Indeed, this is a question of justice, that is of saving innocent blood, rather than an occasion of saving one's face or reputation²⁶.

Another reason for comparing these two texts is that both have to do with some form of recognition, this being at the heart of the employment of deception²⁷. Tamar conceals her identity such that Judah would be unable to recognise her. She banks on this "mis-take", as Adelman rightly calls it, for her plot to succeed. She actually has to cover her face with a veil in order to conceal her identity. In similar fashion, Eleazar is asked to veil the true nature of the meat he was encouraged to eat, leading others to mistake one meat for another. The difference is that Judah's lack of recognition led to his fulfilling of his obligations vis-à-vis the levirate law, whereas the fellow Jews' lack of recognition of the meat eaten by Eleazar would have led them to breaking the Law. Hence, in Tamar's case deception is used as a means to reach her goal, whilst Eleazar must reach his own goal by shunning deception²⁸. The former considers the suppression of moral concerns surrounding inappropriate sexual relations as acceptable when weighed in the scales against saving the family name, not unlike Abraham who

²⁵ To be sure, Genesis is replete with stories revolving around deception; see REYBURN – MCG FRY, *Handbook*, 871. Among several instances, one could also mention the serpent's deceptive words in Gen 3:1.4-5 by which it tried to derail Eve from God's word and his will. As regards deception in human relations, Rebekah contrives a plan to craftily lead Isaac to grant the blessing of the firstborn to Judah rather than to Esau (Gen 27:1-33; see Deut 21:15-17 which speaks of the inheritance rights of the firstborn). However, the purpose of this story and the others in Genesis is not, strictly speaking, about the obligation to observe any specific Torah law, unlike the case with Tamar and Eleazar.

²⁶ Nonetheless, here too, one finds related issues of honour and esteem: Susannah was "acquitted of anything dishonourable" (v. 63) and "Daniel's reputation stood high with the people" (v. 64).

²⁷ See ADELMAN, *Seduction*, 3, 6.

²⁸ The Hebrew sound word pair שכר (drunkenness) and שקר (deceit) are related in Micah, Isaiah and Habakkuk and in the Dead Sea Scrolls period which overlaps with the time covered by 2 Maccabees; see BAUTCH, *In Vino Veritas?*, 555-556. The hedonistic nature of drunkenness tallies with the notion of gluttony which the author of 4 Maccabees seeks to show to be contrary to Eleazar's character.

had relations with Hagar in the face of Sarah's infertility. Eleazar, however, acts by a different ethic since the trickery he could resort to would benefit him alone, adding only a few more years to the long life he had already lived.

Of note is also the aspect of future generations which are at the heart of both accounts. To be sure, this theme appears prior to both accounts. Judah beholds the blood-stained robe of his beloved son Joseph, believing him to be dead (Gen 37:31-35), whilst the faithful mothers have their circumcised babies hung at their breasts before being thrown down to their death (2 Macc 6:10). As for Gen 38, this deals with the deception by which a woman seeks to secure her right for levirate marriage, or better still, for offspring issuing from such an arrangement (see Deut 25:5-10). Given the sociological structure of ancient Israel, Tamar's being sent back to her father's house (Gen 38:11) necessarily implied a life devoid of childbearing²⁹. Her seeing that she had not been given to Judah's youngest son, Shelah, did not merely imply frustration at being abandoned or forgotten, but at having been deprived of the right to have progeny for the sake of her first husband. Her plot betrays her desire to achieve this goal, since the illicit sexual relations she engaged in would lead to conception only, but not to marriage. Tamar used trickery in order to safeguard her own interests on the strength of the Law. Though she realised that "she had not been given to him [Shelah] as his wife" (Gen 38:14), she acted deceptively because it was the only way she could secure the preservation of her husband's name through the birth of offspring from his bloodline.

Had Tamar's intention been to obtain a husband, she would have tried her luck loitering around Shelah, Judah's son, and not Judah himself (who was himself responsible for giving Tamar to Shelah; see v. 14). In fact, no marriage ensued between Judah and Tamar, and whilst she disappeared into oblivion, her sons Perez and Zerah grew into two tribes (see Num 26:20). The plot she contrived ensured that her husband would have children who, forming part of the family, would receive his rightful share of the material inheritance. "The heroine of this story is a Canaanite woman who bravely triumphs in upholding the obligation of a dead husband's brothers to provide descendants for their brother and to assure the dead brother's share in the family inheritance (see verse 8)"³⁰.

²⁹ NIDITCH, *The Wronged Woman Righted*, 145, describes this sociological context succinctly as follows: "Simply stated, the young woman is allowed only two proper roles. She is either an unmarried virgin in her father's home or she is a faithful, child-producing wife in her husband's or husband's family's home."

³⁰ REYBURN – MCG FRY, *Handbook*, 871.

In Eleazar's case, what is being passed down is not material wealth but, rather, a sense of belonging to the family of faith for whom Torah is the greatest gift and inheritance imaginable.

The use of trickery must be seen within the larger framework of the theological intentions of Genesis and 2 Maccabees respectively. The former is often caught up in the personal issues of the patriarchal families which had to do with the preservation or usurpation of rights in a long narrative that was directly linked to the promises made to Abraham concerning his future lineage. The reader is, therefore, led along a plot that steers them through the highs and lows of the human counterpart to the divine, covenantal blessing. At the other extreme end of these founding stories, 2 Maccabees is concerned with the preservation of religious fidelity within a context of persecution against the Judaic family of faith. Hence, both books are concerned about future generations, but in different ways. Genesis is concerned about aetiological matters in order to ascertain the prosperity of an important family line, hence it focuses on flesh and blood relations and their propensity to create descendants for Abraham. 2 Maccabees, on the other hand, was composed in a time of persecution wherein the perpetuity that was at stake was that of the divine law rather than that of human lineage. Though offspring or the young are at the centre of both plots, the intention of safeguarding Torah as such varies in both and is guided by different intentions. The dynamics and the underlying goals of deception are judged and employed differently by Eleazar and Tamar. And though their personal fates differed, Torah won the day.

Concerning Lot's daughters, Tamar, and Ruth, Adelman makes the following point: "each woman engages in an audacious act of seduction for the sake of continuity, subverting the norms of patriarchal society even as she wheedles her way in. The women's heroism, then, is of a particularly feminine hue: It engages in the face-off between the strictures of law and the force impelling life on"³¹. Eleazar's account is strikingly similar, despite obvious differences. Leaving aside any possible patriarchal agenda (due to the central role the brothers' mother has in the subsequent chapter), he too acts boldly for the sake of continuity, not by subverting divine laws but by defying those of the emperor, using such action as a springboard to propel himself and, consequently, to exalt Torah together with him. In the last analysis, Tamar did not choose the course of action described in order to defend Torah as such. Rather, she made

³¹ ADELMAN, *Seduction*, 1.

use of a legal right she had in order to guarantee continuity. That she thereby wished to be formally recognised by Judah's family as a member of his own clan for the fact that she contributed to the furtherance of the family line cannot be excluded. This, indeed, would ultimately safeguard her own survival³². By her behaviour she still laid her life on the line as the sexual intercourse she engaged in was tantamount to adultery given the fact that she was promised to Judah's son Shelah³³. But hers was a calculated risk. Conversely, the old scribe knowingly sealed his fate by forfeiting a discreet manoeuvre that could have saved his life, since this would compromise the very survival of his name and of Torah.

Tamar's daring actions were guided by her rightful claim to justice, but Eleazar's brave stance was inspired by his resolve to protect Torah at the cost of unjustly losing his life³⁴. Tamar had employed the opposite tactics to those of the scribe. By pretending to be a prostitute, she acted dishonourably and hence demeaned herself. On the contrary, Eleazar was a hero not only for dying the death of a martyr, but most especially for the choices he made. Beyond the strict observance of Torah, what takes centre stage is the importance of giving witness to it, that is to the validity of upholding it at all costs. However, whilst in Tamar's case ethical norms are suppressed for her to reach her goal, in 2 Maccabees 6 respectable ethical concerns override the mere, formal adherence to Torah, since its survival depends on a tradition of faithfulness that here can only be guaranteed by making the right ethical choice, which must be seen to be made. All this goes to show the uniqueness of the narrative of Eleazar's martyrdom in relation to the preservation of Torah, which preservation cost him his life even though a form of deceit could have spared the pious, elderly scribe. Hence, a comparison of these similar albeit different accounts goes to show that it is the account of

³² NIDITCH, *The Wronged Woman Righted*, 145: "In terms of long-range security in the social structure, it is more important for a woman to become her children's mother than her husband's wife."

³³ See ADELMAN, *Seduction*, 5. One of Adelman's main points in this article is how Lot's daughters, Tamar and Ruth pushed the limits of the law in order to ensure the continuity of the race "the line of law itself shifts as a result of the life force these biblical women urge forward" (p. 2). On the other hand, the account of 2 Macc 6 adopts a strict approach that goes by the book and does not admit of the slightest departure from the law.

³⁴ As for Tamar, the means chosen for her rehabilitation as seen as positive because she had been wronged; see NIDITCH, *The Wronged Woman Righted*, 148.

Eleazar that safely steers away from deception, thereby precluding the possibility of tarnishing the scribe's faultless character.

3 The Criteria of Honour, Shame and Moral Character

Advances made in the social and cultural anthropology of the Bible and the Greek world have contributed to building a better picture of the dynamics of self-appreciation in the context of human relations³⁵. The notions of honour and shame were deeply-seated in the Israelite social matrix,³⁶ and the text under investigation revolves around these concepts.

Honor is a public claim to worth or value and a public acknowledgment of that claim. Positive shame is a concern for maintaining and protecting one's worth, value, reputation. Negative shame is the loss of one's honor.³⁷

In this regard, 2 Macc 6:18-31 exhibits a gradual build-up, beginning with the natural beauty of Eleazar, then moving on to the notion of preserving one's honour (v. 23), and finally to that of avoiding scandal to others and disgrace to oneself (v. 25). Unlike Tamar who disguises her identity with a veil (Gen 38:14), the beautiful countenance of Eleazar prepares the reader for the dignity and aplomb with which he would face his persecutors³⁸.

Eleazar was guided both by the ethical observance of Torah and also by questions related to personal honour and shame. What concerns him is not, strictly speaking, the hypocrisy involved in secretly procuring kosher meat for himself. This seems to be subordinate to his self-portrayal³⁹. A different nuance can be perceived in Eleazar's martyrdom in 4 Maccabees (1:8; 5:1–7:25) which reflects the platonic tension between reason and feelings, clearly militating in

³⁵ See CROOK, Honor, 591-611; FISHER, *Hybris*; CAIRNS, *Aidōs*; AVRAHAMI, שׁוֹב in the Psalms, 295-313; WU, *Honor*.

³⁶ On the pervasiveness of deceit in various cultures, as well as its relation to self-esteem motives, see DEPAULO, review of *By the Grace of Guile*, 387-389.

³⁷ PILCH, *Honor and Shame*. [Accessed 14-01-2020].

³⁸ REYBURN – MCG FRY, *Handbook*, 878, note that Tamar's wearing of a veil is meant to conceal her identity, but it could also reflect the custom of religious prostitutes to do so in a Canaanite culture.

³⁹ Analysing another late text, though one of a very different context, WEEKS, 'Fear God', 102 states the following concerning Qohelet's exhortation not to delay in fulfilling a vow made to God (Qoh 5:3): "the basis of his advice lies in a direct appeal to self-interest, not to obligation under the Law".

favour of the former. In fact, the very intention of the author is laid out plainly at the beginning of the book in 4 Macc 1:1.3⁴⁰. In 2 Maccabees it is the concepts of honour and shame that are central, whereas in 4 Maccabees it is the ethical norms related to rationally upheld virtues that protect the observance of the Law⁴¹.

In 4 Maccabees, though the author sings the praises of Eleazar's honourable character, the text operates in a framework that is only present sparingly in 2 Maccabees. Eating pork is equated to gluttony and other such contemptible vices. Here, we therefore have an added layer of meaning. Not only is obedience to the Law demanded by religious faithfulness, but it is also an imperative dictated by ethical norms. Adhering to the precepts of the Law is presented as a noble philosophical and rational stance that must be adopted because it is conducive to such norms as temperance, manliness, justice, the love of reason, and self-mastery (see 4 Macc 5:15-38). The old man's eulogy of the Law in these terms thus equates it with the highest philosophical goods. In fact, immediately after speaking of his death, the author adds: "now that reason has conquered the emotions, we properly attribute to it the power to govern." (6:33)

The old scribe's moral stature is further emphasized in 4 Macc 6:16 which describes his emotional reaction to the offer of a life-saving deceptive act: "And Eleazar, as though the advice more painfully tortured him..." In light of the Deuteronomic injunction to express the sapiential and righteous character of the Torah (Deut 4:6-8), the martyrdom of the elderly scribe not only boosts his reputation of being righteous, but it also has a strong multiplier effect, instilling this quality in the young men who would walk in his footsteps⁴². Here too, the vehicle employed to safeguard Torah is a concern for one's dignity: "For it would be shameful if, while an aged man endures such agonies for the sake of religion, you young men were to be terrified by tortures." (4 Macc 16:17)

Defending the heroic behaviour of Jews, Josephus contrasted their selfless respect towards their sacred books to that of the Greeks towards their own:

... it comes natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them. ...to endure racks and deaths of all

⁴⁰ See HARRINGTON, *The Old Testament Apocrypha*, 202, 207-208.

⁴¹ Jesus' statement that it is better to tie a millstone and be thrown into the sea than to give scandal is made in relation to the veracity of God's word rather than to the poor image of oneself reflected in scandalous behaviour: Matt 18:6; Mk 9:42; Luke 17:1-2.

⁴² Eleazar's effectiveness in being a role model for the young is expressed in 4 Macc 8:1 where the young are said to have "prevailed over even harsher instruments of torture".

kinds upon the theatres, that they may not be obliged to say one word against our laws and the records that contain them; whereas there are none at all among the Greeks who would undergo the least harm on that account...⁴³

Elsewhere, Josephus comments on the events surrounding 2 Macc 6:1–7:42, noting that many Jews had acquiesced to the king’s orders with the exception of those protagonists who defied the king:

... but the best men, and those of the noblest souls, did not regard him, but did pay a greater respect to the customs of their country than concern as to the punishment which he threatened to the disobedient; on which account they every day underwent great miseries and bitter torments...⁴⁴

The bold words of Eleazar as well as those of the mother and her seven sons found in 2 and 4 Maccabees were framed within the context of God’s education of his people⁴⁵. These personages were mouthpieces at God’s service by which he conveyed clear messages. Following the role of the prophets and the sages, the “speaking” martyrs constituted the last category of educators in what turned out to be Israel’s final effort to uphold emblematic figures who sought to get the faithful on the straight and narrow⁴⁶. As witnessed in the contexts of Jeremiah and the Isaian servant who lived in times of oppression, great interest was shown in *both* the words and the actions of such individuals.

Yet, was Eleazar simply trying to save face, or was this pure love for Torah? Or was it both? The repeated mention of his old age (vv. 18.23.25) indicates that a change in direction at this point in his life would render all he strove for simply meaningless. Here, the fear of shame is construed as a brake-setter that prevented immoral action. In line with the strong insistence on Eleazar’s noble character, “the holy legislation established by God himself” features in v. 23 not primarily in order to acknowledge its greatness, but rather

⁴³ Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.42-44.

⁴⁴ Josephus, *Ant.* 12.255.

⁴⁵ See HARRINGTON, *The Old Testament Apocrypha*, 210. GRÜNINGER, *Reception* [Accessed 14-04-2020], 3, distinguishes between two ethical perspectives in 2 Macc, namely the one of education and discipline up till chapter 7, and the one of self-defence and resistance from chapter 8 onwards; also see SCHIFFMAN, *Commentaries*, 906.

⁴⁶ The value attributed to the words allegedly spoken by these martyrs must have increased over time as witnessed by the expansion of the events surrounding their martyrdom in 4 Maccabees. In this regard, HARRINGTON, *The Old Testament Apocrypha*, 208, speaks of the “emotional dialogues... and defiant speeches” of the protagonists.

to affirm the elderly man's personal worthiness in relation to it. In fact, it is a continuation of the exaltation of this scribe who is said to have been faultless from childhood.

4 A Fence around Torah

Eleazar's martyrdom doubtlessly acts as a witness to Torah and conveys a strong message about its prerogative of inviolability. Guarding one's dignity and one's acclaimed moral status is presented as a most suitable vehicle that would ensure the protection of the Law. Unlike the later rabbinic forms of the mechanism of forming a fence around Torah, which entailed creating other concrete laws (usually of prohibition) that would safeguard the core divine laws, preserving one's prestige entails a positive disposition that not only protects Torah, but also has an immediate advantageous bearing on the believers themselves. In an article in which Riecker lays out the fourfold mandate of Israel (rather than speaking of its "mission"), the author lists "Israel as mediator of knowledge of God" as one of these four aspects⁴⁷. Riecker limits himself to what the Hebrew Bible itself says about this, however we must also take into consideration the external historical forces that led the Hebrew Bible to attain its shape. It seems reasonable to hold that the martyrdom accounts in general, but that of Eleazar in particular, were devices employed not merely to boost the image of individual personages, but by so doing, to safeguard the continued transmission of Torah and related customs. Riecker identifies Deut 4:6-8 as foundational in this regard in that "these verses point to the fundamental significance of the ethical behavior of Yhwh's people, so that Yhwh can attract the other nations through his people"⁴⁸.

The quality of being a conceptual fence around Torah can be seen by the fact that, from a synchronic perspective, Eleazar's account forms a suitable prelude to the immediately succeeding account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers (7:1-41). The presence of their mother favours the attribution of a relatively young age to these men. Eleazar's death had indeed been judged by the author as having been valuable to the young (6:31). Nonetheless, there is

⁴⁷ RIECKER, *Missions*, 327.

⁴⁸ BORCHARDT, *What Do You Do?*, 17, is in agreement with Dries De Crom who sees the precise description of the translators and the knowledge attributed to them "as part of an ethical argument contributing to the impression of a high quality translation."

a palpable difference between the two accounts. Whereas that of the seven men has several references to resurrection and to the reward of life that is granted to the faithful, Eleazar's primary concern seems to gravitate towards his self-image as well as the fear of divine punishment (see v. 26).

Conversely, the story of Daniel's refusal to eat royal food (Dan 1:8-17), where he and his companions fared better than their companions after consuming vegetables and water, has overlapping qualities with that of Eleazar though it functions with a different logic. In Daniel's case, the notion of martyrdom is altogether missing, but abiding by a Torah-regulated diet is shown to result both in physical wellbeing and also in great skill and intelligence. However, these are simply the fruits of such obedience. Hence, though such a story is conducive to encouraging obedience to the Law, the one of Eleazar has a stronger impact through the mechanism of self-preservation that it instigates. Daniel's complying with the king's commands would have possibly resulted in a performance that was comparable to that of the rest, but Eleazar's obedience to the king's orders would have led him to lose his hard-earned kudos altogether.

Eleazar's story is probably the only one in which adherence to the Law *per se* could have easily been safeguarded had he simply pretended not to be breaking it. If this were not merely a decision taken to defend one's own honour, then it had enormous implications concerning obedience to Torah. The narrator's creation of a possibility to circumvent the breaking of the Law has the effect of dismantling a purely legalistic understanding of it. Better still, it underscores a fundamental truth, namely that the dictates of the Law do not pertain merely to the realm of the senses, that is to what can be perceived, but functions on a higher level of truth.

In the course of the centuries, as the teachings of Torah were being explicated, the rabbis taught that only feigning to be breaking the Law, as would have been the case had Eleazar accepted the secretly prepared kosher food, already constitutes a deviation from it. In interpreting this story, Schiffman speaks of the rabbinic concept of *mar'it 'ayin*, which means "appearance to the eye"⁴⁹. He argues that this is in agreement with Eleazar who "judged even this

⁴⁹ See SCHIFFMAN, Commentaries, 906. Regarding *mar'it 'ayin*, see Minchas Shlomo, 2-3:53 and Talmud Keritut, 21. Despite my contention that the concept of *mar'it 'ayin* here functions differently to what Schiffman suggests, it is curious that in speaking of the location where Tamar played the prostitute, namely the entrance to Enaim (פתח עינים),

[ruse] a violation of the Jewish law⁵⁰. However, this interpretation may not be correct on three counts. First, both in the description given by the author (v. 23) and in the speech reported (vv. 24-28) greatest weight is given to the scribe's self-esteem. Second, it is not immediately noticeable that the text signals a distinction between one's *appearing* to be breaking the Law and one's *actually* breaking it. The expression *μᾶλλον δὲ... ἀκολούθως* ("and above all according to" 6:23) cannot be said to indicate unequivocally that pretence was forbidden by the Law – the point of the matter is plainly that it is unlawful to eat pork. As a matter of fact, his own description of such a trick is not construed in terms of the Law, but rather in relation to one's self-portrayal⁵¹:

"Pretence", he said, "does not befit our time of life; many young people would suppose that Eleazar at the age of ninety had conformed to the foreigners' way of life and ... I should only bring defilement and disgrace on my old age". (6:24-25)

Third, though the rabbis used the notion of *mar'it 'ayin* to forbid permissible actions that seemed to violate Torah precisely because others could wrongly conclude that such actions were in fact permissible (and hence be led astray), this is not the intention of the account in question. Eleazar's fear is not that the young would wrongly assume that eating non-kosher food is permissible, but rather that they would make the wrong conclusion about his idealised persona. The long and short of the story is not that, if Eleazar ate the secretly prepared kosher meat, others would possibly have followed suit in ignorance, but that his standing in the community's consciousness would have been dealt a hard blow. This, in fact, is the opposite of the reasoning behind *mar'it 'ayin* where its employment must be purely to safeguard Torah, rather than to wrongly judge a person who would have seemed to be breaking Torah⁵². The narrative is construed in such a way as to present the dealing of such a blow to Eleazar's stature as being the main preoccupation of our protagonist. It is only in avoiding such a blow dealt to his hero that the author sought to safeguard Torah from being

ADELMAN, *Seduction*, 6 states: "*petah 'enayim*, which can also be read as "the opening of the eyes," is fraught with irony, for this is the place where sight is veiled."

⁵⁰ SCHIFFMAN, *Commentaries*, 906.

⁵¹ However, the Greek term for pretence (which implies deceit) in our text is expressed by the verb *ὑποκρίνομαι* (2 Macc 6:21.24), and this is contrasted to the Law in Sirach 32:15 and 33:2.

⁵² See b. Šabb. 64b:16 and b. Šebu. 30.

written off. The power of the behaviour adopted by Eleazar was such that he hoped it would lead others to imitate him in making a good death (see 6:28). Here too, the focus is on the person who, in dying for the Law, would prove himself or herself worthy of such a great cause.

Concluding Remarks

The account analysed is not merely at the service of historiography, but it is strongly parenetic and didactic. The text points to Eleazar's self-image and a preoccupation with the preservation of his honour, serving the narrator's purpose of highlighting the ultimate value of Torah. Hence, Eleazar's concern about himself and the impression others will have of him turn out to be the means by which a higher reality is affirmed. The author skilfully and intricately bound the value of Torah together with Eleazar's kudos such that the latter became a direct gauge of the former. The greatness and holiness of Torah is emphasized by aggrandizing the personal tragedy that would befall the scribe if he devalued it by a wrong choice.

Though the narrative operates on the belief that deception is evil, the real vehicle that is used to protect the Torah-shaped mores is actually the portrayal of Eleazar's valour and heroism. Eleazar was able to leave "an example of nobility and a record of virtue" (v. 31). The text imparts the image of a Law-abiding person who would not compromise with evil. This is achieved by putting the man himself in the limelight in the entire narrative, including its final verse. For indeed, the nobility and virtue ascribed to Eleazar are purely human, non-religious qualities, but here these derive their existence only in relation to Torah. The deceptive trick offered would have spared Eleazar, but it would have consequentially damaged both his reputation and Torah too. Hence, the account functions as a fence around Torah that bears moral rather than legal force. Guarding one's dignity and one's acclaimed moral status is a vehicle that would ensure the protection of Torah. The text does not qualify this behaviour as being less respectable than dying for Torah for the sake of Torah. In the final analysis, Eleazar's self-immolation is not construed as being less generous than that of the seven young men. Truth be told, they too reasoned in terms of ultimate personal gain, though theirs employed a *Jenseits* perspective.

The foregoing analysis has focused specifically on an idealised prosopography within a narrative of martyrdom that contributed to the preservation of Torah. This study could lead to building a clearer picture of all

the possible techniques that may have been employed to prevent the breaking of Torah apart from such portrayals of valour and the creation of subsidiary laws that bolstered and protected Torah. It would, therefore, be interesting to see how other techniques were used for the same purpose, for instance the ostracization of those who recanted, rewards or honours given to those who upheld Torah (e.g. social status or the assignment of important leadership roles), and the association of wisdom with obedience to Torah, to mention just three possibilities. In the end, all such techniques would have contributed to ensuring the survival and propagation of Torah, which is doubtlessly why the text in question was composed.

Bibliography

- ADELMAN, Rachel: Seduction and Recognition in the Story of Judah and Tamar and the Book of Ruth, *Nashim* 23 (2012) 87-109.
- AVRAHAMI, Yael: בּוֹשׁ in the Psalms – Shame or Disappointment?, *JSOT* 34.3 (2010) 295-313.
- BARRERA, Julio C.: Origins of a Tripartite Old Testament Canon. In: Lee Martin McDonald – James A. Sanders (eds.): *The Canon Debate*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002, 128-145.
- BAUTCH, Richard J.: In Vino Veritas? Critiquing Drunkenness and Deceit in Micah and Isaiah, *ZAW* 129/4 (2017) 555-567.
- BORCHARDT, Francis: What Do You Do When a Text Is Failing? The Letter of Aristeas and the Need for a New Pentateuch, *JSJ* 48/1 (2017) 1-21.
- CAIRNS, Douglas L.: *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- CROOK, Zeba: Honor, Shame, and Social Status Revisited, *JBL* 128/3 (2009) 591-611.
- DEPAULO, Bella M.: Review of *By the Grace of Guile: The Role of Deception in Natural History and Human Affairs*, by Loyal Rue. *Political Psychology* 17.2 (1996) 387-390.
- DORAN, Robert: *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012.
- FERGUSON, Everett: Factors Leading to the Selection and Closure of the New Testament Canon: A Survey of Some Recent Studies. In: Lee Martin McDonald – James A. Sanders (eds.): *The Canon Debate*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002, 295-320.
- FISHER, Nick R. E.: *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1992.
- FITZGERALD, John T.: Virtue/Vice Lists. In: *ABD* VI (1992) 857-859.

- FLAVIUS, Josephus: *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Translated by William Whiston, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
- GOEHRING, James Ernst (ed.): *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex Ms. 193 in the Schøyen Collection* (CSCO.Sub 85) Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1990.
- GRÜNINGER, Ann-Christin: Reception of Scripture and Its Ethical Implications in 2 Maccabees [online]. [Accessed 14-04-2020]. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/38587967/Reception_of_Scripture_and_its_Ethical_Implications_n_2_Maccabees_SBL_Denver_2018.
- HANHART, Robert (ed.): *Maccabaeorum liber II* (Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis IX/2), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- HARRINGTON, Daniel J.: The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Early Church and Today. In: Lee Martin McDonald – James A. Sanders (eds.): *The Canon Debate*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002, 196-210.
- HENDEL, Ronald – JOOSTEN, Jan: *How Old Is the Hebrew Bible? A Linguistic, Textual, and Historical Study*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.
- LIDDEL, Henry George – SCOTT, Robert: *A Greek-English Lexicon*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- MELTZER, Edmund S. – BETHGE, Hans-Gebhard: The Jewish Martyrs: 2 Maccabees 5:27-7:41. In: James Ernst Goehring (ed.): *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex Ms 193 in the Schøyen Collection* (CSCO.Sub 85), Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1990.
- MURPHY, Roland E.: *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature*, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- NIDITCH, Susan: The Wronged Woman Righted: An Analysis of Genesis 38, *HThR* 72.1-2 (1979) 143-149.
- PARTHEY, Gustav: *Vocabularium Coptico-Latinum et Latino-Copticum e Peyroni et Tattami Lexicis*, Berolini: E. Nicolai, 1844.
- PILCH, John J.: *Honor and Shame* [online]. [Accessed 14-01-2020]. Available at: <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195393361/obo-9780195393361-0077.xml>
- REYBURN, William David – MCG FRY, Euan: *A Handbook on Genesis*, New York: United Bible Societies, 1997.
- RIECKER, Siegbert: Missions in the Hebrew Bible Revisited: Four Theological Trails instead of One Confining Concept, *Missiology: An International Review* 44.3 (2016) 324-339.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H.: Commentaries on 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees (HBC), 875-915.
- SCHOENBERG, Martin: *The First and the Second Books of the Maccabees*, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1966.
- SIMKOVICH, Malka Zeiger: Greek Influence on the Composition of 2 Maccabees, *JSJ* 42.3 (2011) 293-310.
- The Catholic Study Bible (New American Bible)*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- TREBOLLE BARRERA, Julio C.: Origins of a Tripartite Old Testament Canon. In: Lee Martin McDonald – James A. Sanders (eds.): *The Canon Debate*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002, 128-145.
- WEEKS, Stuart: 'Fear God and Keep His Commandments': Could Qohelet Have Said This? In: Bernd U. Schipper – D. Andrew Teeter (eds.), *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of "Torah" in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2013, 101-118.
- WU, Daniel Y.: *Honor, Shame, and Guilt: Social-Scientific Approaches to the Book of Ezekiel*, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2016.

Summary

2 Maccabees 6:18-31 recounts the martyrdom of the scribe Eleazar who refused to eat pork from ritually sacrificed swine. Given the late composition of this text concerning dietary laws, Torah and other customs were already firmly established. Yet, the martyrdom accounts recounted in 2 Macc seem to betray as many authorial intentions as the accounts recounted. What is surprising is that Eleazar's rightful resistance does not seem to be guided primarily by pure ethical concerns where deception per se is shunned, but rather by a twofold concern for self-preservation, namely vis-à-vis both men and God.

This text will be related to what is probably the only other biblical text that merges deception with the observance of Torah, namely Tamar's enticement of Judah (Gen 38) by which she seeks to secure her right for levirate marriage, or better still, for offspring issuing from such an arrangement. It will be argued that, though offspring or the young are at the centre of both plots, the intention of safeguarding Torah as such varies in both and is guided by different intentions. Moreover, the dynamics of deception too will be studied, noting that it is judged and employed differently by Eleazar and Tamar. And though their fates differed, Torah won the day. However, the use of deception must be seen within the larger framework of the theological intentions of Genesis and 2 Maccabees respectively.

Advances made in the social and cultural anthropology of the Bible and the Greek world have contributed to building a better picture of the dynamics of self-appreciation in the context of human relations. Insofar as Eleazar was careful not to forgo his hard-gained kudos and feared facing the judgement of God, this account functions as a kind of fence around Torah, without implying the creation of new laws and customs as the rabbinic term does. Guarding one's dignity and one's acclaimed moral status becomes a vehicle that would ensure the protection of Torah-inspired mores.

Keywords: self-portrayal, deception, moral character, moral status, fence around the Torah.


Zhrnutie

Druhá kniha Machabejcov (6,18-31) ozpráva o mučeníctve zákonníka Eleazara, ktorý odmietol jesť bravčové mäso z rituálne obetovaných zvierat. Predpisy o jedle, Tóra a iné zvyky vzhľadom na neskoré datovanie textu už boli pevne ustanovené. Avšak mučeníctvo vyrozprávané v 2Mak prezrádza toľko autorských zámerov, koľko je vyrozprávaných príbehov. Prekvapujúce je, že Eleazarov oprávnený vzdor sa nezdá byť prvotne motivovaný čisto etickými obavami nedopustiť sa zrady *per se*, ale skôr dvojakou obavou o sebazáchovu, konkrétne vis-à-vis človek a Boh.

Tento článok je venovaný pravdepodobne jedinému biblickému textu, ktorý spája zradu s dodržiavaním Tóry, konkrétne Tamarino zlákanie Júdu (Gn 38), ktorým sa pokúsila zaistiť si právo na levirátne manželstvo alebo skôr na potomstvo vyplývajúce z takého zväzku. V článku tvrdíme, že napriek tomu, že potomstvo alebo mládež sú v centre oboch príbehov, zámer dodržania Tóry je odlišný a tiež má odlišné motívy. Študovaná je tiež dynamika zrady i to, že je vnímaná a uplatňovaná inak Eleazarom a inak Tamarou. Hoci sú ich osudy rôzne, nakoniec u oboch zaváži Tóra. Použitie zrady však musí byť posudzované v širšom rámci teologických zámerov v Gen a 2Mak.

Pokrok v sociálnej a kultúrnej antropológii v Biblii a gréckom svete prispeli k budovaniu lepšieho obrazu dynamiky sebaúcty v kontexte ľudských vzťahov. Nakoľko bol Eleazar opatrný, aby nezabudol na svoj ťažko získaný kudos, a obával sa Božieho súdu, natoľko je tento príbeh istým druhom ochranného plotu okolo Tóry bez implikácie nových zákonov a zvykov, ako to robí uvedený rabínsky termín. Stráženie si vlastnej úcty a uznávaného morálneho statusu sa stáva prostriedkom, ktorý by mohol zabezpečiť ochranu Tórou inšpirovaných mravov.

Kľúčové slová: sebaapredstavenie, zrada, morálny charakter, morálny status, ochranný plot okolo Tóry.

Stefan M. Attard
Faculty of Theology
Humanities A
University of Malta
MSIDA MSD 2080
Malta
stefan.m.attard@um.edu.mt
 0000-0002-6364-1797

Jesus and the Passover in Mark 14:1-12

A Chronological Confusion?

Kenneth L. Waters Sr.

And the Passover and feast of Unleavened Bread were two days away, and the chief priests and scribes sought a way to take him by guile and kill him, for they said, “not during the feast lest there be a riot among the people”. (Mark 14:1-2)

On the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the Passover lamb, his disciples said to him, “Where do you want us to go so that we may prepare for you to eat the Passover?” (Mark 14:12)

Introduction

A redaction-tradition critical approach to the Last Supper narrative in the Gospel of Mark has a long, fruitful history¹. However, hermeneutical difficulties in the area of chronology and the relation of the Supper to the Passover remain unresolved. An additional methodological component is needed. Therefore, I will include a culture-critical perspective that is sensitive to divergences between popular and official practices in first century Judaism.

In his review of six studies of ancient Judea, Stenschke observes,

In addition to filling in many details and challenging older interpretations in various ways, there is consensus in all these studies that first century BC and AD Judaea/Palaestina were far more diverse and complex than previously assumed.²

I am not claiming that Stenschke or the authors he mentions would agree with my thesis. I only claim that Stenschke’s review of these authors raise sensitivity to the diversity and complexity that characterized first century

¹ MARXSEN, *Mark the Evangelist*, 15, 21, 24-25.

² STENSCHKE, *Judea*, 16. The six studies that Stenschke surveys are: ROCCA, *Herod’s Judea*; NETZER, *Architecture*; ECK, *Rom und Judea*; ZANGENBERG, *Das Tote Meer*; HANSON – OAKMAN, *Palestine*; MARSHALL, *Jesus, Patrons and Benefactors*.

Judaism. However, I will extend this sensitivity to my reading of Mark's account of the Last Supper and the chronological questions that it raises. I intend to demonstrate that Mark provides a chronologically coherent account of the Last Supper despite appearances to the contrary. The need for this study and its culturally sensitive methodology becomes clearer with a review of previous studies.

1 The Problem of the Last Supper

The late Raymond Brown described the Last Supper of Jesus in Mark 14 as a Passover meal in which Jesus presented himself as the paschal lamb. For Brown, the gospel writer was making a theological point. "In other words, we have a theologoumenon, i.e., the presentation of the Last Supper as a paschal meal in a dramatization of the preGospel proclamation of Jesus as the paschal lamb"³. Brown felt that Mark took this theological narrative over from already established Christian tradition. If Mark himself had created this narrative we would expect him to work out the chronological difficulties. In 14:2, the chief priests and scribes determine that Jesus will not be arrested, tried, and crucified during the feast, but the feast has already begun with the Passover meal. Brown maintains that the Passover setting in the Synoptic Gospels would mean that Jesus was crucified on Sat., Nisan 15, but, Brown argued, this cannot be accurate. Jesus did not die on the day of the Passover meal. He therefore suggested that we give up the synoptic date of the crucifixion. Brown felt that it was most plausible that the Last Supper, trial, and death of Jesus was completed by Fri, Nisan 14, as John proclaims. "Thus there are solid reasons for judging as historical that Jesus died on Thn/Fd. the 14th of Nisan, the day on which paschal lambs were sacrificed, and the eve of the 15th of Nisan on which the paschal meal would be eaten"⁴. Brown uses the marker "Thn/Fd." to indicate that Thursday night was actually Friday morning in Jewish timekeeping.

Scholars generally see the chronology of the Last Supper in Mark as problematic, and by virtue of some kind of literary relationship, the chronological problem extends to the other two Synoptics. Chronological issues haunt scholarly interpretations of Mark 14 and synoptic parallels even when the main focus is upon other matters.

³ BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1370.

⁴ BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1373.

Robin Routledge whose main concern is to show that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, says that the “lack of clear evidence means that we cannot be sure about the chronology” of the Last Supper⁵. He says that one approach to the chronological difficulty is to accept that the four gospels cannot be reconciled, and that a choice must be made between them. He considers the suggestion that John places the crucifixion a day earlier than the Synoptics to identify Jesus with the paschal lambs that were being slain on that day⁶. Another view is that the Synoptics are historically and chronologically more accurate while John in contrast deploys “theological symbolism”⁷. Yet another view is that John’s chronology is correct, and that the synoptic references to the Last Supper are early church interpolations designed to make the Last Supper a “Christian Passover”⁸. He also considers the premises that the Last Supper was another kind of meal in anticipation of the Passover, or a Passover based on a variant calendar, in which case it was without a lamb⁹. Routledge, however, thinks that use of a variant calendar is unlikely. Routledge believes that the Last Supper was a true Passover meal, and even if it was a day earlier than the Passover, it was still received by the disciples as a Passover meal as the language of the Synoptics indicate. The only difference would be that the menu did not include lamb¹⁰.

Joel Marcus directs his main argument against contemporary Jewish scholars who characterize the Passover seder and Haggadah as post-70 CE features, which would mean that the supposed Jewish model for the Last Supper did not exist¹¹. According to these scholars, the Passover seder was, as Marcus explains, “a post-70 CE replacement for the pre-70 tradition of Passover

⁵ ROUTLEDGE, *Passover and Last Supper*, 206.

⁶ ROUTLEDGE, *Passover and Last Supper*, 205, n. 10. He refers to HIGGINS, *The Lord’s Supper*, 22 and JEREMIAS, *Eucharistic Words*, 81-82.

⁷ ROUTLEDGE, *Passover and Last Supper*, 205. Routledge is probably referring to JEREMIAS, *Eucharistic Words*, 81-82 where this view is found.

⁸ Routledge does not mention LESSING, *Die Abendmahlsprobleme*, 250-269, but this was Lessing’s view.

⁹ Routledge may be referring to the variant calendar argument of JAUBERT, *The Date of the Last Supper*, and the different meal view of MARSHALL, *Last Supper*, 67-78.

¹⁰ ROUTLEDGE, *Passover and Last Supper*, 206.

¹¹ MARCUS, *Passover and Last Supper*, 303, n. 10. These scholars and their research are YUVAL, *Easter and Passover*, 98-124; KULP, *Origins*, 112; BOKSER, *Origins*, 14-28; SAFRAI – SAFRAI, *Haggadah*, 9-15; TABORY, *Toward a History*, 63; HAUPMAN, *How Old Is Haggadah?*, 5-18; FRIEDMAN, *Tosefta*, 430-432; LEONHARD, *The Jewish Pesach*, 1-118.

sacrifice, which came to an end when the Romans destroyed the temple in which Jewish sacrifice took place”¹². Marcus, however, marshals evidence from *Jubilees*, Philo, and the NT Last Supper narratives to show that there was “a leisurely Passover meal and a domestic seder, including haggadic recital, in the pre-70 period”¹³. Marcus further responds to the contention of Israel Yuval that the Passover seder was “essentially a *response* to the Christian eucharist rather than being its source”¹⁴. Yuval maintains that Rabban Gamaliel II, in m. Pesah. 10.5, advocates for a counter narrative to the Christian interpretation of Exodus 12 and the Passover sacrifice. This included Gamaliel’s prohibition of *afikomen* (an after-meal indulgence) in m. Pesah. 10.8.¹⁵ Marcus points out that Gamaliel’s ban on *afikomen* is better understood as a response, not to Christian interpretation of the Passover, but to customary pagan post-meal revelry. Marcus finds that other aspects of Yuval’s argument are unconvincing. Tangential to his main argument, there are some chronological issues that Marcus addresses. He prefers John’s chronology, which places Jesus’ Last Supper on the night before Passover (Nisan 13) to that of the Synoptics which place the Last Supper on the first night of the Passover (Nisan 15). The Last Supper in John was therefore not a Passover meal. Scholars who feel that the Synoptics portray the Last Supper as a Passover meal must argue either that John was wrong, that the Synoptics and John were using variant calendars, or that Jesus knowing that he might die before the Passover modelled his Last Supper after the Passover¹⁶.

Mariusz Rosik more directly addresses the “alleged or real” disagreements between the Synoptics and John on the chronology of the Last Supper. In the Synoptics, the supper took place on the eve of the Passover, the day the paschal lambs were slaughtered, a Thursday (Mark 14:12.17 par.). In John, as further assumed, Jesus was crucified on the eve of the Passover, the day the paschal lambs were slaughtered, a Friday, and therefore, before the Passover meal¹⁷.

¹² MARCUS, Passover and Last Supper, 304.

¹³ MARCUS, Passover and Last Supper, 307.

¹⁴ MARCUS, Passover and Last Supper, 318; YUVAL, Easter and Passover, 98-124.

¹⁵ MARCUS, Passover and Last Supper, 319.

¹⁶ MARCUS, Passover and Last Supper, 301.

¹⁷ ROSIK, Dispute, 179.

Rosik explores eight proposed solutions to the chronological problem¹⁸. The first is to recognize two different ways of counting a day in the time of Jesus. The Pharisees preferred that the day begin at sunrise, while for others the day began at sunset¹⁹. On the basis of the first preference, Jesus' Passover meal on Thursday night was still on Thursday, but according to the second, it was on Friday. The main problem with this solution is that it leaves too little time for the trial of Jesus²⁰.

The second solution is that the Synoptics are right when they have Jesus host his Passover supper on the evening of Nisan 14, and then have him crucified on Nisan 15; but, for theological reasons, John changed the day of crucifixion to Nisan 14, the day when the paschal lambs were killed. The alternative to this solution is that John was right in not portraying Jesus' meal with his disciples as a Passover meal, but for theological reasons, the Synoptics turned it into a Passover meal²¹. Rosik referred to another version by Hans Lessing who maintained that the early church added the Last Supper as a Passover meal for theological reasons²². Rosik characterizes these proposals as versions of the "Harmonistic Hypothesis," but makes no assessment of either one²³.

The third solution is that Jesus hosted his Last Supper on Nisan 13, either as an individual decision or in accordance with a law that the paschal lambs be sacrificed on Nisan 13 when Nisan 15 falls on the sabbath. The lambs would still be eaten on the Nisan 14 or 15²⁴. The absence of any mention of lamb with this

¹⁸ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 182, nn. 10-12. Rosik draws upon DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel*, 489-492; MICKIEWICZ, *Ewangelia*, 12-24, 432-452; SMITH, *Chronology*, 30-31; OGG, *Chronology*, 75-77; HAMILTON, *Chronology*, 323-327.

¹⁹ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 182, n. 13, refers to DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel*, 181-182 for this information.

²⁰ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 183.

²¹ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 183, nn. 15-17. As examples of these solutions Rosik cites WALTHER, *Jesus das Passahlamm*, 74-76; KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, אה, 202-210; ŁACH, *Data Ostatniej*, 405; SANDERS, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 285-286; LOHFINK, *Jesus z Nazareta*, 401; DUNN, *Jesus Remembered*, 772-773; MATSON, *The Historical Plausibility*, 291-312; FREDRIKSEN, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 223.

²² ROSIK, *Dispute*, 183, n. 18. Rosik cites LESSING, *Die Abendmahlsprobleme*, 250-269.

²³ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 183.

²⁴ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 184, nn. 20-22. Rosik attributes this solution to Str-B, 812-814; PICKL, *The Messiah*, 120-122; WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 556-559; MARCUS, *Passover and Last Supper*, 303-324; PITRE, *Jesus, the Tribulation*, 441-442.

meal is one of the reasons this hypothesis is attractive²⁵. However, one of the arguments against this hypothesis is that there is mention of lamb at this meal (Mark 14:12; Luke 22:15)²⁶.

A fourth solution is that Jesus kept the Passover meal on Nisan 14 after it was postponed to Friday, Nisan 15 by the Jewish authorities²⁷. The objections to this proposal are that there is no evidence of the Sanhedrin ever postponing a festival, there is no motive that can be found for doing this, and it would be strange for the Jews to obey this directive while Jesus does not²⁸.

A fifth proposal is that the Synoptics follow the solar calendar of the Essene community, while John follows the lunar calendar of the temple priests. According to the Synoptics, Jesus' Last Supper was on Tuesday, which, according to the Essene calendar, was also the day of the Passover meal²⁹. Those who oppose this solution believe that Jesus ate the Passover with his disciples after the paschal lambs were slain in the temple. Also, among other objections listed by Rosik, there is no evidence that Jesus followed an Essene calendar³⁰.

The sixth proposal that Rosik discusses is a modified version of the first. In this version, the Synoptics follow a Galilean practice of counting a day from sunrise to sunrise, while John follows a Judean practice of counting a day from sunset to sunset. Harold Hoehner makes this argument³¹. However, Rosik finds that this argument lacks literary evidence to confirm that Galileans and Judeans differed on how they defined a day³².

²⁵ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 184, n. 23. Rosik notes this as an argument of SCHRÖTER, *Das Abendmahl*, 44.

²⁶ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 185, n. 28. He refers to BARRETT, Luke XII.15, 305-307; JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words*, 18-19.

²⁷ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 186, n. 36. He cites ŁACH, *Data Ostatniej*, 405.

²⁸ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 186, n. 37. He again cites ŁACH, *Data Ostatniej*, 417.

²⁹ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 186, nn. 38-39; 187, n. 42. According to Rosik, representatives of this view are JAUBERT, *Le calendrier des Jubiles*, 35-61; JAUBERT, *The Date of the Last Supper*; NODET, *On Jesus' Last Supper*, 348-369; PIXNER, *Paths of the Messiah*, 242-244; PIXNER, *Mount Zion*, 309-322; SAULNIER, *Calendrical Variations*; RIESNER, *Jesus*, 198-234.

³⁰ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 188, n. 44, nn. 47-50. According to Rosik, those who argue against the Essene hypothesis are HAHN, *The Fourth Cup*, 66-67; MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 392; SMITH, *Chronology*, 30; BROWN, *New Testament Essays*, 212-214; BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1350-1378; PITRE, *Jesus and the Last Supper*, 274-275.

³¹ ROSIK, *Dispute*, 189, n. 52. He refers to HOEHNER, *Chronology*, 2348-2349.

³² ROSIK, *Dispute*, 189, n. 54. He refers to PITRE, *Jesus and the Last Supper*, 259 on this point.

Rosik seems particularly interested in a seventh proposal, that Jesus held his own Passover in counter distinction to the typical Jewish Passover³³. The absence of roasted lamb at the meal is one of the “novelties” that made Jesus’ Passover different. Other novelties were the passing around of Jesus’ own cup to signify unity, the omission of the fourth cup of wine, and that Jesus celebrated the Passover with a different kind of “family,” namely, his apostles³⁴. Rosik entertains the thought that Jesus postponed his Passover meal for one day after the other Jews had their meal, especially in light of all the other changes he made; but Rosik does not explain the chronology that would allow this³⁵.

Rosik also seems particularly interested in the eighth solution, that the perceived discrepancy between John and the Synoptics on the dating of the Last Supper is based on inadequate understanding of the term “Passover” in ancient references³⁶. John never uses the term to refer to the Passover lamb slain on Nisan 14. In John, the term refers to the meal that is eaten on Nisan 15 (John 13:1; 19:14). The term also refers to the other meals eaten during the rest of that week (18:28.39). On this proposal, the meal that Jesus had with his disciples was a Passover on Nisan 15 (13:20). Jesus was arrested later that evening and led to crucifixion on Nisan 16, the day after the lambs were sacrificed in the temple. Accordingly, the reference to the “day of preparation for the Passover” (19:14) does not place Jesus’ crucifixion on Friday, Nisan 14, because it refers to Friday, Nisan 21 instead³⁷.

Rosik thinks that the last two proposals receive the most support in the current debate. Nevertheless, despite the range of proposed solutions, he also feels that the chronological issues revolving around the dating of the Last Supper in the Synoptics and John are not completely resolved³⁸. From this brief but representative overview of Brown, Routledge, Marcus, and Rosik, it seems that the text of Mark 14:1-12 is resistant to a satisfactory solution to its chronological problems.

³³ ROSIK, Dispute, 189, n. 55. He cites JANKOWSKI, *Eucharystia*, 96-99.

³⁴ ROSIK, Dispute, 190, n. 56; 191, nn. 58-59. For these “novelties” he cites JANKOWSKI, *Eucharystia*, 96-99; BARTNICKI, *Ostatnia Wieczerza*, 17; THEISSEN – MERZ, *Der historische Jesus*, 375; LOHFINK, *Jesus z Nazareta*, 410.

³⁵ ROSIK, Dispute, 189-191.

³⁶ ROSIK, Dispute, 191, nn. 63, 68. Rosik cites PITRE, *Jesus and the Last Supper*, 331, 336 for this solution.

³⁷ ROSIK, Dispute, 192-193.

³⁸ ROSIK, Dispute, 194.

2 Cause for Confusion

A careful reading of Mark 14 could therefore lead to confusion over when the disciples of Jesus prepared and ate the Passover meal. We should therefore try a new reading with closer attention to problematic features in the text, and sensitivity to cultural differences within Judaism.

In what follows, all references to days and times are according to ancient Jewish reckoning, where the new day begins at sunset³⁹. For convenience, I will continue to use Western names for the days, but it must be kept in mind that Friday night in the Western view was in fact already Saturday in the ancient Jewish view.

In the first century, the Passover meal began at night (Exod 12:8; Jub. 49:1; m. Zebah. 5:8), however, Jesus began his Last Supper in the evening, before it was night (Matt 26:20; Mark 14:17), although it was night when the meal ended (Matt 26:31; Mark 14:30; cf. John 13:30; 1 Cor 11:23)⁴⁰. In Jewish reckoning this means that the Last Supper of Jesus began on Thursday evening, but ended early on Friday morning.

In Mark, the disciples ask Jesus “Where do you want us to go so that we may prepare for you to eat the Passover?” (Mark 14:12; cf. Matt 26:17; Luke 22:9). They ask this question on “the first day of Unleavened Bread”. Jesus instructs two of his disciples to locate an unnamed associate in Jerusalem and say to him, “The Teacher says, where is my guest room where I may eat the Passover with my disciples (Mark 14:14; cf. Matt 26:18; Luke 22:11)? The disciples follow Jesus’ instructions, they are shown the Upper Room, and they “prepared the Passover” (Mark 14:16; cf. Matt 26:19; Luke 22:13). We therefore see the disciples of Jesus engaged in a “day of preparation for the Passover,” yet it is on “the first day of Unleavened Bread”.

Confusion mounts when Mark narrates events that seemingly lead up to the first day of Unleavened Bread, especially when we read from English

³⁹ DE VRIES, Day, 783.

⁴⁰ WAGENAAR, Passover, 263. “The custom to eat unleavened bread with the passover [sic] meal in the night beginning the fifteenth in the post-priestly additions assumes a day stretching in accordance with later Jewish practice from sunset to sunset. The different ways to calculate the beginning of the day attested in the early and later post-exilic texts suggest that the custom to reckon the days from sunset to sunset was an innovation introduced in the course of the fifth century B.C.E.”

translations like the NRSV. I am referring to English translations in this section, instead of the Greek text, because the English translations have largely contributed to the confusion surrounding these passages, and I want to show why. In Mark 14:1 NRSV, when the author identifies the time when plans for Jesus' arrest were being made, he tells us "It was two days before the Passover and the festival of Unleavened Bread." From a literary perspective, this was two days before the sabbath (Mark 14:17; 15:42)⁴¹. In other words, it was Thursday. This announcement is followed by the conspiracy of the chief priests and scribes, the scene in Bethany in the house of Simon the Leper, and a reference to Judas Iscariot and the plot to betray Jesus, with all of these events from verses 1-11 taking place on Thursday (cf. Matt 26:1-16; Luke 22:1-6). Then at verse 12, the NRSV tells us, "On the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover lamb is sacrificed, his disciples said to him, "Where do you want us to go and make the preparations for you to eat the Passover?" (cf. Matt 26:17; Luke 22:7). It seems then, that this action indicated in verse 12 took place on Saturday.

In that year, the *official* day of preparation for the Passover would have been on Friday (when the Passover lambs were sacrificed) (Mark 15:42; cf. Matt 27:62; Luke 23:54); the Passover would have officially been on Saturday (when the meal was eaten); and the first day of Unleavened Bread would have also been on Saturday (followed by six more days of festival) (Exod 12:1-20; Deut 16:1-8)⁴². On the one hand, it seems then that the disciples of Jesus in Mark are preparing to eat the Passover meal on Saturday. However, in Mark, Jesus was crucified on Friday, and ate the Passover with his disciples on the day before (Mark 15:1.42)⁴³. Therefore, the Last Supper had to have been on Thursday,

⁴¹ How do we know that the Synoptics place the Passover and first day of Unleavened Bread on Saturday in the year that Jesus died? Matthew 26:5 and Mark 14:2 require that the crucifixion of Jesus happen before the first day of Unleavened Bread. Matthew 26:2 and Mark 14:1 allow only two days before the first day of Unleavened Bread, and therefore only one day for Jesus to be crucified. Matthew 27:62 and Mark 15:42 places the crucifixion of Jesus on Friday. The first day of Unleavened Bread in Matthew and Mark therefore occurred on Saturday. Luke (22:14; 23:54) is chronologically consistent with Matthew and Mark regardless of one's theory of synoptic relationships.

⁴² The Passover (Nisan 15) occurred on the first full moon after the vernal equinox, but not always on the same day of the week.

⁴³ All four canonical gospels identify the day of Jesus' death and burial as the "day of preparation for the sabbath" or Friday (Matt 27:57.62; Mark 15:25.42; Luke 23:44.54; John 19:31). The clear chronological sequence "day of preparation," "next day," and "first

especially since it was evening (*ὄψιας*), before nightfall (Mark 14:17; Matt 26:20). If we follow all the literary trails in Mark, we seem to arrive at confusion wrapped in inconsistency. Mark seems to place the day of preparation and the first day of Unleavened Bread on the same day (Saturday). He then seems to place the Last Supper simultaneously on two different days (Thursday and Saturday), and he seems to place the crucifixion of Jesus simultaneously on two different days (Friday and Sunday). From all appearances, this is total confusion.

I will show that despite appearances Mark is not confused. We begin to see this when we realize, first, that Mark actually places the first day of Unleavened Bread on Thursday; second, that this particular Thursday was recognized in the time of Jesus as an *unofficial* first day of Unleavened Bread; third, that the disciples' day of preparation for killing the Passover lamb was an *ad hoc* arrangement, probably shared with other Jews, but yet different from the official day of preparation a day later.

I use the contrast *official* and *unofficial* instead of *traditional* and *nontraditional* because Mark's first day of Unleavened Bread was still *traditional* even though it was not the *official* day observed for this purpose by the temple priests and their congregation. Even though it was a *popular* instead of an *official* schedule it was still just as traditional as the official observance⁴⁴.

The NRSV (and other English translations) give the impression that Mark 14:12 is two days after vv. 1-11; that is to say, Saturday. Even in the Greek text, Mark's awkward transition from vv. 1-11 to v. 12 can be misleading in that it looks like the advent of a later day. In actuality, the time "two days before the Passover and the festival of Unleavened Bread" (14:1 NRSV) and "the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover lamb is sacrificed" (14:12 NRSV) are the same day (Thursday, Nisan 13).

day of the week "(or "day of preparation," "sabbath," and "after the sabbath") occurs with little variation in all four canonical gospels (Matt 27:62; 28:1; Mark 15:42; 16:1.2; Luke 23:54.56; 24:1; John 19:31.42; 20:1). This sequence can only be rendered in sequential terms equivalent to Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.

⁴⁴ The contrast between official and unofficial religion is an established theme in the sociological study of religion, both ancient and contemporary. See BERLINERBLAU, Max Weber's Useful Ambiguities, 605-626; ILLMAN – CZIMBALMOS, Knowing, Being, and Doing, 171-199; ILLMAN, Researching Vernacular Judaism, 91-108; WEBER, *Ancient Judaism*; FAHEY, Max Weber's *Ancient Judaism*, 62-87. These studies use the terms "folk," "popular," "vernacular," and "unofficial," to describe "everyday" religion and distinguish it from "formal," "institutional," or "official" religion.

In verse 14:1, Mark is referring to the *official* Jewish observances of the Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread. The official Passover that year would have been Saturday, Nisan 15, which was also the first day of the feast of Unleavened Bread, to be followed by six more days of festival. However, in verse 14:12, Mark is referring to a different first day of Unleavened Bread. He is referring to the *popular* day when all leaven is removed from the households of Israel⁴⁵. Officially, this activity would have been Saturday in the year that Jesus died, and that day would have *officially* been called the first day of Unleavened Bread. But this day was pushed back two days early by popular demand, and *unofficially* still called the first day of Unleavened Bread. Therefore, Mark's scheduling was not off-kilter after all. He was only following *popular* custom by referring to this day (Thursday) as the first day of Unleavened Bread.

Marcus offers an alternative explanation for why Mark places the first day of Unleavened Bread on the same day as the slaughter of the Passover lambs. He maintains that the chronology of Mark 14:12 may reflect the Greco-Roman sunrise-to-sunrise description of a day. "By the Greco-Roman sunrise-to-sunrise method of reckoning, however, this afternoon slaughter of the lambs occurred on the same day as the evening Passover meal (or "seder")⁴⁶. However, this sunrise-to-sunrise description of Nisan 14 allows for only five or six hours between the slaughtering of the lambs and the Passover meal. This is not enough time for the events of Mark 14:12-15.

In the fourfold gospel narrative, the time of Jesus' Last Supper and the time of the slaughtering of the lambs (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:14) were separated by a sundown (Matt 26:30; Mark 14:30; Luke 22:56; John 13:30) and a sunrise (Matt 27:1; Mark 15:1; Luke 22:66; John 18:28). If sundown occurred around the first hour of the night in Jewish reckoning (7:00 p.m.), and sunrise at around the first hour of the day (7:00 a.m.), then this is a separation of at least twelve hours. The Last Supper and the official Passover seder were separated by a sundown, a sunrise, and yet another sundown (Exod 12:8; Jub. 49:1; m. Zebah. 5:8), a span of at least twenty-four hours. Mark's "first day of Unleavened Bread" in 14:12 (a Thursday), is an entirely different day than the one (a Saturday) that is two days away in 14:1.

⁴⁵ To be clear, there are references to two different "first days of Unleavened Bread" in the Synoptics. There is the *unofficial* day on Thursday, Nisan 13 (Matt 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7), and the *official* day on Saturday Nisan 15 (Matt 26:2; Mark 14:1.2; Luke 22:1; John 13:1).

⁴⁶ MARCUS, *Mark*, 944.

Exodus 12:14-15 is the literary matrix for the tradition preserved in Mark 14:12.

Exod 12:14-15	And this day shall be a memorial for you, and you shall celebrate it as a feast to the Lord, you shall celebrate it throughout your generations forever; you shall eat unleavened bread for seven days; and on the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses.	והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון וחגתם אהו חג ליהוה לדרתים חקת עולם תחגו שבעת ימים מצות תאכלו אך כיום הראשון תשכיתו שאר מכתים
---------------	--	---

Originally, the Hebrews were instructed to remove all leaven from their households on what became the official first day of Unleavened Bread, Nisan 15 (Exod 12:15.19-20; 13:7; Deut 16:3-4). However, as we see in m. Pesah. 1:1-3, this task was at some point pushed back a day early; and then it was pushed back even two days early, by at least some Jews⁴⁷. There were practical reasons for this. The people needed more time to cleanse their houses of leaven and also to bake unleavened bread, so that all would be ready for the Passover meal after the slaying of the Passover lamb⁴⁸. This day of cleansing and baking indicated in Mark 14:12, was on Thursday, the day before the *official* day of slaying the Passover lamb. It was also the disciples' *ad hoc* day of preparing *their* Passover lamb. It may be that the disciples were not the only Jews who used this day to prepare their lamb⁴⁹.

⁴⁷ Cf. m. Pesah. 1:1: אור לאר בעה עשר בודקין את החמץ לאור הנר (On the evening preceding the fourteenth day of the month of Nisan, they search for leaven by the light of the candle). However, this schedule for the task was disputed as we see in 1:3: רבי יהודה אומר: בודקין אור ארבעה עשר (Rabbi Judah says, they search for leaven on the evening of the fourteenth).

⁴⁸ RYLAARSDAM, Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread, 664.

⁴⁹ As suggested by the late CASEY, The Date of the Passover Sacrifices, 245-247, whose perspective we shall discuss.

The Greek text of Mark 14:12, is frequently mistranslated in English Bibles (like the NRSV)⁵⁰. As I have alluded, this has been a further contribution to confusion surrounding the verse. To help remove the confusion, the Greek text is better translated, “On the first day of Unleavened Bread, *when they sacrificed the Passover lamb*, his disciples said to him...” (Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ...) ⁵¹. The implied pronoun “they” does not refer to the priests in charge of the temple nor to their Passover congregation. It refers *only* to the disciples of Jesus and perhaps other Jews who may have observed the Passover at an earlier time.

Similarly, in Luke 22:7 the statement is better rendered “Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, *when they needed to sacrifice the Passover lamb*” (Ἐλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων [ἐν] ἣ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα). Again, the implied pronoun “they” refers not to the priests in charge of the temple nor to their Passover congregation, but only to the disciples and perhaps other Jews. These renderings clarify that the disciples and possibly other Jews organized their own Passover meal two days before the official day of the Passover meal.

Craig Evans maintains, as Maurice Casey did, that “they were sacrificing” refers to Jesus and his disciples, but they still placed Jesus and his disciples in the temple in the presence of the priests when they made their sacrifice⁵². Virtually no other biblical studies scholar who has published on Mark 14:12 or Luke 22:7 argues as I do that the implicit “they” in the translation of these verses refers to Jesus and the disciples acting *independently* of the temple and the priests⁵³. However, five points are certain. First, there is no explicit mention of priests and the temple in Mark 14:12 and Luke 22:7; second, there *is* explicit mention of the disciples preparing the Passover in Mark 14:16, Matt 26:19, and Luke 22:13; third, the Synoptics and John make it clear that the priests sacrificed

⁵⁰ And also the CEB, NASB, NET, NIV, and NLT.

⁵¹ The phrase ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον (“when they sacrificed the Passover lamb”) includes an indeclinable neuter noun in the accusative case governed by an imperfect active verb. The verb should not be translated in the passive voice as the NRSV does. Ironically, the *active voice* translation similar to “when they sacrificed the Passover lamb” was used in the RSV, KJV, and NKJV. The active voice translation is also used by MARCUS, *Mark*, 943; STEIN, *Mark*, 644; EVANS, *Mark*, 368; DONAHUE – HARRINGTON, *Mark*, 391.

⁵² EVANS, *Mark*, 373; CASEY, *Aramaic Sources*; STEIN, *Mark*, 646.

⁵³ See MARCUS, *Mark*, 944; GOULD, *Mark*, 260; STEIN, *Mark*, 646; DONAHUE – HARRINGTON, *Mark*, 398; PERKINS, *Mark*, 702; JOHNSON, *Luke*, 333; NOLLAND, *Luke*, 1032-1033; BOVON, *Luke*, 142-143 et al.

the Passover in the temple on the day of Jesus' death, not the day of his Last Supper (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:31); fourth, in regard to the Supper, the day of Jesus' death was clearly the next day (Mark 15:1; Matt 27:1; Luke 22:66; John 18:28; 19:14); and fifth, there is historic precedence for worshippers sacrificing and preparing the Passover lamb independently of the priests and the temple (Philo, *Spec.* 2.145-46,148; m. Pesah. 8.1; m. Zebah. 2:1; 3:1; 13:1; and implicitly in Deut 16:5-6 and Jub. 49:20-21).

Therefore, we ask, who does "they" refer to in Mark 14:12 and Luke 22:7? Scholars who insist upon seeing temple priests in Mark 14:12 and Luke 22:7 have the burden of showing how they reconcile this judgement with gospel chronology. A critical datum for the Matthean and Markan timeline is that Jesus was arrested, tried, crucified, and buried prior to the feast of Unleavened Bread (Sat.–Fri., Nisan 15–21) (Matt 26:5; Mark 14:2).

3 The First Day of Unleavened Bread

The *official* first day of Unleavened Bread in gospel chronology would be Saturday (Nisan 15) the day after the official Passover sacrifice, but that cannot be the day referred to in Mark 14:12 (nor Matt. 26:17 and Luke 22:7) since Jesus could not have hosted his Last Supper on Saturday. This statement in Mark 14:12 and parallel texts actually refers to the day *before* the official Passover sacrifice. As we have seen, the day *before* the official Passover sacrifice was also called the first day of Unleavened Bread because on that day many Jews removed all leaven from their houses. This unofficial designation for the day results from a practical rather than a precise reading of Exod 12:15 and related texts. In gospel chronology the day before the official Passover sacrifice would be Thursday (Nisan 13). Some Jews went a step further by sacrificing the Passover lamb on this day instead of the official day.

Incidentally, in John, the official day of the Passover sacrifice or the day of *preparation* for the Passover meal was Friday, Nisan 14 (John 19:14.31.42). For John this day was also the day of Jesus' crucifixion and burial. Although it has been denied, the same is true in the Synoptics. However, in the Synoptics there are two referents for the term "day of preparation": the disciples' *ad hoc* day of preparation for the Passover meal (Matt 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7) and the *official* Jewish day of preparation for the Passover meal (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54). The former referent was to Thursday afternoon, the latter to Friday afternoon. Of course, the official day of preparation for the

Passover meal was also “the day of preparation for the sabbath” since that day fell on Friday in the week and year that Jesus was crucified (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:31).

It has frequently been argued that there is disagreement between the Synoptics and John over the day of the week identified as the *eve* of Passover (or day of preparation, Nisan 14)⁵⁴. In the Synoptics, as the argument goes, the eve of Passover was the day *before* the crucifixion of Jesus (Matt 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7), while in John, the eve of Passover was the *day of* the crucifixion (19:14.31.42)⁵⁵. It is further argued that John’s placement of the eve of Passover on the *day of* Jesus’ crucifixion reflected John’s determination to represent Jesus as the archetypal paschal lamb⁵⁶. John therefore shows that the crucifixion of the Lamb of God occurs on the same day that the other paschal lambs were being slaughtered.

The argument that the Synoptics and John disagree on which day was the eve of Passover is mistaken. This argument presupposes that the Synoptic writers actually thought that Jesus and the disciples did not eat their Passover meal until after the slaying of the lambs in the temple. However, the literary evidence indicates that the Synoptic writers were quite aware that Jesus and the disciples had created an earlier *ad hoc* day of preparing and eating the Passover meal⁵⁷. There is then really no disagreement between the Synoptics and John on how to identify the day of Jesus’ crucifixion. In all four of the canonical gospels, Jesus was crucified on the *official* Jewish day of preparation, which, in this context, happened to be Friday, Nisan 14, the eve of Passover (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:14.31).

4 To Clarify Further

My argument may be further clarified through engagement with John Meier’s chronological investigations. I will not rehearse Meier’s incisive

⁵⁴ See THOMPSON, *John*, 388; HAENCHEN, *John*, 105; O’DAY, *John*, 719.

⁵⁵ See DAISE, *Christ our Passover*, 509-510.

⁵⁶ Cf. CULPEPPER, *Luke*, 415; DUNN, *Jesus Remembered*, 772.

⁵⁷ Again, Matthew (26:5) and Mark (14:2) show that Jesus is crucified before the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Sat., Nisan 15). In fact, he is crucified on Friday (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; cf. John 19:31) and hosts his Last Supper on the day before (Matt 26:17.20; Mark 14:12.17; Luke 22:7.14; cf. John 13:1-2; 18:28).

critiques of Strack and Billerbeck, Dockx, Jaubert, and Jeremias⁵⁸. Instead, I will limit myself to the broad contours of Meier's own case, and indicate our points of agreement and divergence.

Meier finds that the Synoptics and John actually agree that the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples occurred on a Thursday evening, that Jesus died on the next day, Friday, which was a dual day of preparation, because the next day, Saturday, was not only the Sabbath, but also the Passover⁵⁹. I agree with Meier on these points.

However, Meier feels that in order for this agreement between the Synoptics and John to stand, we must strip the Synoptic Passion Narratives of all "late or redactional references to Passover"⁶⁰. Meier maintains that "the underlying Synoptic tradition is no more a Passover meal than is the Last Supper in John's Gospel"⁶¹.

For John, the Last Supper was on Thursday, Nisan 13, and therefore not a Passover meal. The meal ended after sunset, the beginning of Friday, Nisan 14, the day of preparation. Jesus was arrested, tried, crucified, and buried on this day; and after sunset the Passover began with the meal on Saturday, Nisan 15⁶².

For the Synoptics, the preparation of the Last Supper as a Passover meal takes place in the daytime on Thursday, Nisan 14, the day the Passover lambs are slaughtered. The Last Supper is then held as a Passover meal after sunset, the beginning of Friday, Nisan 15. The arrest, trial, crucifixion, and burial of Jesus happens on Friday. The Sabbath, on Saturday, Nisan 16, begins at sundown⁶³. For Meier, these differences between John and the Synoptics appear to be "a hopeless contradiction," at least at first reading⁶⁴. Meier's solution, as I pointed out, is to remove all synoptic language that portrays the Last Supper as a Passover meal.

I disagree with Meier that the Thursday of the disciples' preparation of the Last Supper in the Synoptics was Nisan 14. I would argue that this Thursday

⁵⁸ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 390-399; Str-B, 812-853; DOCKX, *Chronologies*, 24-28; JAUBERT, *The Date of the Last Supper*, 48, 69-76, 97-98, 111-12; JEREMIAS, *Eucharistic Words*, 15-84.

⁵⁹ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 390.

⁶⁰ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 398.

⁶¹ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 398.

⁶² MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 389-390.

⁶³ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 389.

⁶⁴ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 390.

came on Nisan 13. Meier places one sunset between the Synoptics' preparation of the Last Supper and the Passover meal⁶⁵. As I have already alluded, there was a sunset (Matt 26:30; Mark 14:30; Luke 22:56; John 13:30), *a sunrise* (Matt 27:1; Mark 15:1; Luke 22:66; John 18:28), *and yet another sunset* (Exod 12:8; Jub. 49:1; m. Zebaḥ. 5:8) between the Last Supper and the official Passover meal on Nisan 15. This minimal twenty-four-hour span pushes the Thursday of the Last Supper back to Nisan 13.

I also disagree with Meier that the implied "they" of Mark 14:12 is a reference to the priests and their activity in the temple⁶⁶. I will continue to argue that the implied "they" of Mark 14:12 are the disciples of Jesus and perhaps other Jews who sacrificed the Passover lamb one day earlier independently of the priests and the temple.

Contrary to Meier, I am convinced that the Last Supper in both the Synoptics and John was a traditional Passover meal occurring prior to the official observance on a day popularly referred to as the first day of Unleavened Bread. Not only is it unnecessary to divest the Synoptic Gospels of all language describing the Last Supper as a Passover meal, it is arbitrary and unwarranted.

5 Passover in the Mishnah

In the Mishnah, it was disputed but nevertheless accepted by some Jews that the Passover sacrifice could be for a different purpose at an earlier time, i.e., "not under its proper name" (שלא לשמו) (m. Pesah. 5:2-3; 6:5; m. Zebaḥ. 2:4)⁶⁷. The original purpose of the Passover sacrifice was to avert the death angel and save the firstborn of Israel (Exod 12:12-13), but later the purpose was to remove individual and corporate sin (or atonement, כפר). This later purpose could only be achieved at the proper time (Nisan 14) in the temple in the presence of a priest who must collect the blood of the sacrificial victim in a bowl and dash it against

⁶⁵ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 389. "The Passover meal...held in the evening after sundown, would take place as the fifteenth of Nisan, Passover Day proper, began."

⁶⁶ MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 392.

⁶⁷ In m. Pesah. 6:5, R. Joshua declares that a man is exempt from sin if the Passover sacrifice he made on the sabbath under an improper name was nevertheless an appropriate offering, i.e., a male lamb. However, R. Eliezer disagreed.

the altar as the sign of atonement⁶⁸. This rule is especially inferred from the Mishnaic tractate *Zevahim*:

m. Zevah. 4:1	The House of Shammai said, Anyone who makes an offering of blood, having tossed it upon the central part of the altar, has effected atonement.	בית שמאי אומרים כל הנתנין על מזבח החיצון שאם נתגן מתנה אחת כפר
m. Zevah 5:8	The First-born offering, the tithe of the herd, and the Passover sacrifice are Lesser Holy Things. They can be slaughtered anywhere in the courtyard. The blood of the offerings must be placed so that it is plainly seen to flow from the left side pillar to the base of the altar. ⁶⁹	הבכור והמעשר והפסח קדשים קלים שחיתתן בכל מקום בעזרה ודמן טעון מתנה אחת ובלבד שיתן כנגד היסוד

However, when the Passover sacrifice is for a different purpose, i.e., a *shalom* offering, it is disputably not necessary for the sacrifice to take place in the temple in the presence of a priest, nor for the blood to be tossed against the temple altar⁷⁰. In this case, the Passover could take place in a home or meeting hall presided over by the male head of a family or association. In many cases, the ritual even took place a day or two earlier than the official time for practical reasons (m. Zevah. 1:1-3)⁷¹.

In m. Zevah. 1:2; 2:3, a distinction is made between animal sacrifices for “Most Holy Things” (קודשי קודשים) and “Lesser Holy Things” (קודשים קלים). The former must occur in the temple; the latter need only occur within the confines of Jerusalem⁷². The Passover sacrifice is a “Lesser Holy Thing”.

⁶⁸ m. Pesah. 5:5-7; m. Zevah. 4:1-2; 5:1-2; 8:12; Jub. 49:19. The tossing of the blood is required for atonement.

⁶⁹ My translation, however, the terms “Most Holy Things” and “Lesser Holy Things” are taken from NEUSNER, *Mishnah*, 701, 709.

⁷⁰ m. Zevah. 4:4. R. Simeon observes that the tossing of the blood against the altar was not required for peace offerings.

⁷¹ See CASEY, *The Date of the Passover Sacrifices*, 245-247.

⁷² NEUSNER, *Mishnah*, 701.

Although it can be made anywhere in the east courtyard of the temple, it need only be made and eaten “within the wall” of Jerusalem (m. Zebah. 2:3; 5:8; 14:8). This was especially true if the purpose of the Passover sacrifice was only to provide a *shalom* offering, i.e., a communal meal.

There was a dispute over whether the man who both slaughtered and offered up a “Holy Thing” outside of the temple was “liable”⁷³. R. Yose the Galilean maintained that if a man both slaughtered and offered a sacrifice outside of the temple he was not liable. He would only be liable if he slaughtered the sacrifice inside the temple and offered it up outside. The same would be true vice-versa, but if he slaughtered it outside of the temple it could not have been offered inside anyway (m. Zebah. 13:1). The critical point here is that allowance is made for a man to slaughter and offer up a “Holy Thing” outside of the temple and apart from the priests.

The ruling, m. Zebah. 2:1, recognizes that non-priests (זר; lit: “strangers”) can officiate over animal sacrifices⁷⁴. The text specifies “all slaughtered animal sacrifices” (כל הזבחים), including the Passover (m. Zebah. 1:4; 2:4; 3:6). The debate is over obscure violations, that would render the sacrifices invalid. However, it is not disputed that non-priests can officiate over an animal sacrifice, such as the Passover lamb.

An even more radical statement appears in m. Zebah. 3:1:

<p>If anyone who is unfit slaughters an animal sacrifice, the offering is valid, just as it is valid if slaughtered by a non-priest, a woman, a slave, or a ritually impure person, even in the case of slaughtering Most Holy Things.</p>	<p>כל הפסולין ששחטו שחיטתן כשרה שהשחיטה כשרה בזרים, בנשים דבעבדים, ובטמאים אפלו בקדשי קדשים</p>
--	---

The offering could still be rendered invalid if its flesh was touched by an unclean person, or if it was slaughtered for an improper purpose. The aim of this section is to allow a fit person in any case to reclaim the blood of the sacrifice for atonement purposes. The ruling in this section is disputed (m. Zebah. 5:1; 6:1;

⁷³ That is to say, liable for sin, and required to make a sin offering (cf. m. Pesah. 6:5).

⁷⁴ See “a non-priest” in NEUSNER, *Mishnah*, 700; cf. “one that is not a priest” in DANBY, *Mishnah*, 469.

7:4), but it indicates ritual behavior independent of the temple and priests, i.e., “outside its proper time and outside its proper place” (חוץ לזמנו וחוץ למקומו).

6 Preparing the Passover Lamb

Some interpreters believe that Jesus and his disciples could not have had their own *ad hoc* Passover on Thursday evening because this would have been prior to the slaughtering of the lambs by the priests of the temple on Friday afternoon⁷⁵. Their point is that no priest would have slaughtered a lamb for the Passover meal prior to afternoon on Friday, Nisan 14⁷⁶. However, although it is true that many people brought their lamb to the priests for the more elaborate rituals of slaughter and preparation in the temple, there was no requirement that the paschal lamb be slaughtered and prepared by priests in the temple unless it was for the specific purpose of atoning sacrifice⁷⁷. Otherwise, it was only required that the lamb be slaughtered, prepared, and eaten in Jerusalem (Deut 16:2.5-7)⁷⁸. Any observant adult male head of a Jewish family or association

⁷⁵ HOEHNER, *The Day of Christ’s Crucifixion*, 255.

⁷⁶ In Exod 12:6, the time of slaughtering the paschal lambs is set “between the two evenings” (בין הערבים), i.e., between sunset and night. Philo, *Spec.* 2.145 indicated that the time of the sacrifice was from noon until evening (ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ἄρχη ἑσπέρας). Josephus, *B.J.* 6.423, said that the time of slaughtering was from the ninth to the eleventh hour (ἀπὸ ἐνάτης ὥρας μέχρις ὀδεκάτης), or 3:00-5:00 p.m. However, CAVICCHIA, *La Citazione*, 5-9, 11, argues that “tra le due sere,” (“between the two evenings”) describes the time set in the *Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds* when both the Jewish daily sacrifice (the *tamid*), and the Passover lamb are slain (b. Pesah. 58a-59a; y. Pesah. 31 a-d). This is the second half of the day, starting at noon (the sixth hour), when the sun begins its descend toward the western horizon. In John 19:14 Jesus is condemned to die ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη (“intorno all’ ora sesta,” “around the sixth hour”). Jesus’ condemnation and death in the Gospel of John roughly coincides with the time set by the *Talmuds* for the slaying of the *tamid* and the Passover lambs (noon to dusk).

⁷⁷ I am grateful to my colleague, William Yarchin of Azusa Pacific University, for pointing out to me that it was not necessary that the Passover lamb be slaughtered by priests in the temple.

⁷⁸ It was at least disputed whether the Passover must be killed and eaten in the sanctuary city or only in the sanctuary (temple) itself (Deut 16:2.5-7; Jub. 49:18-21). For Jesus, his disciples, and other Jews the city was sufficient. However, it was not always the

would then have authority to deploy the far simpler, home-based rituals of slaughter and preparation for the lamb wherever he was as long as he was in Jerusalem. This is implied and presupposed in m. Pesah. 8.1:

<p>When a woman is in the house of her husband, and he slaughters the Passover lamb on her behalf, and at the same time, her father slaughters the Passover lamb on her behalf, she should eat the lamb slaughtered by her husband.</p>	<p>האשה בזמן שהיא בבית בעלה שחט עליה בעלה ושחט עליה אביה תאכל משל</p>
---	---

Any of the male disciples of Jesus would have had the right to slaughter and prepare the lamb for the Passover. In Matt 26:19, the male disciples as a whole are said to prepare the Passover. In Luke 22:8.13, Peter and John are the ones who prepare the Passover. In Mark 14:13,16, the two disciples who prepare the Passover are not identified.

7 Philo and the Passover

Philo of Alexandria is a first century witness to the preparation of the Passover outside of the temple and apart from the priests, although his language may overgeneralize individual roles:

ἐν ἣ θύουσι πανδημει πολλὰς μυριάδας ἱερείων ἄρξάμενοι ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ἄρχῃ ἐσπέρας, ὁ λεῶς ἅπας, πρεσβύται καὶ νέοι, κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ἱερωσύνης ἀξιώματι τετιμημένον. τὸν γὰρ ἄλλον χρόνον οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς τε κοινὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἰδίας ἐκάστου προστάξει νόμων ἐπιτελοῦσι, τότε δὲ σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας

In this sacred festival, many myriads of animal sacrifices are made from noon until evening, with all and everyone, old and young, deemed worthy of priestly service. For at other times, the priests preside over public and private sacrificial ceremonies as prescribed by the law, but on this occasion everyone in the nation presides over sacred

case that the Passover was celebrated exclusively in Jerusalem as implied in legislation recorded in texts from the seventh and second centuries BCE (Deut 16:5-6; Jub. 49:20-21).

ἀγναῖς χερσὶν ἱερουργεῖ καὶ ἱεραῖται. ceremonies and serves as priests with
holy hands and all
authority (Philo, *Spec.* 2.145).

Marcus further directs us to Philo, *Spec.* 2.148 where he speaks of the Passover:

ἐκάστη δὲ οἴκια κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον And every house on that occasion is
σχήμα ἱεροῦ καὶ σεμνότητα imbued
περιβέβληται, with the form and dignity of the
σφαγιασθέντος ἱερείου πρὸς τὴν temple, and the sacrificial animal is
εὐωχίαν εὐτρεπιζουέωου slaughtered, dressed,
and made ready for the sacred meal.⁷⁹

Marcus refers to the F. H. Colson LCL translation of this passage to show that, by the beginning of the first century CE, some Jews celebrated the Passover at home⁸⁰. However, this passage also shows that the slaughter of the Passover lamb could occur at home independent of the temple and the priests.

Philo remarked that, in the original Passover ritual, the people eagerly sacrificed their lambs “without waiting for the priests” (τοὺς ἱερεῖς οὐκ ἀναμένοντες) (*Spec.* 2.146). Philo’s remark is anachronistic, but it gives the impression that the role of the priests in the Passover was more of a convenience than a necessity⁸¹. This may reflect Philo’s perspective even in his own pre-70 CE setting.

Another argument favoring a Thursday Passover for Jesus and his disciples, nevertheless denies that the meal included lamb, because no priest would have killed the lamb prior to Friday evening⁸². Again, there was no requirement that the Passover lamb be killed by a temple priest except for atonement purposes. There would have otherwise been no legal impediment to any observant adult Jewish male providing a lamb for his family or association. There are indications that other Jews besides Jesus and his disciples would have chosen to slaughter and prepare their Passover lamb on Thursday rather than

⁷⁹ My translation.

⁸⁰ MARCUS, Passover, 309. Marcus suggests that Philo may be referring to “Jewry world-wide.”

⁸¹ Canonically, the Israelite priesthood was not established until Moses and the people came to Sinai about two lunar months after the Exodus from Egypt (Exod 19:1; 28:1-4; 29:1-9).

⁸² ROUTLEDGE, Passover and Last Supper, 206; WRIGHT, *Jesus*, 556-557.

Friday (m. Zebaḥ. 1:3). This would have been shifting an activity assigned to “the day of preparation” back one day. At the same time then, an activity assigned to “the first day of Unleavened Bread” was shifted back two days. In this latter case, even the name of the day was shifted back two days as we see in the Synoptics (Matt 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7).

8 Mishnah and Gospel

Casey had argued that many Jews made their Passover sacrifice on Nisan 13 and the morning of Nisan 14, and not just in the afternoon of Nisan 14. The case he made began with his translation of m. Zebaḥ. 1:3:

The Passover [victim] which they slaughter in the morning on the fourteenth [of Nisan] which [is] not [sacrificed] under its [proper] name, R. Joshua declares it valid as if it were slaughtered on the thirteenth. Ben Bathyra declares it invalid as if it were slaughtered ‘between the evenings.’⁸³

In this passage, “between the evenings” means between the evenings of Nisan 13 and Nisan 14, a non-official interpretation of Exod 12:6. To make the Passover sacrifice at this non-official time is what is meant by “under a different heading” or “not under its proper name”. Casey also translated and cited m. Zebaḥ. 1:1 to anchor these interpretations.

This pre-70 CE controversy concerns whether a Passover sacrifice offered “under a different heading,” i.e., on the morning of Nisan 14, is valid. Nevertheless, as Casey observed, “R. Joshua’s judgement takes it for granted that Passover victims slaughtered on 13th Nisan were also valid”⁸⁴. This seemed to be Casey’s pivotal point.

The redactor of m. Zebaḥ. disagrees with R. Joshua’s judgment, but the dispute still shows that there were Jews who considered the official restrictions regulating the Passover sacrifice “inaccurate and very inconvenient”⁸⁵. Casey maintained that the dispute recorded in m. Zebaḥ. 1:1-3 provides the background for interpreting Mark 14:12. Casey further notes his conviction that an Aramaic

⁸³ CASEY, *The Date of the Passover Sacrifices*, 245.

⁸⁴ CASEY, *The Date of the Passover Sacrifices*, 245.

⁸⁵ CASEY, *The Date of the Passover Sacrifices*, 246.

original lies behind Mark 14:12, ביום חד לפטיריא (“on day one for unleavened breads”)⁸⁶.

In a later publication, Casey offered further clarification when he corrected a remark made by Steven Carr. He said:

Again, Carr declares that Mark 14:12 confuses Nisan 15 with Nisan 14, because he interprets the phrase ‘On the first day of Unleavened breads’ to mean literally the first day of the official feast of Unleavened Bread, Nisan 15 (cf. Lev 23.3). We should not interpret Mark like this. In fact, leavened bread had to be destroyed on the morning of Nisan 14, so later that day only unleavened bread could be eaten. It was therefore entirely reasonable of Mark to describe that as ‘on the first day of unleavened bread’, and then to specify more precisely ‘when they were sacrificing the Passover (victim)’, which put Jesus and his disciples in the Temple that afternoon.⁸⁷

I agree with Casey that Mark identifies the day of the Last Supper as the “first day of Unleavened Bread” because this was the day for destroying all leaven in Israel. However, I do not agree with his placement of this day on Nisan 14, the day the paschal lambs were slain. This placement would mean that Jesus was crucified on the same day as the Last Supper. I also do not agree with Casey that Mark 14:12 places Jesus and his disciples in the temple that day to receive their lamb. As I have argued, it would not have been necessary of Jesus and his disciples to get their lamb from the temple. Casey seemed to suppose that the priests and the temple were still necessary for the preparation of the Passover lamb even when the meal was held on a day earlier than the official day. Aside from the gospel texts and Philo, the Mishnah shows us that the Passover preparation and celebration could and did occur independently of the priests and the temple.

Some exegetes would object to interpretations of NT texts based upon the Mishnah and other rabbinic materials. Their warnings against doing so are well-taken⁸⁸. Nevertheless, “the first day of Unleavened Bread” described in Mark 14:12 and Matt 26:17 cannot refer to either Nisan 14 or 15 in gospel chronology. Jesus could not have had the Last Supper on the same day he was crucified nor

⁸⁶ CASEY, *The Date of the Passover Sacrifices*, 247, n. 1.

⁸⁷ CASEY, *Jesus*, 29.

⁸⁸ HARRINGTON, *Can New Testament Interpreters Use Rabbinic Literature?*, 335-340.

on the day after. All indications are that the Supper occurred on Thursday, Nisan 13. Evidently, one or more activities traditionally associated with Nisan 15 were at some point shifted back two days early by at least some Jews, and only this can account for the description of the day in Mark and Matthew. With all due caution taken, the pre-70 CE disputes recorded in the Mishnaic tractates *Pesahim* and *Zevahim* provide our best framework for understanding the occasion and the reasons for this description in the Synoptics. Not every Jew would have recognized Thursday, Nisan 13 as “the first day of Unleavened Bread”. The priests in charge of the temple certainly would not have recognized the day as such, but Jesus, the disciples, and the authors of the first two Gospels did, probably along with many other Jews⁸⁹.

Conclusion

Mark 14:1-12 has long been a source of confusion over the time of Jesus’ Last Supper with his disciples. This is primarily because of the cultural distance between the gospels and Western readers in the modern world. However, if we can rise to the challenge of closing the gap between us and the world of Jesus, and become sensitive to the Jewish differences and disputes in that world, much of the confusion surrounding Mark 14:1-12 would fall away. This has been our aim in this study.

I maintain that Jesus and his disciples observed the Passover two days earlier than the temple priests and their congregation. This also means that Jesus and his disciples had their own day of preparation one day earlier than the temple priests and their congregation. Jesus and his disciples slaughtered and prepared their Passover lamb apart from and independently of the priests and the temple. There was nothing unusual about any of this as other Jews did the same.

From the perspective of many Jews, Jesus’ Last Supper would have been a legitimate Passover meal, and in popular opinion, it was held on a traditional, although unofficial, first day of Unleavened Bread. Contrary to previous judgements, Mark 14:1-12 and synoptic parallels are chronologically coherent accounts of Jesus’ final meal with his disciples prior to his crucifixion.

⁸⁹ Luke (22:7) refers to the day, but he does not use the language “the first day of.”

Bibliography

- BARRETT, Charles K.: Luke XXII.15. To Eat the Passover, *JTS* 9 (1958) 305-307.
- BARTNICKI, Roman: Ostatnia Wieczerza nową Paschą. In: F. Gryslawicz (ed.): *Jezusa Męka Chrystusa*, Lublin: RW KUL, ³1986, 65-85.
- BEARDSLEE, William A.: *Literary Criticism of the New Testament*, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1970.
- BERLINERBLAU, Jacques: Max Weber's Useful Ambiguities and the Problem of Defining "Popular Religion", *JAAR* 69/3 (2001) 605-626.
- BOKSER, Baruch: *The Origins of the Seder: The Passover Rite and Early Rabbinic Judaism*, Berkeley: University of California, 1984.
- BOVON, François: *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28–24:53* (Hermeneia). Translated by James Crouch, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2012.
- BROWN, Raymond: *New Testament Essays*, New York: Image, 1968.
- BROWN, Raymond: *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*, Vol. II, New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- CASEY, Maurice: The Date of the Passover Sacrifices and Mark 14:12, *TynB* 48/2 (1997) 245-47.
- CASEY, Maurice: *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTSMS 102), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- CASEY, Maurice: *Jesus: Evidence and Argument or Mythicist Myths?*, New York: T&T Clark, 2014.
- CAVICCHIA, Alessandro: La citazione in Gv 19,36 e l'ora della condanna di Gesù in Gv 19,14 alla luce di Es 12,6 e del trattato Pesahim, *Anton* 97 (2022) 413-432.
- CULPEPPER, R. Alan: The Gospel of Luke: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections. In: Leander Keck (ed.): *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. IX, Nashville, TN: Abingdon (1995) 3-390.
- DAISE, Michael A.: 'Christ our Passover' (1 Corinthians 5:6-8): The Death of Jesus and the Quartodeciman Pascha, *Neot* 50/2 (2016) 507-526.
- DANBY, Herbert: *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- DE VAUX, Roland: *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Reprint. Translated by J. McHugh, London: Darton-Longman-Todd, 1998.
- DE VRIES, Simon J.: Day. In: George Arthur Buttrick (ed.): *IDB* I, Nashville: Abingdon, 1962, 783.
- DOCKX, Stanislas: *Chronologies néotestamentaires et vie de l'église primitive. Recherches exégétiques*, Paris – Gembloux: Duculot, 1976.
- DONAHUE, John R. – HARRINGTON, Daniel J.: *The Gospel of Mark* (SaPaSe 2), Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2002.
- DUNN, James D. G.: *Christianity in the Making*. Vol. I: Jesus Remembered, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2003.

- ECK, Werner: *Rom und Judea: Fünf Vorträge zur römischen Herrschaft in Palästina, Tria Corda*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- EVANS, Craig A.: *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34B), Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- FAHEY, Tony: Max Weber's *Ancient Judaism*, *AJS* 88 (1982) 62-87.
- FREDRIKSEN, Paula: *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*, New York: Macmillan, 1999.
- FRIEDMAN, Shamma: *Tosefta Atiqta. Pesah Rishon: Synoptic Parallels of Mishna and Tosefta Analyzed with a Methodological Introduction* [in Hebrew], Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University 2002.
- GOULD, Ezra P.: *Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Gospel According to St. Mark* (ICC 2), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983.
- HAENCHEN, Ernst: *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Vol. II: Chapters 7–21 (Hermeneia). Translated by Robert W. Funk. Edited by Robert W. Funk with Ulrich Busse, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1984.
- HAHN, Scott: *The Fourth Cup: Unveiling the Mystery of the Last Supper and the Cross*, New York: Image, 2018.
- HAMILTON, John: The Chronology of the Crucifixion and the Passover, *Churchman* 106 (1992) 323-338.
- HANSON, Kenneth C. – OAKMAN, Douglas E.: *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- HARRINGTON, Daniel J.: Can New Testament Interpreters Use Rabbinic Literature?, *STR* 48/3 (2005) 335-340.
- HAUPMAN, Judith: How Old Is Haggadah? *Judaism* 51 (2001) 5-18.
- HIGGINS, Angus John Brockhurst: *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, London: SCM, 1952.
- HOEHNER, Harold W.: The Chronology of Jesus. In: Tom Holmén – Stanley E. Porter (eds.): *The Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, Leiden: Brill, 2011, 2315-2359.
- HOEHNER, Harold W.: The Day of Christ's Crucifixion, *BS* 131/523 (1974) 241-264.
- HOEHNER, Harold W.: *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1977.
- ILLMAN, Ruth: Researching Vernacular Judaism: Reflections on Theory and Method, *NJSJS* 30/1 (2019) 91-108.
- ILLMAN, Ruth – CZIMBALMOS, Mercedesz: Knowing, Being, and Doing Religion: Introducing an Analytical Model for Researching Vernacular Religion, *Tem* 56/2 (2020) 171-199.
- JANKOWSKI, Augustyn: Eucharystia jako 'nasza Pascha (1 Kor 5,7) w teologii biblijnej Nowego Testamentu, *RuBL* 28 (1975) 89-100.
- JAUBERT, Annie: Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jour liturgiques de la semaine, *VT* 7 (1957) 35-61.
- JAUBERT, Annie: *La date de la Cène : Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* (EtB 15), Paris: Gabalda, 1957.
- JAUBERT, Annie: *The Date of the Last Supper*. Translated by I. Rafferty, Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965.

- JEREMIAS, Joachim: *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by N. Perrin, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1977.
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy: *The Gospel of Luke* (SaPaSe 3), Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, Benjamin: אָן chagh; אָן הָגָג. In: *TDOT* IV (1980) 201-213.
- KULP, Joshua: The Origins of the Seder and the Haggadah, *CBR* 4 (2005) 109-134.
- ŁACH, Janusz: Data Ostatniej wieczerzy w świetle dokumentów znad Morza Martwego, *RuBL* 11 (1958) 404-417.
- LEONHARD, Clemens: *The Jewish Pesach and the Origins of the Christian Easter: Open Questions in Current Research* (SJ 35), Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, 2006.
- LESSING, Hans: *Die Abendmahlsprobleme im Lichte der neutestamentlichen Forschung seit 1900*, Bonn: Bouvier, 1953.
- LOHFINK, Gerhard: *Jesus z Nazareta. Czego chciał. Kim był*. Translated by E. Pieciul-Karمیńska, Poznań: W drodze, 2012.
- MARCUS, Joel: *Mark 8–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27A), New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 2009.
- MARCUS, Joel: Passover and Last Supper Revisited, *NTS* 59/3 (2013) 303-324.
- MARSHALL, I. Howard: *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- MARSHALL, Jonathan: *Jesus, Patrons and Benefactors: Roman Palestine and the Gospel of Luke* (WUNT II.259), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- MARXSEN, Willi: *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*, Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1969.
- MATSON, Mark A.: The Historical Plausibility of John's Passion Dating. In: Paul N. Anderson – Felix Just – Tom Thatcher (eds): *John, Jesus, and History. Vol. II: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLECL 2), Atlanta, GA: SBL 2009, 291-312.
- MEIER, John P.: *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Vol. 1: The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (ABRL), New York et al.: Doubleday, 1991.
- MICKIEWICZ, Franciszek: *Ewangelia według św. Łukasza. Rozdziały 1 – 11* (NKB.NT 3.1), Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła, 2011.
- MOLONEY, Frances J.: *The Gospel of John* (SaPaSe 4), Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- NETZER, Ehud: *The Architecture of Herod the Great Builder* (TSAJ 117), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- NEUSNER, Jacob: *Mishnah: A New Translation*, New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 1988.
- NODET, Étienne: On Jesus' Last Supper, *Bib* 91 (2016) 348-369.
- NOLLAND, John: *Luke 18:35–24:53* (WBC 35C), Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993.
- O'DAY, Gail R.: The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections. In: Leander Keck (ed.): *The New Interpreter's Bible. Vol. IX*, Nashville, TN: Abingdon (1995) 493-865.
- OGG, George: The Chronology of the Last Supper. In: Dennis E. Nineham (ed.): *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament* (TCSPCK 6), London: SPCK 1965, 75-96.

- PERKINS, Pheme: The Gospel of Mark: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections. In: Leander Keck (ed.): *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. VIII, Nashville, TN: Abingdon (1995) 509-733.
- PICKL, Josef: *The Messiah*. Translated by A. Green, Saint Louis, MO: Herder, 1946.
- PITRE, Brant J.: *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.
- PITRE, Brant J.: *Jesus and the Last Supper*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015.
- PIXNER, Bargil: Mount Zion, Jesus, and Archaeology. In: James H. Charlesworth (ed.): *Jesus and Archaeology*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006, 309-322.
- PIXNER, Bargil: *Paths of the Messiah: Jesus and Jewish Christianity in Light of Archaeological Discoveries*, San Francisco: Ignatius, 2009.
- RIÈSNER, Rainer: Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem. In: James H. Charlesworth (ed.): *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1992, 198-234.
- ROCCA, Samuel: *Herod's Judea: A Mediterranean State in the Classical World* (TSAJ 122), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- ROSIK, Mariusz: The Dispute over the Date of the Last Supper: Its Chronology Revisited, *Verbum Vitae* 38/1 (2020) 179-198.
- ROUTLEDGE, Robin L.: Passover and Last Supper, *TynBul* 53/2 (2002) 203-221.
- RYLAARSDAM, J. Coert: Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread, *IDB* 3 (1980) 663-668.
- SAFRAI, Shmuel – SAFRAI, Ze'ev: *Haggadah of the Sages*, Jerusalem: Carta, 2009.
- SANDERS, Ed P.: *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- SAULNIER, Stéphane: *Calendrical Variations in Second Temple Judaism: New Perspectives on the Date of the Last Supper Debate* (JSJSup 159), Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- SCHRÖTER, Jens: *Das Abendmahl. Frühchristliche Deutungen und Impulse für die Gegenwart* (SBS 210), Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2006.
- SMITH, Barry D.: The Chronology of the Last Supper, *WTJ* 53/1 (1991) 29-45.
- STEIN, Robert H.: *Mark* (BECNT), Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.
- STENSCHKE, Christoph: Judea in the First Century AD: A Review of Recent Scholarly Contributions and their Implications, *EJT* 20/1 (2011) 15-26.
- STRACK, Hermann – BILLERBECK, Paul: *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Vol. II, München: Beck 1952. (= Str-B)
- TABORY, Joseph: Toward a History of the Paschal Meal. In: Paul F. Bradshaw – Lawrence A. Hoffman (eds.): *Passover and Easter: Origins and History in Modern Times*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1999, 62-80.
- THEISSEN, Gerd – MERZ, Annette: *Der historische Jesus*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- THOMPSON, Marianne Meye: *John: A Commentary*, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015.
- TUCKER, Gene M.: *Form Criticism of the Old Testament*, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1971.
- WAGENAAR, Jan A.: Passover and the First Day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread in the Priestly Festival Calendar, *VT* 54/2 (2004) 250-268.

- WALTHER, Georg: *Jesus, das Passalam des neuen Bundes. Der Zentralgedanke des Herrenmahles*, Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1950.
- WEBER, Max: *Ancient Judaism*. Translated and edited by Hans Gerth and Don Martindale, New York: Free Press, 1967.
- WRIGHT, Nicholas Thomas: *Jesus and the Victory of God. Vol. 2: Christian Origins and the Question of God*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996.
- YUVAL, Israel J.: Easter and Passover as Early Jewish Christian Dialogue. In: Paul F. Bradshaw – Lawrence A. Hoffman (eds.): *Passover and Easter: Origins and History in Modern Times*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1999, 98-124.
- ZANGENBERG, Jürgen (ed.): *Das Tote Meer. Kultur und Geschichte am tiefsten Punkt der Erde*, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2010.

Summary

There appears to be several chronological problems with Mark's account of the Last Supper. First, Mark places the supper on "the first day of Unleavened Bread," which appears to have been on Saturday in that year. However, other indications in Mark are that Jesus was crucified on Friday. Therefore, if these indications are correct, the Last Supper could not have been on Saturday. Second, Mark seems to say that the Passover lamb was sacrificed on that same Saturday, but there are other indications that the Passover lamb that year was sacrificed on Friday, "the day of preparation for the sabbath". Third, it is therefore not clear from Mark whether the crucifixion of Jesus occurred before the Passover, after the Passover, or on that day. Fourth, it is not clear from Mark whether the Last Supper was in any sense a Passover meal. Mark seems to be chronologically unclear and confused. In this article, I will show why the situation is not as it appears in Mark.


Keywords: day of preparation, feast of Unleavened Bread, Gospel of Mark, Last Supper, Passover.

Zhrnutie

V súvislosti s Markovým rozprávaním o Poslednej večeri sa objavilo niekoľko chronologických problémov. Po prvé, Marek umiestňuje večeru v „prvý deň Nekvasených chlebov“, čo sa zdá byť v sobotu v danom roku. Avšak podľa iných indikácií v Markovi bol Ježiš ukrižovaný v piatok. Ak sú teda tieto indikácie správne, tak sa Posledná večera nemohla odohrať v sobotu. Po druhé sa zdá, že Marek hovorí o obetovaní veľkonočného barančeka v tú samú sobotu, ale podľa iných ukazovateľov bol veľkonočný baranček obetovaný v piatok, „v prípravný deň soboty“. Preto – a to je po tretie – nie je v Markovi jasné, či k ukrižovaniu Ježiša došlo pred Paschou, po nej alebo v deň Paschy. Po štvrté nie je z Marka jasné, či Posledná večera bola v každom ohľade Veľkonočným jedlom. Marek sa zdá byť

chronologicky nejasný a matúci. V tomto článku ukážem, prečo situácia nie je takou, akou sa v Markovi javí.

Kľúčové slová: prípravný deň, sviatok Nekvasených chlebov, Markovo evanjelium, Posledná večera, Pascha.

Kenneth L. Waters Sr.
Azusa Pacific University
School of Theology
701 E. Foothill Boulevard
AZUSA, California 91702-7000, U.S.A.
kwaters@apu.edu
 0000-0002-2628-6946

Kniha Skutkov 12,25 – Kontextový výklad

Július Pavelčík

Úvod

Na konci 12. kapitoly Skutkov apoštolov sa v 25. verši nachádza text so znením: *Βαρναβᾶς δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον*¹. Na prvý pohľad – z hľadiska obsahového i syntaktického – nepatrí ani k predchádzajúcim veršom 12. kapitoly, ani k nasledujúcim na začiatku 13. kapitoly. Je preto celkom legitímne pýtať sa, čo je jeho obsahom a aká je jeho funkcia na tom mieste, kde sa v rozprávaní Skutkov nachádza. Za týmto účelom budeme venovať pozornosť textovo-kritickému problému spojenému s výkladom tohto verša. V ďalšej časti preberieme niektoré užšie i širšie kontextové súvislosti, ktoré môžu prispieť k objasneniu postavenia a účelu tohto jedného verša v Skutkoch apoštolov. Všetky výkladové poznámky sa budú metodologicky týkať len literárnych a teologických súvislostí. V rámci nášho výkladu nás teda nebude zaujímať začlenenie udalosti opisovanej v Sk 12,25 do absolútnej chronológie ranokresťanských dejín ani jej možné postavenie v rámci tak absolútnej, ako aj relatívnej chronológie života a pôsobenia apoštola Pavla. Pokiaľ nás zaujíma chronologické začlenenie 25. verša, tak len v rámci lineárneho postupu deja Skutkov a relatívneho sledu udalostí v nich rozprávaných.

1 Textový problém: εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ

Čo sa týka spojenia *εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, v nie nevýznamných rukopisoch sú namiesto predložky *εἰς* uvedené predložky *ἐξ* (B⁷⁴ A 33. 945. 1739) a *ἀπό* (D E Ψ 323. 453. 614. 1175. 2818), ktoré modifikujú informáciu o Barnabášovi a Šavlovi v tom zmysle, že sa vrátili „z Jeruzalema“. Z hľadiska externej evidencie (B L 81. 1241. 1505 M^{ms} sy^{hmg}), ale predovšetkým na základe aplikácie

¹ Grécky text Nového zákona i textovo-kritický poznámkový aparát, ak nie je uvedené inak, sú v celom článku prevzaté z NESTLE – ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

textovo-kritickej zásady *lectio difficilior*² je možné vcelku oprávnene uvažovať o pôvodnosti čítania εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Dva varianty predstavujúce *lectio facilior* (ἀπό a ἐξ), ako dve úpravy v rovnakom zmysle, sú rozdelené proti sebe a v ich neprospech tiež hovorí skutočnosť, že „Skutki obvykle nešpecifikujú miesto, *odkiaľ* sa návrat realizuje“³. V Skutkoch sa sloveso ὑποστρέφω⁴ nachádza 11-krát, z toho 9-krát v spojení s predložkou εἰς (1,12⁵; 8,25; 12,25; 13,13.34; 14,21; 21,6; 22,17; 23,32), raz s predložkou διὰ (20,3) a raz bez predložky (8,28). Frázu ὑποστρέφω ἀπό nájdeme len v Lk 4,1 a 24,9 a ὑποστρέφω ἐξ nikde v lukášovskom diele. Z tohto prehľadu možno usudzovať, že spojenie ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ v kontexte Lukášovho jazykového úzu pôsobí prirodzene a zodpovedá slovníku, ktorý je pre neho charakteristický⁶.

Tým ale vzniká problém z hľadiska kontextovo-obsahového. Formulácia v Sk 12,25 nesporne obsahovo nadväzuje na verše 11,29-30, kde sa hovorí o „službe“ (διακονία) antiochijských učeníkov poslanej spoluveriacim v Judsku (τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς) prostredníctvom Barnabáša a Šavla. Podľa lineárneho toku Lukášovho rozprávania v dvanástej kapitole, v rámci ktorej dej neopúšťa Jeruzalem, sa dá oprávnene predpokladať, že sa tam (v Judsku, porov. 11,29) v dobe tu rozprávaných udalostí obaja vyslanci antiochijskej cirkvi zdržiavali⁷. Potom ale použitie spojenia εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ vyvoláva isté problémy: Prečo by sa Barnabáš a Šavol vracali do Jeruzalema, potom čo splnili svoje poslanie určené judským veriacim?⁸ Boli azda v dobe

² DUPONT, La mission, 221: „Elle est même si difficile, (...) qu'on est obligé de se demander si elle peut fournir un sens acceptable.“

³ METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 398. Porov. DUPONT, La mission, 220; BOCK, *Acts*, 435.

⁴ Je to jedno zo slov jednoznačne typických pre autora Lukášovho evanjelia a Skutkov: z 35 výskytov sa len tri nachádzajú mimo lukášovského dvojdiela.

⁵ V Skutkoch je len na tomto mieste explicitne uvedené miesto, *odkiaľ* „sa vrátili“, ale až po uvedení miesta, *kam* „sa vrátili“ (Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ ὅρων τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος). Väzba ὑποστρέφειν εἰς je tu zachovaná a primárna.

⁶ Porov. BENOIT, La deuxième visite, 787; GIET, Le second voyage, 265, pozn. 4.

⁷ HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 330: „Daß die antiochenische Delegation gerade während der Verfolgungszeit in Jerusalem weilte, war für Lukas nicht unwahrscheinlich, sondern bewies die innige Gemeinschaft von Mutterkirche und Tochtergemeinde.“

⁸ FUNK, *The Enigma*, 133: „The difficulty involves not only the direction of their movement, but if εἰς is adopted the ‘returned’ also becomes a problem. In what sense were they returning?“

udalostí 12. kapitoly na území Judska mimo Jeruzalema a dostavili sa tam až po nich? Ďalší problém by súvisel s bezprostredne nasledujúcimi veršami začiatku 13. kapitoly, kde sa Barnabáš a Pavol spolu s Jánom Markom nachádzajú už v Antiochii⁹. Pre autora Skutkov by bol takýto geografický „skok“ v rozprávaní atypický; dej alebo postavy svojho diela presúva z miesta na miesto obvykle veľmi plynule¹⁰. Tiež by zmienka o „návrate“ do Jeruzalema nedávala moc zmysel v prípade Jána Marka¹¹, ktorý tam prebýval, ako dosvedčuje 12. kapitola (porov. 12,12)¹². „Bud' treba pripustiť, že tento verš hovorí o návrate Pavla a Barnabáša z Jeruzalema do Antiochie, alebo priznať, že nemá žiadny zmysel.“¹³

Na úrovni textovej kritiky bolo navrhnutých niekoľko pokusov¹⁴ o riešenie problému súvisiaceho s prítomnosťou predložky εἰς na tomto mieste.

Pervo emenduje text na εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἀπ' Ἱερουσαλήμ¹⁵, čo v podstate, ale v obrátenom poradí zodpovedá niektorým rukopisom s *lectio faciliior*, ktoré k spojeniu ἐξ/ἀπό Ἱερουσαλήμ doplňujú εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν (napr. rukopisy E 323 945 1175)¹⁶.

⁹ LONGENECKER, Lukan Aversion, 190, pozn. 8: „That reading gives 12.25 less relation to the events of 13.1ff., since the emissaries would then be in different geographical locations in the two passages.“

¹⁰ DUPONT, La mission, 225: „Or il n'est pas dans les habitudes de Luc de transporter brusquement son lecteur d'un endroit à un autre. Il faut une transition.“

¹¹ DUPONT, La mission, 226: „Faire venir Jean-Marc d'Antioche à Jérusalem alors qu'on le croyait là et qu'on va le retrouver ensuite à Antioche ou dans la région, ce serait commettre une maladresse qui n'est pas dans la manière de Luc.“

¹² Porov. WITHERINGTON, *The Acts*, 374. Sk 12,12 nehovorí, že Ján Marek sa nachádza v Jeruzaleme, avšak čitateľ, ktorý tu o ňom počuje prvýkrát, prirodzene predpokladá jeho prítomnosť tam. Porov. DUPONT, La mission, 226.

¹³ DUPONT, La mission, 226.

¹⁴ Tu predstavíme len pár základných pokusov, niektoré ďalšie v stručnosti uvádza METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 398-399.

¹⁵ Porov. PERVO, *Acts*, 316-317.

¹⁶ K celej fráze ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν uvádza ALAND (et al.), *The Greek New Testament*, 441 nasledujúce rukopisy: (E 1175 ἀπό for ἐξ) 945 1739 1891 (I 1178 ἀπό for ἐξ) I^{AD} it^e. p.^w syr^p cop^{sa}. DUPONT, La mission, 221: „Pour les copistes qui ont ajouté «à Antioche», la 'leçon à Jérusalem' faisait difficulté. C'est cette leçon qu'on devait normalement vouloir 'améliorer' par une leçon plus facile. A ce titre encore, la variante εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ est critiquement préférable.“

Metzger odkazuje na Westcotta a Horta¹⁷, ktorí uvažujú o chybe, ku ktorej muselo dôjsť na začiatku rukopisného tradovania textu („a primitive error“)¹⁸, ktorá sa potom dostala do mnohých ďalších rukopisov, a navrhujú jednoduchú emendáciu v slovoslede (presunutie určitého člena τήν pred predložku εἰς): ὑπέστρεψαν τήν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες διακονίαν¹⁹. K tomuto návrhu Dupont výstižne poznamenáva, že „keby Lukáš napísal toto, nikdy by nebol spôsobený žiadny problém. Konjektúra tohto druhu bezpochyby nemôže trvať na tom, že nám dáva pôvodný text“²⁰.

Niektorí autori akceptujú variant εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ a v tomto doslovnom zmysle ho aj interpretujú ako určenie destinácie návratu Barnabáša a Šavla.

Podľa Gieta je v Sk 12,25 uvedené, že „Barnabáš a Šavol sa vrátili do Jeruzalema“, pretože podľa 9,26-27 tam už predtým boli. Frázu „potom čo dokončili službu“ nevzťahuje k doručeniu pomoci, ale k samotnej zbierke, teda v tom zmysle, že nazbierali/zhromaždili milodary pre jeruzalemskú cirkev²¹.

Buck nepochybuje o správnosti čítania εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Riešenie problémov, ktoré s ním súvisia, zvlášť pri porovnaní Skutkov a Pavlových listov, podľa neho „leží v oblasti kritiky prameňov“²². Návštevu v Sk 11,29-30 stotožňuje s návštevou zmienenou v Gal 2,1-10. Zbierku v Sk 12,25 identifikuje s tou, ktorá je zmieňovaná v Pavlových veľkých listoch (Rim, 1Kor a 2Kor). Je to teda jeho druhá návšteva so zbierkou v prospech jeruzalemských kresťanov postihnutých hladom, ktorú zároveň identifikuje s Pavlovou celkovo treťou návštevou Jeruzalema. Takýto názor však „zahŕňa drastickú revíziu prijímanej chronológie Pavlovho života a písania“²³. Prvý list Korint'anom datuje do obdobia jari roku 47, Gal, Rim a 2Kor do rokov 47 – 48. Evanjelizácia Macedónska a Achájska tak v skutočnosti (v jeho úvahe) predchádzala jeruzalemskému koncilu a uvedené listy pochádzajú z tejto cesty, nie z nasledujúcej, ktorej súčasťou bol

¹⁷ HORT, Notes, 94. Citované podľa METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 398.

¹⁸ O „a primitive error in the text“ ako možnej alternatíve uvažuje aj MARSHALL, *The Acts*, 213, pozn. 1.

¹⁹ METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 398: „having fulfilled their mission at Jerusalem they returned“.

²⁰ DUPONT, *La mission*, 228.

²¹ POROV, GIET, *Le second voyage*, 267.

²² BUCK, *The Collection*, 17.

²³ BUCK, *The Collection*, 16.

Pavlov dlhý pobyt v Efeze²⁴. Návštevu s podporou pre jeruzalemských kresťanov v Sk 12,25 tak stotožňuje s návštevou Jeruzalema z 15. kapitoly²⁵.

Podľa Funka bolo v Antiochii rozhodnuté zorganizovať zbierku pre Judsko (Sk 11,27-30) v dobe, ktorá nie je bližšie špecifikovaná (chronologický údaj v 11,27 „v tých dňoch“ je nejasný). Pavol a Barnabáš boli poverení uskutočniť tento projekt, na čo sa aj podujali, ale každý na svojom vlastnom misijnom území. S vyzbieranou podporou sa vrátili do Jeruzalema, nie však nutne spolu. Zbierka tak bola chápaná ako rozšírenie antiochijskej misie. Verš 12,25 je „dislokovaná tradícia, ktorá pôvodne uzatvárala dielo Pavla a Barnabáša, t. j. ich misiu (v širšom zmysle) k pohanom“²⁶. Získanie finančnej podpory pre jeruzalemských kresťanov tak bolo len jedným aspektom širšieho misijného projektu, v ktorom boli zaangażovaní. Lukáš, ktorý podľa Funka „nie je senzitívny k chronologickým nárokom“²⁷, toto stratil zo zreteľa a udalosť podriadil svojmu vlastnému, skôr geografickému usporiadaniu Skutkov.

Za zmienku na tomto mieste stojí ešte výklad, ktorý v súvislosti s Sk 11,29, kde sa hovorí o podpore pre bratov v Judsku, interpretuje 12,25 v tom zmysle, že Barnabáš a Šavol sa vrátili do Jeruzalema, potom čo ukončili svoju pomocnú činnosť v Judsku, resp. v malých kresťanských spoločenstvách v tejto oblasti²⁸.

Azda najväčší počet zástancov má vysvetlenie, ktoré do samotného textu nezasahuje, neemenduje ho, ale navrhuje riešenie na úrovni interpunkcie textu²⁹

²⁴ Prehľadné zhrnutie je uvedené v BUCK, *The Collection*, 27-28.

²⁵ BUCK, *The Collection*, 28: „On the completion of the collection, or as much of it as could be accomplished, Paul returned to Jerusalem. On this visit, his third, the question of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions, which had come to a head during the collection, was discussed and settled at the council.“

²⁶ FUNK, *The Enigma*, 133, pozn. 14.

²⁷ FUNK, *The Enigma*, 136.

²⁸ Porov. DUPONT, *La mission*, 231-232, kde sú ako zástancovia tohto názoru uvedení J. Renié a V. Bartlet.

²⁹ Z tohto dôvodu je svojimi proponentmi charakterizované rôznymi „pochvalnými“ atribútmi: METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 399: „less violent to Greek syntax and lexical usage“; METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 400: „the least unsatisfactory decision“; WITHERINGTON, *The Acts*, 375: „the simplest solution“; JOHNSON, *The Acts*, 216: „the best solution (...). This keeps the best text and respects the manifest narrative intention.“ DUPONT, *La mission*, 235: „(...) explication, qui concilie manifestement les données de la critique textuelle et celles de la critique littéraire, mais qui paraît le faire au dépens de la grammaire et du beau style.“ Pozri tiež BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 596; BOCK, *Acts*, 435.

v tom zmysle, že spojenie εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ nepriraduje k slovesu ὑπέστρεψαν, ale k participiu πληρώσαντες: „vrátili sa, potom čo naplnili službu v Jeruzaleme“ (ὑπέστρεψαν, εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν)³⁰. V tomto prípade je verš Sk 12,25 prepojený tak s tým, čo predchádza v 11,30, ako aj s tým, čo nasleduje v 13,1³¹. Na jednej strane je pravda, že v prípade takéhoto prekladu sa pracuje s gréckym slovosledom, ktorý nie je moc logický³²; na druhej strane však nie je celkom netypický pre autora Lk a Sk. (a) Predložku εἰς je v tomto prípade nutné chápať buď vo význame „v“³³, čo nie je nič mimoriadne v Skutkoch apoštolov³⁴, alebo vo význame „v prospech (niekoho/niečoho)“³⁵. (b) Pre Lukáša nie je netypické také upravenie slovosledu, ktorého účelom je zdôrazniť nejaké slovo alebo nejakú myšlienku (porov. Sk 4,33; 19,20), čo však niekedy môže zároveň vo vzťahu k zmyslu výpovede pôsobiť na prvý pohľad konfúzne (porov. 1,2; 19,4)³⁶. (c) Dupont v tejto súvislosti poukazuje ešte na dve miesta

³⁰ Porov. HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 330.

³¹ Porov. WITHERINGTON, *The Acts*, 375.

³² Porov. ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento*, 477, pozn. 117. HAUBECK – SIEBENTHAL, *Neuer sprachlicher Schlüssel*, 731: „doch sind sowohl die Deutung des εἰς im Sinn v. ἐν (nach ὑπέστρεψαν) als auch die Wortstellung forciert“.

³³ Porov. MARSHALL, *The Acts*, 213, pozn. 1. BDAG, § 205: „Im NT ist zwar ἐν noch fast doppelt so häufig wie εἰς, aber die Vermischung beider beginnt sich doch schon geltend zu machen, indem εἰς für ἐν im örtlichen Sinn eintritt, aber nur bei Mk, Lk und häufig Agg, selten Jh.“ Pozri tiež VON SIEBENTHAL, *Griechische Grammatik*, § 184g.

³⁴ Napr. Φίλιππος δὲ εὐρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον (Sk 8,40); γενέσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (20,16); γενομένου μου εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (25,15); τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον εἰς Καισάρειαν (25,4). Za zvlášť zaujímavý príklad v tejto súvislosti považuje DUPONT, *La mission*, 239-240 druhú časť verša 12,19 (κατελθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς Καισάρειαν διέτριβεν), kde predložka εἰς sa musí vzťahovať k slovesu διέτριβεν, ktoré k sebe vyžaduje determináciu miesta, a nie k slovesu κατέρχομαι, s ktorým sa inak obvykle v Sk predložka εἰς spája vo význame „do“.

³⁵ Takto napr. ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento*, 477, pozn. 117. DUPONT, *La mission*, 241: „Nous rattacherions donc volontiers le εἰς à l'idée introduit par le mot διακονία: il s'agit de l'accomplissement d'un service 'en faveur de' Jérusalem. Avec cette nuance, l'emploi de εἰς est normal: on le voit tant par saint Paul que par les inscriptions.“

³⁶ Tieto príklady takejto Lukášovej práce s gréčtinou uvádza a komentuje DUPONT, *La mission*, 238-239; porov. ROSSE, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento*, 477, pozn. 117.

z Lukášovho evanjelia (Lk 10,17³⁷; 17,15³⁸), ktoré môžu poslúžiť ako analógia k Sk 12,25. V nich je totiž medzi slovesom ὑποστρέφω v určitom tvare a ďalším slovesom v tvare participia, vzťahujúcim sa k tomu istému podmetu, vložená fráza, ktorá sa na prvý pohľad môže javiť ako rozvinutie slovesa ὑποστρέφω, avšak pri bližšom pohľade sa evidentne vzťahuje k príslušnému participiu³⁹. (d) Pokiaľ by sme sa striktne držali základného významu participia aoristu, totiž predčasnosti vzhľadom na hlavné sloveso, tak dve aoristné prídavia v 12,25 by vyjadrovali, že „sa vrátili“, potom čo dokončili službu a vzali so sebou Jána⁴⁰. Na základe tejto úvahy je veľmi nepravdepodobné, že by sa vrátili do Jeruzalema, kde predtým dokončili službu a odkiaľ vzali Jána Marka – to podporuje interpunkčnú interpretáciu, ktorá potvrdzuje úspešnosť ich poslania.

Týchto pár poznámok ku gramatike a štýlu kumulatívnym spôsobom ukazuje na to, že formulácia v Sk 12,25 v tejto interpretácii nie je lukášovskému štýlu cudzia, a preto z hľadiska štylistického a gramatického nič nebráni tomu, považovať ju za pôvodnú a s týmto významom; nie je preto nutné odkazovať na rôzne zdroje autora Skutkov.

K tejto poslednej interpunkčnej interpretácii sa prikláňame v tomto článku, z čoho vyplýva nasledujúci preklad Sk 12,25: „Barnabáš a Šavol sa vrátili, potom čo v Jeruzaleme dokončili službu a vzali so sebou Jána zvaného Marek.“⁴¹

2 Kontextové súvislosti

2.1 Sk 12,25 a 11,27-30

Skutky apoštolov 12,25 jasne odkazujú na verše 11,29-30, ktoré sú súčasťou textovej jednotky 11,27-30 opisujúcej zorganizovanie pomoci

³⁷ Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] μετὰ χαρᾶς λέγοντες...

³⁸ Εἶς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη, ὑπέστρεψεν μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων τὸν θεόν. (Na príslušnej strane u Duponta nesprávne uvedené 12,15. Text, ktorý cituje, pochádza jednoznačne zo 17,15.)

³⁹ Porov. DUPONT, La mission, 240.

⁴⁰ ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento*, 478, pozn. 125: „La successione di ptc. aor.: *plerosantes ... symparalabontes* (...) andrebbe letta: ‘tornarono, avendo compiuto ... e avendo preso...’.“

⁴¹ Slovenské preklady gréckeho Nového zákona, ak nie je uvedené inak, v celom článku pochádzajú od jeho autora.

antiochijskej cirkvi jeruzalemskému spoločenstvu v reakcii na Agabusovu predpoveď veľkého hladu za cisára Klaudia. Explicitné prepojenie medzi nimi je vytvorené prostredníctvom postáv *Barnabáša a Šavla* a prostredníctvom termínu *διακονία*.

2.1.1 Barnabáš a Šavol

S oboma postavami sa čitateľ Skutkov stretol už v predchádzajúcich kapitolách. Barnabáš, vlastným menom Jozef, židovský levita, narodený na Cypre (Sk 4,36), ktorý predal svoje pole a utržené peniaze priniesol apoštolom (v. 37), patril k významným postavám jeruzalemskej cirkvi. Uvedenie Šavla v Skutkoch je, naopak, negatívne: ako mladý muž strážil šaty „svedkov“ Štefanovho kameňovania (7,58b) a súhlasil s jeho zlynčovaním (8,1a; porov. 22,20). Hneď v nasledujúcej zmienke v 8,3 je už predstavený dokonca ako aktívny ničiteľ Cirkvi, ktorého snahou bolo nielen odvláčať veriacich do väzenia, ale dokonca ich aj vraždiť (9,1; porov. 22,4; 26,10-11). Zlomovou udalosťou, ktorá zásadne zmenila jeho životné smerovanie, bolo stretnutie so vzkrieseným Pánom na ceste do Damasku (9,1-19a), pri ktorom prijal poverenie na ohlasovanie jeho mena tak pohanom, ako aj Židom (porov. v. 15). Po krátkom pôsobení v Damasku, z ktorého nakoniec musel utiecť (vv. 19b-25), bol to práve Barnabáš, ktorý ho v Jeruzaleme, kde „sa ho všetci báli“ (v. 26), priviedol k apoštolom (v. 27). Tu zrejme môžeme vidieť zárodok ich istého výnimočného vzťahu, o ktorom podávajú svedectvo ďalšie texty zo Skutkov, kde ich nachádzame pri spoločnej práci. V Jeruzaleme Barnabáš evidentne rozpoznal Šavlov misijný potenciál. Po tom, čo bol jeruzalemskou cirkvou poslaný do Antiochie na „vizitáciu“, sem totiž priviedol z Tarzu práve Šavla a spolu tu vyučovali veriacich kresťanov (porov. 11,19-26). Až do ukončenia ich spoločného pôsobenia na konci 15. kapitoly obe tieto významné osobnosti ranokresťanskej cirkvi nachádzame vedľa seba ako vyslancov antiochijskej cirkvi (1) pri doručení finančnej podpory cirkvi v Jeruzaleme (11,30; 12,25), (2) pri misijnej činnosti na Cypre a v južnej časti rímskej provincie Galácie (13,4–14,28) a (3) na jeruzalemskom sneme (15,1-35). Ich cesty sa rozišli po nezhodách vzhľadom na Jána Marka, ktorý s Barnabášom odchádza na jeho rodný ostrov Cyprus (porov. 15,36-40). Zatiaľ čo o Barnabášovi sa Skutki už ďalej nezmiňujú, Pavol sa stáva hlavnou misijnou postavou celej ich zvyšnej časti (kap. 16–28).

2.1.2 διακονία

Podstatné meno *διακονία* sa v Skutkoch apoštolov vyskytuje 8-krát (1,17,25; 6,1,4; 11,29; 12,25; 20,24; 21,19). Označuje buď (1) apoštolskú službu (1,17,25), ktorej zásadnou charakteristikou je služba slova (6,4), v prípade Pavla prinášanie svedectva o evanjeliu (20,24), zvlášť medzi pohanmi (21,19); alebo (2) každodennú starostlivosť pri poskytovaní špecifickej pomoci alebo podpory vnútri jeruzalemského spoločenstva (6,1), resp. konkrétnu adresnú podporu antiochijského spoločenstva cirkvi v Jeruzaleme (11,29; 12,25).

Istým problémom v súvislosti s veršami Sk 11,29 a 12,25 je otázka adekvátneho prekladu gréckeho termínu *διακονία* a s tým spojenej interpretácie. V oboch prípadoch sa síce týka jednej a tej istej skutočnosti, avšak v komentároch a prekladoch⁴² sa na týchto miestach nie zriedka stretávame s jeho odlišným prekladom. Pre podstatné meno *διακονία* vo verši 11,29 sú navrhované preklady a interpretácie v zmysle napríklad služby⁴³, pomoci, resp. podpory⁴⁴, alebo zbierky⁴⁵. Pri pohľade na ne vidíme, že navzájom sa nemusia vylučovať, skôr vypovedajú o uhle pohľadu a o sémantickom potenciáli termínu *διακονία*, v uvedenom poradí od všeobecnejšieho ku konkrétnejšiemu. „Služba“ azda

⁴² Na ukážku stačí uviesť niektoré slovenské preklady (citácie sú prevzaté z webovskej stránky <https://biblia.sk> [cit. 24-09-2022]): SEB: 11,29: „... každý podľa svojich možností podporí bratov...“; 12,25: „... po skončení služby...“; SSV: 11,29: „... každý podľa svojich možností napomôže bratom...“; 12,25: „... splnili v Jeruzaleme svoju úlohu...“; SEP: 11,29: „... každý podľa svojej možnosti pošle niečo bratom v Judsku na pomoc...“; 12,25: „... keď skončili svoju službu...“.

⁴³ BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 565: „Here it is service directed towards the brothers (Christians) who lived in Judaea.“ DUPONT, *La mission*, 241: „La *διακονία* ne s'entend pas, même chez Paul, de la collecte de dons, mais de la distribution de secours, du service qu'on rend.“

⁴⁴ SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 96: „Die Hilfe sollte im *εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι* bestehen: Sie wollten '(etwas) zur Unterstützung senden'.“ ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 184: „«Unterstützung» (...) Hier wie bei Paulus (2.Kor 8,4; 9,1.12f.) erscheint es als geprägter Terminus für die Kollekte, wobei wohl der Gedanke impliziert ist, daß sich in der gegenseitigen materiellen Unterstützung der Christen das von Jesus seiner Gemeinde eingestiftete Prinzip des Dienens realisiert.“

⁴⁵ V tomto prípade sa obvykle dáva do súvisu s pavlovským použitím termínu. Porov. napr. JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 328.

najlepšie zodpovedá pôvodnému etymologickému⁴⁶ významu a tiež väčšinovému použitiu slov s koreňom *διακον-* v Skutkoch apoštolov. „Pomoc“, príp. „podpora“ zasa zohľadňuje aspekt solidárnosti, charakteristickej už pre samotné materské spoločenstvo v Jeruzaleme (porov. 2,42-47; 4,32-35), kedy jedna komunita veriacich robí niečo konkrétne pre to, aby poskytla pomoc alebo podporu inému spoločenstvu v situácii núdze. „Zbierka“ vystihuje charakter tejto pomoci v jeho konkrétnom uskutočnení, ako je charakterizované v 11,29⁴⁷. Výstižne by sa azda jeho význam v tomto verši dal opísať ako „osobne zainteresovaná služba“⁴⁸ finančného charakteru za účelom pomoci⁴⁹. Takto opísaný význam je použiteľný aj pre termín *διακονία* v 12,25. Nie je teda nutné redukovať jeho význam na jeden aspekt. Pretože však v preklade je vhodné a žiaduce použiť jeden prekladový ekvivalent, zdá sa byť prijateľným kompromisným riešením použiť v oboch veršoch podstatné meno „služba“ s vedomím jeho ďalších konkrétnejších konotácií vyplývajúcich z opisu situácie a kontextu konkrétnej medzikomunitnej adresnej pomoci. Podľa 11,29 sa antiochijskí učeníci rozhodli za účelom služby (*εἰς διακονίαν*)⁵⁰, ktorá má charakter pomoci, poslať finančnú⁵¹ podporu veriacim v Judsku. Prostredníctvom Barnabáša a Šavla sa „plánovaná

⁴⁶ ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 184: „Das (...) griechische Wort *diakonia* heißt wörtlich ‘Dienst’ und hat vielfach im Neuen Testament die spezifische Bedeutung des gegenseitigen Dienens der Christen nach der durch Jesu Eintreten für die seinen gesetzten Norm.“

⁴⁷ HENTSCHEL, *Diakonia*, 349: „Inhaltlich wird durch Apg 11,29-30 und Apg 12,25 folgender Ereignisablauf nahegelegt: die Gemeindeglieder in Antiochia sammeln nach dem individuellen Vermögen Geld, das zunächst zusammengetragen werden muss. Vergleichbar zur Organisation der Kollekte durch Paulus (2Kor 9,7) kann jeder einzelne nach seinem Vermögen spenden. Diese Geld ist bestimmt für die Gemeinde in Jerusalem.“

⁴⁸ Všeobecne k významovej zvláštnosti slovesa *διακονέω*, ktorá sa týka aj podstatného mena *διακονία* uvádza BEYER, *διακονέω*, 81: „*διακονέω* hat (...) den besonderen Klang, daß es die ganz persönlich einem anderen erwiesene Dienstleistung bezeichnet“.

⁴⁹ MARGUERAT, *Gli Atti*, 503-504: „Il «servizio» compiuto da Barnaba e Saulo a Gerusalemme, in senso proprio la diaconia (...), altro non è che la consegna della colletta destinata a sostenere i cristiani della Giudea (11,29).“

⁵⁰ Podstatné meno *διακονία* gramaticky nie je predmetom ani infinitívu *πέμψαι* (v zmysle „poslať pomoc/zbierku“), ani slovesa *ᾤρισαν* (v zmysle „stanovili/určili pomoc/zbierku“). Vzťahuje sa k predložke *εἰς*, ktorá (veľmi pravdepodobne) ukazuje na účel.

⁵¹ Pozri pozn. 47.

διακονία premenila na čin⁵² (11,30) a bola úspešne realizovaná, ako nakoniec potvrdzuje 12,25.

Barnabáš a Šavol, vyslaní antiochijskými učeníkmi (Sk 11,30) k starším, dokončili (πληρώσαντες)⁵³ v Jeruzaleme dielo pomoci/podpory (διακονία) zorganizované zámožnými kresťanmi v Antiochii. Úspešné ukončenie tohto poslania potvrdilo ich kompetenciu na plnenie ďalších úloh, resp. poslaní na medzikomunitnej úrovni. To dosvedčuje nasledujúca perikopa o ich vyvolení, oddelení (13,2) a vyslaní (v. 4) samotným Duchom Svätým, aby hlásali Božie slovo na Cypre a na juhu rímskej provincie Galácie (porov. 13,4–14,28)⁵⁴.

Osvedčenie sa Barnabáša a Šavla a ich spolupráce ako vyslancov antiochijskej cirkvi je len jednou z ďalších možných súvislostí, na ktoré ukazuje umiestnenie informácie o dokončení ich pomoci pre jeruzalemských kresťanov a pripojení Jána Marka na koniec 12. kapitoly. Skutky apoštolov 12,25 spolu s 11,27-30 tiež vytvárajú isté geografické orámovanie rozprávania tejto kapitoly, ktoré sa odohráva v Jeruzaleme a v Cézarei⁵⁵. Verš 11,30 uzavrel správu o veriacom spoločenstve v Antiochii (vv. 19-30) a 12,25 návratom do Antiochie vedie k ďalšej správe o ňom (13,1-3)⁵⁶. To v rámci Lukášovho rozprávania evokuje oprávnenú predstavu, že Barnabáš a Šavol sa počas udalostí vyrozprávaných v 12. kapitole zdržiavali na území Judska (porov. 11,30). Ďalšie prepojenie sa nachádza vnútri 12. kapitoly, kde v priebehu rozprávania o zázračnom vyslobodení Petra z väzenia je v 12. verši čitateľovi poskytnutá prvá stručná a nepriama informácia o Jánovi Markovi, ktorého si podľa 12,25 priviedli do Antiochie⁵⁷.

⁵² HENTSCHEL, *Diakonia*, 349.

⁵³ BDAG, 736 [πληρώω, 5]: „to bring to completion an activity in which one has been involved from its beginning, complete, finish“.

⁵⁴ Porov. ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento*, 478; HENTSCHEL, *Diakonia*, 350.

⁵⁵ ZMIJEWSKI, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 453: „Der von 11,27-30 bzw. 12,25 eingerahmte Erzählkomplex erweist sich somit als eine Art «Einschaltung».“

⁵⁶ Porov. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 97. Vzhľadom na chronologický aspekt uvádza WITHERINGTON, *The Acts*, 375: „It is worth asking, however, why Luke has set this one verse, 12:25, apart from the rest of the narrative in 11:27-30. Perhaps it is because he knew very well that the famine and the famine relief visit transpired *after* the death of Herod, and the placement of 12:25 reflects this knowledge.“

⁵⁷ Na zaujímavú paralelu poukazuje WITHERINGTON, *The Acts*, 375: „In order to enhance the rhetorical effect of the narrative Luke deliberately transposed the Peter episode to after the famine visit so that he could have both halves of his document end with the

2.2 *Ján Marek*

Dôležitou postavou pre prechod do 13. kapitoly je v Sk 12,25 Ján Marek, ktorého Barnabáš a Šavol „vzali so sebou“ (συμπααραλαβόντες Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μᾶρκον). Sloveso συμπααραλαμβάνω („brať [niekoho] so sebou“) sa v Skutkoch vyskytuje trikrát a vždy je jeho (gramatickým) „predmetom“ nejakým spôsobom práve Ján zvaný Marek⁵⁸. Okrem 12,25 sa nachádza ešte v 15,37⁵⁹ a 38⁶⁰, na konci spoločnej misijnej cesty Barnabáša a Pavla, kde je podľa Skutkov práve tento ich spolupracovník dôvodom ich rozchodu, ukončenia ich spolupráce. Verše 12,25 a 15,37-38 tak vytvárajú istú inklúziu, ktorá zahŕňa ich prvé a zároveň posledné spoločné misijné pôsobenie mimo územia Palestíny a Sýrie (13,4–14,28) a s tým súvisiace riešenie otázky prijímania pohanov do cirkvi na Jeruzalemskom sneme (15,1-35).

Postava Jána Marka teda prepojuje udalosti rozprávané v dvanástej kapitole s rozprávaním v nasledujúcej kapitole. V dome jeho matky sa zhromažďoval značný počet veriacich jeruzalemských kresťanov a tam prišiel apoštol Peter po svojom zázračnom vyslobodení z väzenia (Sk 12,12)⁶¹. Jeho si Barnabáš a Šavol priviedli z Jeruzalema do Antiochie (v. 25), pričom dôvod tohto ich konania nie je výslovne uvedený. Jedným z dôvodov by mohla byť informácia z Kol 4,10, kde je označený ako Barnabášov „bratranec“ (Μᾶρκος ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρναβᾶ)⁶². Je však nutné povedať, že o tomto vzťahu Skutky nič nehovoria. Ďalšie dôvody, ktoré by azda prichádzali do úvahy a vzájomne sa nevylučujú, sú (a) možná predchádzajúca osobná vzájomná známosť Barnabáša a Jána Marka z Jeruzalema; (b) Ján Marek mohol byť oficiálnym vyslancom

imprisonment of an apostle followed by the declaration of the success of God's word (cf. 12:1ff. to 28:16ff.).“

⁵⁸ BENOIT, La deuxième visite, 786: „(...) τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μᾶρκον reprend une formule très ordinaire des Actes (12,12 dit aussi de Marc; cf. encore 1,23; 4,36 etc.).“

⁵⁹ Βαρναβᾶς δὲ ἐβούλετο συμπααραλαβεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν καλούμενον Μᾶρκον...

⁶⁰ Παῦλος δὲ ἤξιον, τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον μὴ συμπααραλαμβάνειν τοῦτον.

⁶¹ συνιδῶν τε ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι.

⁶² Porov. MARSHALL, *The Acts*, 213; BRUCE, *The Book*, 243.

jeruzalemskej cirkvi⁶³. Tieto dôvody spolu so skúsenosťou na Cypre, kde všetci traja spolupracovali a zrejme úspešne, hrali tiež zrejme dôležitú rolu v tom, prečo ho Barnabáš chce so sebou aj na druhú misijnú cestu, ktorá pre neho opäť začala na tomto ostrove (porov. Sk 15,39b). V 13. kapitole ho pod menom Ján (bez Marek) nachádzame ako ich „pomocníka“ (ὕπηρέτην) na Cypre (13,5), ktorý sa však od nich odlúčil na začiatku ich činnosti na pevnine (v Pamfýlii) a vrátil sa do Jeruzalema (v. 13), pričom príčinu jeho odchodu autor Skutkov neuvádza. Tento odchod je však na konci 15. kapitoly v Antiochii pred plánovanou druhou návštevou miest, kde už predtým hlásali Pánovo slovo (porov. 15,36), dôvodom ostrej roztržky medzi Barnabášom a Pavlom, ktorá vedie k ukončeniu ich spolupráce (15,39a)⁶⁴. Markovo správanie v Pamfýlii považuje Pavol až za akési odpadlivosť (τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν) od spoločného diela na Božom slove (v. 38), a preto zásadne nesúhlasí s Barnabášovým zámerom vziať ho opäť k spolupráci (v. 37). Barnabáš sa spolu s Markom odplavia na Cyprus (v. 39b), čo je posledná zmienka o nich v Skutkoch a ich vystúpenie tu končí.

2.3 Verše 12,25 a 12,24

Verš Sk 12,25 nie je s predchádzajúcim veršom prepojený ani terminologicky, ani syntakticky. Oprávnené sa však môžeme nazdávať, že ich bezprostredné postavenie vedľa seba na tomto mieste Lukášovho rozprávania nie je náhodné. To tiež potvrdzuje skutočnosť, že v komentároch bývajú tieto dva verše obvykle vykladané spolu, pričom sa zdôrazňuje ich tranzitná funkcia – spolu vytvárajú prechod medzi dvoma naratívnymi blokmi Skutkov apoštolov, 12,1-23 a kap. 13–14.

⁶³ Toto pripúšťa HENTSCHEL, *Diakonia*, 350, pozn. 220: „(...) Johannes Markus als offizieller Gesandter der Jerusalemer Gemeinde mit Barnabas und Pl nach Antiochia geht. Es ist anzunehmen, dass er Gemeindeleiter und eine einflussreiche Persönlichkeit in der Urgemeinde war (vgl. Apg 12,12).“

⁶⁴ Oprávnené môžeme predpokladať, že na konci 15. kapitoly sa Ján Marek po svojom oddelení a návrate do Jeruzalema nachádza v Antiochii. Na „koncile“ v Jeruzaleme o ňom zmienka nie je, nevieme, či, a pokiaľ áno, v akej miere sa ho aktívne zúčastnil. Do Antiochie sa pravdepodobne presunul nezávisle od Pavla a Barnabáša. Nebol totiž súčasťou oficiálnej delegácie (Pavol, Barnabáš, Júda zvaný Barsabáš a Sílas, 15,22.25-27) vyslanej s koncilovým rozhodnutím z Jeruzalema do Antiochie. (Či bol v ich širšom sprievode, môžeme len špekulovať.) To by možno mohlo ukazovať na už existujúce „dusno“ vo vzťahu medzi ním a Pavlom.

Verš Sk 12,24 uzatvára celú dvanástu kapitolu teologicky veľmi optimistickým tvrdením o samopresadzovaní sa Božieho slova⁶⁵: „Božie slovo rástlo a rozmnožovalo sa.“ Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἠΐξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο. Podobná formulácia o raste a silnení slova sa nachádza v 19,20: Οὕτως κατὰ κράτος τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἠΐξανεν καὶ ἴσχυεν. Slová o raste, sile a množení sa Božieho slova sa v 12,24 nachádzajú pred začiatkom prvej spoločnej veľkej misie Barnabáša a Šavla a v 19,20 vo vrcholnom okamihu Pavlovej misie v Efeze, v meste, kde podľa Skutkov strávil najviac času (tri roky: 20,31; porov. 19,8.10). Od 19,21 totiž Pavol považuje túto časť svojho misijného pôsobenia na území rímskej provincie Ázie za uzavretú, pretože plánuje návrat do Jeruzalema (a potom cestu do Ríma, porov. 19,21), kde počítá s tak zásadnými komplikáciami (20,22-23), že si je istý, že do Efezu, resp. do (provincie) Ázie sa už nevráti (v. 24). Ukončenie poslania v Jeruzaleme a ukončenie veľkej misie v Efeze/Ázii sú podľa Skutkov jedny z kľúčových momentov Pavlovho pôsobenia. V prvom prípade ešte spolu s Barnabášom, v druhom už bez neho.

Obe slovesá αὐξάνω a πληθύνω nájdeme vedľa seba v Štefanovej reči v súvislosti s rastom a rozmnožením sa Božieho ľudu v Egypte v Sk 7,17 (ἠΐξησεν ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ) ako naplnenia Božieho prisľúbenia daného Abrahámovi. Obe slovesá, ale s iným podmetom nájdeme v 6,7 v súvislosti s opisom nádejnej a veľmi optimistickej situácie v prvom jeruzalemskom spoločenstve veriacich (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἠΐξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ σφόδρα). Na ďalších dvoch miestach v Skutkoch sa sloveso πληθύνω vyskytuje (opäť) v súvislosti s narastaním počtu učeníkov v Jeruzaleme (6,1: πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν), resp. rastom cirkvi v Judsku, Galilei a Samárii (9,31: ἐκκλησία [...] ἐπληθύνετο). Nemali by sme v tejto súvislosti zabúdať ani na miesta ako napr. 13,49 (διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας) alebo 16,5 (Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐπερίσσευον τῷ ἀριθμῷ καθ' ἡμέραν.).

⁶⁵ TALBERT, *Reading Acts*, 113: „Nothing can stop the gospel: neither race (11:20), nor famine (11:27-30), nor persecutors (12:1-19), nor self-deifying rulers (12:20-23).“

Zdá sa, že rast Božieho slova⁶⁶ a narastanie počtu učeníkov, resp. kresťanských veriacich, predstavujú pre autora Skutkov akési spojené nádoby⁶⁷ – nejde si jedno bez druhého celkom dobre predstaviť. Prijímanie Božieho slova vo viere konkrétnymi ľuďmi je základným a zásadným viditeľným prejavom jeho vnútornej sily, ktorej zdrojom je Duch Svätý prisľúbený Cirkvi vzkrieseným Pánom⁶⁸. Božie slovo v postavení vetného podmetu, opísané ako subjekt, ktorý rastie, silnie a rozmnožuje sa, je takto predstavené ako akýsi živý organizmus⁶⁹, ktorý si žije svojím vlastným životom a sám sebou sa vo svete presadzuje. Na druhej strane je v Skutkoch apoštolov Božie, príp. Pánovo slovo často vo funkcii predmetnej⁷⁰: je predmetom hovorenia (λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, resp. τοῦ κυρίου: Sk 4,29.31; 8,25; 13,46; 16,32), hlásania (καταγγέλλειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ: 13,5; 15,36; 17,13), počúvania (ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ/τοῦ κυρίου: 13,7;

⁶⁶ ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 192: „Lukas denkt, wenn er vom «Wachstum des Wortes des Herrn» spricht, kaum an konkrete Missionserfolge, die sich in Jerusalem nach der Verfolgung eingestellt hätten; die Zeit des großen Wachstums der Jerusalemer Gemeinde ist für ihn vorbei. Eher will er dem Leser nach den Berichten von Hungersnot und Verfolgung den übergreifenden Richtungssinn des Geschehens ins Gedächtnis zurückrufen: Auch Krisen und Rückschläge können den Weg des Wortes zu den Enden der Erde nicht aufhalten – die sich unmittelbar anschließende Geschichte der antiochenischen Mission (Kp 13-14) wird das gleichfalls zeigen.“

⁶⁷ MARGUERAT, *Gli Atti*, 503: „Come tutti i sommari dovuti alla sua penna, essi sono caratterizzati dai verbi all'imperfetto, che indicano l'aspetto continuativo dello stato descritto. Qui la sorpresa, come in 6,7 e 19,20, è che a crescere non è la Chiesa, bensì la parola di Dio. Luca lavora con una teologia ebraica della Parola, il דָבָר (*dābār*), concepita come una forza attiva e creatrice nel mondo. (...) Non è sbagliato pensare che il pullulare della Parola includa la crescita della comunità credente, manifestazione visibile della parola di Dio. La Chiesa è creazione della Parola, creatura verbi.“

⁶⁸ KÜRZINGER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 323: „Ein unzerstörbares Leben liegt in ihm. Die Lebensmacht des auferstandenen und erhöhten Herrn ist es, die Kraft des Heiligen Geistes, die der Auferstandene seiner Kirche verheißen hat, da er den Aposteln den Auftrag gab, von Jerusalem bis an die Grenzen der Erde seine Zeugen zu sein (1,8).“

⁶⁹ ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli. Introduzione*, 156: „Il sommario riprende il tema della crescita, ma mette «la parola di Dio» come soggetto del verbo; essa è considerata come una realtà viva ed efficace che produce una crescita sempre più numerosa di fedeli.“

⁷⁰ BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 595: „it is one of Luke's most frequent expressions for the Christian message“.

13,44; 15,7; 19,10), alebo inej ľudskej činnosti⁷¹. Ľudia, ktorí v týchto prípadoch vystupujú ako subjekty uvedených činností, majú či už aktívnym alebo pasívnym spôsobom podiel na jeho šírení a rozmáhaní sa. V istom zmysle sú v jeho službách, sú jeho spolupracovníkmi a sprostredkovateľmi. Oboje tak ukazuje na istú tajomnú bohoľudskú synergiu: rast Cirkvi a počtu jej veriacich zvonka a „práca“ s Božím slovom vnútri Cirkvi sú viditeľným prejavom skrytého, ale skutočného pôsobenia a prítomnosti Boha v nej.

Motív rastu Božieho slova vytvára istý kontrast⁷² s predchádzajúcim konaním Herodesa zameraným na likvidáciu apoštolov Jakuba a Petra. Jeho snaha „robiť zle“ (*κακῶσαί*, Sk 12,1) Cirkvi, jednoducho nemôže zabrániť šíreniu Božieho slova a rastu Cirkvi⁷³. Márnosť jeho snaženia jasne vychádza najavo a potvrdzuje sa, keď zomiera v okamihu privlastňovania si slávy, ktorá náleží Bohu (porov. 12,22-23).

Skutky apoštolov 12,24 spolu s veršami podobného znenia uisťujú čitateľa o tom, že projekt šírenia svedectva o zmŕtvychvstalom Pánovi, ním samým programovo vyhlásený v 1,8, sa postupne úspešne realizuje napriek rôznym prekážkam, ktoré mu do toho vstupujú. Tieto verše pôsobia ako akýsi tmel, ktorý celý tento projekt udržiava v kontinuálnom progrese⁷⁴.

Po na prvý pohľad nie moc priaznivých udalostiach v Jeruzaleme z 12. kapitoly, jej 24. verš vytvára veľmi nádejné predznamenanie pre šírenie misie z Antiochie smerom na západ. Jej predpokladom je však návrat jej hlavných protagonistov Barnabáša, Šavla a aj Jána Marka do Antiochie, o čom referuje v. 25, čím vytvára prechod⁷⁵ k celej ďalšej väčšej tematickej časti Skutkov.

⁷¹ Sk 13,48: Ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 15,35: Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Βαρναβᾶς διέτριβον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι μετὰ καὶ ἐτέρων πολλῶν τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου. 18,11: Ἐκάθισεν δὲ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ διδάσκων ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. 6,2: προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν εἶπαν· οὐκ ἄρεστόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς καταλείψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διακονεῖν τραπέζαις.

⁷² Porov. ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento*, 478; BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 593; BRUCE, *The Book*, 290.

⁷³ BOCK, *Acts*, 434: „Intense persecution, including martyrdom, cannot stop the growth and penetration of God’s word through faithful witnesses.“ MARSHALL, *The Acts*, 213: „despite the attacks on the church from outside, *the word of God* continued to spread“.

⁷⁴ BENOIT, *La deuxième visite*, 786: „Le v. 24 est un de ces ciments dont le rédacteur des Actes se sert pour jointoyer les pierres de son édifice, tout en faisant progresser l’action.“

⁷⁵ Porov. BENOIT, *La deuxième visite*, 786.

Verše 24 a 25 v niekoľkých ohľadoch, ktoré sa vzájomne prelínajú, plnia rolu sumára s funkciou prepojenia a prechodu⁷⁶. (1) Uzatvárajú oddiel, ktorý začal v 11,19 a dotýka sa istého prepojenia, resp. istých vzťahov medzi jeruzalemským a antiochijským spoločenstvom. (2) Ich súčasťou je konkrétna adresná pomoc cirkvi v Antiochii cirkvám v Judsku (11,27-30), ktorej úspešné dokončenie potvrdzujú Skutky 12,25. (3) Tvoria bezprostredný záver rozprávania 12. kapitoly. (4) Presúvajú pozornosť z Jeruzalema na Antiochiu, ktorá je pre nasledujúcu misijnú činnosť Cirkvi kľúčová⁷⁷. (5) Na personálnej úrovni s tým súvisí presun pozornosti z Petra na Barnabáša a Šavla ako na hlavné postavy nasledujúceho diania⁷⁸.

Záver

Jedna veta⁷⁹ v Sk 12,25 z hľadiska obsahového nadväzuje na úryvok v 11,27-30 o zorganizovaní pomoci antiochijskej cirkvi pre veriacich v Judsku na základe predpovede veľkého hladu vyslovenej prorokom Agabusom. Potvrdzuje úspešné realizovanie tohto projektu, ktorým boli poverení Barnabáš a Šavol, a tým v rámci Skutkov uzatvára časť venovanú vzájomným vzťahom veriacich spoločenstiev v Jeruzaleme a Antiochii. Postavy oboch hlavných protagonistov spolu s Jánom Markom, ktorého vzali z Jeruzalema, zároveň svojím návratom do Antiochie pripravujú plynulý prechod k nasledujúcej časti. Nachádzame ich totiž na začiatku 13. kapitoly ako kľúčové osoby pre celý ďalší veľký blok misijnej činnosti vychádzajúcej z tohto mesta a organizovanej miestnou cirkvou. Takto autor Skutkov zachováva kontinuitu s predchádzajúcim rozprávaním a posúva ho geograficky i teologicky ďalej. Na jednej strane sa Antiochia osamostatňuje od Jeruzalema v organizovaní svojej vlastnej misijnej činnosti okrem územia Palestíny a Sýrie smerom na západ, čo nakoniec povedie k definitívne kladnému riešeniu otázky prijímania obrátených pohanov do Cirkvi v Sk 15. Na druhej strane však antiochijská cirkev potvrdzuje svoje zásadné

⁷⁶ JERVELL, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 338: „Abschluss- und Übergangsverse“.

⁷⁷ BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 594: „Antioch has established itself in relation to the old church of Jerusalem; it is now ready to move out into new fields and establish new churches dependent on itself.“

⁷⁸ BOCK, *Acts*, 434: „So this brief account is a bridge working both backward and forward in Acts.“

⁷⁹ LONGENECKER, *Lukan Aversion*, 190, pozn. 8: „it operates as a one-sentence story“.

zviazanie s jeruzalemskou cirkvou⁸⁰, čo dosvedčuje tak verš 12,25, ako aj neskôr udalosti 15. kapitoly Skutkov⁸¹. Verš 12,25 tak v nadväznosti na teologicky zásadné konštatovanie o vitalite Božieho slova vo v. 24 plní funkciu šva⁸² v rozhodujúcom okamihu ranokresťanských dejín rozprávaných autorom Skutkov apoštolov.

Zoznam použitej literatúry

- ALAND, Barbara – ALAND, Kurt – KARAVIDOPOULOS, Johannes – MARTINI, Carlo M. – METZGER, Bruce M. (eds.): *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ⁵2014.
- BARRETT, C. K.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. I, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- BENOIT, Pierre: La deuxième visite de Saint Paul à Jérusalem, *Biblica* 40 (1959) 778-792.
- BEYER, Hermann Wolfgang: διακονέω, διακονία, διάκονος. In: *ThWNT* II (1935) 81-93.
- BLASS, Friedrich – DEBRUNNER, Albert – REHKOPF, Friedrich: *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹⁷1990.
- BOCK, Darrell L.: *Acts*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie: *The Book of the Acts. Revised Edition*, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.
- BUCK, Charles H.: The Collection for the Saints, *HTR* 43/1 (1950) 1-29.
- DANKER, Frederick William (ed.): *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (BDAG)*, Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press, ⁴2021.
- DUPONT, Jacques: La mission de Paul ‘à Jérusalem’ (Actes 12,25). In: Jacques Dupont: *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967, 217-241.
- FUNK, Robert W.: The Enigma of the Famine Visit, *JBL* 75/2 (1956) 130-136.
- GIET, Stanislas: Le second voyage de saint Paul à Jerusalem (Actes XI, 27-30; XII, 24-25), *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 25/3 (1951) 265-269.
- HAENCHEN, Ernst: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹³1961.
- HAUBECK, Wilfrid – SIEBENTHAL, Heinrich von: *Neuer sprachlicher Schlüssel zum griechischen Neuen Testament. Matthäus – Offenbarung*, Gießen: Brunnen Verlag, ³2015.

⁸⁰ DUPONT, La mission, 229: „un événement dans lequel Antiochie regarde une dernière fois vers Jérusalem avant de se tourner entièrement vers l’Occident (13–28).“

⁸¹ ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli*, 477: „L’estensione della missione a partire da Antiochia ha quindi radici solide nel terreno-madre della chiesa gerosolimitana.“

⁸² BENOIT, La deuxième visite, 787: „12,25 a tous les caractères d’une simple suture“.

- HENTSCHER, Anni: *Diakonia im Neuen Testament. Studien zur Semantik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rolle von Frauen*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- HORT, Fenton John Anthony: Notes on Select Readings. In: Brooke Foss Westcott – Fenton John Anthony Hort: *The New Testament in the Original Greek. Volume II: Introduction [and] Appendix*, Cambridge and London, ²1896.
- JERVELL, Jacob: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy: *The Acts of the Apostles*, Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- KÜRZINGER, Josef: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1. Teil, Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1966.
- LONGENECKER, Bruce W.: Lukan Aversion to Humps and Hollows: The Case of Acts 11:27–12:25, *NTS* 50/2 (2004) 185-204.
- MARGUERAT, Daniel: *Gli Atti degli Apostoli. I (1–12)*, Bologna: EDB, 2011.
- MARSHALL, I. Howard: *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*, Leicester – Grand Rapids, MI: Inter-Varsity Press – William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- METZGER, Bruce M.: *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, ³1975.
- NESTLE, Erwin – ALAND, Kurt (eds.): *Novum Testamentum Graece. Begründet von Eberhard und Erwin Nestle. Herausgegeben von Barbara und Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ²⁸2012.
- PERVO, Richard I.: *Acts: A Commentary*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- ROLOFF, Jürgen: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen – Zürich: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, ²1988.
- ROSSÉ, Gérard: *Atti degli Apostoli. Commento esegetico e teologico*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1998.
- ROSSÉ, Gérard: *Atti degli Apostoli. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Milano: Edizioni San Paolo, 2010.
- SCHNEIDER, Gerhard: *Die Apostelgeschichte. II. Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 9,1 – 28,31*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 1982.
- VON SIEBENTHAL, Heinrich: *Griechische Grammatik zum Neuen Testament. Neubearbeitung und Erweiterung der Grammatik Hoffmann / von Siebenthal*, Gießen – Basel: Brunnen Verlag – Immanue-Verlag, 2011.
- TALBERT, Charles H.: *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys, 2005.
- WITHERINGTON III, Ben: *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U. K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- ZMIJEWSKI, Josef: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1994.

Zhrnutie


Pri výklade biblického verša, ktorý na prvý pohľad pôsobí izolovane, je nutné sledovať možné užšie i širšie kontextové súvislosti na rovine literárnej i teologickej. Tento článok sa o takýto výklad pokúša v prípade verša 12,25 zo Skutkov apoštolov. Venuje sa dôležitému textovo-kritickému problému spojenému s frázou εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ a všíma si možné obsahové prepojenia so Sk 11,27-30; 12,24 a kap. 13–15. Ukazuje sa, že verš 12,25 má dôležitú funkciu prechodu a zároveň šva uprostred Skutkov, čím prispieva k plynulému toku lukášovského rozprávania o vývoji ranej Cirkvi.

Kľúčové slová: Skutki apoštolov, služba, Pavol, Barnabáš, Ján Marek.

Summary

For interpreting a biblical verse, which at first glance seems isolated, it is necessary to follow possible narrower and wider contextual connections on the literary and theological level. This article attempts such an interpretation of verse 12:25 from the Acts of the Apostles. It deals with an important textual critical problem connected with the phrase εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ and pays attention to the possible content links with Sk 11:27-30; 12:24 and chs. 13–15. It turns out that verse 12:25 has an important function of transition and at the same time a seam in the middle of Acts, thereby contributing to the continuous flow of Luke's narrative about the development of the early Church.

Keywords: Acts of the Apostles, service, Paul, Barnabas, John Mark.

Július Pavelčík
Jihočeská univerzita
Teologická fakulta
Katedra teologických vied
Kněžská 8
370 01 ČESKÉ BUDĚJOVICE, Czech Republic
juliuspavelcik@seznam.cz
 0000-0002-0890-7274

POZNÁMKY

Stopy „ducha múdrosti“ v Starom zákone

Blažej Štrba

Úvod

Starozákonný pojem múdrosti je veľmi široký a hoci sa môže vzťahovať na vrodené alebo získané intelektuálne schopnosti, pojem múdrosti je oveľa širší ako inteligencia. Kľúčovým podstatným menom חכמה sa síce vyjadruje i poznanie či vysoká znalosť skutočnosti, avšak jeho použitie sa vzťahuje skôr na poznanie získané skúsenosťou, o ktorom možno tiež kriticky uvažovať. J. L. Crenshaw už dávno odlišil múdrosť získanú zo skúsenosti, ktorá je reprezentovaná vo výrokoch a učení, od istého typu teoretickej múdrosti, reprezentovanou zamýšľaním sa nad zmyslom života a problematikou nespravodlivosti¹. Predmetom tejto výskumnej poznámky je biblický výraz „duch múdrosti“, v ktorom múdrosť charakterizuje „ducha“ a ktorý je v masoretskom texte zriedkavý. Formálny dôvod súvisel s predmetom medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie, zameranej na problematiku múdrosti v meniacich sa dobách². Obsahový dôvod spočíva v definovaní významu

¹ CRENSHAW, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 30-36. K problematike definície starozákonnej múdrosti porov. ZENGER, *Die Bücher der Weisheit*, 329-332; KYNES, *Wisdom and Wisdom Literature*, 2.

² Sophia in changing times. October 11th – 12th 2019, Žilina, Slovakia. Predložená štúdia je prepracovanou verziou konferenčného výskumu.

hebrejskej syntagmy רִוְחַ חָכְמָה, dosl. „duch múdrosti“, ktorú tvoria dva obsažné pojmy.

Z predmetu nášho výskumu vyplýva, že cieľom nebude skúmať všetky výskyty dvoch kľúčových predmetných slov „duch“ a „múdrost“ v hebrejskom texte oddelene. Navyše malý funkčný rozdiel medzi dvomi slovami v syntagme podporuje nerovnakosť dôležitosti slov. Kým prvé z nich רִוְחַ je *nomen regens*, teda riadiace substantívum a základné slovo v nominatíve a druhé z nich חָכְמָה je *nomen rectum*, resp. riadené substantívum a má doplňujúcu úlohu; práve ono bude predmetom výskumu v tom zmysle, akým spôsobom slovo duch špecifikuje múdrosť. Preto výskum základného slova רִוְחַ samostatne zúžime iba na výskyty s teologickým významom. V druhej časti sa zameriame na druhé slovo חָכְמָה, a opäť iba exemplárne predstavíme niektoré dôležité výskyty. V tretej časti vyzdvihneme špecifiká syntagmy, ktoré vyústia do záverečného uvažovania.

Z podstaty štúdie sa v prvých dvoch častiach budeme zaoberať vymedzením významu jednotlivých slov v ich vlastných kontextoch, kým v tretej časti sa pokúsime nazrieť do toho, v čom spočíva dôležitosť troch textov (Ex 28,3; Dt 34,9; Iz 11,2), v ktorých sa nachádza syntagma רִוְחַ חָכְמָה.

1 Duch – pôvodca

1.1 Vhľad do výskytu a významu

Pri výskume významu hebrejského slova רִוְחַ vychádzame z lexikografického výskumu S. Tengströma³ a dvojice R. Albertz a C. Westermann⁴. V druhom kroku si prostredníctvom niekoľkých príkladov induktívne priblížime špecifický význam slova v danom blízkom kontexte.

V Starom zákone sa slovo רִוְחַ vyskytuje v takmer 400 prípadoch (378 × v hebrejčine a 11 × v aramejčine). Podľa Tengströma⁵, keď ostaneme iba pri hebrejskom texte, v Pentateuchu je ich jedna desatina (38 × [dôležitých 7 z 11 × Gn; 11 × Ex; 14 × Lv a 2 × Dt]), 47 výskytov je u skorších prorokov (26 × Sdc–1Sam, 9 × v cykle Eliáš-Elizeus a 4 × v 1Kr 22. Deuteronomistická redakcia poznačuje „duchom“ vodcov.). U prvých píšucich prorokov z 8. storočia pred

³ TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִוְחַ, 365-402.

⁴ ALBERTZ – WESTERMANN, רִוְחַ, 654-678.

⁵ TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִוְחַ, 372.

Kr., ako aj u Jeremiáša sa výskyt slova רִיחַ nikdy nespája s PÁNOM a slovo je vôbec zriedkavé (1 × Am; 7 × Oz; 3 × Mich). Naproti tomu 28 prípadov (z celkových 51) u Izaiáša pochádza z neskorého obdobia, vrátane 5 prípadov Iz 11,1-4. Výnimkou je jedinečný text Mich 3,8, kde sa prorok predstavuje ako naplnený „duchom PÁNA“⁶. U Jeremiáša je teda 18 výskytov vo všeobecnejšom význame „vietor“ a počínajúc až poexilovými prorokmi sa význam slova rozširuje viac na nefyzický a teologický rozmer (napr. 52 × u Ezechiela; 23 × Iz 40–66; 2 × Jon; 2 × Hab; 2 × Joel; 4 × Ag a 12 × Zach). V poetických knihách sa slovo רִיחַ vyskytuje často: 39 × Ž, 31 × Jób, 21 × Prís a 24 Kaz. V Knihách kroník sa duch prisudzuje častejšie Bohu, najmä keď prichádza na tých, čo majú rečniť (15 × 1–2Krn); menej v menších knihách (1 × Nár; 4 × Dan; 2 × Ezd)⁷.

R. Albertz a C. Westermann zdôraznili, že slovo רִיחַ nevyjadruje čosi fyzické, ale skôr silu, ktorú badať či pri vetre, alebo pri dýchaní⁸. Ved' tak duch רִיחַ je nehmatateľný, podobne ako dych רִיחַ, či vietor רִיחַ. Duchom, ktorý jestvuje v človeku, sa neraz vyjadruje mentálna činnosť, schopnosť či emócia, pričom však nezahŕňa oživujúceho Ducha Božieho⁹. Táto netelesná životná sila sa v človeku podľa Tengströma¹⁰ prejavuje napr. v rôznych stupňoch temperamentu ako chladnokrvnosť (Prís 17,27), roztrpčenosť (Ez 2,14), prchkosť (Prís 14,29), trepezlivosť (Kaz 7,8), alebo vo vnútorných hnutiach ako zatrpknutosť (Gn 26,35); úzkosť/súženie (Jób 7,11), beznádej (Iz 65,41). Najmä v poexilových textoch sa tento termín objavuje pri opise morálnych dispozícií a stavov ako napr. duch poníženia (Iz 57,15), ktorý je aj duchom „zlomeným“ (Ž 51,19), kým protikladom je duch povýšenia (Prís 16,18)¹¹.

Teda רִיחַ v človeku nutne vystupuje na rovine mimo priestoru a nadčasovosti. Rozpoznáva sa podľa jeho najrozmanitejších prejavov iba sčasti, resp. je badateľný vo svojich prejavoch. Istým spôsobom je každý tvoriaci akt výsledkom ducha, čo možno pozorovať najmä u ľudí. Dokonca aj facka na líce môže byť výsledkom ducha, ako to možno vyčítať zo sarkastickej otázky

⁶ TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִיחַ, 372-373. Porov. VARŠO, *Abdiáš. Jonáš. Micheáš*, 227.

⁷ TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִיחַ, 373.

⁸ ALBERTZ – WESTERMANN, רִיחַ, 655.

⁹ TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִיחַ, 388.

¹⁰ Porov. TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִיחַ, 382.

¹¹ Porov. ŠTRBA, Hľadanie pokory, 45-46.

Sedekiáša Micheášovi, ktorého udrel¹². Ježišove slová adresované Nikodémovi v Jn 3,8 trefne vyjadrujú neuchopiteľnosť dynamizmu ducha „Vietor veje, kam chce; počuješ jeho šum, ale nevieš, odkiaľ prichádza a kam ide. Tak je to s každým, kto sa narodil z Ducha.“ Hoci nejde o starozákonný text, je zřejmé, že prepojenie vetra/dychu s duchom a prepojenie ducha s Božím pôsobením je evidentné a rovnako prítomné nielen v starozákonných textoch.

1.2 „PÁNOV duch“

Jedinečnou špecifikáciou „ducha“ je jeho atribút „PÁNOV“, ktorým Boh vyznačuje určité osoby, aby vykonali úlohy v prospech komunity. Albertz a Westermann predstavujú všetkých 27 prípadov syntagmy רִיחַ יְהוָה „PÁNOV duch“ a 20 prípadov, kde sa prípona 1. alebo 3. os. sing. jasne vzťahuje na Pána¹³. „PÁNOV duch“ je počiatkom fyzických činností (napr. Iz 40,7; 59,19 a Oz 13,15), či duchovných schopností (napr. Iz 40,13), a často so silným teologickým podfarbením (Sdc 3,10; 6,34; 11,29; 13,25; 14,6.19; 15,14; 1Sam 10,6; 16,13.14, atď.), v ktorých je účinok pozitívny.¹⁴ Spočinutie PÁNOVHO ducha na niekoľko vybraných postáv sa pokladá za charizmatiké. Išlo iba o osoby prorocké alebo sudcovské, nikdy nie kňazské. Tengström mieni, že ani s kráľovskou dynastiou nebol viazaný „PÁNOV duch“, lebo táto charizma nebola dedičná či spätá s nejakou ustanovizňou¹⁵. Jediným textom, v ktorom by bol budúci Davidovský potomok obdarený PÁNOVÝM duchom je Iz 11,1-10, ktorý však reflektuje eschatologické očakávania v neskorých (po)exilových časoch. Podobne autor

¹² Keď izraelský kráľ Achab hľadal odpoveď u prorokov, tí ho podviedli – tak to vyhodnotil prítomný prorok Micheáš. Krátka stať 1Kr 22,23-25 dokladá Micheášovo kritické ohodnotenie: „²³ Pán teda vložil do úst všetkých týchto tvojich prorokov lživého *ducha* (רִיחַ (שָׁקַר)), lebo Pán vyslovil proti tebe nešťastie.“²⁴ Vtom pristúpil syn Kanaána Sedekiáš, udrel Micheáša po líci a povedal: «Kadiaľže odišiel Pánov *duch* (רִיחַ יְהוָה) odo mňa, aby hovoril s tebou?»²⁵ Ale Micheáš odpovedal: «To uvidíš v ten deň, keď budeš chodiť z izby do izby, aby si sa schoval.» Nemožno uprieť mocenský tón pristupujúceho Sedekiáša, ktorý sarkasticky uvažuje o možnosti, či aj facka po tvári môže pochádzať od PÁNOVHO ducha. Kombináciou ponižujúcej facky a svojho posmešného výkladu arogantne spochybňuje proroka Micheáša a jeho poznanie o tom, ako pôsobí duch.

¹³ ALBERTZ – WESTERMANN, רִיחַ, 668-669.

¹⁴ ALBERTZ – WESTERMANN, רִיחַ, 668.

¹⁵ TENGSTRÖM – FABRY, רִיחַ, 390.

odlíšil dva prípady Mojžiš-Jozue a Eliáš-Elizeus, v ktorých má PÁNOV duch funkčný význam na zdôraznenie legitímnosti nástupníctva. Avšak iba v prípade Eliáš-Elizeus je výraz vlastný rozprávaniu (porov. 2Kr 2,8-15), kým v neskorom (?) kňazskom texte Dt 34,9 (porov. Nm 27,18) namiesto „PÁNOVHO ducha“ je „duch múdrosti“¹⁶.

Typickým príkladom starších textov, v ktorých sú hrdinovia zasiahnutí PÁNOVÝM duchom, je Kniha sudcov. Znamenite to ilustruje text o judskom sudcovi *Otonielovi*. Šíri sa o ňom dobrá správa v Sdc 3,9-10: „⁹ Pán vzbudil Izraelovým synom osloboditeľa, ktorý ich vyslobodil, totiž Otoniela... ¹⁰ Zostúpil na neho Pánov duch a súdil Izrael. Vytiahol do boja a Pán dal do jeho ruky Chusana Rasataim...“ Aj posledný hrdina z Knihy sudcov *Samson* bol viackrát pod vplyvom PÁNOVHO ducha (14,6.19; 15,14), ktorého účinok sa prejavil na ňom. V 14,19 sa účinky prejavili na Samsonovi násilnosťou: „... zostúpil Pánov duch, zašiel do Askalona, pobil tam tridsať mužov, pobral im odevy a dal ich sviatočné obleky tým, ktorí rozlúštili hádanku. Náramne bol rozhnevaný a odišiel do domu svojho otca“. Nemožno však poprieť, že Samsonovo konanie bolo podnietené vydieraním a ľstivosťou jeho nepriateľov, ktoré sa udiali bez jeho vedomia.

Iné sú prejavy PÁNOVHO ducha v neskorších prorockých textoch. Exemplárnym je *Ezechiel*¹⁷, do ktorého PÁNOV duch vstúpil (Ez 2,2), prenášal ho (3,12.14.24; 8,3; 11,1) a uvádzal ho extatických videní či počutí (8,3; 11,5.24; 37,1; 43,5).

Ako posledný z príkladov uvádzame Iz 61,1, kde PÁNOV duch, ktorý pôsobí prostredníctvom PÁNOVHO *pomazaného* a pôsobí mesiášske dobrá (porov. Lk 4,17-19): „Duch Pána, Jahveho, je na mne (רוּחַ יְהוָה עָלַי), pretože ma Pán pomazal, poslal ma *hlásať* radosť ubitým, *obviazať* zlomených srdcom, zajatcom *ohlásiť* slobodu a spútaným oslobodenie.“ Aj tento text (podobne ako Iz 11,1-5 o budúcom panovníkovi s viacnásobným darom „ducha“) podľa Tengströma dosvedčuje neskoré očakávania s eschatologickou víziou¹⁸.

Hoci syntagma „PÁNOV duch“ zvyčajne božský pôvod činností, do ktorých uvádza určitých hrdinov, predsa však substantívum רוּחַ nepredstavuje žiadne božské vtelenie. Fakt, že sa význam slova v neskorších biblických textoch

¹⁶ Porov. TENGSTROM – FABRY, רוּחַ, 390.

¹⁷ TENGSTROM – FABRY, רוּחַ, 394.

¹⁸ TENGSTROM – FABRY, רוּחַ, 395.

rozširuje, svedčí o prehlbujúcom sa význame vnútorných „duchovných“ inšpirácií, ktoré biblická tradícia s postupom času zdôrazňovala intenzívnejšie.

1.3 Múdrost' ako charakteristika ducha

Ako bolo spomenuté predtým, slovo חָכְמָה má viacero významov. Navyše kontext alebo špecifikácia pomocou riadeného substantíva (*nomen rectum*) môžu spresniť významovú hodnotu slova, resp. naznačiť jeho pôvod „ducha“. Takáto špecifikácia ducha nastáva aj prostredníctvom nezameniteľného slova חָכְמָה. Jej skromný výskyt – jestvujú iba tri výskyty slovného spojenia חָכְמָה חָכְמָה „duch múdrosti“ – svedčí o obsahovej výnimočnosti syntagmy. Dva výskyty sú v Pentateuchu (Ex 28,3; Dt 34,9) a jeden u proroka Izaiáša (Iz 11,2). Pozoruhodné je, že spojenie sa nenachádza v sapienciálnej literatúre, kde by predsa malo akési vlastné umiestnenie. Tento jav môže byť relevantný aj pre správne porozumenie syntagmy. Vhodné je nahliadnuť do niekoľkých textov z múdroslovných spisov, kde sa píše o tom, kde (ľudská) múdrost' prebýva.

2 Múdrost' a jej sídlo

2.1 Ideál múdrosti človeka

V sapienciálnej literatúre sa חָכְמָה „múdrost'“ pripisuje ľuďom a je aj akýmsi ideálom pre človeka. Múdrost' v Písme vyjadruje poznanie a súčasne aj jeho realizáciu. Kto má múdrost', ten je znalý a zručný, pozná riešenie problémov a vie (to aj vy)konať. Múdrost' uspôsobuje pre úspešný a šťastný život: na základe múdreho orientovania sa vo veciach, hodnotách a pravidlách či už ľudského konania alebo spoločenského života, alebo aj prirodzeného chodu sveta¹⁹. S múdrost'ou sa vždy konajú veci podľa zmysluplného Božieho plánu. Teda múdry je ten, kto žije podľa Božích ciest a súčasne má aj schopnosti veci správne pomenovať, usporiadať a tvoriť. Preto je mottom v múdroslovných knihách „počiatkom múdrosti je bázeň pred PÁNOM“ (Jób 28,28; Ž 111,10; Prís 1,7; 9,10; 15,33)²⁰. Správne sa múdrost' „rodí“ vo vnútri človeka vtedy, ak je

¹⁹ Porov. KRÜGER, Weisheit, 60.

²⁰ Súvis týchto veršov prostredníctvom motívu bázne pred PÁNOM skúma podrobnejšie FARKAŠ, Starozákonná múdroslovná literatúra, 35-37.

bázeň pred PÁNOM, tvorcom a záchrancom. Preto bohobojná múdrosť je fundamentálnym životným postojom šťastného človeka.

Takéto pozitívne chápanie múdrosti prišlo do svojej krízy v Knihe Jób, ktorá nekompromisne zrelativizovala príliš idealistické chápanie múdrosti. Avšak kríza múdrosti spôsobila aj to, že sa prehĺbilo jej chápanie múdrosti. Veď práve Jóbov príklad ukázal, že bázeň pred PÁNOM je už múdrosťou (Jób 28,28: הֵן יִרְאֵת אֲדֹנָי הִיא חֲכָמָה וְסוּר מִרַע בִּינָה). Tým sa ukázala ďalšia možnosť, že zdroj múdrosti môže byť aj v človeku. Navyše Jóbov text svedčí o takej múdrosti, ktorá negarantuje len úspešný život, ale učí žiť vyrovnané aj v neúspechoch²¹.

2.2 Sídlo múdrosti je v srdci

Nahliadneme do niekoľkých vyjadrení, z ktorých vyplýva nielen to, že k múdrosti prichádza počiatočný impulz od PÁNA (porov. bázeň pred PÁNOM), ale že jej sídlo je vo vnútri, resp. v „srdci“ človeka. Srdce, ktoré patrí ku kľúčovým pojmom v biblickej tradícii²², je podľa R. Northa sídlom poznania a vôle²³. Pod slovom „srdce“ treba teda v biblickej tradícii chápať „vnútorného človeka, (jeho) myseľ, vôľu, srdce“ (DCH IV, 497-509; porov. HALOT II, 514) s doplnujúcou charakteristikou od Á. G. Modrego ako „nediferencované vnútro“²⁴. Práve v tomto sídle zmýšľania a rozhodovania človeka je podľa niektorých textov zdroj múdrosti. Nasledujúce príklady z Písma ilustrujú i dokladajú predložené chápanie.

Ex 31,6 – opis schopností zručného Óliaba. Pri prípravách na vyhotovenie svätyne PÁN nariaďuje Mojžišovi poveriť prácou Beseléla i zručného Oliába (Ex 31,1-6) a dodal: „Do srdca každého zručného remeselníka som dal múdrosť (וּבָלַב לְכָל־חָכֵם־לֵב נָתַתִּי חֲכָמָה), aby urobili všetko, čo som ti prikázal“²⁵. Nasleduje dlhý výpočet toho, čo Oliáb spolu so svojimi robotníkmi dokáže urobiť: od stanu stretávania so všetkým náčiním cez posvätné rúcha pre Árona a jeho synov, až

²¹ Porov. KRÜGER, Weisheit, 61-62.

²² Porov. ŠTRBA (ed.), *Emócie v Biblii*, 133.

²³ NORTH, Brain and Nerve, 577-597, dôvodí, že „srdce“ vo svojich zhruba 850 výskytoch v MT – okolo 600-krát לֵב a okolo 250-krát לִבָּ bez jasného rozdielu vo význame alebo použití – predstavuje výsostne sídlo poznania a vôle. Navyše ani v jednom jeho výskyte špecificky nepredstavuje orgán, ktorý pumpuje krv, ktorý my dnes nazývame srdce.

²⁴ GIL MODREGO, *Estudio de leb-ab*, 43-262.

²⁵ Preklad podľa TIÑO (ed.), *Exodus*, 795.

po olej na pomazanie a voňavé kadidlo pre svätyňu (vv. 8-11). Aby to mohli vyhotoviť, dostali *múdrost'* do *srdca*.

IKr 3,12. Kráľovi Šalamúnovi v známom nočnom zjavení Boh prisľúbil „Hľa, dám ti *srdce múdre* a chápavé (נְתַתִּי לְךָ לֵב חָכָם וְנָבוֹן), takže tebe podobného nebolo pred tebou a takého, ako si ty, nebude ani po tebe.“ Múdrost' a chápavosť sú prívlastkami srdca. Niet divu, že Šalamúnovi sú ideálne pripísané spisy ako *Kniha prísloví*, *Kazateľ* a *Veľpieseň*.

Jób 9,4. Text v Jóbovi 9,4 je diskutovaný, lebo môže ísť o Božie alebo o ľudské atribúty²⁶. V oboch prípadoch však rovnako platí, že sídlo múdrosti je v srdci: „Má *múdrú myseľ* (חָכָם לְבָב) a silu mohutnú. Kto vzoprel sa mu už a zdravý vyviazol?!“

Tri prípady v Knihe prísloví (2,10; 14,33; 16,21). *Kniha prísloví* na viacerých miestach dokladá, že múdrost' prebýva v srdci človeka. Odtiaľ totiž, zo srdca, vychádza všetko na povrch. Ak však vnútri prebýva múdrost', tá pretvára celého človeka: „lebo *múdrost'* ti vojde *do srdca* (כִּי־תָבוֹא חָכְמָה בְּלִבְךָ) a poznanie ti oblaží dušu“ (2,10). Druhý text opisuje v prvom stichu múdrost' prítomnú v srdci rozumného človeka, kým druhý stich konštatuje, že múdrost' je síce známa aj medzi bláznami²⁷, nie je však v ich vnútri: „*Múdrost'* spočíva *v srdci* rozumného [človeka] (בְּלֵב נְבוֹן תִּנְנוּחַ חָכְמָה) ba i medzi bláznami sa dá spoznať“ (14,33)²⁸. Ak teda v srdci neprebýva múdrost', nast'ahuje sa tam to, čo múdrost'ou nie je. Posledný príklad opäť zvýrazní, že múdrost', ktorá vládne v srdci človeka, spája príjemnú reč s účinkom presvedčania: „*Múdreho srdcom* budú volať rozumný (לְחָכְמֵי־לֵב יִקְרָא נְבוֹן) a prívetivá reč zvyšuje presvedčivosť“²⁹.

Z uvedených prípadov vyplýva, že múdrost', ktorá sídli v srdci, t. j. vo vnútri človeka, je počiatkom rozumného správania a správneho porozumenia a harmonizuje kladné veci – medzi tým, čo človek myslí, zamýšľa, hovorí a koná. Je vhodné zdôrazniť, že srdce sa v biblickom jazyku chápe ako všeobecný výraz pre vnútro človeka a znamená akési „nediferencované vnútro“, ktoré predstavuje sídlo poznania a vôle a vôbec vnútorného človeka.

²⁶ ALONSO SCHÖKEL – SICRE DIAZ, *Giobbe*, 201. Napr. FOKKELMAN, *The Book of Job*, 59.217, pripisuje atribúty Bohu.

²⁷ Porov. ALONSO SCHÖKEL – LINDEZ, *I Proverbi*, 380-381.

²⁸ Preklad vlastný.

²⁹ Preklad vlastný; porov. ALONSO SCHÖKEL – LINDEZ, *I Proverbi*, 413.

3 Duch múdrosti

Skupinu textov, ktoré hovoria o tom, že múdrosť sídli v srdci, môžeme postaviť proti trom predmetným textom so syntagmou רִוַח הַחָכְמָה, ktoré výnimočným spôsobom hovoria o „duchu múdrosti“. Genitív „múdrosti“ s najväčšou pravdepodobnosťou nemá atributívny ráz, teda nejde o nezhodný prívlastok, vďaka ktorému by bolo možné preložiť syntagmu ako „múdry duch“. Taký preklad by zodpovedal podobnej konštrukcii s hebrejským prídavným menom ako napr. „múdre srdce“ לֵב חָכָם (1Kr 3,12; Prís 16,23; Kaz 8,6; 10,2), alebo „zlomený duch“ רִוַח נִשְׁבָּרָה a „zlomené srdce“ לֵב נִשְׁבָּר (Ž 51,19). Navyše, keďže v syntagme je slovo חָכְמָה ako *nomen rectum*, slovenský genitív „múdrosti“ sa dá chápať ako podmetový, t. j. múdrosť je zdrojom ducha, duch z nej pochádza. Okrem toho je rovnako dôležité, že všetky tri prípady dosvedčujú, že spomínaný „duch múdrosti“ nepochádza od ľudí, ale odinakiaľ.

Tri prípady רִוַח הַחָכְמָה sa nachádzajú v troch rôznych literárnych kontextoch a týkajú sa troch konkrétnych osôb, z ktorých prvé dve sú azda menej známe. V prvom prípade ide o krajčírov, resp. tkáčov, v druhom o nového vodcu Izraelitov a v treťom o nemenovanú budúcu osobu. Zmienka o tkáčoch sa nachádza v stati o príprave Áronovho rúcha (Ex 28,1-4), zmienka o vodcovi na konci Deuteronomia, bezprostredne v čase po smrti Mojžiša (Dt 34,9-12) a treťou nedefinovanou osobou je prisľúbený vládca v známej stati Iz 11,1-5.

Predstavíme si každý prípad s cieľom objasniť, prečo práve týmto osobám pripisuje hebrejská tradícia „ducha múdrosti“ a odkiaľ pochádza.

3.1 Ex 28,3 – duch múdrosti pre tkáčov

V Knihe Exodus 25–30 PÁN dáva Mojžišovi inštrukcie ohľadom vyhotovenia stánku stretnutia a všetkých bohoslužobných nevyhnutností. Okrem svätostánku a jeho zariadenia sa veľká pozornosť venuje odevu Árona ako veľkňaza v kapitole 28. Tú uvádza textová jednotka 27,20–28,4. V nej PÁN nariaďuje Mojžišovi, aby dal Izraelitom príkazy o oleji pre večné svetlo (27,20-21), Áronovi a jeho synom o tom, že ich ustanoví za kňazov (28,1-2), skupine umeleckých krajčírov/tkáčov³⁰ o vyhotovení veľkňazského odevu (28,3-4).

³⁰ Presné určenie typu remesla nateraz nebolo stanovené a treba urobiť pracovnú voľbu; porov. TIŇO (ed.), *Exodus*, 657. Kým hebrejský text hovorí o „umnom diele“ מְעֻשָׂה (28,6.15), Septuaginta to v Ex 26,1 prekladá „práca tkáča“ ἐργασία ὑφάντου a vo v. 31

Trojici špeciálneho vybavenia chrámu: večné svetlo, veľkňaz a veľkňazské rúcho, zodpovedajú tri okruhy ľudí: Izraeliti, Áron a tkáčski remeselníci. Nepoznáme síce mená umeleckých tkáčov, ale ich charakteristika v 28,3-4 je oveľa dôležitejšia.

Ex 28,3

וְאַתָּה תְּדַבֵּר אֶל-כָּל-חַכְמֵי-לֵב	^{3a}	Ty prehovoriš ku všetkým múdreho srdca ³¹ ,
אֲשֶׁר מִלְּאֵתִיו רוּחַ חֲכָמָה	^{3b}	ktorých som naplnil <i>duchom múdrosti</i> ³² ,
וַעֲשׂוּ אֶת-בְּגָדֵי אֹהֶל	^{3c}	aby zhotovili Áronovo rúcho,
לְקַדְּשׁוֹ לְכַהֲנֹנוּ לִי:		aby ho vyčlenilo pre kňazskú službu pre mňa ³³ .

C. Houtman mieni, že vyjadrenie „duch múdrosti“ znamená určitú výnimočnú charizmu, ktorá odlišuje obdarovaných od iných – v tomto prípade o znamenitú umeleckú zručnosť³⁴. To by mohla podporiť LXX svojím spojením „duch vnímavosti“ *πνεύματος αἰσθήσεως*. T. Dozeman predpokladá paralelu medzi srdcom a múdrosťou, nešpecifikuje ich bližšie, ale tiež ich pokladá za nositeľov božskej inšpirácie³⁵. Tiño uvádza, že súvetie rozlišuje dve kvality: jednou je „umelecké nadanie“ a Mojžiš sa mal obrátiť na ľudí s takýmito danosťami, doslovne „[tí] múdreho srdca“. Druhá kvalita „duch múdrosti“ by mala byť nadprirodzeného charakteru. Kým prvú nadobudli praktizovaním, druhá kvalita by označovala, že boli aj špeciálne obdarovaní³⁶.

V každom prípade treba zdôrazniť, že „duch múdrosti“ nemá pôvod v samotných tkáčoch (teda nie tak, ako je to v prípade „múdрых srdcom“ vo v. 3a), ale že PÁN je jeho pôvodcom; Mojžišovi to vyjaviť: „ja som ich naplnil duchom múdrosti“ (v. 3b). V celej stati inštrukcií sú podmetom činnosti vždy iní

a v 28,6.15 ako „tканé dielo“ *ἔργον ὑφαντόν*. Pri tvorbe odevu šlo prinajmenšom o tkanie a tiež o votkávanie pestrými niťami, či pretkávanie zlatom.

³¹ LXX: *πνεύματος αἰσθήσεως*; SSV: „rozumějúcim umeniu“, SEB: „nadanými remeselníkmi“.

³² SSV: „umeleckým duchom“, SEB: „duchom múdrosti“.

³³ SSV: „žeby sa mohol posvätiť a slúžiť mi ako kňaz“; SEB: „aby mohol byť vysvätený a mohol mi slúžiť ako kňaz.“

³⁴ HOUTMAN, *Exodus. Volume 1*, 56-57. Houtmanovo tvrdenie, že „duch“ môže byť použitý s rovnakým významom ako „srdce“, t. j. sídlo a stred človeka, je prehnané a nivelizuje rozdielnosti v hebrejskom texte. Porov. tiež HOUTMAN, *Exodus. Volume 3*, 473.

³⁵ DOZEMAN, *Exodus*, 644.

³⁶ TIÑO (ed.), *Exodus*, 740.

aktéri, a nie Boh. Toto by bol jediný prípad, kde Mojžišovi sám PÁN určuje, že ak sú aj nejakí remeselníci umelecky zruční, tak sám *vložil* (מָלַל) toho „ducha múdrosti“ do nich.

Boh legitimizuje pred Mojžišom ich talent, aby opodstatnil úlohu, že vytvoria špeciálne odevy. Dôraz na unikátnosť odevov v Ex 28 je podstatný a neprehliadnuteľný. Ako poznamenáva N. Sarna, tak ako posvätný priestor musí byť oddelený od profánneho, tak posluhujúci v posvätnom priestore musia byť oddelení od laikov³⁷. Bude to dielo Bohom inšpirovaných umeleckých tkáčov, ktoré oddelí Árona od ľudí, a tým ho posväťí. Laici vytvoria posväcujúci odev pre veľkňaza³⁸, a tak sa pričinia o jeho posvätenie.

3.2 Dt 34,9 – duch múdrosti pre jedinečné vodcovstvo

Druhý výskyt spojenia „duch múdrosti“ označuje výnimočnosť Jozueho, ktorý sa nachádza v závere Knihy Deuteronomium a ide tu o posledné dni pred vstupom do zaslúbenej zeme. Dt 34,1-4 uvedie posledné chvíle Mojžišovho života a poslednú reč, ktorou mu PÁN pripomenie prísľub zeme. Po Mojžišovej smrti (vv. 5-7) ho ľud oplakával celý mesiac (v. 8). Rozprávač aj zdôraznil dôslednosť oplakávania, a teda vážnosť Mojžišovej straty: „Synovia Izraela ho tridsať dní oplakávali na Moabskej stepi. A dni smútku skončili“ וַיִּתְמוּ יְמֵי בְרִי וַיִּבְלֵ מִשְׁהָה (v. 8). Až následné verše 9-12 uvádzajú na scénu postavu Jozueho ako nového vodcu a nástupcu proroka Mojžiša³⁹, ktorý bol už predtým trikrát uvedený do úlohy vodcu a nástupcu Mojžiša. Prvýkrát ho uviedol kňaz Eleazar v Nm 27,22-23⁴⁰, druhýkrát slávnostne sám Mojžiš po uzavretí Moabskej zmluvy v Dt 31,7-8, a to pred celým Izraelom⁴¹. Tretíkrát bol uvedený do vodcovskej úlohy samotným PÁNOM v stánku zjavenia v Dt 31,23⁴². V Dt 34,9 rozprávač uvádza vodcu proleptickým zhrnutím, a teda z perspektívy času vyrozprávaného už z deja v Knihe Jozue, retrospektívne uvádza nového vodcu,

³⁷ SARNA, *Exodus שמות*, 176.

³⁸ Porov. PRIOTTO, *Esodo*, 532.

³⁹ ŠTRBA, *Joshua among the Prophets*, 33-65.

⁴⁰ ŠTRBA, *Take off Your Sandals*, 122-134. Ani Nm 27,21 nevyklučuje, že by Jozue nemohol byť vodcom; porov. ROOKE, *Zadok's Heirs*, 33. Aj NIHAN, *Joshua and Eleazar* 92-93, považuje Mojžiša za vykonávateľa uvedenia Jozueho do úlohy, a za dôležitejšieho vodcu považuje Jozueho a nie Eleazara.

⁴¹ ŠTRBA, *Take off Your Sandals*, 134-154.

⁴² ŠTRBA, *Take off Your Sandals*, 154-166.

ktorý bude v budúcnosti požívať poslušnosť ľudu⁴³. Práve v tomto retrospektívnom pohľade rozprávač pridáva novú špecifickú informáciu o „duchu múdrosti“ (LXX: *πνεύματος συνέσεως*), ktorým už bol Jozue naplnený (מלא). Mojžišovo vkladanie rúk nebolo toho príčinou, ale iba potvrdením – autorizáciou zo strany najväčšieho vodcu Izraela⁴⁴.

Dt 34,9

וַיְהִי שֶׁעַ בְּנֵי נֹון מְלֵא רוּחַ חָכְמָה	^{9a}	Nunov syn Jozue bol plný <i>ducha múdrosti</i> ,
בִּיָּסְמֵךְ מִשֶּׁה אֶת יָדָיו עָלָיו	^{9b}	ved' Mojžiš naň vložil ruky.
וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֱלֹהֵי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל	^{9c}	A Izraeliti ho počúvali
וַיַּעֲשׂוּ	^{9d}	a robili
כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה	^{9e}	tak, ako PÁN prikázal Mojžišovi.

Na Jozueho boli teda vložené ruky až dvakrát, raz Eleazarom a neskôr i Mojžišom, ako to dokladá tento verš z retrospektívy po Mojžišovej smrti. Naproti tomu ešte pred vložením rúk PÁN sám povedal Mojžišovi, kto bude jeho nástupcom, a to slovami: „Vezmi Nunovho syna Jozueho, muža, v ktorom je duch, a polož na neho svoju ruku“ (Nm 27,18). Teda ešte pred vkladáním rúk PÁN označil Jozueho ako muža, v ktorom bol duch. I to už bol odkaz na udalosť pri Kádešbarna, kde sa Jozue s Kalebom vyznamenali, keď v nich nebol rovnaký duch bojzlivosti ako u ostatných Izraelitov (porov. Nm 14,8-9.24.38).

Jozue sa stal Mojžišovým nástupcom a novým vodcom, ktorý mal viesť ľud do prisľúbenej zeme a následne ju rozdeliť (Dt 31,7.23; Joz 1,5; 13,7). Jozueho úloha viesť ľud do zeme prisľubu bola paralelná Mojžišovej úlohe vyviesť ľud z Egypta. V Knihe Jozue to jasne dokladá on sám slovami: „lebo Pán, váš Boh, vysušil pred vami vody Jordánu, kým ste neprešli, ako kedysi urobil Pán, váš Boh, s Červeným morom, ktoré pred nami vysušil, kým sme neprešli...“ (Joz 4,23). Jeho slová akoby boli odpoveďou na žalmovú otázku: „Čo ti je, more, že utekáš, a tebe, Jordán, že sa naspäť obraciaš?“ (Ž 114,4). Na takú vodcovskú úlohu bola nevyhnutná nielen autorizácia predošlého vodcu, ale určenie od pôvodcu prisľubu – od PÁNA. Možno preto konštatovať, že ak rozprávač potvrdil, že na uvedenú úlohu musel byť kandidát naplnený (מלא) „duchom múdrosti“, ktorý, podobne ako v prípade tkáčov, pochádza od PÁNA.

⁴³ ŠTRBA, *Joshua among the Prophets*, 41-45.

⁴⁴ ŠTRBA, *Take off Your Sandals*, 236-244. Časticu כִּי vo v. 9b prekladáme spojku „ved“ s vysvetľovacím významom a nie spojku „lebo“, ktorá často uvádza príčinnú vetu.

Rovnako možno uvažovať o rozdieloch medzi tkáčmi a Jozuem. Kým o prvých PÁN vyhlásil, že ich on naplnil „duchom múdrosti“ pre vyhotovenie veľkňazského odevu, Jozue bol naplnený (מלל) duchom múdrosti a jeho horlivý postoj za PÁNA možno sledovať výslovne od Kadešbarnea (porov. Nm 14,21.24) až do jeho konca (Joz 14,9; porov. 24,15). Takým duchom múdrosti nebol naplnený nik pred ním ani po ňom.

3.3 Iz 11,2 – duch múdrosti pre budúceho panovníka

Tretí výskyt spojenia „dar múdrosti“ je v známom Izaiášovom proročkom texte o budúcom vládárovi z Dávidovho rodu (Iz 11,1-9). Stať sa nachádza v prvej veľkej časti (Iz 1–12), ktorá je proroctvom o Judsku a Jeruzaleme. V sekcii sú indície na rôzne dejinné udalosti (sýrsko-efraimská vojna, asýrska invázia), avšak odborníci sa líšia v interpretácii historických reálií, z ktorých text povstal⁴⁵. To nemení nič na fakte, že sekcia má dômyselnú koncentrickú štruktúru, ako to odôvodnil G. Benzi⁴⁶. Syntagma sa nachádza v poslednom bloku Iz 11,1–12,6, ktorý možno rozdeliť na tri sekvencie: 11,1-10 (predstavuje vládcu, ktorý bude s darmi prijatými od Boha budovať kráľovstvo spravodlivosti a pokoja); 11,11-16 (ide o „historizáciu“ Božieho konania voči Izraelu: obnovené oslobodenie a víťazstvo na spôsob exodu) a 12,1-6 (záverečný žalm chvály).

Stať o vládcovi (11,1-10) začína opisom účinku PÁNOVHO ducha na vládcu a jeho vládu (vv. 1-5), potom sa metaforicky opíše účinok vládcu na prírodu (vv. 6-8), ktorý sa v závere rozšíri na celé ľudstvo (vv. 9-10). Vo veršoch 2-3 je „duch PÁNOV“ označený šiestimi ideálnymi darmi, ktoré spočívajú na vládcovi veľkého významu⁴⁷. Poslúžia mu pri realizácii takého spravodlivého poriadku, v ktorom chudobní i bezmocní budú požívať rovnaké práva ako bohatí a silní. S príchodom ideálneho vládcu by sa mali pominúť všetky vojny a mali by byť odstránené všetky prejavy násilia, a to nielen medzi ľuďmi, ale i zvieratami (porov. vv. 6-8). Faktom je, že prvý zo šiestich PÁNOVÝCH darov je práve רִיחַ חָכְמָה „duch múdrosti“. Hoci syntagmu neuvádza sloveso „naplniť“, kontext dosvedčuje, že „spočinutie“ (נוח) vyjadruje rovnako podstatný vplyv na

⁴⁵ Porov. BLENKINSOPP, *Isaiah 1-39*, 263-264.

⁴⁶ Iz 2,1–4,6 (A); 5,1-30 (B); 6,1-13(C); 7,1–8,18 (D); 8,19–9,6 (C’); 9,7–10,34 (B’); 11,1–12,6 (A’); porov. BENZI, *Prophetic Menorah*, 7-14.

⁴⁷ Porov. LEPORÉ, *Il Messianismo*, 200-203.

konanie danej osoby. J. Blenkinsopp dodáva, že s takýmto typom harmónie medzi politickým a stvoreným svetom sa možno stretnúť aj v iných prípadoch starovekého Blízkeho východu⁴⁸. Podľa Iz 11,1-5 sa vládca stane ideálnym, iba ak na ňom spočinie PÁNOV duch, a to vo svojich viacerých podobách.

Iz 11,1-3

וַיֵּצֵא הַטָּר מִגִּזְעַי יִשְׂרָאֵל	^{1a}	Z pňa Jesseho vypučí ratolesť
וַיִּנְצֹר מִשְׁרָשָׁיו יִפְרֶה	^{1b}	a z jeho koreňov výhonok vykvitne.
וַנְּחָה עָלָיו רוּחַ יְהוָה	^{2a}	A spočinie na ňom duch PÁNOV:
רוּחַ חֵכְמָה וּבִינָה	^{2b}	<i>duch múdrosti</i> a rozumu,
רוּחַ עֲצָה וּגְבוּרָה	^{2c}	duch rady a sily,
רוּחַ דַּעַת וַיְרֵאתָ יְהוָה	^{2d}	duch poznania a bázne pred PÁNOM
וַהֲרִיחוּ בִּירְאֵת יְהוָה	^{3a}	a naplní ⁴⁹ ho bázeň pred PÁNOM.

Podľa Blenkinsoppa práve prvé dve charakteristiky „duch múdrosti a poznania“ (LXX: *πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως*) vyjadrujú podstatu úspešného žitia v súlade s náboženskou dôslednosťou vyjadrenou v Dt 4,6⁵⁰. Podľa Benziho sa prvé dve dvojice atribútov „duch múdrosti a rozumu, duch rady a sily“ (Iz 11,2bc) zbiehajú v postave ideálneho panovníka, kým tretia dvojica „duch poznania a bázne pred PÁNOM“ (v. 2d) predstavuje predovšetkým prorockú postavu, čo znamená, že šesticu atribútov vykresľuje ideálnu kráľovskú a prorockú postavu zároveň⁵¹. Rovnako je pozoruhodné, že kým prvá charakteristika ideálneho panovníka je „duch múdrosti“, posledná je „(duch) bázne pred PÁNOM“ – teda sú akousi alfou a omegou, neodmysliteľnou podstatou vzorného vládca. Aj o ňom bude platiť, že „duch múdrosti“ nebude jeho vlastníctvom, ale darom od Boha a že ho bude môcť zúročiť iba vtedy, ak bude bohabojný. Ideálny vládca bude celkom preniknutý PÁNOVÝM duchom (v. 2a) až tak, že, vyjadrené metaforicky, bude voňať bázňou pred PÁNOM (v. 3a).

⁴⁸ BLENKINSOPP, *Isaiah 1-39*, 263.

⁴⁹ Možný je aj preklad: „bude voňať bázňou pred PÁNOM“.

⁵⁰ Dt 4,6: Keď Izraeliti budú dodržiavať a plniť všetky nariadenia a predpisy v Tóre: „to bude vaša múdrosť a rozumnosť pred národmi, ktoré zvedia o každom príkaze a budú vraviť: «Naozaj múdry a rozumný je tento veľký národ!»“; BLENKINSOPP, *Isaiah 1-39*, 264.

⁵¹ BENZI, *Il profumo del Messia* (in print).

3.4 Poznámky k časovému zaradeniu textov

Otázka časového zaradenia predmetných troch textov nie je ľahká, keďže hypotézy a diskusie o ich genéze sa ešte neskončili. V prípade prvého textu (Ex 28,3) sa jeho pôvod zväčša pripisuje kňazskej tradícii z exilového alebo poexilového obdobia⁵². R. Albertz ho vo svojej teórii považuje za prvé kňazské prepracovanie (*Erste Priesterliche Bearbeitung*) a datuje ho do poslednej tretiny 6. stor. pred Kr.⁵³.

Podobne aj Dt 34,9 patrí k poexilovým textom. E. Otto mieni, že v (neskoršom) poexilovom období bola „múdrost“ identifikovaná s Tórou (porov. 4,6)⁵⁴ a neskôr táto múdrost, ktorou je Tóra, s Mojžišovým duchom. Inými slovami, podľa Otta, Jozue by bol naplnený duchom Mojžišovej múdrosti⁵⁵.

Posledný text, Iz 11,3, patrí do známej state 11,1-5 s dlhou históriou vzniku. Vzhľadom na predchádzajúcu časť (Iz 10,28-34 – pomyslená cesta asýrskeho vojska proti Jeruzalemu) už H. Barth mienil, že stať 11,1-9 prešla redakciou v časoch Ezechiáša, a to tesne po obliehaní Jeruzalema asýrskym Senacheribom v r. 701 pred Kr. a tiež neskôr za vlády Joziáša⁵⁶. Keďže druhá časť proroctva, 11,11-16, poukazuje na obdobie exilu, či dokonca na obdobie po ňom (asi 2. polovica 6. stor. pred Kr.), predmetný text je možné chápať ako poexilový. K tomu prispieva aj paralelné porovnanie s inými dvoma prorockými textami Ez 34,23-25⁵⁷ a Zach 6,12-13⁵⁸, ktoré text Iz 11,1-5 predpokladajú.

⁵² Porov. DOZEMAN, *Exodus*, 592-596; PRIOTTO, *Esodo*, 499.

⁵³ ALBERTZ, *Pentateuchstudien*, 474-475.

⁵⁴ Porov. OTTO, *Deuteronomium 1-11. Erster Teilband: 1,1-4,43*, 548-550.

⁵⁵ OTTO, *Deuteronomium 12-34. Zweiter Teilband: 23,16-34,12*, 2283.

⁵⁶ BARTH, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit*, 311-336.

⁵⁷ Ez 34,23-25: „²³ I postavím nad ne jedného pastiera, ktorý ich bude pásť: svojho sluhu, Dávida; on ich bude pásť, on im bude pastierom. ²⁴ Ja, Pán, im budem Bohom a môj sluha Dávid bude medzi nimi kniežat'om; ja, Pán, to hovorím. ²⁵ Uzavriem s nimi zmluvu pokoja a odstránim zo zeme divú zver, takže budú v bezpečí bývať na púšti, i v horách môžu spávať.“

⁵⁸ Zach 6,12-13: „¹² A povedz mu: «Toto hovorí Pán zástupov: Pozri, muž, ktorého meno je Výhonok; vyženie na svojom mieste a vybuduje Pánov chrám. ¹³ On postaví Pánov chrám, on dostane slávu a bude sedieť a panovať na svojom tróne; i kňaz bude na svojom tróne a medzi nimi dvoma bude mierová dohoda.»“

Ak by sme porovnali motív ideálneho vládca z Iz 11,1-5 s predchádzajúcimi osobami s „duchom múdrosti“, tak z pohľadu časovosti budú umeleckí tkáči stále žiadani za účelom vyhotovenia nových šiat pre veľkňaza, a to za predpokladu, že šaty sa opotrebujú. Jozue a jemu podobní vodcovia by boli nevyhnutní iba vtedy, ak by išlo o nový, resp. opakovaný vstup do zeme prísľubu. Tak ako sa hovorí o novom exode v niektorých poexilových prorockých textoch (porov. Iz 43,14; 46,1-2; 47,1-15; 48,20; 52,11), tak aj na nový vstup do zeme prísľubu by mohli byť potrební noví vodcovia s duchom odvahy. Ideálny vládca podľa Izaiáša by bol vyjadrením vysokých očakávaní, ktoré povstali zo situácií, kedy sa vodcovia nevyznačovali takým duchom. Prísľub nového ideálneho vládca by však mohol vtlačať do adresátov tohto prísľubu hodnoty, ktorými môžu napomôcť realizácii jeho vlády.

Pokračovanie v Knihe múdrosti

Skutočne Áronovo, resp. neskoršie veľkňazské rúcho bolo najprv späťe so službou v svätyni a potom v Jeruzalemskom chráme. Rovnako ostalo faktom, že Izrael sa už usadil v prísľubenej zemi, a tak Jozueho vodcovská typológia zoslabla. Dokonca, ak sa aj ideálny vládca stále viac spájal s eschatologickou postavou, pozorovanie možno lakonicky ukončiť mienkou, že ten špecifický a jedinečný „duch múdrosti“ by už nebol potrebný pre Izrael v zemi prísľubu. Ak sa však vrátíme k textom a nahliadneme do Knihy múdrosti, ktorá istým spôsobom pokračuje a rozvíja sapienciálne hnutie hebrejskej Biblie, možno z nej opäť vzíde lúč svetla pre problematiku výnimočnosti a pôvodu „ducha múdrosti“. Kniha múdrosti sa pripisuje najmúdrejšiemu z panovníkov, a to Šalamúnovi a iba v nej je jedinečný výraz „duch múdrosti“ v Múd 7,7. Ide o verš zo Šalamúnovho uvažovania o múdrosti vo vv. 7-12⁵⁹. Opisuje ju ako najväčšie dobro. V úvodnom v. 7 hovorí dvakrát o modlitbe (εὐχομαι) a vzývaní (ἐπικαλέω) Boha. Hoci to neuvádza, zrejme ide o zjavenie v 1Kr 3⁶⁰. Múd 7,7:

διὰ τοῦτο εὐξάμην,
καὶ φρόνησις ἐδόθη μοι·

ἐπεκαλεσάμην,
καὶ ἦλθεν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας.

^{7a} Preto som sa modlil:

Bol mi daný rozum.

^{7b} Prosil som

a prišiel ku mne *duch múdrosti*.

⁵⁹ PINTO, *Sapienza*, 162-163; porov. PRIOTTO, *Sapienza*, 1532-1533.

⁶⁰ Porov. PINTO, *Sapienza*, 167.

Šalamún vzýval Boha (*epikléza*) a odpoveďou bolo, že sa k nemu duch múdrosti priblížil. Nekonštatuje, že do neho vošiel, ale iba to, že k nemu prišiel⁶¹. Je ťažké určiť, či ide o ustálené spojenie, ktorým sa vyjadrí vniknutie ducha dovnútra, alebo iba o ponížený Šalamúnov postoj, ktorý mu zamedzuje pýšiť sa, že má ducha múdrosti a je ním naplnený. Netreba však podceňovať výpoveď v. 1 danej kapitoly, v ktorom sa Šalamún začleňuje medzi smrteľníkov (*θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος*), a teda je rovnaký ako ostatní ľudia (7,1). Tak Kniha múdrosti jasne odpovedá na otázky, či sa „duch múdrosti“ celkom vytratil spomedzi ľudí, alebo bol rezervovaný iba nábožným vyvolencom v dávnych dejinách, alebo ho je možné získať – a to nie skúsenosťou, ani uvažovaním, ale vzývaním Boha.

Záver

Kniha múdrosti ponúka nečakanú odpoveď: prosebná modlitba k Bohu disponuje každého smrteľníka na Božie dary, dokonca i na ten najväčší dar, na „ducha múdrosti“. Sapienciálny prúd z Knihy múdrosti mieni, že Boh neobmedzuje „ducha múdrosti“ iba pre niektoré osoby z dávnej histórie, ale prehojne rozmnožil svoje dary pre všetkých, čo ho úprimne vzývajú. Avšak Kniha múdrosti vychádza z toho, čo už obsahovali staršie biblické texty. Ak mala pôvodne „múdrost“ v biblickom kánone antropologické počiatky, neskôr dostáva teologický význam až do tej miery, že jej pôvod je božský – presúva sa z človeka na Boha. Jej „božský“ pôvod sa ľahko vystihol prostredníctvom „ducha“, ktorý pochádzal od PÁNA. Vďaka božskej črte múdrosť zapadla do naratívnych textov a stala sa výnimočným darom pre mimoriadne osoby s výnimočnými úlohami, ktoré majú božský pôvod – či už sú to tkáčski remeselníci veľkňazského rúcha, Jozue ako Mojžišov nástupca, alebo ideálny budúci vládca. Ak sa aj ku koncu vzniku posledných kánonických kníh Starého zákona dospeje k tomu, že „duch múdrosti“ pochádza výlučne iba od Boha, tým skôr ostáva reálnou možnosťou pre každého, dostať sa pod jej vplyv.

⁶¹ Rovnaká dikcia *ἔρχομαι* s datívom osobného zámena sa nachádza v LXX v podobnom význame napr. v 2Sam 24,13; Ž 35,12; Job 3,25; Zach 9,9; Jer 23,23; 30,9; Bar 4,22.

Použitá literatúra

- ALBERTZ, Rainer: *Pentateuchstudien*, Jakob Wöhrle – Friederike Neumann (eds.) (FAT 117); Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- ALBERTZ, Rainer – WESTERMANN, Claus: רִּוּחַ רוּחַ spirito. In: Ernst Jenni – Claus Westermann (eds.): *Dizionario teologico dell'Antico Testamento*, vol II., Torino: Marietti 1982, 654-678. (=DTAT)
- ALONSO SCHÖKEL, Luis – LINDEZ, José Vilchez: *I Proverbi* (Commenti biblici), Roma: Borla, 1988.
- ALONSO SCHÖKEL, Luis – SICRE DIAZ, José Luis: *Giobbe* (Commenti biblici); Roma: Borla, 1985.
- BARTH, Hermann: Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit: Israel und Assur als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung (WMANT 48), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.
- BENZI, Guido: A Prophetic Menorah: Structure and Rhetoric of Isaiah 2,1-12,6, *Salesianum* 80 (2018) 7-14.
- BENZI, Guido: Il profumo del Messia. La figura del discendente davidico in Is 11,1-5 (in print).
- BLENKINSOPP, Joseph: Isaiah 1-39. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 19), New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- CRENSHAW, James L.: *Old Testament Wisdom*, Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1981.
- DOZEMAN, Thomas B., *Commentary on Exodus* (ECC), Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- FARKAŠ, Pavol: Starozákonná múdrostná literatúra. In: Peter Volek (ed.): *Zborník filozoficko-teologických štúdií* (Studia Xaveriana 1). Badín: KSFX, 2002, 30-37.
- FOKKELMAN, Jan P.: *The Book of Job in Form. A Literary Translation with Commentary* (SSN 58), Leiden – Boston: Brill Academic Pub, 2012.
- GIL MODREGO, Ángel: Estudio de leb-ab en el Antiguo Testamento. Análisis sintagmático y paradigmático. Vol. 1 (Dissertation), Madrid: Universidad Complutense 1992.
- HOUTMAN, Cornelis: *Exodus. Volume 1* (HCOT 1), Kampen: Kok, 1993.
- HOUTMAN, Cornelis: *Exodus. Volume 3: Chapters 20–40* (HCOT 3), Leuven: Peeters 2000.
- KRÜGER, Thomas: Weisheit / Gesetz (W./G.). In: Angelika Berlejung – Christian Frevel (eds.): *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe zum Alten und Neuen Testament (HGANT)*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006, 60-65.
- KYNES, Will: Wisdom and Wisdom Literature. Past, Present, and Future. In: Will Kynes (ed.): *The Oxford Handbook of Wisdom and the Bible*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2021, 1-14.
- LEPORE, Luciano: *Il Messianismo*, Bornato in Franciacorta: Sardini, 2020.
- NIHAN, Christophe: Joshua and Eleazar in Numbers 27. In: Sophie Ramond – P. Joseph Titus *Bible and Politics. A Festschrift in Honor of Prof. Rev. Dr Olivier Artus on his 65th Birthday*, Bengaluru: ATC Publications, 2019, 77-97.
- NORTH, Robert: Brain and Nerve in the Biblical Outlook, *Bib* 74 (1993) 577-597.

- OTTO, Eckart: *Deuteronomium 1–11. Erster Teilband: 1,1–4,43* (HThKAT 5,1), Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2012.
- OTTO, Eckart: *Deuteronomium 12–34. Zweiter Teilband: 23,16–34,12* (HThKAT 5,2,2), Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2017.
- PINTO, Sebastiano: *Sapienza. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento* (LB.PT 34), Milano: Paoline, 2022.
- PRIOTTO, Michelangelo: *Esodo. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento* (LB.PT 2), Milano: Paoline, 2014.
- PRIOTTO, Michelangelo: Sapienza. In: Luciano Pacomio (ed.): *La Bibbia Piemme*, Casale Monferrato, AL: Piemme, 1995, 1515-1569.
- ROOKE, Deborah W.: *Zadok's Heirs. The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (OTM), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- SARNA, Nahum M.: *Exodus שמות. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPSTC), Philadelphia, PA – New York – Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- ŠTRBA, Blažej (ed.): *Emócie v Biblii. Výskum fenoménu emócií v biblickej tradícii* (StBiSISup 3; Bratislava 2018).
- ŠTRBA, Blažej: *Hľadanie pokory v starozákonnej tradícii ako podnet pre dnešnú teológiu. Štúdiá venovaná pamäti dona Jozefa Heribana SDB, vynikajúceho biblistu a pokorného človeka*, *AFTUCB* 10 (2013) 43-71.
- ŠTRBA, Blažej: *Take off Your Sandals from Your Feet! An Exegetical Study of Josh 5,13-15* (ÖBS 32), Frankfurt am Main et al.: Peter Lang, 2008.
- ŠTRBA, Blažej: *Why is Joshua among the Prophets like Moses*, *LA* 70 (2021) 33-65.
- TENGSTRÖM, Sven – FABRY, Heinz-Joseph: *רוּחַ רִיחַ*. In: *TDOT* XIII (2004) 365-402.
- TIŇO, Jozef (ed.): *Exodus* (KSZ 3), Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2013.
- VARŠO, Miroslav, *Abdiáš. Jonáš. Micheáš* (KSZ 2), Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2010.
- ZENGER, Erich: *Die Bücher der Weisheit*. In: Erich Zenger (ed.): *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (KStTh 1); Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 52004, 329-334.

Zhrnutie

Téma múdrosti חֵכְמָה patrí k hlavným teologickým témam v knihách hebrejskej Biblie aj gréckej Septuaginty. Podobný význam možno pozorovať aj v multifunkčnom použití motívu ducha רִיחַ. Zatiaľ čo viac ako 350 výskytov lexémy רִיחַ sa hojne používa u prorokov, ako sú Izaiáš, Ezechiel, alebo v spisoch, ako sú Žalmy, Jób, Príslovia a Kazateľ, dominantné použitie lexémy חֵכְמָה má 149 výskytov v Prvej knihe kráľov (17 ×), v knihách Jób (18 ×), Príslovia (39 ×) a Kazateľ (28 ×). Syntagma, ktorú tvoria tieto dve lexémy – „duch múdrosti“ – je v Biblii veľmi zriedkavá a táto exegetická poznámka skúma použitie a význam syntagmy v rámci troch výskytov v hebrejskej Biblii: Ex 28, 3; Dt 34, 9 a Iz 11, 2. O syntagme v týchto biblických pasážach sa bude hovoriť najprv v ich vlastnom literárnom kontexte. Potom ich


výklad môže poslúžiť ako jeden malý príspevok pre ďalšiu teologickú diskusiu o teologickom dopade postupnej zmeny významu múdrosti v rámci kánonu Starého zákona.

Kľúčové slová: duch, múdrosť, tkáči, Jozue, ideálny vládca.

Summary

The theme of wisdom רוּחַ חָכְמָה belongs to the main theological subjects in the books of both the Hebrew bible and the Greek Septuagint. A similar observation can be found in the multifunctional use of the motif of spirit רוּחַ . Whereas more than 350 occurrences of the lexeme רוּחַ is abundantly used in the prophets like Isaiah, Ezechiel or in the Writings like Psalms, Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, the dominant usage of the lexeme רוּחַ חָכְמָה has its 149 occurrences in 1Kings (17 ×), Job (18 ×), Proverbs (39 ×) and Ecclesiastes (28 ×). The combination of these two lexemes – “the spirit of wisdom” – is very rare in the Bible and this essay examines the use and meaning of this syntagm within three occurrences in the Hebrew Bible: Exod 28:3; Deut 34:9 and Isa 11:2. The syntagm in these biblical passages will be discussed first in their own literary context. Then their interpretation may serve as one small contribution for further theological discussion on the significance of a gradual change of the meaning of wisdom within the Old Testament.

Keywords: spirit, wisdom, weaver, Joshua, ideal ruler.

Blažej Štrba
Univerzita Komenského
Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta
Samova 14
949 01 NITRA, Slovakia
Blazej.Strba@frcth.uniba.sk
 0000-0002-9244-0630

ABSTRAKTY

Liber Annuus LXX (2020)

Ročenka Liber Annuus LXX za rok 2020, publikovaná františkánskou Fakultou biblických vied a archeológie v Jeruzaleme (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum), obsahuje 21 vedeckých príspevkov (9-622), ich abstrakty (625-633) a súbor štyroch recenzií (636-655). Na ďalších stranách je uvedený zoznam licenčných a doktorandských téz študentov SBF, informácia o nových zväzkoch zo série SBF a o publikáciách dizertačných téz prezentovaných na SBF. Posledné strany obsahujú stručný prehľad akademického roka 2019/2020 a index LA za obdobie rokov 1981 – 2019 (657-684).

9-32: Michelangelo Priotto: Giacobbe: un ebreo ‘errante’ che incontra Dio.

Jakub je zložitá, pôsobivá a zároveň iritujúca postava, podvodník a oklamáný, túžiaci po moci, ale aj pripravený zmieriť sa, hrdina a zároveň antihrdina. Je to ale aj človek, ktorý poznačil dejiny Izraela, pretože sa stretol s Bohom. Práve jemu náleží geograficko-existenciálna cesta, ktorá vedie k prvému, ale zásadnému naplneniu Božieho prísľubu: veľkej rodine v zasľúbenej zemi. Práve tejto geograficko-existenciálnej ceste je v tomto článku spolu s posledne upravovanými textami biblickej narácie venovaná pozornosť. Pokiaľ finálna redakcia zachováva starobylú tradíciu schopného, ale zároveň nejednoznačného a vypočítavého Jakuba, zdôrazňuje tak nové podstatné znaky charakterizované vierou v Božiu prítomnosť a jeho nezištnú pomoc. Jakubov návrat do Kanaánu nadobúda prvky návratu z exilu a stáva sa takto pre poexilovú generáciu prototypom Žida povolaného vrátiť sa do svojej vlasti a opätovne vytvoriť nové spoločenstvo. Napriek zdaniu Jakub nekráča sám. Postupne vstupuje do sféry božskej prítomnosti. Rovnako ako Abrahámovi, aj jemu YHWH adresuje slová: stačí byť „potulným“, ale nie ako osamelý „tulák“.

33-65: Blažej Štrba: Why is Joshua among the Prophets like Moses. Existujú rôzne výklady Dt 34,10-12. Najnovšie vedecké hypotézy sa zaoberajú riešením domnelého napätia medzi 18,15-18 a 34,10-12. Niektoré z nich navrhujú Jeremiáša za proroka ako Mojžiša. Jozueho navrhuje len veľmi málo z nich. V tomto článku autor uvádza argumenty, že Jozue v Knihe Jozue, ktorý hovorí Jahveho slovo, je prorokom ako Mojžiš. Následne je

v článku študovaná rovnaká vážnosť Mojžiša a Jozueho, tak ako je predstavená v Knihe Jozue. To vedie k ďalšej diskusii zaoberajúcej sa otázkou vzťahu „tvárou v tvár“ v niekoľkých textoch Pentateuchu (Ex 33,11; Nm 12,8; Dt 34,10), čo podporuje čítanie, že Jozue je prorok ako Mojžiš. Tento text odkazuje na „vodcu (vodcov) cez vody“.

67-87: **Domenico Lo Sardo: Na^aman from Aram, Ugarit, or Edom? 2 Kings 5:1-5: Textual Criticism and Ancient Near East Literature.** Ktovie, či v čase Sýrčana Námána malomocenstvo alebo to, čo tento pojem znamenal, vyvolávalo rovnaký strach alebo paniku, aké teraz vyvoláva pandémia? Zdá sa však, že Námán sa pohyboval bez obmedzení a problémov. V 2Kr 5,1-5 podľa MT sa Námán nazýva „Aramejský“ a vo verzii LXXB „Sýrsky“. Kým pre týchto textových svedkov Námánovo malomocenstvo nie je vážnou záležitosťou, pre iných svedkov (LXXL, Pesh, Vg) áno. Námán môže byť statočný bojovník, očarujúci muž, ale podľa týchto textových svedkov je i tak malomocný. Prečo? Čoho sa dopustil? Napriek všetkému má malomocenstvo.

Odkiaľ Námán skutočne pochádza? Z Aramu, Sýrie alebo Edomu? Textová kritika, literárna kritika a porovnanie s textami starovekého Blízkeho východu odhaľujú, že Námán v skutočnosti pochádza z Ugaritu, kde je dobre známy. Kto ho skutočne spozná? Čitateľ, ktorý sa bude musieť sám presvedčiť, že iba YHWH, Boh Izraela, bude môcť Námána vyliečiť z malomocenstva.

89-102: **Vincenzo Lopasso: Ritorno e ricostruzione del Tempio (Esd 1-6).** Mnohé podrobnosti o návrate Židov z Babylonu po tom, čo sa moci chopil Kýros II. a o rekonštrukcii chrámu, ktorú následne vykonalí, sú zahalené rúskom tajomstva. V tomto článku vychádzajúc z dostupných zdrojov, taliansky biblista bilancuje tieto udalosti a predstavuje najkonkrétnejší a najpravdepodobnejší náčrt toho, čo sa stalo medzi príchodom Sasabasára a rekonštrukciou chrámu. Po stručnom prehľade prameňov raného perzského obdobia autor skúma najmä tieto aspekty: Kýrova politika, misia Sasabasára, návrat a úloha Zorobábela, opozícia voči rekonštrukčným prácam, dátum ukončenia prác, dôležitosť chrámu pre navrátilcov. Z ponúknutého náčrtu môžeme vydedukovať veľmi úzku súvislosť medzi návratom a výstavbou jeruzalemského chrámu, ako aj usadením sa navrátilcov medzi miestnym obyvateľstvom. Mat' chrám znamenalo pre navrátenecov legitimizáciu ich právneho a náboženského postavenia, sociálne zakorenenie na území a demonštrovanie ich príslušnosti k starovekému Izraelu.

103-120: **Francesco Filannino: L'avversario del piano di Dio: Satana nel vangelo di Marco.** V Starom zákone, intertestamentálnej literatúre a v spisoch Nového zákona je satan zvyčajne charakterizovaný ako protivník Boha a jeho plánu spásy. Autor v článku pozorným čítaním Markových pasáží, v ktorých sa vyskytuje podstatné meno *σατανᾶς* (Mk 1,12-13; 3,23-26; 4,15; 8,31-33) ukazuje, ako je toto stanovisko mienené v Markovom evanjeliu. Satan sa stavia proti Ježišovmu poslaniu aj poslaniu jeho učeníkov, ktoré majú spoločné prvky prostredníctvom kázania evanjelia, exorcizmov a cesty cez utrpenie a smrť, v zornom poli nadchádzajúcej slávy. Keďže ich misie sú súčasťou Božieho plánu spásy, satan môže byť považovaný za (porazeného) Božieho protivníka aj v Markovom evanjeliu.

121-136: **Matteo Munari: Who Justified Wisdom? (Matt 11:19b // Luke 7:35).** V Mt 11,19b // Lk 7,35 je záhadný *logion*, v ktorom Ježiš hovorí, že múdrosť bola

ospravedlnená „svojimi skutkami“ (Matúš) alebo „všetkými jej deťmi“ (Lukáš). Väčšina exegetov je presvedčená, že Lukáš zachoval najstaršiu verziu tohto výroku. Rozšíreným názorom je, že Matúš nahradil „deti“ slovom „skutky“, aby vytvoril *inklúziu* s Mt 11,2. V súlade s touto prevažujúcou hypotézou niektorí idú ďalej, keď hovoria, že Matúš upravil svoj zdroj, aby stotožnil Ježiša s Božskou múdrosťou. Všetky tieto tvrdenia, často považované za samozrejme a používané ako základ pre exegézu, sú otáznne. V tomto článku sa autor pokúša ukázať nielen to, že sú mylné, ale aj to, ako v skutočnosti bránili pochopeniu *logionu* v jeho najstaršej podobe, ktorú máme, a tou je Matúšova.

137-165: **Eric John Wyckoff: Narrative Art and Theological Meaning: Johannine Stylistic Features in John 4:1-42.** Tento príspevok skúma sedem aspektov osobitého literárneho štýlu Jánovho evanjelia, s ktorými sa čitatelia často stretávajú: slávnostná reč, nejednoznačný jazyk, nepochopenie, irónia, preklenovacie verše, inklúzie a vysvetľujúce poznámky. Jedna pasáž, v ktorej sú tieto stylistické črty obzvlášť rozšírené, je Jn 4,1-42. Analýza toho, ako sú tieto techniky spoločne použité v rámci rozprávania o „jánovskej Samárii“, ukazuje, že ich účelom nie je len predviesť umenie. Naopak, ich funkcia – ako jednotlivé, tak aj kolektívne – stojí do veľkej miery v službe literárnym a teologickým prioritám štvrtého evanjelia. Ako literárne prostriedky prispievajú k vytváraniu významu a slúžia ako interpretačné ukazovatele pre čitateľa, pričom zároveň osvetľujú určité aspekty kompozičného procesu.

167-180: **Francesco Bianchini: Baptism According to Paul: The Example of 1 Corinthians.** Aký je význam krstu podľa Pavla? Pavlove zmienky o krste sú obmedzené počtom a rozložením. Prvý list Korinťanom obsahuje najvyšší počet zmienok o krste. Preto sa autor rozhodol sústrediť svoje skúmanie na tento list. V príspevku talianskeho profesora exegézy NZ sú rozoberané jednotlivé krstné termíny podľa ich literárneho kontextu a funkcie, ktorú majú v mieste svojho výskytu. Výsledkom je, že krst sa používa ako prvok, ktorý je vždy použiteľný pre Pavlove argumentačné účely, zatiaľ čo jeho vnútorná hodnota nie je nikdy dôkladne preskúmaná. Predsa však máme v Prvom liste Korinťanom desať výskytov slovesa βαπτίζω a zdá sa byť jasné, že krst má význam ako v živote kresťanskej komunity, tak aj pre samotného Pavla. Aj keď nepriamo, apoštol o tom v celom liste uvádza niekoľko zaujímavých teologických poznámok. Článok sa originálnym spôsobom zameriava na krst v Prvom liste Korinťanom a podáva nový výklad slávneho *crux interpretum* 1Kor 15,29.

181-205: **José Miguel García Pérez: La venida de Cristo y todos sus santos (1Tes 3,12-13).** Prvý list Solúnčanom je z Pavlových listov považovaný za najviac eschatologický. Vskutku práve tento list najčastejšie používa termín *parúzia*, keď sa zmieňuje o Ježišovi Kristovi. Jeden z nich je v 1Sol 3,11-13. Je to modlitba adresovaná Bohu Otcovi a Pánu Ježišovi. V týchto veršoch nachádzame dve pozoruhodné zvláštnosti. Najprv sa svätý Pavol stavia za vzor lásky, ktorú má Pán udeliť Solúnčanom. Potom tvrdí, že Ježiša budú pri jeho slávnom príchode sprevádzať „všetci jeho svätí“; t. j. všetci verní kresťania. Takéto vyhlásenie nemá paralelu v Pavlových spisoch ani v iných knihách Nového zákona. V tomto článku sa autor pokúša osvetliť tieto vyjadrenia a objasniť koncept eschatológie svätého Pavla.

207-247: **Elisa Chiorrini: Per una classificazione dei significati di ἀρχή nel NT.** Štruktúra hesla pod ἀρχή predstavuje v niektorých lexikónoch NZ množstvo problémov:

zoznam významov nie je vždy úplný; niektoré definície sú nejednoznačné; hlavné odseky hesla sú rozlíšené na základe rôznych kritérií, niekedy koncepčných a inokedy referenčných. Na prekonanie týchto ťažkostí je navrhnutá klasifikácia významov *אֲרָחָה* na základe opätovného preskúmania jeho výskytov v Novom zákone a v Septuaginte. Nutnou podmienkou bolo nájsť čo najranejší význam vyjadrený týmto slovom, ktorým, ako sa zistilo, je dynamický začiatok. Z tohto významu sa postupom času vyvinula bohatá polysémia. Štúdium *אֲרָחָה* v biblických textoch naozaj umožňuje izolovať sedem všeobecných koncepcií obsiahnutých v rôznych významoch. Každý význam je odvodený z aplikácie jednej z týchto koncepcií na typ referentu, ktorý sa má opísať, a môže byť ďalej špecifikovaný témou kontextu a syntagmatickým vzťahom k blízkym slovám.

249-290: **Alessandro Cavicchia: *Ispirazione e verità, dono e discernimento.***

Vzťah medzi inšpiráciou a pravdou je mimoriadne dôležitý pre prístup viery k Písmu, ktorý je vyvážený v napätí, najmä vo vzťahu k vedeckému a historiografickému výskumu. Tento príspevok, ktorý sa skladá zo štyroch častí, sa v úvode vracia k vedeckej ceste historiografie a popisuje jej potenciál a limity. Druhá časť predstavuje niekoľko úvah o vzťahu historiografie a biblických vied, pričom uznáva obmedzenú povahu historiografických akvizícií obidvoch. Preto sa navrhuje obmedziť používanie výrazu „pravda“ vo vzťahu medzi Bibliou a súčasnou historiografiou a uprednostniť, pokiaľ ide o udalosti minulosti, obmedzenejší koncept „dokumentovateľnosti“. V tretej časti krátka analýza niektorých biblických pasáží vo svetle teológie inšpirácie ukazuje cestu rozlišovania o tajomstve Boha, ktoré urobili hagiografi. V poslednom oddiele sa ďalej skúma koncept inšpirácie ako „kritického úsudku“ alebo „rozlíšenia“. Tento prieskum, čiastočný a otvorený pre ďalšie štúdium, má za cieľ predovšetkým podnietiť reflexiu, pričom považuje za relevantnejší ďalší interdisciplinárny alebo transdisciplinárny výskum s kolektívnou účasťou.

291-326: **Sebastiano Crestani: *La Aggadat Mašiah: traduzione e commento di un testo escatologico medievale ebraico.*** Tento príspevok ponúka po prvýkrát v taliančine preklad *Aggadat Mašiah*, stredovekého eschatologického midrašu, ktorý je súčasťou *Midraš Leqah Tov* od rabína Tuviyyah ben Eli'ezer (koniec 11. – začiatok 12. storočia), na komentovanie mesiášsky relevantného biblického verša, akým je Nm 24,17. Analýza a komentár textu odhaľuje množstvo tém a má za cieľ poukázať nielen na jeho pôvod a význam v dejinách židovského myslenia, ale aj na jeho opätovný výskyt v iných stredovekých eschatologických dielach, či už židovských, kresťanských alebo moslimských. Osobitná pozornosť je venovaná aj postave Mesiáša ben Jozefa, skutočného protagonistu midrašu, a jeho úlohe ako trpiaceho mesiáša, bojovníka a kňaza.

327-355: **Gregor Geiger: *Genizat Germania: Ein Blatt einer Talmudhandschrift (Traktat Sukka) aus der Bibliothek des Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Jerusalem.*** V článku autor publikuje list sefardského rukopisu Talmudu datovaného približne do 13. storočia, ktorý sa nachádza v knižnici Studium Biblicum Franciscanum v Jeruzaleme. Pôvod listu nie je známy. Obsahuje časť babylonského Talmudu, traktát Sukka 51b-52a. Text je porovnávaný s inými svedkami tejto časti Talmudu, rukopismi aj skorými vydaniami.

357-384: **Jürgen K. Zangenberg – Anna Lena – Carmelo Pappalardo: *A 'New' Decorated Basalt Stone Block from the Franciscan Excavations at Magdala (Galilee).*** Článok poskytuje prvý popis a výklad výzdoby, vývoja a potenciálnej funkcie opracovaného

čadičového bloku, ktorý našli františkánski archeológovia pred rokom 2000 v Magdale v Galilei („Magdala Stone II“). Touto publikáciou chcú autori prispieť nielen k vedeckej diskusii o starovekej galilejskej materiálnej kultúre, ale zároveň dúfajú, že rozšíria diskusiu o dvoch ďalších, zdanlivo podobných kamenných objektoch „Magdala Stone I“ a „Horvat Kur Stone“.

385-403: Shua Amorai-Stark – Malka HersHKovitz – Yotam Asscher – Yotam Tepper: A Magical Ring from the Environs of Legio and Kefar-‘Othnay, Israel. Nepoškodený magický strieborný prsteň so zeleným chalcedónovým magickým drahokamom bol objavený neďaleko dnešnej väznice Megiddo. Prsteň má rúrkovú obruč a nízky kotlík. Na jeho kove sú zo všetkých strán vyryté symboly a znaky a možno aj nejaké písmená. Na okrúhlom, plochom podklade prsteňa sa v štvorci objavuje svastika. Na drahokame je vyryté stojace mužské božstvo držiace vzpriameného hada, obklopené ďalšími postavami a magickým menom. Ide o prsteň známeho typu. Pochádza z neskoršieho 3. až z raného 4. storočia. Presné meno a identita stojaceho božstva nie sú známe.

Štúdia ukázala, že v tomto symbole je zakomponovaných množstvo mocných synkretizovaných božstiev; že had, ktorého drží boh, je had Chnoubis; a že prsteň a jeho drahokam boli vytvorené, aby plnili funkciu silného, ochranného, blahodarného a terapeutického predmetu. Každý aspekt tohto prsteňa bol zamýšľaný tak, aby presadil a posilnil medicínsko-magickú funkciu a cieľ prsteňa. Spolu so skôr nájdeným strieborným magickým prsteňom na mieste Kefar ‘Othnay s vyobrazením Anguipede na jeho drahokame, oba prstene ukazujú, že medzi obyvateľstvom a vojakmi legionárskej základne VI Ferrata a neďalekej dediny Kefar ‘Othnay boli veriaci, ktorí verili v moc mágov, v silu uzdravenia a v celkovú pomoc a ochranu pred zlými silami a chorobami zakomponovanými do magických drahokamov a prsteňov.

405-444: Walid Atrash – Rivka Elitzur-Leiman – Gabriel Mazor – Débora Sandhaus – Tamar Winter: Nysa-Scythopolis: An Enigmatic Tunnels Complex. Južne od divadla v Nysa-Skytopolise/Bet-Šeane bol odhalený komplex podzemných tunelov. Počas vykopávok bol odhalený značný počet jednotných tunelov, ktoré dosahovali približne 200 m, hoci ďalšie časti, ktoré neboli odkryté, pretože ich tufové steny a klenby boli zle zachované, naznačovali, že komplex tunelov je podstatne väčší. Tunely sú 2,5 – 3,0 m vysoké a 1,5 – 1,8 m široké bez blokovacích úprav, vnútorných hál alebo zariadení. Ich južná časť bola prerušená pri výstavbe zadnej polkruhovej časti divadla Severan a boli vytvorené nové vstupy do rôznych tunelov, ktoré neboli súčasťou pôvodného komplexu. Dve poschodia, pôvodný skalný výrub a stlačená hlinená podlaha vo vyššej úrovni, boli datované na koniec 2. až začiatok 3. storočia n. l. a na koniec 4. až začiatok 5. storočia n. l. Nálezy keramiky a skla a zlatá lamela umožnili datovanie štádií používania komplexu tunelov, hoci nedatovali pôvodné štádium výstavby komplexu, ktoré sa zdá byť skoršie.

Komplex tunelov svojím charakterom, datovaním a umiestnením nekorešponduje so známym fenoménom tunelových komplexov pre úkryt, charakteristickým pre Judeu a Galileu počas židovskej vzbury. Je teda jedinečný a jeho funkcia je záhadná.

445-468: Asher Ovadiah – Sonia Mucznik: Ares, Athena, Herakles and Nike in the Decapolis. Táto štúdia sa zaoberá štyrmi božstvami, ktorých úcta a uctievanie prevládalo v Dekapolise v rímskom období: Áres, Aténa, Herakles a Niké. Diskusia sa opiera

o architektonické, sochárske, epigrafické a numizmatické dôkazy, ako aj o drobné nálezy (drahokamy). Je zvláštne, že vo Philadelphii (dnešný Ammán, Jordánsko) sa zachovali iba architektonické pozostatky jediného chrámu zasväteného Heraklovi; kým pre ostatné božstvá, ako sa zdá, nejestvovali v žiadnom z ďalších miest Dekapolisu nijaké chrámy, dokonca neboli ani vizuálne reprezentované na minciach. Napokon dôkazy naznačujú, že kultu týchto bohov a bohýň existovali vo verejnej (mestskej) aj súkromnej sfére.

469-577: **Michal Piasezky-David – Moshe Fischer – Itamar Taxel – Ruth E. Jackson-Tal – Oren Tal – Iness Efraimov – Hila May – Irit Ziffer – Pawel Golyźniak: Roman and Byzantine Burials at Yavneh-Yam: New Insights into the Site's Settlement History.** Tento príspevok hovorí o rímskych a byzantských hrobkách a pohrebných jaskyniach v Yavneh-Yam (prístavná lokalita starovekej Jamnie) vykopaných v 60. a 80. rokoch 20. storočia. Zameriava sa na nálezy získané počas týchto vykopávok, ktoré zlepšujú naše vedomosti o sociálnej a náboženskej histórii lokality v porovnaní s nedávnymi vykopávkami a výskumnými prácami obývanej lokality. Konkrétnejšie, diskutované pohrebné pozostatky odrážajú zmeny v sociálnom zložení lokality medzi raným rímskym a byzantským obdobím. Kým v ranom rímskom období bol Yavneh-Yam pravdepodobne prevažne židovský, v neskorej rímskej a najmä byzantskej dobe sa vyvinul na veľké a prosperujúce prístavné mesto, ktorého zmiešané obyvateľstvo tvorili polyteisti, Židia, Samaritáni a kresťania.

579-585: **Salome Dan-Goor – Yana Tchekhanovets: A Metal Figurine of Fortuna-Isis from the City of David.** Článok predstavuje importovanú rímsku olovenú figurínu Fortuna-Isis, ktorá bola nedávno objavená počas zachraňovacích vykopávok v Dávidovom meste a je datovaná do polovice 4. storočia n. l. Prítomnosť tohto helenisticko-rímskeho egyptského synkretického božstva nebola predtým potvrdená v jeruzalemských archeologických záznamoch.

587-608: **Tamar Winter: L'eternità ritrovata. The City of Be'er Sheva in the Late Byzantine and Early Islamic Periods in the Light of Newly-Published Excavated Glass Finds.** Mesto Beer Ševa prekvitalo počas byzantského obdobia; avšak jeho rozvoj počas raného islamského obdobia je menej zjavný. Tento článok sa zaoberá kultúrnymi procesmi starovekého mesta počas dvoch storočí po arabskom dobytí so zameraním na bohatý sklenený korpus z centra mesta, datovaný do neskorého byzantského a raného islamského obdobia a skúmaním ďalších súvekých sklenených zbierok z Beer Ševy.

Kombinované poznatky z tejto štúdie naznačujú, že v 6. až 8. storočí n. l. boli obyvatelia centra Beer Ševy a obývaných oblastí kultúrne angažovaní a dobre poznali prepracované trendy sklárskeho priemyslu svojej doby. Okrem toho nie je v sklárskych výrobkoch zjavný nijaký prelom po celý čas hlavných historických udalostí tohto obdobia. Avšak výskyt niekoľkých typov sklenených nádob súvisiacich s moslimami môže naznačovať transformáciu časti obyvateľstva alebo zmenu kultúry niektorých obyvateľov, ku ktorej došlo v ranom islamskom období, možno v 8. storočí n. l.

Navyše, hoci niekoľko exemplárov s datovaním do 8. storočia n. l. patrí k typom, ktoré mohli pokračovať aj v období Abbásovcov, žiadny z tu prezentovaných nálezov skla nemožno nesporne priradiť do 9. storočia n. l. alebo neskôr. Nálezy skla z Beer Ševy preto

naznačujú, že aktivita v centre mesta a v obývaných oblastiach poklesla alebo prestala približne na konci 8. alebo začiatku 9. storočia n. l.

609-622: **Varda Sussman: Note on 'Saucer'-, 'Beehive'-, or 'Dome'-shaped Lamps (Second Part of Islamic Period, 9th-15th Centuries CE).** Okrem toho, že olejové lampy mali funkčný účel ako zdroj svetla, boli od svojho vzniku vysoko cenené, majúce kultúrnu a duchovnú moc. To pre náznak, že uzatvorená lampa bola zdobená ako „Dom svetla“ od klasického (helenistického) obdobia. Zdobenie bolo inšpirované architektonickými prvkami, ako je stĺp, ktorého výška siahala do neba a ktorého masívnosť podopierala ťažkú stavbu, akou je chrám. Autorka navrhuje premenovať olejovú lampu v tvare podšálky alebo „úľa“ z druhej až tretej časti islamského obdobia na lampu v tvare „kupoly“, keďže horná časť, ktorá zakrýva nádobu, má tvar kupoly. Okrem toho kupola takejto lampy má rovnaký tvar ako obydlia, ktoré stavali arabské kočovné kmene, aby poskytovali úkryt pred horúčavou, no napriek tomu zostali pod kontrolou neba, t. j. sídla Boha.

*Vavrinec Radoslav Mitro OP
Convento dei SS. Domenico e Sisto
Largo Angelicum 1
00184 Roma
Italia*

RECENZIE – REVIEWS

RÜCKL, Jan: *Ageus. Budování chrámu v Judsku perské doby* (ČEK.SZ 37), Praha: Česká biblická společnost, 2018. 247 s. ISBN 978-80-7545-048-7.

Monografia sa obsahom a stavbou riadi edíciou Českého ekumenického komentára k Starému zákonu. Jednotlivé biblické pasáže sa podľa pravidiel tohto komentára vykladajú v piatich krokoch: krátke predstavenie štruktúr a formy, autorský preklad (pracovný), textové a prekladové poznámky, výklad jednotlivých veršov a význam.

Pri zachovaní pravidiel edície sa v jednotlivých krokoch prejavuje aj špecifický prístup formulovaný a opísaný v úvodnej časti komentára. Špecifikom pracovného prekladu je pokus o rekonštrukciu čo najstaršej podoby hebrejského textu, ktorý je v niektorých prípadoch odlišný od masoretského (s. 17). Pri rekonštrukcii textu sa autor opiera hlavne o svedectvá kumránskych textov a Septuaginty, zdôvodnenia uvádza v textových a prekladových poznámkach (s. 17, 137 – 138, atď.). Pritom J. Rückl zmienené svedectvá kriticky posudzuje jednotlivo. Konfrontuje domnienku A. Schenkera o staršom texte LXX oproti MT, ktorú pripúšťa s istou opatrnosťou (vv. 1,1.10.12; 2,5.6.13.15.16, s. 21), alebo ju prehodnocuje (napr. plus v LXX v 2,14, s. 165) s tendenciou nezmmožovať hypotetické fázy vývoja knihy (s. 153).

V úvodnej kapitole *Struktura a forma knihy* sa autor v skratke vyjadruje k neľahkej otázke formy textu, konkrétne, či je text prózou alebo poéziou, resp. ich kombináciou. Pritom vychádza z definovania odlišností medzi poéziou a prózou z teórie J. Mukařovského, založenej na princípe „rytmického impulzu“ odlišujúceho poéziu od prózy (s. 23). Výsledkom je minimalistický postoj: „podle uvedeného kritéria Ageovy výroky poezií spíše nejsou, poněkteré pasáže však lze považovat za ‚básnickou prózu‘ či přesněji ‚rytmizovanou prózu““ (s. 23 – 24). To podľa

uvedených kritérií sedí. Otázne je, či to je v prístupe k biblickým textom adekvátny východiskový bod, keďže v prípade poetických textov ide o orientálnu poéziu. Sám autor častejšie upozorňuje na poetické prvky v texte (jazyk včestby je „poetičtejší“, s. 58; spomína rytmizované vyjadrenia, s. 152, či poetickú povahu textu, s. 155, alebo možnosť „básnického [synekdochického] pomenovania“, s. 181). V problematike poézie textu by bolo vhodnejšie hľadať východiskové kritériá v klasickom manuáli hebrejskej poézie od L. Alonsa Schöckela, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (Studia Biblica 11), Rím 1988.

Obširny úvod s ťažiskom na riešenie historicity knihy týkajúcej sa vzniku a utvárania knihy má svoje zdôvodnenie v úmysle autora dopracovať sa k jej najstaršej podobe. To sa zdá byť pri Knihe Aggeus vhodným rozhodnutím. Radí sa k veľkej skupine exegétov voliacich tzv. konzervatívny prístup a zhoduje sa s nimi v presvedčení, že proroctvo bolo zapísané už počas prorokovho pôsobenia a následne v krátkom čase aj redakčne upravené do kanonizovanej podoby (s. 25, 40 – 41, 80, 92, 123)¹. V prístupe k textu sa opiera o historicko-kritické metódy. Pracuje predovšetkým s jazykovou analýzou a s redakčnou kritikou, ktorá sa s veľkou obľubou používa od polovice 20. stor. (Redaktionsgeschichte, Redaktionskritik), pričom túto metódu dôsledne a konzistentne používa v celom komentári.

V úvode venuje dostatok pozornosti otázke autora textu. Definuje ho ako „autora redakčného rámce“, ktorý pracoval s prvou verziou textu nazvaného „prameňom“ (s. 28) ukázkovo aplikovanou v časti výkladu pri predstavení redakčného vývoja prvých troch veršov knihy 1,1-3 (s. 91 – 93). Na príklade analýzy 1,4-11 (s. 119 – 122) vymedzuje vlastné chápanie literárno-kritickej analýzy v konfrontácii s použitím tejto metódy v dialógu s M. Hallaschkom, ktorý na základe analýzy predpokladá extrémne zložitý vývoj textu. Pri porovnaní s uvedeným autorom, ktorý v ôsmich veršoch detekuje sedem redakčných vrstiev, je pri aplikovaní literárnej kritiky citeľný skôr zdržanlivý prístup J. Rückla. To sa prejavuje v chápaní „koherencie“, príp. „nekoherencie“ textu len v prípade skutočného rozporu s inou jeho časťou (s. 121). Výsledkom je predtým naznačené chápanie autora naratívneho rámca ako autora knihy, ktorý spracoval zbierku Aggeových výrokov (s. 119).

Metodicky najdôležitejšou otázkou redakčnej kritiky je čo najpresnejšie určenie času a s ním súvisiaceho historického kontextu. V úvode tomu zodpovedá obširna rozprava datovania samotného proroctva ako aj jeho literárneho spracovania v Knihe proroka Aggea na seba nadväzujúcimi krokmi s postupným zužovaním perspektívy od rámca veľkých dejín (s. 39 – 40) cez situáciu Judska v počiatkoch

¹ Téza je obširnejšie predstavená v nedávnom článku: „Haggai as an Old Book“, *ZAW* 134 (2022) 193-214.

perzskej doby (s. 40 – 42) až po otázku konkrétneho perzského panovníka, počas vlády ktorého sa udalosti opísané v Knihe Aggeus mohli odohrať (s. 43 – 54).

Autor práce v hlavnej časti monografie – výklade, dôsledne pracuje s textom podľa stanovených pravidiel. Delenie rešpektuje hebrejský text a umožňuje dobrú orientáciu pri samotnom výklade. Kľúčový moment, *preklad*, vykazuje známky vysokej precíznosti a vynikajúceho poznania textu v hebrejskom, gréckom, aramejskom i sýrskom jazyku. *Textové a prekladové poznámky*, v ktorých vysvetľuje a zdôvodňuje preklad zložitých miest hebrejského originálu, poukazuje na vynikajúcu znalosť uvedených jazykov z pohľadu morfológie i syntaxe, ako aj z dejín ich vývinu. Snaha dôjsť k čo najstaršej podobe textu sa takýmto spôsobom dostáva precíznou analýzou k svojmu cieľu. Rovnako v časti *výklad* autor presvedčivo a na vysoko odbornej úrovni argumentuje a zdôvodňuje spôsob chápania textu, pri ambivalentnosti uvádza dôvody pre aj proti a necháva čitateľovi priestor pre zváženie a vlastné rozhodnutie (napr. v 2,15 chápanie časového údaju otvoreného na minulosť aj budúcnosť, s. 180, či na rozvažovanie, s. 193 – 194).

Podľa autora komentára sa u Aggea nepredpokladá znalosť veľkých starozákonných literárnych tradícií (s. 156), no známe sú mu literárne tradície okolitých kultúr, predovšetkým mezopotámskych textov (s. 157 – 158, 160 – 161). V prípade, že sa niektoré vyjadrenia približujú k starozákonným literárnym textom, J. Rückl venuje relatívne veľký priestor vylúčeniu takýchto súvislostí. Napríklad otázku o kňazskom naučení v 2,11-12 napriek podobnej, aj keď nie identickej problematike v Lv 6,20 hodnotí ako takú, ktorá neodkazuje na žiadny text Pentateuchu (s. 171 – 172, argumentované kriticky v pozn. 452), alebo ešte priamejšiu súvislosť s Pentateuchom v prípade Ag 2,13 a Nm 19,22 vyhodnocuje ako takú, ktorá nepredpokladá autoritu zákonov Pentateuchu ani nehovorí nič o literárnom vzťahu textov (s. 174). Pripúšťa prítomnosť tém okolitých kultúr v SZ, ale v prípade proroka Aggea sa prikláňa skôr k mimobiblickému vplyvu ako k biblickým textom (napr. vyjadrenie o naplnení chrámu Hospodinovou slávou, s. 156, či dar Hospodinovho pokoja v 2,9, s. 161 – 162; chrámu ako zdroja požehnania – hospodárskej prosperity, s. 194 – 195). Svoju argumentáciu sofistikovane rozvíja pri obrazoch použitých v závere Aggeovho proroctva (s. 200 – 222). Najprv prisúdi záverečnú časť proroctva z literárno-kritického hľadiska autorovi naratívneho rámca. Argumentácia vyznieva skôr váhavo: „kloníme sa však spíše k chápaní vv. 21b-23 na jedné redakční rovině, a to především pro nedostatek argumentů pro opačnou pozici“ (s. 199). Potom vylúči vplyv paralel zo SZ (s. 200), aj keď v prípade vyvolenia Zorobábela pripúšťa „kráľovské a davidovské konotace“ (s. 217). Pri výklade záverečných veršov formuluje tézu, ktorú vystihuje formulácia „Popsané kontradiskursivní užití motivů, perské ideologie v Ag 2,21b–22 lze považovat za záměrné z hlediska ilokuční funkce textu... Nutným předpokladem pro vznik našeho

textu je recepcie daných motivů a jejich srozumitelnost u předpokládaných adresátů textu“ (s. 211 – 212), s konštatovaním malého alebo žiadneho vplyvu biblických tradícií na text Knihy Aggeus. Pritom vyvstáva otázka, či veľký záujem a výborná znalosť tradícií okolitých kultúr, ktoré prorocká kniha obsahuje, nepredpokladá prinajmenej rovnaký záujem o vlastnú kultúru a tradície, či už zapísané alebo rozprávané o to viac, že autor/autori knihy ju adresovali Izraelu. Zároveň je pochopiteľná zdržanlivosť pri intertextuálnom prepájaní SZ textov (ako upozorňuje v pozn. 530, s. 204), predovšetkým pri stanovenom celi výskumu počiatocnej podoby textu knihy deklarovanom už v úvode.

Komentár ku knihe Aggeus je vynikajúcim exemplárom edície Českého ekumenického komentára k Starému zákonu, ktorý potvrdzuje jej vysokú odbornú úroveň.

*Miroslav Varšo
Spoločenskovedný ústav CSPV SAV
Karpatská 5
040 01 Košice
Slovenská republika*

SPRÁVY A OZNAMY

Anotácia doktorskej tézy

Dňa 4. apríla 2022 na Fakulte biblických vied a archeológie Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Pápežskej univerzity Antonianum v Jeruzaleme obhájil Milan Diheneščík, gréckokatolícky kňaz Košickej eparchie, svoju dizertačnú prácu s názvom *Sichemská zmluva. Exegetická štúdia Joz 24*. Moderátorom tézy bol prof. Massimo Pazzini z Fakulty biblických vied a archeológie v Jeruzaleme a korelátorm doc. Blažej Štrba, pôsobiaci na tej iste fakulte, ako aj na Rímskokatolíckej cyrilometodskej bohosloveckej fakulte Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave. Oponentami boli prof. Michelangelo Priotto z Interdiecézneho teologického inštitútu vo Fossane a prof. Guido Benzi z Pápežskej saleziánskej univerzity v Ríme, obaja taktiež pôsobiaci na Fakulte biblických vied a archeológie v Jeruzaleme.

Predložená téza je exegetickou štúdiou poslednej kapitoly Knihy Jozue, t. j. Jozueho posledných činov počas zhromaždenia v Sicheme, osobitne aktu obnovy zmluvy, koncentrovanou na štúdium intertextuálnych vzťahov tohto textu s niektorými ďalšími textami komplexu Gn–2Kr.

Prvá kapitola práce prináša prehľad histórie výskumu textu s naznačením významných zlomových bodov vo vývoji jeho interpretácie. Koncentruje sa zvlášť na poslednú, t. j. súčasnú fázu výskumu kapitoly, v ktorej sa prístup odborníkov sústreďuje na vzťahy textu Joz 24 s inými textami Starého zákona. V druhej kapitole je predstavený a odôvodnený výber metodológie exegetického výskumu textu, obzvlášť so zreteľom na štúdium intertextuálnych vzťahov. Tretia kapitola sa zaoberá problematikou textovej kritiky, literárnej jednoty textu, jeho štruktúrou a v poslednom kroku jeho lexikálnou analýzou. Najrozsiahljšia a zároveň nosná časť exegetického štúdia danej kapitoly je predstavená v štvrtej kapitole, ktorá rozoberá intertextuálne vzťahy Joz 24 s niektorými inými textami komplexu Gn–2Kr, predovšetkým s tými, ktoré sa zaoberajú tematikou zmluvy v rôznych obdobiach histórie opísanej v zmienenom komplexe starozákonných kníh. Analýza obsiahnutá v tejto kapitole je realizovaná v dvoch krokoch. V prvom kroku sú intertextuálne vzťahy medzi Joz 24 a ďalšími textami analyzované zo synchronického aspektu. Následne, v druhom kroku, je analýza prevedená aj z diachronického aspektu, s cieľom stanoviť relatívnu chronológiu medzi textom Joz 24 a jednotlivými textami, s ktorými vytvára nejaký

intertextuálny vzťah, a takto v konečnom dôsledku určiť miesto študovaného textu vnútri diachronického vývoja komplexu Gn–2Kr. V poslednej, piatej kapitole práce sa výsledky predchádzajúcej analýzy stávajú východiskom pre hlbšie zaobranie sa literárnym horizontom kapitoly Joz 24, teda jednotlivými témami, ktoré prepájajú študovaný text s inými textami v komplexe Gn–2Kr. Druhá časť záverečnej kapitoly rieši otázky historického horizontu kapitoly v úsilí nájsť konkrétne historické obdobie, v ktorom text kapitoly so všetkými svojimi intertextuálnymi vzťahmi vznikol a popísať cieľ, s ktorým ho jeho autor práve takto skomponoval.

Vo finálnych konklúziách sa popisuje text Joz 24 ako súčasť tej istej redakcie ako texty Gn 35,1-5 (spolu s časťou kapitoly Gn 31); Dt 31,16-18; Sdc 10,11-16a a 1Sam 7,3-4. Táto línia bola vytvorená ako nový typ zápasu proti cudzím božstvám (אלהי הנכר), ktorý je založený na aktívnom prístupe ľudu vo veci ich odstránenia zahrnutom vo výzve vyjadrenej frázou אשר בקרבכם/בתכם וחסירו את־אלהי הנכר אשר בקרבכם/בתכם a v následnom vyplnení tejto výzvy konkrétnou skupinou ľudí v konkrétnom období biblickej histórie. Ako historické pozadie pôvodu textu Joz 24 a ďalších uvedených textov je identifikované poexilové, perzské obdobie, presnejšie koniec 5. storočia pred Kristom. Z perspektívy tohto historického kontextu Joz 24 predstavuje výzvu pre všetky jahvistické skupiny, teda tie, ktoré sa nachádzajú v zaslúbennej zemi, ako aj tie, ktoré sa nachádzajú v diaspóre, zjednotiť sa v bezpodmienečnej službe Bohu Izraela a odstrániť všetko cudzie, čo by mohlo národ znova zaviesť k modloslužbe.

Cieľom predloženej exegetickej štúdie je prispieť k stále prebiehajúcej odbornej diskusii týkajúcej sa jednak miesta záverečnej kapitoly Knihy Jozue v rámci komplexu Gn–2Kr, hlavne v zmysle jeho celkového zámeru v tomto širšom kontexte, jednak historického obdobia, v ktorom je potrebné hľadať pôvod tohto textu, teda bodov, v ktorých stále absentuje konsenzus medzi odborníkmi a zároveň priniesť nový pohľad na intertextuálne vzťahy tejto kapitoly s ďalšími starozákonnými textami.

*Milan Diheneščík
Európska trieda 5
040 13 Košice*

Výzvy pre starovekých a moderných prekladateľov Biblie II

Koniec septembra sa v Košiciach už tretíkrát po sebe spájal s uskutočnením medzinárodnej vedeckej biblickej konferencie a sprievodných popularizačných aktivít so zameraním na prekladanie Biblie. Zakaždým boli organizované Slavistickým ústavom Jána Stanislava Slovenskej akadémie vied, v.v.i. (www.slavu.sav.sk) a Centrom pre štúdium biblického a blízkovýchodného sveta v Košiciach (biblia.abuke.sk). Aj preto bol tento ročník viacerými účastníkmi označovaný za akési Hieronymove dni na východe Slovenska.

Tohoročná vedecká konferencia Challenges for Ancient and Modern Bible translators II (viac na <https://biblia.abuke.sk> v sekcii články), ktorá sa uskutočnila v dňoch od 27. 9. 2022 do 29. 9. 2022 v Košiciach, tematicky a programovo úzko nadviazala na minuloročnú konferenciu s rovnakým názvom (viac informácií o nej na <https://biblia.abuke.sk> v sekcii články). Obidve spomínané konferencie sa realizovali v rámci riešenia výskumného projektu APVV-20-0130 Biblický text a jeho terminologické diskurzy v modernom spisovnom jazyku. Na príklade Listov apoštola Pavla. Projekt je riešený v Slavistickom ústave Jána Stanislava SAV, v.v.i. Zodpovedným riešiteľom je Róbert Lapko. Pripravovaným výstupom projektu bude nový preklad všetkých autentických Listov apoštola Pavla. Na projekte spolupracuje aj Centrum pre štúdium biblického a blízkovýchodného sveta v Košiciach.

Konferencia začala otváracou prednáškou prof. Petra Dubovského, SJ na aktuálnu tému Eliáš v škole cudziny, vdovy?, ktorá sa uskutočnila v aule Centra spirituality Východ-Západ Michala Lacka v Košiciach a bola otvorená pre verejnosť. Prof. Dubovský predstavil ako odlišnosť označenia Eliáša ako proroka v masoretskom texte, oproti textu Septuaginty poukazuje lepšie na formačný proces Eliáša v jeho úlohe proroka. Dôležitú úlohu v tomto procese zohrali práve cudzinky.

Vedecká časť konferencie prebiehala počas dvoch dní, a to 28. a 29. 9. v priestoroch Kláštora bosých karmelitánov v Košiciach-Lorinčíku. Svojou prednáškou ju otvorila Dr. Juliane Ecksteinová, ktorá pôsobí na Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule St. Georgen vo Frankfurte nad Mohanom a na Johannes Gutenberg Universität v Mainzi. Poukázala na náročnosť prekladu textov, ktoré chcú čitateľovi sprostredkovať istú emóciu. Táto náročnosť sa často prejavuje v neadekvátnosti zvolených termínov pri preklade, ktoré sú často archaické a čitateľom vzdialené. Pri voľbe vhodných termínov je potrebné prihliadať na podstatu emócie, ktorú chce v čitateľovi text vzbudiť.

Dr. Harald Samuel z The University of Oxford sa venoval problematike prekladu hebrejských slovesných foriem wayyiqtol najmä v poetických textoch Biblie a poukázal na potrebu prehodnotenia ich prekladu v niektorých prípadoch.

Nasledujúce dve prednášky sa venovali margináliám biblického textu. Dr. Peter Juhás, ktorý pracuje ako vedecký pracovník na Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung v Münsteri, sa venoval poznámkam v manuskriptoch sýrskeho prekladu Tomáša z Harkelu. Poznámky svedčia o ťažkostiach pri prekladaní už u starovekých prekladateľov. Poznámkami často objasňovali zvolené termíny pri prekladoch do sýrčiny.

Problematiku odkazov na starozákonné state v súčasných vydaniach Nového zákona predstavila vo svojej online prednáške prof. Beate Kowalski z Technische Universität v Dortmunde. Pri skúmaní týchto odkazov v NA28 a UBS5 sa ukazujú ich nedostatočnosť a nejasnosť ich kategorizácie. Je potrebná ich systematická revízia, pretože sú veľmi užitočné pri príprave moderných prekladov a na pochopenie vnútrobiblických prepojení pre širokú verejnosť. Na ich revízii vo vydaniach Nestle-Aland sa už začalo.

Popoludňajší blok prvého dňa otvoril prof. Reinhard Müller z Georg-August-Universität v Göttingene, tiež cez online pripojenie. V prednáške sa zameril na to, ako neskoršie chápanie hebrejského výrazu „Torah“ ovplyvnilo jeho preklad do gréčtiny. Na tento fenomén poukázal na príklade Dt 17,19 a Jer 26,4.

Doc. Blažej Štrba z Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave a Studium Biblicum Franciscanum v Jeruzaleme ukázal, že v centre záujmu Ex 33,7-11 je opis klaňania sa Izraelitov Pánovi vždy, keď Mojžiš vchádzal do stánku a zostupoval naň oblačný stĺp. Tomuto chápaniu napomáha predchádzajúca perikopa (Ex 33,4-6), ktorá pripravuje čitateľa na to, aby vnímal, ako sa týmto klaňaním obnoví uctievanie Pána Izraelitmi.

Prvý deň vedeckej časti konferencie uzavrel Dr. Miroslav Varšo zo Spoločenskovedného ústavu SAV svojimi poznámkami k prekladom hebrejských termínov týkajúcich sa lásky v knihe Pieseň piesní do gréčtiny v Septuaginte.

Riaditeľ SÚJS SAV doc. Šimon Marinčák otvoril druhý deň prednášok. Pri svojom skúmaní prekladov názvov hudobných nástrojov z hebrejčiny do vybraných slovanských prekladov zistil ich veľkú neusporiadanosť a nekonštantnosť. Pre jeden hebrejský termín sa v moderných prekladoch často používa celá škála ekvivalentov. Bolo by vhodné zjednotiť terminológiu v rodiaciach sa moderných prekladoch.

V nasledujúcej prednáške prof. Róbert Lapko (SÚJS SAV, C-SBBS) predstavil Kamaldulskú Bibliu, historický kontext jej vzniku, výsledky doterajšieho výskumu realizovaného v SÚJS SAV, v.v.i. a na Katolíckej univerzite v Ružomberku. Detailnejšie sa zameril na exegetické charakteristiky textu a poznámok knihy Tobiaš.

Doc. Juraj Feník (SÚJS SAV) predstavil časť svojej práce na novom preklade Listu Rimanom. Venoval sa predovšetkým presnejšiemu chápaniu výrazov *κατὰ σάρκα* – *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, ktoré sa v novom preklade odráža a ktoré je tiež súčasťou niektorých moderných prekladov do iných jazykov. Novému chápaniu napomohla najmä práca prof. Michaela Woltera (Universität Bonn), ktorý sa následne pripojil online, aby bližšie ozrejmil toto chápanie a uviedol podobné príklady v iných biblických textoch.

Konferenciu uzavrel svojím príspevkom doc. Jozef Tiňo z Trnavskej univerzity. Poukázal na dilemu prekladateľov či už hebrejského alebo gréckeho textu do slovenčiny pri voľbe slovenských ekvivalentov „skúšať“ alebo „pokúšať“. Výrazy v pôvodných jazykoch nenesú takú teologickú záťaž, ako je tomu v prípade slovenských termínov. Aj tu sa ukazuje potreba revízie, aby súčasné preklady lepšie zodpovedali súčasnému chápaniu týchto výrazov v slovenčine.

Celé podujatie sa nieslo vo výbornej atmosfére. Po každej z prednášok nasledovala diskusia, ktorá bola často veľmi živá a priniesla ďalšie podnety na uvažovanie pri práci na nových prekladoch biblických textov.

Konferencia tvorila vedeckú časť riešenia spomínaného projektu. Jeho aplikačnou časťou bolo biblické podujatie s názvom Biblia: kniha kníh a jej príbeh vo Vranove nad Topľou, ktoré prebiehalo paralelne v dňoch od 26. 9. 2022 do 30. 9. 2022. Súčasťou tejto aktivity bola moderovaná diskusia s prof. Petrom Dubovským, SJ a doc. Bohdanom Hroboňom, počas ktorej bol predstavený nový preklad Jánovho evanjelia (<https://obchod.postoj.sk/produkt/janovo-evanjelium/231>), séria biblických popularizačných prednášok o prekladoch Svätého písma a výstava biblických artefaktov Michala Lapčáka (viac na: <https://biblia.abuke.sk> v sekcii články).

*Matúš Imrich
Hlavná 91
042 03 Košice*

*Róbert Lapko
Dúbravská cesta 9
841 04 Bratislava*

Medzinárodná konferencia Profil ideálneho vládcu v helenistickom svete Pápežský biblický inštitút, Rím 9. – 10. novembra 2022

Otázka obrazu ideálneho vládcu, ktorá je stará ako ľudstvo samo, sa stala hlavnou tematikou medzinárodnej konferencie na Pápežskom biblickom inštitúte (PBI) v Ríme v dňoch 9. až 10. novembra 2022. Konkrétnejšie sa konferencia zamerala na hľadanie odpovede na uvedenú otázku z pohľadu rôznych kultúr v historickom období 4–1 stor. pred n. l, nazývanom aj helenizmus. Konferencia sa stala dejiskom interdisciplinárneho dialógu vedcov, ktorí predstavili a zároveň aj porovnávali, ako boli tradičné vzory ideálneho vládcu vsadené do nových okolností autormi píšucimi po egyptsky, akkadsky, grécky, aramejsky a hebrejsky. To bol aj dôvod, pre ktorý bola konferencia rozčlenená do šiestich sekcií reflektujúc geograficko-lingvistické kritérium a vedecké zameranie.

Konferenciu otvorila aramejská sekcia, ktorú moderoval Craig Morrison. Diskutujúci, ktorými boli Holger Gzella (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München) a Agustinus Gianto (PBI, Rím), predstavili kráľovskú ideológiu a opak ideálneho vládcu v aramejských častiach Knihy Daniel.

Druhý deň konferencie odštartovali príspevky venované obrazu ideálneho vládcu z obdobia dynastie Ptolemajovcov v Egypte. Predniesli ich Federico Contardi (Università degli Studi di Firenze) a Stefan Pfeiffer (Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg). Moderátorom bol Anthony SooHoo.

Nasledoval spoločný vstup dvoch odborníčov na akkadčinu, ktorý moderoval Mark Avila. Rocío Da Riva (Universidad de Barcelona) a Paola Corò (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia) priblížili poslucháčom tvorbu imidžu ideálneho vládcu v skorom a neskorom babylonskom období z perspektívy interkultúrneho výskumu.

Posledná predpoludňajšia sekcia, vedená Federicom Giuntolim, bola venovaná gréckej literatúre. Laurent Pernot (Université de Strasbourg) a Michael Tilly (Eberhard Karls Universität, Tübingen) sa zamerali na obraz ideálneho vládcu v klasickej gréckej literatúre a v Prvej knihe Machabejcov.

Poobednú časť zameranú na židovský helenizmus otvorila prednáška Hindy Najmanovej (University of Oxford) o ideálnom kráľovi ako učiteľovi. Pokračoval príspevok Luigiho Santopaola (PBI) o Melchizedechovi ako ideálnom vládcovi v apokalyptickej literatúre. Moderátorkou uvedenej sekcie bola Benedetta Rossi.

Konferenciu ukončili príspevky troch biblistov z oblasti gréckeho Starého zákona. Daniela Scialabba (PBI) hovorila o modeli ideálneho kráľa v gréckej verzii Knihy Ester. Príspevok Martiny Korytiakovej (PBI a Univerzita Komenského v

Bratislave) bol venovaný vernosti v službe ako kľúčovému aspektu dobrého vládcu podľa Knihy Judita. Záverečná prednáška patrila Petrovi Dubovskému, SJ (PBI), ktorý porovnaním hebrejskej verzie Prvej knihy kráľov s jej gréckymi prekladmi ukázal na rozdiely vo vyobrazení ikonického kráľa zo Starého zákona, Šalamúna.

Tak ako na úvod konferencie aj na jej konci sa slova ujal rektor PBI, Michael Kolarcik, SJ. Slovom i malou pozornosťou (pamätnou mincou o založení PBI v Ríme pápežom Píom X. v r. 1912) sa poďakoval organizátorom konferencie za jej uskutočnenie, moderátorom sekcií za ich profesionálnu službu, a prednášateľom za ich hodnotné príspevky.

Program konferencie pokračoval aj tretí deň, ale už bez prednášok. V doobedňajších hodinách sa konalo neformálne stretnutie všetkých prednášajúcich s niekoľkými študentami doktorandského štúdia na PBI. Sedenie začal Joseph Sievers krátkym zhrnutím výsledkov prednášok z predošlých dvoch dní a aj formulovaním otvorených otázok, ktoré prednášky priniesli. Následne jednotliví doktorandi artikulovali svoje otázky týkajúce sa konferencie prednášajúcim, ktorí na ne spontánne reagovali. Na záver Rocío Da Riva premietla zúčastneným krátke video z projektu na Blízkom východe organizovaného univerzitou v Barcelone, ktorého bola vedúcou. Cieľom náročného projektu bolo vytvorenie kvalitných snímok jedného starovekého nápisu na skale, ktorý sa nachádza v ťažko dostupnom teréne. Zámerom zosnímania nápisu bola archivácia tohto vzácneho artefaktu, ktorý rýchlo podlieha poveternostným podmienkam, pre vedecké bádanie v budúcnosti. Poobede bol pre prednášajúcich pripravený program v podobe prehliadky Trajánových trhov sprevádzanej odborným výkladom v historickom srdci Ríma pri Rímskych fórach.

Za konferenciu, ktorá bola zvládnutá na vysokej úrovni, treba úprimne poďakovať jej hlavným organizátorom Petrovi Dubovskému, SJ a Luigimu Santopaolovi, SJ, ako aj členom pomocnej rady, ktorú tvorili Agustinus Gianto, Joseph Sievers a Daniela Scialabba, všetci akademicky pôsobia ako vyučujúci Starého zákona na Biblickej fakulte PBI. Bez pochyb možno skonštatovať, že ciele organizátorov konferencie sa naplnili. Boli identifikované črty ideálneho vládcu naprieč rôznymi kultúrnymi a náboženskými oblasťami, boli predstavené spôsoby, akými bol model ideálneho vládcu aplikovaný v rôznych geografických podmienkach a historických obdobiach. Napriek veľkému časovému odstupe môžu byť závery odbornej interdisciplinárnej diskusie o obraze ideálneho vládcu z helenistického obdobia skutočnou inšpiráciou aj pre lídrov zo súčasnosti.

*Martina Korytiaková
Univerzita Komenského, RKCMF
Kapitulská 26
814 58 Bratislava*