

## Contents

### Treaties

**Peter DUBOVSKÝ**

Critical Exegesis of the Books of Kings in the Light of  
the Concept of Inspiration ..... 1-21

**Blažej ŠTRBA**

Who Can Judge a Manslayer? The Recontextualization of  
the Legislation about the Cities of Refuge in Josh 20:4-5 ..... 22-49

**František ÁBEL**

*Ioudaïsmos* through the Lens of Remembering: Exploration of  
the Semantic Shift of the Term from Maccabees to the Early Second  
Century CE ..... 50-76

**Michal MALIŠ**

Why Did Jesus Turn Around? The Multiple Significance of Jesus'  
Physical Turning in the Synoptic Gospels ..... 77-102

**Helena PANCZOVÁ**

Did Peter in Luke 5:10 Really Become a “Man Catcher”? On  
the Semantics of the Verb ζωγρέω ..... 103-115

**Abstracts and Reviews** ..... 116-128

**Communications and References** ..... 129-131



*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 XVI (2024), číslo 1

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

Redakčná rada/Editorial board:

František ÁBEL (Bratislava, SK)	Róbert LAPKO (Košice, SK)
Georg BRAULIK, OSB (Wien, AT)	Adam MACKERLE (České Budějovice, CZ)
Jaroslav BROŽ (Praha, CZ)	Libor MAREK (Detroit, US)
Núria CALDUCH-BENAGES (Roma, IT)	Helena PANCZOVÁ (Bratislava, SK)
Jeremy CORLEY (Dublin, IE)	Július PAVELČÍK (České Budějovice, CZ)
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)
Leslie HOPPE, OFM (Chicago, US)	Emanuel TOV (Jerusalem, IL)
Peter JUHÁS (Münster, DE)	Miroslav VARŠO (Košice, SK)
Branislav KEUSKA (Ružomberok, SK)	Ian YOUNG (Sydney, AU)

Šéfredaktor: Blažej ŠTRBA (Nitra, SK)  
Zástupca šéfredaktora: Jozef JANČOVIČ (Bratislava, SK)  
Výkonná redaktorka: Martina KORYTIAKOVÁ (Nitra, SK)

Za recenzovanie všetkých článkov zodpovedá redakčná rada.

Obálka: Karol Hájiček

Na príprave spolupracovali: Alessandro Coniglio, OFM, Veronika Černušková, Lionel Goh, OFM, Dagmar Kráľová, FMA, Vincenzo Lopasso, Zuzana Očkajáková, Jana Plátová a David Vopřada.

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 hebrejčinu 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](http://www.biblica.sk).

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

S povolením Arcibiskupského úradu v Bratislave zo dňa 3. júna 2014

Prot. N. 2229/2014

**Studia Biblica Slovaca**

Printed in Slovakia, 6/2024

Vychádza dvakrát do roka.

Cena: 9 €

ISSN 1338-0141

e-ISSN 2644-4879

EV 3744/09

## Obsah

### Štúdie

#### **Peter DUBOVSKÝ**

Kritická exegéza Kníh kráľov vo svetle konceptu inšpirácie ..... 1-21

#### **Blažej ŠTRBA**

Kto môže súdiť vraha? Rekontextualizácia právnych predpisov o mestách útočiska v Joz 20,4-5 ..... 22-49

#### **František ÁBEL**

*Ioudaïsmos* z hľadiska spomínania. Výskum sémantických zmien výrazu od obdobia Makabejcov po rané druhé storočie po Kr. .... 50-76

#### **Michal MALIŠ**

Prečo sa Ježiš obrátil? Viacvýznamovosť Ježišovho fyzického obrátenia sa v synoptických evanjeliách ..... 77-102

#### **Helena PANCZOVÁ**

Stal sa z Petra v Lk 5,10 naozaj „lovec ľudí“? O sémantike slovesa ζωγράφω ..... 103-115

**Abstrakty a recenzie** ..... 116-128

**Správy a oznamy** ..... 129-131

# Critical Exegesis of the Books of Kings in the Light of the Concept of Inspiration

*Peter Dubovský*

## Introduction

The Bible contains two historiographic compositions that cover the history of the universe. The first, extending from Genesis to 2 Kings, covers the history of the universe from the creation of the world to the fall of Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>. These books were edited and redacted several times. After the return from exile, the history of the universe was rewritten in 1–2 Chronicles, from a Judean viewpoint. Flavius Josephus (c. 37–100 CE) reviewed these historiographic compositions in *Antiquities of the Jews*, but this monumental historiographic work, despite its high literary and historical value, did not become part of the Sacred Scriptures. Besides these major compositions the Bible contains various minor narratives summarizing the history of the world, such as Joshua 24:2-13.

Critical studies of these historiographic compositions have raised several problematic questions concerning their historicity and normative values, and this in turn has directed scholarly attention to the question of inspiration<sup>2</sup>. Responses on the part of the Catholic magisterium include both *Dei Verbum* (1965), which nuanced the concept of inspiration by speaking of the respective roles of God and people chosen by God to be “true authors” (DV 11), and *Verbum Domini* (2010), which took a similar approach. Also the Pontifical Biblical commission has issued *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church* (1993) and *The Inspiration and Truth of Sacred Scripture* (2014).

Numerous other explanations have been proposed by scholars and clergy. For example in 1586 Lessius argued that it is not necessary for inspiration to extend verbally to every single word of the biblical text, and he called attention

---

<sup>1</sup> MACHINIST, Periodization in Biblical Historiography.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for example VAN BEMMELEN, *Issues in Biblical Inspiration*; ACHTEMEIER, *Inspiration and Authority*; BLANCHARD, «Toute Écriture est inspirée» (2 Tm 3,16); SESBOÛE, *La canonisation des écritures*.

to the different ways in which the authors were divinely moved to write<sup>3</sup>. Although Lessius' theory lacked precision on some points, he was attentive to the interplay between divine grace and human freedom in the process of inspiration, accentuating the human, linguistic and literary responsibility of the authors alongside divine initiative. The concept of verbal dictation was gradually abandoned, as is apparent in the words of Cardinal Bea: "Any attempt to explain the nature of inspiration by means of the word *dictare* used in the proper sense of modern dictation is wrong."<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Luis Alonso Schökel (1920–1998)<sup>5</sup>, recognized the role of linguistic and literary creativity in divinely inspired human authors; subsequently a group of Roman professors edited a volume on inspiration. The most recent theories take into consideration social, psychological, pneumatological, and other aspects of inspiration<sup>6</sup>.

Generally speaking, inspiration "refers to divine influence in virtue of which the biblical text is, in fact, experienced by some people/communities as revelatory"<sup>7</sup>. This definition of inspiration is generally accepted, but its interpretation has raised numerous problems and it has rightly been criticized<sup>8</sup>. In various nuanced proposals scholars have introduced the concept of verbal plenary inspiration, the model of double authorship, and also more sophisticated models such as dynamic, partial, intuitive, and poetic inspiration<sup>9</sup>.

This paper will argue that historical critical and textual studies have revealed the need for further nuancing of the concept of inspiration. More specifically, it will be argued that it is necessary to speak about different models of inspiration corresponding to the different formation phases of 1–2 Kings.

## The Formation of 1–2 Kings and the Concept of Inspiration

Before plunging into the wild waters of theological and biblical discussion of inspiration and biblical criticism, let us define a few premises that will help to organize the flow of the argument of this paper.

---

<sup>3</sup> LESSIUS, *De Sacra Scriptura*.

<sup>4</sup> BEA, *Libri sacri Deo dictante conscripti*, 333.

<sup>5</sup> ALONSO-SCHÖKEL, *La Parola ispirata*.

<sup>6</sup> BRUMMOND, *Under the Inspiration*.

<sup>7</sup> DOBROVOLNY, *Inspiration and Revelation*, 61.

<sup>8</sup> ZELLER, *Inspiration in the Act of Reading*.

<sup>9</sup> FARKASFALVY, *Inspiration & Interpretation*.

First, any historiographic work must engage not only the literary values of the text but also its historical reliability. For this reason, let us employ the concept of the three “worlds” of the text, which is often used by biblical scholars and which has been summarized brilliantly by A. SooHoo in his dissertation:

The world of the text is the reality—including the literary and rhetorical construction of time and space in which the agents interact—presupposed and imagined in the telling of the story. [...] The world behind the text is the socio-cultural, religious, and historical milieu that gives rise to the text and to which it may refer. [...] Finally, the world before the text consists of the various audiences that encounter and interpret it and the different contexts in which the text is transmitted.<sup>10</sup>

Accordingly we can speak about the text of 1–2 Kings, about the world of historical events behind that text, and also about the world before that text, its reception.

Second, despite diverse and often contradictory proposals as to the formation of 1–2 Kings, there is general agreement that these books were not composed by one author or in one period. Scholars have dated the books and their parts into periods covering almost a millennium. This has a double impact on the worlds of the text mentioned above. There is the world of historical events that the biblical text refers to, such as the events attributed to a given king. But the narratives also reflect the events and the political and religious circumstances of later editors and redactors. Thus, interpretations of later scribes became part of the biblical text, with the result that for the later generation the world before the text became not only the world of the text but also part of the world behind the text. For example, portions of 1–2 Kings that were composed in Josiah’s period reflect the world before the text but also became the world behind the text for the Hellenistic audience.

Third, redactional processes were significantly different before, during and after the exile, as well as in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Hellenistic redactors had at their disposition authoritative biblical collections that were not available to scribes of the early monarchic period. Moreover, the scribes were influenced in their editorial and redactional work by the techniques of that time. Naturally, the redaction techniques of the Neo-Assyrian period differed from those of the Hellenistic period.

---

<sup>10</sup> SooHoo, *Violence*, 172-173.

Fourth, recent studies of Greek and Hebrew versions of 1–2 Kings have brought forward different versions and editions of those books. Consequently, we can speak about more than one text of 1–2 Kings.

Obviously, these premises have an impact on the concept of inspiration. In this article, the relationship between critical studies of 1–2 Kings and the inspiration of those books will be approached from a historical critical viewpoint. On the basis of the premises listed above and previous scholarly studies, we can reasonably propose the following stages of the formation of 1–2 Kings, from most recent to most ancient:

1. formation of the canonical texts,
2. translations into Greek and other languages,
3. formation of first larger compositions,
4. formation of the first written works<sup>11</sup>.

As suggested above, the scribal processes and techniques employed in the formation of 1–2 Kings were significantly different in each of these four phases. It follows that the models of inspiration should differ according to the phases: we should speak not of a single model of inspiration explaining all phases of the formation of 1–2 Kings, but rather of different models. In what follows I will discuss the process of formation and will suggest models of inspiration applicable to the various phases.

### ***The Formation of Canonical Texts***

Various religious traditions and confessions fixed the content of their sacred scripture at certain moments in time. The formation of canonical texts involves three decisive factors: which biblical books will be part of the canon, which language(s) of those books will be authoritative, and finally which textual variants will be normative.

The authoritative collection of biblical books is called the canon, and its formation lasted for centuries<sup>12</sup>. The final articulation of the canon took place for the Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Florence (1442) and the Council of Trent (1546), for the Church of England in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion (1563), for the Calvinistic tradition at the Synod of Dort (1619), for the Eastern Orthodox Church at the Synod of Jerusalem (1672), etc. T.H. Lim has

---

<sup>11</sup> We can add another point, namely, the oral tradition; cf. SKA, *The Tablet of the Heart*.

<sup>12</sup> FARKASFALVY, *Inspiration & Interpretation*, 159-186.

argued that the Jewish canon corresponds essentially to the Pharisaic canon, completed sometime between 150 and 250 CE<sup>13</sup>.

The biblical canon of a given religious tradition determined which books should be included in the Sacred Scripture. Along the way some biblical books got incorporated into the canon and others were eliminated for linguistic, dogmatic, liturgical, or pastoral reasons<sup>14</sup>. Once the books of Sacred Scripture were fixed, that collection became normative for a given religious community. The canonical collection of the biblical books was considered to be inspired. Despite the diversity of the canons, the Jewish-Christian canons have a strikingly similar core. This indicates that collections such as the Pentateuch, Prophets, Psalms, etc. were considered by all traditions to be inspired<sup>15</sup>. Since the historiographic collections (Genesis–2 Kings and 1–2 Chronicles) are included in all canons, we can rightly conclude that all communities considered them to be inspired texts. However, some canons include other historiographic works and novels, for example 1–2 Maccabees, Tobit, Judith, and the Greek version of Esther in the Catholic Canon, 3–4 Esdras in the Armenian Canon, 1–3 Enoch in the Orthodox Tewahedo Canon, and 3 Maccabees in the Greek, Slavonic, and Georgian Orthodox Canon.

The order of the historiographic collection also differs in different traditions. For example, the Roman Catholic canon orders the historical books as follows: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel–2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Tobit, Judith, Esther, 1–2 Maccabees<sup>16</sup>. But the Hebrew canon includes Joshua–2 Kings among the prophets, and Ruth, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1–2 Chronicles among the Writings. The Catholic organization of the biblical historiography presents a linear historical progression, starting with Joshua, going through the periods of the Judges, Monarchies, Exile, Return from the Exile, and the Hellenistic domination of Israel, and finishing with the Roman Empire (1 Macc 8). The gospels resume the narrative with the Roman period. Moreover, the Catholic

---

<sup>13</sup> LIM, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, 304.

<sup>14</sup> For the complexity of this process see BECKER – SCHOLZ, *Kanon in Konstruktion*.

<sup>15</sup> For the list of different canons see McDONALD, *The Formation of the Biblical Canon*, 491–497.

<sup>16</sup> It is necessary to notice that the translations into modern languages, even though approved by local authorities, have different order. Most translations put 1–2 Maccabees after Esther and thus create a coherent historiographic corpus and the Old Testament ends with the Book of Malachi (cf. CEI, CELAM, *Einheitsübersetzung, La Bible de Jérusalem*, etc.). However, the Neo-Vulgate puts 1–2 Maccabees at the end of the Old Testament. Consequently, the theology of the history is different.

Canon connects biblical historiography with the Pentateuch, starting with the creation of the world and ending with the Roman period. The Roman Catholic Canon is oriented Christologically<sup>17</sup>, whereas the Jewish Canon concludes with the Books of Chronicles and emphasizes the return to the Holy Land<sup>18</sup>. In the Roman Catholic Canon the Books of Kings are part of a Christologically-oriented historiography<sup>19</sup>.

The formation of the canon presupposed a biblical text which was more or less fixed. Since the Bible and its parts have been translated into 3,589 languages<sup>20</sup>, it was and is necessary to evaluate the quality of the translations. It follows that the formation of the biblical text went hand-in-hand with the formation of the Canon. It was crucial for communities to decide in which language(s) the authoritative texts should be transmitted, which version of the Bible should be used in the cult, and which textual variants should be taken into account. The Jewish Canon included texts written in Hebrew and Aramaic, but not those written in Greek. In the Roman Catholic tradition, the Neo-Vulgate promulgated in 1979 and revised in 1986 presents a selection of Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic texts and indicates the textual variants that should be used in official Catholic translations for cultic activities. A comparison of official Latin translations, such as the Sixtine Vulgate (1590), the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate (1592), the Stuttgart Vulgate (1969), and the Neo-Vulgate (1979 and 1986) shows that the official Latin translation has been corrected and improved, taking into consideration biblical studies available to the translators. A similar process can be noticed in the Syriac, Slavonic, Armenian, Coptic, Greek, Ethiopic, and other official translations of the Bible.

From the historical critical viewpoint, we can suggest that in this phase of the formation of the Bible copyists were no longer distinguishing different strata of the text. The originally different strata of the text (see below) had collapsed

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Greek Orthodox, Slavonic and Armenian Canon.

<sup>18</sup> “Thus said King Cyrus of Persia: The LORD God of Heaven has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and has charged me with building Him a House in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Any one of you of all His people, the LORD his God be with him and let him go up.” (2 Chr 36:23; NRSV)

<sup>19</sup> This organization of the biblical books made its way into several Christian chronicles that start with the creation of the world and go to the era of their writers; thus, Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–339 CE) composed his *Chronicle* and *Church History*, St. Cyril composed his *Proglas* covering the history up to the 9<sup>th</sup> cent. AD.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. <https://www.wycliffe.net/resources/statistics/> [accessed August 12, 2023].



into one sacred text. Also, textual variants and translations were controlled by a fixed authoritative sacred text (cf. Neo-Vulgate).

Prior to the invention of the printing press authoritative texts were copied by hand and copyists may have introduced some changes, intentionally or unintentionally. A marginal note in the *Codex Vaticanus* reads “Fool and knave, leave the old reading and do not change it!” To sum up, by this point it was no longer advisable to alter the content of a biblical book, as had been the case in earlier phases (see below).

Finally, the copyists were attentive not only to the general content but also to single words and even single letters that they copied. Thus, at the end of the Books of Kings is written:

סכום פסוק' דספר מלכים אלף וחמש מאות ושלשים וערבעה. וסימנו אשר הגוי  
אשר הי אלהיו<sup>21</sup>

This example indicates that scribes carefully counted the words of each book, so that copyists could check whether they had omitted anything. This suggests that the communities and their representatives considered inspired not only the Bible's general content but also its single words.

What does the foregoing imply for the concept of inspiration? The formation of the canonical texts was in most cases a communal decision that was promulgated in an official form, such as the Council of Trent, the Synod of Dort, etc. The result of this process was triple. First, it was decided which books were part of the canon; second, which version/translation of the Bible was to be considered inspired and normative for a given community; and finally, which textual variants should be preferred in the normative texts.

It follows that a model of inspiration pertinent for this phase of the formation of the Bible should explain the discernment of the community or its representatives that decided which books and textual variants should be included or excluded from the biblical canon. The choice and the order of the biblical books determined not only which historiographic collections were considered inspired, but also how to interpret the history of the universe.

Moreover, the copyists' attentiveness to every single word and even to letters suggests that at this stage they were no longer free to modify the manuscripts that they copied, as had been the case in earlier phases (see below).

---

<sup>21</sup> The sum of the verses of the book of the Kings is one thousand five hundred and three hundred and four and (the center) is marked by (the words) אשר הי אלהיו.

Every single word was to be transmitted, since each word was considered an inspired utterance of God.

Taking into consideration the conclusions summarized above, we can rightly employ the term verbal inspiration to explain the transmission of the biblical text, 1–2 Kings included. At this stage not only the kerygma of the Bible was at stake but also single words and phrases. Consequently not only the general concepts were inspired but also every single word was considered inspired and thus to be carefully transmitted. If we ask what role the human being played in this process, we can use the concept of instrumental inspiration: first, the copyists were to faithfully copy manuscript; second, the manuscript was perceived as being composed by an author who was “acting simply as an instrument in God’s hand; so that the resulting composition [was] not his, but God’s”<sup>22</sup> and thus normative for the given community.

### *Translations into Greek*

Before the translation of the Bible into Latin, Syriac, Armenian, or other languages took place, the first major translation was into Greek. The translation of the Bible into Greek during the Hellenistic period radically widened access to the Israelite sacred texts. On the one hand, the Israelite sacred texts became available even to the non-Jewish public; on the other hand, the translation into Greek entailed the modification of those texts.

Even a quick thumbing through the Greek<sup>23</sup> and Hebrew manuscripts of 1–2 Kings suffices to reveal numerous differences between them. Some differences can be explained as scribal mistakes, others as intentional changes<sup>24</sup>. To illustrate the editorial and translational processes of this phase of the formation of the Bible, let us turn to an example from the Solomon narrative.

The G<sup>B,Ant,A</sup> contain major differences relative to the MT. First, the G<sup>B,Ant</sup> have two sets of miscellanea in ch. 2, namely, after v. 35 and v. 46. The first set

<sup>22</sup> McCLOREY, *The Inspiration of the Bible*, 49-50.

<sup>23</sup> In particular, the *Codex Vaticanus* (G<sup>B</sup>), the *Codex Alexandrinus* (G<sup>A</sup>), and the Antiochian text (G<sup>Ant</sup>).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. SPERBER, *Some Tannaitic Biblical Variants*; LEUCHTER – ADAM, *Soundings in Kings*; SCHNIEDEWIND, *Excavating the Text of 1 Kings 9*; EDELMAN, *Deuteronomy-Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books*; RÖMER, *The Case of the Book of Kings*; VERMEYLEN, *Les écrivains deutéronomistes travaillaient-ils en Babylonie ou en Palestine?*; ROFÉ, *Text and Context*; TREBOLLE BARRERA – OTERO – MORALES, *Textual and Literary Criticism*.

of miscellanea<sup>25</sup> appears in the G<sup>B,A,Ant.</sup>, whereas the second occurs only in the G<sup>B,Ant.</sup>. Other important plusses appear in ch. 10 after v. 22. Similar themes are treated in the MT in chs. 9 and 10. Secondly, there are some noteworthy changes to chs. 3, 5, 6, and 7. Some are concerned with syntax and vocabulary, and there are some repetitions and short plusses and minuses. There are also passages that prove that there were two different versions of the same biblical text. For example, ch. 1 Kings 6 of the MT and of the G<sup>B,Ant.</sup> present two different descriptions of the Jerusalem temple<sup>26</sup>. Comparing these two descriptions we can suggest that there was Vorlage one for the MT and Vorlage two for G<sup>B,Ant.</sup>. Finally, the G<sup>Ant.</sup> text begins the narrative of the Books of Kings only in 1 Kgs 2:12, leaving verses 1 Kgs 1:1–2:12 as part of the Books of Samuel.

As a result of the different organization of the chapters, the plusses and minuses, the repetitions, and the specific translation techniques, the Greek texts present king Solomon in a different light from how he is presented in the MT<sup>27</sup>. For example: according to the MT, prior to Solomon's vision at night in Gibeon (1 Kgs 3:4-15), his wisdom was limited to executing his opponents. His first dream was a watershed in his behavior. He became a king-judge and no longer executed his enemies; instead, he constructed peaceful relationships with his people and neighbors and built the temple, palaces, and other cities. Thus, according to the MT Solomon's increased wisdom was the result of his relationship with God: beginning with his vision in Gibeon, growing with his construction and dedication of the temple (1 Kgs 6–8), and deepening in his second dream (1 Kgs 9:1–9). Following this logic, the MT inserts most wisdom passages after the first and the second dream (1 Kgs 9:10–10:29). In other words, Solomon's wisdom was granted to him by God in his vision in Gibeon and then was gradually increased.

As already noted, the G<sup>B,Ant.</sup> contain two miscellanea located in chapter 2. Consequently, the G<sup>B,Ant.</sup> transfer most wisdom passages to ch. 2, i.e., before Solomon's dream in Gibeon. As a result the G<sup>B,Ant.</sup> present Solomon's growth in wisdom and glory in a way different from the MT: Solomon was a full-fledged sage from the beginning of his reign. In the G<sup>B,Ant.</sup>, Solomon's wisdom increased

---

<sup>25</sup> In most cases, the G<sup>A</sup> follows the MT taking into consideration the G<sup>B</sup> and sometimes the G<sup>Ant.</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, *The Building of the First Temple*, 109-212.

<sup>27</sup> VAN KEULEN, *Two versions of the Solomon Narrative*; MORALES, *Textual Criticism*; MORALES, *How Much Hexaplaric Material?*; TREBOLLE BARRERA – MORALES, *From the Greek Recensions to the Hebrew Editions*; MORALES – TREBOLLE BARRERA, *The Edition of III–IV Kingdoms*.

after his dream in Gibeon and the construction of the temple, but the vision at night in Gibeon did not have such a decisive impact on his behavior as in the MT. The G<sup>B,Ant.</sup> affirm that Solomon's wisdom came from God, but it is not specified how. The texts allow us to conclude that Solomon's wisdom was innate or was acquired through his education, particularly by observing the rules given to him by his father David (1 Kgs 2:1-4).

A comparison of the Solomon narrative with other passages in 1–2 Kings in Greek and in Hebrew<sup>28</sup> suggests the following points. Firstly, the basic plot of the story is the same in the Greek and Hebrew texts. Secondly, some passages contain only minor additions or omissions (cf. for example 1 Kgs 3). Thirdly, there are passages that maintain the basic plot but also contain important changes (cf. 1 Kgs 6). Fourthly, there are chapters with significant changes (1 Kings 2 and 9–10). A similar variety of textual variants and editions is found in the Qumran manuscripts, which contain two versions of Isaiah, Samuel, etc. This short overview suggests that at this stage of the formation of the Bible the communities used different texts, and that consequently we cannot speak about one canonical text that was considered normative. The example of the Solomon narrative shows that the translators and editors felt free to change the order of the chapters and to edit entire passages in ways that were unacceptable in Phase 1 (see above). Finally, Solomon's second dream (1 Kgs 9:1-9) indicates that, even though these verses came from different sources, all manuscripts transmitted the redactional composition without separating the sources<sup>29</sup>. This means that at this stage some redactional interventions were considered part of the text (cf. Phase 3).

An implication of these reflections on the concept of inspiration is that at this stage of the formation of the Bible the inspired text had two dimensions: static and dynamic. On the one hand there were unchangeable elements of the Biblical text, i.e. the features of Solomon that were shared by all textual traditions. On the other hand, there were changeable elements of the Biblical text, i.e. the elements that Greek and Hebrew redactors and translators felt free to change in order to update the ancient narrative for a new audience. What is required of a model of inspiration so that it is able to give justice to these editorial changes and translational strategies? It must account for the capacity to discern, on the one hand, what was the core narrative that had a normative value

---

<sup>28</sup> Similarly, we can notice important differences in the Jeroboam, Elijah-Elisha cycle, etc. These narratives also maintain the basic plot in the Greek and Hebrew texts, however, the scribes felt free to change words and even the order of the chapters.

<sup>29</sup> TALSHIR, Texts.

and could not be changed and, on the other hand, what were the sections that were “in the hands of the scribes”. As to the former, we cannot speak about verbal inspiration, since the translators felt free to adjust syntax and vocabulary and to make minor omissions and additions. Thus, we can partially adopt the content model of inspiration, holding that the message of the narratives was considered inspired, but not the single words<sup>30</sup>. As to the latter, since not all changes were accepted, the inspiration model should be able to explain how the scribes and communities were “guided” in their discernment as to which changes were acceptable and which should be excluded<sup>31</sup>. Finally, at this stage there were different traditions of the texts (cf. 1 Kgs 6), and it seems that both were considered inspired and therefore to be transmitted<sup>32</sup>. It follows that inspiration did not presuppose one fixed text but rather a variety of texts and editions. We can agree with J. B Prothro:

[T]he Spirit’s work [was] to prompt and guide the textualization of divine revelation in history through persons (inspiration’s “subjective” aspect). [...] Scripture is inspired in multiple forms, but not all forms are inspired for the same purposes in the divine economy.<sup>33</sup>

### ***The Collection of Larger Compositions and Their Revision***

The translators into Greek of 1–2 Kings had at their disposal what we have called a core narrative of those books. But that core narrative was not written by one person nor in one precise moment of history. On the contrary, various studies have shown that the Israelite sacred texts underwent a complex redactional process<sup>34</sup>. D. Edelman proposed a reasonable hypothesis of the formation of Deuteronomistic History, including the Books of Kings<sup>35</sup>.

Although there is no unanimous scholarly consensus as to the formation of 1–2 Kings, scholars argued that an important phase of the formation of 1–2 Kings was when scribes started assembling different traditions into larger compositions that were later reviewed and edited. The Elijah-Elisha cycle can serve as an

---

<sup>30</sup> For the discussion and limits of this model see PROTHRO, *Inspiration*.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. G<sup>A</sup> as a choice among the existent traditions.

<sup>32</sup> For a similar situation see, longer and shorter versions in Jeremiah, Sirach, and Esther.

<sup>33</sup> PROTHRO, *Inspiration*, 144-145.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. LEMAIRE – HALPERN – ADAMS, *The Books of Kings*; LEVIN, *Re-Reading the Scriptures*; THOMAS, *Hezekiah*.

<sup>35</sup> EDELMAN, *The Text-Dating Conundrum*.

example. A. Rofé<sup>36</sup> argued that originally there were independent stories narrating miraculous deeds of Elijah and Elisha, and that these short legends circulated as an oral tradition. The best examples of short legends are the stories of the widow of Zarephath (1 Kgs 17:10-16), the healing of the waters at Jericho (2 Kgs 2:19-22), the killing of children by she-bears (2 Kgs 2:23a-24), the miraculous recovery of the axhead (2 Kgs 6:1-7), etc. The Elijah and Elisha cycle attests that some of these short legends were assembled into a larger narrative that Rofé calls the lives of the prophets. In some collections there are few links or none between the stories, such as the stories of Elisha's miracles (2 Kgs 4); in others there are literary links, such as in the movements of the prophets (2 Kgs 2:19-25); and in still others there are more elaborate literary links (1 Kgs 17:2-24<sup>37</sup>). These shorter cycles were later linked to the royal narratives and transformed into a critique of the Omride dynasty (1 Kgs 17-19; 21; 2 Kgs 1). Finally, the prophet-king controversy was inserted into a larger composition narrating the history of ancient Israel from Solomon to Zedekiah. Narratives of the deeds of single kings, in this case the kings of the Omride dynasty, were introduced and concluded with royal résumés that formed a literary frame for the legends, annals, prophetic speeches, etc. (cf. for example 1 Kgs 15:1-24, but also 1 Kgs 16:29 and 1 Kgs 22:39-40 that frames the Ahab narrative). This literary frame formed a larger narrative called a synchronistic history that coordinated the reigns of the southern and northern kings. This organization is similar to the synchronistic chronicles in Mesopotamia (cf. *ABC* 1), but different from 1-2 Chronicles, in which the stories of the northern kingdom were eliminated.

These compositions were revised several times, and internal connections were created within 1-2 Kings. The revisions were theological in nature, such as the Deuteronomistic revisions of the evaluation of the fall of Samaria (2 Kgs 17:7-23) or of the evaluation of kings (cf. the case of Manasseh in 2 Kgs 21<sup>38</sup>). Moreover, the sections of early prophetic material were harmonized (cf. 1 Kgs 11; 12; 14; 16; 21<sup>39</sup>). Finally, specific links were created within 1-2 Kings, such as in 1 Kgs 13:2 and 2 Kgs 23:16-18 linking the altar in Bethel, the prophet from Judah, and king Josiah, etc., or the falls of the northern and southern kingdoms<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>36</sup> ROFÉ, *Storie di profeti*.

<sup>37</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, *Elijah*.

<sup>38</sup> MACHINIST, *Manasseh of Judah*.

<sup>39</sup> WEIPPERT, *Die Ätiologie des Nordreiches*.

<sup>40</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, *Suspicious Similarities*.

In summary, at a certain moment a narrative of the history of the Israelite and Judahite kings began to assume its final shape, drawing upon different literary and oral traditions. Scholars debate whether this process started in the pre-exilic period, namely, during the reign of Hezekiah or Josiah<sup>41</sup>, or whether the composition of the overall narrative began after the exile. Different models have been proposed for the edition of 1–2 Kings, such as the source model, the block model, the *Schichten Model*, or even more complex models (DtrNA, DtrNB, DtrEP, DtrLP, DtrPostDtr<sup>42</sup>), or models distinguishing between political and kerygmatic historiography<sup>43</sup>, etc.

We cannot reconstruct with confidence each step of this process, but the redactional techniques used by biblical scribes were well known in the ancient Near East. An analysis of Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions brings to light some scribal techniques that were used by the biblical scribes as well. Ashurbanipal's conquest of Elam shows that the final summary was moveable, i.e. when a new event was added the summary was moved to include a new part of the account. A similar technique can be observed in the final regnal summaries, which were moved when an account such as the story of Elijah was inserted into the narrative (1 Kgs 22:39-40). Moreover, Ashurbanipal's inscriptions show that Prism T was inserted into Prism F and A. In other words, an entire block of text (Prism T) that represents another textual source, was combined with an older tradition (Prism F and A). This technique illustrates the freedom of the scribes to combine different sources. We can see this also in the combination of DtrG, DtrN, and DtrP, which were originally independent<sup>44</sup>. Comparing Prism A and F, we can see that the author of Prism A added to the matrix (Prism F) new sections which contained direct speeches, prophecies, intervention of gods, etc.; these insertions offered theological reinterpretations of the events. Similarly, the Books of Kings contain numerous theological evaluations that were inserted into the text, reflecting positive or negative judgments on the part of the scribes (cf. 2 Kgs 17; 21)<sup>45</sup>.

---

<sup>41</sup> See JEPSEN, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 30, 38; ADAM, Warfare; LEVIN, Das synchronistische Exzerpt; THOMAS, *Hezekiah*.

<sup>42</sup> RÖMER, Salomon d'après les Deutéronomistes.

<sup>43</sup> ROFÉ, Properties of Biblical Historiography.

<sup>44</sup> RÖLLING et al., *Altorientalische Literaturen*.

<sup>45</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, Dynamics of the Fall.

A comparison of Esarhaddon's annals (7<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE) with the Babylonian Chronicles (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. BCE) shows that the text composed several centuries after the event did not change the basic information, i.e. the case of the conquest of Arza<sup>46</sup>.

Thus, studies of the scribal variants occurring in Mesopotamian historiographic texts have shown that the scribes "felt free to change the order of certain events, to omit certain material they considered superfluous, and to reorder or exchange with contextually synonymous equivalents various lexemes and phrases in the exemplar before him"<sup>47</sup>.

In summary, on the one hand, this phase of the formation of the Bible presupposed earlier textual and oral traditions. But on the other hand, the scribes were not pure conservators of tradition; they creatively reused the ancient traditions, composed an overall narrative, and edited it. Finally, these scribal processes were the product of several generations of single scribes and scribal schools.

S. Lear's study of the book of Malachi has proposed a scribal model that can be helpful for explaining this phase of the formation of 1–2 Kings. Lear defined a scribe as a "person who had the education and skills to produce literature in the ancient world"<sup>48</sup>. Lear proposed three traits or roles that might define a scribe: reader, interpreter, and composer. A scribe was first a reader, i.e. a person familiar with the older written traditions. A scribe was also a creative interpreter of the ancient traditions: when interpreting the older text, a scribe applied models of his period to interpret it. Finally, a scribe not only transmitted the ancient texts but also composed new texts.

Applying these conclusions to the concept of inspiration, it is necessary to postulate, first, that we cannot speak about one inspired scribe, but rather about a group and even schools of scribes. Consequently, the concept of "true authors" can be adopted to explain this process. On the basis of the foregoing reflections, we can conclude that the model of inspiration pertinent for this phase will have to be able to explain the process of selection of ancient traditions, the reflective interpretation of preexisting religious texts<sup>49</sup>, and the creation of new compositions. Finally, since the scribes followed redactional and editorial techniques common in the ANE, it is correct to speak about the scribes who were got their inspiration from surrounding cultures.

---

<sup>46</sup> Assyrian prisms RINAP 4 1, 2, 3, 30, 31, 77, 78, 79, 93 are dated between 676–672 BCE; Babylonian chronicle ABC 14 is dated to the third cent. BCE.

<sup>47</sup> HOBSON, *Transforming Literature*, 32.

<sup>48</sup> LEAR, *Scribal Composition*, 147.

<sup>49</sup> SCHMID, *Is There Theology in the Hebrew Bible?*, 49.



### *First Written Compositions*

The scribal activities described above presuppose ancient written and oral traditions. Scholars heatedly debate which strata of 1–2 Kings represent the oldest ones. Recently it has been argued that some northern traditions, which were later incorporated into the southern narratives, might represent the earliest strata<sup>50</sup>. P. Dubovský has presented methodologies that, if combined, can identify the oldest stratum of the Northern tradition in 2 Kgs 13–14<sup>51</sup>. The first step is a comparison with ANE textual material dated to the 9<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE. Selected geographic areas of the ancient Near East, such as Assyria, Urartu, Suḫu, Hamath, Sam'al, Damascus, and Moab, provide texts dated to the 9<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE that allow us to reconstruct the reasons for the composition of a written text, namely, the king's victories and liberation from oppression by neighbors. Similar motifs appear in 2 Kgs 13–14. According to the Bible, the Nimshide kings took advantage of the Assyrian expansion not only to recover territories lost to Aram but also to conquer Judah, to capture Judahite Amaziah, and to loot Jerusalem and its temple. On one hand it is difficult to imagine that the looting of Jerusalem could have been invented by a Judahite scribe in the postexilic period. On the other hand, some of these achievements, such as the battle at Beth-shemesh and Nimshide territorial expansion and building activities, can be corroborated by archeological evidence<sup>52</sup>. Comparable royal achievements were normally sufficient reason for composing historiographic texts during the ninth–eighth century. Thus, the achievements of the Nimshide kings, such as the conquest of Aram and Judah as well as the new constructions described in 2 Kgs 13–14, would have been a good motif for the composition of a historiographic text in Israel, as it was in other regions.

Second, an examination of the literary styles of 2 Kgs 13–14 demonstrates that the scribes employed three literary genres: the report (2 Kgs 13:3b.7.22.24–25; 14:25.28b), the account (2 Kgs 13:3–5.22–25; 14:25–27), and the historical story (2 Kgs 14:8–14). These literary forms, along with such motifs and themes as divine anger and the oppression-liberation pattern, were generally employed by ANE scribes in historiographic texts in the regions mentioned above. In other

---

<sup>50</sup> RÖMER, Jeroboam II.

<sup>51</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, *The Birth of Israelite Historiography*, 70–100.

<sup>52</sup> BUNIMOVITZ – LEDERMAN, *The Iron Age Fortifications of Tel Beth Shemesh*; BUNIMOVITZ – LEDERMAN, *The Final Destruction of Beth Shemesh*; BUNIMOVITZ – LEDERMAN, *Tel Beth-Shemesh*.

words, the biblical scribes not only used the same motifs but also the same literary styles as the historiographies of the 9<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE.

Finally, a study of the redactional history of 2 Kings 13–14 shows that beneath a thick layer of Deuteronomistic redaction there are pre-Deuteronomistic sections, such as an ancient synchronization of the royal chronologies of Judah and Israel, oppression-liberation stories, and salvation vocabulary. Putting all these data together, Dubovský has argued that Israelite historiography started during the Nimshide dynasty in the 9<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE, and that it followed the historiographic conventions used in that period throughout the ANE, focusing mainly on royal military achievements. In summary, these passages (2 Kgs 13:7. 13.22.24-25; 14:7-14.19-20.25a) represent the most ancient historiography of Israel, a literary genre typical of the 9<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE royal inscriptions.

Similarly, in light of studies of legal documents, treaties, administrative texts, magic and other types of texts, we can conclude with D. Edelman that the written texts of this phase were limited primarily to specialized genres<sup>53</sup>.

This and similar examples<sup>54</sup> show that the oldest strata of 1–2 Kings were originally part of different compositions and only later were incorporated into the later narrative, with some changes. These ancient compositions were composed anew, following literary and religious patterns that were common in the surrounding cultures. These compositions were not originally intended as Sacred Scripture, as we now understand it. The references to different annals and songs in 1–2 Kings suggest that there were several historiographic and other types of compositions.

Which kind of model of inspiration is required for this phase of the formation of the Bible? First, the model needs to explain the interaction between the Spirit and the scribe who was composing a text anew while following the literary models and religious scheme common to the period. Second, because no historiographic composition is absolutely objective, the model of inspiration must take into account the ideological and religious interpretations that could have significantly altered the historical event in order to promote the glory of the king, his god(s) and his nation (see the presentation of Sennacherib's campaign against Jerusalem in 2 Kings 18–19<sup>55</sup>). Finally, some texts that were later incorporated or referred to in the biblical compositions had no religious overtone and so were not originally composed as Sacred Scripture: for example, receipts,

<sup>53</sup> EDELMAN, *The Text-Dating Conundrum*, 7.

<sup>54</sup> For more details cf. MCKENZIE, *1 Kings 16 – 2 Kings 16*.

<sup>55</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies*.

contracts, and letters excavated at Jerusalem, Arad, Lachish, etc. that follow the models of first millennium administrative practices<sup>56</sup>.

## Conclusions

This article has argued for a renewal of the concept of inspiration. Our focus has been to create a dialogue between the historical critical methodology and the concept of inspiration<sup>57</sup>. Toward that goal we first summarized different phases of the formation of the Books of Kings. Based on that proposal we proposed, on one hand, that a single concept of inspiration cannot explain different stages of the formation of the Books of Kings. On the other hand, some traditional models of inspiration can be still used, such as instrumental or verbatim inspiration. However, they are applicable only for some phases of the formation of the Bible.

## Bibliography

- ACHTEMEIER, Paul J.: *Inspiration and Authority: Nature and Function of Christian Scripture*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- ADAM, Klaus-Peter: Warfare and Treaty Formulas in the Background of Kings. In: Mark Leuchter – Klaus-Peter Adam (eds.): *Soundings in Kings: Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2010, 35-68.
- ALONSO-SCHÖKEL, Luis: *La Parola ispirata: La Bibbia alla luce della scienza del linguaggio*, Brescia: Paideia, 1967.
- BEA, Augustin: Libri sacri Deo dictante conscripti, *EE* 34 (1963) 329-337.
- BECKER, Eve-Marie – SCHOLZ, Stefan: *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion. Kanonisierungsprozesse religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- VAN BEMMELEN, Pater Maarten: *Issues in Biblical Inspiration: Sanday and Warfield*, Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988.
- BLANCHARD, Yves-Marie: «Toute Écriture est inspirée» (2 Tm 3,16): Les problématique de la canonisation et de l'Inspiration, avec leur enjeux respectifs. In: Christoph Theobald – Pierre Gibert (eds.): *La réception des Écritures inspirées: exégèse, histoire et théologie*, Paris: Bayard, 2007, 15-35.
- BRUMMOND, Michael: Under the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit: Pneumatological Considerations for the Theology of Biblical Inspiration, *Logos* 26 (2023) 52-70.

---

<sup>56</sup> RADNER, *Die neuassyrischen Privatrechtsurkunden*.

<sup>57</sup> For other methodologies and their impact on the concept of inspiration see DUBOVSKÝ – SONNET, *Ogni Scrittura è ispirata*; ZELLER, *Inspiration in the Act of Reading*.

- BUNIMOVITZ, Shlomoh – LEDERMAN, Zvi: The Iron Age Fortification of Tel Beth Shemes: A 1990–2000 Perspective, *IEJ* 51 (2001) 121-147.
- BUNIMOVITZ, Shlomoh – LEDERMAN, Zvi: The Final Destruction of Beth Shemesh and the *Pax Assyriaca* in the Judean Shephelah, *Tel Aviv* 30 (2003) 3-26.
- BUNIMOVITZ, Shlomoh – LEDERMAN, Zvi: *Tel Beth-Shemesh: A Border Community in Judah: Renewed Excavations 1990–2000. Vol. II: The Iron Age* (Tel Aviv University Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology 34), Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016
- DOBROVOLNY, Mary K.: Inspiration and Revelation. In: Katharine D. Sakenfeld (ed.): *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 3, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008, 57-63.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies: Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Intelligence Services and Its Significance for 2 Kings 18–19* (BibOr 49), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: Dynamics of the Fall: Ashurbanipal's Conquest of Elam. In: Katrien de Graef – Jan Tavernier (eds.): *Susa and Elam: Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives. Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Gent University, December 14-17, 2009* (Mémoires de la délégation en Perse 58), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2013, 47-71.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: *The Building of the First Temple: A Study in Redactional, Text-Critical and Historical Perspective* (FAT 103), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: Suspicious Similarities: A Comparative Study of the Falls of Samaria and Jerusalem. In: Peter Dubovský et. al. (eds.): *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of Torah* (FAT 107), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 47-71.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: The Birth of Israelite Historiography: A Comparative Study of 2 Kings 13–14 and Ninth–Eighth-Century BCE Levantine Historiographies. In: Peter Dubovský – Federico Giuntoli (eds.): *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls: Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (ArcB 3), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 65-111.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: Elijah, *BibAnn* 14 (2024) 1-16.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter – SONNET, Jean-Pierre: *Ogni Scrittura è ispirata: Nuove prospettive sull'ispirazione biblica* (Lectio 3), Roma – Milano: GBP, San Paolo, 2013.
- EDELMAN, Diana V.: The Text-Dating Conundrum: Viewing Genesis and Kings from an Achaemenid Framework. In: Peter Dubovský – Federico Giuntoli (eds.): *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls: Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (ArcB 3), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 7-38.
- EDELMAN, Diana V.: *Deuteronomy–Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation*, Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- FARKASFALVY, Denis M.: *Inspiration & Interpretation: A Theological Introduction to Sacred Scripture*, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- HOBSON, Russell: *Transforming Literature into Scripture: Texts as Cult Objects at Niniveh and Qumran*, Sheffield, UK – Oakville, CT: Equinox, 2012.
- JEPSEN, Alfred: *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, Halle: Veb Max Niemeyer, 1956.

- LEAR, Sheree: *Scribal Composition: Malachi as a Test Case* (FRLANT 270), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018.
- LEMAIRE, André – HALPERN, Baruch – ADAMS, Matthew Joel: *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (VTSup 129), Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2010.
- LESSIUS, Leonardus: *De Sacra Scriptura* (BibVict 1) Vitoria: Eset, 1974.
- LEUCHTER, Mark – ADAM, Klaus-Peter: *Soundings in Kings: Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2010.
- LEVIN, Christoph: Das synchronistische Exzerpt aus den Annalen der Könige von Israel und Juda, *VT* 61 (2011) 616-628.
- LEVIN, Christoph: *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament* (FAT 87), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- LIM, Timothy H.: *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.
- MACHINIST, Peter: Periodization in Biblical Historiography. In: John Baines et al. (eds.): *Historical Consciousness and the Use of the Past in the Ancient World*, Sheffield, UK – Bristol, CT: Equinox, 183-226, 2019.
- MACHINIST, Peter: Manasseh of Judah: A Case Study in Biblical Historiography. In: Peter Dubovský – Federico Giuntoli (eds.): *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls: Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (ArcB 3), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 183-226, 2020.
- MCCLOREY, John A.: *The Inspiration of the Bible*, St. Louis, MO: B. Herder, 1929.
- MCDONALD, Lee Martin: *The Formation of the Biblical Canon*, London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020.
- MCKENZIE, Steven L.: *1 Kings 16 – 2 Kings 16*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2019.
- MORALES, Pablo A. Torijano: How Much Hexaplaric Material Entered into the Antiochene Textual Tradition? In: Anneli Aejmelaeus – Tuukka Kauhanen (eds.): *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (DSI 9), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017, 69-119.
- MORALES, Pablo A. Torijano: Textual Criticism and the Text-Critical Edition of IV Regnorum: The Case of 17,2-6. In: Hans Ausloos et al. (eds.): *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (BETL 246), Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012, 195-212.
- MORALES, Pablo A. Torijano – TREBOLLE BARRERA, Julio C.: The Edition of III–IV Kingdoms: The Critical Reconstruction of the Old Greek Text and the Construction of the Critical Apparatus. In: Felix Albrecht – Frank Feder (eds.): *Editing the Septuagint: The Unfinished Task. Papers presented at the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (DSI 16), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022, 53-79.
- PROTHRO, James B.: Inspiration and Textual Preservation: A Catholic Essay on the Bible, *ProEc* 30 (2021) 141-162.
- RADNER, Karen: *Die neuassyrischen Privatrechtsurkunden als Quelle für Mensch und Umwelt* (SAAS 6), Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997.

- ROFÉ, Alexander: *Storie di profeti: la narrativa sui profeti nella Bibbia ebraica: generi letterari e storia* (BSSTB 8), Brescia: Paideia, 1991.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: Text and Context: The Textual Elimination of the Names of Gods and Its Literary, Administrative, and Legal Context. In: Cana Werman (eds.): *From Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*, Winona Lake, IND: Eisenbrauns, 2015, 63-79.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: Properties of Biblical Historiography and Historical Thought, *VT* 66 (2016) 433-455.
- RÖLLING, Wolfgang et al.: *Altorientalische Literaturen* (NHL 1), Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1978.
- RÖMER, Thomas: Salomon d'après les Deutéronomistes: Un roi ambiguë. In: Claude Lichert – Dany Nocquet (eds.): *Le roi Salomon, un héritage en question: Hommage à Jacques Vermeulen*, Bruxelles: Lessius, 2008, 433-455.
- RÖMER, Thomas: The Case of the Book of Kings. In: Diana V. Edelman (ed.): *Deuteronomy–Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation* (SBLANEM 6), Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013, 187-201.
- RÖMER, Thomas: Jeroboam II and the Invention of Northern Sanctuaries and Foundation Stories. In: Peter Dubovský – Federico Giuntoli (eds.): *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls: Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (ArcB 3), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 127-140.
- SCHMID, Konrad: *Is There Theology in the Hebrew Bible?* (Critical studies in the Hebrew Bible 4), Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- SCHNIEDEWIND, William M.: Excavating the Text of 1 Kings 9. In: Thomas E. Levy (ed.): *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism*, London – Oakville: Equinox, 2010, 241-249.
- SESBOÛE, Bernard: La canonisation des écritures et la reconnaissance de leur Inspiration. In: Christoph Theobald – Pierre Gibert (eds.): *La réception des Écritures inspirées: exégèse, histoire et théologie*, Paris: Bayard, 2007.
- SKA, Jean Louis: The Table of the Heart and the Tablets of Stone: Orality and Jurisprudence in Ancient Israel. In: Peter Dubovský – Federico Giuntoli (eds.): *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls: Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (ArcB 3), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 39-61.
- SOOHOO, Anthony P.: *Violence in the Service of Order in Mesopotamian Myth, Ritual, and Historiography*. PhD Thesis, The New York University, New York, U.S.A. Unpublished. 2019.
- SPERBER, Daniel: Some Tannaitic Biblical Variants, *ZAW* 79 (1967) 79-80.
- TALSHIR, Zipora: Texts, Text-Forms, Editions, New Compositions and the Final Product of Biblical Literature. In: Christl M. Maier (ed.): *Congress Volume Munich 2013*, Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2014, 40-66.
- THOMAS, Benjamin D.: *Hezekiah and the Compositional History of the Book of Kings* (FAT 2.63), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- TREBOLLE BARRERA, Julio C. – MORALES, Pablo A. Torijano: From the Greek Recensions to the Hebrew Editions: A Sample from 1 Kgs 2:1-10. In: Reinhard Müller – Juha

- Pakkala (eds.): *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* (CBET 84), Leuven: Peeters, 2017, 267-293.
- TREBOLLE BARRERA, Julio C. – PIQUER OTERO, André – MORALES, Pablo A. Torijano: *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings: Collected Essays* (VTSup 185), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2020.
- VAN KEULEN, Percy S. F.: *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005.
- VERMEYLEN, Jacques: Les écrivains deutéronomistes travaillaient-ils en Babylonie ou en Palestine? In: Christl M. Maier (ed.): *Congress Volume Munich 2013*, Boston, MA: Brill, 2014, 154-181.
- WEIPPERT, Helga: Die Ätiologie des Nordreiches und seines Königshauses (1 Reg 11:29-40). *ZAW* 95 (1983) 344-375.
- ZELLER, Kinga: Inspiration in the Act of Reading: A Discussion of Ulrich H. J. Körtner's Hermeneutics, *Dialog* 55 (2016) 210-219.

### Summary


The focus of this article is to create a dialogue between the historical critical methodology and the concept of inspiration. Firstly, I advance a proposal on the composition of the Books of Kings and based on this proposal I will argue that a single concept of inspiration cannot explain different stages of the formation of the Books of Kings. Consequently, the article proposes different models of inspiration for different phases of the formation of the Books of Kings.

*Keywords:* Inspiration, Redactional Criticism, Canon, 1–2 Kings.

### Zhrnutie

Cieľom článku je vytvoriť dialóg medzi historicko-kritickou metodológiou a konceptom inšpirácie. Najskôr približujem návrh kompozície Kníh kráľov a na jeho základe tvrdím, že len koncept inšpirácie nedokáže vysvetliť rôzne etapy formovania Kníh kráľov. Následne článok navrhuje rôzne modely inšpirácie pre rôzne fázy formovania Kníh kráľov.

*Kľúčové slová:* inšpirácia, redakčná kritika, kánon, 1-2Kr.

Peter Dubovský  
Biblical Faculty  
Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Piazza della Pilotta, 35  
00187 ROME, Italy  
dubovsky@biblico.it  
 0000-0002-3159-5276

## “Who Can Judge a Manslayer?”

### The Recontextualization of the Legislation about the Cities of Refuge in Josh 20:4-5

*Blažej Štrba*

Hartmut N. Rösel in his commentary to Joshua, suggested that the tradition of the cities of refuge comes from early sanctuaries that served as places of asylum and “[a]ccording to Josh 20 and related texts this ancient reality, not regulated by any administration, was abandoned. Now special places were determined, and legal *standards developed*. Juridical regulations took the place of sacred asylum”<sup>1</sup>. According to Rösel the ancient custom that the person in danger of life would seek protection at the cultic place did not have any institutional support. On the other side, Adrian Schenker suggested the institution of place of refuge belonged to the most ancient Israelite tradition<sup>2</sup>. As survey of research done by Martin Staszak has shown<sup>3</sup> that the debate on the interesting issue of the asylum cities is not yet over. However, once the institution of city of asylum was introduced in Deut 19 and Num 35, the cultic aspect slowly disappeared. In Num 35 and in Josh 20:6, perhaps the motif of the death of the high priest might be a faint echo of cultic vestige<sup>4</sup>.

The aim of our research is to determine the possible reason for the legislative innovation in Jos 20:4-5. We will proceed in four steps. The comparison of the three Pentateuchal asylum laws with the aim to identify differences regarding a role of the authorities in the process of protecting the unintentional manslayer, will be the first step of this study. In the second step, special attention will be given to the role of the authorities in the asylum regulation from Josh 20. In the third step different viewpoints on the unintentionality of the texts and of the manslayer will be discussed. In the fourth

---

\* I want to thank Lionel Goh for his careful reading and corrections of my English. Any mistakes are mine.

<sup>1</sup> RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 324 (*italics added*).

<sup>2</sup> SCHENKER, *Intentionalität*, 209-217.

<sup>3</sup> STASZAK, *Die Asylstädte*, 1-43.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 324.



step the reason for the novelty of Josh 20:4-5 will be proposed. The conclusion follows.

## 1 Three Laws within the Pentateuch

In this part we present briefly three Pentateuchal laws related to the protection of the manslayer. The first text to be treated is the shortest one (Exod 21:12-14). The second text will be Deut 19:1-13 and the third text the longest – Num 35:9-34, which is a later priestly elaboration based on the Deuteronomic version, as many exegetes argue<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, for the purpose of our study, we present these texts in accordance with their assumed process of development, which is far from simple<sup>6</sup>. However, our attention will especially be focussed on how the authorities treat the unintentional manslayer, particularly in Josh 20. Thus, we will not address the direction of dependence among the Pentateuchal texts, but rather we focus on dependence of Josh 20 over against the Pentateuchal texts<sup>7</sup>.

### 1.1 Exod 21:12-14 in Its Literary Context

#### Four death penalties

In the book of the covenant (Exod 21:20–23:33) there is the group of four laws that defines the crimes against another's bodily well-being with the death penalty, 21:12-17. The four laws have a simple structure: after the protasis which describes the offence, follows the apodosis with the final sentence מוֹת יִמָּוֶת “shall be put to death”. Each law is characterised by the participial style in the protasis, i.e. in the sentences describing the crimes: “he who *strikes* (מַכֶּה) a man” (v. 12a), “he who *strikes* (וּמַכֶּה) his father or mother” (v. 15a), “he who *steals* (וּגָנֵב) a man

<sup>5</sup> Cf. ROFÉ, *History*, 205-239; RUWE, *Das Zusammenwirken*, 200-218; STACKERT, *Rewriting*, 58-61; OTTO, *Deuteronomium 1,1–4,43*, 596-598; see also notes 6 and 7.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. STACKERT, *Rewriting*, 68-96; COCCO, *Torah as a Place*, 113-158; KISLEV, *Cities of Refuge Law*, 249-263.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. WELLHAUSEN, *Composition (1889)*, 207, was probably the first to propose diachronic order: Exod 21:12-14, Deut 19:1-13, then Num 35:9-34 and finally Josh 20. For the early overview of the state of research see ROFÉ, *History*, 205-210; also RUWE, *Das Zusammenwirken*, 195-196; STASZAK, *Die Asylstädte*, 122-229; COCCO, *Torah as a Place*, 145-155; GASS, *Asyl*, 52-61. Moreover, whether the text of Exod 21:13-14 is a later insertion dependent on Deut 19 is a subject of ongoing debate.

and sells him” (v. 16a), “he who *curses* (וּמְקַלֵּל) his father or his mother” (v. 17a). These four laws form a unity characterised by parallelism and alternation. The parallelism consists in the participial form of the verb of crime and in the execution מוֹת יוֹמָת “shall be put to death” (vv. 12c.15b.16d.17b). The alternation is observed in the persons being attacked: “man” (vv. 12a.16a), and “his father or mother” (vv. 15a.17a).

### Two specifications of the first crime (vv. 13-14)

An obvious syntactic distinction is evident within this unit of four laws from the use of verbs. Whereas in the four laws the protasis has the participle (vv. 12-17), in a small unit of vv. 13-14 the verbs are in the finite forms<sup>8</sup>. This grammatical form distinguishes these verses very well not only from the four neighbouring laws (vv. 12.15-17), but also from the whole unity of all legal sentences of the casuistic laws – *mishpatim* (21:1–22:16). More precisely, in vv. 13-14 the protasis has the verb in the *qal* (v. 13a, צָדָה) or *yiqtol* (v. 14a, יָזַד), while the apodosis has the decisive verb in *yiqtol* (v. 13d, יָנוּס; v. 14b, תִּקְחֶנּוּ)<sup>9</sup>.

וְאִשֶּׁר לֹא צָדָה	13a	But if he did not lie in wait for him,
וְהָאֱלֹהִים אָנָּה לְיָדוֹ	13b	but God let him fall into his hand,
וְשִׁמְתִי לָךְ מְקוֹם	13c	then I will appoint for you a place
אֲשֶׁר יָנוּס שָׁמָּה: ס	13d	to which he may flee.
וְכִי־יִזַּד אִישׁ עַל־רֵעֵהוּ לְהָרְגוֹ	14a	But if a man willfully attacks another to kill him
בְּעָרְמָה		by cunning,
מֵעַם מִזְבְּחֵי תִקְחֶנּוּ לְמוֹת: ס	14b	you shall take him from my altar, that he may die.

Most importantly, vv. 13-14 attract our attention in terms of content, because they develop the theme of the previous law (v. 12) that is not the case in the other three laws (vv. 15-17). Indeed, they can provide a specific careful distinction for the first law with the capital punishment. The first law deals with the case of the “free Israelites with all the rights of free citizens”<sup>10</sup>. As proposed by Francesco Cocco, the crime occurs in the context of “the peaceful co-existence of the ‘covenant community’”<sup>11</sup>; in the daily life in which the people interact

<sup>8</sup> Biblical quotations are taken mostly from the English Standard Version.

<sup>9</sup> For the issue of vv. 13-14 as later additions, see e.g. OTTO, *Wandel*, 31-32; SCHWIENHORST-SCHÖNBERGER, *Bundesbuch*, 38-41; or COCCO, *Torah*, 121-122, 132.

<sup>10</sup> HOUTMAN, *Exodus 20–40*, 132.

<sup>11</sup> COCCO, *Torah*, 116.

within a variety of the situations. But the two further stipulations recognize that not all homicides are equal. The stipulations distinguish between accidental homicide (v. 13) and premeditated (murder) (v. 14). If the manslaughter happened in a moment of anger, or under other substantial exterior influence on the killer, he may be granted safety in a place **מִקוּם** of asylum (v. 13). However, asylum was not granted to the killer in full possession of his faculties, giving an example of personal gain or vengeance (v. 14)<sup>12</sup>.

Two other regulations, one from Num 35 and another from Deut 19, elaborate much on the issue of the asylum law from Exod 21:12-14 in different way. Let us list only some improvement. First, the cultic place (altar) is substituted by the urban place – city. Second, they extend the description of intentionality of both the killer and the accidental homicide. Third, major importance is given on the process of discernment.

## 1.2 Deut 19:1-13

The law of asylum (Deut 19:1-13) that replaced the old law of the altar asylum (Exod 21:13)<sup>13</sup>, indicates urban places as a protected area and also specifies the executor. In the first part (Deut 19:1-10) the executor of the punishment is “the avenger of blood” **גֹּאֵל הַדָּם** (v. 6, cf. v. 12), while in the second part (vv. 11-13) there are “the elders of the city” **זִקְנֵי הָעִיר** (v. 12) who will deliver the intentional murderer to the avenger. But the way capital punishment is carried out is not made explicit in this regulation.

### The outline of Deut 19:1-13

The passage starts with a theological *introduction* (v. 1) followed by the command to set apart *three asylum cities* so that any manslayer can flee to them (vv. 2-3). Then there is an explanatory case of the *accidental* (**בְּבִלְי־דַעַת**)<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Cf. HOUTMAN, *Exodus 20–40*, 133. For more on reconceptualization of **מִקוּם** in Deuteronomy 19:1-13, see STACKERT, *Rewriting*, 49-57.

<sup>13</sup> STACKERT, *Why Does Deuteronomy*, 24-49; STACKERT, *Rewriting*, 38-49, has pointed to strong literary connections between these laws and argues that Exod 21:12-14 serves as the main source for Deut 19:1-13.

<sup>14</sup> The expression **בְּבִלְי־דַעַת** occurs five times in the MT, out of which four deal with our issue (Deut 4:42; 19:4; Josh 20:3.5) and one in Job 35:16 “Job opens his mouth in empty talk / he multiplies words without knowledge.” The translation “unknowingly”, “unwittingly” (cf. CHRISTENSEN, *Deuteronomy 1-21*, 422) has the basic aim to distinguish it from the synonymous “unintentionally”.

*manslayer* (vv. 4-7), which also discusses the possibility of his unjust execution. (This part occupies 1/3 of the whole passage.) In verses 8-10 another theological note envisions a future *enlargement* of the territory and thus also *three new asylum cities*. The last part of the regulations (vv. 11-12) involves the (long) protasis with an explanatory case of the (intentional) *murderer* (v. 11) and in the apodosis of v. 12 there is a regulation how the murderer shall be treated – *eliminated*. The final verse of the pericope (v. 13) *encourages* the audiences (cf. the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sg) not to have pity on the murderer and to purge the guilt of innocent blood.

### The role of the authorities in the process (v. 12)

The authorities are involved in the execution process only in v. 12. The three propositions describe the elders from the murderer’s city who act.

- וְשָׁלְחוּ זִקְנֵי עִירוֹ 12a then the elders of his city shall send  
 וְלָקְחוּ אֹתוֹ מִשָּׁם 12b and take him from there,  
 וְנָתַנּוּ אֹתוֹ בְּיַד גֹּאֵל הַדָּם 12c and hand him over to the avenger of blood,  
 וְנָמַת׃ 12d so that he may die.

First, the elders of the murderer’s city send (וְשָׁלְחוּ) emissaries to the asylum city, who take the murderer (וְלָקְחוּ אֹתוֹ) and hand him over (וְנָתַנּוּ אֹתוֹ) to the avenger, who acts accordingly. Thus only v. 12 presents an authoritative decision of “the elders” from the murderer’s city (זִקְנֵי עִירוֹ, v. 12a) on how the murderer shall be brought back and handed over to the executor – avenger.

However, there is no description about any specific discussion on how the murderer should be proven guilty. Only a final decision of the elders from the home city of the murderer is presented. It is also clear that the murderer had escaped previously to “one of these cities” (אֶל-אַחַת הָעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה, cf. v. 11) of refuge and that the juridical deliberation of the elders of the murderer’s city is binding for the asylum city.

### 1.3 Num 35:9-34

Num 35 consists of two distinct prescriptions. The first is short and concerns 48 cities with the land for the Levites (35:1-8). The second, which is

much longer prescribes the designation of the six<sup>15</sup> cities of asylum (vv. 9-34)<sup>16</sup>. It is commonly accepted that Num 35:9-34 is a (late) priestly composition<sup>17</sup>. It is a code of law regulating different forms of murder that have broad social, religious and economic implications for our understanding of post-exilic society. Num 35:9-34 provides significant information on the subject of biblical criminal law and according to Cocco, it reflects a clearly identifiable phase in its development<sup>18</sup>.

This regulation on the asylum cities in Num 35:9-34 may be divided into four parts. After the presentation of the cities of refuge (vv. 9-15), the distinction between the murderer and an unintentional manslayer is presented (vv. 16-23). The third part presents the procedures with the unintentional manslayer (vv. 24-29) and the last part closes the unit with the religious justification of the penalty (vv. 30-34).

#### The outline of Num 35:9-34

The pericope on the asylum cities opens with the instructions regarding setting up the *cities of refuge for the unintentional* manslayer (vv. 9-15). After the introduction of the divine instruction (vv. 9-10b), God through Moses instructs the people about six cities of refuge (vv. 10c-15), which shall protect only the “unintended” manslaughter (רִצְחָה [vv. 11.12] and כָּל־מִמְדָּה־נֶפֶשׁ [v. 15]). The word בְּשִׁגְגָה “inadvertently”<sup>19</sup> encompasses this part (vv. 11c.15b).

The second part (vv. 16-23) is a detailed description that, via fictive examples, instructs how to *distinguish* between the *premeditated* murder (six

<sup>15</sup> According to BARMASH, *Homicide*, 84, “[t]he precise number of cities of refuge is therefore generated by the Priestly law’s theological numerology”.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. KNIERIM – COATS, *Numbers*, 325-327; COCCO, *Torah*, 45-50. However, the two texts are linked through the two related topics. First, because the six cities of asylum are taken from those 48 Levitical cities (v. 6) and second, because, in both the idea that the Levites have a special role is present, as Dozeman suggests, because their divine possession has the ability to protect Israel and its land from the danger of divine wrath. Cf. DOZEMAN, *Numbers*, 263; SEEBASS, *Numeri 22,2–36,13*, 426-427.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. ROFÉ, *History*, 205-239; RUWE, *Das Zusammenwirken*, 209-218; cf. McKEATING, *Development*, 54-55; BUDD, *Numbers*, 382; LEVINE, *Numbers 21–36*, 547; SCHMIDT, *Numeri 10,11-36,13*, 217; SEEBASS, *Numeri 22,2–36,13*, 427.

<sup>18</sup> COCCO, *Torah*, 52-158.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. LEVINE, *Numbers 21–36*, 554; ASHLEY, *Numbers (2022)*, 581. The word can be rendered by the expression “by mistake”, as the example of Lev 22:14 suggests: “And if anyone eats of a holy thing *unintentionally* (יֵאָכֵל קֹדֶשׁ בְּשִׁגְגָה), he shall add the fifth of its value to it and give the holy thing to the priest.”

examples in vv. 16-18 [(1) with an iron object, (2) with a stone tool, (3) with a wooden tool].20-21[(4) out of hatred בְּשִׂנְאָה, (5) with malicious intent בְּצָדִיָּה, (6) in enmity בְּאַיִבָּה] and the unintentional *accidental* homicide (six cases in vv. 22-23 [(7) suddenly בְּפִתְעָא, (8) without enmity בְּלֹא־אַיִבָּה, (9) without malicious intent בְּלֹא צָדִיָּה, (10) without seeing בְּלֹא רְאוּת, (11) not (being) his enemy לֹא־אוֹיֵב לוֹ, (12) not seeking him harm וְלֹא מְבַקֵּשׁ רָעָתוֹ]).

The third part (vv. 24-29) deals with the *necessary procedures* of “the congregation” הָעֵדָה regarding the case of unintentional manslayer destined to the asylum city (vv. 24-25). Then special attention is given to the permanent stay of the manslayer in the city of refuge (vv. 26-29). If he leaves the city before the death of the high priest who is actually in the office, the avenger may kill the manslayer (v. 27).

The last part, *the religious justification of the penalty* (vv. 30-34), opens another problem in v. 30 – that of witnesses. The next two verses (vv. 31-32) deal with the two cases of unacceptable bribery. Similarly, the last two verses (vv. 33-34) present a new issue of *the theological perspective* by which the unity is closed, and which seeks to spare the murderer from a revenge of blood undertaken privately and without the community’s involvement.

### The role of the authorities (vv. 12b.24-25)

There are at least two explicit mentions (vv. 12b.24-25), in which some procedure of the authorities on the manslayer’s status may be established. In v. 12 there is first evidence that הָעֵדָה “the congregation” shall give the judgment (לְמִשְׁפָּט) regarding the accused killer. Indeed, הָעֵדָה conveys a juridical role. Although the term הָעֵדָה represents a juridical body, it cannot include any major group, but, as Pamela Barmash argues, it can here “apply to a small local court, not a central assembly”<sup>20</sup>.

וְהָיוּ לָכֶם הָעָרִים לְמִקְלָט מִגֹּאֵל 12a The cities shall be for you a refuge from the avenger,  
וְלֹא יָמוּת הָרָצֵחַ 12b that the manslayer may not die  
עַד־עֲמֹדוֹ לִפְנֵי הָעֵדָה לְמִשְׁפָּט: 12c until he stands before the congregation for judgment.

Most probably it is not this whole court, but its chiefs who hold the executive power over the manslayer. According to Barmash, “Numbers 35 is the only reference to the judicial function of the עֵדָה” and all other cases of עֵדָה in

<sup>20</sup> BARMASH, *Homicide*, 89.

the Hebrew Bible do not exercise any similar role<sup>21</sup>. From the text itself it is not clear where the seat of this “congregation” is, though one may assume that it will be in the manslayer’s city (cf. Deut 19:12).

In vv. 24-25 there is another explicit reference to הַעֲדָה, which represents a juridical authority, and which offers more details about its executive obligations than v. 12.

- וְשִׁפְטוּ הַעֲדָה בֵּין הַמִּכָּה 24a ... then **the congregation shall judge** between the  
וּבֵין גֹּאֵל הַדָּם manslayer and the avenger of blood,  
עַל הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים הָאֵלֶּה: 24b in accordance with these rules,  
וְהִצִּילוּ הַעֲדָה אֶת-הַרֹצֵחַ 25a and **the congregation shall rescue** the manslayer  
מִיַּד גֹּאֵל הַדָּם from the hand of the avenger of blood,  
וְהִשִּׁיבוּ אֹתוֹ הַעֲדָה 25b and **the congregation shall restore** him  
אֶל-עִיר מְקֻלָּטוֹ to his city of refuge  
אֲשֶׁר-נָס שָׁמָּה 25c to which he had fled.

וַיֵּשֶׁב בָּהּ עַד-מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל 25d And he shall live in it until the death of the high priest

אֲשֶׁר-רָמַשְׁח אֹתוֹ בְּשֶׁמֶן הַקֹּדֶשׁ: 25e who was anointed with the holy oil.

Whereas in the preceding verses 22-23 that form a long protasis of a case regarding the innocent manslayer is described, in verses 24-25c that form an apodosis, the judgment is passed. The הַעֲדָה decides on the basis of הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים הָאֵלֶּה “these rules” (v. 24), which is a reference to the previous regulations in vv. 22-23. The congregation’s decision was binding both for the “avenger of blood” and for “the manslayer” (v. 25a), which proves that the congregation’s juridical authority was respected. Moreover, also the executive authority of הַעֲדָה is equally respected since it lets the innocent manslayer “bring back” (וְהִשִּׁיבוּ) to the asylum city and lets him stay there till the death of the high priest (v. 25b-d).

In the first three juxtaposed sentences in the apodosis there is one and the same subject הַעֲדָה “the congregation”, repeated with each of the three different verbs “judge” (וְשִׁפְטוּ, v. 25a), “rescue” (וְהִצִּילוּ, v. 25b) and “restore” (וְהִשִּׁיבוּ, v. 25b). The emphasis on “the congregation” is evident and each action must be taken by it, and not by any other authority. It appears clear from the congregation’s last action (וְהִשִּׁיבוּ) that this executive authority came not from the asylum city, but either from the city of the origin of the killer, or killed person, or perhaps of the place of killing. Indeed, the case may be examined by (the

<sup>21</sup> BARMASH, *Homicide*, 89.

congregation of) the people who might know and examine the circumstances of the (unintentional) killing. Then, the manslayer, on the other hand, must have first escaped from the place of the killing and must have stayed in the asylum city (cf. vv. 11-12) before he was to be taken back to the congregation for judgment.

Thus, this explicit reference to the juridical authority in vv. 24-25 supports the view that before the innocent manslayer be *officially* accepted into the asylum city (i.e. his second entry), its case must be examined in the city to which the killing is directly related. Although the manslayer must have previously escaped to the asylum city, there is not any reference to the examination of manslayer’s case at the first entry to the asylum city. It is clear that the congregation makes a final decision that is obligatory for both parties.

Somehow passive in this juridical process is the authority of the high priest (v. 25), whose death has nonetheless a binding consequence for the manslayer’s stay in the city of refuge. When the high priest dies<sup>22</sup>, the manslayer is free to leave the asylum city. Though the overall meaning of the phrase is not very clear, it does not have an important impact on our issue.

#### ***1.4 Comparison of the Authorities’ Involvement***

When the two texts Num 35 and Deut 19 are compared regarding how they treat the juridical authority, the differences reveal some improvement of the priestly text over against the Deuteronomic tradition. Or more precisely the comparison indicates the shift of interest from one text to another. The method of examining the intentionality of the crime, which must have been important for the juridical body, is simpler in Deuteronomy (19:4d-5.[6].11) than in Numbers (35:16-18[19].20-21d.[21ef].22-23). Numbers 35 witnesses to the qualitative

---

<sup>22</sup> There have been several proposals made to explain the meaning of this sentence. The explanation of the expiatory death of the high priest (KEIL – DELITZSCH, *Commentar. I,2*, 394-395; MERZ, *Die Blutrache*, 132; NICOLSKY, *Das Asylrecht*, 168-171; recently ASHLEY, *Numbers [2022]*, 583-584) enjoys great popularity (more than 100 years). BARMASH, *Homicide*, 103, argues for an expiatory role of the high priest for the others on the basis of two texts – Lev 4:13-21 and Exod 28:36-38 – and then concludes that “[a]ccording to Numbers 35, after the high priest’s death, the accidental murderer is no longer pursued by גֹּאֵל הַדָּם, because the expiatory death of the high priest is accepted by גֹּאֵל הַדָּם.” However, there is also a contrasting opinion on this issue, e. g. STASZAK, *Die Asylstädte*, 296. According to GASS, *Asyl*, 37-41, who presents different possibilities, the time limit is not interpreted internally in the Bible, and this blank space cannot be explained anyway.



development of the instructions for the investigation. There is also a difference in the authorities' designation in the city of refuge – “the elders” of the manslayer's city in Deut 19:12 are substituted by “the congregation” in Num 35. Though “the elders” might be included in the latter “congregation”, vice versa is hardly possible. Moreover, there is also a difference in the authorities' actions. The elders' involvement includes actions like “to send”, “to take” and “to hand over” (Deut 19:12), whereas the congregation's involvement comprises actions like “to judge”, “to rescue” and “to restore” (Num 35:24-25). Also interesting is the difference of authorities' decision regarding the movement of the manslayer: whereas the elders command the killer to come back to the home city and be handed over to the avenger; the congregation, conversely, judge the manslayer innocent and hand him over back to the city of refuge. But this decision depends more on the intentionality of the manslayer than on the reasoning of the authorities. Moreover, the congregation's engagement in Num 35 is described more in detail and is presented both with juridical terminology and executive authority, whereas Deut 19 simply presupposes mainly the juridical authority of the elders. It is important to note that none of the two texts deals with the process of acceptance of the manslayer at his first entry into the city of refuge.

## 2 The Role of the Authorities in MT Josh 20

In Josh 20, the LORD commands Joshua to designate the cities of refuge and Joshua shall do it in accordance with the God's previous commands given to Moses (vv. 1-2). First and foremost, this first reference of the LORD is clearly to the pericope Num 35:9-34. There is also another evident reference of Josh 20:4.5 which is Deut 19:5.6. Basically, the short text of Josh 20 is a combination of both Pentateuchal passages. This fact created a general tendency among the scholars to understand Josh 20 as a composition depending on the parallel Pentateuchal texts<sup>23</sup>.

First, we present the outline of Josh 20:1-9 and then due attention will be given to the speech of the LORD (vv. 2-6) where the role of the authorities is significant.

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. NOTH, *Josua* [1938], 95-97; NOTH, *Josua* [1953], 123-124, 127. (Interestingly, in his later commentary to the Book of Numbers [Noth, *Numeri*, 218-219], Noth considered Num 35 as later than Josh 20); CORTESE, *Josua 13-21*, 79-80; VAN DER KOOIJ, *Zum Verhältnis*, 190; RUWE, *Das Zusammenwirken*, 218-220.

## 2.1 The Outline of Josh 20:1-9

The chapter begins with a short *introduction* of the divine discourse (v. 1), followed by a relatively long *speech of the LORD* (vv. 2-6) after which there is a brief report on the *implementation* of divine instructions (vv. 7-8). The *conclusion* (v. 9) follows.

*Introduction* (v. 1). It is useful to note that out of 100 cases of the phrase  $\text{וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל}$  “and the LORD spoke to” 97<sup>24</sup> are in the Pentateuch (15 × Exod; 35 × Lev; 44 × Num; 3 × Deut) only one is in Josh (20:1)<sup>25</sup> and two are in Chronicles (1 Chr 21:9; 2 Chr 33:10). Moreover, as Ederer noted, both the *speaking* of God thematised in Josh 20:1 and the *commission* to Joshua to pass on God’s speech to the Israelites (v. 2) are formulated with the verb  $\text{דָּבַר} + \text{אֶל}$  “to speak to” (cf. Table 1), which connotes a sovereign-authoritative speaking or proclaiming<sup>26</sup>. Moreover, the command  $\text{דָּבַר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  “Speak to the people of Israel”, is always preceded by the standardized phrase  $\text{וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל}$  – addressed by the LORD either to Moses (23 times)<sup>27</sup>, or to Moses and Aaron (3 times)<sup>28</sup> or once to Joshua alone in our case 20:1-2a. Needless to recall that Joshua is here paralleled to Moses. Thus, the analogy of Joshua “the mediator of revelation” with Moses is evident and for our case of the divine speech it is of unique importance within the Book of Joshua<sup>29</sup>.

*Speech of the LORD* (vv. 2-6). The speech of the LORD is important for our research, in which the role of the authorities appears. First, God orders Joshua

<sup>24</sup> In most of the cases the Lord speaks to ( $\text{וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל}$ ) Moses, eight times he speaks to both Moses and Aaron (Lev 11:1; 13:1; 14:33; 15:1; Num 2:1; 4:1.17; 16:20) and once he speaks to Aaron alone (Num 18:1). In 1 Chr 21:9 the Lord spoke to David’s seer Gad and in 2 Chr 33:10 to Manasseh and his people.

<sup>25</sup> However, one shall distinguish our case 20:1a from all other five cases in the Book of Joshua, where the phraseology occurs in a relative clause  $\text{וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל} + \text{אֶל}$  (Josh 4:8; 11:23; 14:6; 21:45; 23:15) that refers to multiple previous addresses of the LORD either to Moses, Joshua or to the people. In other words, it is not on the main narrative line.

<sup>26</sup> EDERER, *Josua*, 281.

<sup>27</sup> 23 times in Pentateuch: 2 × in Exod (14:1-2; 25:1-2); 12 × in Lev (1:1[! וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל]-2; 4:1-2; 7:22-23.28-29; 12:1-2; 18:1-2; 23:1-2.9-10.23-24.33-34; 25:1-2; 27:1-2); 9 × in Num (5:5-6.11-12; 6:1-2; 9:9-10; 15:1-2.17-18; 17:16-17; 33:50-51; 35:9-10). In three cases the introduction is done by  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר}$  (Exod 14:15-16; 31:12-13; Num 15:37-38).

<sup>28</sup> Three times in Lev 11:1-2; 15:1-2 and Num 19:1-2.

<sup>29</sup> The discussion in rabbinic source *b. Mak* 11a is interesting regarding the emphatic importance of the verb  $\text{דָּבַר}$  in vv. 1-2. LAZARUS, *Makkoth*, 70.

to speak about the cities of refuge (vv. 2-3) and then he addresses the issue of procedure: how to protect the unintentional killer (vv. 4-6).

In vv. 7-8 there is a brief report on the *implementation* of divine instructions on the consecration of the six cities of refuge (vv. 7-8). In the *conclusion* of v. 9, the narrator emphasises that the role of the cities of refuge is crucial *before* the official trial takes place in front of the community in the city of the killing (cf. 9b: **וְלֹא יָמוּת בַּיַּד גֹּאֵל הַדָּם עַד-עֲמֻדוֹ לְפָנַי הָעֵדָה**).

### 2.2 *Speech of the LORD (vv. 2-6)*

Vv. 2-3. A closer look at the LORD’s speech will show the special role of the authorities in the whole process of investigation. Regarding *the cities of refuge* (vv. 2-3), God recalls that this topic is not new since he spoke about it already through Moses (v. 2bc). The reference to Num 35:9-11 hints of a possible reference of Josh 20:2c to Num 35:9, but most of all the reference is more evident from the topic, the vocabulary and word-by-word phraseology (cf. the text in bold in Table 1). Moreover, in the following v. 3, the LORD explains promptly the purpose of this instruction and presents the protective function of the cities. They “shall be” (וְהָיוּ) a refuge for the asylum seeker from the avenger (v. 3bc). Thus, also the theme of the unintentional manslayer is introduced.

Table 1: Josh 20:1-3 compared to Num 35:9-11

Num 35:10-11	Josh 20:1-3
9 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל-מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר:	1a וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לֵאמֹר:
10a דַּבֵּר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	2a דַּבֵּר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר
10b וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם	
10c כִּי אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים אֶת-הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרְצָה כְּנָעַן:	
11a וְהִקְרִיתֶם לָכֶם עָרִים	2b תִּגְנוּ לָכֶם אֶת-עָרֵי הַמְּקֹלֵט
11b עָרֵי מְקֹלֵט תִּהְיֶינָה לָכֶם	
	2c אֲשֶׁר-דִּבַּרְתִּי אֵלֵיכֶם בְּיַד-מֹשֶׁה:
11c וְנָס שָׂמָה רֹצֵחַ	3a לְנוֹס שָׂמָה רֹצֵחַ
11d מִכֶּה-נֶפֶשׁ בְּשִׁגְגָה:	3b מִכֶּה-נֶפֶשׁ בְּשִׁגְגָה בְּבַלִּי-דָעַת
12a וְהָיוּ לָכֶם הָעָרִים לְמְקֹלֵט מִגֹּאֵל	3c וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְמְקֹלֵט מִגֹּאֵל הַדָּם:
12b <sup>1</sup> וְלֹא יָמוּת הָרֹצֵחַ	

Vv. 4-5. Then in v. 4 the LORD explains *the acceptance process*. It consists of six important steps, described in the chain of the six *w<sup>e</sup>qatal* sentences (וַנִּס, וְעָמַד, וַדְּבַר, וַאֲסָפוּ, וַנִּשֵּׁב, וַנִּתְּנוּ, וַאֲסָפוּ, וַדְּבַר, וְעָמַד; see the Table 2) which are in temporal succession of the previous *w<sup>e</sup>qatal* וְהָיוּ of v. 3c. They present the six future actions – the six subsequent procedural steps of the investigation of the innocent manslayer (cf. v. 3b). In four of these actions the subject is the manslayer (v. 4a-c.f), and in two the “elders” (v. 4de). However, all sentences except the first reflect the role of the authorities. In fact, in the first step the scene is set up with the manslayer fleeing from the avenger to “one of these cities” (v. 4a)<sup>30</sup>.

Table 2: Josh 20:3b.4-5 compared to Deut 19:4d.5.6

Deut 19:4d.5.6	Josh 20:3b.4-5
אֲשֶׁר יָכָה אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ בְּבַלְיַדְעַת 4d...	מִכֹּה־נִפְשׁ בְּשִׁנְגָה בְּבַלְיַדְעַת 3b...
הוא יָנוּס אֶל־אַחַת הָעָרִים־הָאֵלֶּה 5f	וְנָס אֶל־אַחַת מִהָעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה 4a   1.
	וְעָמַד פֶּתַח שַׁעַר הָעִיר 4b   2.
	וַדְּבַר בְּאָזְנוֹי זְקֵנֵי־הָעִיר הֵיחָא אֶת־דְּבָרָיו 4c   3.
	וַאֲסָפוּ אֹתוֹ הָעִירָה אֵלֵיהֶם 4d   4.
	וַנִּתְּנוּ־לוֹ מְקוֹם 4e   5.
וְחָי: 5g	וַיֵּשֶׁב עִמָּם: 4f   6.
פָּן־יִרְדֹּף גֹּאֵל הַדָּם אַחֲרָי הָרֹצֵחַ 6a	וְכִי יִרְדֹּף גֹּאֵל הַדָּם אַחֲרָיו 5a
כִּי־יִחַם לָבֹו וְהִשִּׁיגוּ 6bc	וְלֹא־יִסְגְּרוּ אֶת־הָרֹצֵחַ בְּיָדוֹ 5b
	כִּי בְּבַלְיַדְעַת הִכָּה אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ 5c
כִּי לֹא שָׂנֵא הוּא לוֹ מִתְּמוּל שְׁלֹשׁוֹם: 6g	וְלֹא־שָׂנֵא הוּא לוֹ מִתְּמוּל שְׁלֹשׁוֹם: 5d

In the second step, the manslayer is stopped at “the city gate” (v. 4b). There is evident contrast between his frenetic “fleeing” (נוס) in v. 4a (see the parallel text Deut 19:5-6) and his static “standing” (עמד) in v. 4b. The reader is also stopped to realise that the asylum seeker may not enter the city without any preliminary inquiry (see note 30). However, both the “standing” position of the

<sup>30</sup> It is not clear if in case the elders did not accept him, he could try to go to another city. The possibility of a second try remains implicit and may reveal the genuineness of the scrutiny of the elders. However, more acceptable is the idea that the elders would have accepted him into the city of refuge since this is only a first and preliminary precautionary procedure to stop the spilling of more innocent blood until the second and decisive process has taken place.

asylum seeker and the place at “the gate of the city” (שַׁעַר הָעִיר) allude to a juridical decision. Thus, the admission of the manslayer has a character of a legal procedure<sup>31</sup>. Indeed, it may have taken some time (otherwise not specified) to gather the competent authorities for the inquiry. The third step is crucial for asylum seeker who must present his case in front of the gathered elders (v. 4c). The phrase “to speak in the ears of...” דַּבֵּר + בְּאָזְנֵי occurs 25 times in MT<sup>32</sup> and it puts emphasis on the hearing of the receiver of the message (cf. *DCH* 2 [1995], 392). When in these cases the direct object “a word” דְּבָרִים/דָּבָר “word(s)”<sup>33</sup> also occurs, then the emphasis is on the content of the speech too. Thus, it is clear that the manslayer’s *case* (דְּבָרָיו) is carefully listened to by the elders. Indeed, in the next step the decision follows. The elders’ decision is made obvious from their action – they have accepted the manslayer into their city (v. 4d). They rely only on the manslayer’s testimony according to which he struck his neighbour “unwittingly” בְּבִלְיִדְעָתָא (cf. v. 5c). Therefore, they will not hand the manslayer over into the hands of the avenger (cf. v. 5ab). This line of thought is similar to Deut 19:4-6.10, where the presumption of innocence is the key factor for the asylum seeker (cf. vv. 4b.5f). The fifth step addresses the practical issues of the lodging of the manslayer (Josh 20:4e). Indeed, the elder’s decision must be put into action. Again, the authority of the elders has a crucial role – they will (have to) provide “a place” מְקוֹם where the manslayer may stay within the city<sup>34</sup>. The sixth and last step closes the acceptance process – the fugitive can live “with them” (v. 4f: עִמָּם).

The following sentence of v. 5a suspends the chain of *w<sup>e</sup>qatals* of v. 4, because it introduces a special circumstance of the possible persecution by the avenger. The threat of the avenger serves to emphasise the elders keeping save the manslayer in the place they gave him to live – they will not deliver him to the avenger (וְלֹא־יִסְגְּרוּ; v. 5b), since according to their inquiry he caused the death “unwittingly” (v. 5c) and thus he is innocent. For the sake of clarity, we coin this first sojourn of the manslayer in the city as an *early stay*.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. EDERER, *Josua*, 283.

<sup>32</sup> Gen 20:8; 23:13.16; 44:18; 50:4; Exod 11:2; Num 14:28; Deut 5:1; 31:28.30; 32:44; Josh 20:4; Judg 9:2.3; 1 Sam 8:21; 11:4; 18:23; 25:24; 2 Sam 3:19.19; 2 Kings 18:26; Is 36:11; Jer 26:15; 28:7; Prov 23:9.

<sup>33</sup> Gen 20:8; 44:18; Deut 31:28.30; 32:44; Josh 20:4; Judg 9:3; 1 Sam 8:21; 18:23; Jer 26:15.

<sup>34</sup> According to EDERER, *Josua*, 283, the noun מְקוֹם refers to Exod 21:13c and symbolizes protection. GASS, *Asyl*, 32-33, differentiates more possibilities.

The *formal novelty* of the acceptance process is more evident when vv. 4-5 are compared with its source in Deut 19. As Table 2 shows there is similar or identical phraseology (text in bold) in some sentences between Josh 20:3b.4-5 and Deut 19:4.5.6. Both texts deal with one who strikes “unwittingly” (Josh 20:3b.5bc // Deut 19:4d), flees to one of these cities (Josh 20:4a // Deut 19:5f), stays there alive (Josh 20:4f // Deut 19:5g), since the persecuting avenger did not reach him (Josh 20:5a // Deut 19:6c). Once more the innocence of the manslayer is declared (Josh 20:5d // Deut 19:6g). Interestingly, the detailed description of the acceptance process analysed above (Josh 20:4b-e) has no other parallel in Deut 19 than the act of fleeing (v. 4b: **אֲשֶׁר-יָנוּס שָׁמָּה**, v. 5f: **הוּא יָנוּס אֶל-אַחַת** **הָעָרִים-הָאֵלֶּה**, v. 11f: **וְיָנוּס אֶל-אַחַת הָעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה**), however, without any inquiry before the entry in the asylum city. Moreover, the authority mentioned are only the elders from the manslayer’s city (v. 12).

V. 6. The *w<sup>e</sup>qatal* of v. 6a is a resumption from v. 4f, but it adds some key information about the manslayer’s *early stay* (see Table 3). The manslayer may live only within “that city” (v. 6a<sup>1</sup>), i.e. the city where he escaped (cf. Num 35:25) and only up to certain moment – until the final judgment, which will decide on his future (v. 6a<sup>2</sup>)<sup>35</sup>. Moreover, it is a different authority that comes into play – “the congregation”<sup>36</sup> **לְמַשְׁפָּט הַקְּעָדָה** that will gather for the “judgment” **לְמַשְׁפָּט**. While in v. 4 the intentionality of the killer was scrutinised by the elders, in v. 6 it is the congregation that must examine the circumstances of the killing in order to pass judgment<sup>37</sup>. Naturally, the congregation must consist of the people who have

<sup>35</sup> ROFÉ, Joshua 20, 138, argues for the dependence of Josh 20:6 on Num 35:25.28.

<sup>36</sup> As GASS, *Asyl*, 35-36 argues, the **הַקְּעָדָה** can hardly be the whole of Israel, for practical reasons, but rather it is a local assembly, a communal assembly; cf. BARMASH, *Homicide*, 89. According to STASZAK, *Die Asylstädte*, 290-292, it is a national assembly, whereas LEVINE, *Numbers 21–36*, 555, understands it as the assembly, which is representing the entire Israelite community.

<sup>37</sup> Scholars often assume that v. 6 creates tensions with v. 4, precisely because they believe that it is one judicial process involving two different authorities, which is difficult to reconcile, e.g. ROFÉ, Joshua 20, 136: “It is the former clause (v. 6a<sub>2</sub>), calling for a redundant second trial, which brings verses 4-5 and 6 into conflict...”; GÖRG, *Josua*, 89-90; STACKERT, *Rewriting*, 97: “Verse 6 presumably adds a second step in the manslayer’s adjudication... This second level of judgment is redundant and thus unnecessary, for v. 5 clarifies that, once admitted, the manslayer may live in the refuge city under its protection”; DIETRICH, *Asyl*, 75; KNAUF, *Josua*, 171; Interestingly, though GASS, *Asyl*, 62, notes the tension, on page 65 he explains that the institution of the “elders” at the gate area was introduced in v. 4 – those who exercised judicial functions and apparently initiated... preliminary examination at the gate thus introducing a new element.

more information on the murder, i.e. the congregation is most probably from the city of origin of the manslayer (as the two words “his city” עירו and “his house” ביתו suggest; v. 6d; cf. Num 35:24-25.28)<sup>38</sup> or of the person killed<sup>39</sup>. Thus, the case of the manslayer will be closed (in his presence; cf. Num 35:25b) by the final judgment of the congregation to which the killing circumstance must be well-known. When the congregation judges the manslayer innocent (indeed the text speaks about the innocent manslayer), it does not however mean that the manslayer will be released from the city of refuge. Vice versa, he will have to return to the city of refuge (cf. Num 35:25b) once again for his *second stay* there, this time not of his own will, but by the authority of the congregation. And he will have to sojourn there until the death of the incumbent high priest (v. 6a<sup>3</sup>-b). This time limit comes from Num 34:12.28, as can be seen from the parallel texts (in bold in Num) in the Table 3. Thus clearly, the judgment of the congregation marks the beginning of the second stay on if the innocent manslayer in the city of refuge and the death of the high priest marks the end of his stay. The two dates placed side by side, actually complement each other harmoniously<sup>40</sup>.

Table 3: Josh 20:6 compared to Num 35:25.12.28

Num 35:25.12.28	Josh 20:6
25d וַיֵּשֶׁב בָּהּ עַד־מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדֹל	6a <sup>1</sup> וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּעִיר הַהִיא
12b <sup>1</sup> עַד־עָמְדוֹ לִפְנֵי הָעֵדָה לְמִשְׁפָּט:	6a <sup>2</sup> עַד־עָמְדוֹ לִפְנֵי הָעֵדָה לְמִשְׁפָּט
28a <sup>1</sup> כִּי בְּעִיר מִקְלָטוֹ יֵשֶׁב	
28a <sup>2</sup> עַד־מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדֹל	6a <sup>3</sup> עַד־מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל
28b <sup>1</sup> וְאַחֲרֵי מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדֹל	6b אֲשֶׁר יְהִי בַיָּמִים הָהֵם
28b <sup>2</sup> יָשׁוּב הָרֹצֵחַ	6c אֶז יָשׁוּב הָרֹצֵחַ
אֶל־אֶרֶץ אַחֲזָתוֹ:	6d וּבֹא אֶל־עִירוֹ וְאֶל־בֵּיתוֹ אֶל־הָעִיר
	6e אֲשֶׁר־נָס מִשָּׁם:

The reference to the final judgment and to the length of the manslayer’s *second stay* in the city of refuge is made in v. 6a. It is very short when compared to its source parallel in Num 35:24-25. Indeed, in the LORD’s speech the

<sup>38</sup> Cf. STACKERT, *Rewriting*, 110, n. 206.

<sup>39</sup> NIELSEN, *Deuteronomium*, 189, thinks of Jerusalem because of the word הָעֵדָה.

<sup>40</sup> Thus, the conjecture of HOLZINGER, *Josua*, 1901, 86, that the two dates differ grammatically and factually, repeated by many after him, may not be as persuasive an argument as it seems.

emphasis is on the first examination performed by the elders (cf. Josh 20:4-5), which is of primary importance in this passage.

### **The role of the authorities (vv. 4-6)**

The six steps mentioned above present a rather elaborate acceptance process in the city of refuge (v. 4). The activity of the elders over against the manslayer can be summarised by these actions: they “gather”, carefully “listen” to him, “decide” to accept him, “provide” a safe lodging for him and “share” with him the living conditions. Thus v. 4 gives some procedural indications on how to receive into the city of refuge the manslayer who killed the person “unwittingly” (v. 5c). By a different way, Andreas Ruwe arrived at a similar conclusion on the improvement of asylum protection<sup>41</sup>.

However, this whole procedure of the elders is to be distinguished from the final judgment of the congregation, which will take place later and in the manslayer’s city. While the elders decide on the *early stay* of the manslayer in the city of refuge until the moment of the judgment of the community (v. 6a<sup>2</sup>), the congregation will make a final judgment about the manslayer’s *second stay* in the city of refuge which will end with the death of the high priest (v. 6a<sup>3</sup>). Thus v. 4 elaborates carefully on the Deuteronomic tradition to protect a member of the community and presents the innovative steps that confer on the elders some limited executive power<sup>42</sup>, that extends only to their city and its inhabitants. This innovation of the first hearing in public (at the gate) executed by the elders is a first part of the two-stage juridical process.

## **3 Different Viewpoints on the Unintentionality**

Though Josh 20 is a significantly reduced version of the two Pentateuchal parallels, there are two words, important for the issue of intentionality, which are curiously repeated twice (see Table 4). The first *בְּשֵׁנֶינָהּ* comes from Num 35:10-11 and the second *בְּבִלְי־דָעַת* comes from Deut 19:4-6 (see above). Their disposition in Josh 20 suggests that the idea of intentionality plays an important role in the passage.

<sup>41</sup> RUWE, *Das Zusammenwirken*, 220.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. WAGNER, *Beobachtungen II*, 562, calls the function of the elders notarial, in that they receive the asylum seeker’s declaration; and executive, in that they regulate their living conditions in their city.



Table 4: *בְּשִׁגָּה* and *בְּבִלְי־דַעַת* in *Josh 20*

The LORD' speech (vv. 2-6):	v. 3a	<i>בְּבִלְי־דַעַת</i> <i>בְּשִׁגָּה</i> <i>לְנוֹס שָׁמָּה רוֹצֵחַ מִכֶּה־נֶפֶשׁ</i>
	v. 5c	<i>כִּי בְּבִלְי־דַעַת</i> <i>הִכָּה אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ</i>
Narrator's conclusion (v. 9):	v. 9a	<i>לְנוֹס שָׁמָּה כָּל־מִכֶּה־נֶפֶשׁ בְּשִׁגָּה</i>

The issue of the intentionality of the manslayer in Num 35:9-34 and Deut 19:1-13 has been studied by Eliezer Hadad. He compared the theme in the two texts and argued that the differences between the two texts come from different internal logic of each pericope. Behind each text there are different ideological presuppositions: whereas the flight to the city of refuge in Numbers prevents the implementation of the death sentence, in Deuteronomy the flight to the city of refuge is to ensure the implementation of regulation on the cities of refuge. Indeed, Numbers assumes that the essential punishment of the unintentional manslayer is death. Deuteronomy, on the other hand, works with the opposite assumption, namely that the suspected killer had acted “unwittingly”, and thus he is innocent. Thus, if anyone would kill him, he spills innocent blood<sup>43</sup>. Whereas in Numbers the cities of refuge commute (!) that death sentence, in Deuteronomy they prevent the execution of the unintentional manslayer<sup>44</sup>. Another difference presented by Hadad is that in Deuteronomy the city of refuge protects any manslayer based on the presumption of innocence, but in Numbers the assembly must judge between the murderer and the avenger and thus the unintentional killer will be saved by restoring him to the city<sup>45</sup>. Interesting also is the observation that, while Numbers focuses on the actions, Deuteronomy focuses on the intention. Therefore, in Numbers examination of the physical contact of the body and the object of the blow is examined in order to establish the (un)intentionality of the manslayer. For Deuteronomy, on the other hand, the facts alone are not sufficient for establishing the bad intention, but the factual circumstances may prove that there was no intention to kill, and that the killing happened through an unwitting deed<sup>46</sup>. Meanwhile Deuteronomy protects the innocent. What matters in Numbers is the blood of the victim of unintentional manslaughter, which defiles the land where the LORD dwells. But the law

<sup>43</sup> HADAD, Unintentionally, 156-157.

<sup>44</sup> HADAD, Unintentionally, 158-159.

<sup>45</sup> HADAD, Unintentionally, 160.

<sup>46</sup> HADAD, Unintentionally, 160-163.

permits commuting the original sentence of the unintentional manslayer to exile in a city of refuge<sup>47</sup>. What seems clear is that Num 35:9-34 presupposes the cities of refuges as a given fact and is preoccupied much more with the process of the identification of the killing made “intentionally” or otherwise (בְּשִׁגָּגָה). Deut 19:1-13 on the other side, is preoccupied with the establishment of the cities of refuge but the manslayer’s killing is basically presupposed as having been done “unwittingly” בְּבִלְי־דַעַת. This contextual usage of the two words may shed some light also in their meaning in Josh 20, as if the two above mentioned logic were put there one beside the other. Indeed, the issue of unintentional killing is noticeably repeated in Josh 20. However, the unequal repetition of the two words may be better understood from the different viewpoints on the issue of the (un)intentionality of the manslayer.

The first instance of the two words בְּשִׁגָּגָה and בְּבִלְי־דַעַת is interesting. They are put side by side as seemingly synonymous. The couple occurs in the introductory words of the LORD in v. 3a in which the establishment of the cities of refuges (עָרֵי הַמְּקֹלֵט, לְמִקְלֵט, vv. 2b.3b) is at stake. Thus, the cities are destined to accept only those manslayers whose killing has been done both בְּשִׁגָּגָה “unintentionally” and בְּבִלְי־דַעַת “unwittingly”. Apparently the first word is more precise than the second, because as Cocco suggests, it “describes inadvertence and not simply error”<sup>48</sup>, where the second indicate lack of knowledge and sufficient awareness. Thus, the juxtaposition of the words must have some meaning; it may reflect two different perspectives. The first word “unintentionally” represents a perspective of Num 35, where the process of the detection of the manslayer’s was more detailed and in which emphasis was given to an objective assessment of intent. This first perspective takes more facts into account and is reminiscent of the final decision of “the congregation” of the manslayer’s city. The second word “unwittingly” reflects a perspective of Deut 19 that considers primarily the personal testimony of the manslayer and assumes his innocence, considered as such by the elders of his city. Furthermore, this occurrence is more akin to the perspective of the “elders” of the city of refuge who tend to protect the manslayer.

The second occurrence of the word בְּבִלְי־דַעַת “unwittingly” in Josh 20:5 reflects the situation of the initial interrogation process of the elders in the city

<sup>47</sup> HADAD, Unintentionally, 165-166.

<sup>48</sup> COCCO, *Torah*, 155.

of refuge (v. 4). They appropriate the manslayer's self-defence and therefore their goal is first of all the initial protection of the fugitive from the persecution of the avenger (v. 6). Thus, the notion of "unwittingly" links the initial process of interrogation in the city of refuge with the final process in the manslayer's city according to the two versions, in which the killing was labelled as unintentional (in Num) and unwitting (in Deut). Moreover, the motive of unwittingness supports a differentiated two-stage judicial process.

The second occurrence of the word *בְּשִׁגָּגָה* "unintentionally" is in the final narrator's statement (v. 9), again emphasising both the protective purpose of the city of refuge and the unintentional killing of the manslayer. However, both the word "unintentionally" and the time span "until he will stand before the congregation" allude to the final judgment of the congregation in the city of the manslayer. In other words, the final decision of the congregation of the manslayer's city must have the obligatory effect on both the manslayer and the avenger.

In sum, the two words *בְּשִׁגָּגָה* and *בְּבִלְי־דַעַת* may witness to the careful merging process of the two Pentateuchal traditions in Josh 20. Whereas the first Deuteronomic *בְּבִלְי־דַעַת* "unwittingly" is recalling the asylum seeker's status as having committed the act "without knowledge" (Deut 19:4), the second word *בְּשִׁגָּגָה* "unintentionally" witnesses to the more thorough process of inquiry performed by the congregation (Num 35:24-28). The Deuteronomic "unwittingly" reflects the situation at the entry to the city of refuge, whereas the other word "unintentionally" reflects the situation of the judgment of the community in the manslayer's city. Josh 20:4-5 on the other hand makes clear emphasis on the first hearing performed by the elders of the asylum city, that marks the beginning of the early stay in the city of refuge.

Joshua 20 innovates the tradition about the asylum seeker by making a clear distinction between the two periods of stay – the first period is marked by a first hearing by the elders, while the second period begins with the judgment of the community. The two independent authorities deal with the same case at two different times and places, and yet, both establish the stay of the innocent manslayer in the city of refuge. While the elders set the early stay of the asylum seeker "until he will stand before the congregation for judgment", the congregation of the manslayer's city on the other hand will decide on the second stay in the asylum city "until the death of the high priest". Thus, the double hearing process might be a further development of the earlier traditions present

in Deut 19, and advanced in Num 35. Just as Num 35 has a more developed hearing process of the congregation with deeper reasoning on the cause of killing over against the first in Deut 19, so Josh 20:4-5 established more detailed hearing process<sup>49</sup> of the asylum seeker in the asylum cities over against both Pentateuchal texts. By putting emphasis on the first hearing process in the asylum city, the double hearing process is established. The elders in the asylum city are the first instance, whereas the congregation of the manslayer’s city are the second and final instance to pass the judgment. The length of stay of the manslayer in the asylum city does not come from the decision of any of the two authorities, but from the unpredictable death of the high priest, as it has been established in Numbers.

#### 4 Recontextualizing the Law

Our intention to detect the role of the authorities in the judiciary process of the innocent manslayer has shown, that the acceptance process of the asylum seeker in Josh 20:4-5 has been an *innovation* elaborated by the composer of the MT Josh 20. The introduction of v. 1 and the introductory words of the LORD (v. 2) clearly indicate a special status of Joshua as the mediator of revelation. The aim must have been to emphasise the new content of the LORD’s speech. Indeed, as we have seen, the asylum cities mentioned in v. 3 are not novel, as it reflects Num 35:11c-12a. Rather vv. 4-5 appears to be a novelty regarding the prescription of the cities of refuge. Ruwe has also proposed that v. 4 presents a formalisation of the admission process and that it improves asylum protection, since Josh 20, when compared to Num 35, gives the full status of residence even to the stranger<sup>50</sup>. Verse 6 does not add any important novelty on the issue of the authorities, which were not mentioned in Num 35.

Let us turn for the moment to the *difference* between the MT and LXX of the Book of Joshua, which preoccupies the scholars of the history of the text variants of Joshua. Regarding the case of Josh 20, LXX is substantially shorter (cf. Table 5). For our case the most important fact is that vv. 4-5 are missing in LXX completely; and from v. 6 there is only a temporal indication of the juridical

---

<sup>49</sup> GASS, *Asyl*, 31, too understands this procedure as “das Gespräch am Toreingang” [the conversation at the entrance to the gate], which is actually “[die] erste[n] Untersuchung durch die Ältesten” [the first investigation by the elders].

<sup>50</sup> RUWE, *Das Zusammenwirken*, 220.

process (v. 6a<sup>2</sup>) in both MT and LXX<sup>51</sup>. Moreover, the rest of v. 6 is taken from Num 35 almost word by word (see above), only the last v. 6e is a reverse version of Num 35:25c, thus letting the innocent eventually return happily home. Since the issue of the authorities is what matters for our paper and it occurs in a significant plus of vv. 4-5, the Greek text is silent on the issue. Some scholars are led to argue for a *Vorlage* different from the MT. While the MT is attested relatively well by the Targum, Peshitta and Vulgate, LXX Josh represents a slightly different text that is witness to a different edition. Emanuel Tov speaks of the three kinds of differences of the Greek text of Joshua: a shorter text, significant additions or different sequence (of verses)<sup>52</sup>. Therefore he (alongside with the others like Auld, Rofé, Mazor) suggests that “two different literary strata are involved”, with LXX representing most probably the older textual phase<sup>53</sup>.

Table 5: Comparison of MT Josh 20:2-7 with the Greek version

Josh 20:3b.4-5.6.7a	LXX 20:3.7a
לְנוֹס שָׁמָּה רוּצַח 3a	φυγαδευτήριον τῷ φονευτῇ
מִכֶּה־נִפְשׁ בְּשִׁנְגָה בְּבַל־יַדְעַת 3b	τῷ πατάξαντι ψυχὴν ἀκουσίως,
וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְמִקְלָט 3c <sup>1</sup>	καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν αἱ πόλεις φυγαδευτήριον,
–	καὶ οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται ὁ φονευτῆς
מִגְּאֹל הַדָּם: 3c <sup>2</sup>	ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγχιστεύοντος τὸ αἷμα,
4	–
5	–
וַיֹּשֶׁב בְּעִיר הַהִיא 6a <sup>1</sup>	– [cf. Num 35:25d]
עַד־עֲמֹדוֹ לִפְנֵי הָעֵדָה לְמִשְׁפָּט 6a <sup>2</sup>	ἕως ἂν καταστῇ ἐναντίον τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰς κρίσιν.
עַד־מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל 6a <sup>3</sup>	– [cf. Num 35:28a <sup>2</sup> ]
אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה בֵּימֵי הַהֵם 6b	– [cf. Num 35:28b <sup>1</sup> ]
אִז יָשׁוּב הָרוּצַח 6c	– [cf. Num 35:28b <sup>2a</sup> : יָשׁוּב הָרוּצַח]
וּבֹא אֶל־עִירוֹ וְאֶל־בֵּיתוֹ אֶל־הָעִיר 6d	– [cf. Num 35:28b <sup>2b</sup> : וְיָשׁוּב אֶל־עִירוֹ]
אֲשֶׁר־נָס שָׁמָּה: 6e	– [cf. Num 35:25c: שָׁמָּה]
וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ אֶת־קֹדֶשׁ בְּגָלִיל... 7a	καὶ διέστειλεν τὴν Καδης ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ...

<sup>51</sup> Cf. AULD, *Joshua*, 202.

<sup>52</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism* (2001), 328-332.

<sup>53</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism* (2001), 327. See also Tov, *Writing*, 119-124.

Arie van der Kooij argues that on the basis of the assumption that the Greek translation is to be regarded as fairly literal, it is highly uncertain to attribute the differences to the translator. Rather, they are evidence of a different Hebrew model<sup>54</sup>. Yet, as Michaël N. van der Meer puts it, chapter 20 “continues to be a cornerstone in theories about the overlap between text-critical and redaction-critical data”<sup>55</sup>. Indeed, as Gass summarised, the most diverse conceptions of literary criticism on 20:4-6 have been developed and no one option is beyond doubt<sup>56</sup>.

Years ago Alexander Rofé argued that the pluses in MT Josh 20:4-6 are secondary in terms of literary criticism<sup>57</sup>. Our proposal of the special acceptance process guided by the elders in Josh 20:4-5, may corroborate that the challenging discrepancy between the Hebrew and shorter Greek versions is due to the later extension of the MT. We propose to understand this elaboration of the Hebrew text as a kind of recontextualization of the law of the protection of the innocent manslayer. By recontextualization we mean the amendment of regulations considering the new and growing societal need for a more rigorous inquiry into the innocence of manslaughterers. For some reason or other, the authority of the elders in the city of refuge became more important in Josh 20 than in the other Pentateuchal parallels. More precisely, they were inserted anew in Josh 20. Though the elders of the manslayer’s city in Deut 19:12 were substituted in Num 35:12.24-25 by the congregation, attested also in Josh 20:6, there must have been an important reason to reintroduce “the elders” back into Josh 20:4. Indeed, since the permanent authority of the elders does not seem to diminish in the Second temple period<sup>58</sup>, the case of their comeback in Josh 20 witness to their great importance. The reason is simple. An innocent man’s life and his protection are at stake.

When James W. Watts explored the usage and the development of the legislative Pentateuchal legal texts, he argued that the laws that are intended for public reading not only emphasized instruction and persuasion, but that their repetition also had an impact on the very formation of these laws. He remarked

---

<sup>54</sup> VAN DER KOOIJ, *Zum Verhältnis*, 188.

<sup>55</sup> MEER, *Joshua*, 80.

<sup>56</sup> GASS, *Asyl*, 61-63.

<sup>57</sup> ROFÉ, *Joshua* 20, 131-147. SCHMIDT, *Leviten- und Asylstädte*, 104-113 and COCCO, *Torah*, 153-158, argue for the priority of the MT over the LXX. For the further discussion see GASS, *Asyl*, 26-29.

<sup>58</sup> According to GERTZ, *Die Gerichtsorganisation*, 231-233, the importance of the elders was increasing in the post-monarchic period.

that there is greater concern with the law regarding homicide than with the breaking of the Sabbath<sup>59</sup>. Such a close attention given to the asylum law bears witness to the primary importance given to the protection of the innocent manslayer. This legislative preoccupation of the asylum seeker might reflect the well rooted underlying tradition of the unconditional protection of life that was present in some casuistic laws of lesser importance (Exod 21:18-19), as recently argued by Eckart Otto<sup>60</sup>. Therefore, we consider the development of the acceptance process in Josh 20:4-5 as concomitant to the development of the absolute value of human life for which protections must have been the actual working of supreme authorities.

## Conclusion

The discussion in the Babylonian Talmud on the issue of the legal status of the city of refuge depends on the presence of the elders (*b. Mak* 10b). According to the opinion of R. Eleazar and R. Assi, the elders were an essential requisite in the ordinance of the city of refuge (cf. Josh 20:4). However, R. Ammi argued that it was merely a statement of what was required generally<sup>61</sup>. Seemingly, the absence of the elders in the city of refuge in parallel Torah texts was the reason of R. Ammi's argumentation<sup>62</sup>.

However, we can conclude that the innovation of Josh 20 over the other texts of the Pentateuch presents some interesting facts. For the first time it is the elders who have an important judicial role in the cities of refuge, consisting of several elements. The elders gather and carefully and publicly listen to the asylum seeker. Once recognising him as innocent, they together decide to accept him into the city; they provide a safe lodging for him and let him share the full status of a city resident. Moreover, Josh 20 is the first place where the protection of the innocent murderer is secured by a two-stage interrogation process with one final judgment by the congregation. From the obvious emphasis on the role of the elders in vv. 4-5 in the admission process, it seems that Josh 20, more than resolving the protocol of admission, presents the seriousness and importance of the authority of elders in the process.

---

<sup>59</sup> WATTS, *Reading Law*, 68.

<sup>60</sup> OTTO, *Der Lebensschutz*, 1-13.

<sup>61</sup> LAZARUS, *Makkoth*, 69.

<sup>62</sup> See also the reasoning of R. Judah and other rabbis in *b. Mak* 11a on the importance of the appointment of the cities of refuge "as being an ordinance in the Torah"; LAZARUS, *Makkoth*, 70.

## Bibliography

- ASHLEY, Timothy R.: *The Book of Numbers* (NICOT), Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2022.
- AULD, A. Graeme: *Joshua: Jesus, Son of Nauē, in the Codex Vaticanus* (SEPT), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005.
- BARMASH, Pamela: *Homicide in the Biblical World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- BUDD, Philip J.: *Numbers* (WBC 5), Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984.
- CHRISTENSEN, Duane L.: *Deuteronomy 1:11–21:9* (WBC 6A), Nashville, TN: Nelson, 2001.
- COCCO, Francesco: *The Torah as a Place of Refuge: Biblical Criminal Law and the Book of Numbers* (FAT II.84), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- CORTESE, Enzo: *Josua 13–21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (OBO 94), Freiburg-Schweiz – Göttingen: Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- DIETRICH, Christine: *Asyl. Vergleichende Untersuchung zu einer Rechtsinstitution im Alten Israel und seiner Umwelt* (BWANT 182), Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2008.
- DOZEMAN, Thomas B.: *The Book of Numbers. Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. In: *NIB 2* (1998) 1-268.
- EDERER, Matthias: *Das Buch Josua* (NSK.AT), Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2017.
- GASS, Erasmus: *Asyl, Leviten und ein Altar. Eine literarhistorische Analyse von Josua 20–22* (FAT 144), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.
- GERTZ, Jan Christian: *Die Gerichtsorganisation Israels im deuteronomischen Gesetz*, (FRLANT 165), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- GÖRG, Manfred: *Josua* (NEB.AT 26), Würzburg: Echter, 1991.
- HADAD, Eliezer: “Unintentionally” (Numbers 35:11) and “Unwittingly” (Deuteronomy 19:4): Two Aspects of the Cities of Refuge, *AJSR* 41/1 (2017) 155-173.
- HOLZINGER, Heinrich: *Das Buch Josua* (KHC 6), Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1901.
- HOUTMAN, Cornelis: *Exodus. Volume 3: Chapters 20–40* (HCOT), Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- KEIL, Carl Friedrich – DELITZSCH, Franz: *Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Mose's: I, 2. Leviticus, Numeri und Deuteronomium*, Helsingfors: Dörffling und Franke, 1870.
- KISLEV, Itamar: *The Cities of Refuge Law in Numbers 35:9-34: A Study of Its Sources, Textual Unity and Relationship to Deuteronomy 19:1-13*, *ZAR* 26 (2020) 249-263.
- KNAUF, Ernst Axel: *Josua* (ZBK 6), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008.
- KNIERIM, Rolf P. – COATS, George W.: *Numbers* (FOTL IV), Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2005.
- VAN DER KOOIJ, Arie: *Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele*. In: John Adney Emerton (ed.): *Congress Volume – Cambridge 1995* (VTSup 66), Leiden: Brill, 1997, 185-202.



- LAZARUS, H.M.: Makkoth: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices. In: Isidore Epstein (ed.): *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Neziḳin. Vol 4*, London: Soncino, 1935.
- LEVINE, Baruch A.: *Numbers 21–36. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 4A)*, New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- MCKEATING, Henry: The Development of the Law on Homicide in Ancient Israel, *VT* 25/1 (1975) 46-68.
- MEER, Michaël N. van der: Joshua. In: James K. Aitken (ed.): *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London – New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015, 86-101.
- MERZ, Erwin: *Die Blutrache bei den Israeliten (BWAT 20)*, Helsingfors: J.C. Hinrichs, 1916.
- NICOLSKY, Nicolaj M.: Das Asylrecht in Israel, *ZAW* 48 (1930) 146-175.
- NIELSEN, Eduard: *Deuteronomium (HAT I/6)*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- NOTH, Martin: *Das Buch Josua (HAT 7)*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1938.
- NOTH, Martin: *Das Buch Josua (HAT 7)*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), <sup>2</sup>1953.
- NOTH, Martin: *Das vierte Buch Mose. Numeri (ATD 7)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- OTTO, Eckart: *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel: eine Rechtsgeschichte des "Bundesbuches" Ex XX 22-XXIII 13 (StB 3)*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988.
- OTTO, Eckart: *Deuteronomium 1–11. Erster Teilband: 1,1–4,43 (HThKAT 5,1,1)*, Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2012.
- OTTO, Eckart: Der Lebensschutz in Der Rechtsanthropologie Des Kasuistischen Rechts Der Hebräischen Bibel, *Bib* 104/1 (2023) 1-13.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated. In: Jeffrey H. Tigay (ed.): *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 1985, 131-147.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: The History of the Cities of Refuge in Biblical Law. In: Sara Japhet (ed.): *Studies in Bible 1986 (ScrHier 31)*, Jerusalem: University of Pennsylvania, 1986, 205-239.
- RÖSEL, Hartmut N.: *Joshua (HCOT)*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters Publishers & Booksellers, 2011.
- RUWE, Andreas: Das Zusammenwirken von „Gerichtsverhandlung“, „Blutrache“ und „Asyl“: Rechtsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den todesrechtsrelevanten Asylbestimmungen im Hexateuch, *ZAR* 6 (2000) 190-221.
- SCHENKER, Adrian: Die Analyse der Intentionalität im Bundesbuch (Ex 21–23), *ZAR* 4 (1998) 209-217.
- SCHMIDT, Ludwig: Leviten- und Asylstädte in Num. XXXV und Jos. XX; XXI 1-42, *VT* 52/1 (2002) 103-121.
- SCHMIDT, Ludwig: *Das vierte Buch Mose. Numeri 10,11–36,13 (ATD 7/2)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- SCHWIENHORST-SCHÖNBERGER, Ludger: *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie (BZAW 188)*, Berlin – New York: Gruyter, 1990.

- SEEBASS, Horst: *Numeri. 3. Teilband: Numeri 22,2–36,13* (BKAT IV/3), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2007.
- STACKERT, Jeffrey: Why Does Deuteronomy Legislate Cities of Refuge? Asylum in the Covenant Collection (Exodus 21:12-14) and Deuteronomy (19:1-13), *JBL* 125/1 (2006) 23-49.
- STACKERT, Jeffrey: *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- STASZAK, Martin: *Die Asylstädte im Alten Testament. Realität und Fiktivität eines Rechtsinstituts* (ÄAT 65), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- TOV, Emanuel: *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis, MN – Assen: Fortress – Van Gorcum, <sup>2</sup>2001.
- TOV, Emanuel: Writing an Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: A Modern Approach, *StBiSl* 15/2 (2023) 119-126.
- WAGNER, Volker: Beobachtungen am Amt der Ältesten im alttestamentlichen Israel. 2. Teil: Die Kompetenzen und Aufgaben der Ältesten im Rechtsleben und im Kult, *ZAW* 114/4 (2002) 560-576.
- WATTS, James W.: *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch* (BiSe 59), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- WELLHAUSEN, Julius: *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und die historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Berlin: Georg Reimer, <sup>2</sup>1889.

### Summary


The legislative texts that are repeated in the Pentateuch were explored from the perspective of literary and communicative strategy. James W. Watts (1999) suggested that the laws that are intended for public reading not only emphasized instruction and persuasion, but that their repetition also had an impact on the very formation of these laws. Therefore, by examining the hermeneutics of the formation of parallel laws, a refinement of biblical logic can be uncovered. Though Josh 20 is out of the Pentateuchal legislature, nevertheless it is a concrete example of the repetition of the juridical regulations concerning the cities of refuge (Exod 21:12-14; Num 35:9-34; Deut 19:1-13). They have become the subject of research both in redactional studies and literary studies. In Josh 20, the motif of the legal attitude towards the intentional manslayer dominates and our interest will be on the role of the authorities towards him. We compare the roles of the authorities involved in the handling of an innocent manslayer's asylum application in each of the parallel regulations. Though the repeated law in Josh 20 is simpler than the Pentateuchal sources, interestingly the role of the authorities is more elaborated especially in vv. 4-5. Moreover, its Hebrew version is considerably longer than the Greek, suggesting a deliberate compositional innovation that may have arisen because of recontextualization.

*Keywords:* Cities of Refuge, Juridical Authorities, Elders, Re-contextualization, Josh 20:4-5.

*Zhrnutie*

Legislatívne texty, ktoré sa opakujú v Pentateuchu, boli skúmané z hľadiska literárnej a komunikačnej stratégie. James W. Watts (1999) vyslovil domnienku, že zákony, ktoré sú určené na verejné čítanie, nekladú dôraz len na poučovanie a presvedčanie, ale že ich opakovanie malo vplyv aj na samotné formovanie týchto zákonov. Preto skúmaním hermeneutiky tvorby paralelných zákonov možno odhaliť spresnenie biblickej logiky. Joz 20 síce nepatrí do pentateuchálnej legislatívy, ale napriek tomu je konkrétnym príkladom opakovania právnych predpisov týkajúcich sa miest útočiska (Ex 21,12-14; Nm 35,9-34; Dt 19,1-13). Tie sa stali predmetom výskumu tak v redakčno-kritických, ako aj v literárnych štúdiách. V Joz 20 dominuje motív právneho postoja k neúmyselnému vrahovi a náš záujem bude zameraný na úlohu príslušných autorít voči nemu. Porovnáme úlohy autorít, ktoré sa podieľajú na zaobchádzaní so žiadosťou nevinného páchatel'a o azyl vo všetkých paralelných predpisoch. Hoci opakovaný zákon v Joz 20 je jednoduchší ako v pentateuchálnych textoch, zaujímavé je, že úloha autorít je viac rozpracovaná najmä vo vv. 4-5. Navyše, jeho hebrejská verzia je podstatne dlhšia ako grécka, čo nasvedčuje zámernej kompozičnej inovácii, ktorá mohla vzniknúť v dôsledku rekontextualizácie.

*Kľúčové slová:* mestá útočiska, právne orgány, starší, rekontextualizácia, Joz 20,4-5.

Blažej Štrba  
Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave  
Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta  
Samova 12  
949 01 NITRA, Slovakia  
Blazej.Strba@frcth.uniba.sk  
 0000-0002-9244-0630

# ***Ioudaïsmos* through the Lens of Remembering**

Exploration of the Semantic Shift of the Term from  
Maccabees to the Early Second Century CE

*František Ábel*

## **1 Prologomena to the Issue**

It is well-known that from the 1980s onwards, theories of social (collective and cultural) memory have also become more prominent in the field of theological research, especially in biblical research, mainly among New Testament scholars<sup>1</sup>. All these theories are certainly, more or less, helpful<sup>2</sup> since they enable us to understand key biblical phenomena in a more complex and unbiased manner. In other words, the development of crucial theological concepts and phenomena, including their role in the process of creation and the development of the movement of Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-followers<sup>3</sup>, also

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by the Scientific Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic and the Slovak Academy of Sciences (VEGA), as part of the research project entitled “The Early Reception of Paul in the Corpus of New Testament Writings” (VEGA 1/0188/22), with its home base at Comenius University Bratislava, at the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Faculty, as well as the Department of Old and New Testament, Stellenbosch University, South Africa, where the author worked in the position of research fellow. The study is a revised and adapted version of my contribution presented during the EABS annual meeting in Syracuse (2023, 10-13 July), in the Memory, Method and Texts section (Session 2.1.14).

<sup>2</sup> See BUTTICAZ – NORELLI, Introduction, 1-14. Detailed summaries of the current state of research in this regard were produced by Chris Keith in the journal *Early Christianity: KEITH, Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research (Part One)*, 354-376; KEITH, *Social memory Theory and Gospels Research (Part two)*, 517-542. Stated by BUTTICAZ – NORELLI, Introduction, 1 n. 1. Concerning this topic of research, I should mention also the two current works: CIELONTKO – ČAPEK (eds.), *Collective Memory*, and HATINA – LUKEŠ (eds.), *Social Memory Theory*.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, KIRK – THATCHER (eds.), *Memory, Tradition, and Text*; THATCHER (ed.), *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text*; THATCHER (ed.), *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism*. As SCHWARTZ, *Where There’s Smoke*, 10-11, broadly explains, the ‘social memory’ theorists in the field of New Testament research observe “four dimensions of memory that have been distinguished: (1) the past as it actually was; (2) «history,» which

including substantial shifts within intra-Jewish dialogue, either directly or indirectly confronted with the Christ-movement, developed the basis of the so-called Rabbinic Judaism.

Nevertheless, as I mentioned in my former paper focusing on the remembering in regards to the eucharistic tradition in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians<sup>4</sup>, "the application of memory studies suffers from terminological ambiguity and the failure to distinguish between different concepts, which refer to different processes in the theoretical discussion". For example, North American scholars who engage in *memory studies* usually use the term social memory for all phenomena, ignoring any distinction within, while some European scholars, such as Maurice Halbwachs, Aleida and Jan Assmann, or Sandra Huebenthal, offer differences between social, collective, and cultural memory<sup>5</sup>. On the other side, however, I am convinced that the significance and relevance, as well as the research benefits of any kind of hermeneutic approach to ancient texts and writings of biblical and deuterocanonical literature, should not be evaluated only on the basis of differences in regards to or nonuniformity within methodologies. Therefore, in my opinion, *memory studies* are, besides traditional methods of historical-critical exegesis<sup>6</sup>, an equally relevant and

---

refers to linear representations of the past that take the form of oral and written narratives; (3) «commemoration,» whose symbols lift from the historical narrative those parts that best express society's ideals; and (4) social memory—how individuals, in the aggregate, think and feel about the past.”

<sup>4</sup> ÁBEL, Remembering, 84.

<sup>5</sup> For extensive discussions and voluminous existing outcomes of the categories and models of social, collective, and cultural memory theory, see, in more detail, HUEBENTHAL, 'Frozen Moments', 26-29.

<sup>6</sup> This includes 1) historical analysis: text criticism, form criticism, and redaction criticism; 2) rhetorical analysis: social scientific reconstruction of the author's and audience's situations as part and parcel of historical and cultural analysis of the Graeco-Roman world; and theological interpretation taking into consideration all these details. As JEWETT, *Romans*, 1, emphasizes concerning the historical-critical reconstruction: "Historical reconstruction is an essential dimension of interpretation." See in more detail JEWETT, *Romans*, 1-91. See also KRENTZ, *The Historical-Critical Method*, 33-88; ZIMMERMANN, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre*, 17-49, 77-84, 125-178, 215-237; RIEDLINGER – STRASBURGER – REVENTLOW et al., *Die historisch-kritische Methode*, 54-71; TUCKETT, *Reading the New Testament*, 41-187; BROWN, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3-47; BRANICK, *Understanding the New Testament*, 5-19; SÖDING – MÜNCH, *Wege der Schriftauslegung*, 16-80; 221-304; MARGUERAT – COMBET-GALLAND – CUVILLIER et al., *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, 139-158; EHRMAN, *The New Testament*, 13-15; 260-275; EBNER – HEININGER, *Exegese des Neuen Testaments*, 1-24, 157-165, 205-218, 325-345, 347-359; DESILVA, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 219-226, 258-266, 370-377, 438-444, 463-471, 477-479, 508-517, 531-

important method of approaching and working with biblical and non-biblical texts and scriptures, especially for focusing, among others, on the social identity theory inquiring into aspects of the identity of an individual deriving from belonging to a group or community<sup>7</sup>. As Sandra Huebenthal aptly remarks regarding the New Testament writings:

Reading New Testament texts through the lens of social memory theory is the attempt to understand how identity is shaped and how texts provide frames for future processes of identity construction. As regards methods, this reading attitude implies the need to accept that it is impossible to say how the events recalled and interpreted in these texts actually took place. Such a reading rather provides insights into the current situation of a commemoration community (“Erinnerungsgemeinschaft”) and its processes of identity construction. New Testament texts allow us to witness how particular commemoration communities made sense of the founding events and their impact.<sup>8</sup>

In any event, regardless of specific opinions and stances, it should be especially emphasized when engaging with early Christian traditions that the difference between *social* and *cultural* memory partially disappears, since there was the necessity to transform the various subjective memories of the first Jesus associates into steady and fixed verbal and written formulas aiming, in this regard, to construct the identity of future Christ-followers.

The interpretative and semantic shifts are also observable in particular terms, which later became essential and significant for the social and religious identity formations on both sides—nascent Rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity: synagogue, church, heresy, and, among others, also the term *Ioudaïsmos*. In Christian non-Jewish circles, from the second century CE on, this term – also including its cognates (especially the term *ioudaïzein*)—was

---

534, 578-585, 629-630, 703-713, 800-805, 831-838, 858-860, 879-881, 908-911; HOLLADAY, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, 16-24, 39-57, 227-240, 263-281, 348-360. For criticism of the historical-critical approach, including so-called “Practical Realism”, see APPLEBY – HUNT – JACOB, *Telling the Truth about History*, 11. Stated by JEWETT, *Romans*, 1, n. 1, 3.

<sup>7</sup> Among recent scholars who are applying the methodology of the Social Identity Theory in biblical research, especially concerning Paul and his message, it is necessary to highlight especially William S. Campbell. See especially his three recent works CAMPBELL, *Romans*; CAMPBELL, *The Nations in the Divine Economy*; CAMPBELL, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*.

<sup>8</sup> HUEBENTHAL, ‘Frozen Moments’, 41. See in more detail HUEBENTHAL, ‘Frozen Moments’, 32-43.

traditionally understood and interpreted ecclesiastically as a reference to Judaism, contrary to early Christianity, and thus mainly in a negative (religious) connotation.

Due to the above-mentioned conceptual ambiguity in the memory studies, I want to refrain from engaging in the specifics of—and related differences of opinion contained in theories of social, collective, and cultural memories<sup>9</sup>—and rather focus on the reception history in this paper using the more appropriate term memory, or remembering—in terms of the meaning of the ability of someone, a group of people, or a community to recall past events, and recollect these significant moments with some rhetorical intent. This approach is much more significant, since within the development of the Jewish traditions, memory and faith are interconnected and represent its basic and typical character<sup>10</sup>. Considering all these aspects, I will focus on the conceptualization of the term *Ioudaïsmos*, from the Maccabean period, through Paul the Apostle, up to its use by Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch of Syria at the beginning of the second century CE, since his story is one particular example of the changing times, and his letters provide us with a rare opportunity to focus on the early reception of Jewishness after the Jewish War in the first century CE (66–70 CE). First, I focus briefly on all the occurrences of this term in Jewish literature, including Paul’s message, taking into consideration the current findings regarding its historical-critical analysis that can help us better understand the hermeneutical differences we are noticing in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch. Finally, I look at the findings through the lens of one particular example of remembering theories presented by Barry Schwartz, focusing on the reception history concerning this term, and trying to understand contextually, within the development of the social identity

---

<sup>9</sup> In this connection, it is necessary to mention the research and work of sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, and the sociologist Barry Schwartz. Very useful for the methodology of this approach to the topic is the above-mentioned collective monograph SCHWARTZ (ed.): *Memory and Identity*. See in more detail BUTTICAZ – NORELLI, Introduction, 1-14; HUEBENTHAL, ‘Frozen Moments’, 17-43.

<sup>10</sup> As Simon Butticaż and Enrico Norelli have aptly remarked on this interdependency, “memory is not merely a valuable tool for describing and analysing how the past was shaped to construct a common identity in the present [...] It is also a semantic category with significant theological implications and intrinsic to the self-conception of the groups under investigation.” (BUTTICAZ – NORELLI, Introduction, 10-11.) See also BARTON – STUCKENBRUCK – WOLD (eds.), *Memory*. In this regard, DAHL, *Jesus in the Memory*, 13, has stated: “The God of Israel was a God who acted and manifested himself in history. That is why the memory of his work of salvation and his commandments had a fundamental importance in the religion of Israel.” Stated by BUTTICAZ – NORELLI, Introduction, 11, n. 45.

of the early Christian movement, the influence of remembering on the semantic shifts concerning this term. All this should help us to answer the question—although still aware that it is almost unfeasible—of why later, after the Jewish War and onward, this term becomes associated with mostly a sense of negatively characterizing and labeling Jewish people in Christian religious and theological perspectives. Due to the limited space of one paper, I will not employ thorough exegesis of the selected texts, nor engage in a detailed review and evaluation of all interpretative options concerning this term and its cognates.

## 2 *Ioudaïsmos*: Conceptualization of the Term in the Historical Context

As is known concerning the term *Ioudaïsmos* (Ἰουδαϊσμός), it is a very rare term found in ancient Jewish literature, occurring only four times in 2 Maccabees (2:21; 8:1; 14:38[2×]), once in its literary imitator 4 Maccabees (4:26), and in the New Testament corpus twice in Galatians (1:13, 14). From the later Roman period, there are two other known occurrences of the term, both in the inscriptions. The first (*CIJ* 537) is found in the funerary inscription from the third or fourth century CE for a woman from Porto (near Rome). The second (*CIJ* 694) is the synagogue benefaction inscription from the third century CE from Stobi in Macedonia<sup>11</sup>. In the early second century CE, this term is found in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (*Ign. Magn.* 8.1; 10.3 [2×]; *Ign. Phld.* 6.1), however, there is also its opposite, the word *Christianismos* (Χριστιανισμός; *Ign. Magn.* 10.1, 3[2×]; *Ign. Rom.* 3.3; *Ign. Phld.* 6.1), most probably being his own neoplasm (if not, then learned of it in Antioch)<sup>12</sup>.

Concerning Galatians, Marcion of Sinope similarly read this term as a conflict between two religions—Christianity and Judaism—as Matthew Novenson remarks, “but he takes the further step of inferring a conflict between two opposing gods”<sup>13</sup>. Although Tertullian rejects Marcion’s ditheism, in this

<sup>11</sup> Both inscriptions are described in FREY (ed.), *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, vol. 1, 398, 504-507.

<sup>12</sup> See COHEN, *Judaism*, 397. There is a high probability of neologism created by Ignatius himself since this word is first attested just in his letters (*Ign. Phld.* 6.1; *Ign. Magn.* 10.1, 3; *Ign. Rom.* 3.3). A little bit later, this word is attested in *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (*Mart. Pol.* 10.1).

<sup>13</sup> NOVENSON, *Paul’s Former Occupation in Ioudaïsmos*, 26. Novenson here refers to Marcion, *Antitheses*, as reconstructed by HARNACK, *Marcion*, 53-63 (cf. Tertullian,



interpretation Galatians is characterized as: “The epistle which we also allow to be the most decisive against Judaism [*Judaismus*] is that wherein the apostle instructs the Galatians” (Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.2)<sup>14</sup>. From the paradigmatic semantic shift of this term, it is clear that it had to refer to the developing non-Jewish Christian identity forming a definite opinion on the Jewish symbolic world and transmitting Paul, the Hellenistic Jew of the first century CE, into the abstract symbolic world of the rising early Christian church. Recent knowledge about the possible sense of this term, as well as other cognates (especially the term *ioudaizein* [ἰουδαΐζειν]) in contemporary Jewishness, including Paul’s message, would help us also to understand better, at least hypothetically, Ignatius’ understanding of the term, and in this manner its later influence and role in the process of forming the new “religious” identity of the non-Jewish Jesus Christ movement, especially in the regions of Asia Minor<sup>15</sup>.

This term, usually translated as “Judaism” and mainly understood in terms of religion, which characterizes the beliefs, religious traditions, and practices of Jewish people, in opposition to Christian religious traditions. However, this understanding is historically misleading and thus incorrect. The reason is, as Daniel Boyarin aptly explains, is that “there is no word in premodern Jewish parlance that means ‘Judaism.’”<sup>16</sup> Similarly, other scholars besides those mentioned above also argue this point, such as Shaye J. D. Cohen, Steve Mason, Matthew Novenson, and others<sup>17</sup>. Therefore, looking at the occurrences of this term within the Second Temple period, we should change this traditional “Christian” opinion and stance to its semantics<sup>18</sup>.

---

*Against Marcion*, book 4). In this regard, see also MOLL, *The Arch-heretic Marcion*, 84-89, 107-115. Stated by NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaismos*, 26-27, n. 14.

<sup>14</sup> Translated by Peter Holmes in: ROBERTS – DONALDSON (eds.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3. Stated by NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaismos*, 26-27, n. 15.

<sup>15</sup> In this regard, see especially MASON, *Jews*, 457-512; MASON, *Josephus*, 141-184; MURRAY, *Playing a Jewish Game*, 3-7; BOYARIN, *Rethinking Jewish Christianity*, 7-36. In regard to Paul’s message, see especially NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaismos*, 24-39; FREDRIKSEN, *Judaism*, 235-260.

<sup>16</sup> BOYARIN, *Rethinking Jewish Christianity*, 8.

<sup>17</sup> See footnote 15. See especially chapter 5 of MASON, *Josephus*, 141-184. See also COHEN, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 69-106.

<sup>18</sup> For older traditional interpretations of this term and its cognates see GUTBROD, Ἰουδαϊσμός.

## 2.1 *Ioudaios/Ioudaioi/Ioudaïsmos – From Ethnic-Geographic to Cultural Characterization*

At first, we must begin with the term *Ioudaios* (pl. *Ioudaioi*), the Greek equivalent of Hebrew *Yehudi* (pl. *Yehudim*), which in ethnic-geographic antiquity terms relates to the inhabitants of the land of *Ioudaia* (Hebr. *Yehudah*), similar to the Egyptians, Edomites, Cappadocians, etc.<sup>19</sup> Shaye Cohen argues that all occurrences of the term *Ioudaios* in the period before the middle or end of the second century BCE should be translated “not as ‘Jew,’ a religious term, but as ‘Judaean,’ an ethnic-geographic term”<sup>20</sup>. Application of this term to people who were not ethnic or geographic Judaeans, but who either adhered to the belief in the God of the Judaeans or became Judaeans in a political sense by joining the Judaean state, begins in the second half of the second century BCE. It means that the *Ioudaioi* are members of the Judaean people ethnically, coming from Judaea, their homeland. Using the term *Ioudaios* (Judaean) in the Diaspora means to be a member of the association of those who originally come from the ethnic homeland, regardless of whether they have been born directly in Judaea. None of the characteristics of what it meant to be Judaean/Judaeans, like language, customs, institutions, dress, religious traditions, and so on, are necessarily more important than any other in defining this ethnic-geographic group.

However, what is significant concerning the semantic development of this term, as Cohen aptly remarks, is “that it was only in the Maccabean period that the ethnic-geographic self-definition was supplemented by religious (or ‘cultural’) and political definitions because it was only in this period that the Judaean *ethnos* opened itself to the incorporation of outsiders”<sup>21</sup>. It means that in the Hellenistic period, the term “Judaeans” symbolizes practically all members of Judaean *ethnos* who worship the God of Israel with the sacral center in the Jerusalem temple<sup>22</sup>. At the same time, due to persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, it is becoming increasingly apparent there is a clash between two kinds of ways within the Jewish phenomenon; the ways of the Judaeans and the ways of the Greeks, a process that emerged with two new definitions of *Ioudaios*,

<sup>19</sup> For the characterization of this term, see in more detail BDAG, 478-479.

<sup>20</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 70. In this section, I follow primarily Cohen’s characterization of these issues (69-106).

<sup>21</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 70.

<sup>22</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 105.

as Cohen emphasizes, “that for the first time allowed gentiles the opportunity to join the Judaeans people”<sup>23</sup>.

Thus, now when speaking about *Ioudaioi*, there are two different definitions. The political definition forming a political community that extends citizenship even to those who were not natives, but could become *Ioudaioi*, without changing their ethnicity and retaining much of their religious and cultural traditions. However, as *Ioudaioi*, they declared loyalty to the God of Israel (or Judaeans). As Gruen emphasizes, this political definition is passing away with the end of the Hasmonean empire, “but left behind clear traces in later Jewish reflections on the meaning and process of conversion to Judaism”<sup>24</sup>. The second definition is cultural, and uses the anachronistic term, “religious”. The Judaeans form a cultural (religious) community that can extend membership to nonnatives joining *Ioudaioi* by holding in veneration the God of Israel (Judaeans), whose temple is in Jerusalem. This is the crucial point within the history of Jewish phenomenon concerning the semantic shifts in the term *Ioudaios/Ioudaioi*. As Cohen aptly remarks, “Second Maccabees 6:6 and 9:17, the first witness to this new conception and new terminology, mark an important turning point in the history of the word *Ioudaios* and, indeed, in the history of Judaism”<sup>25</sup>. It is therefore not a coincidence that just in this book, the term *Ioudaïsmos* (2 Macc 2:21; 8:1; 14:38[2×]) appears for the first time, which we should understand and interpret not too narrowly and anachronistically in the sense of religion (Judaism), but rather as an accumulation of all those known attributes and peculiarities, political as well as cultural, of the *Ioudaioi* that make them Jewish in a specific world view and way of life<sup>26</sup>. Cohen himself suggests that the term should be translated rather as “Judaeanness”, not “Judaism”, in contrast to its antonym *Hellēnismos*, characterizing the adoption of foreign (non-Judaeans) Greek ways<sup>27</sup>. Therefore, Second Maccabees is the first literary witness of the use of the terms *Ioudaïsmos* and *Ioudaios* in this new way, in the sense of being a “Jew” ethnically and cultural-religiously as well (ethno-religion)<sup>28</sup>.

---

<sup>23</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 105.

<sup>24</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 105.

<sup>25</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 105.

<sup>26</sup> Or, as COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 106, remarks concerning this term: “It means rather «the aggregate of all those characteristics that make Judaeans Judaeans (or Jews Jewish)»”.

<sup>27</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 106.

<sup>28</sup> COHEN, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 106. For development of these two new definitions of Judaeanness, their origin and connections to the events of the second century

The significant influence of remembering in this process is more than evident. The appearance of the term signifies an important flash in the development of Jewish self-identity. Before focusing on the topic through the lens of remembering, I will make a brief excursus into the historical context of all the above-mentioned occurrences of this term.

### 2.2.1 2 Maccabees

Second Maccabees, as it is generally known, is, behind 1 Maccabees, a very important source of raising the formation and development of Jewish, ethnic, and religious devotion and piety<sup>29</sup>. This book is remarkable also from a formal aspect. According to 2:23, it is a synopsis of the five books of Jason of Cyrene (cf. 2:19-32). It is questionable if it is a synopsis or a brief digest, since its content presentation of the selected events is so compact and coherent, that it points rather to independent work. This book is also the second source for the history of the Oniads<sup>30</sup>. Its content is dealing at length with Onias III, in contrast to 1 Maccabees<sup>31</sup>, describing him in a glamorized way highlighting only his good, not evil. He is characterized as “the benefactor of the city, the protector of his compatriots, and a zealot for the laws” (4:2 [NRSV]; καὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὸν κηδεμόνα τῶν ὁμοεθνῶν καὶ ζηλωτὴν τῶν νόμων ἐπίβουλον τῶν πραγμάτων ἐτόλμα λέγειν). In any case, as John Collins remarks, “2 Maccabees exaggerates the pietistic character of Onias III.”<sup>32</sup> However, this idealized

---

BCE, see in more detail, part 2 and 3, 109-340. See also COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 64-83.

<sup>29</sup> In this regard, especially the second chapter of 1 Maccabees is coming to the fore of the scholars' interest, since, as Blažej Štrba (ŠTRBA, Mattathias as Joshua in 1 Macc 2, 51) aptly remarks: “the second chapter presents the first main figure – the aged Mattathias, father of the five sons.” Concerning this figure, the author, taking into consideration and emphasizing the fact “that Mattathias' final speech (2:48-69) is the longest poetical text in 1 Macc” and focusing on several textual references (syntagms and motifs) to the figure of Joshua in 1 Maccabees 1–2, works with an engaging hypothesis that these references depict Mattathias with the characteristics of Joshua.

<sup>30</sup> See in more detail, COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 77-83. In regard to the prominence which Onias enjoys in 2 Maccabees, some scholars suggested, for example, J. A. Goldstein “that the hypothetical «propagandistic work of Onias IV» served as a source here too”. See GOLDSTEIN, *1 Maccabees*, 58-61, 90; GOLDSTEIN, *The Tales of the Tobiads*, 112-113. Quoted by COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 77, including n. 71.

<sup>31</sup> GOLDSTEIN, *1 Maccabees*, 56-57, argues that the neglect of Onias III in 1 Maccabees and also in Josephus is the result of a pro-Hasmonean tendency.

<sup>32</sup> COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 78.

portrayal of the selected events from the Maccabean revolt serves the author's purposes, provides significant insight into the relation between Jerusalem and the Egyptian Diaspora of that period (the second century BCE).

While 1 Maccabees is a great record of significant historical events from which the audience should recognize that the God of Israel was protecting his people, in this book God's interventions to the benefit of his people are described as multiple heavenly phenomena that solved a seemingly impossible situation. Despite that the sequence of events written down here is the same as in 1 Maccabees 1–7, 2 Maccabees is independent of the first one, and it's debatable whether its author knew 1 Maccabees at all<sup>33</sup>. Nevertheless, comparing these two books in a general sense and a broader context—since the direct comparison is not possible due to the very fact that 2 Maccabees is dealing only with selected parts of the events recorded in 1 Maccabees, which describes them in more detail—there are clear tracks of the influence of the increasing tradition related to the Maccabean movement and its significance for Jewish phenomenon, especially concerning Judaeon complexities. Although this work supporting the Maccabean revolt was written in Greek around the first half of the first century BCE, probably within the circles of Alexandrian Jews and following Hellenistic rhetoric and conventional style, its content deals entirely with events that happened in Palestine. One of the author's main purposes was to clearly support the Greek-speaking Diaspora, as Martin Hengel highlights as well<sup>34</sup>.

In any case, the author's emphasis is on devout life by God's will that is expressed in the Law, an example of which is the piety of Onias III. In other words, observing the laws is bringing the people of God and inhabitants in Jerusalem unbroken peace (2 Macc 3:1). All sufferings of the persecution were designed to discipline the people (5:12). Therefore, the suffering of martyrs who refused to be defiled by eating an unclean meal (chapters 6–7, the story of Eleazar and his seven brothers, the main content of 4 Maccabees, where this story is elaborated and retold even in more detail), are considered to be atonement for the sins of the people, bringing an end to the wrath of God (7:38). Moreover, as

---

<sup>33</sup> For the composition of Second Maccabees, its subject, purpose, date, and other significant issues like the sources, development, historical worth, leading ideas, language, style, reception, and text, see in more detail SCHWARTZ, *2 Maccabees*, 3-126, including all the references to other significant literature concerning 2 Maccabees dealing with various stances and opinions towards its issues.

<sup>34</sup> "Presumably the intention was to gain some understanding and support in the Greek-speaking Diaspora and the Greek world in general for the Jews who were fighting for the integrity of their sanctuary and their piety." Quoted by HENGEL, *Judaism*, 97.

Stefan M. Attard interestingly notes on the martyrdom of Eleazar, “Guarding one’s dignity and one’s acclaimed moral status is a vehicle that would ensure the protection of Torah”<sup>35</sup>. I think the hypothesis that this book would arouse from the Pharisaic circles is not unsubstantiated. Frequent angelic manifestations, including the strong hope for resurrection, are typical just for the Pharisees, and the whole content of the book suggests that its main goal was not that much the description of the selected historical events, but rather to draw a lesson from these events and abide by the Pharisaic teaching. In this context, the attitude of 2 Maccabees to the non-Jews (Gentiles) is also interesting since it is ambiguous. On the one side, Gentiles are enemies of the Jews, as their manners and behavior are bad and unacceptable (6:1-11), and they are characterized as a “blasphemous and barbarous nations” (10:4 [NRSV]). On the other side, Gentiles are described as those who are impressed by Jewish piety (4:37; 14:24), and are still offered conversion (3:35-40; 9:13-18). Although the author’s intent is to support Jews living in the Diaspora, “neither the introductory letters nor the text of 2 Maccabees makes any attempt to subordinate the Diaspora to Jerusalem”<sup>36</sup>. Therefore, an ideal of Jewishness in regards to being Judaeon (Jew) is coming to the fore where the whole content of the book is not primarily political, but is based on the pious way of life and devoutness to the observance of the law, including the hope of the martyrs for resurrection<sup>37</sup>.

All this relates also to the meaning of the terms *ioudaïzein* and *Ioudaïsmos*, and their usage in later Second Temple Jewish sources. Due to limited place, I focus only on the latter, however, taking into consideration the correlation of both. In 2 Macc we found four occurrences of this term: 2:21; 8:1; 14:38(2×):

2 Macc 2:21: καὶ τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ φιλοτίμως ἀνδραγαθήσασιν, ὥστε τὴν ὅλην χώραν ὀλίγους ὄντας λεηλατεῖν καὶ τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη διώκειν (“and the appearances that came from heaven to those who fought bravely for Judaism, so that though few in number they seized the whole land and pursued the barbarian hordes”, [NRSV])

2 Macc 8:1: Ἰουδας δὲ ὁ καὶ Μακκαβαῖος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κώμας προσεκαλοῦντο τοὺς συγγενεῖς καὶ τοὺς μεμενηκότας ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ προσλαμβανόμενοι

<sup>35</sup> ATTARD, *Self-Portrayal*, 175.

<sup>36</sup> COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 83.

<sup>37</sup> COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 83.

συνήγαγον εἰς ἑξακισχιλίους. (“Meanwhile Judas, who was also called Maccabeus, and his companions secretly entered the villages and summoned their kindred and enlisted those who had continued in the Jewish faith, and so they gathered about six thousand.” [NRSV])

2 Macc 14:38: ἦν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις τῆς ἀμειξίας κρίσιν εἰσηνηγεμένος Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ, καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ παραβεβλημένος μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενίας. (“In former times, when there was no mingling with the Gentiles, he had been accused of Judaism, and he had most zealously risked body and life for Judaism.” [NRSV])

The English translation of this term in all passages follows a traditional interpretation, which is, however, anachronistic, rendering it in a religious sense. Steve Mason aptly underlines that “we need to ask how Ἰουδαϊσμός functions and whether it nominalizes the -ίζω verb in keeping with the same pattern. This is particularly important because of the enormous weight placed upon these passages in scholarship, in spite of their scarcity”<sup>38</sup>.

All these occurrences are fully in the context of the changed sense and meaning of this term and express an accumulation of all those known attributes and peculiarities, political as well as cultural, of the Jewish specifics concerning the worldview and way of life influenced strongly by the Maccabean revolt, meaning “Judaeaness”, in reaction to cultural *Hellenismos*, as an antithesis to “foreignism” characterizing the adoption of foreign (non-Judaeans) Greek ways (customs and worldviews)<sup>39</sup>. Or, as Matthew Novenson says in the context of Paul’s usage of this term in Gal 1:13-14: “Ἰουδαϊσμός is the name of the cause

---

<sup>38</sup> MASON, *Josephus*, 147. For HENGEL, *Judaism*, 2, “the word means both political and genetic association with the Jewish nation and exclusive belief in the one God of Israel, together with observance of the Torah given by him”. AMIR, The Term *Ioudaismos*, 38, characterizes this term in a similar way and emphasizes that it was a remarkable exception to the standard Greek usage, since, as he states: “In the entire Hellenistic-Roman cultural realm, to the extent of our present knowledge, not a single nation, ethnic, or other group saw the need of creating a general term for all the practical and ideological consequences entailed by belonging to that group, with the exception of the Jewish people [*scil.* in Ἰουδαϊσμός].” And SCHWARTZ, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Early Christianity*, 15, emphasizes that just in the latter half of the Second Temple period was increasing Jewish self-understanding: “as adherents of an *ism*”: «Judaism» as opposed to Jewish territory or Jewish blood, became the only way of defining «Jews» which was well founded in the logic and facts of Jewish existence.” Stated and quoted by MASON, *Josephus*, 147.

<sup>39</sup> For commentary to all the passages with the occurrence of the term *Ioudaismos*, see in more detail SCHWARTZ, *2 Maccabees*, 172-174, 323-326, 488-489. See also MASON, *Josephus*, 147-149.

championed by Judah Maccabee and his Jewish partisans (2 Macc. 2:21; 8:1; 14:38; 4 Macc. 4:26)”<sup>40</sup>.

### 2.2.2 Galatians

Throughout the history of Christian interpretation of Galatians, there was much debate about the meaning of the term *Ioudaïsmos*, which occurs in the corpus of the New Testament only here (Gal 1:13-14), as well as of the term *ioudaïzein* occurring only in Paul’s speech of the Antioch incident (2:11-14)<sup>41</sup>. The interest in both terms is understandable, not only from the context of these passages and the letter as a whole, but also from a lexical point of view<sup>42</sup>.

Concerning the term *Ioudaïsmos*, as was mentioned above, there are two occurrences, both in the first chapter (1:13-14):

Ἦκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πόρθουν αὐτήν, καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. (“You have heard, no doubt, of my earlier life in Judaism. I was violently persecuting the church of God and was trying to destroy it. I advanced in Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age, for I was far more zealous for the traditions of my ancestors.” [NRSV])

Focusing on the historical context of both the occurrences in the context of the correlation of this term with its verbal cognate *ioudaïzein* (2:14), there is a

<sup>40</sup> NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 32.

<sup>41</sup> LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, 78, aptly remarks that it is “probably the most crucial term of this sentence for an understanding of Paul’s rebuke of Cephas.” For another significant view and interpretation of the situation in Galatians, see NANOS, *The Irony of Galatians*, and NANOS (ed.), *The Galatians Debate*. The latter is one significant endeavor of the recent period designed to bring readers closer to the contemporary issues, significant and central to the interpretation of Galatians including an adducing amount of relevant literature. The contributors concentrate on three important research areas. The first part (3-154) examines contemporary rhetorical and epistolary analyses of the letter. The second part (157-318) investigates recent interpretations of Paul’s autobiographical narrative (Gal 1–2), and the third part (321-433) investigates various interpretations of the situation among Paul and his addressees in Galatia.

<sup>42</sup> For the analysis and interpretation of the term in the context of Galatians, see ÁBEL, *The Semantics of the Term ἰουδαΐζειν in Paul’s Message*, 7-33.



Jewish (Judaean) cultural movement connected tightly with circumcision and observance of the Judaean law, as represented by the Pharisaic traditions<sup>43</sup>.

Matthew Novenson contributes in a significant manner to the current discussion concerning the meaning of this term, not only in the context of Galatians, but as a whole, and is pointing out that *ioudaïzein* is something that only non-Jews can do. Novenson argues that the form *Ioudaïsmos* is the nominalization of the verb *ιουδαίζω*, according to the normal rules of etymology this word ought to mean “the observance of Jewish customs by non-Jewish persons”, not the “customs of the Jewish people” as it is typically used<sup>44</sup>. Thus, he suggests that this term should be translated rather as “judaizing”, or “judaization”. However, what is significant regarding the understanding of the nominal form of the verb *ioudaïzein*, Novenson emphasizes that *Ioudaïsmos* also applies to Jews like Paul identifies his former activity as *Ioudaïsmos*<sup>45</sup>.

This rendering conforms to a convention like it is in 2 Maccabees, including its literary imitator 4 Maccabees, where (as I mentioned above concerning 2 Maccabees) Novenson aptly remarks: “*Ἰουδαϊσμός* is the name of the cause championed by Judah Maccabee and his Jewish partisans (2 Macc. 2:21; 8:1; 14:38; 4 Macc. 4:26)”<sup>46</sup>. This interpretation fits fully with two later attestations of this word in the Roman period, as I mentioned above, both in epigraphic records, the first in the funerary inscription from the third or fourth century CE for a woman, Cattia Ammias, from Porto (*CIJ* 537), and the second in the synagogue benefaction inscription from the third century CE from Stobi in Macedonia (*CIJ* 694) concerning Claudius Tiberius Polycharmus, also called

---

<sup>43</sup> As MASON, *Josephus*, 146, remarks in this connection: “The only two occurrences of the verb in Josephus, which come in close proximity, mean much the same thing. At *War* 2.454 he describes the slaughter of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem, which only Metilius survives – on his promise ‘that he will Judaize all the way to circumcision’ (*μέχρι περιτομῆς ιουδαΐσειν*). A few sentences later (2.463), when hostilities erupt between Judeans and Syrians, Josephus reports that the latter killed most of the *Ioudaioi* in their midst, while remaining suspicious of the many Judaizers in each city (*ἕκαστοι τοὺς ιουδαΐζοντας εἶχον ἐν ὑποψίᾳ*)”.

<sup>44</sup> Like the verb *ἑλληγνίζω* means for a non-Greek to adopt Greek ways, and the noun *Ἑλληγνισμός* means the adoption by non-Greeks of Greek ways. See NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 29, 30-32.

<sup>45</sup> NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 32.

<sup>46</sup> NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 32. For more information, including the interpretative options offered by the recent scholarship, see NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 26-30, 35-39, including the notes.

Achyrius<sup>47</sup>. The general interpretation of the scholars who study these texts in both inscriptions see it “to mean simply ‘Judaism’ in the sense of the religion practiced by the presumably Jewish honorees<sup>48</sup> and does not fit the period practice in the Hellenistic as well as the Roman period. Ancient writers, when referring to Jewish culture or traditions, use the words “νόμοι (“laws”), ἔθνη (“customs”), παραδόσεις (“traditions”), or πάτρια (“ancestral ways”). Therefore, Novenson aptly emphasizes that Cattia and Polycharmus were not just “good Jews”<sup>49</sup> or proselytes<sup>50</sup>, “but rather Jewish activists, advocates for the cause of Ἰουδαϊσμός in their respective Diaspora contexts”<sup>51</sup>. Thus, taking into consideration all these important facts, to live in *Ioudaïsmos* means “the defense and promotion of Jewish customs by Jewish people”<sup>52</sup>, or in the context of the Maccabean revolt tradition, this word is used “to signify the suddenly radical choice by Jews to follow their own ancestral ways”<sup>53</sup>.

What does it mean in the context of Galatians? Paul is not talking about his Jewish identity or Judaism as a religion. He is talking about his former, zealous activity in a movement for a strong defense of Jewish ancestral ways, probably performed by the Pharisaic faction Paul belonged to, which was a sectarian program within the Jewish phenomenon of that period created under the strong influence of the Maccabean movement tradition. In other words, Paul’s own usage of this term is another significant example of remembering, now concerning his activities against the Jesus Christ movement.

### 2.2.3 4 Maccabees

This book, a literary imitator of 2 Maccabees, presents a strong defense of the Jewish way of life presented as “a «most philosophical discussion» of the thesis that «devout reason is sovereign over the emotions» (1.1), for which the

---

<sup>47</sup> For both, see in more detail NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 32-33.

<sup>48</sup> For example: MARMORSTEIN, *The Synagogue*, 373-84; HENGEL, *Die Synagogeninschrift*, 145-183; AMIR, *The Term Ioudaïsmos*; WILLIAMS, *The Meaning and Function of Ioudaios*; LEVINE, *The Ancient Synagogue*, 270-273. Quoted by NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 33, n. 50.

<sup>49</sup> So, Martin Hengel, and Lee I. Levine.

<sup>50</sup> So, for example: MASON, *Jews*, 479; LIETZMANN, *Die Synagogeninschrift*, 93-95. Quoted by NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 33, n. 51.

<sup>51</sup> NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 36.

<sup>52</sup> NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 33.

<sup>53</sup> NOVENSON, Paul’s Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*, 35.

martyrs under Antiochus IV provide the most conclusive proof”<sup>54</sup>. The author and audience of this writing are Hellenistic Jews who are accustomed to and well-acquainted with Greek values, thought, and culture. However, they want to maintain their ancestral ways of Jewishness by trying to motivate other Jews to devoutness to the Jewish way of life, traditions, and culture, even up to martyrdom.

Among scholars, there is no consensus concerning the date of origin and provenance of this writing. Some of them argue for Alexandria in Egypt, and others for Antioch in Syria, which is, in my opinion, the most probable location<sup>55</sup>. Regarding the date, most scholars consider it between 40 BCE and 118 CE. There are also the possibilities of the late first century and early second century CE, therefore, I am inclined to the hypothesis supporting the later period as the time when Paul wrote his epistle to the Galatians<sup>56</sup>. Since the background of this writing expresses great admiration for the Maccabean movement, I consider it sufficiently persuasive that the author’s strategy to address the Hellenizing crisis of the second century BCE period (175–164) with intent to motivate a response of loyalty to the ancestral ways of Judaism, best characterizes what it means to live in a way of *Ioudaïsmos*<sup>57</sup>. Concerning this particular term, there is one occurrence (4:26), the context of which is borrowed from 2 Maccabees:

---

<sup>54</sup> DESILVA, *4 Maccabees*, 11. The story of the priest Eleazar, the mother, and her seven sons, who during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, were put to death because of their faithfulness to the Torah is recorded in 2 Macc 6–7, and retold again in 4 Maccabees. I inquire into the issues of 4 Maccabees in the Antiochian context and its supposable influence on Ignatius’ perception of Paul and Judaism in my paper ÁBEL, Παύλου συμμύσται ἔστε.

<sup>55</sup> Antioch in Syria is mentioned as a plausible location by BARCLAY, *Jews*, 370, including n. 63, GILBERT, *Wisdom Literature*, 318, and also ZETTERHOLM, *The Formation of Christianity*, 82, admits this location as probable. DESILVA, *4 Maccabees*, 21, locates 4 Maccabees in an urban center with a significant Jewish community somewhere in Syria or Cilicia. CHARLESWORTH, *The Pseudepigrapha*, 151, mentions both cities (Alexandria in Egypt and Antioch in Syria) as plausible locations. ANDERSON, *4 Maccabees*, 537, as well as VAN HENTEN, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 82, give the preference to a location “in a city of Asia Minor around 100 C.E. or a short time later”.

<sup>56</sup> For the introductory information about this writing, including the selected bibliography, see ANDERSON, *4 Maccabees*, 531–543. See also DESILVA, *4 Maccabees*, 12–32.

<sup>57</sup> There is necessary to note that it is uncertain what Ignatius means by the terms Ἰουδαϊσμός, and the opposite of it, Χριστιανισμός, since he nowhere provides a clear definition. Moreover, the meaning of the first of these terms is obscure, even in the time of Paul. Recent knowledge about the possible sense of this term, as well as other cognates (especially the term ἰουδαΐζειν) in contemporary Judaism, including Paul’s message, emphasizes that this term does not relate to ancient Israel’s ethnic identity as such, but represents the particular, rigorous Jewish way of life concerning the obedience to the Torah

4 Macc 4:26: ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ δόγματα αὐτοῦ κατεφρονεῖτο ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ, αὐτὸς διὰ βασάνων ἕνα ἕκαστον τοῦ ἔθνους ἠνάγκαζεν μιαρῶν ἀπογευομένους τροφῶν ἐξόμνησθαι τὸν Ιουδαϊσμόν. (“...when, I say, his decrees were despised by the people, he himself tried through torture to compel everyone in the nation to eat defiling foods and to renounce Judaism.” [NRSV])

Undoubtedly, the term *Ioudaïsmos* used by the author has the same meaning as in the previous examples found in 2 Maccabees, signifying the radical choice by some Jews to follow their own ancestral ways. This meaning is strengthened here by the longer time of remembering the Maccabean period with all its specifics and particularities.

## ***2.2 Ioudaïsmos from Jewish (Judaean) Context to Ignatius’ Own Perception***

Since 4 Maccabees and its ideology of martyrdom enjoyed great influence on post-70 CE Jewish self-understanding and social-ethnic identity, we can legitimately assume that this influence was the same, if not major, for the Torah-oriented Jewish group in Antioch of Syria. And, since Ignatius of Antioch himself strongly emphasizes martyrdom as a characteristic feature of the pious Christ-believers, he also had to be influenced by 4 Maccabees<sup>58</sup>. In this period, after the Jewish War against the Romans (66–70/73 CE), the situation began to change on both sides, Jewish, including the Jewish Jesus Christ-believers, as well as non-Jewish. Therefore, the sense of the term gains a different connotation given the changes in the political situation and its influence on the relations between Jewish and non-Jewish Jesus Christ believers, and mostly between

---

and the ancestral traditions, very closely related to the Maccabean movement and later, a positive admiring reverberation of Maccabean revolt through some particular Jewish groups, like, the Pharisaic movement. This knowledge helps us to better understand, among others, also Ignatius’ understanding of the term.

<sup>58</sup> Here, I follow my paper, ÁBEL, Παύλου συμμύσται ἐστε, 420-433. Another piece of the mosaic of Ignatius’ negative attitude toward “judaizing people” within the early Christ movement, and at the same time his eager declination to martyrdom, presents itself by way of the existence of this Jewish group that was strongly influenced by the Maccabean movement, and emphasizing the ideology of martyrdom. For these Jews obedience to the Torah was worth dying for. Some scholars argue for the existence of a Jewish cult of the Maccabean martyrs in Antioch. For the issue, see also: ROBINSON, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 129 n. 6; DESILVA, *4 Maccabees*, 149-50; ZETTERHOLM, *Formation*, 81, 107-108, including n. 137.

arousing Rabbinic Judaism and these two ways of the Jesus-messianic movement.

Although this is only hypothetical, it is in making these and other suggestions that we may be able to develop a deeper insight into the historical settings of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles in Antioch of Syria—especially and primarily within the early Christ movement. The significance of this focus is even more evident if we take into consideration that, besides Ignatius' letters, the Gospel of Matthew is also assigned an Antiochian or at least a Syrian milieu<sup>59</sup>. And another important early Christian writing, the *Didache*, also reflects the situation in Antioch of Syria<sup>60</sup>. These sources are all early evidence of the changing situation concerning the relationships between Jesus-believing Jews and Gentiles. Recent scholars mostly agree that Ignatius either used Matthew's Gospel or drew from the same oral tradition<sup>61</sup>. Thus, in Ignatius' letters, terms like *Ioudaïsmos*, *ioudaïzein*, and *Christianismos* start to come to the fore (Ign. *Magn.* 8.1; 10.3; Ign. *Phld.* 6.1). These terms show a significant change in the attitudes of the Gentile representatives of nascent Christianity toward arising Judaism based on the Tannaitic traditions. Remembering the times of the first generation of Jesus followers were beginning to vary in the next two or three generations of the Jesus Christ movement, especially in the geopolitical context of Antioch of Syria and its surroundings<sup>62</sup>.

---

<sup>59</sup> For recensions, editions, manuscripts, abbreviations in the apparatus, and a selected bibliography concerning the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, see in more detail, ÁBEL, Παύλου συμμύσται ἐστε, 424 n. 38.

<sup>60</sup> Concerning the *Didache*, this writing is sometimes also assigned to Syria showing clearly Jewish influence, and drawing the same source of the tradition as Matthew and Ignatius, with particular sensitivity to Jewish phenomenon.

<sup>61</sup> For these issues including other relevant literature, see in more detail, ROBINSON, *Ignatius*, 20-21, n. 78, 79. On Matthew's connection to Antioch, see ZETTERHOLM, *Formation*, 7, 211-216; ROBINSON, *Ignatius*, 89-94. Other scholars argue also for other Christian canonical writings that would be known to Ignatius. See ÁBEL, Παύλου συμμύσται ἐστε, 420 n. 8.

<sup>62</sup> This is one particular example of an effort to separate Gentile Christ believers from Jewishness – at least in some regions of the contemporary Roman Empire, like Antioch itself, or in some cities of Asia Minor. This on its own, however, should not be construed as a full *parting of the ways*, although, we should be cautious to understand it as a rapid, and general process. A lot of Jews in the Diaspora participated in the larger non-Jewish society without a clash of loyalties, including the relations with members of Christian communities in the later period. In this regard, see especially FREDRIKSEN, What 'Parting of the Ways'? This is important since, although Ignatius writes from a perspective clearly outside Judaism, which means that the separation between Judaism and nascent Christianity had to some extent

The hypothesis of the direct influence of the martyrdom ideology of 4 Maccabees, the book which would originate in Antioch of Syria—possibly just within this Jewish faction in the time of, or just before Ignatius<sup>63</sup>—on Ignatius also supports specific terminology, as well as verbal and conceptual parallels related to martyrdom ideology<sup>64</sup>. If we acknowledge that 4 Maccabees indeed originated in Antioch in the late first century CE<sup>65</sup>, we should take into consideration the existence of a Torah and martyrdom ideology connected to some Jewish group emphasizing the obedience and zeal for the Torah as the values that were worth dying for—it is for *Ioudaïsmos*. Therefore, Ignatius would be influenced by both 4 Maccabees and this Jewish group. Thus, for him, this ideology and these characteristics would become a strong inspiration to follow by its example, however, it transformed into a different subject of obedience to, and zeal for, Jesus Christ, his Church, and bishops (Ign. *Rom. inscr.*; *Eph.* 20.2), it is *Christianismos* that is worth dying for<sup>66</sup>. Thus, with understandable, at least hypothetically, that for Ignatius who was influenced by his own experiences in Antioch, including relations between local Jewish groups and their attitudes to Gentiles (not excepting relations within the early Christ movement), the adherents of what he calls *Christianismos* have to cease to practice or be in contact with what he calls *Ioudaïsmos*<sup>67</sup>. Even though there is no unequivocal

---

already taken place, we cannot allege that the separation process was completed, only that for the bishop in Antioch and his symbolic world, Christianity should be a non-Jewish movement, as ZETTERHOLM, *Formation*, 203, aptly remarks in this regard.

<sup>63</sup> For the issue, see DESILVA, *4 Maccabees*, 149-50; ZETTERHOLM, *Formation*, 81, including n. 137; SCHATKIN, *The Maccabean Martyrs*, 100-101.

<sup>64</sup> For this particular issue, see in more detail ÁBEL, *Παύλου συμμύσται έστε*, 427-433.

<sup>65</sup> ZETTERHOLM, *Formation*, 82.

<sup>66</sup> In addition to the influence of this Torah-oriented Jewish group, we also should take into consideration the process of separation between the Gentile Jesus believers from the Matthean community in Antioch. See, ZETTERHOLM, *Formation*, 211-216; ROBINSON, *Ignatius*, 89-94.

<sup>67</sup> In my opinion, this is the real meaning of the two most characteristic anti-Jewish, or anti-judaizing passages within the whole corpus of Ignatius' letters in *Magnesians* 8–10 (8.1; 9.1; and especially 10.3) and *Philadelphians* 6–9 (especially 6.1). In this regard, MURRAY, *Playing a Jewish Game*, 82, argues, in my opinion very aptly, that Ignatius' letters are another piece of literary evidence that helps us to understand contextually the accusations made by John in the Book of Revelation (Rev 2:9; 3:9), in the context of persistent Christian Judaizing tendencies in Asia Minor in the late first and early second century CE. For Murray's analysis of Revelation, see in more detail MURRAY, *Playing a Jewish Game*, 73-81. For thorough analysis and interpretation of the above-mentioned passages from *Magnesians*, see SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 118-119, 123-127, and from *Philadelphians*, see SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 202-203, 207-209.

opinion among scholars whether Ignatius's references to Judaism (*Ioudaïsmos*, *ioudaïzein*) are or are not related directly to Jewishness and Jewish traditions—first and foremost circumcision—or the notion of Israel as such, or if Ignatius focuses only on Judaizing tendencies within Christian churches, we in any case have to emphasize that the first explicit claim that Christians had replaced Israel as the true people of God, or the “new Israel,” occurred later in the mid-second century CE (Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*). In any case, Ignatius rejects and fights against any judaizing tendencies on behalf of the Gentile Jesus believers who are still, more or less, attracted to Jewish scriptures and traditions.

All Jewish heroes of faith for Ignatius, like the apostles of Jesus, Paul,<sup>68</sup> or even the prophets of Israel, since they announced prospectively the coming of Jesus—the promised Jewish Messiah, are no longer part of *Ioudaïsmos*, but they are part and parcel of *Christianismos*. We can legitimately assume that Ignatius was well-acquainted with the meaning of the term *Ioudaïsmos*, primarily in its Antiochian context, its relation to the Maccabean movement and martyrs, as well as its relation to Paul in the time before he came to believe in Jesus as the Jewish Messiah (Gal 1:13-14). Whether Ignatius knew Galatians is uncertain, however, we cannot exclude that he would know the Pauline traditions of Paul in *Ioudaïsmos* in the time before he (i.e., Paul) came to believe in Jesus as the Jewish Messiah (Gal 1:13-14), as well as of the Antiochian incident (Gal 2:11-14), including its consequences on the relations between Jewish and Gentile Jesus believers, especially in the time after Paul. Although, in my opinion, just the ideology of martyrdom represents the only real Jewish matrix of Ignatius's message, all pieces of this contextual mosaic fit well together and are understandable concerning the significant semantic shift of the term *Ioudaïsmos* in the early Second Century CE.

### 3 Conclusion

Focusing on the term *Ioudaïsmos* through the lens of remembering and trying to explore its conceptualization during the Second Temple period, from Maccabees through Paul the Apostle, up to Ignatius of Antioch, helps us to better

---

<sup>68</sup> Besides the allusions to the Pauline tradition that occurred in Ignatius' letters, there are two direct mentions of Paul by name (Ign. *Eph.* 12.2; *Rom.* 4.3). Therefore, it is evident that Ignatius was significantly influenced by the early Pauline tradition, in my opinion, primarily based on the disputed deutero-Pauline letters (Ephesians, Colossians) and Pastoral epistles (1 Timothy, and 2 Timothy). See in more detail, ÁBEL, Παύλου συμμύσται ἐστε, 430-433.

understand the semantic shifts concerning this term. Situating these findings into the frame of Barry Schwartz's "social memory" definition in the field of New Testament research<sup>69</sup>, making it wider in the context of the Jewish Second Temple period, the four dimensions of memory would be as follows: (1) the past as it actually was is completely unreachable, however, it is still alive as (2) "history" (which refers to linear representations of the past that take the form of oral and written narratives) in 1 and 2 Maccabees. The next step in the process of remembering the Maccabean movement is found in 4 Maccabees, the book that consists of (3) "commemoration" (whose symbols lift from the historical narrative those parts that best express society's ideals), particularly emphasizing and wanting to maintain the ancestral ways of Jewishness (Judaeans) by trying to motivate other Jews to devoutness to the Jewish way of life, traditions, and culture, even up to martyrdom. Finally, establishing (4) "social memory" (how individuals, in the aggregate, think and feel about the past), is coming about, but in different ways (outside and within Jewishness) by Paul the Apostle in his situation, and later, within nascent Christianity represented by Ignatius of Antioch. The whole of this process manifests the creation of the social and religious identity of the communities that are behind, explaining, at least partially, the semantic shifts in the usage of the term *Ioudaïsmos*, as well as *Christianismos*.

Undoubtedly, the term *Ioudaïsmos* used by the authors of 2 Maccabees and 4 Maccabees has the same meaning, signifying the radical choice by some Jews to follow their own ancestral ways in contrast to its antonym *Hellēnismos*, characterizing the adoption of foreign (non-Judaeans) Greek ways. In 4 Maccabees, this meaning is strengthened by the longer time of remembering the Maccabean period with all its specifics and particularities. In the context of Galatians, Paul is talking about his former, zealous activity in a movement for a strong defense of Jewish ancestral ways performed probably by the Pharisaic faction Paul belonged to, which was a sectarian program within the Jewish phenomenon of that period created under the strong influence of the Maccabean movement tradition. Paul's usage of this term is another significant example of remembering, now concerning his former activities against the Jesus Christ movement. Finally, Ignatius of Antioch works with different memory concerning this term, as well as its cognates, especially the term *ioudaïzein*. Most probably, Ignatius perceived Paul as a convert from what he labels *Ioudaïsmos* to the

---

<sup>69</sup> SCHWARTZ, Where There's Smoke, 10-11.



complete opposite of it, *Christianismos*. The anti-Judaizing feature of Ignatius's corpus could be explained rather as one of the consequences of anti-Jewish proceedings introduced by the Roman administration after the Jewish War across the entire Empire, including Antioch. This fact, as well as the experiences with regard to local Jewish groups and their attitudes to Gentiles, especially the rigorous Torah-oriented Jewish group emphasizing Maccabean martyrdom ideology, including relations within the early Christ movement, would explain Ignatius's ignorance of Jewish phenomenon as such in his corpus, with the intent to keep Christianity distinct from Jewishness. Ignatius's eagerness for martyrdom, the only real Jewish matrix of his message and life, gains its rationale. Therefore, for Ignatius himself, the adherents of what he calls *Christianismos* have to refrain from any influences of *Ioudaïsmos*.

## Bibliography

- ÁBEL, František: The Semantics of the Term *ιουδαΐζειν* in Paul's Message: An Exposition on the Issue According to Luther's Interpretation and the Current Discussion about Paul within Judaism. In: Maroš Nicák – Martin Tamcke (eds.): *500 Jahre der Reformation in der Slowakei* (Kirchengeschichte 2), Münster: Lit, 2019, 7-33.
- ÁBEL, František: Remembering in the Eucharistic Tradition Reflected in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25 (17–34): Its Meaning and Role in Eschatological Perspective, *CV* 64/2 (2022) 83-102.
- ÁBEL, František: Παύλου συμμύσται ἐστε. Ignatius' Reception of Paul and Jewishness in the Antiochian Context: Another Piece of the Mosaic. In: František Ábel (ed.): *Receptions of Paul during the First Two Centuries: Exploration of the Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity*, Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2023, 419-454.
- AMIR, Yehoshua: The Term *Ioudaïsmos*: A Study in Jewish-Hellenistic Self-Identification, *Immanuel* 14 (1982) 34-41. (in Hebrew)
- ANDERSON, Hugh: 4 Maccabees: (First Century A.D.): A New Translation and Introduction. In: James H. Charlesworth (ed.): *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010, 531-564.
- APPLEBY, Joyce Oldham – HUNT, Lynn – JACOB, Margaret: *Telling the Truth about History*, New York: Norton, 1994.
- ATTARD, Steffan M.: Self-Portrayal as a 'Fence around Torah': An Ethical Critique of Eleazar's Martyrdom in 2 Maccabees 6:18-31, *StBiSl* 14 (2023) 157-179.
- BARCLAY, John M. G.: *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

- BARTON, Stephen C. – STUCKENBRUCK, Loren T. – WOLD, Benjamin G. (eds.): *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity. The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)* (WUNT 1/212), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- BAUER, Walter – DANKER, Frederick W. – ARNDT, William F. – GINGRICH, F. Wilbur: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago – London: The University of Chicago – Cambridge University Press, <sup>3</sup>2000.
- BOYARIN, Daniel: Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (to which is Appended a Correction of my *Border Lines*), *JQR* 99/1 (2009) 7-36.
- BRANICK, Vincent P.: *Understanding the New Testament and Its Message: An Introduction*, New York: Paulist Press, 1998.
- BROWN, Raymond E.: *Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- BUTTICAZ, Simon – NORELLI, Enrico: Introduction. In: Simon Buttica – Enrico Norelli (eds.): *Memory and Memories in Early Christianity* (WUNT 398), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018, 1-14.
- CAMPBELL, William S.: *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity* (TTCBS), London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- CAMPBELL, William S.: *The Nations in the Divine Economy: Paul's Covenantal Hermeneutics and Participation in Christ*, Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academy, 2018.
- CAMPBELL, William S.: *Romans: A Social Identity Commentary* (T&T Clark Social Identity Commentaries), London: T&T Clark, 2023.
- CHARLESWORTH, James H.: *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement*, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- CIELONTKO, David – ČAPEK, Filip (eds.): *Collective Memory in the Bible and Christianity: From Theoretical Issues to Practical Applications*, Praha: Karolinum, 2022.
- COHEN, Shaye J. D.: *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.
- COHEN, Shaye J. D.: Judaism without Circumcision and 'Judaism' without 'Circumcision' in Ignatius, *HTR* 95/4 (2002) 395-415.
- COLLINS, John J.: *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (BRS), Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, <sup>2</sup>2000.
- DAHL, Nils: *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.
- DESILVA, David A.: *4 Maccabees* (GAP), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- DESILVA, David A.: *An Introduction to the New Testament: Context, Methods, and Ministry Formation*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- EBNER, Martin – HEININGER, Bernhard: *Exegese des Neuen Testaments. Ein Arbeitsbuch für Lehre und Praxis*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005.
- EHRMAN, Bart D.: *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, New York: Oxford University Press, <sup>2</sup>2000.

- FREDRIKSEN, Paula: Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look on Galatians 1 and 2. In: Mark D. Nanos (ed.): *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002, 235-260 (first published in *JTS* 42.2 [1991] 532-564).
- FREDRIKSEN, Paula: What 'Parting of the Ways'? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City. In: Adam H. Becker – Annette Yoshiko Reed (eds.): *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (TSAJ 95), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003, 35-63.
- FREY, Jean-Baptiste (ed.): *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum. Vol. 1: Europe*, Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1936.
- GILBERT, Maurice: Wisdom Literature: 4 Maccabees. In: M. E. Stone (ed.): *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud: Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, II: Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, Assen: Gorcum, 1974, 316-319.
- GOLDSTEIN, Jonathan A.: The Tales of the Tobiads. In: Jacob Neusner (ed.): *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at 60*, Leiden: Brill, 1975, 85-123.
- GOLDSTEIN, Jonathan A.: *1 Maccabees* (AB 41), Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- GUTBROD, Walter: Ἰουδαῖος, κ.τ.λ. In: *TDNT* III (1976) 356-391.
- VON HARNACK, Adolf: *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*. Translated by John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma, Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1990.
- HATINA, Thomas R. – LUKEŠ, Jiří (eds.): *Social Memory Theory and Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish and Christian Antiquity* (SCCB 8), Paderborn: Brill Schöningh, 2023.
- HENGEL, Martin: Die Synagogeninschrift von Stobi, *ZNW* 57 (1966) 145-183.
- HENGEL, Martin: *Judaism and Hellenism. Vol. 1: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Hellenistic Period*, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1974.
- VAN HENTEN, Jan Willem: *Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (JSJSup 57), Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- HOLLADAY, Carl R.: *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament: Interpreting the Message and Meaning of Jesus Christ*, Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.
- HUEBENTHAL, Sandra: 'Frozen Moments' Moments' – Early Christianity through the Lens of *Social Memory Theory*. In: Simon Buttica – Enrico Norelli (eds.): *Memory and Memories in Early Christianity* (WUNT 398), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018, 17-43.
- JEWETT, Robert: *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- KEITH, Chris: Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One), *EC* 6 (2015) 354-376.
- KEITH, Chris: Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part two), *EC* 6 (2015) 517-542.
- KIRK, Alan – THATCHER, Tom (eds.): *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity* (SemeiaSt 52), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005.

- KITTEL, Gerhard – FRIEDRICH, Gerhard (eds.): *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley, 10 vols., Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964–1976.
- KRENTZ, Edgar: *The Historical-Critical Method*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- LEVINE, Lee I.: *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- LIETZMANN, Hans: Die Synagogeninschrift in Stobi/Ausgrabungen in Doura-Europos, *ZNW* 32 (1933) 93-95.
- LONGENECKER, Richard N.: *Galatians* (WBC 41), Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1990.
- MARGUERAT, Daniel – COMBET-GALLAND, Corina – CUVILLIER, Élian et al.: *Introduction au Nouveau Testament. Son histoire, son écriture, sa théologie*, Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2000.
- MARMORSTEIN, Arthur: The Synagogue of Claudius Tiberius Polycharmus at Stobi, *JQR* 27 (1937) 373-384.
- MASON, Steve: Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorisation in Ancient History, *JSJ* 38 (2007) 457-512.
- MASON, Steve: *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- MOLL, Sebastian: *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT 250), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- MURRAY, Michele: *Playing a Jewish Game: Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries, CE* (SCJud 13), Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004.
- NANOS, Mark D.: *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002.
- NOVENSON, Matthew V.: Paul's Former Occupation in *Ioudaïsmos*. In: ELLIOT, Mark W. – HAFEMANN, Scott J. – WRIGHT, N. T. – FREDERICK, John (eds.): *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014, 24-39.
- RIEDLINGER, Helmut – STRASBURGER, Hermann – REVENTLOW, Henning Graf et al.: *Die historisch-kritische Methode und die heutige Suche nach einem lebendigen Verständnis der Bibel*, Freiburg: Katholische Akademie, 1985.
- ROBERTS, Alexander – DONALDSON, James (eds.): *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- ROBINSON, Thomas A.: *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- SCHATKIN, Margaret: The Maccabean Martyrs, *VC* 28 (1974) 97-113.
- SCHOEDEL, William R.: *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985.
- SCHWARTZ, Barry: Where There's Smoke, There's Fire: Memory and History. In: Barry Schwartz (ed.): *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz* (SemeiaSt 78), Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014, 10-11.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R.: *Studies in the Jewish Background of Early Christianity* (WUNT 60), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R.: *2 Maccabees* (CEJL), Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

- SÖDING, Thomas – MÜNCH, Christian: *Wege der Schriftauslegung. Methodenbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Basel: Herder Freiburg, 1998.
- ŠTRBA, Blažej: Mattathias as Joshua in 1 Macc 2, *StBiSl* 15/1 (2023) 51-69.
- THATCHER, Tom (ed.): *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*, Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- THATCHER, Tom (ed.): *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz (SemeiaSt 78)*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- TUCKETT, Christopher M.: *Reading the New Testament: Methods of Interpretation*, London: SPCK, 1987.
- WILLIAMS, Margaret H.: The Meaning and Function of Ioudaios in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions, *ZPE* 116 (1997) 249-262.
- ZETTERHOLM, Magnus: *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity (RECM)*, New York: Routledge, 2003.
- ZIMMERMANN, Heinrich: *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode*, Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, <sup>7</sup>1982.

### Summary


An important aspect of memory studies regarding Jewish religious tradition is that memory and faith are interconnected and as such represent its basic character. Besides an essential function of memory, which is to describe and analyze how the past was shaped to make a common identity of the community in the present, remembering is also, as Simon Buttica and Enrico Norelli have aptly remarked on this interdependency, a semantic category with significant theological implications. It is a typical character of Jewishness that confirms this fact. The goal of this paper is to explore the conceptualization of the term *Ioudaïsmos* during the Second Temple period, from Maccabees through Paul the Apostle, up to nascent Christianity in the early Second Century CE, including its impact on the self-conception of the groups of non-Jewish Jesus followers. The findings of this investigation confirm that applying this approach to the topic enables us to understand this term, including its semantic shift historically and contextually, without bias and traditional (anti-Jewish) stereotypes.

*Keywords:* Ioudaïsmos, remembering, Second Temple period, Maccabees, Paul the Apostle, Ignatius of Antioch.

*Zhrnutie*

Dôležitým aspektom štúdií pamäte (memory studies) vo vzťahu k židovskej náboženskej tradícii je vzájomná previazanie pamäte a viery, ktoré predstavuje základný charakter tejto výskumnej platformy. Popri esenciálnej funkcii pamäte, ktorou je opísať a analyzovať vplyv udalostí minulosti na identitu spoločenstva v prítomnosti, proces spomínania je tiež, ako v súvislosti s uvedenou vzájomnou previazanosťou Simon Buttica a Enrico Norelli výstižne podotkli, sémantická kategória s dôležitými teologickými dôsledkami. Ide o typický charakter židovstva ako náboženského a kultúrno-spoločenského fenoménu, ktorý túto skutočnosť preukazuje. Cieľom štúdie je preskúmať konceptualizáciu výrazu *Ioudaïsmos* naprieč obdobím druhého chrámu, od Makabejcov, cez apoštola Pavla, až po rané druhé storočie po Kr., vrátane dopadov na sebavnímanie skupín nežidovských nasledovníkov Ježiša Krista. Výsledky tohto bádania potvrdzujú, že tento metodický prístup k skúmanej téme nám umožňuje lepšie a komplexnejšie porozumieť tomuto výrazu, vrátane jeho sémantických zmien historicko-kriticky a kontextuálne, bez predsudkov a tradičných (protižidovských) stereotypov.

*Kľúčové slová:* Ioudaïsmos, spomínanie, obdobie Druhého chrámu, Makabejci, apoštol Pavol, Ignác z Antiochie.

František Ábel  
Evangelical Lutheran Theological Faculty  
Comenius Univerzity  
Bartókova 8  
811 02 BRATISLAVA, Slovak Republic  
abel@fevth.uniba.sk  
 0000-0003-2364-5293

# Prečo sa Ježiš obrátil?

Viacvýznamovosť Ježišovho fyzického obrátenia sa  
v synoptických evanjeliách

*Michal Mališ*

## Úvod

Jednoduché úkony dostávajú inú hodnotu, keď ich koná dôležitá a vzácna osoba. Toto môžeme povedať aj o jednoduchom obrátení sa<sup>1</sup> (otočení), keď osobou, ktorá ho koná, je Ježiš. Obyčajné fyzické otočenie sa dostáva inú hodnotu. Jeho obrátenia si všimli autori synoptických evanjelií. Táto štúdia bude skúmať špecifikum Ježišovho obrátenia sa podľa synoptikov.

Štúdia vychádza už z predošlých zmienok o Ježišových obráteniach v dielach biblických vedcov. V r. 1986 sa M. Soards venoval Ježišovmu obráteniu sa k Petrovi po zapretí<sup>2</sup>. O rok neskôr si ten istý autor vo svojej štúdií o Ježišovej reči k plačúcim ženám všimol sedemnásobné Ježišovo obrátenie sa v Lukášovom evanjeliu<sup>3</sup>. Komentáre k pašiám v Lukášovom evanjeliu dopomohli lepšie porozumieť Ježišovmu obráteniu, najmä k plačúcim ženám. Boli to komentáre od J. Neyreya z r. 1985<sup>4</sup>, ale aj novšie od D. Bocka (2011)<sup>5</sup> a F. Bovona (2012)<sup>6</sup>. K téme Ježišovho obrátenia sa k ženám v Lukášovom evanjeliu prispela štúdia od A. Weissenriederovej z r. 2003, v ktorej sa venovala chorobám v treťom evanjeliu v dialógu so starobylými lekáorskými textami<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Zvratný tvar „obrátiť sa“ z hľadiska slovenskej gramatiky presnejšie vyjadruje Ježišov fyzický pohyb. V niektorých prípadoch v texte však nebude tento zvratný tvar vyjadrený kvôli plynulosti čítania. No stále pôjde o ten istý fyzický pohyb, ktorého podmetom je Ježiš.

<sup>2</sup> SOARDS, „And the Lord Turned and Looked Straight at Peter“: Understanding Luke 22,61.

<sup>3</sup> SOARDS, Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Jesus' Speech to the “Daughters of Jerusalem” (Luke 23,26-32).

<sup>4</sup> NEYREY, *The Passion According to Luke*.

<sup>5</sup> BOCK, *A Theology of Luke's Gospel and Acts*.

<sup>6</sup> BOVON, *Luke 3*.

<sup>7</sup> WEISSENRIEDER, *Imagess of Illness in the Gospel of Luke*.

V r. 2004 vyšla Mendézova-Moratallova štúdia o obrátení v Lukášovom evanjeliu<sup>8</sup>, no bola skôr venovaná obráteniu v zmysle zmeny života. Štúdia E. Dowlingovej z r. 2007<sup>9</sup>, venujúca sa lukášovskému teologickému pohľadu na ženy, dopomohla k našej téme len veľmi málo. O Ježišovom obrátení sa v dome farizeja Šimona sa zmienil aj W. Cotter vo svojej štúdii z r. 2022<sup>10</sup>. O Ježišových obráteniach u Marka sú útržkovité zmienky v komentároch od R. Steina (2008)<sup>11</sup>, A. Wesleyho (2013)<sup>12</sup> a P. Dubovského (2013)<sup>13</sup>. Ježišove obrátenia u Matúša parciálne spomínajú komentáre od H. Clarkeho (2003)<sup>14</sup>, R. Francea (2007)<sup>15</sup> a Ch. Talberta (2010)<sup>16</sup>.

Čiastočný prieskum odbornej literatúry k téme Ježišových obrátení ukázal, že najviac štúdií, v ktorých sú zmienky o týchto obráteniach, bolo venovaných Lukášovmu evanjeliu. Obrátenia u ostatných synoptikov sú spomínané vo veľkých, celkových komentároch, v ktorých nie sú špecificky analyzované. Takisto aj štúdie k udalostiam Lukášovho evanjelia, v ktorých sú zmienky o Ježišovom obrátení, sa venujú tejto téme sporadicky. Tento prieskum ukázal potrebu ucelenej štúdie o téme Ježišovho obrátenia sa, a to nielen u Lukáša, ale v celom synoptickom diele. Nie početné, no o to vzácnejšie zmienky o Ježišovom obrátení sa v synoptickom diele, si zaslúžia osobitný výskum. Táto naša štúdia má napomôcť prehĺbenému skúmaniu Ježišových obrátení v synoptických evanjeliách.

V našej štúdii najprv vymedzíme sémantické pole pre pojmy vyjadrujúce Ježišovo obrátenie sa v synoptickom diele. Následne najprv celkový prehľad zmienok o Ježišových obráteniach vystrieda prehĺbené skúmanie v rámci každého synoptického evanjelia, začínajúc chronologicky prvým, Markovým evanjeliom. Na konci skúmania u každého synoptika uvedieme stručný súhrn. Závety skúmania týchto zmienok v medzisyntických vzťahoch nám v závere priblížia dôležité charakteristiky Ježišovho obrátenia sa v synoptickom diele.

---

<sup>8</sup> MÉNDEZ-MORATALLA, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*.

<sup>9</sup> DOWLING, *Taking Away the Pound*.

<sup>10</sup> COTTER, "Simon I Have Something to Say to You" (Luke 7:40).

<sup>11</sup> STEIN, *Mark*.

<sup>12</sup> WESLEY, *Matthew*.

<sup>13</sup> DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*.

<sup>14</sup> CLARKE, *The Gospel of Matthew*.

<sup>15</sup> FRANCE, *The Gospel of Matthew*.

<sup>16</sup> TALBERT, *Matthew*.



## 1 Sémantické pole pojmov pre Ježišovo obrátenie sa u synoptikov

Synoptici vyjadrili Ježišovo obrátenie sa slovesami ἐπιστρέφω a στρέφω. Louw a Nida zaradili sloveso ἐπιστρέφω najprv do kategórie slov pre vyjadrenie lineárneho pohybu, konkrétne do časti slov opisujúcich návrat. Toto sloveso vyjadruje návrat do bodu alebo do oblasti, kde už niekto bol predtým. Ako príklad je uvedený návrat Ježiša, Márie a Jozefa do Galiley po predstavení v chráme (Lk 2,39)<sup>17</sup>. Ďalej je toto sloveso uvedené v kategórii slov, ktoré vyjadrujú vieru a dôveru, konkrétne v časti vyjadrujúcej zmenu názoru ohľadom pravdy. Ako príklad je použité Pavlovo rozčarovanie nad návratom k slabým a úbohým žvlom (Gal 4,9)<sup>18</sup>. Môže vyjadrovať aj obrátenie podnietené iným človekom, ako napr. v prípade Jána Krstiteľa, ktorý, podľa predpovede anjela, mnohých obráti k Pánovi (Lk 1,16)<sup>19</sup>. Sloveso je uvedené aj v časti pojmov pre opis správania, konkrétne jeho zmeny, napr. v zmysle zmeny spôsobu života v obrátení sa k Bohu (Mk 4,12)<sup>20</sup>. Vyjadruje aj obrátenie srdca (Lk 1,17)<sup>21</sup>. Podobne Bauer vyjadril použitie tohto slovesa aj na označenie zmeny v duchovnom alebo morálnom zmysle<sup>22</sup>.

Sloveso στρέφω je zaradené medzi pojmy vyjadrujúce nelineárny pohyb, napr. obrátiť aj druhé líce (Mt 5,39)<sup>23</sup>. Opisuje aj zmenu nejakej veci na inú (Zjv 11,6)<sup>24</sup>. Patrí však aj medzi slovesá vyjadrujúce lineárny pohyb v zmysle odnesenia, vrátenia niečoho naspäť, na pôvodné miesto (Mt 27,3)<sup>25</sup>. V podobnom význame ide o splatenie alebo o vrátenie peňazí (Mt 27,3)<sup>26</sup>. Opisuje aj odvrátenie sa Boha (Sk 7,42)<sup>27</sup>. Takisto ako v prípade ἐπιστρέφω, Bauer poukázal na použitie tohto výrazu vo význame vnútornej zmeny (Mt 18,3)<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 194.

<sup>18</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 373.

<sup>19</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 374.

<sup>20</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 510.

<sup>21</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 300.

<sup>22</sup> BAUER – DANKER – ARNDT – GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 337.

<sup>23</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 214.

<sup>24</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 156.

<sup>25</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 206.

<sup>26</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 575.

<sup>27</sup> LOUW – NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 449-450.

<sup>28</sup> BAUER – DANKER – ARNDT – GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 843.

## 2 Celkový prehľad synoptických zmienok o Ježišových obráteniach

V nasledujúcej časti uvedieme celkový prehľad zmienok o Ježišových obráteniach v synoptických evanjeliách. Krátko opíšeme jednotlivé výskyty a uvedieme, aké sloveso je použité v jednotlivých prípadoch. Zmienky uvedieme prehľadnou formou v tabuľke. Ďalej sa budeme podrobnejšie venovať Ježišovým obráteniam v jednotlivých zmienkach v rámci každého synoptika. Zmienky v rámci každého synoptika uzavrieme súhrnom.

*Tabuľka 1: Zmienky o Ježišových obráteniach v synoptických evanjeliách*

Markove zmienky	Matúšove zmienky	Lukášove zmienky
5,30: Ježišovo obrátenie sa v udalosti uzdravenia ženy trpiacej na krvotok; <i>ἐπιστραφεῖς</i>	9,22: Ježišovo obrátenie sa v udalosti uzdravenia ženy trpiacej na krvotok; <i>στραφεῖς</i>	7,9: Ježišovo obrátenie sa v udalosti uzdravenia stotníkovho sluhu; <i>στραφεῖς</i>
8,33: Ježišovo obrátenie sa pri pokarhaní Petra; <i>ἐπιστραφεῖς</i>	16,23: Ježišovo obrátenie sa pri napomenutí Petra; <i>στραφεῖς</i>	7,44: Ježišovo obrátenie sa v dome farizeja Šimona; <i>στραφεῖς</i>
		9,55: Ježišovo obrátenie sa pri pokarhaní Jakuba a Jána; <i>στραφεῖς</i>
		10,23: Ježišovo obrátenie sa pri makarizme učeníkov; <i>στραφεῖς</i>
		14,25: Ježišovo obrátenie sa pri vyslovení požiadaviek na učeníka; <i>στραφεῖς</i>
		22,61: Ježišovo obrátenie sa po Petrovom zapretí; <i>στραφεῖς</i>
		23,28: Ježišovo obrátenie sa na krížovej ceste; <i>στραφεῖς</i>

Markove zmienky o Ježišovom obrátení sa sú dve, a to po zacítení dotyku na šatách od ženy trpiacej na krvotok (5,30) a pri pokarhaní Petra (8,33). Marek v oboch prípadoch vyjadril Ježišovo obrátenie sa slovesom *ἐπιστρέφω*, a to

v tvare ἐπιστραφεῖς. Ide o part. pas. aor., v nom. mask. sg., je tu použitý v reflexívnom význame<sup>29</sup>. Tvar môžeme preložiť ako „obráteneý“ alebo „bol otočený/obráteneý“<sup>30</sup>.

Matúšove zmienky sú tiež dve, a to v rovnakých udalostiach ako u Marka, po dotyku obruby odevu ženou trpiacou na krvotok (9,22) a pri napomenutí Petra (16,23). Matúš sa však odlišil od Marka použitím slovesa στρέφω v tvare στραφεῖς, čo je však gramaticky rovnaký tvar ako u Marka („obráteneý“).

Lukáš rozšíril počet výskytov Ježišovho obráteneia sa na sedem, a to v odlišných udalostiach od Marka s Matúšom. Prvá zmienka sa nachádza pri ocenení viery stotníka (7,9), druhá pri stretnutí s hriešnou ženou v dome farizeja Šimona. Ďalšie tri zmienky o Ježišovom obráteneii sa týkajú učeníkov: pokarhanie Jakuba a Jána (9,55), pri makarizme učeníkov (10,23) a pri vyslovení podmienok pre učeníka (14,25). Posledné dve Ježišove obráteneia Lukáš umiestnil do paší: po Petrovom zapretí (22,61) a na križovej ceste pri plačúcich ženách (23,28). Lukáš na Ježišovo obráteneie sa použil identický tvar s Matúšom, a to vždy v rovnakom tvare στραφεῖς.

## 2.1 Ježišovo obráteneie sa u Marka

V nasledujúcej časti si detailnejšie priblížime zmienky o Ježišovom obráteneii sa v Markovom evanjeliu. Pôjde o dve zmienky: v udalosti uzdravenia ženy trpiacej na krvotok (5,30) a pri pokarhaní Petra (8,33). Jednotlivé zmienky predstavíme najprv prehľadne v tabuľke, potom sa budeme venovať obsahovým zvláštnostiam, ktoré vynášajú do popredia dôležitosť Ježišovho obráteneia sa.

### 2.1.1 Ježišovo obráteneie sa a žena trpiaca na krvotok (Mk 5,30)

Verš	Grécka syntagma <sup>31</sup>	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Mk 5,30b	ἐπιστραφεῖς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἔλεγε	Obrátil sa k zástupu a spýtal sa.	Obráteneý v tom zástupe hovoril.

Udalosť uzdravenia ženy trpiacej na krvotok je bezprostredne spojená so vzkriesením dcéry Jairusa. Týmto dvom spojeným udalostiam predchádza

<sup>29</sup> DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*, 335.

<sup>30</sup> DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*, 335.

<sup>31</sup> V celej štúdií budeme používať grécky text podľa NA<sup>28</sup>. Konkordančný výskyt bude v celej štúdií vykonávaný pomocou elektronickej konkordancie v softvéri *BibleWorks* 6, Version 6.0.005y, Copyright 2003.

uzdravenie posadnutého v gerazskom kraji (5,1-20) a nasledujúcou udalosťou je Ježišova návšteva v jeho vlasti (6,1-6).

Umiestnenie udalosti v kontexte podporuje tradičné vysvetľovanie cez rituálnu nečistotu. Problémy s menštruačným krvácaním robili ženu rituálne nečistou<sup>32</sup>. Aj v predošlej udalosti Marek zlého ducha označil za nečistého, hroby, kde býval posadnutý, boli rituálne nečistým miestom. Samotný kraj mal pohanský charakter a ošipané boli nečisté<sup>33</sup>. No rozdielny pôvod nečistoty upozorňuje na väčšiu opatrnosť vo výklade stavu chorej ženy. Jej stav nesúvisel s posadnutosťou, ale s jej fyzickou chorobou. Aj Weissenriederová upravuje tradičný výklad o nečistote ženy v spojitosti s Lv 15. Poukazuje na názov choroby uvedený Markom a Lukášom (ῥύσις αἵματος). Sémantické pole čistoty a nečistoty je pre Marka v tejto udalosti irelevantné, v texte absentuje. Choroba trvajúca dvanásť rokov signalizovala nevyliciteľnosť a blížiacu sa smrť. Text teda zvyrazňuje skazu choroby, a nie skazu nečistoty. Opisom choroby udalosť dostala dimenziu smrti<sup>34</sup>. Aj Dubovský podotkol, že ochorenie ohrozovalo jej život<sup>35</sup>. Naznačuje to aj spojitosť s udalosťou mŕtvej dvanásťročnej dcéry Jairusa. Ježiš uzdravením vrátil život žene, chorej dvanásť rokov, hoci ešte nebola fyzicky mŕtva, no blížila sa k smrti.

Žena prišla v zástupe (ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ) a dotkla sa jeho šiat (Mk 5,27). Po tomto dotyku žena pocítila uzdravenie (v. 29), no aj Ježiš hneď poznal, že z neho vyšla sila (v. 30a). Toto poznanie ho priviedlo k obráteniu sa v zástupe (ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ). Toto obrátenie sa uprostred zástupu predstavovalo aj istú ťažkosť, lebo zástup ho tlačil (v. 31), no Ježiš ju neváhal podstúpiť. Obrátený položil otázku, kto sa dotkol jeho šiat (v. 30b). Prvotným dôvodom Ježišovho obrátenia sa bol uvedomelý a cielený ženin dotyk s jeho šatami, sprevádzaný vnútorným monológom, v ktorom žena vyjadrila istotu vlastnej záchrany (σῶζω), nielen uzdravenia (v. 28). Ježiš v jej vnútornom postoji videl vieru (v. 34), čo odlišovalo ženin dotyk od tlačenia zástupom (v. 31). Ježiš tento dotyk pocítil v sebe, a preto obrátený hľadal jeho pôvodcu (v. 32). Viera zachránila ženu a bola uzdravená z choroby (v. 34). Ježiš sa obrátil tesne potom, ako jej uzdravením vrátil život. Ježiš po obrátení sa hovoril. Marek dáva dôraz na Ježišovo obrátenie, nie až tak na adresáta, ku ktorému sa Ježiš obrátil.

<sup>32</sup> Porov. DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*, 337.

<sup>33</sup> DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*, 323, 325.

<sup>34</sup> WEISSENRIEDER, *Imagess of Illness in the Gospel of Luke*, 229-256.

<sup>35</sup> DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*, 337.

### 2.1.2 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a pokarhanie Petra (8,33)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Mk 8,33a	ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει	On sa obrátil, pozrel sa na svojich učeníkov a Petra pokarhal.	Ale on obrátený a (ako) ten, čo pozrel na svojich učeníkov, pokarhal Petra a hovorí <sup>36</sup> .

Toto druhé Ježišovo obrátenie u Marka sa nachádza v kontexte Petrovho vyznania pri Cézarey Filipovej (8,27-30) a prvej predpovede utrpenia (8,31-32a). Po prvej predpovedi utrpenia si Peter vzal Ježiša nabok a začal ho karhať (v. 32b). Gesto vzatia Ježiša nabok znamená podľa Steina Petrovu nadradenosť a povýšenosť<sup>37</sup>. Marek neuvádza obsah Petrovho karhania Ježiša. Stein vidí v Petrovom karhaní neprijatie Ježišovej interpretácie mesiášskej úlohy, hoci správne vyznal Ježiša ako Mesiáša (v. 29). Práve toto karhanie bolo podnetom na Ježišovo obrátenie sa a pohľad na učeníkov, ktorých Peter zastupoval ako hovorca. Dôvodom pohľadu na učeníkov mohlo byť aj to, že oni videli Petrovo karhanie (v. 32b), takže Ježiš musel na to verejne, pred nimi, reagovať<sup>38</sup>.

Dôvodom Ježišovho obrátenia sa však zostáva neprijatie Ježišovej mesiášskej úlohy, ktoré bolo vyjadrené Petrovým karhaním. Ježišovo obrátenie je opäť spojené s jeho výrokom. Marek, podobne ako v prvom prípade Ježišovho obrátenia sa (5,30), nedal dôraz na adresáta obrátenia, ale na samotnú zmenu Ježišovej pozície. Keby sme chceli určiť adresáta obrátenia, z Ježišovho pohľadu na učeníkov vyplýva, že to boli skôr učeníci, ako Peter.

## 2.2 Súhrn

Marek uvádza dve Ježišove obrátenia sa, pri uzdravení ženy trpiacej na krvotok (5,30) a pri pokarhaní Petra (8,33). V oboch prípadoch vyjadril Ježišovo obrátenie sa zhodným tvarom ἐπιστραφεὶς. V prvom prípade bol pre Ježišovo obrátenie sa podnetom pozitívny nenápadný dotyk ženy s Ježišovými šatami,

<sup>36</sup> Helena Panczová vysvetľuje, že ide o historický prízvuk. U Marka je veľmi častý (151-krát). V jeho markovskom používaní možno vidieť aj autorský zámer, a teda nielen živšie sprítomnenie minulej udalosti. Pomocou historického prízvuku je niekedy možné rozlíšiť roviny deja. Týmto spôsobom sa dosiahne, že udalosti v prízvuku vystúpia do popredia (prvá rovina deja) a udalosti opisované v minulých časoch tvoria naratívne pozadie (druhá rovina deja) [DUBOVSKÝ (ed.), *Marek*, 503, 64-65]. V tomto prípade teda Marek dal do popredia obsah Ježišovho výroku a pokarhanie Petra zostáva na pozadí.

<sup>37</sup> STEIN, *Mark*, 402.

<sup>38</sup> STEIN, *Mark*, 403.

sprevádzaný jej vnútorným postojom, ktorý Ježiš označil za vieru. V druhom prípade bol podnetom negatívny postoj učeníka Petra k Ježišovej vízií Mesiáša. Marek uviedol nielen protikladné podnety pre Ježišove obrátenia, ale kontrast vyjadril aj postavami, ktoré ich podnietili. V prvom prípade išlo o neznámu chorú ženu, v druhom prípade o prvého učeníka Petra. Zároveň kontrast bol aj v okolnostiach. Prvému obráteniu predchádzalo ženino dotknutie sa šiat zozadu, v zástupe, druhému obráteniu predchádzalo viditeľné vzatie si Ježiša nabok pred učeníkmi. Marek dal dôraz na obrátenie, adresátov obrátenia nešpecifikoval úplne zreteľne. Ježišovo obrátenie sa v oboch prípadoch sprevádza Ježišov výrok, ktorým reagoval na vieru ženy alebo na Petrovo neprijatie jeho vízie Mesiáša.

### 2.3 Ježišovo obrátenie sa u Matúška

V tejto časti sa budeme venovať zmienkam o Ježišovom obrátení sa u Matúša. Pôjde o dve zmienky v identických udalostiach ako u Marka: v udalosti uzdravenia ženy s chorobou krvotoku (9,22) a pri dôraznom dohovaraní Petrovi (16,23). Hoci ide o identické udalosti s Markom, vzhľadom na Ježišovo obrátenie poukážeme na rozdielové detaily u Matúša.

#### 2.3.1 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a žena s chorobou krvotoku (9,22)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Mt 9,22a	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς στραφεὶς <sup>39</sup> καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἶπεν	Ježiš sa obrátil, a keď ju zazrel, povedal.	Ale Ježiš obrátený a (ako) ten, čo pozrel na ňu, povedal.

Rovnako ako u Marka udalosť uzdravenia ženy chorej na krvotok (9,20-22) je spojená so vzkriesením dcéry popredného muža (9,18-19.23-26). V blízkom kontexte tejto udalosti je aj povolanie Matúša (9,9-13). Na konci stolovania v dome Ježiš povedal farizejom, že lekára nepotrebujú zdraví, ale chorí (9,12). Matúš v 9. kap. zvýraznil Ježiša ako lekára, ktorý jednak odpúšťa hriechy (9,2), ujíma sa hriešnych a mýtnikov (9,9-10), ale aj fyzicky uzdravuje, dokonca kriesi mŕtvych (ochrnutý, žena chorá na krvotok, dvaja slepci, nemý, dcéra popredného muža).

<sup>39</sup> Niektoré neskoršie kódexy ako napr. C, K, L, W uvádzajú tvar *επιστραφεὶς*, v harmonizácii s Markom. Kódex D dopĺňa *εστη στραφεὶς* (zastal obrátený). No starobylé kódexy, ako  $\aleph$ , B, N a i. uvádzajú tvar *στραφεὶς*.

Matúš je oproti Markovi konkrétnejší, keď spomína obrubu odevu (9,20), zatiaľ čo Marek nešpecifikuje časť šiat. No vo vnútornom monológovi ženy spomína len odev (9,21), rovnako ako Marek. Prevedenie dotyku bolo na obrube, v úmysle bol dotyk so šatami. Rozhodujúcou sa však viac ukazuje vnútorná dispozícia viery, než špecifikovanie časti odevu, ktorej sa žena dotkla. U Matúša nachádzame iný názov choroby (αἱμορροεῶν) v porovnaní s Markom a Lukášom (ῥύσις αἵματος), čo viac približuje chorobu k téme nečistoty podľa Lv 15,33 (LXX)<sup>40</sup>. Podľa Talberta sa verilo tomu, že takýto dotyk spôsobil nečistotu dotknutého<sup>41</sup>.

Matúš, na rozdiel od Marka a Lukáša, neumiestnil túto udalosť do zástupu. Ako prítomné postavy opísal popredného muža, Ježiša, a učeníkov. Preto u Matúša nenachádzame ani Ježišovu otázku, kto sa ho dotkol, lebo sám zazrel túto ženu (v. 22a). No uzrel ju ako obrátený a vyzval ju, aby dúfala a poukazuje na jej vieru, ako dôvod jej záchranu (v. 22b). Clarke pripomína Ježišovo upresnenie, že ju uzdravila jej viera, a nie jej dotyk obruby odevu<sup>42</sup>. Ježiš obrátením sa „obrúti“ predošlú skutočnosť, prenesie dôraz na niečo iné, než čo je bezprostredne spomínané, a to z odevu na vieru. Ježiš, hoci nie je obklopený zástupom, otáča sa a uvidí ženu, ktorá sa ho dotkla. Teda o Ježišovom obrátení sa nerozhoduje zástup, ale skutočnosť dotyku, za ktorým je viera. Aj kódex Bezae chcel ešte viac zdôrazniť toto obrátenie tým, že mu predchádzalo Ježišovo zastavenie sa (ἔστη στραφείς). Ježiš túto ženu vyzval k odvahe rovnako ako ochrnutého človeka, ktorému odpustil hriechy (9,2).

Matúš na Ježišovo obrátenie sa použil tvar στραφείς namiesto Markovho ἐπιστραφείς. Matúšov tvar vyjadruje aj nelineárny pohyb, teda pohyb otáčavý, ktorý Ježiš mohol bez problémov urobiť, keď ho neobklopoval zástup. U Marka snáď musel trochu počkať, vrátiť sa v zástupe (ἐπιστραφείς) a vytvoriť si priestor, aby sa mohol otočiť. Výber slovesného tvaru mohol závisieť aj od okolností, do ktorých evanjelista vsadil dej (zástup alebo bez zástupu). Aj tu je Ježišovo obrátenie sa spojené s jeho výrokom.

---

<sup>40</sup> WEISSENRIEDER, *Imagess of Illness*, 237.

<sup>41</sup> TALBERT, *Matthew*, 120.

<sup>42</sup> CLARKE, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 105.

### 2.3.2 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a dôrazné dohováranie Petrovi (16,23)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Mt 16,23	ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς <sup>43</sup> εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ	On sa obrátil a povedal Petrovi.	Ale obrátený povedal Petrovi.

Aj u Matúša je táto zmienka o Ježišovom obrátení sa v kontexte Petrovho vyznania pri Cézarey Filipovej (16,13-20) a prvej predpovede utrpenia (16,21). Marek neuviedol obsah Petrovho karhania Ježiša, kým Matúš áno (v. 22). Aj Matúš charakterizoval Petrovo dohováranie Ježišovi ako karhanie, no pri Ježišovom dohováraní Petrovi, na rozdiel od Marka, karhanie vôbec nespomína. Matúš zjemňuje charakter Ježišovej výpovede voči Petrovi, keď ho uvádza ako jednoduché hovorenie.

Podľa Wesleyho je u Marka Petrovo pokarhanie Ježiša prezentované ako dôsledok jeho neúplného pochopenia, kým je Ježiš (Mk 8,29). Ale keďže Matúš predstavuje Petra tak, že jasne chápe, kto je Ježiš (v. 16), motivácia pokarhania tu nie je taká jasná. Ježiš vo svojom výroku Petrovi nehovorí až tak o motivácii pokarhania, ale skôr o jeho dôvode: Peter sa zameriava na ľudské veci, a nie na Božie. Je to v kontraste s Ježišovým výrokom o tom, že nie telo a krv (ľudské veci) zjavili Petrovi Ježišovu identitu, ale Otec (v. 17)<sup>44</sup>. France vysvetľuje Ježišovo obrátenie sa ako reč tela, ktorá pridáva na efekte verejného dohovárania Petrovi<sup>45</sup>. Aj tu je Ježišovo obrátenie spojené s výrokom.

## 2.4 Súhrn

Matúš, rovnako ako Marek, uvádza dve Ježišove obrátenia – pri uzdravení ženy trpiacej na krvotok (9,22) a pri dôraznom dohováraní Petrovi (16,23). V oboch prípadoch vyjadril Ježišovo obrátenie sa zhodným tvarom *στραφεὶς*, hoci neskoršie kódexy majú tendenciu harmonizácie s Markom. Matúš neumiestnil dotyk chorej ženy do zástupu, ale do užšej skupiny učeníkov a popredného človeka. Matúš Ježišovmu dohováraníu Petrovi ubral charakter pokarhania, hoci Petrove slová k Ježišovi ako pokarhanie vníma. U Marka bolo Petrovo karhanie Ježiša dôsledkom nedostatočného poznania Ježiša a neprijatia

<sup>43</sup> Podobne ako v Mt 9,22, aj v tomto verši sa neskoršie kódexy, ako napr. D, K, L, pokúšajú harmonizovať výraz pre obrátenie s Markom. Nahrádzajú *στραφεὶς* výrazom *επιστραφεὶς*. No kódexy, ako X a B, uvádzajú *στραφεὶς*.

<sup>44</sup> WESLEY, *Matthew*, 170.

<sup>45</sup> FRANCE, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 580.



jeho vízie Mesiáša. U Matúša bolo Petrovo poznanie Ježiša vyjadrené v úplnosti, no chýbal mu zmysel pre Božie veci. Obrátenie sa dáva Ježišovmu dohováraniu Petrovi silnejší efekt. Matúš dal oproti Markovi väčšiu zreteľnosť adresátom, ku ktorým sa Ježiš obrátil, najmä spomenutím pohľadu na ženu. V obidvoch prípadoch je obrátenie sa spojené s Ježišovým výrokom.

### **2.5 Ježišovo obrátenie sa u Lukáša**

V nasledujúcej časti sa budeme venovať zmienkam o Ježišovom obrátení sa v Lukášovom evanjeliu. Na rozdiel od Marka s Matúšom, Lukáš uviedol až sedem zmienok o Ježišovom obrátení. No s Markom a Lukášom ho spája identický gramatický tvar a pridŕža sa Matúšovho tvaru *στραφεῖς*. Textová kritika v jednotlivých výskytoch neuvádza textový variant s *επιστραφεῖς* v neskorších kódexoch. Ježišovo obrátenie sa spomína v udalostiach odlišných od ostatných dvoch synoptikov. Zároveň však poukážeme na ich vnútornú súvislosť a lukášovské rozvíjanie témy Ježišovho obrátenia v kontinuite s Markom a Matúšom.

V udalosti uzdravenia ženy chorej na krvotok, kde Marek s Matúšom uviedli Ježišovo obrátenie sa, ho Lukáš nespomína. Udalosť napomenutia Petra v kontexte jeho vyznania Lukáš nespomína vôbec, a teda chýba aj zmienka Ježišovho obrátenia, uvedená u Marka a Matúša. Lukáš však zaznamenal Ježišovo obrátenie sa v udalosti uzdravenia stotníkovho sluhu (7,9). V paralelnej udalosti u Matúša (8,5-13) Ježišovo obrátenie nie je spomenuté. V 7. kap. je ešte jedna zmienka o Ježišovom obrátení, a to v udalosti stretnutia s hriešnou ženou v dome farizeja Šimona (7,44). Ďalšie tri zmienky o Ježišovom obrátení Lukáš zaznamenal pri pokarhaní Jakuba a Jána v ich nesprávnej horlivosti voči Samaritánom (9,55). Potom v pozitívnom význame pri makarizme učeníkov (10,23), ktorý uvádza aj Matúš (13,16-17), ale bez Ježišovho obrátenia. Ježiš sa obráti aj pri vyslovení podmienok pre učeníka pred zástupmi (14,25). Ježišove výroky s podobným obsahom uviedol aj Matúš (10,37-38), ale bez Ježišovho obrátenia. Posledné dve Ježišove obrátenia Lukáš umiestnil do pašií: po Petrovom zapretí (22,61) a na krížovej ceste k plačúcim ženám (23,28).

Podľa Soardsa pozoruhodnosť slovesného tvaru *στραφεῖς* nie je v jeho význame, ale v tom, že podmetom fyzického obrátenia sa k nejakému adresátovi, čo tento tvar vyjadruje, je v Lukášovom evanjeliu len Ježiš<sup>46</sup>. Fitzmyer vidí

---

<sup>46</sup> SOARDS, Jesus' Speech, 231.

v στραφεῖς oblúbený tvar pre Lukáša<sup>47</sup>. Bovon uvádza, že Lukáš rád hovorí, ako sa Ježiš obráti k partnerom v rozhovore skôr, než s nimi prehovorí. Lukáš má svoj oblúbený literárny prostriedok: frázu πρὸς αὐτάς („k nim“) spája nielen so στραφεῖς, ale aj s εἶπεν („povedal“)<sup>48</sup>.

Jednotlivé zmienky predstavíme najprv prehľadne v tabuľke, potom sa budeme venovať špecifickému lukášovskému rozpracovaniu.

### 2.5.1 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a stotníkova viera (7,9)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 7,9	στραφεῖς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπεν	Obrátil sa a zástupom, čo ho sprevádzali, povedal.	Obrátený povedal zástupu, čo ho nasledoval <sup>49</sup> .

Udalosť uzdravenia stotníkovho sluhu nasleduje po Ježišovej reči na rovine (6,17-49), tesne po podobenstve o dvoch staviteľoch (6,48-49). Nasledujúcou udalosťou je vzkriesenie syna vdovy pri Naime (7,11-17), súvislý blok o Jánovi Krstiteľovi (7,18-35) a udalosť stretnutia s hriešnou ženou v dome farizeja Šimona (7,36-50).

Podľa Bocka sa touto udalosťou Ježišovo uzdravovanie vzťahuje aj na pohanov<sup>50</sup>. Hoci u Lukáša stotník neprišiel osobne za Ježišom ako u Matúša (8,5), prvé Ježišovo obrátenie v treťom evanjeliu bolo podnietené stotníkovým odkazom. Teda pohan bol nepriamym dôvodom prvého Ježišovho obrátenia sa u Lukáša. Môžeme tu vidieť kontinuitu s prvou Ježišovou rečou v Nazarete, v ktorej vyzdvihol vdovu v Sarepte a Sýrčana Námána (4,26-27). Ježišovo obrátenie spôsobil stotníkov odkaz, ktorý Ježiš vysvetlil ako prejav takej viery, akú nenašiel ani v Izraeli. Reakciu na stotníkov odkaz Ježiš povedal obrátený k zástupu, ktorý ho nasledoval. Lukáš tu jasnejším spôsobom vyjadruje adresáta Ježišovho obrátenia, ktorým je zástup, ktorý ho nasleduje. Aj tu je Ježišovo obrátenie sa spojené s výrokom.

Matúš v paralelnej udalosti neuviedol Ježišovo obrátenie sa a Marek udalosť nespomenul vôbec. Lukáš do nej vtlačil prvok Ježišovho obrátenia. Stotník, ktorý postavil synagógu, sa stal príkladom človeka, ktorý počúval

<sup>47</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 653.

<sup>48</sup> BOVON, *Luke 3*, 302.

<sup>49</sup> Fitzmyer navrhuje preklad „obrátený povedal...“, pretože datív (ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ) je nepriamym predmetom slovesa povedať (FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 653).

<sup>50</sup> BOCK, *A Theology of Luke's Gospel*, 70.

Ježišovo slovo a dôveroval mu, a tak naplnil podobenstvo o mužovi stavajúcom na skale (6,47-48; 7,5).

### 2.5.2 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a viera hriešnej ženy (7,44)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 7,44	καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη	Potom sa obrátil k žene a Šimonovi povedal.	A obrátený na tú ženu Šimonovi povedal.

Druhé Ježišovo obrátenie sa v treťom evanjeliu a druhé aj v jeho 7. kap. je k hriešnej žene v dome farizeja Šimona. Ježiš bol pozvaný farizejom Šimonom k spoločnému stolovaniu, teda určite – aspoň podľa farizejov – do lepšej spoločnosti ako v dome Léviho (5,29-30). Záver udalosti ukázal (v. 49), že v dome farizeja bola početnejšia spoločnosť, nielen Šimon. No aj tam vstúpila hriešna žena z mesta (v. 37) a ani táto spoločnosť nebola uchránená od zástupcu hriešnikov.

Podľa Bocka táto žena nepovedala v udalosti ani jedno slovo, no jej konanie vyvolalo reakciu od všetkých prítomných. Farizej si bol istý, že Ježiš nie je prorok. Zatiaľ čo farizej vynáša tento súd, Ježiš si pripravuje podobenstvo, ktorým je zrejmé, že Ježiš vie o jeho vnútornom posudzovaní. Ježiš považoval konanie ženy za znak vd'ačnosti za odpustenie. Podobenstvo, ktoré povedal, zdôraznilo, že láska vzniká z odpustenia<sup>51</sup>. Hoci po skončení podobenstva je Ježiš obrátený k žene, práve Šimonovi hovorí slová, ktoré hodnotia a oceňujú jej konanie. Zo všetkých prítomných je Ježiš obrátený výslovne len k žene. Dagmar Kráľová sa tiež zmienila o zvláštnosti gesta Ježišovho obrátenia k žene, ktorým chcel farizeja Šimona priviesť predovšetkým k pohľadu na túto ženu<sup>52</sup>.

Nolland uvádza, že poskytnutie vody hosťom na umytie nôh nebolo bežným prejavom pohostinnosti. Šimon teda nič nezanedbal, no žene z mesta bolo umožnené so slzami ako vodou a vlasmi ako uterákom ukázať mimoriadnu veľkorysosť, vyjadrujúcu pohostinnosť hostiteľa, ktorý bol svojmu hosťovi dlžný veľkú vd'ačnosť<sup>53</sup>. Podľa Cottera Ježiš až do okamihu obrátenia sa nemohol vidieť ženu, ktorá bola vzadu (v. 38), pri jeho nohách<sup>54</sup>. Keď bol Ježiš obrátený k žene, už mu nezmáčala nohy slzami, neutierala mu nohy vlasmi, aj

<sup>51</sup> BOCK, *A Theology of Luke's Gospel*, 346.

<sup>52</sup> KRÁĽOVÁ, *Lebo veľmi miluje*, 166.

<sup>53</sup> NOLLAND, *Luke 1–9:20*, 357.

<sup>54</sup> COTTER, "Simon I Have Something to Say to You", 97.

pomazanie olejom už skončilo. Pretrvávalo však vrúcne bozkávanie nôh, ktoré neprestalo odvtedy, čo Ježiš vošiel do Šimonovho domu. Žena mu neprestala bozkávať nohy, aj keď bol Ježiš k nej obrátený. Ježišove slová o bozkávaní nôh od chvíle vojdenia pripúšťajú možnosť, že žena už na Ježiša vo farizejovom dome čakala. Ježiš obrátený k žene, prijímajúc jej bozky na svoje nohy, už povedal priamo jej, a nie Šimonovi, že jej hriechy boli odpustené (v. 48). Dowling uvádza, že žene bolo odpustené ešte pred pomazaním Ježiša<sup>55</sup>. Takisto Ježiš obrátený k nej povedal, že ju zachránila jej viera. Ježiš obrátený k žene vyzdvihol jej gestá vďačnosti, uistil ju o odpustení hriechov a jej vieru označil za dôvod jej záchrany.

Hoci Lukáš vo svojom rozprávaní o žene chorej na krvotok (8,43-48) nespomenul Ježišovo obrátenie sa, môžeme vidieť vnútornú spojitosť v udalosti s hriešnou ženou. Obidve ženy prišli zozadu za Ježišom (7,38; 8,44) a pri obidvoch Ježiš použil takmer identické slová vyzdvihujúce ich vieru, ktorá ich zachránila, a prepustil ich v pokoji (7,50; 8,48). Podľa J. Feníka obidve ženy vďaka viere a stretnutiu s Ježišom zakúsili fundamentálnu životnú premenu, ktorej výsledkom bol odchod v pokoji zo scény rozprávania s plnosťou Božieho požehnaní<sup>56</sup>.

Lukáš však Ježišovo obrátenie sa rezervoval pre hriešnu ženu, aby Ježišovo obrátenie nebolo venované len fyzickej chorobe a rituálnej nečistote, ale nastalo v okamihu, keď išlo o hriech. Ježišovo obrátenie nebolo venované žene, ktorá prestala krváčať, ale ktorej prestali hriechy kvôli odpusteniu. Zároveň sme však poukázali na to, že Markova a Lukášova podoba udalosti so ženou chorou na krvotok nechcela zdôrazniť až tak jej rituálnu nečistotu, ale jej stav ohrozujúci život, stav blízko smrti. Lukáš však do takejto dramatickej situácie nedal zmienku o Ježišovom obrátení. Presunul ju do udalosti s hriešnou ženou. Tým zvýraznil vážnosť hriechu, ktorý sa rovná stavu blízkeho smrti, avšak odpustenie je vrátením života pre hriešnicu. Hriešna žena bola zachránená pred smrťou, rovnako ako žena chorá na krvotok. Takto Lukáš Ježišovo obrátenie sa posunul do ešte väčšej hĺbky biedy človeka, kde hriech je tiež stavom ohrozujúcim život a kde je rovnako potrebný Ježišov zásah vrátenia života cez odpustenie.

---

<sup>55</sup> DOWLING, *Taking Away the Pound*, 148.

<sup>56</sup> FENÍK, *Dočasne neplodná*, 240.

### 2.5.3 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a pokarhanie dvoch učeníkov (9,55)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 9,55	στραφεῖς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς <sup>57</sup>	On sa obrátil a pokarhal ich.	Ale obrátený im pohrozil <sup>58</sup> .

Lukáš neuvádza Petrovo pokarhanie Ježiša a ani následnú Ježišovu reakciu, tak ako ju opísali Marek s Matúšom. Zaznamenal však pohrozenie iným dvom učeníkom, a to Jakubovi a Jánovi (9,55). Toto pohrozenie bolo spojené s Ježišovým obrátením, prvým na jeho ceste do Jeruzalema (9,51). V tejto 9. kap. sa nachádza aj Petrovo vyznanie (v. 20), ktoré však nevyústi do Petrovej reakcie ako u Marka a Matúša. Takisto v tejto kap. je aj Ježišovo premenenie, ktorého sú účastní Peter, Ján a Jakub. Napomenutí budú však len Jakub a Ján, Peter ostane nespomenutý.

Podnetom pre Ježišovo obrátenie sa bola iniciatíva dvoch bratov, ktorí chceli svojím slovom dosiahnuť zostúpenie ohňa z neba, ktorý by zničil obyvateľov samarijskej dediny (v. 54). Obrátenie sa bolo spojené s pohrozením dvom bratom. Neskoršie rukopisy uviedli aj obsah tohto napomenutia, no skorší textoví svedkovia (I<sup>45</sup> a I<sup>75</sup>) jeho obsah neuvádzajú. Podľa Fitzmyera je Ježiš zobrazený ako ten, ktorý vedie spoločenstvo nasledovníkov<sup>59</sup>. Z toho by vyplývalo, že sa Ježiš obrátil k učeníkom, ktorí za ním povedali slová o zničení dediny. Adresátni Ježišovho obrátenia by boli dvaja bratia. No adresáti v 9,55 sú o niečo menej zreteľní ako v predošlých dvoch prípadoch Ježišovho obrátenia (7,9; 7,44).

Ježišovo obrátenie sa a pohrozením vyjadrený nesúhlas s návrhom dvoch bratov určili charakter jeho cesty do Jeruzalema. P. Mareček uvádza, že Ježiš neputuje do Jeruzalema v roli sudcu, ale Spasiteľa<sup>60</sup>. Ježiš, hoci si zatvrdil tvár pre cestu do Jeruzalema (9,51), čím bolo vyjadrené nemenné rozhodnutie tam ísť, sa hneď na začiatku cesty obrátil. Toto obrátenie bolo nevyhnutné pre vyjasnenie charakteru jeho cesty. Podľa Bocka Ježišovo odmietnutie ponuky

<sup>57</sup> Na konci v. 55 niektorí textoví svedkovia čítajú: „A povedal: «Neviete, (akého) ducha ste synmi.»“ A na začiatku v. 56 čítajú: „Lebo Syn človeka neprišiel zničiť duše ľudí, ale zachrániť.“ Variant pripomína Lk 19,10 alebo Jn 3,17 (OMANSON, *A Textual Guide*, 126). Ide o textových svedkov, ako napr. K, Γ, Θ, f<sup>1.13</sup>, 700 a i. Samotný variant v. 55, bez variantu na začiatku v. 56, uvádzajú kódex D a Epifánus Konštantský (†403). Skoršie papyrasy ako P<sup>45</sup> a P<sup>75</sup> (3. stor.), Laudov kódex (E) zo 6. stor. a Hesychius (†451) tieto dodatky vynechávajú (FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 830).

<sup>58</sup> PANCZOVÁ, *Grécko-slovenský slovník*, 525.

<sup>59</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 830.

<sup>60</sup> MAREČEK, *Evangelium podle Lukáše*, 326.

dvoch bratov znamenalo, že ešte neprišiel čas na konanie súdu. Ježišovo obrátenie a pokarhanie učeníkov dotvárajú nasledujúce Ježišove slová o tom, že jeho nasledovníci nebudú mať domov a nebudú mať, kde hlavu skloniť (vv. 57-58)<sup>61</sup>. Ak sa pridržame prijatej lektúry podľa vážených rukopisov, Ježišovo obrátenie sa nebolo spojené s konkrétnym výrokom, ale s pohrozením, ktorého obsah nepoznáme.

#### 2.5.4 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a šťastie učeníkov (10,23)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 10,23 <sup>62</sup>	Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν <sup>63</sup> εἶπεν	Potom sa obrátil osobitne k učeníkom a povedal.	A obrátený osobitne na učeníkov povedal.

Druhá zmienka o Ježišovom obrátení sa na ceste do Jeruzalema má iný náboj ako tá prvá. Kým pri tej prvej bolo pokarhanie, v tejto druhej sú učeníci označení za blahoslavených. Téma učeníkov však spája prvú aj druhú zmienku. Prvému Ježišovmu obráteniu na ceste do Jeruzalema predchádzala iniciatíva dvoch bratov vykonať súd nad dedinou, druhému obráteniu predchádza Ježišovo zaplesanie v Duchu Svätom a zvelebovanie Otca. V tejto atmosfére je Ježiš obrátený k učeníkom, ktorým adresuje makarizmus vzťahujúci sa na ich oči. Podobný makarizmus zaznamenal aj Matúš (13,16-17), no bez zmienky o Ježišovom obrátení sa a vzťahuje sa aj na uši učeníkov.

Lukáš je opäť zreteľný v určení adresáta Ježišovho obrátenia sa, ktorým sú učeníci. Fráza κατ' ἰδίαν sa môže vzťahovať na Ježišovo obrátenie sa alebo na slová učeníkom. Fráza môže spresniť a ešte viac vymedziť adresáta Ježišovho obrátenia alebo môže odčleniť predošlé Ježišove slová (vv. 21-22) od makarizmu učeníkov. Slová makarizmu sú určené osobitne učeníkom a nie Otcovi. Podľa Nollanda obrátenie sa k učeníkom predznamenáva prejdenie od modlitby k reči

<sup>61</sup> BOCK, *A Theology of Luke's Gospel*, 72.

<sup>62</sup> Na začiatku Lk 10,22 veľa textových svedkov, ako napr. A, C, K, N a i., pridávajú frázu zo začiatku v. 23: „Obrátil sa k učeníkom a povedal.“ Ale tieto slová sú druhoradé, zobraté z v. 23 a pridané prepisovačmi, aby vysvetlili náhlu zmenu z Ježišovej modlitby (v. 21) k jeho výroku k učeníkom (v. 22). Lukášovým štýlom nie je opakovať slová alebo frázy, tak ako to naznačuje spomínaný variant (OMANSON, *A Textual Guide*, 129). Text bez pridaného úvodu vo v. 22 uvádzajú aj skoršie papyrasy ako P<sup>45</sup> a P<sup>75</sup> a kódexy, ako napr. B a B. Prikláňame sa k týmto skorším textovým svedkom, ako to uvádza aj prijatá lektúra.

<sup>63</sup> Kódex D, 1424, lat a sy<sup>s,c</sup> vynechávajú frázu κατ' ἰδίαν („osobitne“). Variant je však málo doložený.

učenikom<sup>64</sup>. Aj tu je Ježišovo obrátenie spojené s jeho výrokom. Učeníci nie sú blahoslavení preto, že sa im poddávali duchovia (10,17.20), ale preto, že v prítomnosti vidia Ježiša a jeho skutky.

### 2.5.5 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a podmienky pre učeníkov (14,25)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 14,25	Συνεπορεύντο δὲ αὐτῶ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ στραφεῖς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς	Išli s ním veľké zástupy. Tu sa obrátil a povedal im.	Ale išli s ním veľké zástupy a obrátený povedal im.

Tretie Ježišovo obrátenie sa na ceste do Jeruzalema súvisí s témou učeníctva, tak ako v predošlých dvoch. V. 25 je prejdením od stolovania v dome popredného farizeja (14,1-24) k spoločnému kráčaniam spolu s veľkými zástupmi na ceste do Jeruzalema. Ježiš sa sám od seba bez výslovného podnetu obrátil a povedal zástupom, ktoré ho sprevádzali, kto nemôže byť jeho učeníkom. Podobný text uvádza aj Matúš (10,37), no Mareček uvádza, že prvú Ježišovu podmienku pre učeníka Lukáš predstavil oveľa radikálnejšie (v. 26). Pohoršlivý výraz „nenávidieť“ sa tu nesmie chápať emocionálne, ale treba ho brať v zmysle „prikladať menší význam“<sup>65</sup>. Aj druhá Ježišova podmienka nachádza podobnosť u Matúša (10,38). Kto nenesie svoj kríž, nemôže byť učeníkom (Lk 14,27). Kto teda neprikladá menší význam vzťahom s najbližšími ľuďmi a nenesie kríž, nemôže byť učeníkom. Ježiš formuloval podmienky pre svojho učeníka v negatívnom zmysle, nie kto môže, ale kto nemôže byť učeníkom<sup>66</sup>.

V podobnom texte u Matúša nie je zmienka o Ježišovom obrátení. V Lukášovom podaní táto zmienka je, no aj prvá podmienka je podaná radikálnejšie ako u Matúša. Ježišovo obrátenie snád' oprávňuje evanjelistu zvýšiť požiadavku na Ježišovho učeníka. Avšak náročnosť Ježišových požiadaviek je zjavná aj v ďalšom kontexte, keď v 15,1 zostali z veľkých zástupov len všetci mýtnici a hriešnici, ktorí sa približovali k Ježišovi. Zmienka o nesení kríža je už prípravou na dve Ježišove obrátenia v opise jeho umučenia. Aj tu je Ježišovo obrátenie sa spojené s jeho výrokmi.

<sup>64</sup> NOLLAND, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 575.

<sup>65</sup> MAREČEK, *Evangelium podle Lukáše*, 427.

<sup>66</sup> Viac o téme spojenia kríža s učeníkom v publikácii MALIŠ, *Šimon z Cyrény*.

### 2.5.6 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a Petrovo zapretie (22,61)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 22,61	καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ <sup>67</sup>	Vtedy sa Pán obrátil a pozrel sa na Petra.	A obrátený Pán sa zahľadel <sup>68</sup> (k) Petrovi.

Prvé Ježišovo obrátenie sa v pašiách bolo na Petra po jeho treťom zapretí a speve kohúta. V tomto prípade Lukáš zameral pozornosť na Ježišovo obrátenie, no zároveň je zreteľný aj jeho adresát, vyjadrený pohľadom na Petra. Sloveso ἐμβλέπω vyjadruje Ježišov upretý pohľad na Petra.

Podľa Bovona Ježišov pohľad vyvoláva spomienku. To, že sa Ježiš obrátil, je vyjadrením toho, že Ježiš nezabúda na osud svojho učeníka. Čitatelia vedia, že Ježiš stratil slobodu pohybu. No Ježiš využíva svoje posledné právo otočiť hlavu a pozrieť sa na svojho učeníka. Evanjelista tento pohľad nepopisuje. Dá sa povedať len toľko, že Ježišovi nejde o seba, ale o učeníka. Javí sa nemožné určiť, či Ježišov pohľad prezrádza smútok alebo výčitku. Lukáš opísal len účinok, ktorý táto neverbálna komunikácia pohľadom priniesla, a to spomenutie si na Pánovo slovo. Ježiš je tu obrátený ako Pán. Lukáš chce zdôrazniť, že ten, kto sa pozrel na Petra, nie je jednoducho „Ježiš“, ale „Pán“<sup>69</sup>.

Čitateľ by čakal, že tu konečne zaznejú slová pokarhania voči Petrovi, ktoré Lukáš úplne vynechal po Petrovom vyznaní (9,20). No nestane sa tak. Ježiš zostane pri obrátení sa a mlkvom pohľade na Petra. Toto obrátenie sa na Petra je *jediné* Ježišovo obrátenie u synoptikov, po ktorom *nenasleduje* Ježišov výrok, ktorého obsah poznáme alebo pokarhanie, ktorého obsah nepoznáme. Toto obrátenie sa je uzavreté Ježišovým mlkvým pohľadom na Petra.

Dubovský spája toto posledné stretnutie pozemského Ježiša s Petrom s jeho prvým povolaním (Lk 5,10-11). Prvý dialóg s Petrom sa skončil Petrovým

<sup>67</sup> Starobyľý papyrus P<sup>69</sup> z 3. stor. [obsahuje len časť Lukášovho evanjelia 22,41.45-48.58-61 (NA<sup>28</sup>, 796)] uvádza textový variant, hoci nie s úplnou istotou. Namiesto subst. κύριος uvádza vlastné subst. Πέτρος, zamieňa podmety vo vete. Z toho vyplýva aj ďalšia zmena, keď vo fráze je namiesto ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ („pozrel sa na Petra“) spojenie ἐνέβλεψεν αὐτῷ („pozrel sa na neho/mu“). Hneď potom papyrus zamieňa καὶ za τότε („vtedy“). Časť tohto verša podľa P<sup>69</sup> by v pracovnom preklade znela: A obrátený Peter sa pozrel na neho, vtedy sa Peter rozpamätal na Pánovo slovo. Hoci tento variant nie je prijatou lektúrou a uvádza ho len tento papyrus, je zaujímavým pohľadom na zámenu podmetov a významný obsahový presun z Ježišovej činnosti na Petrovu reakciu.

<sup>68</sup> PANCZOVÁ, *Grécko-slovenský slovník*, 440.

<sup>69</sup> BOVON, *Luke 3*, 224, 232-233.



vyznaním, že je hriešnik, ktorý žiada, aby Ježiš od neho odišiel (5,8). Posledné stretnutie s Ježišom sa skončí bez slov a Petrove slová sa naplnia. Peter si uvedomí, že je hriešnik, a na druhej strane Ježiš definitívne odíde. Peter pri tomto poslednom stretnutí pred Ježišovou smrťou precítil to, čo povedal na začiatku, že je hriešnik<sup>70</sup>.

Slová zapretia boli podnetom pre Ježišovo obrátenie sa. Avšak toto obrátenie je Ježišovým vyznaním voči Petrovi, krátko po Petrovom zapretí voči Ježišovi. Nie Petrovo zapretie a spev kohúta bude poslednou udalosťou, ale Ježišovo obrátenie a pohľad na Petra. Toto obrátenie Ježiš Petrovi nepredpovedal, no bolo vyjadrením toho, že aj po zapretí bude Petrova úloha pokračovať.

### 2.5.7 Ježišovo obrátenie sa a plačúce ženy (23,28)

Verš	Grécka syntagma	SPSiNZ	Pracovný preklad
Lk 23,28	στραφεῖς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν	Ježiš sa k nim obrátil a povedal.	Ale obrátený na ne Ježiš povedal.

Druhé Ježišovo obrátenie sa v pašiách a posledné v Lukášovom evanjeliu je na krížovej ceste k plačúcim ženám. V tomto poslednom prípade je Lukáš jednoznačný v adresátovi, ku ktorému sa Ježiš obrátil. Spojitosť s predošlým obrátením je aj v plači. Peter plakal po Ježišovom obrátení a pohľade na neho (22,62), ženy plačú ešte pred Ježišovým obrátením a aj počas neho (23,27-28).

Bovon vidí v tomto obrátení sa Ježiša k ženám jeho zvláštnu a láskavú pozornosť<sup>71</sup>. Neyrey zase pripúšťa, že v tomto obrátení možno vidieť výzvu k zmene života, ale ešte viac v ňom vidí vynesenie rozsudku nad hriešnym Jeruzalemom<sup>72</sup>. Bock uvádza, že Ježiš použil súcit žien na varovanie, že ak sa takýto súd koná so zeleným stromom, aký potom stihne strom mŕtvy<sup>73</sup>. Soards uvádza, že v žiadnom inom známom prameni nie je informácia o tomto dialógu so ženami, takže Lukáš nevychádzal z iného literárneho diela, ani z ústnej tradície, ani nezávisí od predlukášovských zdrojov. Toto stretnutie je najpravdepodobnejšie Lukášovou kompozíciou. Tieto slová opäť ukazujú na zobrazenie Ježiša v pašiách, ktoré má črty konania s autoritou, čoho prejavom je aj obrátenie sa k ženám. Podobne to bolo pri obrátení sa na Petra (22,61). Aj keď Lukášova zmienka o Ježišovom obrátení nemusí sama osebe znamenať

<sup>70</sup> DUBOVSKÝ, Povolanie a formácia Petra, 104.

<sup>71</sup> BOVON, *Luke 3*, 302.

<sup>72</sup> NEYREY, *The Passion According to Luke*, 111-112.

<sup>73</sup> BOCK, *A Theology of Luke's Gospel*, 349.

významný čin, obrátenie sa vytvára aktivitu, ktorá je veľmi dôležitá. Ježiš sa obracia typicky lukášovským spôsobom, aby prorocky hovoril k „jeruzalemským dcéram“<sup>74</sup>. Plač žien bol dôvodom Ježišovho obrátenia. Toto obrátenie sa poukazuje aj na Ježišovu vnímavosť ešte aj na krížovej ceste.

## 2.6 Súhrn

Lukáš osobitným spôsobom rozpracoval tému Ježišovho obrátenia. Poukazuje na to aj ich počet (sedem) oproti Markovi s Matúšom (dve). Tieto obrátenia zaznamenal v rozdielnych udalostiach od ostatných synoptikov (7,9; 7,44; 9,55; 10,23; 14,25; 22,61; 23,28).

U Lukáša nachádzame stabilitu pojmu *σραφείς* bez textových variantov s *ἐπιστραφείς* a jeho podmetom je len Ježiš. Lukáš prehľbil tému Ježišovho obrátenia sa. Vidíme to v udalosti uzdravenia ženy chorej na krvotok, kde sa Lukáš, oproti ostatným synoptikom, vyhol zmienke o obrátení. Ale použil ho v udalosti s hriešnou ženou, kde toto obrátenie vynikne ešte viac. Ježiš sa obrátil k človeku s morálnou nečistotou (hriech) a nie s rituálnou nečistotou (choroba). Zároveň Ježišovo obrátenie umiestnil do stretnutia s hriešnou ženou, ktorá potrebovala záchranu a vrátenie života rovnako ako žena chorá na krvotok.

Spolu s témou Ježišovho obrátenia Lukáš rozpracoval aj postavu Petra. Nezobrazil ho, ako karhá Ježiša a ani on nebol pokarhaný Ježišom. Z trojice najbližších učeníkov boli pokarhaní len Jakub a Ján. Peter je Lukášom chránený, dokonca aj pri obrátení na Petra po zapretí Ježiš mlčí. Od Petra sa bude vyžadovať hlbšia vnímavosť, ktorou pochopí nielen slová, ale aj celkovú komunikáciu. Lukáš takisto najviac rozpracoval Ježišovo obrátenie sa po zapretí, keď zaznamenal nielen obrátenie, ale aj Ježišov pohľad na Petra. Ježiš sa obrátil na Petra ako na hriešnu ženu vo chvíli, keď Peter precítil, že je človek hriešny.

Lukáš rozpracoval aj jasnosť adresátov, ku ktorým sa Ježiš obrátil. Jasnosť adresátov je vidieť najmä v 7,9 (zástup), 7,44 (žena), 10,23 (učeníci), 22,61 (Peter) a v 23,28 (ženy).

Lukáš vytvára z jednotlivých obrátení dvojice, naznačil to aj ich vzájomnou blízkosťou v kontexte. Spája ich tematicky a vnútornou súvislosťou. Spája obrátenie 7,9 a 7,44 cez stotníka a ženu, cez ich náboženský a morálny status. V jednom prípade ide o pohana, v druhom o hriešnu ženu. Zároveň ich spája téma viery. Zmienky 9,55 a 10,23 spájajú učeníci, Jakub a Ján a sedemdesiati dvaja. Spája ich kontrast Ježišovho pokarhania a plesania.

<sup>74</sup> SOARDS, Jesus' Speech, 230-231.

Zároveň sú obidve na ceste do Jeruzalema. Zmienka v 14,25 spája predošlé dve zmienky v súvislosti s učeníkmi a zmienkou o nesení kríža pripravuje Ježišove obrátenia v pašiách. Dvojicu Ježišových obrátení v 22,61 a 23,28 spája okolnosť Ježišovho umučenia i plaču postáv, ku ktorým sa Ježiš obrátil.

Ježišovým obráteniam u Lukáša predchádza emotívny prvok. K obráteniu v 7,9 sa vzťahuje Ježišov údiv, v 7,44 sú to neprestávajúce bozky od ženy na Ježišove nohy (7,45). Obráteniu sa k Jakubovi a Jánovi predchádza ich zvolávanie pomsty, za ktorým možno vidieť ich rozhorčenie (9,54) a obráteniu k učeníkom predchádza Ježišovo plesanie (10,21). Pri obrátení k Petrovi je to ťaživá okolnosť zapretia (22,60) a obráteniu na krížovej ceste predchádza plač žien (23,27).

Ježišove obrátenia Lukáš spojil s výrokom (7,9; 7,44; 10,23; 14,27; 23,28), s pokarhaním (9,55). Jediné obrátenie sa bez výroku je po Petrovom zapretí (22,61).

### 3 Súhrn synoptických zmienok o Ježišom obrátení

V predošlých súhrnoch sme sa venovali záverom zo zmienok o Ježišom obrátení sa u jednotlivých synoptikov. V nasledujúcej časti budeme hovoriť o Ježišom obrátení sa vzhľadom na medzisyntické vzťahy. Uvedieme vývoj tohto obrátenia v synoptickom diele a prinesieme konkrétne záverečné pozorovanie.

Naše záverečné pozorovanie sa bude týkať Ježišovho obrátenia sa z hľadiska jeho odkazu (čo vyjadruje), sémantického významu a vývoja pojmu pre obrátenie. Ďalej budeme sledovať toto obrátenie z hľadiska jeho podnetov a vývoja zreteľnosti adresátov, ku ktorým sa Ježiš obrátil a zameriame sa aj na fakt Ježišových výrokov po obrátení.

#### a) Odkaz Ježišovho obrátenia

Gesto Ježišovho obrátenia sa (otočenia) bolo *rečou tela* na dosiahnutie väčšieho efektu nasledovného Ježišovho výroku. Bolo vyjadrením *výmeny* adresátov Ježišových slov. Ďalej bolo prejavom Ježišovej láskavej *pozornosti* a vôle *uvidieť človeka*, od ktorého prichádzal podnet. Bolo vyjadrením postoja Ježiša, vyzývajúceho k *zmene života (postoja)* a vynášajúceho *rozsudok*.

#### b) Sémantický význam a vývoj pojmu pre obrátenie

Ježišovo obrátenie sa (otočenie) synoptici vyjadrili slovesami ἐπιστρέφω a στρέφω, ich konkrétnymi tvarmi ἐπιστραφεῖς a στραφεῖς. Sloveso ἐπιστρέφω

zahŕňa v sebe črtu lineárneho návratu, kým στρέφω aj črtu nelineárneho, otáčavého pohybu. Rozdielne použitie termínov ilustrujú napr. Mk 5,30 a Mt 9,22. V Mk 5,30 bol Ježiš súčasťou zástupu, ktorý sa tlačil na neho. Na Ježišovo otočenie tu Marek použil tvar ἐπιστραφείς, lebo Ježiš potreboval urobiť najprv návrat, vytvorenie priestoru, aby sa mohol uprostred zástupu otočiť. Paralelnú udalosť Matúš vyňal zo zástupu a snád aj preto použil tvar στραφείς, keďže Ježiš sa mohol otočiť s ľahkosťou, netiesnený zástupom. Teda výber slovesného tvaru pre Ježišovo obrátenie mohol súvisieť aj s okolnosťami deja, do ktorých evanjelista vsadil celú udalosť (zástup alebo bez zástupu).

U synoptikov môžeme vidieť vývoj použitia týchto termínov pre obrátenie. Marek použil tvar ἐπιστραφείς bez textových variantov tohto tvaru. Matúš zvolil tvar στραφείς, no v neskorších kódexoch ešte badať tendenciu harmonizácie s markovským ἐπιστραφείς. K jasnosti a presnému vymedzeniu pojmu στραφείς pre Ježišovo obrátenie sa prichádzame u Lukáša, kde prestala tendencia harmonizácie a textoví svedkovia mlčia o iných variantoch tohto tvaru. Čo však spája synoptikov ohľadom gramatickej stránky Ježišovho obrátenia, je zhodný tvar participia pasívneho aoristu, v nominatíve singuláru maskulína („obrátený“).

### c) Podnety Ježišovho obrátenia

Okrem jedného prípadu bolo Ježišovo obrátenie sa reakciou na predchádzajúci podnet. Bezprostredný podnet nenachádzame pri Ježišovom obrátení, spojenom s vyslovením požiadaviek pre jeho učeníka. Ostatné podnety pochádzajú od ľudí, v jednom prípade môžeme hovoriť o podnete „zhora“. Podnety pre Ježišovo obrátenie od ľudí sú: dotyk ženy volajúci po záchrane, Petrovo neprijatie Ježišovej vízie Mesiáša a stotníkov odkaz. Dojemným a delikátnym podnetom sú neprestávajúce bozky ženy na Ježišove nohy, neprimerane horlivý návrh dvoch bratov na zničenie samarijskej dediny, Petrovo zapretie a plač žien. Jediným podnetom „zhora“ je kontakt s Otcom, pred makarizmom učeníkov.

### d) Vývoj zreteľnosti adresátov Ježišovho obrátenia

Tak ako sme uviedli vývoj pojmu pre Ježišovo obrátenie, takisto môžeme sledovať vývoj zreteľnosti adresátov, ku ktorým sa Ježiš obrátil. V udalosti ženy chorej na krvotok u Marka je adresát málo zreteľný, no v Matúšovom podaní je zrejmejší cez pohľad na ženu. V udalosti napomenutia Petra je zase adresát

zreteľnejší u Marka cez pohľad na učeníkov. Lukáš určil adresátov najzreteľnejšie. Najmä v udalosti uzdravenia stotníkovho sluhu (zástup), v dome farizeja Šimona (žena), pri makarizme (učeníci), na križovej ceste (plačúce ženy). Najzreteľnejšie vyjadril Lukáš adresáta po zapretí, keď nielen spomenul Pánovo obrátenie, ale aj sprievodný pohľad na Petra. V nezreteľných prípadoch adresátov Ježišovho obrátenia, keď si je už čitateľ takmer istý, ku komu sa Ježiš obráti, synoptici akoby chvíľu postoja a čitateľa vrátia k sústredenosti na fakt Ježišovho obrátenia.

### e) Ježišove výroky po obrátení

Okrem jedného prípadu vždy po Ježišovom obrátení nasledoval jeho výrok. Buď išlo o výrok, ktorého obsah poznáme alebo o pokarhanie s neznámym obsahom. V jedinom prípade nenasledoval Ježišov výrok, a to po Petrovom zapretí. Ježišovo obrátenie sa bolo spojené s Ježišovým mlkvým pohľadom na Petra.

## Záver

To, že synoptici zaznamenali jednoduchý Ježišov pohyb, jeho obrátenie sa, svedčí o jeho dôležitosti. Vzhľadom na to, kto bol jeho podmetom i na preberané výskyty. Hoci termín pre obrátenie prešiel vývojom, samotný fakt Ježišovho obrátenia sa je istý u všetkých synoptikov.

Nejasnosť adresátov, ku ktorým sa Ježiš obrátil, poukazuje znovu na prvotnú dôležitosť samotného obrátenia. Ich zreteľnosť odkrýva synoptickú prácu s týmto jednoduchým Ježišovým pohybom.

Synoptické zmienky o Ježišovom obrátení sa zbiehajú v postave Petra a žien. Synoptici zaznamenali Ježišovo obrátenie pri napomenutí Petra a po jeho zapretí. Tieto negatívne okolnosti ešte viac zvýraznili Ježišove obrátenia k Petrovi. Najmä Ježišovo obrátenie a mlčanlivý pohľad po zapretí, ktorý priviedol Petra k plaču, naznačoval vrátenie života učeníkovi, ktorý mal posilňovať bratov vo viere. A práve viera bola dôvodom záchrany chorej a hriešnej ženy, ktorým Ježiš vrátil život uzdravením a odpustením hriechov.

Ježiš sa obrátil k Petrovi tak ako k *hriešnej žene* vo chvíli zapretia, keď Peter precítil, že je *hriešnym človekom*. Peter pri zapretí dospel k stotožneniu sa s vlastným výrokom o sebe, a vtedy sa Ježiš na neho obrátil. Ježiš sa neobrátil k Petrovi skôr, než neprecítil, že je človekom hriešnym. Takýmto *hriešnym ľudom* (žena a Peter) Ježiš venoval svoje obrátenie, v ktorom im vrátil život. Svojím fyzickým obrátením Ježiš aj navonok vyjadril vnútorné, neviditeľné vrátenie života.

## Zoznam použitej literatúry

- BAUER, Walter – DANKER, Frederick W. – ARNDT, William F. – GINGRICH, Felix W.: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago – London: The University of Chicago, 42021. (= BDAG)
- BOCK, Darrell, L.: *A Theology of Luke's Gospel and Acts*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011.
- BOVON, François: *Luke 3*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- CLARKE, Howard: *The Gospel of Matthew and Its Readers*, Bloomington – Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- COTTER, Wendy: "Simon I Have Something to Say to You" (Luke 7:40): Jesus as Prophet, or, Turning the Tables on Simon. In: Cambry G. Pardee – Jeffrey M. Tripp (eds.): *Sacred Texts & Sacred Figures: The Reception and Use of Inherited Traditions in Early Christian Literature*, Turnhour: Brepols, 2022, 85-104.
- DOWLING, Elisabeth, V.: *Taking Away the Pound*, London – New York: T&T Clark International, 2007.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter (ed.): *Marek* (KNZ 1), Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2013.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: Povolanie a formácia Petra v evanjeliu podľa Lukáša, *VTh* 10/1 (2011) 88-106.
- FENÍK, Juraj: Dočasne neplodná. Alžbeta a premena žien v Lukášovom evanjeliu, *StBiSl* 7/2 (2015) 220-247.
- FITZMYER, Joseph: *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX* (AB 28), New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- FRANCE, Richard, Thomas: *The Gospel of Matthew*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- KRÁLOVÁ, Dagmar: Lebo veľmi miluje. Náčrt komplementarity naratívnej analýzy a psychologických aspektov v Lk 7,36-50, *StBiSl* 6/2 (2014) 158-185.
- LOUW, Johannes, P. – NIDA, Eugene, A. (eds.): *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- MALIŠ, Michal: *Šimon z Cyrény ako príklad učeníka v Lukášovom dvojdielne*, Badín: Kňazský seminár sv. Františka Xaverského, 2012.
- MAREČEK, Petr: *Evangelium podle Lukáše*, Praha: Centrum biblických studií AVČR a UK, Česká biblická společnost, 2018.
- MÉNDEZ-MORATALLA, Fernando: *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, London – New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- NESTLE, Ervin – ALAND, Kurt (eds.): *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 282012. (= NA<sup>28</sup>)
- NEYREY, Jerome: *The Passion According to Luke*, Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985.
- NOLLAND, John: *Luke 1–9:20* (WBC 35A), Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- NOLLAND, John: *Luke 9:21–18:34* (WBC 35B), Dallas: Word Books, 1993.
- OMANSON, Roger: *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

- PANCZOVÁ, Helena: *Grécko-slovenský slovník. Od Homéra po kresťanských autorov*, Bratislava: Lingea, 2012.
- SOARDS, Marion, L.: “And the Lord Turned and Looked Straight at Peter”: Understanding Luke 22,61, *Bib* 67/4 (1986) 518-519.
- SOARDS, Marion, L.: Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Jesus’ Speech to the “Daughters of Jerusalem” (Luke 23,26-32), *Bib* 68/2 (1987) 221-244.
- STEIN, Robert, H. (ed.): *Mark*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Sväté písmo Starého i Nového zákona*, Rím: SÚSCM, 1995. (= SPSiNZ)
- TALBERT, Charles, H. (ed.): *Matthew*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.
- WEISSENRIEDER, Annette: *Images of Illness in the Gospel of Luke: Insights of Ancient Medical Texts*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- WESLEY, Allen, Jr.: *Matthew*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

### Zhrnutie

Predmetom štúdie sú Ježišove obrátenia v synoptických evanjeliách. Najprv je vymedzené sémantické pole gréckych výrazov, ktorými je vyjadrené Ježišovo obrátenie sa (ἐπιστρέφω a στρέφω). Dva príbuzné grécke pojmy prešli vývojom vzhľadom na ich použitie pre Ježišove obrátenia. Od celkového pohľadu na jednotlivé zmienky sa prejde k skúmaniu Ježišových obrátení v rámci každého synoptika zvlášť. Toto skúmanie v rámci každého synoptického evanjelia je uzavreté stručným súhrnom. Marek s Matúšom uviedli dve Ježišove obrátenia – v rovnakých udalostiach uzdravenia chorej ženy a pri napomenutí Petra. No došlo aj k rozdielom vo vnímaní Ježišovho obrátenia. Lukáš tému rozpracoval, o čom svedčí sedem výskytov Ježišovho obrátenia, ale v odlišných udalostiach od Marka s Matúšom. Na základe súhrnov je vytvorené pozorovanie, ktoré skúma charakteristické znaky Ježišových obrátení v medzisyntických vzťahoch. V závere sú priblížené pozorovania, ktoré približujú spoločné synoptické znaky Ježišových obrátení. Synoptické zmienky Ježišových obrátení sa zbiehajú pri zmienke o Petrovi a ženách.

*Kľúčové slová:* obrátenie, synoptici, Peter, ženy, Lukáš.

### Summary

The subject of the study is the turnings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. First, the semantic field of Greek terms that express Jesus’ turning (ἐπιστρέφω and στρέφω) is defined. Two related Greek terms have evolved with respect to their use for Jesus’ turnings. From an overall view of individual mentions, we move on to an examination of Jesus’ turnings within each synoptic separately. This examination within each synoptic gospel is concluded with a brief summary. Mark and Matthew mentioned two turnings of Jesus, in the same events of the healing of the sick woman and in the admonition of Peter. But there were also differences in

the perception of Jesus' turning. Luke elaborated on the topic, which is evidenced by the seven occurrences of Jesus' turning, but in different events from Mark and Matthew. Based on the summaries, an observation is made that examines the characteristic features of Jesus' turnings in intersynoptic relations. At the end, observations are made that show the common synoptic features of Jesus' turnings. The synoptic mentions of Jesus' turnings converge with the mention of Peter and women.

*Key words:* turning, synoptics, Peter, women, Luke.

Michal Mališ


Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave

Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta

Kapitulská 26

814 58 BRATISLAVA, Slovakia

m.michalmalis@gmail.com

 0000-0002-6291-2932



# Stal sa z Petra v Lk 5,10 naozaj „lovec ľudí“?

O sémantike slovesa ζωγρέω

*Helena Panczová*

## Úvod

Keď Ježiš povolával svojich prvých učeníkov, Šimonovi Petrovi a jeho bratovi Andrejovi sľúbil pracovný postup z obyčajných rybárov na „rybárov ľudí“ (ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων). To je verzia podľa Matúša (Mt 4,19) a Marka (Mk 1,17). U Lukáša máme trochu odlišnú formuláciu a Ježišov prísľub Šimonovi znie: ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν (Lk 5,10). Slovenské (aj inojazyčné) preklady to väčšinou interpretujú v zmysle „budeš loviť ľudí“. Táto interpretácia však reflektuje skôr význam Lukášových synoptických kolegov než jeho vlastnú lexikálnu voľbu.

Zložené sloveso ζωγρέω (ζωγρῶ ζωγεῖν) má vo svojej prvej časti koreň ζω- „život, živý“, ktoré je určujúcim prvkom pre všetky jeho významy. Toto sloveso sa najčastejšie vyskytuje v kontexte vojny s predmetom nepriateľských vojakov, ktorí boli „chytaní živí“, t. j. boli zajatí, nie zabití. Používa sa však aj všeobecnejšie vo význame „zachrániť niekomu život“, t. j. nenechať ho zomrieť. Toto je pravdepodobne zmysel, ktorý nám chcel Lukáš komunikovať. V jeho verzii je v protiklade rybolov, ktorého cieľom je zabíjanie ulovených rýb, a činnosťou ζωγεῖν, ktorej cieľom je záchrana ľudského života, ktorý bol takmer stratený.

Pomenovať túto činnosť ako „lov“ iste nie je vhodné. Na nasledujúcich stranách predostrieme doklady používania tohto slovesa v gréckych literárnych aj neliterárnych textoch a na základe ich analýzy sa pokúsime dopracovať k adekvátnemu prekladu miesta u Lukáša.

## 1 Význam „chytať živých, zajímať“

Najfrekvencovanejší význam slovesa ζωγρέω je „chytať (niekoho) živého“, čiže „zajímať, brať do zajatia“, ktorý je v dokonalom súlade s etymológiou slova: ζωός „živý“ + ἀγρέω „chytať, loviť, lapať“<sup>1</sup>.

Sloveso ζωγρέω je doložené už u Homéra<sup>2</sup>:

ζώγρει Ἄτρεός υἱέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα  
zajmi ma, Átreov syn, a príslušné výkupné prijmi<sup>3</sup>;  
ζωγρεῖτ', αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐμὲ λύσομαι  
len ma zajmite, veď sa ja vykúpim.<sup>4</sup>

Vôbec sa nevyskytuje u lyrikov a tragikov. Naproti tomu je časté u historikov a v neskoršej próze. Thúkydídés píše: οἱ Κορίνθιοι... πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐτράποντο φονεύειν... μᾶλλον ἢ ζωγρεῖν „Korint'ania sa vrhli na tých ľudí, aby ich zabili, nie vzali do zajatia“<sup>5</sup>.

To, že niekomu ušetrili život v boji, však ešte neznamenalo, že mu ho zachovali aj neskôr<sup>6</sup>. Zajatí vojaci mohli byť neskôr zabití, ako svedčí Hérodotos napr. o Skýtoch:

ὅσους {δ'} ἂν τῶν πολεμίων ζωγρήσωσι, ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν ἀνδρῶν ἄνδρα ἓνα θύουσι  
zo všetkých nepriateľov, ktorých zajali, obetujú jedného muža z každej stovky.<sup>7</sup>

Podobne po porážke vzbury na Aigíne víťazi ἐπτακοσίους... τοῦ δήμου ζωγρήσαντες ἐξήγον ὡς ἀπολέοντες „vzali sedemsto zajatých mužov z ľudu a viedli ich von na popravu“<sup>8</sup>.

V klasickej gréckej literatúre sa vyskytuje takmer výlučne vo vojenskom kontexte a týka sa mužov-vojakov – nie žien a detí ani iných civilistov (na to slúžilo αἰχμάλωτος „zajatec“ a odvodená skupina slov, ktorá zahŕňala všetky

<sup>1</sup> BEEKES, *Etymological dictionary*, 503-504; CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire etymologique*, 401.

<sup>2</sup> Grécke klasické texty čerpám z databázy *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*. Slovenský preklad je môj, pokiaľ nie je uvedené inak.

<sup>3</sup> HOMÉROS, *Ílias* 6.46 = 11.131. Preklad Miloslav Okál, 138, 241.

<sup>4</sup> HOMÉROS, *Ílias* 10.378. Preklad Miloslav Okál, 230.

<sup>5</sup> THÚKYDIDÉS, *Dejiny peloponézskej vojny* 1.50.1.

<sup>6</sup> DUCREY, *Le traitement*, 31.

<sup>7</sup> HERODOTOS, *Dejiny* 4.62.3.

<sup>8</sup> HERODOTOS, *Dejiny* 6.91.2.

osoby, zvieratá aj inú vojnovú korisť<sup>9</sup>). V Septuaginte sa dosah ζωγρέω rozširuje aj na ženy<sup>10</sup> a zvieratá<sup>11</sup>. (Ku konkrétnym príkladom a ich prekladu sa vrátíme neskôr.)

Dve substantíva odvodené od ζωγρέω reflektujú jeho význam „zajímať“. Výraz ζωγρία, iónsky -ίη f. „zajímanie“ sa vyskytuje len v datíve: ζωγρίῃ λαβεῖν/αίρειν „brat' (niekoho) do zajatia“<sup>12</sup>, ζωγρία τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἰκανοὺς ἀποβαλεῖν „stratili značný počet vojakov, ktorí upadli do zajatia“<sup>13</sup>. Ani tu zajatie negarantovalo spoľahlivú záchranu života<sup>14</sup>: ὧν ὅσους λάβοι ζωγρία, πάντας παρέβαλλε τοῖς θηρίοις „všetkých, ktorých zajali, nechal hodiť pred zvery (= slony)“<sup>15</sup>.

V Septuaginte sa toto substantívum nevyskytuje. V Rahlfsovej edícii sa nachádza tvar ζωγρεία na dvoch miestach – Nm 21,35 a Dt 2,34 –, ktorý staršie bádanie identifikovalo ako akuzatív od ζωγρεία (= ζωγρία)<sup>16</sup>. Ale podrobnejšie textovokritické bádanie tento tvar emenduje na ζωγρίαν a odvodzuje ho od ζωγρίας<sup>17</sup>.

Druhé substantívum, ktoré reflektuje význam slovesa ζωγρέω „zajímať“, je práve ζωγρίας m. „zajatec“: νικᾷ Κῦρον, καὶ συλλαμβάνει ζωγρίαν „porazil Kýra a vzal ho ako zajatca = zajal ho“<sup>18</sup>. To je doložené aj inde v Septuaginte:

λαβόμενος τῆς χλαμύδος ἤγεν αὐτὸν εὐρώστως καὶ  
βουλόμενος τὸν κατάρατον λαβεῖν ζωγρίαν  
chytil ho za plášť a násilne ho ťahal preč,  
lebo si chcel toho prekliateho muža ponechať ako zajatca.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Porov. HAUSPIE – CLARYSSE – CARMINATI, *αἰχμάλωτος*.

<sup>10</sup> Nm 31,15.18.

<sup>11</sup> Dt 20,16.

<sup>12</sup> HERODOTOS, *Dejiny* 6.28.2, 6.37.1.

<sup>13</sup> POLYBIOS, *Dejiny* 1.15.2.

<sup>14</sup> DUCREY, *Le traitement*, 32.

<sup>15</sup> POLYBIOS, *Dejiny* 1.84.8-9.

<sup>16</sup> Porov. LUST – EYNIKEL – HAUSPIE, *Lexicon*, 262.

<sup>17</sup> Porov. MURAOKA, *Lexicon*, 315, ktorý heslo ζωγρεία vôbec nemá. Porov. aj WEVERS (ed.), *Numeri*, 265; WEVERS (ed.), *Deuteronomium*, 80.

<sup>18</sup> KTĒSIÁS, *Fragmenta* 9,4.

<sup>19</sup> 2Mak 12,35.

## 2 Význam „zachovať nažive“

Význam „zachovať nažive“ je pri slovese ζωγρέω oveľa zriedkavejší. Je pozoruhodný v tom, že dôraz je na „živote“, zatiaľ čo myšlienka „chytania“ je natoľko v úzadí, že musí byť vyjadrená iným slovesom: εἶλε μὲν τὴν Ἐπίδουρον, εἶλε δὲ αὐτὸν Προκλέα καὶ ἐζώγησε „(Periandros)... dobyl Epidauros, zajal samotného Prokla a (ponechal ho nažive =) uväznil ho“<sup>20</sup>.

U Platóna je ojedinelý výskyt v inom ako vojenskom kontexte:

ἐὰν δὲ τις θυμῷ δοῦλος δεσπότην αὐτοῦ κτείνει, τοὺς προσήκοντας τοῦ τελευτήσαντος χρωμένους τῷ κτείναντι χρεῖαν ἦν ἂν ἐθέλωσι, πλὴν μηδαμῆ μηδαμῶς ζωγοῦντας, καθαροὺς εἶναι

Ak otrok v hneve zabije svojho pána, príbuzní mŕtveho muža môžu potrestať vraha, akýmkoľvek spôsobom uznajú za vhodné – pod podmienkou, že ho za nijakých okolností nenechajú nažive –, a budú pokladaní za čistých.<sup>21</sup>

Tento význam je doložený aj na ojedinelom nápise, ktorého adresátom je thrácky boh Héros:

ζώγρε(ι), δέσποτ' ἄναξ, τὸν σὸν ναετῆρα μεθ' ἡμῶν

Κλαυδιανόν, Θρησκῶν πρῶτον ἐν εὐσεβίῃ

zachovaj nám nažive, mocný pane, svojho služobníka

Claudiana, najzbožnejšieho z Thrákov.<sup>22</sup>

## 3 Exkurz: substantívum ζῳάγρια

Tu bude užitočné pozrieť sa na sémantiku výrazu ζῳάγρια (neutrum plurál). Je to starobylé substantívum, evidentne príbuzné so slovesom ζωγρέω, ktoré dokonca zachováva epické nestiahnuté samohlásky<sup>23</sup>. Staršia lexikografia preň postulovala význam „výkupné“ (za život zajatého vojaka), ktorý je údajne pôvodný<sup>24</sup>. Tento význam je však doložený iba raz, a to až u Hérodota:

<sup>20</sup> HÉRODOTOS, *Dejiny* 3.52.7-53.1.

<sup>21</sup> PLATÓN, *Zákony* 868b-c.

<sup>22</sup> *Epigram* 341.7 (KAIBEL, *Epigrammata Graeca*, 343-344). Thráčia, 149 n. l.

<sup>23</sup> Ak medzi dvoma samohláskami bolo digamma, ako je to v tomto prípade, u Homéra sa tieto samohlásky ešte nesťahovali. Preto je aj ťažké vysvetliť, prečo uňho sloveso ζωγρέω má v koreni stiahnuté samohlásky, keď by mali byť nestiahnuté \*ζωφ-αγρέω.

<sup>24</sup> CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire* 401; LIDDEL – SCOTT – JONES, *Lexicon*, 758.

κατακρύπτουσι τὸν Κροΐσον ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ λόγῳ ὥστε ...

δῶρα λάμπονται ζῶαγια Κροΐσου

ukryli Kroisa v nádeji, že dostanú dary ako výkupné.<sup>25</sup>

U Homéra sa však tento výraz používa vo význame „odmena za záchranu života“ – pričom život dotyčného nebol ohrozený vojnou, ale nejakým iným nebezpečenstvom. Princezná Nausikaá prišla na pomoc Odysseovi, keď ho zúboženého po stroskotaní more vyplavilo na breh u Fajákov. V dome jej otca kráľa Alkinoa sa oňho postarali a vypravili ho na ďalšiu cestu. Pri rozlúčke ho Nausikaá prosí, aby si na ňu spomenul, keď príde domov: *μοι πρώτη ζῶαγι' ὀφέλλεις* doslova „mne prvej dlžíš odmenu za záchranu života“, básnicky „mne prvej si za život povinný vd'akou“<sup>26</sup>. Odysseus sľubuje, že nezabudne: *σὺ γάρ μ' ἐβίωσας, κόρη* „veď ty si mi, dievčina, spasila život“<sup>27</sup>.

Na inom mieste je epizóda, kde bohyňa Thetis príde k Héfaištovi s prosbou, aby pre jej syna Achillea vykoval novú výzbroj. Héfaiistos jej ochotne vyhovie, veď predsa musí *Θέτι καλλιπλοκάμῳ ζῶαγια τίνειν* „Thetide s krásnymi vrkočmi odmenu za život splatiť“<sup>28</sup>. Keď ho totiž Héra zhodila z Olympu, nebolo to preňho fatálne, lebo ho morské bohyne Thetis a Eurynomé prijali do svojich vln a poskytli mu útočisko: *αἶ μ' ἐσάωσαν* „tie život mi spasili“<sup>29</sup>.

V podobnom význame je tento zriedkavý výraz doložený aj na nápisocho. Na podstavci sochy boha Asklépia sa nachádza dedikácia: *Θῆκε... νούσων τε κακῶν ζῶαγια Νικο- | μήδης* „Venoval Nikomédés ako odmenu (z vd'aky) za záchranu z ťažkej choroby“<sup>30</sup>. Tu má výraz *ζῶαγια* význam d'akovnej obety za uzdravenie.

Je pravdepodobné, že význam „odmena za záchranu života“ je pri slove *ζῶαγια* pôvodný (teda nejde o „výkupné“)<sup>31</sup>. Toto bude mať vplyv aj na diskusiu o pôvodnom význame slovesa *ζωγρέω*, ku ktorej smerujeme. No prv než sa dostaneme k hypotézam, pozrime sa na posledný doložený význam.

<sup>25</sup> HERODOTOS, *Dejiny* 3.36.5.

<sup>26</sup> HOMEROS, *Odysseia* 8.462. Preložil Miloslav Okál, 151.

<sup>27</sup> HOMEROS, *Odysseia* 8.468. Preložil Miloslav Okál, 151.

<sup>28</sup> HOMEROS, *Ílias* 18.407. Preložil Miloslav Okál, 423.

<sup>29</sup> HOMEROS, *Ílias* 18.405. Preložil Miloslav Okál, 423.

<sup>30</sup> *IGUR* I 102a. Rím, približne 150 – 200 n. l.

<sup>31</sup> LUPPINO, *Verbi Omerici: ζωγρέω*, 74-75.

#### 4 Význam „oživovať, privádzať k životu“

Niektorí vedci pri význame „zachovať nažive“ rozlišujú ešte jeden špecifický variant: „oživovať, privádzať (znova) k životu“<sup>32</sup>, ktorý sa dá vidieť iba na dvoch nezávislých miestach. Jedno sa nachádza u Homéra, kde hrdina Sarpédón utrpel zranenie a oči mu už-už zastieralo temno, ale našťastie *περι δὲ πνοιῆ Βορέας ζώγει ἐπιπνείουσα κακῶς κεκαφηότα θυμόν* „Boreov vánok, čo vôkol vanul, ho k životu kriesil, hoc púšťal už slabého ducha“<sup>33</sup>.

Druhý prípad je z botanického/farmaceutického spisu: *βαρύοδμος ἐπὶ φλογὶ ζωγρηθεῖσα χαλβάνη ... ἐν φλογιῇ καπνηλὸν ἄγει καὶ φύξιον ὀδμήν* „vonná živica galban oživená ohňom pri horení dymí a vydáva vôňu, čo odpudzuje (háved)“<sup>34</sup>.

#### 5 Etymológia slovesa ζωγράφω

Významy slovesa ζωγράφω môžeme zhrnúť takto: 1. Dominantný význam je „chytať (niekoho) živého, zaujímať, brať do zajatia“. 2.A Význam „zachovať nažive“ je síce výrazne slabšie zastúpený, ale nachádza podporu aj v starobylom substantíve *ζωάγρια* „odmena za záchranu života“. 2.B Význam „oživovať, privádzať (znova) k životu“ sa dá vidieť iba na dvoch miestach.

Problém slovesa ζωγράφω spočíva v tom, že významy 1 a 2 nie je možné navzájom od seba odvodiť. Sú natoľko vzdialené, že už od čias byzantského homérskeho scholiastu Eustathia vedci predpokladajú, že ide o dva odlišné slovesné korene, ktoré spolu splynuli. Význam 1 sa odvodzuje – ako sme uviedli – ako *ζωός* „živý“ + *ἀγρέω* „chytať, loviť, lapať“. Pre význam 2 sa tradične navrhuje derivácia od *ζωή* „život“ + *ἀγείρω/ἐγείρω* „privádzať k životu, prebúdzat život, oživovať“.

V novej dobe prišiel so zaujímavým návrhom Luppino, ktorý navrhuje oba významy (v homérskom kontexte) odvodzovať od prostého koreňa *ζω*<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> LIDDEL – SCOTT – JONES, *Lexicon*, 758.

<sup>33</sup> HOMÉROS, *Ílias* 5.697-698. Preklad Miloslav Okál, 129.

<sup>34</sup> NÍKANDROS, *Theriaca* 51-54.

<sup>35</sup> Rekonštrukcia pomocou prostého koreňa rieši problém, prečo má u Homéra ζωγράφω v koreni stiahnuté samohlásky, keď prítomná digamma (pri rekonštrukcii so ζωός) by mala tomu zabrániť: \*ζωφ-αγρέω. Hoci aj Luppinova rekonštrukcia predpokladá, že dve

s kauzativnou a imperatívnou silou v kombinácii s epickou imperatívnou časticou ἄγρει „nože, hor' sa, rýchlo“<sup>36</sup> (podobne ako φέρε, ἄγε): ζῶ, ἄγρει „nože nechaj ma žiť“<sup>37</sup>. Toto riešenie výborne sedí na homérsky materiál, kde tri zo štyroch dokladov sú imperatívy. Tie sme pôvodne priradili k významu 1 („zajímať“). V Luppinovej rekonštrukcii by ich preklad znel napr.: ζῶγρει Ἀτρέος υἱέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα „nechaj ma žiť, Átreov syn, a príslušné výkupné prijmi“<sup>38</sup>. Jediný homérsky výskyt, ktorý nie je imperatív, je vo význame 2 – Sarpédón, ktorého πνοιῆ Βορέαο ζῶγρει „Boreov vánok k životu kriesil“<sup>39</sup>. Sloveso v imperfekte sa dá interpretovať ako *imperfectum de conatu* – „usiloval sa udržať pri živote = udržiaval pri živote“<sup>40</sup>.

Bez ohľadu na to, či akceptujeme všetky detaily Luppinovej rekonštrukcie, alebo nie, jej nesporným prínosom – aj pre naše potreby – je to, že spochybňuje nevyhnutnosť výkladu tohto slovesa pomocou významu „chytania“. Podporu tejto interpretácii poskytuje aj jedna zachovaná homérska glosa, ktorá prezentuje dva významy slovesa takýmto spôsobom: ζῶγρει β'. ζῶντα φύλασσε (Z 46). καὶ ζωποῖει (E 698)<sup>41</sup>, čiže „zachovávať nažive“ a „oživovať, privádzať k životu“. Ten prvý význam je už citovaný verš ζῶγρει Ἀτρέος υἱέ, ktorý náš glosátor interpretuje ako „nechaj ma nažive, Átreov syn“.

## 6 Možná reinterpretácia: Septuaginta

Mnohé ďalšie miesta sa tiež dajú interpretovať vo význame „ponechať nažive“. Týka sa to aj takmer všetkých výskytov ζωγρέω v Septuaginte<sup>42</sup>. Už sme spomínali, že v tomto korpuse textov má toto sloveso mierne posunutý význam aj v prípade, že by sme ho interpretovali vo význame „zajímať“. Týka sa totiž nielen vojakov, ale aj civilistov (ba aj zvierat ako vojnovnej koristi). No práve v kontextoch LXX je oveľa vhodnejší význam „ponechať nažive“, napr.:

---

samohlásky v ζω-ἄγρει by tvorili jednu slabiku, v tomto prípade by išlo o nejaký variant javu *synaloifé*, ktorý sa v epike vyskytuje.

<sup>36</sup> Porov. HOMÉROS, *Ílias* 5.765, *Odysseia* 20.149.

<sup>37</sup> LUPPINO, *Verbi Omerici: ζωγρέω*, 73-77.

<sup>38</sup> HOMÉROS, *Ílias* 6.46 = 11.131.

<sup>39</sup> HOMÉROS, *Ílias* 5.697-698. Preklad Miloslav Okál, 129.

<sup>40</sup> LUPPINO, *Verbi Omerici: ζωγρέω*, 77.

<sup>41</sup> APIÓN, *Fragmenta de glossis Homericis*, 74.239.24.

<sup>42</sup> Nm 31,15.18; Dt 20,16; Joz 2,13; 6,25; 9,20; 2Sam 8,2. Jedinou výnimkou je 2Krn 25,12, kde ide o zajatie a následnú popravu.

ἵνα τί ἐζωγράησατε πᾶν θῆλυ;  
 prečo ste nechali nažive všetky ženy?<sup>43</sup>;  
 πᾶσαν τὴν ἀπαρτίαν τῶν γυναικῶν ἣτις οὐκ οἶδεν κοίτην ἄρσενος  
 ζωγράησατε αὐτάς  
 všetky ukoristené ženy, ktoré nespali s mužom, ponecháte nažive<sup>44</sup>;  
 καὶ Ρααβ τὴν πόρνην καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκον τὸν πατρικὸν αὐτῆς ἐζώγησεν  
 Ἰησοῦς  
 Jozue nechal nažive prostitútku Rachab a celý jej otcovský dom<sup>45</sup>;  
 οὐ ζωγράησετε ἀπ’ αὐτῶν πᾶν ἐμπνέον  
 nenecháte z nich nažive nijakú živú bytosť.<sup>46</sup>

Sloveso ζωγράφω je prekladovým ekvivalentom hebrejského slovesa חיית „žiť“ v tvare hifil alebo piel „ponechať nažive“<sup>47</sup>. Prekladatelia LXX teda evidentne pracovali s druhým významom ζωγράφω, pri ktorom význam „chytania“ nie je aktívny. To isté však nachádzame aj pri ďalších dvoch prekladových ekvivalentoch hifilu a pielu od חיית, ζωγονέω „rodiť živé (potomstvo)“ a ζωποιέω „robiť živým, oživovať, privádzať k životu“<sup>48</sup>. Aj tieto slovesá majú v LXX význam, ktorý (zdanlivo) ignoruje ich etymológiu:

πᾶν ἄρσεν ὃ ἐὰν τεχθῆι τοῖς Εβραίοις εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ῥίψατε  
 καὶ πᾶν θῆλυ ζωγονεῖτε αὐτό  
 Každého chlapca, čo sa narodí Hebrejom, hod’te do Nilu,  
 ale každé dievča nechajte žiť/nažive.<sup>49</sup>  
 ἀσεβῆ οὐ μὴ ζωποιήσει  
 (Boh) nenechá žiť/nažive bezbožníka.<sup>50</sup>

Vo väčšine prípadov v LXX je vhodné sloveso ζωγράφω prekladať vo význame „zachovať nažive, nechať žiť“, ktorý je doložený aj v klasických gréckych textoch. Sémantika druhej časti tejto zloženiny nie je aktívna – podobne ako v niektorých prípadoch slovies ζωγονέω a ζωποιέω. Dôraz je na zachovaní života.

<sup>43</sup> Nm 31,15.

<sup>44</sup> Nm 31,18.

<sup>45</sup> Joz 6,25.

<sup>46</sup> Dt 20,16.

<sup>47</sup> HATCH – REDPATH, *A Concordance*, 599.

<sup>48</sup> HATCH – REDPATH, *A Concordance*, 601.

<sup>49</sup> Ex 1,22.

<sup>50</sup> Jób 36,6.



## 7 Rybár Peter a „lovec ľudí“?

Videli sme, že sloveso ζωγρέω síce má dominantný význam „chytať (niekoho) živého“, ale týka sa vojenského kontextu a znamená „zajímať, brať do zajatia“ (predovšetkým vojakov). Menej frekventovaný význam „zachovať nažive“ v akomkoľvek kontexte však dominuje v LXX. Vráťme sa teraz k našej epizóde o povolání Petra v Lukášovej verzii. Ježiš mu sľubuje postup od lovenia rýb na ἀνθρώπους ἔσθῃ ζωγρῶν (Lk 5,10). Čo to teda znamená?

### 7.1 Slovenské preklady

Väčšina našich prekladov to interpretuje ako „budeš loviť ľudí“ (SSV, SEB, SEP, BOT, ROH). Na základe našej sémantickej analýzy lexémy ζωγρέω veríme, že nevhodnosť tohto prekladu je už zrejmá.

Najnovší katolícky pracovný preklad Lukášovho evanjelia má znenie: „budeš loviť ľudí, aby mali život“<sup>51</sup>. V poznámke sa uvádza:

Na vyjadrenie Šimonovej budúcej misie Lukáš používa zvláštne sloveso ζωγρέω, ktorého význam je „chytať živého, loviť bez usmrtenia“. Preklad chce túto sémantiku zachytiť spojením „loviť ľudí, aby mali život“.<sup>52</sup>

Význam „života“ je tu naozaj dôležitý, ale – ako náš výskum ukazuje – sémantická časť o „chytaní“ nie je nevyhnutná<sup>53</sup>. V tomto kontexte by teda význam „lovu na ľudí“ vôbec nemal byť prítomný. Aj keby sme nepoznali sémantiku tohto „zvláštneho slovesa“, pred „lovením ľudí“ by nás mala varovať prirodzená ľudská citlivosť. Nie je možné loviť ľudí a zachovať pritom ich dôstojnosť a slobodu.

Výbornú interpretáciu však má preklad *Nádej pre každého*: „Odteraz nebudeš loviť ryby, ale budeš zachraňovať ľudí pre mňa.“ To je presne lexikálny význam slovesa aj význam jeho kontextu.

<sup>51</sup> LAPKO, *Lukášovo evanjelium*, 42.

<sup>52</sup> LAPKO, *Lukášovo evanjelium*, 44.

<sup>53</sup> Aj základný slovník uvádza širšiu sémantiku, porov. PANCZOVÁ, *Grécko-slovenský slovník*, 587.

## 7.2 Hypotetické literárne alúzie

Keď sa na text dívame z tohto uhla pohľadu, zdá sa byť možné, že tu máme aj literárnu alúziu na Homéra. Nausikaá zachránila Odyssea a Thetis Hefaista, keď obidvom hrozila smrť utopením v mori. A tu máme na brehu jazera/mora Petra, ktorý tiež dostáva výzvu zachraňovať ľudské životy. More tu získava metaforický význam – podobne ako Níl hroziaci smrťou... To sú, pravda, len hypotetické súvislosti. Vráťme sa k faktom.

## 7.3 Patristické pramene

Pozrime sa, ako so slovesom ζωγρέω pracovali neskorší kresťanskí autori. Keďže ide o zriedkavé sloveso, textových dokladov nie je veľa.

Vo Vulgáte je ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγρῶν preložené ako *homines eris capiens* „budeš chytať ľudí“, čo je asi zdroj všetkých moderných prekladov, ktoré majú variant s „lovením“. No je pozoruhodné, že hoci čítanie Vulgáty (a zrejme aj starého latinského prekladu) bolo takéto, Ambróz to vo svojom výklade dôsledne reformuluje ako *eris homines vivificans* „budeš oživovať ľudí / budeš ľudí privádzať k životu“<sup>54</sup>.

Interpretáciu slovesa ζωγρέω ako „oživovať“, resp. „robiť živým“ nachádzame aj u Nonna z Panopolu, epického básnika z 5. storočia, v jeho poetickej *Parafráze Jánovho evanjelia*, kde sa toto sloveso nachádza na dvoch miestach.

Prvý prípad je parafrázou Jn 5,21 a ide o synonymiu so slovesom ζωοποιέω originálu: ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὗς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ „lebo ako Otec kriesi mŕtvych a oživuje, tak aj Syn oživuje, koho chce“. Nonnos to prebásnil nasledovne:

ὡσπερ γὰρ γενέτης νέκυας μετὰ πότμον ἐγείρει  
ζωγρήσας παλίνορσον ἀκινήτων δέμας ἀνδρῶν  
οὕτως οὗς ἐθέλει καὶ ὁμοίος υἱὸς ἐγείρει  
ζωγρήσας φθιμένων παλινάγρετα σώματα φωτῶν.<sup>55</sup>

Ved' ako Rodič kriesi mŕtvych, ktorí podľahli smrti,  
a privádza naspäť k životu už nehybné postavy mužov,  
rovnako tak aj Syn kriesi tých, ktorých chce,  
a privádza naspäť k životu už (smrťou) povolané telá zosnulých ľudí.

<sup>54</sup> AMBRÓZ, *Exameron* 5.6.16 a 6.8.50 (CSEL 32/1, 151 a 242).

<sup>55</sup> NONNOS Z PANOPOLU, *Paraphrasis in Joannis euangelium* E 79-82.

Druhé miesto, kde Nonnos používa sloveso ζωγρέω, je epizóda, kde Ježiš uzdravil človeka v sobotu a rozhneval tým Židov. Vo verši Jn 7,23 Ježiš hovorí: ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα „v sobotu som uzdravil celého človeka“. V Nonnovej parafráze: ζωγρήσας ὅλον ἄνδρα „priviedol som k životu celého človeka“<sup>56</sup>.

## Záver

Sloveso ζωγρέω sa najčastejšie vyskytuje v kontexte vojny s predmetom nepriateľských vojakov, ktorí boli „chytaní živí“, t. j. boli zajatí, nie zabití. Význam „zachovať nažive, zachrániť život“ (v akomkoľvek kontexte) je síce menej frekventovaný, je však doložený už od najstaršieho obdobia a v LXX dominuje. Pri preklade formulácie ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγρῶν v Lk 5,10 teda nie je dôvod nástojiť na význame „lovenia“, ako to má väčšina slovenských prekladov. Správny kontextový význam je „zachraňovať život“. Na základe synonymie so slovesom ζωοποιέω by sa dalo uvažovať aj nad posunom smerom k významu „privádzať ku (kvalitnejšiemu) životu“. Toto je smer interpretácie, ktorým ide *Nádej pre každého*, jediný slovenský preklad, ktorý vystihol význam originálu.

## Zoznam použitej literatúry

### *Pramene a preklady*

AMBROSIUS: *Opera. Pars I. (Exameron, De paradiso, De Cain et Abel, De Noe, De Abraham, De Isaac, De bono mortis)* (CSEL 32/1) Edidit Carolus Schenkl. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1896/1897.

*Biblia. Slovenský ekumenický preklad s deuterokánonickými knihami*. 4. (2. opravené) vydanie, Banská Bystrica: Slovenská biblická spoločnosť, 2012. (= SEB)

*Biblia. Písmo Sväté Starej a Novej zmluvy*. Preklad komisie Slovenskej evanjelickej cirkvi a. v. z r. 1978, Londýn: Spojené biblické spoločnosti, 1979. (= SEP)

HOMÉROS: *Ílias*. Preložil Miloslav Okál, Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1962.

HOMÉROS: *Odyseia*. Preložil Miloslav Okál, Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1966.

LAPKO, Róbert (ed.): *Lukášovo evanjelium. Nový preklad a krátky komentár*. Preklad Juraj Feník, Jozef Jančovič, Róbert Lapko, Jaroslav Rindoš, Peter Žeňuch, Bratislava: Veda, 2020.

*Nádej pre každého. Nový Zákon v modernom jazyku* (Biblica), Bratislava: Creativpress Herrljunga – International Bible Society, 1993.

NESTLE, Eberhard et al. (eds.): *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, <sup>28</sup>2012.

---

<sup>56</sup> NONNOS Z PANOPOLU, *Paraphrasis in Joannis euangelium* H 91.

- NONNI PANOPOLITANI: *Paraphrasis S. Evangelii Ioannei*. Edidit Augustinus Scheindler, Lipsiae: Teubner, 1881.
- RAHLFS, Alfred (ed.): *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Svätá Biblia*. Z pôvodných jazykov preložil Prof. Jozef Roháček. Podľa druhého revidovaného vydania z roku 1969, Banská Bystrica: Slovenská biblická spoločnosť, 2012. (= ROH)
- Sväté písmo: Jeruzalemská Biblia*. Text Svätého písma z pôvodných jazykov preložil Anton Botek. Úvod, poznámky, komentáre a chronologické tabuľky sú prevzaté z Jeruzalemskej Biblie, ktorú vydala Jeruzalemská biblická škola. Tretie opravené vydanie, Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2014. (= BOT)
- Sväté písmo Starého i Nového zákona*, Rím: SÚSCM, 1995. (= SSV)
- WEVERS, John William (ed.): *Septuaginta III/1. Numeri*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020.
- WEVERS, John William (ed.): *Septuaginta III/2. Deuteronomium*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Sekundárna literatúra*
- BEEKES, Robert: *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010.
- CHANTRAINE, Pierre: *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1968.
- HATCH, Edwin – REDPATH, Henry A.: *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.
- HAUSPIE, Katrin – CLARYSSE, Willy – CARMINATI, Miriam: *αἰχμάλωτος, αἰχμαλωσία, αἰχμαλωτεύω, αἰχμαλωτίζω* in Eberhard Bons (ed.): *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint. Volume I: Alpha – Gamma*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 435-455.
- DUCREY, Pierre: *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris: E. de Boccard, 1968.
- KAIBEL, Georgius (ed.): *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin: G. Reimer, 1878.
- LIDDEL, Henry G. – SCOTT, Robert: *A Greek-English Lexicon: with a Revised Supplement*, compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie, and with the cooperation of many scholars. Supplement edited by P. G. W. Glare, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- LUPPINO, Antonino: Verbi Omerici: ζωγράφω, *SMEA* 15 (1972) 73-78.
- LUST, Johan – EYNIKEL, Erik – HAUSPIE, Katrin: *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Revised Edition, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
- MURAOKA, Takamitsu: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009.

- PANCZOVÁ, Helena: *Grécko-slovenský slovník: od Homéra po kresťanských autorov*, Bratislava: Lingea, 2012.
- Searchable Greek Inscriptions*. The Packard Humanities Institute [online]. [naposledy cit. 2023-12-31]. Dostupné na internete: <https://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/187735>.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. The University of California [online]. [naposledy cit. 2023-12-31]. Dostupné na internete: <https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>.

### Zhrnutie


Sloveso ζωγρέω sa najčastejšie vyskytuje v kontexte vojny s predmetom nepriateľských vojakov, ktorí boli „chytaní živí“, t. j. boli zajatí, nie zabití. Tento význam je v súlade so zrejmom etymológiou slovesa. Význam „zachovať nažive, zachrániť život“ (v akomkoľvek kontexte) je síce menej frekventovaný, je však doložený už od najstaršieho obdobia a v LXX dominuje. Pri preklade formulácie ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγρῶν v Lk 5,10 teda nie je dôvod nástožiť na význam „lovenia“, ako to má väčšina prekladov. Správny kontextový význam je „zachraňovať životy ľudí“. Na základe synonymie so slovesom ζωποιέω je možný aj posun smerom k významu „privádzať (ľudí) ku (kvalitnejšiemu) životu“.

*Kľúčové slová:* Lukáš 5,10, loviť ľudí, ζωγρέω, ζωποιέω, preklad Nového zákona.

### Summary

The verb ζωγρέω most frequently appear in the context of war, with the object of inimical soldiers who are “caught alive”, i.e. they were captured, not killed. This meaning is in accordance with the verb’s obvious etymology. The meaning “preserve alive, save life” (in any context), though less frequent, has been attested since the earliest period, and in the Septuagint it dominates. When translating ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγρῶν in Luke 5:10, there is no reason to insist on the meaning of “catching” found in the majority of translations. The correct meaning in this context is “save (people’s) lives”. On the basis of the synonymity with the verb ζωποιέω, there is a possibility of a semantic shift towards “bring (people) to a (better) life”.

*Key words:* Luke 5:10, catching men, ζωγρέω, ζωποιέω, New Testament translation.

Helena Panczová  
Teologická fakulta  
Trnavská univerzita  
Kostolná 1  
P. O. Box 173  
814 99 BRATISLAVA, Slovakia  
helena.panczova@gmail.com  
 0000-0002-4749-5042

## RECENZIE – REVIEWS

---

---

**CASNEDA, Alessandra: *Giovanni 20. Uno studio narrativo* (Analecta biblica 241), Roma: GBPress, 2023. 426 s. ISBN 979-12-598-6021-7.**

The book written by Alessandra Casneda offers readers the publication of the doctoral dissertation defended at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 2023 under the authoritative guidance of Jean-Noël Aletti, who introduces the volume by writing its preface. The research focuses on John 20, particularly on the relationship between seeing and believing, which appears ambiguous in relation to the perception of signs. Indeed, extreme contrasts are observed between the disciples who see and therefore believe (cf. 20:8.25.29a) and the believers proclaimed blessed by Jesus despite not having access to the vision (cf. 20:29b). In order to examine this issue, the research adopts a narratological analysis. The hypothesis guiding the research contends that the author of the Fourth Gospel, at the conclusion of his work, offers his readers a reflection on how one can believe in Jesus without having direct access to vision anymore. The Fourth Evangelist explicitly declares to aim for this function, namely to offer a selection of the signs of Jesus' life that can support the reader's choice to believe, who will consequently have access to life (cf. John 20:30-31) (cf. p. 7). The purpose of the study is explicitly recognized in the investigation of how "the book of signs"—referring to the entire Fourth Gospel—intends to elicit the reader's faith (cf. p. 46).

In this perspective, Casneda provides a comprehensive overview regarding the relationship between seeing and believing, John 20 as a narrative of the birth of the Easter faith, the role of Jesus' resurrection in the Fourth Gospel, the relationship between the farewell discourses and the Easter narratives, and the connection between the passion and resurrection accounts (cf. p. 8-23). At the end of the overview, Casneda identifies three issues, which she addresses before undertaking

the research. (1) The first clarifies the semantics of the vocabulary related to seeing and the criteria for distinguishing its meaning: in summary, βλέπω highlights material perception; θεωρέω indicates a careful examination of the seen object; and finally, ὁράω concerns the significance of the perceived object (cf. p. 24). (2) Regarding the relationship between seeing and believing, Casneda, drawing upon Aletti's research, focuses on the three non-narrative inserts in John 19:35; 20:30-31, and 21:24-25. Within these, it is possible to discern two semantic lines that also identify two essential issues to be addressed throughout the research. The first line concerns the relationship between the signs and the faith of the disciples, and it is situated at an intradiegetic level. The second line pertains to the relationship between the written testimony of the signs and the invitation to faith commitment addressed to the reader and found on the extradiegetic level. (cf. p. 25-29). (3) The third issue identified in the status quaestionis concerns the relationship between John 20 and the macro-narrative of the entire Gospel of John that is verified at the end of the research. However, Casneda considers it feasible to study John 20 autonomously, taking into account the thematic threads and complements that can be identified in this chapter, particularly in relation to the farewell discourses (cf. John 13–17). Based on this, the research employs the criteria of narrative and semiotic analysis, considering them particularly suitable for the emerging questions. The study is structured on seven chapters, summarized as follows (cf. p. 29-31).

The first chapter introduces the methodology adopted for the research, namely narrative analysis. Guiding the reader towards an understanding of the chosen method, it elucidates the essential principles of narrative analysis, aimed at investigating the strategies employed by the author to influence the reader. It investigates plot, distinguished between plot of situation or resolution and plot of revelation, as well as character construction and characterization (cf. p. 33-39). The latter emerges from the recounting of the actions that the characters undertake and from the comments expressed by the narrator or by the characters themselves. The analysis of character construction is closely linked to this aspect, which arises from those traits that enable the progression of the narrative. These traits may include both intradiegetic elements, i.e., elements that are part of the plot, and extradiegetic elements, namely aspects that are significant only for the reader, not involving the characters in the story. (cf. p. 40-41). The summary schema, which draws upon a previous contribution by Aletti, proves to be particularly useful (cf. p. 43-45). Finally, space is given to the role of the reader in distinguishing between the historical reader or primary reader, that is, the one for whom the book was actually written, and the implicit reader, or model reader. The latter is the result of textual analysis and identifies a fictional figure whose status is still debated among analysts. Throughout the analysis, Casneda pays attention to how the reader's collaboration is

activated through narrative universals of suspense, curiosity, and surprise, as well as the adopted narrative techniques. (cf. p. 45-49). To this end, in addition to narratology, interpretive semiotic analysis, according to the understanding of U. Eco and S. C. Peirce, is considered a significant contribution due to the three factors involved in the semiotic process: the sign, the object, and the interpretant. Semiotics is also useful for its attention to the processes of decoding signs and *anagnórisis*, or recognition, both by the characters in the narrative and by the reader. In this way, the “divine surplus” perceived in the signs narrated in the Gospel of John coincides with “the object to which the sign (the element perceptible by the senses) refers and which the interpretant (the subject interpreting the sign) grasps in the sign.” (p. 50).

Subsequently, the research addresses the insights from the historical-critical readings of John 20, which have brought to light the discontinuities, inconsistencies, and duplications within the narrative, as well as numerous narrative gaps that leave open various questions. Among these, one can recall the inconsistencies in John 20:1-2, where the reason for Mary Magdalene’s visit to the tomb is not explicitly stated, given that Jesus’ body had already been anointed by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus (cf. John 19:38-40). There is also a discrepancy between the narrative stating that Mary saw the stone removed from the tomb, while later, in the dialogue, she declares to the disciples “they have taken the Lord out of the tomb,” and her gaze into the tomb is narrated only in John 20:11. Moreover, the woman seems to have gone there alone, but when she communicates to the disciples that she does not know where Jesus’ body is, she speaks in the plural (20:2: *οὐκ οἶδαμεν*). The entire chapter 20 includes elements subject to similar observations (cf. p. 52-54). Numerous scholars have explained such tensions through the editorial history of the text. Conversely, Casneda highlights the statement in Jn 20:30-31 according to which the Gospel narrative consists of a selection of events concerning Jesus’ life and is aimed at arousing the reader’s faith. The author’s mastery is recognizable in how he has subtly constructed the story, using sophisticated narrative tools such as *anagnórisis*, or recognition, *synkrisis*, or comparison, irony, and others. Thus, the narrative gaps and tensions within the text appear to be functional to the narrative strategy of the skilled author-editor. For these reasons, Casneda believes it is appropriate to trust the author as the story can have its own coherent narrative dynamic, without the need to resort to editorial explanations. The tensions that emerged, on the contrary, can be read as a significant contribution to the progress of the narrative of the entire chapter 20 of the FG (cf. p. 52-63).

Through the criteria of narrative analysis presented earlier, the limitations of the ending of the Gospel of John are identified, indicating chapter 20 as a plausible field of investigation from a narrative perspective. Indeed, on one hand, the changes of characters, places, and times between John 19:38-42 and 21:1 indicate a clear



boundary to the pericope. On the other hand, the issue of the relationship between seeing and believing is considered by Casneda as a circumscribed and unifying theme in John 20. In the same chapter, then, based on the changes of time, place, and characters, four narrative programs can be recognized, developed in as many scenes and concluded by the extradiegetic commentary of John 20:30-31: John 20:1-10; 20:11-18; 20:19-23; and 20:24-29 (cf. p. 63-72).

After providing essential information about the adopted methodology and the scenes comprising John 20, chapters 2 to 5 of the volume present an application of the findings to the indicated scenes, essentially following the same structure with analyses of plot, characters, the reader's journey emerged from the narrative, and concluding observations.

In the second chapter, the analysis of the plot in John 20:1-10 identifies the various elements of the narrative: a) The exposition in John 20:1a, which highlights the timing (the first day of the week) and the situation of darkness between the external dimension of early morning, and perhaps also internal to the characters (cf. p. 71-78). b) Complications arise in Mary's words, as she speaks not simply of a rolled-away stone (cf. 20:1a), but of the hypothetical action of unknown individuals who have taken away the Lord, and in her use of the plural regarding her ignorance of where Jesus' body has been placed (*οὐκ οἶδαμεν*) (cf. 20:1b-2) (cf. p. 78-82). c) The progression of the narrative prepares for the resolution through the journey of the disciples and their visit to the empty tomb (cf. John 20:3-8). In this context, the expression "he saw and believed" (20:8) raises questions regarding the object of the vision and how the beloved disciple reached faith. According to Casneda, the beloved disciple grasps the meaning of the sign narrated and the sign seen in an authentic *anagnōrisis* (cf. p. 82-94). d) The narrator's commentary in John 20:9 raises several questions regarding its content (which Scripture is referred to) and its function relative to the context of John 20:1-10. Casneda explains the reference to Scripture in relation to the various passages explicitly cited earlier, which somehow allude to the resurrection (cf. p. 95-103). e) The conclusion in John 20:10 raises several questions, including the hushed exit of the beloved disciple who remains silent regarding what he saw and believed. On one hand, Casneda notes that the announcement of the resurrection will occur only by the risen Lord's own command in John 20:17.21-23. On the other hand, the character of the beloved disciple shows a progression through two essential scenes of *anagnōrisis* in John 20:3-10 and in 21:1-8, which will culminate in that particular type of testimony/writing that is the book [i.e. the Gospel] itself, as narrated in John 21:24 (cf. p. 104-112).

The analysis of the characters focuses on Mary Magdalene, on the comparison (*synkrisis*) between the beloved disciple and Peter, and on the decisive role played by the absence of Jesus' body. Mary Magdalene is characterized by a discipleship

that continues even after the death of the Master. It is described in harmony with the early morning setting, amidst the lack of understanding at the beginning of the scene, the misunderstanding of the empty tomb, and the irony of her words, subtly crafted by the evangelist (v. 2: ἤραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν; cf. v. 13). These aspects highlight not so much the absence of a corpse but rather the search for the Lord and the place “where” he might be found (cf. p. 117-119). The comparison (*sýnkrisis*) between Peter and the beloved disciple is characterized by both common elements and differences. It is noted that they both remain silent, with the narrator’s predominance in recounting their actions, their commonality in running to the tomb and looking at (*θεωρέω*) the linen inside it. However, the beloved disciple runs faster but does not enter, and above all, he “saw and believed” (verse 8: εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν). This description fits into the revelatory progression of the passage in John 20:1-10, oriented towards the manifestation of the Lord’s resurrection and its effects (cf. p. 119-125). Particular attention is subsequently given to the beloved disciple, retracing the passages where he appears explicitly (cf. John 13:23-25; 19:25-27; 20:1-10; 21:1-8; 21:20-23) and debatably (cf. John 1:35-42; 18:15-16). The character is depicted as “constantly and immediately receptive to the revelation of Jesus [...] faithful to the Son until the end [...] living with him in a relationship that makes him resemble him” (p. 135). However, the fact that in the macro-narrative (cf. John 13:1; 15:13-15) the characteristic of being loved by Jesus is not an exclusive prerogative to the beloved disciple, but concerns every disciple, makes him a prototype of discipleship and a model of faith (cf. p. 125-138). A brief paragraph is dedicated to the “absence” of Jesus, which actually plays an essential role both in the plot of the situation and in that of revelation: Mary Magdalene and the disciples move towards the empty tomb, and the question about his disappearance, sustaining the tension of the narrative with the opening to the resolution of the resurrection in John 20:9 (cf. p. 139).

The collaboration of the reader is detected primarily on the basis of the role of suspense and narrative techniques. As a first-level reader, inclined to understand the simple unfolding of the story, he is drawn towards the second level of reading, aimed at understanding how the story unfolds and, above all, his involvement. The situation created in John 20:1-10 with the absence of Jesus’ body and the unanswered questions from Mary Magdalene intensifies the suspense for the reader’s identification and emotional involvement, leading him to delve deeper and seek answers in the continuation of the narrative. Through the technique of *showing* via the characters’ and narrator’s perspectives, the reader grasps a narrative that is certain and reliable yet also open-ended due to Mary’s ambiguous question regarding the absence of the “Kyrios,” whose body has been possibly taken away by someone. An essential role is played by the *telling*, namely the explicit commentary of the narrator in John 20:9,

which corrects Mary's perception. Here the narrator explains that the faith of the beloved disciple (cf. John 20:8) was aroused by his journey and his ability to interpret the signs of what he saw in the tomb, and definitively informs the reader that Jesus' absence from the tomb is due to his resurrection from the dead. The way in which *showing* and *telling* are constructed endows the narrative itself with the characteristics of a sign to be interpreted and leads the reader to assume the same perspective as the beloved disciple. This raises the question of whether the cooperation of the reader constructed by the narration also entails adherence to faith. While on one hand, the invitation to believe is explicit in the insert in John 19:35 and from the orientation of the reading of John 20:1-10, on the other hand, the mere reading of the narrative cannot be equated with the experience of the Risen One narrated therein. The reader's openness to faith will depend on how they evaluate the reliability of the "book" [i.e. the Gospel] and the journey of the beloved disciple (cf. p. 140-148).

The subject of Chapter III is John 20:11-18, in which Mary Magdalene, remaining at the tomb after the disciple's departure, encounters first the angels and then the risen Jesus. An introductory paragraph presents the various issues of the passage and the exegetical solutions offered. The plot is recognized as the main compositional principle. The passage, thus, results organized by the exposition (cf. John 20:11a), the succession of complications (cf. vv. 11b-15), the resolution (cf. v. 16), a return to the plot (cf. v. 17), and the conclusion (cf. v. 18) (cf. p. 152-159). Mary is the character who holds the narrative together, representing first the search and then the encounter with Jesus, who transitions from being an absent corpse to being the main character as the Risen One. The passage revolves around two types of complications: those concerning Mary's intentions (first inclined towards the tomb and then turned backward) and those concerning the functions of the characters she encounters. The two stages that make up the passage first see a preparatory phase, in which Mary is addressed by the angels and then by Jesus. Both invite her to shift her focus from the material elements around her to the personal and relational dimension (cf. John 20:11b-15). Secondly, the word of the Risen One, which operates on a personal and relational level, opens up to recognition and a change of attitude with the announcement to the disciples (*anagnórisis* and *peripéteia*, in John 20:16-18). Furthermore, three revelatory nuclei can be identified around the journeys of Mary, the disciples, and Christ. The revelatory nucleus concerning Mary primarily involves her personal experience and relationship with the Risen One, who reveals himself by calling her by name. The revelation to the disciples features them as protagonists of a knowledge that becomes participation in the relationship between the Son and the Father. Finally, the revelatory nucleus concerning Christ shows, on the one hand, the "place" where he is located, near the tomb and now oriented towards returning to the Father, and on the other hand, it presents the novelty of the

announcement entrusted to the nascent community and embodied by Mary (cf. p. 159-207).

In the study of the characters, Casneda highlights how Mary Magdalene is described through the analysis of the voices that outline her characteristics. The narrator has already introduced the character in Jn 19:25, then describes his movements in the environment around the tomb (cf. 20:1.18) and gradually, being omnipresent and omniscient, he also indirectly reveals something of her inner world—the pain expressed by her tears and affection for Jesus—skilfully weighing the information provided to the reader, up to the climax of the *anagnōrisis*. Mary's words provide the reader with the most information regarding her external movements and inner motivations, showing both her attachment to “her” Lord and the search for his body, as well as her lack of understanding of Jesus' bodily absence and ignorance regarding his resurrection. Even the climax of the *anagnōrisis* is entrusted to Mary's voice, who, when called by name, is finally able to recognize the Lord. What actually leads to this climax, therefore, are the voices of the other characters on stage, the angels and Jesus himself. They cause Mary's transformation and recognition to occur not through the act of seeing, but thanks to the voice of the Risen One. In this construction that complements the external and internal planes, Mary herself thus becomes “a sign of the Risen One.” (p. 214). Subsequently, Casneda identifies possible echoes and references to the Song of Solomon 3:1-4, which establishes a *synkrisis* between Mary and the beloved woman in the Song. At the intradiegetic level, the character of Mary, in this way, functions as an eyewitness who calls her interlocutors, the disciples, to believe in the risen Christ and to their reliability. At the extradiegetic level, Mary assumes the role of witness to the fidelity of Jesus' word: he can be encountered after his death and resurrection and can still be sought and found. She also witnesses to the transforming power of the word of the Risen One, and to a possible path of love through listening to his word (cf. p. 207-232). The function of the angels is analyzed in light of their role in preparing for the encounter with the Risen One and in the combination of two possible allusions to Exodus 25:18-22, regarding the angels guarding the propitiatory in the tent of meeting, and to the guards, addressed by the beloved in the Song of Solomon 3:1-4. Finally, the character of Jesus is constructed in such a way as to present continuity and discontinuity with the pre-Paschal Jesus: he is consistent with the expectations prepared in the macro-narrative regarding his presence after his death and resurrection, and capable of building relationships of communion. At the same time Mary is not capable of recognizing him (cf. p. 232-236). The reader's path towards the recognition of the Risen One is exposed through the analysis of *suspense* (why does Mary remain at the tomb and bend down?), *surprise* (the appearance of the angels and the Risen One) and *showing*. The account of Mary's recognition leaves the reader at a certain impasse, for he can have neither

an experience of Christ before his death nor after his resurrection. The reader will be able to overcome the obstacle only if he adopts an interior attitude similar to that of Mary, of searching, loving and listening. Mary thus becomes a model of the reader's journey, through the book he has at his disposal (cf. p. 237-249).

Chapter IV is dedicated to the analysis of John 20:19-23. It opens with an explanation of the narrative incongruities of the passage, such as the silence regarding the reception of Mary's message, the identity of the disciples, Jesus' presence on the same day as his ascension to the Father, the meaning of *anagnōrīsis*, the repetition of the greeting of peace and a second giving of the Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, and finally, the difficulties related to the compositional models of the passage and its articulation (cf. p. 251-259). The manifestation of Jesus to the disciples is interpreted in the light of their formative path towards participation in divine life. It is divided into three stages: their discipleship during Jesus' public ministry (cf. John 1:19–12:50), the lengthy dialogues of Jesus with his disciples in ch. 13–17, and finally, the last stage that leads the disciples through the experience of the Lord's death and resurrection (cf. ch. 18–21) (cf. p. 259-274). The analysis proceeds to examine two sets of complications in John 20:19b-20 and 20:21-23. In the first set, the coming of the Lord is understood as subsequent to his ascension to the Father and aimed at completing the disciples' formation. The gift of peace is placed in continuity with the pre-Paschal promise of Jesus in John 14:27 and can find fulfillment in relation to the power of the Risen One that helps the disciples overcome their fear—although it does not eliminate the hostility of the world—and is connected to the gift of the Spirit (cf. 14:26; 20:22). Although the cognitive difficulty of the disciples is not explicitly stated, the manifestation of the Risen One can be understood as a scene of *anagnōrīsis*, which, according to Aristotle's classification, falls among those that occur by the will of the one who manifests himself through the recognition of signs. Jesus, indeed, displays the signs of his passion, which thus become distinctive. The *peripeteia* is evident in the transition from fear to joy experienced by the disciples (cf. p. 275-284). The second set of complications in John 20:21-23 addresses, first and foremost, the repetition of the greeting of peace (cf. 20:19, 21), which demonstrates the continuity and stability of the gift of peace, and in turn opens up to the mission of the disciples. This was also anticipated in the farewell discourses in John 15:9 and 17:18, and it is shown in continuity with the mission that the Son received from the Father and as an outcome of the disciples' participation in divine communion. In line with this, the gift of the Spirit actualizes what was anticipated in the macro-narrative both during Jesus' public ministry (cf. John 1:33; 3:3-7.34; 4:20-24; 6:63; 7:37-39) and during the farewell discourses (cf. John 14:16-17.25-26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11.12-15). The gift of the Spirit, foreshadowed on the cross in 19:30, highlights the act of creation by the glorified Risen One. Receiving and embracing the Spirit (λάβετε),

the disciples are now fully reconciled with the previously abandoned Master. The ultimate consequence of all this is the transmission to the disciples of the power to forgive sins, which also is in continuity with the ministry of Jesus (cf. 1:29; 3:16-19; 9:39) (cf. p. 284-307).

The story creates a considerable difference between the first and the second level reader due to the fact that while the former remains suspended in the continuation of the narrative, the latter is already involved in greater collaboration: between *suspense* and *surprise*, he is led to read the events narrated in the light of the farewell speeches, showing their truthfulness and the way in which several promises have been fulfilled. The *showing* and the *telling*, moreover, lead him to recognize that his condition is not so different from that of the disciples, and he is led to recognize himself in a similar formative path towards the decision of faith. This narrative highlights, on one hand, the journey of the disciples who move from seeing the signs of the Risen One to recognizing him anew and bearing witness, and on the other hand, that of the reader who is called to the journey that progresses from reading to faith (cf. p. 307-314).

Chapter V deals with the encounter between Thomas and the Risen One in Jn 20:24-29. The analysis of the plot shows how the passage begins with a new exposition, in which the absence of Thomas is noted, being characterized by his belonging to the group of the Twelve and by the nickname, “twin” (see v. 24a: Θωμαῖς δὲ εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος). Casneda notes that this appellation may be an indication of a specific feature of the character in similarity with the reader. On the other hand, the fact of being both “one of the Twelve” and “absent” at the time of Jesus’ appearance foreshadows an incipient difficulty. In verse 25, the disciples’ announcement to Thomas appears as their first testimony in obedience to Jesus’ command (cf. 20:21). It initiates the new way in which the disciples will continue the Master’s mission after his ascension to the Father. Thomas’s reaction shows a clear opposition and sets the conditions for arriving at faith, namely, to experience something similar to that of the disciples: seeing and touching in the Risen One the signs of the passion. A primary function of the dialogue is therefore to open up the question of the possibility of believing in the Risen One without having seen him, relying solely on the heard word. The conditions set by Thomas also recall the attitude towards the announcement, such as the demand for direct experience of the Risen One, which actually can only occur by the initiative of Jesus himself. Verse 26 introduces a new exposition analogous to the initial manifestation of Jesus in John 20:19, with the difference that this time Thomas is with the other disciples. The presence and words of the Risen One, inviting Thomas to put his fingers into the wounds of the passion and to leave behind his state of disbelief, touches the disciple in his concrete situation of unbelief and desire, and

manifests his personal care and gratuitous love for the disciple himself. Verse 28 presents the moment of *anagnōrīsis* with Thomas' profession of faith (ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου), which is unique in the Fourth Gospel. It allows the integration of the Christological titles of the lordship and divinity of the Risen One. Joined to the possessive pronoun, they express the personal dimension of the disciple's faith. In this way, Thomas receives an excess of gift compared to what was previously requested, fully participating in the benefits of Jesus' resurrection and becoming a witness of the transition from unbelief to faith. The passage ends in v. 29 with the confirmation of the recognition of Thomas by the Risen One (ὅτι ἐώρακάς με πεπίστευκας) and beatitude to those who believe without seeing (μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες). Against the background of biblical macarisms—"a mixed discursive form, of a sapiential type [...] between a statement of observation and a statement of admonition," (p. 340-241) which arouses desire—John's statement appears as a sapiential observation and is kerygmatic in nature, as it invites to have faith in the Risen Lord and proclaims the happiness of those who come to faith in the Risen One beyond the experience of vision. Among these, one has to recognize the beloved disciple (cf. 20:9) and the reader, who will be personally involved in his responsibility regarding the possibility of believing in the Risen One. John 20:29 thus serves the important function of connecting the intra-diegetic level with the extra-diegetic one (cf. p. 315-345).

In the analysis of the characters, Casneda revisits the passages where Thomas is present, in addition to 20:24-29 (cf. 11:16 and 14:5). In the overall view, the construction of the character is portrayed by John's narrative techniques of irony and misunderstanding, combined with the absence of information about his personal story. In this way, the reader at the first level who intends to delve into this figure is led towards a backward reflection of the narrative with greater involvement. The reader is prompted to be caught by the doubts and questions that Thomas raises and reaches the conclusion that to be a disciple one must trust the eyewitnesses and access faith. The repetition of Jesus' manifestation finally endows this character with the solidity and stability of the new condition: "He is and will always be the Lord risen from the dead and the Son of God who gives life" and peace (p. 354).

The reader's journey is characterized by surprise at Thomas's absence with his peers and by a renewed curiosity about the outcome of the story. On the other hand, the return of the Risen One evokes suspense regarding his reaction to Thomas's disbelief. The doubts and perplexities raised by the character of Thomas actually lead the reader to recognize themselves in the disciple's journey and to become involved in the possibility for the beatitude of faith without seeing. Therefore, the

character of Thomas is constructed in a “twin” manner with the journey of second-level readers, prompting them towards faith adherence (cf. p. 345-358).

In chapter VI, the last and shortest of the work, Casneda deals with John 20:30-31—the first conclusion of the Fourth Gospel. She first addresses two exegetical difficulties. The first pertains to the meaning of the term *σημεῖα*—the signs performed by Jesus—which is understood broadly. In 20:30, it refers to the deeds performed by Jesus during his life, while in 20:31, through the resumption of the relative pronoun, the term indicates the writing of the signs, that is, the narrative contained in the book. The second difficulty concerns a textual criticism issue regarding the verb “πιστεύω” in verse 31, which presents two different readings: “πιστεύητε,” in the present subjunctive, usually interpreted to convey a sense of ongoing belief (i.e., “continue to believe”) and thus referring to the contemporaneous readers of the text, or “πιστεύσητε,” in the aorist subjunctive, typically understood in an ingressive sense (i.e., “begin to believe”) and therefore referring to the future readers of the Gospel. Casneda notes that the other occurrences of “πιστεύσητε,” in the aorist subjunctive (cf. John 4:48; 8:24; 11:15; 13:19) do not necessarily imply an ingressive sense. She considers that the simple verb alone is not sufficient to resolve the question of the gospel’s recipients. Casneda concludes by stating that it is probably not necessary to choose between the two interpretations. Both a community that has to continue its journey and new believers can be considered as recipients of the text. Casneda also highlights how in the final verses three surprises are reserved for the reader: the first concerns the nature of the book that presents itself as a selection of the signs performed by Jesus with the intention of equating their revelatory capacity with the writing itself. The second surprise pertains to the purpose of the book, namely the faith of the reader, exalted through a beatitude. The third surprise concerns the gift received through faith, namely eternal life, through the gift of the Spirit and the participation in the communion of love between the Father and the Son. Casneda shows how the call for cooperation leads the reader towards retrospection and an ongoing process of understanding the book. The response of faith remains suspended and entrusted to the responsibility of the reader, who is prepared by the book but reliant on the manifestation of the Risen One, who alone can evoke recognition and adherence of faith, as seen in John 20 (cf. p. 359-367).

The brief conclusion intends to avoid repeating what the conclusions of each chapter have already expressed and gathers two essential considerations. The first recalls the main question of the inquiry, namely the journey of the reader invited to believe in the Risen One without having access to the vision. The answer is offered in John 20:29 with the beatitude reserved for those who adhere to faith. It is a journey of a sapiential nature that reveals in the testimony of the book the essential steps of



the protagonists that become a mirror of one's own journey of faith. The second consideration concerns the final assessment of the research, which evaluates the application of the narrative method as indispensable for unraveling the essential questions regarding the relationship between seeing and believing in the tension that emerges in the narratives in John 20. It is exposed in five points: 1) In light of the findings, the research has made it possible to grasp, first and foremost, how the dynamics of seeing and believing are articulated within the plot and the character development. Furthermore, it has highlighted how this journey involves the reader, who lacks access to the vision but is called to faith through the book. 2) The analysis has clarified how the four episodes narrated in John 20 are "relatively autonomous, intertwined with each other in such a way as to present an overall unified and cohesive plot, both thematically and dramatically" (p. 372). 3) The research has explained the narrative tensions within a meaningful framework without resorting to the diachronic composition of the text. 4) Several exegetical difficulties have found a significant explanation; for example, one can consider the relationship between John 20:8 and 20:9, as well as the silent departure of the disciple in John 20:10. 5) The use of semiotic analysis has shed light on the functioning of scenes of *anagnōrīsis*, highlighting the role of signs and the articulation of *showing* and *telling* for the construction of the narrative (cf. p. 369-373).

Casnedá's publication is presented coherently, and despite the abundant use of technical terminology related to narratology, it remains engaging and relatively easy to read. The application of narrative analysis appears thorough and adequately, often brilliantly executed. She consistently engaged with not only the classic Johannine commentaries such as Barrett, Brown, Bultmann, Carson, Keener, de la Potterie, Léon-Dufour, Schnackenburg, and Zumstein, but also with the most reputable studies in the field, including those by Aletti, Bennema, Culpepper, Koester, Larsen, Schneiders, and Taschl-Erbeer, just to name a few of the most cited authors. Furthermore, she does not hesitate to appropriately criticize unfounded positions, even though supported by prominent authorities in the exegetical field. It's worth noting the frequent reference to Italian-language authors, less cited internationally but deserving of consideration for their valuable contribution to research, such as the works of Fabris, Marcheselli, and Vignolo.

Indeed, despite the brevity of the conclusion, which may not fully highlight the value of the research, Alessandra Casnedá's contribution appears remarkable from various perspectives. The methodological notes at the beginning of the inquiry are particularly valuable because, amidst the variety of possible considerations inherent in narrative analysis, the text provides essential and unambiguous criteria, precisely because they are explained that will guide the inquiry. The explanations provided in most cases shed light on the passages analyzed in a consistent and

convincing manner. The way in which scenes of *anagnōrīsis* are explained is particularly commendable and adds enjoyment to reading and rereading the text, showcasing the author's mastery. Indeed, the greatest appreciation should be acknowledged in the explanations of thorny issues or narrative gaps, without resorting in most cases to assumptions and conjectures regarding the history of the text, that sometimes appear as easy way outs. On the contrary, the skillfully applied narrative analysis has proven to be capable of illuminating the final text, highlighting the narrative abilities of the author of the Johannine Gospel that were employed at the service of faith in the Risen One.

Indeed, among the aspects that raise perplexities or that should have deserved more careful argumentation, one can note the transitions between the plane of explicitly narrated elements and those presumed on the psychological-real level of the involved characters (see the reference to the inner journey of the beloved disciple on p. 105 and the reconstruction of the encounter between the disciples and Thomas on p. 327). In this way, it seems as if one falls into the same error criticized in other authors, namely, filling narrative gaps with conjectures not explicitly stated in the text. Furthermore, a more extensive conclusion, offering a synthetic re-reading of the major results from the analysis—in the style of an exegetical essay—would have been appropriate.

The research of Alessandra Casneda certainly deserves a very high consideration. It is an excellent work. Reading it will enrich anyone dedicated to the exegetical study of John 20. On several occasions, I have noticed that Anglophone biblical scholars sometimes overlook the bibliography of Romance languages in general. In this case, it must be noted that the loss would be considerable, or an English translation of the work is at least desirable.

*Alessandro Cavicchia OFM  
Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SBF)  
Faculty of Biblical Sciences and Archeology  
Via Dolorosa 1  
P.O.B. 19424  
9119301 Jerusalem  
Israel*

### **Nový zákon v grécko-rímskom kontexte** **22. – 26. januára 2024, Pápežský biblický** **inštitút v Ríme**

Posledný januárový týždeň je na Pápežskom biblickom inštitúte v Ríme (PIB) už tradične venovaný aktualizačnému semináru pre vyučujúcich a študentov Svätého písma. Dvanásť ročník sa konal 22. – 26. januára 2024 a zameral sa na *Nový zákon v grécko-rímskom kontexte*. Ako v minulom roku i tento raz bol garantom seminára prof. Jean Louis Ska. Funkciu koordinátorov plnili prof. Antonio Pitta (Lateránska univerzita) a Paolo Costa (PIB). S príspevkami vystúpili: Marc Rastoin, Antonio Pitta, Katell Berthelot, Cédric Brélaz, Chiara Ombretta Tommasi, Claudio Doglio, Paolo Costa, Josef Briffa, Santiago Guijaro, Francesco Filannino, Juan Manuel Granados, Andrzej Gieniusz, Dorota Hartman, Maurizio Marcheselli, Joseph Sievers, Matteo Crimella, Domenico Dursi, Lorenzo Rossi a Philip F. Esler.

Po troch spoločných dopoludňajších prednáškach v hlavnej aule si popoludní účastníci mohli zvoliť jednu alternatívu z troch alebo štyroch ponúkaných tém, ktoré sa prezentovali a následne diskutovali v menších skupinách.

Prostredie, v ktorom vznikali texty prijaté do kánonu Nového zákona, bolo v priebehu aktualizačného seminára predstavené z viacerých uhlov pohľadu. Niektoré príspevky prispeli k objasneniu historických reálií vo svetle najnovších archeologických výskumov. Ďalšie prednášky priblížili religiózny kontext stredomorskej oblasti na prelome letopočtov. Iné príspevky boli zamerané na štúdium mimobiblických literárnych textov, ktoré vďaka dobe a geografickému priestoru svojho vzniku významne prispievajú k pochopeniu niektorých novozákonných konceptov. Nechýbali prednášky, v ktorých sa reálie

popisované v novozákonných knihách posudzovali z hľadiska legislatívy a štátnej správy rímskeho impéria.

Medzi početnými účastníkmi seminára nechýbali biblisti slovenskej a českej proveniencie: Juraj Feník, Monika Golianová FMA, Ladislav Heryán SDB, Mária Kardis, Branislav Kluska, Andrea Korečková, Peter Kuriško a Peter Olas.

*Anna Mátiková  
Pontificio Istituto Biblico  
Piazza della Pilotta, 35  
00187 Roma, Italia*

## **Biblia, jazyk a kontext. Rekontextualizácia hebrejskej Biblie v staroveku 26. – 28. februára 2024, České Budejovice**

V posledné februárové dni 26. – 28. februára 2024 zorganizovala Teologická fakulta Juhočeskej univerzity v Českých Budejoviach medzinárodné sympóziu na tému *Biblia, jazyk a kontext. Rekontextualizácia hebrejskej Biblie v staroveku/The Bible, the Language and the Context. Recontextualisation of the Hebrew Bible in Antiquity*. Sympóziu bolo súčasťou výskumného projektu „Capital Offences in the Deuteronomic Code, and Their Early Linguistic Recontextualization“. Prípravný tím tvorilo trio Mgr. Viktor Ber, Ph.D., doc. Adam Mackerle, Th.D. a ThLic. Július Pavelčík, Th.D.

Počas troch dní sympózia postupne odznelo devätnásť vedeckých príspevkov od autorov z rôznych krajín v troch tematických okruhoch: 1. deň: Capital Offences and Capital Punishments in the Bible, 2. deň: Biblical Law and Its Jewish Interpretation a 3. deň: Christian Exegesis of the Pentateuch.

Slovensko bolo na sympóziu zastúpené dvomi prednášajúcimi. V prvý deň sympózia vystúpila S.S.D. Ing. Martina Korytiaková z RKCMBF Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave s príspevkom „Who Ought to Be Sentenced to Death and Why? The Death Penalty, Its Reasons and Legal Justifications in Judith“. V tretí deň doc. Helena Panczová, PhD. z Teologickej fakulty Trnavskej univerzity v Trnave predstavila príspevok na tému „«We Will Go by the Royal

Road; We Will Not Turn Aside to the Right Or to the Left»: Num 20:17 in the Bible, Philo of Alexandria, and Patristic Exegesis”.

Súčasťou sympózia bol aj kultúrny program v podobe poznávania krás mesta České Budejovice a jeho okolitého prostredia, ako aj ikonického zámku Hluboká.

Medzinárodné sympóziu svojim tematickým zameraním na trestné činy, ktoré sú penalizované trestom smrti podľa deuteronomistickej legislatívy a jej recepcie, bol nepochybne originálnym prínosom na poli biblicko-teologického skúmania. Jednotlivé príspevky ukázali, že aj táto ťaživá téma ako súčasť posvätných spisov má rôzne aspekty a vyžaduje si, aby bola vedeckou obcou náležite skúmaná a vysvetlená.

*Martina Korytiaková  
Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave  
Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta  
Kapitulská 26  
814 58 Bratislava*

## Studia Biblica Slovaca – Supplementum



1. Blažej ŠTRBA: *Bibliografia biblických vied slovenskej a českej proveniencie (1989 – 2013). Bibliography of biblical sciences of Slovak and Czech provenance (1989 – 2013)* (StBiSISup), Badín: Vlastným nákladom, 2014. 390 s. ISBN 978-80-971792-7-4



2. Helena PANCZOVÁ: *Preklad z biblickej gréčtiny do slovenčiny. Problémy, riešenia a perspektívy* (StBiSISup 2), Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2018. 142 s. ISBN 978-80-223-4596-5



3. František ÁBEL, Juraj FENÍK, Josef HŘEBÍK, Vladimír JUHÁS, Martina KORYTIAKOVÁ, Dagmar KRÁĽOVÁ, Eva NANIŠTOVÁ, Helena PANCZOVÁ, Július PAVELČÍK, Blažej ŠTRBA, Miroslav VARŠO: *Emócie v Biblii. Výskum fenoménu emócií v biblickej tradícii* (StBiSISup 3), Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2018. 328 s. ISBN 978-80-88696-75-9



4. Iveta STREKOVÁ: *Devastata è Ninive! Studio esegetico di Na 3,1-7 alla luce del suo contesto storico-letterario* (StBiSISup 4), Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2020. 383 s. ISBN 978-80-223-5050-1



5. Blažej ŠTRBA – Miroslav VARŠO (eds.): *Tvoje oči videli. Štúdie venované Georgovi Braulíkovi, OSB* (StBiSISup 5), Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2021. 268 s. ISBN 978-80-223-5233-8



6. Timothy MEJDA: *Obedient in Gethsemane. A Narrative-Critical Reading of Matthew 26:36-46* (StBiSISup 6) Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 2022. 302 s. ISBN 978-80-223-5462-2



7. Blažej ŠTRBA: *Jozue v Knihe Exodus. Exegetický výskum literárnej postavy* (StBiSISup 7), Bratislava: Comenius University, 2023. 195 s. ISBN 978-80-223-5683-1