

## Contents

### Treaties

#### *Emanuel Tov*

Divine Names: Different Approaches and Writing Procedures  
in the Qumran Scrolls ..... 133-158

#### *Joël André MINSI ENDOMO*

Gen 9:18-29 and the Drunkenness of a Main Parental or Divine Figure  
Entailing the Future of Their Filial Entities ..... 159-194

#### *Jan JOOSTEN*

“King Sihon, Who Dwells in Heshbon”: A Textual Problem  
in Num 21:34 and Parallels ..... 195-200

#### *Tomasz KOSZAREK*

The Structure and Poetic Elements of Jotham’s  
Speech (Judg 9:7g-20) ..... 201-229

#### *Lionel GOH YEH CHENG*

ἄγνοια in Wis 14:22 ..... 230-247

#### *Pavol FARKAŠ*

The Apostle Paul before the Members of the Council in Acts  
23:1-5: Interpretation of the Biblical Text – Rhetorical  
Intonational Aspect ..... 248-255

#### *Helena PANCZOVA*

The Life-Giving “Wind over Water”: The Semantics of the Verbs ζωογονέω  
and ζωοποιέω from Greek Mythico-Philosophical Ideas to the “Holy Spirit,  
Giver of Life” and the Patristic Debate on Gen 1:2c ..... 256-274

Abstracts and Reviews ..... 275-285

Communications and References ..... 286-292



*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 2

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: Federico Giuntoli, Lionel Goh, OFM a Zuzana Očkajáková.

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

Príspevky sa požadujú v elektronickej podobe, podľa možnosti v textovom editore Microsoft Word. Preferované fonty písma pre hebrejštinu a gréčtinu sú SBL Hebrew and SBL Greek. Príspevok typu štúdia, poznámka alebo reflexia musí byť doplnený abstraktom a jeho anglickou verziou, anglickým názvom príspevku, max. piatimi kľúčovými slovami v slovenčine/češtine a angličtine, zoznamom bibliografie a kontaktom na autora príspevku. Nevyžiadané rukopisy sa nevracajú. Redakcia si vyhradzuje právo upraviť titulok a vykonať potrebnú jazykovú a štylistickú úpravu prijatých príspevkov. Spresňujúce podmienky pre prispievateľov sú dostupné na [www.biblica.sk](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, 12/2024

Vychádza dvakrát do roka.

Cena: 9 €

ISSN 1338-0141

e-ISSN 2644-4879

EV 3744/09

## Obsah

### Štúdie

#### **Emanuel TOV**

Božie mená. Rôzne prístupy a postupy písania v Kumránskych zvitkoch ..... 133-158

#### **Joël André MINSI ENDOMO**

Gn 9,18-29 a opitosť rodičovskej alebo božskej postavy predznačujúca budúcnosť ich potomstva ..... 159-194

#### **Jan JOOSTEN**

„Kráľ Sehon, ktorý sídlil v Hesebone.“ Textový problém v Nm 21,34 a v paralelách ..... 195-200

#### **Tomasz KOSZAREK**

Štruktúra a poetické prvky Joatamovej reči (Sdc 9,7g-20) ..... 201-229

#### **Lionel GOH YEH CHENG**

Ἄγνοια v Múd 14,22 ..... 230-247

#### **Pavol FARKAŠ**

Apoštol Pavol pred členmi veľrady v Sk 23,1-5. Interpretácia biblického textu: Rétoricko-intonačný aspekt ..... 248-255

#### **Helena PANCZOVÁ**

Životodarný „vietor nad vodou“. Sémantika slovies ζωγονέω a ζωποιέω od gréckych mýticko-filozofických predstáv po „Ducha Svätého, Oživovateľa“ a patristická diskusia o Gn 1,2c ..... 256-274

**Abstrakty a recenzie** ..... 275-285

**Správy a oznamy** ..... 286-292

## Divine Names

### Different Approaches and Writing Procedures in the Qumran Scrolls

*Emanuel Tov*

Traditionally, the ancient Israelites approached the name of God with reverence as is visible in the third commandment (Exod 20:7; Deut 5:11). This reverence is also visible in other manifestations of that name when pronounced and written. The name is part of the divine being, almost in a mystical sense, and this is the source of the special care that surrounded God's different appellations. In the written documents, a special approach towards the Tetragrammaton is already visible in the Elohistic Psalter (Psalms 42–83) in which that name was usually replaced with אלהים in all textual witnesses<sup>1</sup>, implying that the process took place at a very early stage, in the Persian period, before all known texts were copied. A similar avoidance of the Tetragrammaton is evidenced in many Qumran scrolls. Ben-Dov draws a parallel between the revision behind the Elohistic Psalter and the Qumran movement of name changing<sup>2</sup>. Machiela and Meyer noticed a similar avoidance of the Tetragrammaton in several Jewish Aramaic texts<sup>3</sup>. For Qumran and the Greek evidence, the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton was described in detail by Stegemann<sup>4</sup> and Skehan<sup>5</sup>, based on

---

<sup>1</sup> Not Psalms 84–89. Further, in some places יהוה has been left in the text (e.g., Ps 48:2; 69:17; 71:16; 83:19). DAY, *Psalms*, 113 reflects the common view when stating: "...the name Elohim has been systematically (though not universally) substituted for Yahweh." On the other hand, HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalms 2*, 346 claim that "...there is no underlying redaction that more or less consciously replaced the divine name YHWH with the generic name Elohim."

<sup>2</sup> BEN-DOV, *The Elohistic Psalter*.

<sup>3</sup> MACHIELA, *Lord or God?*, 463; MEYER, *Naming God*, 90-129.

<sup>4</sup> STEGEMANN, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ*. See also STEGEMANN, *Erwägungen*.

<sup>5</sup> SKEHAN, *The Divine Name*.

the evidence available in 1969 and 1980 respectively, and by others<sup>6</sup>. As for Hebrew texts, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, and 1QM, for example, do not use the Tetragrammaton or אֱלֹהִים, except in 1QS VIII 14, 1QSB IV 25, 1QM X 4, 7 (twice in quotations from Scripture). In the last case, 1QM twice alludes to יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם in a quote from Deut 20:4 and Num 10:9 while omitting יהוה. The exceptions, that is when the divine names are used, occur especially in Scripture quotations.

In yet other cases, the Tetragrammaton was replaced in the Qumran scrolls by אֱל or אֱדוּנִי, especially in the sectarian scrolls. For example, in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 31, quoting Exod 15:11 אֱדוּנִי replaces יהוה and likewise in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q163) 23 ii 8 quoting Isa 30:18 אֱדוּנִי replaces יהוה. Likewise, in 4QHos<sup>b</sup> (4Q167) 2 6; 7–9 2; 16 3, אֱל probably replaces יהוה, in the latter case probably in a Scripture quotation (Hos 8:13). In 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> (4Q173) 5 4, לֵאל (in unusual script) replaces לַיהוה (cf. MT Ps 118:20).

The overwhelming preponderance of אֱל in the sectarian writings (pesharim, *Hodayot*, prayers, blessings, Rules) as opposed to the rare use of the Tetragrammaton in these writings (mainly in Scripture quotations), provides ample evidence of this avoidance, especially in 1QS and 1QH<sup>a</sup>. Special circumlocutions of the divine names in the Qumran scrolls are:

- אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם in 1QS VI 27 (= Deut 28:58 and Sir 47:18 MS Genizah B בשם הנכבוד)<sup>7</sup>.
- הוֹאֵהָא in 1QS VIII 13 (in a quotation from Isa 40:3)<sup>8</sup>. Katz rather fancifully assumes that the five letters of this word represent five dots (strokes) that are used once for the name of God in 4QHist Text A (4Q248) 5.
- הַאֲמַת in 4QS<sup>c</sup> (4Q259) III 4 elaborating upon Isa 40:3 (דֶּרֶךְ הַאֲמַת for דֶּרֶךְ יְהוָה).
- הוּ הַכּוּל in 4QD<sup>a</sup> (4Q266) 11 9, possibly a corrupted form of יהוה הַכּוּל (cf. the substitute for the name for God in m. Sukk. 4.5).

<sup>6</sup> SCHULLER, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 40-41; NEWSOM, “Sectually Explicit” Literature, 177 went one step further when claiming that ‘any text containing the tetragrammaton in free and original composition can be presumed to be of non-Qumran authorship.’ Many data were provided by PARRY, Notes.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion, see SCHIFFMAN, *Sectarian Law*, 133-136.

<sup>8</sup> See KATZ, *Die Bedeutung*.

The phrase was translated by Joseph Baumgarten as ‘Almighty God’<sup>9</sup>.

- יוד in 4QShir<sup>b</sup> (4Q511) 10 12 (in a quotation from Ps 19:10) [11 25 in the edition of Joseph Angel<sup>10</sup>] probably represents an abbreviated divine name using the initial letter *yod* (י) and spelled out as משפטי יוד.<sup>11</sup>

Reflecting a similar approach to the avoidance of the use of divine names, *scribal* solutions were invented in order to avoid the regular writing of these names in the text; they are the focus of our analysis. Thus, in addition to the writing of the Tetragrammaton in square characters, which occurs infrequently in the Qumran texts, four scribal systems were devised for the graphic representation of the divine names, with the emphasis on the first two (for the philosophy behind the changes, see Ben-Dov, “Elohistic Psalter”). With one exception (representation of the Tetragrammaton in XHēv/SeEschat Hymn [XHēv/Se 6] 2 7), the four systems are unique to the Qumran scrolls and were not used in the scrolls from the other Judean Desert sites:

1. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Paleo-Hebrew characters (אָאָאָ);
2. Four dots (named *Tetrapuncta*) (...);
3. A dicolon (:) in 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364);
4. לאלהיכ written in red in 11QpaleoUnid. Text (11Q22).

### 1. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Paleo-Hebrew characters (אָאָאָ)

When the Tetragrammaton was included in the text, the most frequently known system in Hebrew sources was the employment of a *different script*. The representation of the divine names (mainly the Tetragrammaton) in Paleo-Hebrew characters in several Qumran manuscripts was noticed from the earliest days of the Qumran discoveries, since it is found in several texts from Cave 1, the first discovered cave.

<sup>9</sup> BAUMGARTEN, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 77. For a discussion, see BAUMGARTEN, A New Qumran Substitute. Alternatively, the text has to be read as אתהוהכל = (א) (ה) (ה) (א) הכל (‘you are everything’) suggested by KISTER, On a New Fragment, comparing with Sir 43:27 וקץ דבר הוא הכל.

<sup>10</sup> ANGEL, *The Songs of the Sage*, 86.

<sup>11</sup> NEBE, *Der Buchstabenname*, 283-284.

1QpHab, especially, has drawn much attention in this regard. For an analysis of the Qumran evidence known until 1980, see Skehan<sup>12</sup>; for an earlier, more detailed, analysis, see Stegemann<sup>13</sup>. A full list of the evidence known in 1983 was provided by Mathews<sup>14</sup>, not yet including three further texts, 4QExod<sup>j</sup>, 4QLev<sup>g</sup>, and 4QS<sup>d</sup> (4Q258). In one instance (4QpPs<sup>b</sup> [4Q173] on Psalm 127), the divine name is written with unusual letters. The divine name is also written in Paleo-Hebrew characters in an Aramaic text, 4QpsDan<sup>a</sup> ar (4Q243) 1 2 (אלהכה). For a paleographical analysis of these letters, see Michael Langlois<sup>15</sup>.

*Background.* The use of a different script for the Tetragrammaton and other divine names provided them with a higher level of holiness probably reflecting the views of a group of Qumran scribes (see below). On a practical level, the separation of these words from the context in both biblical and nonbiblical scrolls was meant to safeguard them from erasure and pronunciation. The device succeeded, and indeed the Tetragrammata in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> were not erased but marked with cancellation dots, above and below (XVI 7; XXI 2), while twenty-eight words were erased in that scroll<sup>16</sup>.

A slight clue to the background of this system is found in a few halakhot in the much later rabbinic literature that were written in the same spirit. These halakhot, especially y. Meg. 1.71d (parallels in b. Shev. 35b) providing the rules for the writing of the divine names, stipulate which divine names and which parts of them were not to be erased. The discussions in the Talmud illustrate the problems of the Judean Desert scribal practice, which is far from unified, regarding the divine names covered by this special practice and the inclusion or exclusion of the prefixes and suffixes of the divine names. However, they do not mention the core issue, that of writing in the Hebrew script. Siegel<sup>17</sup> points to the practical background of the writing in the Paleo-Hebrew script, namely the prevention of accidental erasure<sup>18</sup>. Such erasure could be prevented because of the visibility of that script amidst the square Hebrew writing.

---

<sup>12</sup> SKEHAN, Divine Name.

<sup>13</sup> STEGEMANN, *KYPIOS*, 149-151.

<sup>14</sup> MATHEWS, The Background.

<sup>15</sup> LANGLOIS, Theonyms, 274-275.

<sup>16</sup> See the list of SANDERS, *The Psalms Scroll*, 9. The argument is not watertight since the Tetragrammata that were written in the square script in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (III 24, 25 [Isa 3:17, 18]; XLVI 21 [Isa 56:8]) and 4QIsa<sup>d</sup> Isa 49:4 were not erased either, but canceled with dots.

<sup>17</sup> SIEGEL, Employment; SIEGEL, *The Scribes of Qumran*, 29-45.

<sup>18</sup> SIEGEL, Employment, 162, 169.

A second factor for the writing in that script would have been equally significant: the avoidance of the pronunciation of the divine names. 1QS VI 27–VII 1 spells out that the name of God was not to be uttered by the covenanters: א[שר יזכיר דבר בשם הנכבד, “anyone who speaks aloud the Honored Name...” The penalty for transgressing this ruling (VII 2) was expulsion from the community<sup>19</sup>.

The sanctity of the writing in the Paleo-Hebrew script is underlined by an unusual scribal custom, that of its inscription by a special scribe: In some manuscripts, spaces were left by the original scribe for the Paleo-Hebrew words to be filled in later, possibly because of the sanctity of the divine name or because special skills were required for the copying.

- 1QpHab: According to Stegemann<sup>20</sup>, the difference between the somewhat coarse pen of the scribe and the more refined writing of the Tetragrammata written in that text (illustr. 3) shows that the latter were written at a later stage.
- 4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> (4Q165) 6 4: In this scroll, for which the use of the Tetragrammaton is not evidenced, a space was left open where MT (Isa 32:6) has a Tetragrammaton, to be filled in later:  
 MT: לְדַבֵּר אֶל־יְהוָה תּוֹעָה לְהָרִיק,  
 4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> (4Q165): [ת] תועה ולהמ[ית] ל[ולדבר א]
- 11QPsa: In one instance, the Tetragrammaton was not inserted in the space left in III 4, at which point it is found in MT (Ps 121:5) (for an extensive analysis, see Meyer<sup>21</sup>). Al Wolters<sup>22</sup> noticed that the shape of the *vav* of the Tetragrammata until VI 11 differs from that of the later occurrences in the scroll. This may imply that two different hands wrote the Tetragrammata. The writing of the Tetragrammata shows much variation, both regarding the size of the letters and the space around them (fig. 27). The scribe left irregular spaces, and it appears that at a later stage someone, possibly the original scribe himself, penned in the Tetragrammata, sometimes squeezing them in between the surrounding words. This procedure often created the misleading impression of a ligature (e.g., IV 3, 11; X 9; XIII 8, 12;

<sup>19</sup> SCHIFFMAN, *Sectarian Law*, 133-136.

<sup>20</sup> STEGEMANN, *KYPIOS*, A, 91, n. 502.

<sup>21</sup> MEYER, *Naming God*, 157-159.

<sup>22</sup> WOLTERS, *The Tetragrammaton*, 93.

XIV 4; XVI 11), while in other instances either ample space was left around the Tetragrammaton (XIV 8) or the Paleo-Hebrew letters were very large (VIII 5).

This custom is also known from Greek sources (below, § A).

The talmudic evidence does not hint at the writing of the divine names in the Paleo-Hebrew script, which is prohibited in rabbinic literature. It would therefore be surprising had the rabbis ascribed a higher degree of sanctity to the writing in that script. The parallel with rabbinic literature pertains to the setting apart of these words in order to safeguard them from erasure. The sanctity of the writing in this script<sup>23</sup> was thus not part of the rabbinic culture but was related to the scribal community that employed this system as shown by a statistical investigation of the texts that used this system.

The distribution of the divine names written in Paleo-Hebrew characters in scrolls written with square characters displays remarkable features. Table 1 records twenty-nine texts containing the Paleo-Hebrew form of the Tetragrammaton (not specified below) and/or of אֱלֹהִים (specified) and צְבָאוֹת (specified) in scrolls written with square characters. This practice features only in texts found at Qumran but the texts could have been copied anywhere. A lone text is written in Aramaic, 4QPsDan<sup>a</sup> ar (4Q243). If the scribe of 4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> (4Q165) intended to include a Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton, as indicated by the space left in frg. 6 4, this text needs to be added to the list (in that case, numbering altogether thirty texts).

Table 1 presents a list of the texts written in square characters that contain Paleo-Hebrew divine names. Almost all occurrences of these names in nonbiblical scrolls involve *Scripture quotations or allusions* (indicated in the list, although it is often unclear whether a quotation is involved). Most scrolls relate to the QSP (17), while some are too fragmentary for analysis of their orthography.

---

<sup>23</sup> PERROT – RICHELLE, *Paleo-Hebrew Script*, present a thorough discussion of the question whether the Paleo-Hebrew script was renewed in the second pre-Christian century or was used continually throughout the centuries.



*Table 1: Tetragrammata and 'El(ohim) Written in Paleo-Hebrew Characters in Scrolls Written with Square Characters (29)*

a. Biblical manuscripts (9 [5 QSP])
2QExod <sup>b</sup> 2 2; 7 1; 8 3 (Exod 12:27; 31:16; 34:10) QSP, c20 <sup>24</sup>
4QExod <sup>i</sup> 1–2 3 (Exod 8:1) QSP, c20
4QLev <sup>g</sup> 18 (Lev 7:25) (also square script)
11QLev <sup>b</sup> 2 2, 6, 7 (Lev 9:24; 10:1)
4QDeut <sup>k2</sup> 5 6 (Deut 26:3) QSP, b15
4QIsa <sup>c</sup> יהוה passim, e.g. 6 6 (Isa 11:9); 9 i 25 (Isa 22:12); צבאות in 1–2 + 49 11 (Isa 9:12); 3–5 + 50 4 (Isa 10:25); 24 36 (Isa 44:6); אלוהים + suffixes, e.g. Isa 44:6; אדוני, e.g. 9 i 25 (Isa 22:11) QSP (also square script), c50
1QPs <sup>b</sup> 2–5 3 (Ps 127:3) (too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography) <sup>25</sup> , c60
11QPs <sup>a</sup> II 2 (Ps 146:9), 4 (Ps 146:10), 6 (Ps 148:1), and passim (both in the biblical text and in nonbiblical sections, such as XXVII 4) <sup>26</sup>
3QLam 1 2 (Lam 1:11; too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography), c20
b. Nonbiblical Compositions <sup>27</sup> (18 [12 QSP])
1QpMic (1Q14) 1–5 1, 2 (quotations); 12 3 ('El) QSP, c44
1QpHab VI 14; X 7, 14; XI 10 (all: quotations; fig. 26) QSP, c25
1QpZeph (1Q15) 3, 4 (quotation; too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography)
1QMyst (1Q27) II 11 ('El) QSP
1QH <sup>a</sup> e. g. VII 38; IX 28; X 36 (all: 'El, in X 36 'Eli with the suffix; probably all quotations; most occurrences of 'El in this scroll are written in the square script) QSP, c5 <sup>28</sup>
1QH <sup>b</sup> (1Q35) 1 5 ('El), c5 <sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Most tentative dates in this table are based on WEBSTER, Chronological Index.

<sup>25</sup> According to BARTHÉLEMY – MILIK, *Qumran Cave 1*, 71, 1QPs<sup>b</sup> does not necessarily reflect a scroll of all the Psalms, and it could have belonged to the same scroll as 1Q30 (1QLiturgical Text A?), written in the same handwriting.

<sup>26</sup> For a list, see SANDERS, *The Psalms Scroll* (DJD 4), 9 (fig. 27) QSP, c25.

<sup>27</sup> Except for 4QS<sup>d</sup> (4Q258). According to Joseph Baumgarten (BAUMGARTEN, *Qumran Cave 4.XXV*, 62), a Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton is to be reconstructed in 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) 1 4, but there is no intrinsic reason for this reconstruction.

<sup>28</sup> PUECH, Hodayot, 366.

<sup>29</sup> PUECH, Hodayot, 366.

- 
- 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> (4Q161) 8–10 13 (quotation) QSP  
 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (4Q171) II 4, 12, 24; III 14, 15; IV 7, 10 (all: quotations); not in the supralinear addition in III 5 QSP  
 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> (4Q173) 5 4 ('*El*, quotation), לאל instead of ליהוה of MT (too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography), b15  
 4QAgos of Creation A (4Q180) 1 1 ('*El*) QSP, c50  
 4QMidrEschat<sup>e?</sup> (4Q183) 2 1; 3 1; 1 ii 3 ('*El*). This text probably is part of the same ms as 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (4Q171)<sup>30</sup> (too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography)  
 4QS<sup>d</sup> (4Q258; not QSP) VIII 9; IX 8 ('*El*), b15  
 4QD<sup>b</sup> (4Q267) 9 i 2; iv 4; v 4 (all: '*El*), next to 10 occurrences of '*El* written in the square script, e.g. 2 5, 7 QSP, b15  
 4QD<sup>c</sup> (4Q268) 1 9 ('*El*) QSP, c15  
 4QShirShabb<sup>g</sup> (4Q406) 1 2; 3 2 (both: '*Elohim*; too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography)  
 4QComposition Concerning Divine Providence (4Q413) 1–2 2, 4 (both: '*El*) QSP, c20  
 6QD (6Q15) 3 5 ('*El*; too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography) (also square script), c50  
 6QpapHymn (6Q18) 6 5; 8 1; 10 3 (all: '*El*) QSP, c20  
 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q165) 6 4: The scribe possibly meant to include a Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton for which space was left (not included in the counting)  
 The highlighted texts (14) wrote אל(ה)ים in Paleo-Hebrew characters.  
 See further 3Q14 18 2 in § c.
- 

c. A Fragment of Unclear Nature (1)

- 
- 3QUnclassified frgs. (3Q14) 18 2 ('*El*) (too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the orthography)
- 

d. An Aramaic Text (1)

- 
- 4QPsDan<sup>a</sup> ar (4Q243) 1 2 (אלהכה = אלהים) c15
- 

---

<sup>30</sup> Thus STRUGNELL, Notes, 263. This composition was named 4QmidrEschat<sup>e?</sup> by STEUDEL, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*.

The connection of the writing of the Tetragrammata and *'El(ohim)* in Paleo-Hebrew characters in scrolls written in square characters with the scribes of the QSP is unmistakable since all the texts that are large enough for analysis (except for the Aramaic 4Q243) show the hallmarks of that scribal practice. This practice displays reverence for the divine names, which is known also from other indicators of the Qumran community that generally preferred to avoid the use of the Tetragrammaton (see above). At the same time, scribes writing in the Qumran scribal practice act in different directions and they are often inconsistent even within the same composition<sup>31</sup>:

The single occurrence in an Aramaic text is remarkable. The editors of this text, John Collins and Peter W. Flint, connect the combined text 4Q243–244 (4QPs-Dan<sup>a-b</sup> ar) with the 'sectarian literature,' but they note that it does not refer explicitly to the Qumran yahad<sup>32</sup>.

- Inconsistency within a scroll: 1QH<sup>a</sup> *'El* (in X 36 *'Eli* with the suffix); e.g., VII 38; IX 28; X 36 are written in the Paleo-Hebrew script, while most occurrences of *'El* in this scroll are written in the square script.
- Within a scroll: 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> was inconsistent in the writing of two divine names: צבאות (following יהוה) was written in square script in frg. 40 3 (Isa 54:5); likewise, אדוני was written in that script (without the Tetragrammaton) in frg. 9 ii 27 (Isa 24:1); elsewhere both words were written in the Paleo-Hebrew script.
- Within a scroll: 4QD<sup>b</sup> (4Q267) 9 i 2; iv 4; v 4 (all: *'El*) are written in the Paleo-Hebrew script, while some ten occurrences of *'El* are written in the square script, e.g., 2 5, 7.

Further signs of inconsistency:

- Two different systems are used side by side regarding the inclusion of the prefixes and suffixes in the writing of the divine names with Paleo-Hebrew characters. The following texts include the prefixes and/or suffixes in the Paleo-Hebrew script. No distinction is made between prefixes and suffixes as is done in rabbinic literature<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> Thus also MEYER, *Naming God*, 172-174.

<sup>32</sup> John Collins and Peter W. Flint in ULRICH – CROSS, *Qumran Cave 4.VII*, 137.

<sup>33</sup> Scribes writing in the QSP and the later rabbis struggled with the exact same problem (are the prefixes and suffixes of the divine names equally as sacred as the divine

- 4QLev<sup>g</sup> 1 8 (Lev 7:19): prefix.
- 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>: prefixes in Isa 26:4; 44:5 and suffixes to *'Elohim* in Isa 51:15; 52:10 (on the other hand, in 55:5 *'Elohim* with a suffix was written in square characters).
- 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> (4Q173) 5 4 לֵאֱלֹהִים written in cryptic characters: prefix. The *'aleph* resembles that of the cryptic scripts<sup>34</sup>, while the *lamed* resembles the Latin L.
- 1QH<sup>a</sup> X 36 *'Eli* with the suffix.
- The following texts wrote the prefixes and/or suffixes of the divine names in the square script:
  - 2QExod<sup>b</sup> 7 16 (Exod 31:16).
  - 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (4Q171) III 14.
  - 6QpapHymn (6Q18) 8 1 בִּלְאֵלִים.
  - 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: passim, e.g., IV 3 (Ps 125:1); XVI 4, 5, 6 (Ps 118:8.9.29); E i 5 (*DJD* XXIII) (Ps 118:29).

A reverse examination of the texts written in the QSP reveals that fifty-nine texts did *not* use a special system for the writing of the divine names in Paleo-Hebrew characters. The data in Table 2 show that within the group of Qumran scribes, different practices were employed for writing the divine names<sup>35</sup>. H features only in Table 1, while Instruction, M, and T feature only in Table 2; texts of S, D, the pesharim, and ShirShabb feature in both tables. Table 2 contains more texts than Table 1.

---

names?), although in the QSP environment the names were written with Paleo-Hebrew characters and according to the rabbinic practices with square characters. Y. Meg. 1.71d makes a logical distinction between the prefixes (may be erased) and the suffixes of *'El(ohim)* (may not be erased).

<sup>34</sup> PFANN – ALEXANDER – BROSHI, et al., *Cryptic Texts*, 526.

<sup>35</sup> In compiling Tables 1–2, I used ABEGB – BOWLEY – COOK, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, Abegg's Qumran modules within the Accordance computer program, and a list compiled by Abegg for me in September 2023.

*Table 2: Tetragrammata and 'El(ohim) Written in Square Characters in Texts Written According to the Qumran Scribal Practice (59)*

a. Biblical Texts (18)
4Q[Gen-]Exod <sup>b</sup>
4QNum <sup>b</sup>
2QDeut <sup>c</sup>
1QDeut <sup>a</sup>
4QDeut <sup>j</sup>
4QDeut <sup>k1</sup>
4QDeut <sup>m</sup>
4QRP <sup>a</sup> (4Q158)
4QRP <sup>c</sup> (4Q365)
1QIsa <sup>a</sup> (also: <i>Tetrapuncta</i> inserted by the corrector in Isa 40:7)
2QJer
4QXII <sup>c</sup>
4QXII <sup>e</sup>
4QXII <sup>g</sup>
4QPs <sup>o</sup>
11QPs <sup>b</sup>
11QPs <sup>c</sup>
4QLam
b. Nonbiblical Texts (41)
1QSa (1Q28a) (' <i>El</i> )
1QM (1Q33) (' <i>El</i> )
4QpIsa <sup>b</sup> (4Q162) II 3, 7, 8 (quotation)
4Qpap pIsa <sup>c</sup> (4Q163) I 19; II 6; 15–16 1; 21 9; III 3, 9; 25 7 (all: quotations)
4QHos <sup>b</sup> (4Q167) 2 6; 7–9 2; 16 3, probably replacing יהוה (' <i>El</i> )
4QpNah (4Q169)
4QpPs <sup>b</sup> (4Q173)
4QCatena A (4Q177; quotation)
4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)
4QJub <sup>f</sup> (4Q221; ' <i>Elohim</i> )
4QD <sup>a</sup> (4Q266; ' <i>El</i> )
4QD <sup>f</sup> (4Q271; ' <i>El</i> )
4QBer <sup>a</sup> (4Q286; ' <i>El</i> )
4QMyst <sup>a</sup> (4Q299; ' <i>El</i> )
4QRP <sup>b</sup> (4Q365; also: ' <i>Elohim</i> , ' <i>El</i> )

---

4QapocrMoses<sup>a</sup> (4Q375; also: 'Elohim, 'El)  
 4QApocryphal Pentateuch B (4Q377) 2 ii 3, 5  
 4QCommunal Confession (4Q393 hand B; 'El, 'Elohim)  
 4QShirShabb<sup>b</sup> (4Q401; 'El, 'Elohim)  
 4QShirShabb<sup>c</sup> (4Q402; 'El, 'Elohim)  
 4QShirShabb<sup>d</sup> (4Q403; 'El, 'Elohim)  
 4QShirShabb<sup>f</sup> (4Q405; 'Elohim)  
 4QInstruction<sup>b</sup> (4Q416; 'El)  
 4QInstruction<sup>c</sup> (4Q417; 'El)  
 4QInstruction<sup>d</sup> (4Q418; 'El)  
 4QParaphrase of Gen and Exod (4Q422; 'El)  
 4QH<sup>a</sup> (4Q427; 'El)  
 4QH<sup>b</sup> (4Q428; 'El)  
 4QBarkhi Nafshi<sup>d</sup> (4Q437; 'El)  
 4QNarrative Work and Prayer (4Q460; 'Elohim)  
 4QM<sup>a</sup> (4Q491; 'El)  
 4QpapM<sup>f</sup> (4Q496; 'El)  
 4QpapRitMar (4Q502; 'El)  
 4QpapPrQuot (4Q503; 'El, 'Elohim)  
 4QDibHam<sup>a</sup> (4Q504; 'El)  
 4QShir<sup>b</sup> (4Q511; 'Elohim)  
 4QOrdinances<sup>b</sup> (4Q512; 'El)  
 11QapocrPs (11Q11)  
 11QMelch (11Q13; 'Elohim, 'El)  
 11QT<sup>a</sup> (11Q19; also: 'Elohim, 'El)  
 11QT<sup>b</sup> (11Q20; also: 'Elohim)

---

Some of these texts were written in the same period, indicating different scribal habits rather than a different chronological background. The latter assumption was espoused by Patrick W. Skehan<sup>36</sup>, who ascribed the writing of the Tetragrammaton in Paleo-Hebrew characters to a late stage of the writing of the Qumran scrolls. Among other things, he expressed this view regarding the internal differences within the pesharim<sup>37</sup>, assuming that the earlier pesharim wrote the Tetragrammaton in square characters, while the later ones used Paleo-Hebrew characters, but this is not borne out by the dates now assigned to these

---

<sup>36</sup> SKEHAN, *The Qumran Manuscripts*, 151.

<sup>37</sup> SKEHAN, *Divine Name*, 22.

manuscripts<sup>38</sup>. A more cautious formulation is that of Meyer: “About half use the square script for the divine name, while the other half use paleo-Hebrew, a practice that enters the picture around 30 BCE, which continues alongside the use of the square script into the first century CE.”<sup>39</sup>

It remains correct to say that the practice of the writing of the paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata in texts written with square characters is closely linked to the Qumran scribal practice, reflecting the religious beliefs of the covenanters.

## 2. Four dots (*Tetrapuncta*) (....)

Four dots (named *Tetrapuncta* by Stegemann<sup>40</sup>) in texts written in the square script (....) represent the Tetragrammaton in nine nonbiblical and biblical texts written in the QSP, as well as in four additional Qumran texts (in one-stroke) and XHev/SeEschat Hymn (XHev/Se 6) 2 7 (four diagonal strokes). This practice was limited to a very small group of texts and possibly it was limited to a certain period. These dots and strokes were positioned level with the tops of the letters: e.g., 4QTest (4Q175) 1, 19 and 4QT<sup>b</sup> (4Q524) 6–13 4. These *Tetrapuncta* represent the four-letter word יהוה in Hebrew texts, while in the Aramaic 4QpapTob<sup>a</sup> ar (4Q196) they likely represent אֱלֹהִים.

This practice reflects reverence for the divine name, considered so sacred that it was not to be written with regular characters lest an error be made or lest it be erased by mistake. Possibly, the dots and strokes were also meant to alert against pronouncing the divine name. Usually, the scribe wrote a series of four consecutive dots but in 4QTanh (4Q176) and 4QNarrative C (4Q462) two clusters of two dots are written. The scribes of four texts drew four or five strokes. The only scribe who wrote *Tetrapuncta* in Scripture scrolls is that of 4QSam<sup>c</sup> who also corrected 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

---

<sup>38</sup> The summary list of WEBSTER, Chronological Index assigns the following dates to pesharim that write the Tetragrammata in square characters: 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> (4Q162; 50–25 BCE), 4Qpap pIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q163; 85 BCE), 4QpNah (4Q169; 50–25 BCE). The following dates have been assigned to pesharim inscribing the Tetragrammata in Paleo-Hebrew characters: 4QpMic? (4Q168; 30 BCE–68 CE), 1QpHab (1–50 CE), 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> (4Q161; 50–25 BCE), 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (4Q171; 50–25 BCE), 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> (4Q173; 30–1 BCE), 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q165; 30–1 BCE).

<sup>39</sup> MEYER, *Naming God*, 174.

<sup>40</sup> STEGEMANN, *KYPIOS*, 152, fig. 19.

Table 3: *Tetrapuncta in the Judean Desert Scrolls (14)*

a. Texts Written in the Qumran Scribal Practice (9)
1QS VIII 14 (quotation from Isa 40:3), also once $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ (VIII 13).
1QIsa <sup>a</sup> : Supralinear corrections in cols. XXXIII 7 (Isa 40:7; illustr. 1) and XXXV 15 (Isa 42:6), in the latter case probably five dots <sup>41</sup> .
4QSam <sup>c</sup> 1 3 (1 Sam 25:31); III 7, 7 (2 Sam 15:8).
4QTest (4Q175) lines 1, 19 (biblical quotations, fig. 19).
4QTanḥ (4Q176) 1–2 i 6, 7, 9 (four dots); 1–2 ii 3 (two clusters of two strokes); 8–10 6, 8 (twice), 10 (two clusters of two dots), all Scripture quotations. Furthermore, once in the square script: 3 1.
4Qpap paraKings et al. (4Q382) 9 5 (quotation of 2 Kgs 2:3-4); 78 2; but not in 11 4 (2 Kgs 2:4) and 53 1.
4QPersonal Prayer (4Q443) 1 5.
4QNarrative C (4Q462) 7 (four dots) 12 (two clusters of two dots, probably Scripture quotations).
4QT <sup>b</sup> (4Q524) 6–13 4, 5 (four dots).
b. Texts Not Written in the Qumran Scribal Practice (5)
4QpapTob <sup>a</sup> ar (4Q196) 17 i 5 (Tob 12:22); 18 15 (Tob 14:2), probably representing $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ . <sup>42</sup>
4QHist Text A (4Q248) 5 (five strokes, possibly with a combining stroke between strokes 2 and 3 counted from the right).
4QMen of People Who Err (4Q306) 3 5 (four strokes).
4Qpap psEzek <sup>c</sup> (4Q391) 36 (3 times), 52, 55, 58, 65 (four dots, insufficient data on the orthographic system).
XHev/SeEschat Hymn (XHev/Se 6) 2 7 (four strokes). This text probably derived from Qumran, and not from Hever/Seiyal.

According to Stegemann<sup>43</sup>, the four dots indicating the divine name are also evidenced in an early copy of the LXX (P.Fouad 266b [848] of Deuteronomy, middle of 1 BCE), where they were subsequently overwritten by the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in small square characters, leaving much space on both sides. Since, according to Stegemann, the dots in this *Greek* manuscript were replaced by the Tetragrammaton, the scribes of the mentioned Hebrew texts probably also intended to replace the dots with actual letters. However, this assumption cannot

<sup>41</sup> DELCOR, *Les divers manières*, 153.

<sup>42</sup> See my study TOV, *Scribal Habits*.

<sup>43</sup> STEGEMANN, *KYPIOS*, 155.



be examined for the Greek text, since it is difficult to recognize any dots behind the writing of the Tetragrammaton in P.Fouad 266b<sup>44</sup>.

Because of the statistical pattern recorded in the table, a connection between the *Tetrapuncta* and the QSP is likely. While it is difficult to determine the chronological relationship between the different modes of representing the divine name, Stegemann<sup>45</sup> suggested that the *Tetrapuncta* preceded the writing of the divine name in square characters. Most texts displaying *Tetrapuncta* are dated to the Hasmonean era (150–30 BCE)<sup>46</sup>, possibly pointing to a practice employed in that period:

- 1QS–4QTest (4Q175)–4QSam<sup>c</sup> dated in different ways: 100–50 BCE for 1QS, 100–75 BCE for 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, 125–75 BCE for 4QTest (4Q175) and for 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (125–100 BCE),
- 4QTanḥ (4Q176) hand A: 30 BCE; hand B: 30 BCE–68 CE,
- 4Qpap paraKings et al. (4Q382): ca. 75 BCE,
- 4QPersonal Prayer (4Q443): 100–75 BCE,
- 4QNarrative C (4Q462): 50–25 BCE,
- 4QT<sup>b</sup> (4Q524): 150–125 BCE,
- 4QHist Text A (4Q248): 30–1 BCE,
- 4QMen of People Who Err (4Q306): 150–50 BCE,
- 4Qpap psEzek<sup>c</sup> (4Q391): 150–100 BCE,
- XḤev/SeEschat Hymn (XḤev/Se 6): 30 BCE–68 CE,
- 4QpapTob<sup>a</sup> ar (4Q196): ca. 50 BCE.

### 3. A dicolon ( : )

A dicolon ( : ) followed by a space is systematically placed before the Tetragrammaton (written in the square script) in only one text, 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364, QSP, e.g., 14 3 [Exod 24:17]). This dicolon resembles the later *Qere* practice, indicating that the word should be read differently or not at all.

---

<sup>44</sup> Thus DUNAND, *Papyrus grecs bibliques*, 13 and ALY – KOENEN, *Three Rolls*, 5-6 (photographs provided by Aly – Koenen). However, there may be dots in frg. 37 (Deut 24:4).

<sup>45</sup> STEGEMANN, *KYPIOS*, 157.

<sup>46</sup> See the summary list of WEBSTER, *Chronological Index*.

#### 4. לאלהיכ written in red in 11QpaleoUnid. Text (11Q22, frag. 1)<sup>47</sup>

This is the only instance of the special treatment of a divine name in a text written in Paleo-Hebrew characters.

The picture that emerges from a study of the writing of the divine names is that there is a clear tendency to present these names with various graphical solutions in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls, but not in the other Judean Desert scrolls. This tendency is not felt across the board in the Qumran scrolls, but it is mainly limited to the scrolls that are closely connected to the QSP. Negative evidence pertaining to that suggestion will be defined as all the occurrences of one of the four mentioned systems of presentation in texts that are *not* connected with the QSP, to wit: (i) the occurrence of the Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton in the Aramaic 4QPsDan<sup>a</sup> ar (4Q243) 1 2 (אָפּאָלֶח); (ii) four Hebrew texts of a nonsectarian nature and one Aramaic text that employ the *Tetrapuncta*. Of these five texts, three employ strokes rather than dots, which may imply a different scribal background, one is Aramaic (4QpapTob<sup>a</sup> ar [4Q196]), and one has an unclear orthographic background (4Qpap psEzek<sup>c</sup> [4Q391]). In summary, the negative evidence is not strong.

By way of appendix, a similar system was used in the manuscripts of *Greek Scripture* that is parallel with system 1 of the Hebrew texts. A system of transliteration (ii) was used as well. In all cases, the systems indicate reverence for the sacred names of God.

#### *A. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters in Greek texts*

All the Greek texts use different letter shapes of the Hebrew letters because each scribe has a different handwriting<sup>48</sup>. Some scribes distinguish between a medial and final letter *he*<sup>49</sup>:

<sup>47</sup> In GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – TIGCHELAAR – VAN DER WOUDE, *Qumran Cave 11. II* and pl. XLVIII.

<sup>48</sup> An ancient testimony to this custom is preserved in Jerome's Prologus Galeatus (Praef. in Libr. Sam. et Malach.; PL 28:594-596): Et nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimus.

<sup>49</sup> For analyses, see STEGEMANN, *KYPIOS*, 110-133, 194-228; SKEHAN, *Divine Name*; MERCATI, *Sulla scrittura del tetragramma*; ROBERTS, *Manuscript*, 26-48; HURTADO, *The Origin*; WILKINSON, *Tetragrammaton*.

**i. In the Paleo-Hebrew script on leather and papyrus, sometimes using a separate final letter *he* (אָאָאָ)**

- Scribes A and B of 8HevXIIgr (Rahlfs 903; end of 1 BCE); the Tetragrammaton includes a *final* letter *he*. (Revision)
- P.Oxy. 50.3522 of Job 42 (Rahlfs 857; 1 CE); the Tetragrammaton includes a *final* letter *he*. This text resembles the main tradition of the LXX (note the vocabulary) and is not a revision of the OG (note the free addition of *καὶ ἐθαύμασαν* in 42:11)<sup>50</sup>. (OG)
- P.Oxy 77.5101 of Psalms 27, 45, 48–50, 64–65 (Rahlfs 2227; 1–2 CE), “probably the earliest extant copy of the Septuagint Psalms.”<sup>51</sup> (OG)
- P.Oxy. 7.1007 (leather) of Genesis 2–3 (Rahlfs 907; 3 CE) = P.Lit.Lond. 199; the Tetragrammaton consists of a double *yod* written with a horizontal stroke through both letters, also known from Jewish coins of the second century CE. This text also has the abbreviated *θ(εό)ς*, which could point to a Christian scribe. This papyrus resembles the main tradition of the LXX and not Aquila, Theodotion, or Symmachus<sup>52</sup>. (OG)
- P.Vindob. Gr 39777 of Psalms 68, 80 in the version of Symmachus (3–4 CE): (Revision)<sup>53</sup>.

---

<sup>50</sup> Thus already Peter J. Parsons in the publication of this text: BOWMAN – COCKLE – COCKLE et al. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 1. See also the reedition of this text by HACHAM – ILAN, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum V*, 158-159.

<sup>51</sup> Thus, the editors, COLOMO – HENRY, 5101. LXX, 2. See also the reedition of this text by HACHAM – ILAN, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum V* (n. 50), 152-157. See further SMITH, *The Text-Critical Significance*, 5.

<sup>52</sup> In 2:19, this papyrus reads *χ[ατ αυτον* against Aquila *ὡς κατέναντι αὐτοῦ* (according to M 235). In other details, it deviates from MT in a fashion that is uncharacteristic of Aquila: In v. 24 the fragment does not represent the pronominal suffixes of *אָבִי* and *אָמִי*; it has a plus of *οι* *δνο* against MT (cf. v. 25); the last word in 3:6 has a plural form as opposed to MT.

<sup>53</sup> Tov, P.Vindob. G 39777.

- The Aquila fragments of Kings and Psalms from the Cairo Genizah published by Burkitt (6th c. CE)<sup>54</sup> and Taylor (5–6 CE)<sup>55</sup>. In the Burkitt fragments, the *yod* and *vav* are identical.

**ii. In the square script (יהוה, ΠΙΠΠ). (Revision)**

The Tetragrammaton is also represented by the square (Aramaic) script. These letters were no longer understood in later times, when they were taken as the similarly shaped Greek letters ΠΙΠΠ, also transliterated as such into Syriac.

- In P.Fouad 266b (848) of LXX-Deut (middle of 1 BCE), ample space was left in thirty-one instances (equal to five or six letters) for the divine names, e.g., Deut 18:5; 20:13; 27:2; 28:61; 29:3. These spaces were large enough for κύριος, although the shorter square Hebrew Tetragrammaton was written in them. At some point, two dots were inserted between which the scribe was to write the Tetragrammaton, but these dots were disregarded, as the Hebrew Tetragrammaton required more space. For a good example, see frg. 49 (col. 34). The scribe who wrote the Tetragrammaton in this papyrus was not an expert scribe, as the *yod* and *vav* were penned identically as in the Burkitt fragments of Aquila. On the other hand, the Tetragrammata in the Greek 8HevXIgr were probably written by the scribe of the manuscript itself<sup>56</sup>.
- ΠΙΠΠ in several Hexaplaric manuscripts (Q<sup>margin</sup>, 86 [Barberinus], 88 [Chisianus], 234<sup>margin</sup>, 264) (6–7 CE to 10–11 CE)<sup>57</sup>.
- ΠΙΠΠ in the Hexapla fragments of Ps 22:15–18, 20–28 published by Taylor (7 CE) (columns of Aquila, Symmachus, and LXX)<sup>58</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> BURKITT, *Fragments*, 4-5, 21-25. The fragments from the Cairo Genizah are inventoried as Cambridge UL, T-S 12.184 and UL, T-S 20.50.

<sup>55</sup> TAYLOR, *Hebrew–Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests*, 54-65. These fragments are inventoried as Cambridge UL, T-S 12.186; UL, T-S 12.187; and UL, T-S 12.188.

<sup>56</sup> TOV, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 12.

<sup>57</sup> RAHLFS, *Verzeichnis*, 348.

<sup>58</sup> TAYLOR, *Palimpsests*, 4-11. The fragments are inventoried as Cambridge UL, T-S 12.182. For ΠΙΠΠ, see also KANTOR, *The Oldest Fragment* [Accessed 7-17-2024]; MEADE, *Critical Edition*.

- **יהוה** in the margins of Syro-Hexapla manuscripts, such as Codex Ambrosianus ms C 313 Inf. (8 or 9 CE).
- **יהוה** The second (transliterated) column as well as the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth columns of the Hexapla by Aquila, Symmachus, the “LXX” and the “Quinta” in the Mercati fragments, e.g., Ps 18 (17):31.32.42 of the Hexapla of Psalms published by Mercati (10 CE)<sup>59</sup>.
- **IIII** in the Catena manuscripts Rahlfs 1122 and 1173, containing Hexaplaric Psalm fragments as published by Schenker (11 and 12 CE)<sup>60</sup>.

We have no means of determining which of these two scripts represents the earlier custom. There is equally early evidence in favor of both the square script (P.Fouad 266b [Ra 848; middle of 1 BCE]) and the Paleo-Hebrew script (scribes A and B of 8HevXIIgr [Rahlfs 903; end of 1 BCE]).

### ***B. Representation of the Tetragrammaton with either a transliteration (IAΩ) or κύριος***

4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> (Rahlfs 802) of Leviticus 2–5 (1 BCE) transliterated the Tetragrammaton as IAΩ (preceded and followed by a space) in Lev 3:12<sup>61</sup>. This transcription is unique among the witnesses of Greek Scripture<sup>62</sup>. See further below.

The first scribe of P.Oxy. 4.656 of Genesis 14–27 (Rahlfs 292; 2 or 3 CE) left spaces for the divine name (Tetragrammaton?), as in P.Fouad 266b (848; middle of 1 BCE); these were filled in by a second hand with the unabbreviated form of κύριος in 15:8; 24:31.42. According to Van Haelst, these occurrences of κύριος were written with a different pen<sup>63</sup>.

<sup>59</sup> MERCATI, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae*.

<sup>60</sup> SCHENKER, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke*, 248 and passim.

<sup>61</sup> SHAW, *Jewish Use of Iaw*, with much bibliography; TOV, *The Renderings*, 215-218.

<sup>62</sup> Hatch – Redpath misleadingly quote in the list of the personal names a marginal reading IAΩ from Codex Marchalianus (Q) in Ezek 1:2 and 11:1: HATCH – REDPATH, *A Concordance*, 76. These readings refer to *Ιωακειμ* in 1:2 and to *בניהו* in 11:1, represented in this note as *οιακος ιαω*. They are not mentioned in the edition of ZIEGLER, *Ezechiel*, 91, 128.

<sup>63</sup> VAN HAELST, *Catalogue*, 17.

All the uncial manuscripts of the LXX as well as P. Chester Beatty VI (963; Numbers–Deuteronomy) of 2 or 3 CE represented the divine name with  $\kappa(\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron)\varsigma$ , usually without the article<sup>64</sup>. This use probably represents a later stage in the development of the translation (see n. 66).

### *C. Analysis of the Greek evidence*<sup>65</sup>

There is no consensus regarding which system was used by the first Greek translators. Some texts that present the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters reflect early revisions; for these revisions, the employment of Hebrew characters was considered a sign of authenticity and antiquity, by which the reviser attempted to get close to the Hebrew original. Other texts probably represent the Old Greek translation<sup>66</sup>.

A special practice for the writing of the divine names was followed in many manuscripts of SP. In those manuscripts, the last one or two letters were always separated from the remainder of the last word in the line, creating an elegant column structure at the beginning and end of the column. When the Tetragrammaton was to occur at the end of the line, creating a divided Tetragrammaton (יהוה), many scribes retracted the Tetragrammaton slightly from the left margin in order to avoid the division of its letters<sup>67</sup>.

Scholars have not yet asked themselves what the relation is, if any, between the use of the Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton in early Greek and Hebrew documents because the data as analyzed in this study were not available previously. The Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata appear roughly at the same time in Hebrew and Greek texts, for which 8HevXIIgr (end of the 1st century BCE) is the earliest witness in Greek. In Greek, as far as we can tell, these forms occur both in texts that reflect the OG and in early revisions (see § a i). In Hebrew, they are linked to the Qumran scribal practice. In my view, the writing of the Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton in either script was not influenced by protorabbinic

<sup>64</sup> VON BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios*, passim; STEGEMANN, *KΥΡΙΟΣ*, 200-202.

<sup>65</sup> Origen recognized this feature, stating that the ‘most accurate exemplars’ of Greek Scripture wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters (*Sel. Ps.*; Migne, PG12:1104 [B]). See PARRY, Notes.

<sup>66</sup> See my study: TOV, P. Vindob. G 39777.

<sup>67</sup> For such ‘retractive’ manuscripts, see CROWN, *Dated Samaritan MSS*, e.g., John Rylands ms 1, New York Public Library 11010; *Séfer Abiša*’ as described by CROWN, *The Abiša Scroll*, 45.

circles since the use of the Paleo-Hebrew script was disallowed in the rabbinic literature (y. Meg. 1.71b; b. Meg. 19a; b. Sanh. 21b).

Can we say more? The QSP is related to the Essene movement, but it is unknown whether the writing of the Paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton in Greek texts can be connected with any group or movement. In 1963, Barthélemy described *kaige*-Theodotion, the revision embodied in 8HevXIIgr, as influenced by the Palestinian rabbinate<sup>68</sup>, but this view is not accepted any more<sup>69</sup>.

Summarizing, several *scribal* solutions were invented in order to avoid the regular writing of the divine names in the text. These scribal systems have been found mainly in the texts written in the Qumran scribal practice and in early Jewish copies of Greek Scripture.

## Bibliography

- ABEGG, Martin G. – BOWLEY, James E. – COOK, Edward M.: *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*, Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- ALY, Zaki – KOENEN, Ludwig: *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy* (PTA 27), Bonn: R. Habelt, 1980.
- ANGEL, Joseph L.: *The Songs of the Sage, 4Q510, 4Q511* (DSSE 2), Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- BARTHELEMY, Dominique: *Les devanciers d'Aquila, trouvés dans de Désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien* (VTSup 10), Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- BARTHÉLEMY, Dominique – MILIK, Jozef T.: *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1), Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- VON BAUDISSION, Wolf Wilhelm Graf: *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*. Vols. 1–2, Giessen: Topelmann, 1926–1929.
- BAUMGARTEN, Joseph M.: A New Qumran Substitute for the Divine Name and Mishna Sukkah 4.5, *JQR* 83 (1992) 1–5.
- BAUMGARTEN, Joseph M.: *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD XVIII), Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- BAUMGARTEN, Joseph et al.: *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD 35), Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- BEN-DOV, Jonathan: The Elohist Psalter and the Writing of Divine Names at Qumran. In: Adolfo Daniel Roitman – Lawrence H. Schiffman – Shani Tzoref (eds.): *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International*

<sup>68</sup> Note the subtitle of BARTHÉLEMY, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*.

<sup>69</sup> See GENTRY, Pre-Hexaplaric Translations.

- Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (STDJ 93), Leiden: Brill, 2011, 79-104.
- BOWMAN, ALAN KEIR – COCKLE, H. M. – COCKLE, W. E. H. et al. (eds.): *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Volume 50* (EES.GRM 70), London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 1983.
- BURKITT, Francis C.: *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila: From a Ms. Formerly in the Geniza at Cairo Now in the Possession of C. Taylor [...] and S. Schechter [...]*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897.
- KATZ, Elias: *Die Bedeutung des Hapax Legomenon der Qumraner Handschriften HUAHA*, Bratislava: Kaufman, 1967.
- COLOMO, Daniela – HENRY, W. Benjamin: 5101. LXX, Psalms XXVI 9–14, XLIV 4–8, XLVII 13–15, XLVIII 6–21, XLIX 2–16, LXIII 6–LXIV 5. In: Amin Benaissa (ed.): *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXVII* (EES.GRM 98), London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2011, 1-11.
- CROWN, Alan D.: The Abisha Scroll of the Samaritans, *BJRL* 58 (1975) 36-65.
- CROWN, Alan D.: *Dated Samaritan MSS: Some Codicological Implications*, Sydney: n. p., 1986.
- DAY, John: *Psalms* (Old Testament Guides), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- DELCOR, Matthias: Les divers manières d'écrire le tétragramme sacré dans les anciens documents hébraïques, *RHR* 147 (1955) 135-173.
- DUNAND, Ferdinand: *Papyrus grecs bibliques (Papyrus F. Inv. 266): Volumina de la Genèse et du Deutéronome, Introduction* (RAPH 27), Cairo: Imprimerie de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1966.
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Florentino – TIGCHELAAR, Eibert J. C. – VAN DER WOUDE, Adam S.: *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (DJD XXIII), Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- GENTRY, Peter J.: Pre-Hexaplaric Translations, Hexapla, Post-Hexaplaric Translations. In: Armin Lange – Emanuel Tov (eds.): *Textual History of the Bible*. Vol. 1A, Brill: Leiden, 2016, 211-235.
- HACHAM, Noah – ILAN, Tal: *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum V: The Early-Roman Period (30 BCE–117 CE)*, Berlin: De Gruyter; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2022.
- HATCH, Edwin – REDPATH, Henry A.: *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1897–1906. [Repr. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954; 2nd ed.: ed. R.A. Kraft and E. Tov; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.]
- HOSSFELD, Frank-Lothar – ZENGER, Erich: *Psalms 2* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- HURTADO, Larry W.: The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*: A Proposal, *JBL* 117 (1998) 655-673.
- JEROME: *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Opera Omnia*. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne (PL 28), Paris: Migne, 1845.
- KANTOR, Benjamin: The Oldest Fragment of Origen's Hexapla: T-S 12.182, Fragment of the Month [online]. [Accessed 7-17-2014] <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/298275>.
- KISTER, Menahem: On a New Fragment of the Damascus Covenant, *JQR* 84 (1993) 249-251.



- LANGLOIS, Michael: Theonyms Written in Palaeo-Hebrew and Other Alternative Scripts on the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: Esther Eshel – Michael Langlois (eds.): *The Scribe in the Biblical World: A Bridge Between Scripts, Languages and Cultures* (BZAW 547), Berlin: De Gruyter, 2023, 249-294.
- MACHIELA, Daniel: Lord or God? Tobit and the Tetragrammaton, *CBQ* 75 (2013) 463-472.
- MATHEWS, Kenneth A.: The Background of the Paleo-Hebrew Texts at Qumran. In: Carol L. Meyers – Michael Patrick O’Connor (eds.): *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983, 549-568.
- MEADE, John D.: *A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 22–42*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020.
- MERCATI, Giovanni: Sulla scrittura del tetragramma nelle antiche versioni greche del Vecchio Testamento, *Bib* 22 (1941) 339-366.
- MERCATI, Giovanni: *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae*, Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1958.
- MEYER, Anthony R.: *Naming God in Early Judaism: Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek* (SCCB 2), Leiden: Brill, 2022, 90-129.
- NEBE, Wilhelm: Der Buchstabenname Yod als Ersatz des Tetragramms in 4Q511, *RevQ* 12 (1986) 283-284.
- NEWSOM, Carol: “Sectually Explicit” Literature from Qumran. In: William Henry Propp, et al. (eds.): *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990, 167-187.
- ORIGEN: *Origenous ta euriskomena panta/Origenis opera omnia*. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne (PG 12), Paris: Migne, 1857.
- PARRY, Donald W.: Notes on Divine Name Avoidance in Scriptural Units of the Legal Texts of Qumran. In: Moshe J. Bernstein, et al. (eds.): *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (StTDJ 23), Leiden: Brill, 1997, 437-449.
- PERROT, Antony – RICHELLE, Matthieu: The Dead Sea Scrolls’ Paleo-Hebrew Script: Its Roots in Hebrew Scribal Tradition. In: Élodie Attia – Antony Perrot (eds.): *The Hebrew Bible Manuscripts: A Millennium* (THBSup 6), Leiden: Brill, 2022, 47-54.
- PFANN, Stephen J. – ALEXANDER, Philip – BROSHI, Magen, et al.: *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- PUECH, Émile: Hodayot. In: EDSS I (2000) 365-369.
- RAHLFS, Alfred: *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, (Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum gottingensis editum, Supplementum 1.1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- SANDERS, James A.: *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)* (DJD 4), Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- SCHENKER, Adrian: *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke: Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62* (OBO 8), Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H.: *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33), Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- SCHULLER, Eileen: *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28), Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- SHAW, Frank: *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of Ιαω* (CBET 70), Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H.: *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33), Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- SIEGEL, Jonathan P.: The Employment of Palaeo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources, *HUCA* 42 (1971) 159-172.
- SIEGEL, Jonathan P.: *The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, With Special Reference to the Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the Tannaitic Traditions of Massekheth Soferim*. PhD diss., Brandeis University, 1971; University Microfilms, 1972.
- SKEHAN, Patrick W.: The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint, *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 16-44.
- SMITH, Jannes: The Text-Critical Significance of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 5101 (Ra 2227) for the Old Greek Psalter, *JSCS* 45 (2012) 5-22.
- STEGEMANN, Hartmut: *KΥΠΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ und KΥΠΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ: Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von KΥΠΙΟΣ und seine Verwendung im Neuen Testament*, Habilitationsschrift: Bonn, 1969.
- STEGEMANN, Hartmut: Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten. In: Mathias Delcor (ed.): *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46), Paris: Duculot, 1978, 195-217.
- STRUGNELL, John: Notes en marge du Volume V des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan", *RevQ* 7 (1970) 163-276.
- STEUDEL, Annette: *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QmidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>)* (STDJ 13), Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- TAYLOR, Charles: *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection, Including a Fragment of the Twenty-Second Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900.
- TOV, Emanuel: *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD 8), Oxford: Clarendon, 1990; Oxford: Clarendon, <sup>2</sup>1995.
- TOV, Emanuel: P.Vindob. G 39777 (Symmachus) and the Use of Divine Names in Greek Scripture Texts. In: Emanuel Tov: *Studies in Textual Criticism. Collected Essays. Vol. 5, Part 2: The Septuagint* (VTSup 197), Leiden: Brill, 2024, 308-318.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Renderings of the Names in the Greek Torah. In: Emanuel Tov: *Studies in Textual Criticism. Collected Essays. Vol. 5, Part 2: The Septuagint* (VTSup 197), Leiden: Brill, 2024, 213-227.
- TOV, Emanuel: Scribal Habits of the Aramaic Qumran Texts, *Textus* (forthcoming).
- ULRICH, Eugene – CROSS, Frank M. et al.: *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD 12), Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

- VAN HÆLST, Joseph: *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976.
- WEBSTER, Brian: Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert. In: Emanuel Tov (ed.): *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39), Oxford: Clarendon, 2002, 351-446.
- WILKINSON, Robert J.: *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God: From the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century* (SHCT 179), Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- WOLTERS, Al: The Tetragrammaton in the Psalms Scroll, *Textus* 18 (1995) 89-98.
- ZIEGLER, Joseph: *Ezechiel* (Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum 16.1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952.

### Summary

Traditionally, the ancient Israelites approached the name of God with reverence as is visible in the third commandment (Exod 20:7; Deut 5:11). In the written documents, a special approach towards the Tetragrammaton is already visible in the Elohist Psalter (Psalms 42–89 [83]) in which that name was usually replaced with אלהים in all textual witnesses. A similar avoidance of the Tetragrammaton is evidenced in many Qumran scrolls. Reflecting a similar approach to the avoidance of the use of divine names, scribal solutions were invented in order to avoid the regular writing of these names in the text; they are the focus of our analysis: (i) The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Paleo-Hebrew characters; (ii) Four dots (named *Tetrapuncta*) (...); rarely: (iii) A dicolon (: ) in 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364); (iv) לאלהים written in red in 11QpaleoUnid. Text (11Q22). The picture that emerges is a clear tendency to present these names with various graphical solutions in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls, but not in the other Judean Desert scrolls. This tendency is not felt across the board in the Qumran scrolls, but it is mainly limited to the scrolls that are closely connected to the Qumran scribal practice. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Paleo-Hebrew characters is also evidenced in Greek manuscripts and the connection between the Hebrew and Greek evidence is scrutinized.

*Keywords:* *Tetrapuncta*, Tetragrammaton, Divine name, Dead Sea scrolls, Qumran scribal practice.

*Zhrnutie*

Starovekí Izraelčania tradične pristupovali k Božiemu menu s úctou, ako to uvádza tretie prikázanie (Ex 20,7; Dt 5,11). V písomných dokumentoch je osobitný prístup k tetragramu viditeľný už v Elohistickom žaltári (Žalmy 42 – 89 [83]), kde dané meno bolo obvykle nahradené výrazom אלהים vo všetkých textových svedkoch. Podobné vynechávanie tetragramu je zaznamenané vo viacerých Kumránskych zvitkoch. Pisári reflektovali podobný vyhýbavý prístup pri používaní Božích mien a ich riešením bolo, že vynášli spôsoby, ako obísť bežné písanie takýchto mien v texte a na ne sa zameriava naša analýza: (i) Písanie tetragramu v paleohebrejských znakoch; (ii) štyri bodky nazývané aj *tetrapuncta* (...); menej bežná (iii) dvojbodka (:) v 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364); (iv) לאלהים písané červenou farbou v 11QpaleoUnid. Text (11Q22). V Kumránskych zvitkoch, avšak nie v ostatných zvitkoch z Judejskej púšte, je vidieť jasnú tendenciu predstaviť tieto mená rôznymi gramatickými riešeniami. Táto tendencia nie je viditeľná naprieč Kumránskymi zvitkami, ale sa obmedzuje najmä na zvitky, ktoré sú úzko späté s písomníctvom v Kumráne. Písanie tetragramu v paleohebrejských znakoch je tiež zaznamenané v gréckych rukopisoch a v spojitosti medzi hebrejskou a gréckou evidenciou sú predmetom výskumu.

*Kľúčové slová:* *tetrapuncta*, tetragram, Božie meno, zvitky od Mŕtveho mora, kumránska metóda písania.

Emanuel Tov  
Department of Bible  
Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
91905 JERUSALEM, Israel  
Emanuel.Tov@mail.huji.ac.il  
 0009-0003-0195-5151

# Gen 9:18-29 and the Drunkenness of a Main Parental or Divine Figure Entailing the Future of Their Filial Entities

*Joël André Minsi Endomo*

Gen 9:18-29 in which the hero of the biblical flood becomes drunk in his tent after the world cataclysm, remains fascinating as well as disconcerting. Even after it is known that the Bible does not have a monopoly on the flood story in the ANE<sup>1</sup>, this episode of Noah remains unique. It is not only because its hero dies, contrary to the Mesopotamian myths where almost all heroes become immortal<sup>2</sup>, but more so for the scene of drunkenness. Certainly, the absence of such an episode in the known complex of diluvian stories of the ANE, could lead to considering Gen 9:18-29 as a distinct feature of the biblical narrative which liked to stress the contrast with Mesopotamian myths by describing Noah in a rather unflattering scene<sup>3</sup>. But even by accepting it, the reader does not seem better informed about the origin, the meaning or the role of this episode of drunkenness prior to the table of nations, and that Gertz rightly suggest reading “primarily as a story about Canaan, its absent but ever-present main character”<sup>4</sup>.

Was it part of one of the biblical traditions of the flood or should we rather think of an independent episode that probably belongs to the creation traditions in general and which would have found an adequate insertion here? Moreover, what was the meaning and purpose of preceding with the biographical note of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *ANET*, 42-44 (Sumerian flood); 93-97 (Gilgamesh, Tablet XI); DALLEY, *Myths*, 9-35.

<sup>2</sup> Wasserman reports in his study of the Akkadian flood sources that *Atrahasis* in I, r, 4', also known as *Ziusudra* in z, v, 15'-19', received also immortality like the other Mesopotamian flood heroes. This clears doubts that had previously hung over Atrahasis' end according to the available sources (*Atrahasis*, VII,1-35), see WASSERMAN, *The Flood*, 84, 101; L'HOUE, *Genèse 5-11*, 103; LAMBERT – MILLARD, *ATRA-HASIS*, 102-103; DALLEY, *Myths*, 34-35.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. WENHAM, *Genesis 1-15*, 204.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. GERTZ, *Genesis 1-11*, 352.

Noah's death with a family episode that strangely focused on Canaan who, not only did not take an active part in it, but was not yet born? This contradicts the style of Gen 1–11. An examination of Gen 9:18-29 seems to provide convincing inputs likely to illuminate them significantly, and thus broaden the understanding of this unprecedented episode.

A quick reading of Gen 9:18-29 will highlight at once the prominent role of drunkenness in this plot, in a terms and conditions more or less analogous to Gen 19:30-38 and Ps 78:65-72. Seemingly confirmed by extra-biblical literature, this will suggest that the use of the drunkenness of a main parental figure was a known pattern in the context of creation narratives. It was used in cases of delicate generational transitions, by resorting to the effect of surprise specific to drunkenness. This will lead to a better understanding of the function and purpose of this literary pattern in general, as well as its probable Mesopotamian influence in Gen 9:20-27 within the general creation's context of Gn 1–11.

## 1 Gen 9:18-29 – Noah's drunkenness, plot and structure

Some authors such as Corinne Bonnet and Sofia Cavalletti already noted analogies between the drunkenness of Noah in Gen 9:18-29 or of Adonai in Ps 78 with some uses of it in the extra-biblical literature<sup>5</sup>. By following this line of thought, I intend to investigate what appears to be a literary motif of drunkenness of a main parental or divine figure, by highlighting its elements and its purpose in general, as well as the specific orientation chosen by Gen 9:18-29 within the framework of the section Gen 9:18–10:32. Since the conjunction of the syntagm *הַלְאָיִם* (Gen 10:1) which opens the exposition of table of nations, suggests that Gen 9:18-29 and 10:1-32 are connected.

### 1.1 The plot of Gn 9:18-29

Gen 9:18-29

- <sup>18</sup> The sons of Noah who came out of the ark were Shem, Ham and Japheth, and Ham, he was the father of Canaan.  
<sup>19</sup> These were the three sons of Noah, and from them came the people who were scattered over the whole earth.  
<sup>20</sup> Noah, a man of the soil started, he planted a vineyard.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. BONNET, *Le vin*, 73-91; CAVALLETTI, *Proposta*, 339-340.

- 21 He drank some wine; he became drunk and lay uncovered inside his tent.
- 22 Ham, the father of Canaan, saw his father naked and told his two brothers outside.
- 23 But Shem and Japheth took a garment and laid it across their shoulders, then they walked in backward and covered their father's naked body; and their faces, as they were walking backward, did not see their father's nakedness.
- 24 Noah awoke from his wine and found out what his youngest son had done to him.
- 25 He said: Cursed is Canaan! The lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers.
- 26 He also said: Praise is the Lord, the God of Shem! May Canaan be his slave.
- 27 May God extend Japheth's territory, may Japheth live in the tents of Shem, and may Canaan be his slave.
- 28 After the flood, Noah lived 350 years.
- 29 Noah lived a total of 950 years, and then he died.

Genesis 9:18-29 is generally divided in three parts: The introduction in vv. 18-19, the exposition of the story in vv. 20-27 and the conclusion in vv. 28-29. Furthermore, the central part of the narrative is further subdivided into two scenes which are both constructed around the alternation between the parental category (Noah) and the filial one, and according to a precise order that starts from Noah, then Ham/Canaan followed by Shem-Japheth. Based on the dynamics of the characters, vv. 20-27 are a parallelism which enable the progressive transformation of the characters thanks to Noah's drunkenness and his awakening from it.

*Inciting moment*

The tension created by the naming of Ham as Canaan's father ( וְחָם הוּא ) in v. 18b after the sons of Noah who left the ark (v. 18a) is detectible even in the syntax of the verse, since the story shifts to the background by a double protasis-apodosis proposition in v. 18b-c. It breaks the pace of the narration and drawing attention to Ham and Canaan. This syntactic choice in which the protasis, וְחָם ("and Ham"), is a *casus pendens* as suggested by its repetition by the singular masculine personal pronoun הוּא ("he"). It signals the

importance the narrator gives to what is said of Ham in the apodosis, namely that he was the father of Canaan<sup>6</sup>.

The mention of Canaan thus coincides with the “inciting moment” in which the conflict appears for the first time, and it is probably in this sense that Blecher considers that information to be central and that v. 18 would represent the entire story<sup>7</sup>.

#### *Complication*

Verses 20-21, which narrates the drunkenness, call for solutions that is perceptible both in the syntax and the plot.

After the consumption of wine and drunkenness (vv. 21a-b), the simplified syntactic constructions “verb-subject” or “verb-object” of v. 20 become more elaborate and are enriched with new elements: “verb-[subject]-את-object” (v. 22a; vv. 23a.d). In addition, there is also the appearance of new syntactic categories such as adverbial phrases of place (בְּתוֹךְ אֲהֶלֶה, v. 21c; בְּחוּץ, v. 22b and עַל-שִׁכְמְךָ, v. 23b), of manner (אֲחֲרַנִּית, v. 23c) or indirect object complements (לְשִׁנֵּי־אֲחִיו, v. 22b).

In terms of plot, the distinctive feature of vv. 21a-b is due to the fluctuation of the pace which passes from the expeditious tone of vv. 20-21, to a longer narrative time in vv. 22-23. The consumption of wine and drunkenness in vv. 20-21 has as much an impact on the narrative as on its syntax. It begs for an explanation regarding the conflict raised by the naming of Canaan.

The search for an explanation begins with the first active appearance of Noah’s sons following a chiasmus that contrasts Ham’s “sight” of Noah’s nudity and his filial failure on the one hand; and Shem-Japheth’s “non sight” and their helping of the parent on the other hand:

	22
	וַיֵּרָא חָם אֲבִי כְנַעַן אֶת
	עֲרוֹת אָבִיו
וַיַּגֵּד לְשִׁנֵּי־אֲחִיו בְּחוּץ	
וַיֵּשִׁימוּ עַל-שִׁכְמְךָ וַיִּקַּח שֵׁם וַיַּפֵּת אֶת-הַשְּׂמֹלֶה	23
שִׁנְיָהֶם וַיִּלְכוּ אֲחֲרַנִּית וַיַּכְסּוּ אֶת עֲרוֹת אָבִיהֶם	
וּפְנֵיהֶם אֲחֲרַנִּית	
	וְעֲרוֹת אָבִיהֶם לֹא יָאוּ

<sup>6</sup> Cf. JOÜON – MURAOKA, *A Grammar*, § 156a; WALTKE – O’CONNOR, *An Introduction*, § 4.7b; NICCACCI, *Sintassi*, § 123.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. BLECHER, *Noah’s Curse*, 131.



According to this chiasmus, the characterization of Noah's sons is not determined first by their "seeing" or otherwise of the father's nakedness, as the supporters of voyeurism maintain. It is rather determined by their behavior in confronting that situation. Thanks to this first active appearance of the filial entity, the reader now knows that the three sons of Noah are different because of their reaction towards their father.

#### *Climax*

In Noah's return on the scene, the narrator prefaces the statement with "[he] awakened from his wine" (וַיִּקְץ נֹחַ מִיַּיִנוֹ, v. 24a). This awakening, which allows Noah to inquire about the events that occurred during his "absence", also leads him to confirm the differences that have arisen between his sons and which constitutes the turning point. He thus resolves the problem of the embarrassing mention of Canaan in Ham's lineage, by formalizing the latter's inability to be treated equally with "his brothers", because he is cursed (אָרֹר), hence opposed to Sem whom God is blessed (בְּרֹךְ).

Designating A as the appearance of the parental entity and by B as the filial counterpart, vv. 20-27 consist of a parallel framework ABA'B'. These two parts are both driven by drunkenness, which arouses the search for solutions in the first part, while Noah's awakening from it marks the turning point in the resolution of the problem.

### ***1.2 The Structure of Gen 9:18-29***

Introduction: Shem, Ham the father of Canaan and Japheth populate the whole earth (vv. 18-19)

Shem, Ham and Japheth are the sons of Noah who came out from the ark (v. 18a)

Ham was the father of Canaan (v. 18b)

Three are the sons of Noah (v. 19a)

The whole earth was populated from these three sons of Noah (v. 19b)

A Noah the farmer, winegrower gets drunk (vv. 20-21)

A<sub>1</sub> Noah begins to cultivate (v. 20a)

A<sub>2</sub> He plants a vineyard (v. 20b)

A<sub>3</sub> He drinks wine (v. 21a)

A<sub>4</sub> He gets drunk (v. 21a)

A<sub>5</sub> He uncovers himself inside his tent (v. 21b)

- B<sub>1</sub> Ham, the father of Canaan, sees his father's nakedness and makes it known (v. 22)  
 B {  
   B<sub>1a</sub> Ham the father of Canaan sees his father's nakedness (v. 22a)  
   B<sub>1b</sub> He tells his two brothers outside (v. 22b)  
 B<sub>2</sub> Shem and Japheth cover their father and do not see his nakedness (v. 23)  
   B<sub>2a</sub> Shem and Japheth take the mantle (v. 23a)  
   B<sub>2b</sub> They put it on their shoulders (v. 23b)  
   B<sub>2c</sub> They walk backwards (v. 23c)  
   B<sub>2d</sub> They cover their father's nakedness (v. 23d)  
   B<sub>2e</sub> They do not see their father's nakedness (v. 23e)  
 A' Noah wakes up from drunkenness and returns to cognition (v. 24)  
 A'<sub>1</sub> Noah wakes up from his drunkenness (v. 24a)  
 A'<sub>2</sub> He knows what his youngest son did to him (v. 24b)  
 B' {  
   B'<sub>1</sub> Curse of Canaan (v. 25)  
   B'<sub>1a</sub> Cursed is Canaan (v. 25a)  
   B'<sub>1b</sub> Canaan will be the last of his brothers' servants (v. 25b)  
   B'<sub>2</sub> blessings of Shem and Japheth (vv. 26-27)  
     B'<sub>2a</sub> Blessing of Shem (v. 26)  
       B'<sub>2aα</sub> Blessed is Yhwh the God of Shem (v. 26a)  
       B'<sub>2aβ</sub> Let Canaan be the servant of Shem (v. 26b)  
     B'<sub>2b</sub> Blessing of Japheth (v. 27)  
       B'<sub>2bα</sub> May God enlarge Japheth (v. 27a)  
       B'<sub>2bβ</sub> May Japheth dwell in the tents of Shem (v. 27b)  
       B'<sub>2bγ</sub> Let Canaan be the servant of Japheth (v. 27c)
- Conclusion: The length of Noah's life (vv. 28-29)  
   The Lifespan of Noah after the Flood (v. 28)  
   The entire Lifespan of Noah (v. 29a)  
   Death of Noah (v. 29b)

#### *Annotations*

Genesis 9:18-29 in which drunkenness constructs and structures the unfolding of the plot seems to share similarities with Gen 19:30-38 and Ps 78:65-72. Therefore, it is appropriate to study these two other biblical episodes in order to see what comes out of it. In doing so, it will also be investigating the extra-biblical universe in search of such similar uses of drunkenness, which will allow to better understand what seems to be a literary pattern of drunkenness of a main parental figure.

## 2 Other allusions in the Bible

### 2.1 *The drunkenness of Lot in Gen 19:30-38*

The intertextual allusion between the destruction of the flood and that of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah was already known in the time of Luke 17:26-30 and 2 Pet 2:5-8. Moreover, the fact that Noah and Lot, the survivors of these two destruction stories, are both described in a scene of drunkenness immediately after the cataclysm, seems to support the possibility of a substantial connection between these episodes.

#### Gen 19:30-38

- <sup>30</sup> Lot and his two daughters left Zoar and settled in the mountains, for he was afraid to stay in Zoar. He and his two daughters lived in a cave.
- <sup>31</sup> And the elder daughter said to the younger, “Our father is old, and there is no man to give us children, as is the custom over the earth.
- <sup>32</sup> Let’s get our father to drink wine and then sleep with him and preserve our family line through our father.”
- <sup>33</sup> That night they got their father to drink wine, and the elder daughter went in and slept with him. But he was not aware of it when she lay down or when she got up.
- <sup>34</sup> The next day, the elder daughter said to the younger, “Last night I slept with my father. Let’s get him to drink wine again tonight, and you go in and sleep with him so we can preserve our family line through our father.”
- <sup>35</sup> So they got their father to drink wine that night also, and the younger daughter went in and slept with him. But he was not aware of it when she lay down or when she got up.
- <sup>36</sup> So both of Lot’s daughters became pregnant by their father.
- <sup>37</sup> The elder daughter had a son, and she named him Moab; he is the father of the Moabites to this day.
- <sup>38</sup> The younger daughter also had a son, and she named him Ben-Ammi; he is the father of the Ammonites to this day.

The story of Lot’s drunkenness in Gen 19:30-38 is divided into three subunits: the introduction in v. 30, the story itself in two parallel scenes in vv. 31-35, and the conclusion in vv. 36-38.

Verse 30 sets the scene and delimits the framework of the story, which is the isolated space of a cave in the mountain. The solitude of Lot and his daughters in this separate place leads to the *inciting moment* with the eldest daughter’s speech which point out with concern the aging of and the absence of descendants

for their father (אָבִינוּ זָקֵן). It is a situation more disturbing since there is no man in the country to unite with them and remedy the problem (וְאִישׁ אֵין בְּאֶרֶץ לְבוֹא (עָלֵינוּ בְּדֶרֶךְ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ).

On the other hand, v. 31 constitutes the *complication* and it leads to the first attempts to solving the problem at v. 32 which is syntactically marked by volitive phrases, unlike the enunciative one of v. 31 (וְנִשְׁכְּבָהּ, וְנִשְׁקָהּ, לָכֶּה). But it is the drunkenness at the beginning of each night (vv. 33.35) that constitutes *the turning point* of the resolution, thanks to its capacity to neutralize Lot and allows the daughters to implement their respective solutions of saving the family. In that period of the absence of Lot, each of the daughters distinguishes herself by becoming a mother.

#### Structure of Gen 19:30-38

Introduction: Lot and his two daughters in a cave on the mountain (v. 30)

- A First speech of the elder: Lot is old and there are no men (v. 31)
  - B Motivation of the speech: to make the father drunk and raise up descendants from him (v. 32)
    - C Execution of the plan (v. 33)
      - C<sub>1</sub> The two daughters get their father drunk (v. 33a)
      - C<sub>2</sub> The elder daughter sleeps with her father (v. 33b-c)
      - C<sub>3</sub> Lot is unaware of his daughter's going to bed or getting up (v. 33d)
- A' Second speech of the elder daughter the next day (v. 34a-c)
  - B' Motivation of the speech: Getting the father drunk and raise up descendants from him (34d-g)
    - C' Execution of the plan (v. 35)
      - C'<sub>1</sub> The two daughters get their father drunk again that night (v. 35a)
      - C'<sub>2</sub> 35a)
      - C'<sub>3</sub> The younger daughter sleeps with him (v. 35b-c)
        - Lot is unaware of his daughter's going to bed or getting up (v. 35d)

Conclusion: Etiological notes on the Moabites and the Ammonites (vv. 36-38)

- v. 36: Lot's two daughters are pregnant
- v. 37: The elder daughter gives birth to Moab and information on the Moabites
- v. 38: The younger daughter gives birth to Ben-Ammi and information on the Ammonites

*Annotations*

In Gen 19:30-38, Lot does not voluntarily become drunk but is made drunk by his daughters in order to ensure the continuity of their family. This differs from Gen 9:18-29 in the *modus operandi* and the intended result. However, a focus on the general purpose and motivation will highlight the issue of the future of the descendants of the drunken person. Furthermore, the main scene, which takes place in two parallel sequences punctuated and inherently driven by drunkenness, argues for a functional use of this latter in order to justify a given condition of a main parental figure's descendants.

This therefore encourages further investigation by examining the allusion to Adonai's drunkenness in Ps 78:65-72. In this psalm, Adonai strangely wakes up like a warrior from drunkenness. Just like in Gen 9:18-29, the verb  $\text{״קַרַּן}$  is related to the adverbial phrase  $\text{״בַּיַּיִן}$  by means of the preposition  $\text{״בְּ}$ . Moreover, after this awakening from drunkenness, it also highlights an opposition of an uncle to his nephew as in Gen 9:18-29.

**2.2 The drunkenness of Adonai in Ps 78:65-72**

Sofia Cavalletti analyzed the semantic correspondences between the drunkenness of Yhwh in Ps 78:65 and that of 'El in Ugarit. She sensed that the bold allusion to Yhwh's drunkenness in Ps 78 could have been the result of Canaanite influence and that this would provide proof of a diffuse practice in the ANE<sup>8</sup>.

## Ps 78:65-27

- <sup>65</sup> Then Lord awoke as from sleep, like a warrior who had been struck down by wine.  
<sup>66</sup> He beat back his enemies, he put them to everlasting shame.  
<sup>67</sup> Then he rejected the tents of Joseph, the tribe of Ephraim he did not choose.  
<sup>68</sup> But he chose the tribe of Judah, mount Zion, which he had loved.  
<sup>69</sup> He built his sanctuary like the heights, like the earth that he established forever.  
<sup>70</sup> He chose David his servant, and took him from the sheep pens;  
<sup>71</sup> from tending the sheep, he had brought him, in order to be the shepherd of his people Jacob, of Israel his inheritance.  
<sup>72</sup> And he shepherded them with integrity of heart, with skillful hands he led them.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. CAVALLETTI, Proposta, 339-340.

As was already said, the awakening of Adonai which is compared to that of a warrior who returns from his drunkenness according to the verb יקץ followed by מנין is quite evocative of Gen 9:18-29. Moreover, the elective act of Adonai following an antithetical parallelism seems to lead back again to Gen 9:18-29.

This antithetical parallelism places in confrontation the tent of Joseph and the tribe of Ephraim which are rejected on the one hand, and the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion and David who are chosen on the other hand. Furthermore, just as in Gen 9:18-29 where Canaan finds himself opposed to his uncle Shem, the real opposition in Ps 78:65-72 occurs between the tribe of Ephraim (לֹא בְחָר) and that of Judah (בְּחָר). This highlights a probable analogy between these two episodes.

#### The structure of Ps 78:65-72

Introduction: Adonai's awakening from drunkenness and reaction against his enemies (vv. 65-66)

- A Non-election (v. 67)
  - A<sub>1</sub> Rejection of Joseph's tent (v. 67a)
  - A<sub>2</sub> Non-election of the tribe of Ephraim (v. 67b)
- B Election (vv. 68-72)
  - B<sub>1</sub> Election of the tribe of Judah (v. 68a)
  - B<sub>2</sub> Election and manifestation of God's choice for the mount Zion (vv. 68b-69)
    - B<sub>2a</sub> He Chooses mount Zion, which he loved (v. 68b)
    - B<sub>2b</sub> Manifestation of the choice: Construction of the sanctuary similar to the heights and the earth (v. 69)
  - B<sub>3</sub> Election and manifestation of the divine choice for David (vv. 70-71)
    - B<sub>3a</sub> He chooses David his servant (v. 70a)
    - B<sub>3b</sub> Manifestation of the divine choice (vv. 70b-71)
      - B<sub>3bα</sub> He takes him as shepherd of the flock and of the mother sheep (vv. 70b-71aα)
      - B<sub>3bβ</sub> He brings him to shepherd Jacob and Israel (vv. 71aβ-b)

Conclusion: David fulfills his task with all his heart and with intelligence (v. 72)

#### *Annotations*

The presentation of Adonai's awakening is quite evocative of Gen 9:18-29. It contributes to understanding the biblical literary use of drunkenness involving main parental or divine figures that carry implications for the future of their filial parts.

Before drawing synthetic conclusions on this topic of drunkenness, it is useful to first explore the extra-biblical world. To be explored are scenes of drunkenness of main divine or parental figures that may contribute to the knowledge of a gradually emerging literary pattern used to resolve the issue of the children's future.

### 3 Investigation into the extra-biblical world<sup>9</sup>

#### 3.1 Ancient Mesopotamia

In the mythologies of ancient Mesopotamia, the banquet, an essential component of social life, appears as the privileged place for scenes of drunkenness. In these festive contexts, there is a desire to broaden the aspect of sharing in the banquet other aspects such as power. But if one does not share power or royalty, then the myths of *Enki's journey to Nippur*, *Inanna and Enki* or of the relation of Marduk's ascension to the head of the Babylonian pantheon in the *Enūma eliš*, make these transmissions of power possible through use of the sharing of beer or wine. This includes the replacement or approval of the status of someone in apparently strained and delicate contexts. Corinne Bonnet is right by asserting that drunkenness is used in these stories as a disinhibiting expedient<sup>10</sup>.

##### 3.1.1 Enki's journey to Nippur<sup>11</sup>

This Sumerian myth dates back to the end of the 3rd millennium BC. It narrates how after having built a highly sumptuous palace in Eridu, Enki journeys to Nippur, the residence of Enlil his "father", and offers a banquet in honor of the latter, together with other main divinities of the Sumerian pantheon.

In this 129-line story, the introduction occupies the first ten lines. It presents a summary of the work accomplished by Enki in the past. After a brief account of the temple construction in lines 11-17, lines 18-68 offers a lyrical

---

<sup>9</sup> For reasons of the extent of the work on the one hand, and on the other, given that *the Book of the heavenly cow* in Egypt and *the drunkenness of 'El in Ugarit* offer information that almost already appear in the other extra-biblical stories, they will not be examined here. For the drunkenness theme in there, see VIROLLEAUD, *Les nouveaux textes*, 545-551; PARDEE, *Les textes*, 13-74; DIETRICH – LORETZ, *Studien*, 409-523; BONNET, *Le Vin*, 84-86.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. BONNET, *Le Vin*, 78, 83.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. BOTTÉRO – KRAMER, *Lorsque les dieux*, 142; LOISEL, *L'ivresse*, 40.

celebration of the temple by Isimud, Enki's page<sup>12</sup>. At the end of this, Enki grants himself a rest (l. 69-76) and realizes he must go to Nippur to Enlil whose "son" he was. This requires Enki to swear allegiance to Enlil and submit his designs to him for ratification (l. 77-94).

With Enki's arrival in Nippur, the poem enters into the phase of the banquet. There is an extensive description of the preparations, notably the concoction of alcoholic beverages (l. 95-100). The guests are seated and among them An, Enlil, Nintu and the Anunna. The banquet begins with an abundant consumption of beer and wine that relaxes the atmosphere (l. 101-113). Then Enlil comes out of his retreat and gives a speech approving Enki's construction (l. 114-129)<sup>13</sup>:

*Enki's journey to Nippur, 111-126*

111	<i>kaš ba-naĝ kurun<sub>2</sub> ba-du<sub>10</sub>-ga-ta</i>	[once lifted] beer and wine had been libated and enjoyed.
112	<i>e<sub>2</sub>-ta ĝiri<sub>3</sub>-bi-a ba-ra-ĝar-ra-ta</i>	[once lifted] from the house where his feet were placed.
113	<i><sup>d</sup>en-lil<sub>2</sub> nibru<sup>ki</sup>-a hul<sub>2</sub>-la mu-ni-ib-DU</i>	Enlil who was made happy in Nibru.
114	<i><sup>d</sup>en-lil<sub>2</sub>-le <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ke<sub>4</sub>-ne gu<sub>3</sub> mu(un)-na-de<sub>3</sub>-e</i>	Enlil addressed the Anuna gods.
115	<i>diĝir gal-gal-la i<sub>3</sub>-su<sub>8</sub>-ge-en-za-na</i>	Great gods who are standing here.
116	<i><sup>d</sup>a-nun-na ub-š<sub>u</sub>-unken-na-ka si mu-un-sa<sub>2</sub>-sa<sub>2</sub>-e-en-za-na</i>	Anuna, who have lined up in the Ubšu-unkena.
117	<i>dumu-ĝu<sub>10</sub> e<sub>2</sub> mu-un-du<sub>3</sub> lugal <sup>d</sup>en-ki ke<sub>4</sub></i>	My son, King Enki has built up the temple.
124	<i>eš<sub>3</sub> abzu nam-du<sub>10</sub> <sup>d</sup>en-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> me galam-ma tum<sub>2</sub>-ma</i>	The Apsû sanctuary of Enki is something favorable, skillfully constructed and appropriate to the <i>me</i> .
125	<i>eridu<sup>ki</sup> e<sub>2</sub> ku<sub>3</sub>-ga du<sub>3</sub>-a-ba</i>	[for having] well-built Eridu, the pure abode.
126	<i><sup>d</sup>en-ki za<sub>3</sub>-mim</i>	Enki be praised.

By emphasizing Enlil's emotional transformation that is fostered by the consumption of alcoholic beverages, the introduction of the final speech underlines the fundamental and essential role of what could be characterized as

<sup>12</sup> Cf. BOTTÉRO – KRAMER, *Lorsque les dieux*, 142.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. CECCARELLI, *Enkis Reise*, 96, 105-106; ETCSL 1.1.4, *Enki's journey to Nibru*, 114-120, 127-129; BOTTÉRO – KRAMER, *Lorsque les dieux*, 146; BONNET, *Le vin*, 83; LOISEL, *L'ivresse*, 41.



drunkenness (l. 111-113). Returning to l. 113 where Enlil is described by the subordinate verbal form *hul<sub>2</sub>-la* (“who is joyful”), and considering the huge quantities of beer and wine consumed by the guests, this would be the case where drunkenness manifests itself by a euphoric excitement.

It suggests that the construction of Enki’s sumptuous temple without consulting his “fathers” would have created implicit tensions at the top of the Pantheon; it had to be appeased. Thanks to this excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages that relaxes the gods, Enki achieves his aim: the ratification of his work by his “fathers”, particularly by Enlil the main god of Nippur.

### 3.1.2 Inanna and Enki

This tale is mainly reported by two incomplete tablets divided into six columns, and completed in some places by two or three fragments and a handful of erratic scraps dating from the first third of the 2nd millennium BC<sup>14</sup>. Like the previous myth, *Inanna and Enki* entails a visit to a god; Inanna the goddess of Uruk-kul’aba to her “father” Enki, the sovereign of Eridu.

In this long tale marked by numerous repetitions, the heart of the story consists in showing how Enki passed down his powers to Inanna, and how Uruk-kul’aba acquired the powers of civilization thanks to its titular goddess Inanna<sup>15</sup>. After relating Inanna’s departure from the desert for the steppe in order to join a shepherd, she is presented for the beauty of her genital organs. This is followed by her decision to go to Eridu to meet Enki, the wise god capable of penetrating the thoughts of deities from afar<sup>16</sup>.

Upon Inanna’s arrival and after her welcome, the narrative enters the main phase of the banquet. Enki and Inanna indulge in beer and wine in a textual exposition that evokes the previous myth. It is suggestive of a literary *topos* of drunkenness<sup>17</sup>:

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. BONNET, *Le vin*, 78; BOTTÉRO – KRAMER, *Lorsque les dieux*, 230.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. BONNET, *Le vin*, 78.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. FARBER-FLÜGGE, *Der Mythos*, 16-17; ETCSL 1.3.1, *Inanna and Enki*; BOTTÉRO – KRAMER, *Lorsque les dieux*, 230.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. FARBER-FLÜGGE, *Der Mythos*, 20-21; CECCARELLI, *Enkis Reise*, 96, 105; BOTTÉRO – KRAMER, *Lorsque les dieux*, 146, 231-232; BONNET, *Le vin*, 78; LOISEL, *L’ivresse*, 43.

<p><i>Enki's journey to Nippur, 106-109</i></p> <p>106 <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na ki-us<sub>2</sub>-ki-us<sub>2</sub>-bi im-mi-in- dur<sub>2</sub>-ru-ne-eš</p> <p>107 lu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>3</sub>-ne kaš i<sub>3</sub>-na<sub>8</sub>-na<sub>8</sub>- e kurun<sub>2</sub> im-du<sub>10</sub>-ge-ne</p> <p>108 <sup>zabar</sup>AGA im-kur<sub>4</sub>-kur<sub>4</sub>-(r)e-ne</p> <p>109 <sup>zabar</sup>-e an uraš-e a-da-min<sub>3</sub> mu-un- e<sub>3</sub>-ne</p> <p>The Anunna sat on its pedestals. They drank beer and enjoyed wine. They filled the bronze vessels AGA to the brim. In heaven and on earth they competed for the bronze vessels.</p>	<p><i>Inanna and Enki, I, ii, 27-30</i></p> <p>27 <sup>d</sup>en-ki <sup>d</sup>inanna e-en-bi-ta</p> <p>28 abzu-a kaš im-na<sub>8</sub>-na<sub>8</sub>- ne kurún im-du<sub>10</sub>-ge-ne</p> <p>29 <sup>zabar</sup>AGA im-gur<sub>4</sub>-gur<sub>4</sub>-e-n[e]</p> <p>30 [za]bar <sup>d</sup>uraš-a a-da-min mu- un-a[ka-ne]</p> <p>Enki and Inanna, side by side. In the Absû, they drank beer and enjoyed wine. They filled the bronze vessels AGA to the brim. In heaven and on earth they competed for the bronze vessels.</p>
--	--

Since the text explicitly reports that Enki was drunk, the description of Enlil as “happy” in the previous myth would therefore also be an expression of drunkenness. But unlike the previous one, Enki comes to:

<p>9 kaš-nag-ġa-ra kaš-nag-ġa- ra kaš mu-un-ta<sup>2</sup>-e<sub>11</sub>-da</p> <p>10 a-a <sup>d</sup>en-ki kaš-nag-ġa-ra kaš mu- un-(ta<sup>2</sup>-e<sub>11</sub>-da)</p>	<p>Beer he drank, beer he drank, he ascended from beer. Father Enki drank beer, he ascended from beer. (Inanna and Enki, I, v, 9-10)</p>
--	--

Following this awakening, Enki undertook to regain his powers seven times in vain. At the end of these unsuccessful attempts, Inanna arrived at the port of Uruk to the cheers of her people praising her bravery. However, the story ends with a speech of Enki who, visibly resigned, endorses his daughter's work.

However, considering that Enki was able to penetrate the hearts of the gods from afar, he knew the purpose of Inanna's visit, which appeared thus doomed to failure. But the anesthetic power of drunkenness allowed control over him, thereby transferring his powers to Inanna for the progress and great happiness of Uruk.

### 3.2 *Marduk's rise to the head of the pantheon in Enūma Eliš*

In the Akkadian creation story, the election of Marduk as the “avenger” of the gods during a banquet presided over by Anšar, the “father” of the great gods,

also uses the expedient function of drunkenness to persuade the great gods to renounce their prerogatives forever in favor of their “son” Marduk. It was written probably between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st millennium BC.

Tiamat, the mother of all the gods, was exasperated by the din orchestrated by some divinities. She decided to decimate these latter (I, 105-162)<sup>18</sup>. In panic and advised by Anšar, the culprits tried in vain to reach a peaceful resolution through the respective mediations of Ea and Anu (II, 1-124). In this turmoil, Ea the father of Marduk (I, 79-84) suggested he to go to Anšar to appease the latter’s heart, and probably to make himself as the avenger of the fathers against Tiamat (II, 130-135). So, Marduk agreed but put forward some preconditions<sup>19</sup>:

155	<i>bēlum ilāni šimat ilāni rabiūtīm</i>	Lord of the gods, destiny of the great gods.
156	<i>šummama anāku mutēr gimillikun</i>	If I should become your avenger.
157	<i>akamme tiāmtama uballaṭ kāšun</i>	If I should bind Tiamat and preserve you.
158	<i>šuknāma puḥra šūterā ibā šīmtī</i>	Convene an assembly, and proclaim for me an exalted destiny.
159	<i>ina Ubšu-kkinakki mithāriš ḥadiš tišbāma</i>	In the Upšukkinakku, sit all together joyfully.
160	<i>epšū pīja kīma kātunuma šīmāta lušīm</i>	Let me, with my utterance, decree destinies instead of you.
161	<i>lā uttakkar mimmu abannū anāku</i>	Whatever I have instigate must not be changed.
162	<i>aj itūr aj innenā siqar šaptīja</i>	Nor may my command be nullified or altered.

(Tablet, II, 155-162)

Given the imminent context of war in this dialogue, the suggestion of l. 159 seems out of place unless tablet III is taken into consideration. It explains Marduk inviting the gods to sit in a copiously washed down banquet (cf. III, 8-10, 133-138). If the banquet itself is convivial, the description of the events at the end of tablet III nevertheless points to a phenomenon similar to that of Enlil’s

<sup>18</sup> One notes immediately the similarity of the respective causes of anger and decision to destroy in *Enūma Eliš* by *Tiamat* on the one hand, and in *Atrahasis*, the Akkadian flood tale, by *Enlil* on the other. However, the guilty parties are gods in *Enūma Eliš*, whereas they are humans in *Atrahasis*.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. LAMBERT, *Babylonian*, 72-73; TALON, *The Standard*, 45, 86; KÄMMERER – METZLER, *Das babylonische*, 176-177; GÖSTA, *Enūma Eliš*, 137.

drunkenness which is manifested in great joy. The use of the literary topos of drunkenness would therefore highlight the difficulty inherent in Marduk's request: that the great gods renounce their prerogatives "forever" in his favor.

Furthermore, while Marduk's proposal is debated among the great gods (III, 130-133). It is only ratified after the latter have drunk beer and become largely carefree<sup>20</sup>:

<p>8 <i>lišāna liškunū ina qerēti lišbū</i>  9 <i>ašnan likulū liptiqū kurunnu</i>  ---  ---  ---  10 <i>ana dAMAR.UTU mutir</i>  <i>gimillišunu lišimū šimtum</i>  Let them confer as they sit at table.  Let them eat grain, let them drink beer.  ---  ---  ---  For Marduk their avenger, let them decree the destiny.</p>	<p>133 <i>lišānu iškunū ina qerēti ušbū</i>  134 <i>ašnan īkulū iptiqū kurunnu</i>  135 <i>širīsa matqu usanninū rāṭi-šunu</i>  136 <i>šikru ina šatê ḫabāšu zumri</i>  137 <i>ma'diš egū kabattāšunu itelliš</i>  138 <i>ana dAMAR.UTU mutir</i>  <i>gimillišunu išimū šimta</i>  They conferred as they sat at table.  They ate grain, they drank beer.  They stuffed their drinking-tubes with sweet beer.  As they drank the strong drink, [their] bodies relaxed.  They became quite carefree; their mood was merry.  For Marduk, their avenger, they decreed the destiny.</p>
--	---

(Tablet III, 8-10, 133-138)

The discrepancy observable in the statements of Marduk's request in tablet III are not random. In the first repetition in l. 8-10, Anšar confirms that the joy requested by Marduk is the banquet, while the use of the *topos* of drunkenness in l. 135-137 underlines the intoxicating dimension of the latter. It is also this specific character of drunkenness that appears in tablet VI, 70-77 where the great gods curse themselves so that only Marduk remains exalted<sup>21</sup>:

<p>70 <i>bēlum ina BARAG MAḤ ša ibnū</i>  <i>šubas-su</i>  71 <i>DINGIR.DINGIR AD.MEŠ-šu</i>  <i>qerētā-šu uštēšib</i>  72 <i>annām Bābili šubat narmê-kun</i></p>	<p>The lord being on the lofty shrine they had built for his dwelling.  The gods, his fathers, seated at the banquet.  This is Babylon, your fixed dwelling.</p>
--	--

<sup>20</sup> Cf. LAMBERT, *Babylonian*, 76-77, 82-83.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. LAMBERT, *Babylonian*, 72-73, 114-117; TALON, *The Standard*, 100-101.

73	<i>mugâ ašruš-šu hidūtā-šu tišbâ- ma</i>	Take your pleasure here! Sit down in joy!
74	<i>ūšibū-ma DINGIR.DINGIR GAL.GAL</i>	The great gods sat down.
75	<i>šarbaba iškunū ina qerēti ušbū</i>	Beer was set out, they sat down at the banquet.
...	.....	.....
95	<i>iphurū-nim- ma DINGIR.DINGIR GAL.GAL</i>	The great gods assembled.
96	<i>šimat dAMAR.UTU ullū šunu uškinnū</i>	As the fate of Marduk is the highest, they bowed down.
97	<i>uzakkirū-ma ana ramānī-šunu ararru</i>	They invoked a curse on themselves.
98	<i>ina A.MEŠ u GIŠ.I3 itmû ulappitū napšāti</i>	They took an oath with water and oil, they put their hands on their throats. (Tablet VI, 70-75, 95-98)

Although the great gods had already recognized Marduk's greatness because of his victory over Tiamat, their prerogatives still seemed to contrast Marduk's sovereignty. Moreover, the fact that they had to curse themselves during a joyful gathering to establish Marduk, betrays the difficult and unusual nature of what they were about to do.

Ancient Mesopotamia therefore was acquainted with a literary use of drunkenness involving parental or main divine figures. It is employed in cases requiring the containment of the power and office of the latter, in order to enable a generational passage that is rather delicate, unexpected and unhelped. Moreover, this use of drunkenness also seemed to be known beyond Mesopotamia, as suggested by the tradition of theogonies especially the Orphic reported by Porphyry of Tyre.

### ***3.3 Zeus' rise to the head of the pantheon in the orphic theogony***

According to the orphic theogonic tradition reported by Porphyry of Tyre in section 16 of *de anthro nympharum*, honey played a decisive role in the victory of Zeus over Cronus<sup>22</sup>:

<sup>22</sup> Cf. PORPHYRIUS TYRIUS, *De Antro nympharum*, 16; KERN, *Orphicorum*, 193-194; REALE – VERZURA, *Orfici*, 418-421; KERN, *Orphic Fragmenta* 154 [Accessed 01-10-2024].

παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ὀρφεῖ ὁ Κρόνος μέλιτι ὑπὸ Διὸς ἐνεδρεύεται· πλησθεὶς γὰρ μέλιτος μεθύει καὶ σκοτοῦται ὡς ὑπὸ οἴνου καὶ ὑπνοῖ, ὡς παρὰ Πλάτωνι ὁ Πόρος τοῦ νέκταρος πλησθεὶς· οὕτω γὰρ οἶνος ἦν. φησὶ γὰρ παρ' Ὀρφεῖ ἡ Νύξ τῷ Διὶ ὑποτιθεμένη τὸν διὰ μέλιτος δόλον  
 εὔτ' ἂν δὴ μιν ἴδῃαι ὑπὸ δρυσὶν ὑψικόμοισιν  
 ἔργοισιν μεθύοντα μελισσάων ἐριβόμβων,  
 δῆσον αὐτόν.

ὁ καὶ πάσχει ὁ Κρόνος καὶ δεθεὶς ἐκτέμνεται, ὡς ὁ Οὐρανός, τοῦ θεολόγου δι' ἡδονῆς δεσμεῖσθαι καὶ κατάγεσθαι τὰ θεῖα εἰς γένεσιν αἰνισσομένου ἀποσπερματίζειν τε δυνάμεις εἰς ἡδονὴν ἐκλυθέντα. ὅθεν ἐπιθυμία μὲν Ουνουσίας τὸν σύρανόν<sup>23</sup> κατιόντα εἰς Γῆν ἐκτέμνει Κρόνος·

In Orpheus, likewise, Cronus is ensnared by Zeus through honey. For Saturn, being filled with honey, is intoxicated, his senses are darkened, as if from the effects of wine, and he sleeps; just as Porus, in the banquet of Plato, is filled with nectar; for wine was not (says he) yet known. The Goddess Night, too, in Orpheus, advises Jupiter to make use of honey as an artifice. For she says to him:

“When stretched beneath the lofty oaks you view,  
 with honey by the bees produced  
 Sunk in ebriety (intoxication), fast bind the God.”

This therefore, takes place, and Cronus being bound is emasculated in the same manner as Heaven; the theologian obscurely signifying by this that divine natures become through pleasure bound, and drawn down into the realms of generation; and also, that, when dissolved in pleasure they emit certain seminal powers. Hence Saturn emasculates Heaven, when descending to earth through a desire of generation. But the sweetness of honey signifies, with theologians, the same thing as the pleasure arising from generation, by which Saturn, being ensnared, was castrated. For Saturn, and his sphere, are the first of the orbs that move contrary to the course of Cœlum or the heavens. Certain powers, however, descend both from Heaven (or the inerratic sphere) and the

<sup>23</sup> The expression *ουνουσίας τὸν σύρανόν* is probably an *homoiarton* error due to resemblance between σ and ο at the beginning of the lexemes *ουνουσίας* and *οὐρανόν*, hence the proposition of Hercher to read *ουνουσίας* rather than *ουνουσίας* on the one hand, and *οὐρανόν* instead of *σύρανόν* on the other hand. This is probably also the opinion of Nauck whose text presents *ουνουσίας τὸν Οὐρανόν*, see HERCHER, *Adnotatio critica to Aeliani, De natura*, lxix; NAUCK, *Porphyrī philosophi Platonici*, 68.

planets. But Cronus receives the powers of Heaven, and Zeus the powers of Cronus.

The drunkenness of Cronus is therefore essential for his dethronement by his son Zeus. Furthermore, the reference to the “lofty oaks” is highly suggestive as it seems similar to the tradition of the “oaks of Dodona”, the sacred space from which Zeus pronounced his oracles<sup>24</sup>.

Beyond the late nature of this Porphyrian testimony, there seems to be no reason to doubt the antiquity of this tradition. Considering the likeness of Cronus’ drunkenness to that of Expedient in Plato’s *Banquet*, the greatness of honey is reflected and enhanced. The similarity of both examples bolsters the truth of the statement. Given the authenticity of the episode on the drunkenness of Expedient in the *Banquet*<sup>25</sup>, it seems plausible that Porphyry had connected it with another tradition known to his audience.

Drunkenness thus appears necessary to thwart the attention of the very vigilant Cronus who devoured all his children at their birth to avoid any rivalry<sup>26</sup>. Following this eviction which consecrated him as the supreme master of Olympus, Hesiod’s theogonic narrative shifts into a description of the ordering of reality and creation under the control of Zeus. This description is similar to that of *Enūma Eliš* after Marduk’s consecration as sole sovereign.

#### **4 Synthetic Remarks on the Drunkenness’ Pattern and the Form Adopted in Gen 9:18-29**

Beyond the overall differences that emerge from the episodes examined, the texts nevertheless appear united by the use of drunkenness, following a certain procedure. This drunkenness’ pattern always intervenes in trans-generational questions. It momentarily annihilates the main parental or divine figures, in order to enable the manifestation of new filial configurations.

Now I intend to highlight the literary conventions attached to this pattern: the occasion that creates and frames it, the contents and the forms associated it. This will gradually allow the identification of the option taken by Gen 9:18-29, regarding its potential origin and its orientation toward Gen 10, specifically with Canaan, the unexpected figure of the tale opposed to Shem and his descendants.

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. LIDDELL – SCOTT, δρῦς, 451; BAILLY, δρῦς, 540-541.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. PLATO, *Symposium*. 203b.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. HESIODUS, *Theogony* 466-467.

### ***4.1 Context of drunkenness***

These episodes almost always take place in a family setting and present an issue involving the filial entity. The resolution involves the intoxication of the parental or divine figure. Drunkenness tames the parental or divine figure at the most expressive area of his function. It momentarily creates a space outside the omnipresence and power of the parental or divine figure wherein the filial entities can distinguish themselves. The trigger for the crisis therefore always seems to be related to the trans-generational question.

It should be noted that the distinctions in filial entities are not always the same, nor do they aim at the same objectives. Indeed, if the manifestations of the filial figure in the episodes of Noah and Adonai are quite similar, the other stories seem to move towards other perspectives. The former stories distinguish two entities of the filial part by an election of the uncle and disqualification of the nephew, while the Mesopotamian and Greek ones concern the rise of divinities and their tributary civilizations. The logic is similar to that of the etiological story of Gen 19:30-38 which exposes the rise of the Moabites and Ammonites from Lot.

But unlike Gen 19:30-38 in which there is no apparent rivalry between Lot and his daughters and the *Enūma Eliš* in which the conflict is between Marduk and Tiamat, the Greek and Mesopotamian accounts present a tension between the filial figure who is exalted and the parental figure who is drunk. The biblical accounts of Noah and Adonai also agree with this tension. In fact, Noah's indignation in Gen 9:24 over the younger son's behavior towards him reveals a latent antagonism that is more manifest in Ps 78, with the sons of Ephraim who refuse to walk in the Law of God (Ps 78:9-11), tempting him (cf. נָטָה, Ps 78:18.41.56) and continually rebelling against him (cf. מָרָה, Ps 78:8.17.40.56).

### ***4.2 Content of drunken scenes***

#### **4.2.1 Parental figures are main characters and filial ones are renowned**

Filial figures are almost exclusively renowned characters and all the parental figures are main characters in the events. However, a quick glance could lead one to think that Lot is an exception. But in Gen 19:30-38, this aspect is suggested as much by the post-cataclysm context of the narrative, as by the words of his elder daughter. She notes the impossibility of finding a man with whom to



unite as it was customary throughout the earth (וְאִישׁ אֵין בְּאֶרֶץ לְבוֹא עָלֵינוּ כְּדָרְךָ כָּל-הָאָרֶץ, v. 31). The final and modal infinitive clause אֵין בְּאֶרֶץ לְבוֹא denies the subject אִישׁ (“man”) as if to say that one could not find a man on earth. This leads, either to think to the total destruction of all life; or only to limit it in the isolated region where they live with their father.

At another level, the biblical filial entities span two generations, unlike the extra-biblical stories that have only one. In the Mesopotamian myths, drunkenness appears as a community phenomenon, whereas the biblical perspective and the Greek ones, do not have filial figures consuming alcoholic beverages. Far from being a common phenomenon, drunkenness was here aimed first at the parental or divine figure, and was not to be confused with any phenomenon of intoxication.

#### *The younger son*

A review of these stories suggests the functional nature of the term בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן, *his youngest son*, in Gen 9:18-29. Its function seems even to extend to the choice of Canaan who, according to the presentation of the table of nations, is the youngest son of Ham (Gen 10:6). In addition, it is emphasized that Ephraim who is taken to task in Ps 78 was the youngest son of Joseph at the time of Jacob’s arrival in Egypt<sup>27</sup>. Moreover, Joseph would also have been chosen in the psalm because he was the youngest son of Jacob during the return from his uncle Laban<sup>28</sup>.

The focus on the younger son would probably also be at work in Gen 19:30-38. It is seen in the attention paid to Lot’s younger daughter, who acts according to a predetermined plan unlike the elder daughter. In fact, the initial plan that is made explicit in v. 32 involves sleeping with their father according to the verb שָׁכַב + the preposition עִם (see also vv. 34.35). But in the action of the elder daughter, one reads rather אָתָּה + שָׁכַב (v. 33.34), contrary to that of the younger who remains consistent (v. 35). Moreover, in the action of the elder daughter, it is no longer a question of *our father* (אָבִינוּ, vv. 31.32.33.35); but of *her father* (אָבִיהָ) or my father (אָבִי).

In the extra-biblical context, Marduk who generally appears as Ea’s first-born, is nevertheless his only son in *Enūma Eliš*. In the Greek story, the pattern of the younger son is rather explicit, since Zeus is designated in Hesiod’s

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Gen 48:1-19.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Gen 30:1–33:7.

theogony as *ὀπλότατος*, *the youngest*, the most appropriate to undertaking a revolution<sup>29</sup>.

#### 4.2.2 Drunkenness and manipulation of the parental or divine figure

Drunkenness is almost always the result of abundant consumption of alcoholic beverages and is expressed by lexemes (רַכַּץ, Gen 9:21), μεθύσκω (for Cronos); or by syntagms as in the case of Lot (Gen 19:33.35), Adonai (Ps 78:65) and the Mesopotamian figures. In most cases, drunkenness leads to an emotional change or cognitive alteration as it appears with Noah and Lot who become unconscious. In Ps 78:65-72, this appears in the comparison of Adonai with a warrior who was overcome by wine (מְתַרְוֵן, Ps 78:65) whose effects, according to the LXX's perfect participle *κεκραίπαληκώς*, are still felt.

In the *topos* of drunkenness of Sumerian myths, there is also the mention of emotional changes in Enlil who becomes joyful (cf. *hul2-la*), an aspect which was probably also reported in the myth of *Inanna and Enki*, where almost 34 lines are missing. Furthermore, there is an affinity between the Babylonian myth of *Enūma Eliš* and these Sumerian stories, since Tablet III, 137 relates that after drinking, the great gods became tired or careless.

The verb *egū(m)* used for the occasion could express either to “be tired” or to “be careless/negligent”, which would indicate a lack of interest to the surrounding reality in a posture similar to “non-knowledge”<sup>30</sup>. In any case, the text expresses a psychosomatic decline stimulated by the consumption of an alcoholic beverage, as also in the situation of Cronus in Greece. However, based on cognitive data, the Mesopotamian myths of *Enki's journey to Nippur* and *Enūma Eliš* are distinguished from other narratives by the fact that the gods who are described as drunk, deliver substantial speeches without prior sobering.

Drunkenness of a main parental figure was therefore part of a process in the transformation of a reality that involves prior sensory manipulation of the parental figure who guarantees authority. It is noted in this regard that, if in the extra-biblical myths and in Gen 19:30-38 one seems to seek emotional alteration to control the parental figure, then in Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72, it is rather to awaken the latter from the situation prior to his drunkenness. The parental or

<sup>29</sup> Cf. HESIODUS, *Theogonia*, 137-138.478; BAILLY, *ὀπλότατος*, 1391b; MONTANARI, *ὀπλότατος*, 1471.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. VON SODEN, *egū(m)*, 191; OPPENHEIM et al., *egū*, 48-49.

divine figure is invited to wake up and react against the situation in which a nephew and his descendants appear to prevent the emergence of his uncle and the entities associated with him.

#### 4.2.3 The action of the parental or divine figure after intoxication

A crucial moment in these stories occurs after drunkenness and during which, the parental or divine figure performs concrete acts usually a speech, except for the episodes of Lot and Zeus. This moment allows distinguishing these stories of drunkenness from those in which the latter is used to assassinate a character who can no longer act, speak or simply be there. Furthermore, the actions of the parental or divine figure after or during his drunkenness will profoundly change the content of the exposition, becoming more decisive. Although from a different perspective, the actions of the parental or divine figures in *Enūma Eliš* and in Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72 highlight the theme of the domination of certain entities.

Unlike some Mesopotamian episodes in which parental figures make speeches during their drunkenness, the biblical accounts of Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72 have been keen to separate the speech or action of the latter from drunkenness. They probably anticipated the objections that could have arisen regarding the value of such an act undertaken under the influence of drunkenness. That was probably already implicit in *Inanna and Enki*, with Enki who claimed his powers from Inanna after awaking, because he thought he was unconscious.

The occasion and content of these episodes of drunkenness therefore underline similarities between the key moments of these expositions. The complication or inciting moment is connected with a trans-generational problem. The resolution occurs thanks to the drunkenness of a parental or divine figure in the most significant place of his function, creating significant upheavals and the appearance of new configurations.

##### *Elements of drunkenness' pattern of a main parental or divine figure*

- (1) An explicit or implicit conflict, linked to the trans-generational question.
- (2) Drunkenness of the parental or divine figure in order to remedy the problem.
- (3) Action of filial figures.
- (4) Return to the cognition of the parental or divine figure.
- (5) Parental/divine action that confirms or directs the new configurations.

The common exposition groups together (1), (2), (3) and sometimes (5); while (4) appears already in *Inanna and Enki* are found in Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72 as a necessary moment for the credibility of the action of the parental or divine figure.

### **4.3 Recurrent linguistic and stylistic forms**

#### **4.3.1 The propensity for poetic narration of history**

The prosaic aspect is dominant, even in Ps 78. Hossfeld and Zenger define it as “Geschichte in poetischer Brechung” in considering the prominent role of wayyiqtol in it<sup>31</sup>. Indicating *en passant* the prosaic orientation of the episodes of Noah and Lot, this appears also true in the Mesopotamian and Greek myths that demonstrate mainly a prosaic attitude.

The extrabiblical myths develop according to the pattern of the creation of a civilization in a primeval context and point out the heroism of the titular divinity. In the bible where the context no longer directly deals with gods but with humans or humans in their correlations with God, there is also a use of mythical motifs in the contexts of these episodes (heavenly cataclysms, plagues of Egypt).

However, beyond this framework similar to that of the primitive or nature sagas especially in the Genesis’ accounts, there is a tendency towards the family saga with an etiological content. It explains either the origin of the two peoples descended from Lot in Gn 19:30-38, or the favor of one filial entity over another as in Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72.

#### **4.3.2 Parallelism and Repetitions**

The tendency to repeat words, sentences or entire paragraphs is quite marked in these episodes, and particularly in the extra-biblical ones. In the biblical texts, it is articulated as parallelism, which is one of the common stylistic elements of these episodes. Thanks to it, similarities are established between members of the filial entities, and scenes or characters are opposed or distinguished. Gen 19:30-38 presents a synonymic parallelism of the daughters

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalms* 2, 286.

of Lot, the two nights of his drunkenness and the generation of his descendants; whereas Gen 9:18-29<sup>32</sup> and in Ps 78:65-72<sup>33</sup> resort to the antithetical parallelism.

#### 4.4 *Stories reporting an awakening from drunkenness*

##### 4.4.1 Numerical arrangement

###### A. Inanna and Enki

If it is difficult to establish correlations between the lists of powers (*me*) in the phase preceding Enki's sobering there is a numerical logic that add one unit<sup>34</sup>:

Lists' number	Translation	Lists' number	Translation
1 <sup>st</sup> list	(1) the office of <i>en</i> priest (2) the office of <i>lagal</i> priest (3) divinity (4) the great and good crown (5) the royal throne	6 <sup>th</sup> lists	lost
2 <sup>nd</sup> list	(1) the noble sceptre (2) the staff and crook (3) the noble dress (4) shepherdship (5) kingship	7 <sup>th</sup> list	(1) the standard (2) the quiver (3) sexual intercourse (4) kissing (5) prostitution (6) ..... running(?)
3 <sup>rd</sup> list	(1) the office of <i>egi-zi</i> priestess, (2) the office of <i>nin-dijir</i> priestess, (3) the office of <i>icib</i> priest, (4) the office of <i>lu-mah</i> priest, (5) the office of <i>gudu</i> priest	8 <sup>th</sup> list	(1) forthright speech (2) deceitful speech (3) grandiloquent speech (4) ..... (5) the cultic prostitute (6) the holy tavern

<sup>32</sup> Ham sees (רָאָה, v. 22) / Shem and Japheth do not see (לֹא רָאוּ, v. 23). Canaan is cursed (רָעָה, v. 25) / the God of Shem is blessed (בֵּרַךְ, v. 26).

<sup>33</sup> Joseph is rejected (מָאָס), the tribe of Ephraim is not chosen (לֹא בָחַר, v. 67) / the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion and David are chosen (בָּחַר, vv. 68.70).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. ETCSL 1.14, segment F, 14-34.

Lists' number	Translation	Lists' number	Translation
4 <sup>th</sup> list	(1) constancy	9 <sup>th</sup> list	(1) the holy <i>nijin-jar</i> shrine
	(2) ....		(2) .....
	(3) ....		(3) the hierodule of heaven
	(4) going down to the underworld,		(4) loud musical instruments
	(5) coming up from the underworld,		(5) the art of song
	(6) the <i>kur-jara</i> priest		(6) venerable old age
5 <sup>th</sup> list	(1) the sword and club		
	(2) the cultic functionary <i>saj-ursaj</i>		
	(3) the black garment		
	(4) the colourful garment		
	(5) the ..... hair-style		
	(6) the ..... hair-style		

This appears also in the fact that Enki hands over his powers to Inanna during his drunkenness in six speeches, while he tries to recover them seven times<sup>35</sup>:

Number	During drunkenness	After drunkenness
(1)	I, iii, 1-4.	II, i, 1-34.
(2)	I, iii, 5-9.	II, i, 35-68.
(3)	I, iii, 10-13.	II, ii, 1 – II, ii, 34.
(4)	I, iii, 14-17.	II, ii, 35 – II, iii, 4.
(5)	I, iii, 18-21	II, iii, 5 – II, iii, 38.
(6)	I, iii, 22-25.	II, iii, 39 – II, iv, 15.
(7)	—————	II, iv, 16ss.

#### B. In Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72

A similarity between these two stories based on the numerical logic of increasing one unit is immediately noted, as it appears in the later phases of the

<sup>35</sup> The remaining two lines of I, iii (26-27) could not have contained a seventh phase of delivery of the *me*, because it would have required at least 4 lines, see FARBER-FLÜGGE, *Der Mythos*, 21-25, 33-53.

awakening from drunkenness. Here, the number of entities of the disqualified filial part is increased by one unit in the group of the election (Table 1).

*Table 1: Addition of a character in the elected part*

	Gen 9:18-29		Ps 78:65-72	
During drunkenness		vv. 22-23		_____
<i>Negative filial reaction</i>	רָאָה	(1) Ham, the father of Canaan		_____
<i>Positive filial reaction</i>	לֹא רָאָה	{ (1') Shem (2') Japheth		_____
After waking up		vv. 25-27		vv. 65-72
<i>Rejected filial part</i>	אָרֶר	(1) Canaan (v. 25)	מָאָס לֹא בָחַר	(1) Tent of Joseph (v. 67a) (2) Tribe of Ephraim (v. 67b) (1') Tribe of Judah (v. 68a)
<i>Chosen filial part</i>	בָּרַד פָּתָה	(1') Shem (v. 26) (2') Japheth (v. 27)	בָּחַר	{ (2') Mount Zion (vv. 68b-69) (3') David (vv. 70-72)

This numerical pattern is applied as much to the elements of the different antithetical parts, as to the number of meanings within the chosen parts of the tale.

Verse 72 is not included into the elective part of Ps 78 because, unlike vv. 68-71 where the subject of the verbs is Adonai, in v. 72 it is David who is described as shepherd of the people in conformity with the divine election (Table 2).

Table 2: Addition of a phrase in the elected part

		Gen 9:25-27		Ps 78:65-71
Non election	Canaan	(1) Cursed is Canaan (v. 25a)	Joseph	(1) Joseph's tent set aside (v. 67a)
		(2) Servant of his brothers (v. 25b)	Ephraim	(1') Tribe of Ephraim not elected (v. 67b)
Election	Shem	(1) Blessed is Yhwh, God of Shem (v. 26a) (2) Canaan be his servant (v. 26b)	Juda	(1) Tribe of Juda is chosen (v.68a)
	Japheth	(1) God enlarges Japheth (v. 27a) (2) Let him dwell in the tents of Shem (v.27b) (3) Canaan be his servant (v. 27c)	Sion	(1) Mount Zion is chosen (v. 68b) (2) Building the sanctuary like the heights and foundations of the earth (v. 69)
			David	(1) David is chosen (v. 70a) (2) He is taken from the flock, behind the sheep (vv. 70b-71a) (3) He shepherds Jacob and Israel (vv. 71b-c)

#### 4.4.2 The sentences of sobering up in *Inanna and Enki*, Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72

In *Inanna and Enki*, I, v, 9-10 it is reported:

- <sup>9</sup> *kaš-nag-ġa-ra kaš-nag-ġa-ra kaš mu-un-ta<sup>2</sup>-e<sub>11</sub>-da* Beer he drank, beer he drank, he ascended from beer
- <sup>10</sup> *a-a<sup>d</sup>en-ki kaš-nag-ġa-ra kaš mu-un-(ta<sup>2</sup>-e<sub>11</sub>-da)* Father Enki drank beer, he ascended from beer

In the phrase *mu-un-ta-e<sub>11</sub>-da* at the end of these lines, the prefix *mu-* suggests the animate nature of the subject of the verb *e<sub>11</sub>*, to ascend, to go down. This subject who is indicated by the pronominal prefix of the third person *-un-* refers to Enki and not to the inanimate noun *kaš*, beer. However Gertrud Farber-



Flügge chose to translate it as: [9] Als das Bier demjenigen, der Bier getrunken hatte, demjenigen, der Bier getrunken hatte, hochgestiegen war (?), [10] Als das Bier dem Vater Enki, der Bier getrunken hatte, (hochgestiegen war (?))”<sup>36</sup>.

Furthermore, the ablative prefix *-ta-* and its corresponding directional ablative postposition *-da* refers to the inanimate complement *kaš* as the point of origin “from which” the movement of the verb *e<sub>11</sub>* starts. As a result, *kaš mu-un-ta-e<sub>11</sub>-da* refers to an ascent out of the beer. This is similar to Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72, with the parental or divine figure waking up. This is expressed by the verb 𒌦𒌦 (‘‘to wake up’’) related to the adverbial phrase 𒌦 (‘‘wine’’), by means of the preposition 𒌦, *out of* or *from*.

The Sumerian text thus provides valuable evidence both for the use of a syntagm semantically close to that of the stories of Gen 9:24 and Ps 78:65, and for the similarity of the syntactic construction. In these three episodes, the awakening is expressed by a formal or conceptual verb of movement (*e<sub>11</sub>*; 𒌦𒌦) that is related to the adverbial phrase of place characterized by an alcoholic drink (*kaš*; 𒌦), by means of a preposition of distance (*-ta-*; 𒌦). This analogy also covers the phase following the awakening since in all these episodes, the parental figure who awoke reacts against the filial entity at the heart of the confusion or the affront.

These stories would therefore not aim to inform about the unfolding of an historical event. Rather it creates a continuity between the past and the present in the treatment of a facet of present reality, by using drunkenness to explain an unexpected trans-generational passage.

#### ***4.5 The form adopted by Gen 9:18-29***

As already noted, the purposes of these stories of drunkenness of a main parental or divine figure are sometimes distinct from one another. Mesopotamian and Greek myths generally seek to explain the origins of the main religious institutions, societal structures and political roles. It is based on the bravery and qualities of the titular deity. They gain advantage over their ‘‘father’’ thanks to the latter’s drunkenness. Although not intended to supplant, Gen 19:30-38

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. FARBER-FLÜGGE, *Der Mythos*, 26-27; WOODS, *The Grammar*, 111, 143-144; THOMSEN, *The Sumerian Language*, § 342; ATTINGER, *e<sub>11</sub>*, 335; HALLORAN, *e<sub>11</sub>*, 58; HALLORAN, *-n-*, 183-184.

focuses also on Lot's replacement by his daughters in order to beget descendants from/for him.

In this overall context, Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72 are more interested in showing how a certain fundamental change of direction occurred within the filial entities of Noah and Jacob, starting from the respective drunkenness of Noah and Adonai. In the phase following the awakening, these two episodes develop in an analogous way according to the pattern that elects an uncle to the detriment of one of his nephews, the youngest son among his siblings. They seemed to integrate and formalize a characteristic already found in *Enūma Eliš* and more explicitly in the theogonic tradition relating to Zeus. These two biblical stories offered a formalization in their own terms.

Gen 9:18-29 appears however as a criticism of the attempt to supplant the father and signals the failure of the attempt. Gen 9:18-29 would therefore be a synthesis using intoxication of a main divine or parental figure as an element in the legitimation of a present filial situation relating to the election, and to territory. The territorial data in this pattern is not a creation of Gen 9:18-29, because it already appears in the Mesopotamian and Greek myths, since they deal with the rise of a civilization and its territory.

Therefore, it is possible to presume its Mesopotamian importation to Gen 9:18-29, facilitated by the general context of primeval account of Gn 1–11 which is also underlined in the extra-biblical and especially the Mesopotamian myths. Given the above similarities mentioned between *Enūma Eliš* and *Atrahasis* the Babylonian flood, and considering the connection of Gen 9:18-29 to the biblical flood, the Mesopotamian inspiration of this pattern applied to Noah appears to be likely.

The mythical figure of Noah is in line with the extra-biblical trend. It situated the favors that the line of Shem would have had and the disfavor of Canaan in the origin of the world. In other words, following the main theme of the episode that Gen 9:19 stipulates in terms of the settlement of the earth and its concretization in Gen 10; Gen 9:18-29 intended to rationalize the unexpected territorial occupation of the "land of Canaan" by certain descendants of Shem, as a reality rooted in the primordial event.

*Formal pattern of drunkenness in Gen 9:18-29*

- drunkenness of the main parental figure (Noah)
  - actions of the filial entities towards the parental one
    - negative (Cham father of Canaan: brother)
    - + positive (Shem and Japheth: brother)
- awakening from drunkenness of the main parental figure (Noah)
  - reactions of the main parental figure on the filial entities
    - negative: curse (Canaan: nephew)
    - + positive: blessing (Shem: uncle)
    - + positive: blessing (Japheth: uncle)

**4.6 Social and literary context of Gen 9:18-29**

It is clear that the formulas אָרַר and בָּרַךְ have several life settings in biblical literature, the oldest of which would be that associated with home and family. However, the omission of the specific reason in the blessing of v. 26, leads one to think of formulas used in worship to praise God. Jenni and Westermann considers Gen 9:18-29 as no longer in a family setting but in a cultic context<sup>37</sup>.

Following the interpretation suggested by v. 19, the benefit is linked to the occupation of the land. Considering that the curse formula אָרַר of v. 25 is in the third person and the blessing בָּרַךְ of v. 26 does not contain any motivation<sup>38</sup>, it could suggest that Gen 9:18-29 bears a late territorial polemic. Japheth would also have participated in the favors of Shem's blessing by dwelling in his tents, hence Gen 9:18-29 would be inscribed in the inclusive line of non-P blessings.

Thus, for reasons related to the coherence of the overall narrative, the original life setting of this account was probably the controversy over territorial occupation that was transposed into the primordial context. Genesis 9:18-29 therefore appears as a kind of cultic legitimization of social, political and religious institutions. This is in line with the ancient tendency in which one does not simply designate the aspects of existential facts, but grounds its *raison d'être* by etiology<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. JENNI – WESTERMANN, ברך, 324.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. SCHARBERT, ארר, 408-409 ; SCHARBERT, ברך, 305-307.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. SPARKS, *Ancient Texts*, 15.

## Conclusion

Drunkenness of a main parental or divine figure that challenges the future of its filial part is therefore attested beyond the biblical world. In Mesopotamian stories, this pattern was part of the creation and affirmation of civilization stories, with a particular emphasis on the unexpected nature of this passage. This is possible thanks to the bravery of the filial figure who was none other than its titular divinity. There is also that aspect of supplanting the parental figure thanks to drunkenness recounted in the Greek story of Zeus, that translates as parental replacement in Gen 19:30-38.

If the extra-biblical episodes are associated with the cultic framework and that of the family, Gen 19:30-38 has only the family context and could represent a possibility of this literary pattern detached from the cult. However, cultic allusions are not totally foreign to the biblical use of this pattern as evidenced by Gen 9:18-29 and Ps 78:65-72.

In these two stories that expose a phase of awakening from drunkenness, the idea of parental supplanting is transformed into a failure or rebellion towards the parental or divine figure. It signals a failure of the dominant tendency of the ancient biblical world to favor the younger son. The favored filial figure is no longer the one whom the narrative lingers, since Canaan or Ephraim who are the most prominent figures in their respective episodes, are unfortunately also rejected.

These two stories of drunkenness would therefore have extended the emotional change of the parental or divine figure. The drunkenness is no longer aimed at supplanting him, but at awakening him so that he can react against the threat. Starting from drunkenness as an instrument to manipulate or overcome the obstacle represented by the parental or divine figure, Gen 9:18-29 exhibits substantial modifications that facilitated its collocation in the primeval account.

Its application to the mythical figure of Noah would also follow this general trend. However, there is not enough evidence to affirm that this story was part of any P or non-P source of the flood. Neither can it claim that Gen 9:18-29 is only an editorial tale connected to the flood narrative. Now, the presence of this literary motif of drunkenness in Gen 9:18-29, provides some proofs regarding its possible origin and function in this story of Canaan before birth, in contradiction with the style of Gn 1–11 which speaks of a protagonist only after his birth narrative.

Moreover, these results lead to the current state of recognizing the distinctive character of Gen 9:18-29 which, beyond its probable inspiration from

a known Mesopotamian pattern, has nevertheless resorted to a specific synthesis. Thanks to its ability to decant rather complex situations, the biblical author resorted to the drunkenness motif known for its disconcerting force and its capacity to produce the unexpected. It served to guide in this early phase, not only the election of the Abrahamic branch in Gen 11:26 and his favor on Canaan on the land of his original dispersion (Gen 10:19), but also served to differentiate the biblical hero from those of Mesopotamia because he became drunk. Ultimately, he died.

## Bibliography

- ATTINGER, Pascal: *Glossaire sumérien-français. Principalement des textes littéraires paléobabyloniens*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2021.
- BAILLY, Anatole: *Dictionnaire grec Français*, Paris: Hachette, <sup>5</sup>1906.
- BLECHER, Adi: Noah's Curse. Punishment and Paradox, *ZABR* 23 (2017) 123-135.
- BONNET, Corine: Le Vin et 'les Vrais Rois': approche comparée du lien entre ivresse et transmission du pouvoir, *ASDIWAL* 12 (2017) 73-91.
- BOTTÉRO, Jean – KRAMER, Samuel N.: *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme. Mythologie mésopotamienne* (Bibliothèque des histoires), Paris: Gallimard, 1989.
- CAVALLETTI, Sofia: Proposta di Lettura del Sal 78,65, *RivBib* 26 (1978) 335-340.
- CECCARELLI, Manuel: Enkis Reise nach Nippur. In: Catherine Mittermayer – Sabine Ecklin (eds.): *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger: mu-ni u4 ul-li2-a-aš ĝa2-ĝa2-de3* (OBO 256), Fribourg – Göttingen: Academic Press Fribourg – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012, 89-118.
- DALLEY, Stéphanie: *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford world's classics), New York: Oxford University Press <sup>2</sup>2008.
- DIETRICH, Manfred – LORETZ, Oswald: *Studien zu den ugaritischen Texten. I. Mythos und Ritual in KTU 1.12, 1.24, 1.96, 1.100 und 1.114* (AOAT 269/1), Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.
- FARBER-FLÜGGE, Gertrud: *Der Mythos "Inanna and Enki" unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Liste der m e* (StP 10), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973.
- GERTZ, Jan C.: *Genesis 1–11* (HCOT), Leuven – Paris – Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2023.
- GÖSTA, Gabriel: *Enūma Eliš – Weg zu einer globalen Weltordnung. Pragmatik, Struktur und Semantik des babylonischen "Lieds auf Marduk"* (ORA 12), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014.
- HALLORAN, John A.: *Sumerian Lexicon: A Dictionary Guide to the Ancient Sumerian Language*, Los Angeles: Logogram Publishing, 2006.
- HESIODUS: Theogonia. In: Paul Mazon (ed.): *Theogonie, les jours et les travaux, bouclier* (CUFr 45), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002, 31-69.
- HESIODUS: Theogonia. In: Glenn W. Most (ed.): *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia* (LCL 57), Cambridge: harvard University Press, 2018, 2-85.

- HOSSFELD, Frank-Lothar – ZENGER, Erich: *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer and English translation by Linda M. Maloney (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- JENNI, Ernest – WESTERMANN, Claus: *Dizionario Teologico dell'Antico Testamento*, Torino – Casale Monferrato: Marietti, 1978.
- JOÜON, Paul – MURAOKA, Tamitsu: *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SubBi 27), Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.
- KÄMMERER, Thomas R. – Metzler, Kai A.: *Das babylonische Weltschöpfungsepos Enūma Eliš* (AOAT 375), Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2012.
- KERN, Otto: *Hellenic Gods* [online], Orphic Fragment 154 [Accessed 01-10-2024]. Available at: <https://www.hellenicgods.org/orphic-fragment-154---otto-kern>.
- LAMBERT, Wilfred G.: *Babylonian Creation Myths*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- LAMBERT, Wilfried G. – MILLARD, Alan R.: *ATRA-ḪASĪS: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- L'HOUE, Jean: *Genèse 5–11: commentaire* (ÉtB 90), Leuven – Paris – Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2022.
- LIDDELL, Henry G. – SCOTT, Robert: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- LOISEL, Anne-Caroline R.: L'ivresse en Mésopotamie. De la plénitude des sens à la déraison, *Mythos* 11 (2017) 37-47 [online]. [Accessed 01-11-2024]. Available at: <http://journals.openedition.org/mythos/583>.
- MONTANARI, Franco: *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015.
- NICCACCI, Alviero: *Sintassi del verbo ebraico nella prosa biblica classica* (ASBF 88), Milano: Editrice Terra Santa, 2021.
- OPPENHEIM, Adolf L. et al.: *Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago: Verlag J.J. Augustin, 1992.
- PARDEE, Dennis: *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)* (Mémoire 77), Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations 1988.
- PLATO: Symposium. In: *Platon oeuvres complètes. Tome IV, 2e partie: Le banquet*. Edited by Léon Robin (CUFr 329), Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1929.
- PORPHYRIUS TYRIUS: De Antro Nympharum. In: Rudolf Hercher: *Aeliani. De natura animalium, varia historia, epistolae et fragmenta, Porphyrii philosophi, De abstinentia et de antro nympharum, Philonis byzantii, De septem orbis spectaculis*, Paris: Editore Ambrosio Firmin Didot, 1853, 87-98.
- PORPHYRIUS TYRIUS: De Antro Nympharum. In: *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici. Opuscula selecta*. Iterum recognovit Augustus Nauck (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1887, 53-81.
- PRITCHARD, James B.: *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1969.
- REALE, Giovanni – VERZURA, Elena: *Orfici, testimonianze e frammenti nell'edizione di Otto Kern. Testi Originali a Fronte*, Milano: Bompiani, 2011.
- SCHARBERT, Josef: אָרר. In: *TDOT I* (2011) 405-418.
- SCHARBERT, Josef: בָּרך. In: *TDOT II* (1977) 279-308.

- VON SODEN, Wolfram: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch I*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965.
- SPARKS, Kenton L.: *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.
- TALON, Philippe: *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth, Enūma Eliš: Introduction, Cuneiform Text, Transliteration, and Sign List with a Translation and Glossary in French* (SAACT 4), Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text corpus project, 2005.
- The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* 1.1.4, *Enki's journey to Nibru*. [Accessed 01-01-2021]. Available at: <https://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=c.1.1.4&display=Crit&charenc=&lineid=c114.1#c114.1>. (= ETCSL)
- The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* 1.3.1, *Inanna and Enki*. [Accessed 01-01-2021]. Available at: <https://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/section1/c131.htm#lineA1> [visited on 01/01/ 2021]. (= ETCSL)
- THOMSEN, Marie-Louise: *The Sumerian Language: An Introduction to Its History and Grammatical Structure* (Mesopotamia 10), Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 2001.
- VIROLLEAUD, Charles: Les nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques de Ras Shamra, *Ug.* 5 (1968) 545-605.
- WALTKE, Bruce K. – O'CONNOR, Michael P.: *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- WASSERMANN, Nathan: *The Flood: The Akkadian Sources. A New edition, Commentary and Literary Discussion* (OBO 290), Leuven – Paris – Bristol CT: Peeters, 2020.
- WENHAM, Gordon J.: *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1), Waco: Word book, 1987.
- WOODS, Christopher: *The Grammar of Perspective: The Sumerian Conjugation Prefixes as a System of Voice* (CuMo 32), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008.

### Summary


Some authors such as Corinne Bonnet and Sofia Cavalletti already noted analogies between the drunkenness of Noah in Gen 9:18-29 or of Adonai in Ps 78 with some uses of it in the extra-biblical literature. Following this line of thought, I intend to investigate what appears to be a literary motif of drunkenness of a main parental or divine figure, by highlighting its elements and its purpose in general, as well as the specific orientation chosen by Gen 9:18-29 within the framework of the section Gen 9:18–10:32. That is, to guide in the early phase of Gen 1–11 the favor of the Abrahamic branch on Canaan, regarding the land of the Canaanites' original dispersion in Gen 10:19.

*Keywords:* Drunkenness, Noah, Canaan, Curse, Abrahamic descentance.

*Zhrnutie*

Medzi autorov, ktorí už poukázali na analógiu medzi opitosťou Noema v Gn 9,18-29 alebo Pána v Ž 78 a na použitie opitosti v mimobiblickej literatúre patria aj autorky Corinne Bonnet a Sofia Cavalletti. Zámerom autora článku je v tejto línii preskúmanie literárneho motívu opitosti rodiča alebo postavy božstva s dôrazom na prvky motívu a jeho účel vo všeobecnosti, ako aj na jeho špecifické použitie v Gn 9,18-29 v rámci celku Gn 9,18–10,32. Inak povedané, článok poukazuje na to, že priazeň Abrahámovskej vetvy v skorej fáze Gn 1–11 bola nasmerovaná na Kanaán, vzhľadom na krajinu s pôvodným rozptýlením Kanaánčanov v Gn 10,19.

*Kľúčové slová:* opitosť, Noe, Kanaán, kliatba, potomstvo Abraháma.

Joël André Minsi Endomo  
Archidiocèse de Bertoua  
P.O.Box 40 Bertoua  
91905 BERTOUA, Cameroon  
minsijoel@yahoo.fr  
 0009-0000-6811-5814



# “King Sihon, Who Dwells in Heshbon”

## A Textual Problem in Num 21:34 and Parallels

*Jan Joosten*

Four passages in the Pentateuch refer in identical wording to King Sihon:

Num 21:34

וְעָשִׂיתָ לוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ לְסִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֱמֹרִי אֲשֶׁר יוֹשֵׁב בְּחֶשְׁבֹן

“You shall do to him as you did to King Sihon of the Amorites, who dwells in Heshbon.” See also Deut 1:4<sup>1</sup>; 3:2; 4:46.

Although the issue goes unnoticed in commentaries and critical editions, the text in all these passages is problematic for several reasons. In “classical Biblical Hebrew” (CBH), when a participle functions as a verb it must normally be accompanied by an explicit subject, whether this be a noun or a pronoun<sup>2</sup>. This rule is valid in the entire classical corpus, from Genesis to 2 Kings, and applies to relative clauses<sup>3</sup>. Even when the antecedent of the relative clause is also the subject of the participle, the personal pronoun is normally required:

Deut 20:20

וּבְנִיתָ מְצֹר עַל־הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר־הוּא עֹשֶׂה עִמָּךְ מִלְחָמָה

“You will build siegeworks against the town that *makes* war with you.”<sup>4</sup>

In addition, the semantics of the participle do not fit the context. The participle would normally imply contemporaneity with the reference time. The MT suggests that Sihon is still dwelling in Heshbon when God commands Moses to exterminate Og<sup>5</sup>. This is not so, however. In Num 21:34, quoted above, God

---

<sup>1</sup> This verse also refers in similar wording to “King Og of Bashan, who dwells in Ashtaroth and in Edrei.”

<sup>2</sup> See JOOSTEN, *Verbal System*, 391-394.

<sup>3</sup> In this corpus there are 23 cases of *'ašer* – 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun – participle. The cases of *'ašer* – participle, in addition to the ones discussed in this paper, are: Gen 7:8; 39:22; 1 Kgs 5:13; 2 Kgs 7:17 (for this last instance see below).

<sup>4</sup> See also Num 14:27a; 1 Sam 10:19.

<sup>5</sup> See GROSS, Partizip, 26, in reference to Deut 4:46 only.

commands Moses to do to Og as he has already done to Sihon<sup>6</sup>. In the other passages, too, the discourse is retrospective. When Sihon is mentioned, he has already been exterminated with his entire family and his people and no longer dwells in Heshbon. The semantics of the Hebrew perfect would suit this context better. Note:

Gen 19:29

וַיְהִי בַשַּׁחַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת־עָרֵי הַכְּפָר וַיִּזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־אַבְרָהָם וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת־לוֹט מִתּוֹדָה  
הַהִפְכָּה בַּהִפְךָ אֶת־הָעָרִים אֲשֶׁר־יָשַׁב בָּהֶן לֹט:

“So it was that, when God destroyed the cities of the Plain, God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in which Lot *dwelt*.”

When God destroyed the cities Lot was no longer dwelling there, as the use of the perfect in the relative clause indicates. Similarly:

Josh 13:10

וְכָל עָרֵי סִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֱמֹרִי אֲשֶׁר מָלַךְ בְּחֶשְׁבֹּן

“The cities of King Sihon of the Amorites, who *reigned* in Heshbon.”

Looking back on Joshua’s conquest, the time Sihon ruled in Heshbon is long past. Although a different verb is used here, the use of the perfect shows that the participle in Num 21:34 and parallels is not the correct form.

It is interesting, therefore, to note a variant reading that recurs in our problematic relative clauses. Instead of the *plene* spelling, יֹשֵׁב, the Samaritan Pentateuch has in all instances the *defective* spelling יִשָּׁב<sup>7</sup>. More pointedly, the traditional recitation of the Samaritans reads the forms as perfects: *alsiyyon mālāk ā’ēmarrī ēšār yāšāb bišbon*, “to King Sihon of the Amorites, who *dwelt* in Heshbon”<sup>8</sup>. This reading does away with the problem of the subject-less verbal participle. It also fits the retrospective character of the passages in question. On internal grounds, the Samaritan variant would seem to be superior to the Masoretic reading.

<sup>6</sup> So also Deut 3:2. The other two passages in Deuteronomy occur in retrospective passages in the voice of the narrator.

<sup>7</sup> The *plene* spelling is also attested for the first occurrence of the participle in Deut 1:4 in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> See BEN-HAYYIM, *Words of the Pentateuch*. The value of the Samaritan reading was pointed out to me by Elisha Qimron many years ago. I have not been able to find a note on this point in his published work.

It is not common in textual criticism to prefer readings uniquely transmitted in the oral tradition of the Samaritans. But it is not unheard of<sup>9</sup>. The consensus of knowledgeable scholars is that the Samaritan reading tradition goes back to a time when Hebrew was still spoken, more specifically the late Second Temple period<sup>10</sup>. This oral tradition does not appear to have been contaminated by Masoretic reading traditions to any meaningful degree. Thus, the possibility that it should independently transmit early and authentic readings is to be granted.

If the Samaritan reading is primary, how did the variant in the MT arise? A possible explanation is that the participle was read under the influence of the many passages of similar tenor using the participle with the definite article instead of a relative clause:

Josh 12:2

סִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֱמֹרִי הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּחֶשְׁבֹן

“King Sihon of the Amorites, *who dwelt* in Heshbon.”<sup>11</sup>

This is not a verbalized participle, but a nominal one. In this construction, the participle can refer to contemporaneous processes or states, but also to the past or the future. No explicit subject is required.

In the later reading tradition, tradents may have felt that אֲשֶׁר יָשַׁב was similar to הַיּוֹשֵׁב, without bothering with the niceties of classical syntax. This would account for the participle in the MT of Num 21:34 and parallels. In late Biblical Hebrew it is not uncommon for the participle to exert a verbal function without explicit subject<sup>12</sup>.

In light of these considerations, the Samaritan reading merits to be adopted in a critical edition of the text. Substantially, the contribution of this note may seem trifling. The text-critical issue is of little importance for interpretation. Methodologically, however, the case is interesting because diachronic syntax, verbal semantics, and textual criticism work together to produce a more precise reading of the four passages under discussion.

<sup>9</sup> See Loewenstamm, אֲנֹכִי אֶחֱטָא, 410. Other possible cases have been discussed by Schorch in the book referred to in the next note; see also HIMBAZA, *Texte du Lévitique*, 78-80.

<sup>10</sup> See the extensive discussion in SCHORCH, *Vokale*.

<sup>11</sup> Other examples include Gen 14:7; Num 14:45; Deut 1:44; 2:4.8.

<sup>12</sup> See JOOSTEN, *Verbal System*, 392.

### Appendix

The grammatical reasoning applied to these four cases may throw light on an additional instance. The story of the siege of Samaria and the ensuing famine told in 2 Kgs 7 mentions a “captain on whose hand the king leaned” *הַשָּׁלִיֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר־* *לְמַלְכָּהּ נִשְׁעַן עַל־יָדוֹ* (2 Kgs 7:2)<sup>13</sup>. This character casts doubt on Elisha’s prediction that food will be cheap at the gate of Samaria on the morrow. Later in the story, after Elisha’s prophecy has been fulfilled, this man is mentioned again:

2 Kgs 7:17

וְהַמֶּלֶךְ הִפְקִיד אֶת־הַשָּׁלִיֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁעַן עַל־יָדוֹ עַל־הַשַּׁעַר וַיִּרְמְסוּהוּ הָעָם בַּשַּׁעַר וַיָּמָת  
 “Now the king had appointed the captain on whose hand *he leaned* to have charge of the gate; the people trampled him to death in the gate.”

In verse 2, the pointing *נִשְׁעַן*, *niphal* participle, is unproblematic: the captain is with the king, the “leaning” is contemporary with the reference time of the story. The syntax too is regular, with a noun phrase, “the king,” expressing the subject of the participle.

In verse 17, however, the captain is no longer with the king. He has been given charge of the gate and perishes in the stampede that follows the discovery of food in the abandoned camp of the Aramaeans. The “leaning” is not contemporary with the reference time: the information is retrospective<sup>14</sup>. This, as stated above, is not a usual function of the participle. Moreover, the verse’s syntax is exceptional because no subject accompanies the verbal participle. An elegant solution would be to emend the text. If we read *נִשְׁעַן*, *niphal* 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. sg. perfect, the verbal semantics would agree with the context: the main function of the perfect is to express antecedent processes. The syntax too would be regular, for the perfect does not require the expression of the subject. If the original text had the perfect in verse 17, the change to the participle could be explained as an assimilation to verse 2<sup>15</sup>.

The proposed emendation in this case finds no support in ancient documents. One should remember, however, that the Masoretic text is the only extant source for the Hebrew text of Kings, except for some very rare fragments

<sup>13</sup> Instead of *לְמַלְכָּהּ*, it is preferable, with BHS, to read *הַמֶּלֶךְ*.

<sup>14</sup> The two cases are distinguished in the Vulgate: v. 2 *incumbebat* (imperfect), v. 17 *incubuerat* (pluperfect).

<sup>15</sup> Note that assimilation of v. 17 to v. 2 happened also in the Septuagint through the addition of the subject “the king.”

retrieved from the caves near Qumran. No texts from Qumran cover the present passage nor, being unvocalized, would they have given any help in the present case if they did.

## Bibliography

- BEN-HAYYIM, Ze'ev: *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*. Volume IV: The Words of the Pentateuch, Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1977.
- GROSS, Walter: Das nicht substantivierte Partizip als Prädikat im Relativsatz hebräischen Prosa, *JNSL* 4 (1975) 23-47.
- HIMBAZA, Innocent: Le texte du Lévitique. In: Grant Macaskill – Christl M. Maier – Joachim Schaper (eds.): *Congress Volume Aberdeen 2019* (VTSup 192), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2022, 71-98.
- JOOSTEN, Jan: *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose*, Jerusalem: Simor, 2012.
- LOEWENSTAMM, Samuel E.: אֲנֹכִי אֶחָטְאָה, *ZAW* 90 (1978) 410.
- SCHORCH, Stefan: *Die Vokale des Gesetzes: Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora*. Band 1: Das Buch Genesis (BZAW 339), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

## Summary

The participle יֹשֵׁב “dwelling” in Num 21:34 and parallels raises grammatical and exegetical problems: when God promises to deliver Og into the hand of the Israelites, Sihon is no longer “dwelling” in Heshbon. The consonantal text and the reading tradition of the Samaritan Pentateuch read the form as a perfect. The article argues that the Samaritan reading is to be preferred and tries to account for the Masoretic text.

*Keywords:* Hebrew syntax, Textual Criticism, Samaritan Pentateuch.

*Zhrnutie*

Participium יושב „sídliť“ v Nm 21,34 a paralelných textoch spôsobuje gramatické a exegetické problémy: v čase, keď Boh dal prísľub, že vydá kráľa Oga do rúk Izraelitov, o Sehonovi už viac neplatilo, že „sídliť“ v Hesebone. Konsonantný text a tradícia čítania Samaritánskeho Pentateuchu čítajú danú slovesnú formu v perfekte. V článku zastávame názor, že prednosť sa má dať samaritánskej verzii čítania textu a pokúšame sa vysvetliť masoretský text.

*Kľúčové slová:* hebrejská syntax, textová kritika, Samaritánsky Pentateuch.

Jan Joosten  
9 rue Romantica  
67310 WASSELONNE, France  
janj76772@gmail.com  
 0000-0002-8553-3994

# The Structure and Poetic Elements of Jotham's Speech (Judg 9:7g-20)

*Tomasz Koszarek*

## 1 Introduction

The genre of fable, which appears several times in the Bible (Judg 9:8-15; 2 Kgs 14:9 and its parallel in 2 Chr 25:18), is also a noteworthy biblical genre. One of these appearances is credited to Jotham (Judg 9:8-15) and is contained in a speech he gives to the Shechemites (vv. 7g-20).

There are scholars<sup>1</sup> who consider vv. 8-15 to be a fable. The others<sup>2</sup> ponder the fable extended to vv. 8-20. Some researchers<sup>3</sup> reflect the fable in vv. 7-20. There are also those<sup>4</sup> who consider vv. 7-21 to be a fable.

Jotham's fable (vv. 8-15) has sometimes been considered a poetic text. Although the rest of Jotham's speech (vv. 16-20) was not considered to have poetic qualities, the purpose of this work is to show them throughout the entire Jotham's statement. Syntax markings and verses division come from the system of Gregor Geiger's from *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum* in Jerusalem<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> GUNKEL, *Das Märchen*, 17; RICHTER, *Untersuchungen*, 282-295; WONG, *Compositional Strategy*, 8, 191, n. 3; BUTLER, *Judges*, 239; WEBB, *The Book of Judges*, 272-273; SASSON, *Judges 1-12*, 381-385; MARTINS, *Le fable des arbres*, 223-224; WHITMAN, *Fable*, 149; CLIFTON, *Literal Sense*, 257; DUBOVSKÝ, *Fable-metaphors*, 59-62.

<sup>2</sup> BOLING, *Judges*, 174 (the fable's application in Judg 9:16-20); FRITZ, *Abimelech*, 132 (the fable's commentary in Judg 9:16-20); IRWIN, *Not Just Any King*, 450 (the fable's complement in Judg 9:16-20); JANZEN, *Gideon's house*, 465 (the fable's moral in Judg 9:16-20).

<sup>3</sup> JANZEN, *A Certain Woman*, 34-35 (the fable and its explication); ASSIS, *Self-Interest*, 141-153 (the fable's moral in verses 16-20); OESTE, *Legitimacy*, 137-145 (the fable's application in Judg 9:16-20).

<sup>4</sup> MALY, *The Jotham Fable*, 299; ÁLVAREZ BARREDO, *Abimelec*, 1 (the fable in Judg 9:7-15a and vv. 15b-21 – its application); GROSS, *Richter*, 485.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. GEIGER, *Text-Linguistic Analysis*, 644-645.

## 2 The Structure of Jotham's Speech (Judg 9:7g-20)

There are three main components of Jotham's speech unit: [A] introduction of the speech – vv. 7g-h; [B] fable – vv. 8-15 and [C] main speech – vv. 16-20. The introductory part is very short:

שָׁמְעוּ אֵלַי בְּעֲלֵי שָׁכֶם \* | v. 7g

וַיִּשְׁמַע אֲלֵיכֶם אֱלֹהִים: | v. 7h

The fable in vv. 8-15 contains introduction to the fable in v. 8a, proper fable in vv. 8-15a and conclusion of the fable in vv. 15b-g.

הַלֹּזֵד הֶלְכוּ הָעֵצִים לְמַשַׁח עֲלֵיהֶם מֶלֶךְ (\* | v. 8a

וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְזֵית | v. 8b

\* מְלוּכָה [מֶלֶכָה] עָלֵינוּ: | v. 8c

וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הַזֵּית | v. 9a

\* הִחַדְלֹתִי אֶת־דִּשְׁנִי | v. 9b

אֲשֶׁר־בִּי יִכְבְּדוּ אֱלֹהִים וְאָנָּשִׁים | v. 9b<sup>2</sup>

וְהִלַּכְתִּי לְנוֹעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים: | v. 9c

וַיֹּאמְרוּ הָעֵצִים לְתֹאנָה | v. 10a

\* לְכִי־אֵת | v. 10b

מֶלְכִי עָלֵינוּ: | v. 10c

וַתֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הַתֹּאנָה | v. 11a

\* הִחַדְלֹתִי אֶת־מִתְקִי וְאֶת־תְּנוּבָתִי הַטּוֹבָה | v. 11b

וְהִלַּכְתִּי לְנוֹעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים: | v. 11c

וַיֹּאמְרוּ הָעֵצִים לְגִפְן | v. 12a

\* לְכִי־אֵת | v. 12b

מְלוּכִי [מֶלְכִי] עָלֵינוּ: | v. 12c

וַתֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הַגִּפֶּן | v. 13a

\* הִחַדְלֹתִי אֶת־תִּירוּשֵׁי הַמִּשְׁמַח אֱלֹהִים וְאָנָּשִׁים | v. 13b

וְהִלַּכְתִּי לְנוֹעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים: | v. 13c

וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָל־הָעֵצִים אֶל־הָאֶטָד | v. 14a

\* לָךְ אֵתָה | v. 14b

מֶלֶךְ־עָלֵינוּ: | v. 14c

וַיֹּאמֶר הָאֶטָד אֶל־הָעֵצִים | v. 15a



* אַם בְּאַמַּת אַתֶּם מְשַׁחִים אֹתִי לְמֶלֶךְ עֲלֵיכֶם	v. 15b
בֹּאוּ	v. 15c
חֲסוּ בְּצִלִי	v. 15d
וְאִם־אֵין	v. 15e
תֵּצֵא אִשׁ מִן־הָאֶטֶד	v. 15f
וְתֹאכַל אֶת־אַרְזֵי הַלְּבָנוֹן:	v. 15g

The main speech in vv. 16-20 contains transition to the main speech in v. 16a (וְעַתָּה), accusation in form of three rhetorical questions in vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>-d, reminder of good received in vv. 17a-c, one more accusation in vv. 18a-d and conclusion in vv. 19-20.

וְעַתָּה	v. 16a
אִם־בְּאַמַּת וּבְתַמִּים עֲשִׂיתֶם	v. 16a <sup>2</sup>
וְתִמְלִיכוּ אֶת־אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ	v. 16b
וְאִם־טוֹבָה עֲשִׂיתֶם עִם־יִרְבֶּעֵל וְעִם־בֵּיתוֹ	v. 16c
וְאִם־כְּגִמּוֹל יָדְיוֹ עֲשִׂיתֶם לִּי:	v. 16d
אַשְׁר־נִלְחַם אָבִי עֲלֵיכֶם	v. 17a
וַיִּשְׁלַךְ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ מִנְּגֶד	v. 17b
וַיִּצַל אֶתְכֶם מִיַּד מִדָּן:	v. 17c
וְאַתֶּם קִמַּתֶּם עַל־בֵּית אָבִי הַיּוֹם	v. 18a
וְתִהְיֶה אֶת־בְּנֵי שְׁבָעִים אִישׁ עַל־אֶבֶן אַחַת	v. 18b
וְתִמְלִיכוּ אֶת־אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ בֶּן־אַמְתוֹ עַל־בְּעֵלֵי שְׁכֶם	v. 18c
כִּי אַחִיכֶם הוּא:	v. 18d
וְאִם־בְּאַמַּת וּבְתַמִּים עֲשִׂיתֶם עִם־יִרְבֶּעֵל וְעִם־בֵּיתוֹ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה	v. 19a
שִׂמְחוּ בְּאַבְיִמֶלֶךְ	v. 19b
וַיִּשְׂמַח גַּם־הוּא בְּכֶם:	v. 19c
וְאִם־אֵין	v. 20a
תֵּצֵא אִשׁ מֵאַבְיִמֶלֶךְ	v. 20b
וְתֹאכַל אֶת־בְּעֵלֵי שְׁכֶם וְאֶת־בֵּית מְלֹוא	v. 20c
וְתֵצֵא אִשׁ מִבְּעֵלֵי שְׁכֶם וּמִבֵּית מְלֹוא	v. 20d
וְתֹאכַל אֶת־אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ:	v. 20e

In the main three segments of Jotham's speech mentioned above, further following structural elements can be distinguished:

[A] vv. 7g-h – introduction to the speech

[B] vv. 8-15 – fable

- v. 8a – introduction to the fable
- vv. 8b-15a – proper fable
  - vv. 8b-10 – olive tree (stanza I)
  - v. 11 – fig tree (stanza II)
  - vv. 12-13 – vine (stanza III)
  - vv. 14-15a – thorn tree (stanza IV)
- vv. 15b-g – conclusion of the fable
  - vv. 15b-d – under shadow (reconciliation)
    - v. 15b (זֶלֶל) – protasis
    - vv. 15cd – apodosis
  - vv. 15e-g – in fire (punishment/curse)
    - v. 15e (אֵשׁ-זֶלֶל) – protasis
    - v. 15fg – apodosis

[C] vv. 16-20 – main speech

- v. 16a – transition to the main speech (וַיִּשְׁפָּט)
- vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>-d – accusation: three rhetorical questions (in the form of protasis)
  - vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>-b – the question about choosing Abimelech as king
  - v. 16c – the question about dealing with Jerubbaal and his family
  - v. 16d – the question about gratitude
- vv. 17a-c – reminder of good received: three actions of Gideon for the people of Shechem
  - v. 17a – the fighting for the Shechemites
  - v. 17b – the risking life for the Shechemites
  - v. 17c – the deliverance from Midian
- vv. 18a-d – accusation: the people of Shechem's three ungrateful responses to Gideon
  - v. 18a – the uprising against the house of Jerubbaal
  - v. 18b – the murder of seventy sons of Jerubbaal
  - vv. 18c-d – the election of Abimelech as king
- vv. 19-20 – conclusion

- vv. 19a-c – mutual joy (reconciliation)
  - v. 19a (מִשְׂמֵחַ) – protasis
  - vv. 19bc – apodosis
- vv. 20a-e – mutual destruction by fire (punishment/curse)
  - v. 20a (יִשְׂרָאֵל־מִשְׂמֵחַ) – protasis
  - vv. 20b-e – apodosis.

The threefold pattern is present in the main structure of Jotham's speech: introduction of the speech, fable, main speech. What is more, there is a deliberate arrangement of verses connected in a threefold pattern both in vv. 8-15d and in vv. 16-20. Vv. 8-15d presents three candidates who refused to be elected king. As for vv. 16-20, one can find three rhetorical questions in vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>-d; three actions of Gideon for the people of Shechem in vv. 17a-c, and the people of Shechem's three ungrateful responses to Gideon in vv. 18a-d.

It should be noted that three rhetorical questions correspond to three accusations creating a chiasmus:

- [X] vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>-b – the question about choosing Abimelech as king
- [Y] v. 16c – the question about dealing with Jerubbaal and his family
- [Z] v. 16d – the question about gratitude
- [Z] v. 18a – the uprising against the house of Jerubbaal
- [Y] v. 18b – the murder of seventy sons of Jerubbaal
- [X] vv. 18c-d – the election of Abimelech as king.

Sometimes threefold pattern is transforming into a reinforced 3+1 arrangement. The first example of this is the fable about trees: after three candidates for king in the next three stanzas (olive tree, fig tree, and vine), the fourth, thorn tree, is appointed in stanza IV. The second example of the 3+1 structure one can find in the main speech: after three rhetorical questions forming protasis in vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>.c.d, there is the fourth rhetorical question in v. 19a which forms protasis as well.

Having discussed Jotham's speech structure in general, I will now present the structure of [B] fable and [C] main speech. As for the structure of [B] Jotham's fable (vv. 8-15d), the theme of anointing helps delineate fable. Robert Boling notes that the three words from v. 8a (הִלְוֹךְ הִלְכוּ הָעֵצִים לְמִשַׁח עֲלֵיהֶם מֶלֶךְ) (to anoint – above them – a king), which is the beginning of the fable, also appear in v. 15b (אִם בְּאַמַּת אֲתֶם מִשְׁחִים אֹתִי לְמֶלֶךְ עֲלֵיכֶם) (anoint – a king – above you),

forming its end<sup>6</sup>. The anointing (חֹשֶׁבֶת) appears within Jotham's speech only in vv. 8a.15b. The structure of the fable understood in this way can be presented as follows:

v. 8a	Introduction	
vv. 8b-10	Stanza I	Olive tree
v. 11	Stanza II	Fig tree
vv. 12-13	Stanza III	Vine
vv. 14-15a	Stanza IV	Thorn tree
vv. 15b.c.d	Conclusion	

What is characteristic of this fable is its threefold pattern on the one hand and its 3+1 structure on the other. When it comes to the threefold pattern, the structure of the triad (olive – fig – vine) “is typical of folklore”<sup>7</sup>. The three tree candidates also have a triple structure: the imperative is used three times (vv. 8.10.12), and the refusal of the candidates appears three times (vv. 9.11.13). Each candidate's refusal also has a triple structure<sup>8</sup>:

1. But the tree said to them...
2. “Should I give up...
3. ...shall I go to sway above the trees?”

It is also worth paying attention to the appearance of a prominent structure in narrative analysis of the Bible called the “three-and-four structure” (known also as 3+1 structure) in Jotham's fable: olive – fig – vine, and thorn tree at the end<sup>9</sup>. The 3+1 structure means that after three occurrences of a certain situation,

<sup>6</sup> Cf. BOLING, *Judges*, 173; WEBB, *The Book of Judges*, 276.

<sup>7</sup> LINDARS, *Jotham Fable*, 362.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. OESTE, *Legitimacy*, 82.

<sup>9</sup> In addition to the three-and-four structure in Jotham's fable, there is also another example from the Book of Judges: Delilah's three failed attempts to find out where Samson's strength comes from; only after the fourth try does the situation change, leading to Samson's downfall (Judg 16:6-20). Likewise, the fourth choice poses a real danger. Cf. BRETTLER, *The Book of Judges*, 56. This is a pattern that the Deuteronomist likes to use in his work. The fourth and final choice does not necessarily bring about something bad, but rather something unexpected. The 3+1 structure is visible, for example, in 2 Sam 3 in the description of Samuel's calling (three calls, and the boy's response on the fourth try). J. Blenkinsopp notes other applications of this pattern in the Deuteronomist in 1 Sam 10:2-8, which describes the Ark's journey through the Philistine cities of Ashdod – Gath – Ekron until it finally reaches

there is a fourth, which gives the desired effect of contrast<sup>10</sup>. The 3+1 structure was a *trope* of Mesopotamian literature<sup>11</sup>. Yosef Tsamudi puts it this way: the statement is clearly divided into three parts connected by a certain rhythm, while the ending is added in the form of a different, unexpected event<sup>12</sup>.

In turn, as for the structure of [C] the main speech of Jotham's statement (vv. 16-20) the text was conceived as a triple threefold structure of the statement in vv. 7g.16-19a. First, ( $\alpha$ ) ׀ in vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>.16c.16d forms a threefold pattern of three rhetorical questions beginning with the same conjunction. Then, ( $\beta$ ) three good acts by Gideon for the people of Shechem are listed: vv. 17a.17b.17c. Finally, ( $\gamma$ ) there is the triple ungrateful response of the inhabitants of Shechem to the good done by Gideon in vv. 18a.18b.18c-d<sup>13</sup>.

The 3+1 structure of Jotham's fable (vv. 8-15) parallels the three-and-four structure of Jotham's explanation (vv. 16-20), but the explanation seems to have been modified and fitted to the fable by the redactor<sup>14</sup>. The three initial conditional clauses [I] + [II] + [III] are summarized in v. 19a.

		וְעֵתָה	v. 16a
[I]		אִם־בָּאֲמַת וּבְתָמִים עֲשִׂיתֶם	v. 16a <sup>2</sup>
		וּתְמַלִּיכוּ אֶת־אֲבִימֶלֶךְ	v. 16b
[II]		וְאִם־טוֹבָה עֲשִׂיתֶם עִם־רִבְעֵל וְעִם־בֵּיתוֹ	v. 16c
[III]		וְאִם־כָּגְמוּל יָדְיוֹ עֲשִׂיתֶם לּוֹ:	v. 16d
		וְאִם־בָּאֲמַת וּבְתָמִים עֲשִׂיתֶם עִם־רִבְעֵל וְעִם־בֵּיתוֹ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה	v. 19a

Beth Shemesh. Cf. BLENKINSOPP, *Structure*, 74-75. A similar pattern can be found in the description of Elijah being taken to heaven in 2 Kgs 2. There are three stops, Gilgal – Bethel – Jericho, before Elijah finally reaches the Jordan, from where he is taken to heaven in a chariot of fire. It is worth noting that this pattern also appears in other places in the Bible. It marks the announcement of punishment by the prophet Amos because of the three-and-four transgressions of Damascus (Amos 1:3-5); Gaza and the Philistines (vv. 6-8); Tire and Phoenicia (vv. 9-10); Edom (vv. 11-12); Ammonites (vv. 13-15); Moabites (2:1-3); Judah (vv. 4-5) and Israel (vv. 6-8). In the Book of Proverbs this 3+1 pattern appears in the sayings in Prov 30:15; 30:18-19; 30:21-23; 30:24-28; 30:29-31.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. OESTE, *Legitimacy*, 66, 138.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. BAKER, *Hollow Men*, 86.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. TSAMUDI, *המבנה*, 247. “הנאום נחלק בברור לשלשה חלקים (בתאום עם מקצב) “המשולש) ונוסף עליהם הסיום בצורת פואנטה”

<sup>13</sup> Cf. TSAMUDI, *המבנה*, 247.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. OESTE, *Legitimacy*, 67, 70, 89.

The resulting apodosis to Jotham's three conditions is:

שָׁמְחוּ בְּאַבְיִמֶלֶךְ | v. 19b

וַיִּשְׂמַח גַּם־הוּא בְּכֶם: | v. 19c

According to Gordon Oeste<sup>15</sup>, the ninth chapter of the Book of Judges consists of the exposition (vv. 1-6); the complication (vv. 7-15 + vv. 16-22); the change (vv. 23-24); the unraveling (vv. 25-55); and the ending (vv. 56-57). In addition to the 3+1 structure in vv. 7-15 and vv. 16-22, Oeste also notices its presence in the part he calls the unraveling (vv. 25-55).

On the other hand, one can see another example of 3+1 structure connecting Jotham's fable with main speech. In vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>.c.d, Jotham questions the Shechemites' sincerity and genuineness (אִם־בְּאֵמֶת) three times, just as the thorn tree questioned the sincerity of the trees (v. 15b).

In general, there are elements of Jotham's speech that serve to combine Jotham's fable (vv. 8-15) and Jotham's statement (vv. 16-20) into one structure, especially there are visible connections integrating the fable (vv. 8-15d) with the statement in vv. 7g.16-19a. Similar vocabulary (בְּאֵמֶת) connects the end of the fable and the beginning of the subsequent statement: v. 15b (אִם־בְּאֵמֶת) // v. 16a (אִם־בְּאֵמֶת)<sup>16</sup>. At the same time, in v. 16a<sup>2</sup> one can see the same phrase as in v. 19a: אִם־בְּאֵמֶת וּבְתַמִּים עָשִׂיתֶם.

Similarly, vv. 19bc is the glue that connects both passages. Angelo Penna<sup>17</sup> notes the repetition of the verb שָׂמַח, which initially appears in v. 13b, in v. 19b and Judg 9:19c. In his opinion, this serves the purpose of irony – the reign of Abimelech will not bring the serenity or joy that accompanies wine drinkers.

Then, another link is the proverb of vv. 15f-g, which could have been added at this stage of redaction to bridge vv. 20b-e. The connecting factor is the cause of the threat: vv. 15f-g (thorn tree) // vv. 20b-e (Abimelech).

Ultimately, what cements the parallel between the fable extended to vv. 8-15 and the statement in vv. 16-20 is the similar structure of the use of conditional conjunctions<sup>18</sup>: v. 15b (אִם) // v. 19a (אִם) and v. 15e (וְאִם־אֵין) // v. 20a (וְאִם־אֵין).

Moreover, v. 15b and v. 19a use the same word אִם to connect three rhetorical questions also starting with אִם (vv. 16a<sup>2</sup>.c.d). Reinforced by the presence of אִם in

<sup>15</sup> Cf. OESTE, Legitimacy, 70.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. TSAMUDI, המבנה, 247.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. PENNA, Giudici e Rut, 151.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. BLUEDORN, Yahweh, 222.

the formula וְאִם־אֵין (v. 15e // v. 20a), this creates the impression of a structure based on אֵין:

v. 15b // vv. 16a <sup>2</sup> .c.d.19a	אֵין
v. 15e // v. 20a	וְאִם־אֵין

In summary, vv. 15e.f.g were adjusted to match vv. 20abc in order to fit in with vv. 7.16-20. The phrase “But if not, let fire come out of the thorn tree and devour the cedars of Lebanon” (vv. 15e.f.g) is the separate proverb combining the fable with v. 15e (וְאִם־אֵין). This proverb was added to the fable because of the common theme of the thorn tree – in fact, the cedars do not fit the fable in any way. Both a thorn bush and a cedar of Lebanon appear also in parallel short biblical fable in 2 Kgs 14:9 (par. 2 Chr 25:18) which strengthens the assumption of independence of Judg 9:15f.g. It should be also noted that the “moral” of the fable in vv. 16-20 refers almost exclusively to the “moral” in vv. 15f.g.

At this level, one can observe a perfect analogy between vv. 15e.f.g and vv. 20a.b.c. It is a syntactic parallelism with the pattern [A] – [B] – [C] // [A'] – [B'] – [C'].

[A]	וְאִם־אֵין	v. 15e
[B]	תֵּצֵא אֵשׁ מִן־הָאֶטָד	v. 15f
[C]	וְתֹאכַל אֶת־אֲרָזֵי הַלְּבָנוֹן:	v. 15g
[A']	וְאִם־אֵין	v. 20a
[B']	תֵּצֵא אֵשׁ מֵאֲבִימֶלֶךְ	v. 20b
[C']	וְתֹאכַל אֶת־בְּעֲלֵי שָׂקָם וְאֶת־בֵּית מְלוּא	v. 20c

[A] and [A'] are an identical forms of the conjunction introducing a conditional sentence with the negative particle (וְאִם־אֵין). Particle אֵין occurs here without a personal suffix. וְאִם־אֵין means “if it be not so”, “if it be not the case”.

[B] and [B'] are both apodosis of וְאִם־אֵין and have an almost identical wish/curse forms introduced by the same verb in the *yiqtol* form (תֵּצֵא). The subject is the same – fire (אֵשׁ). The difference is an indirect object. From this parallelism it follows that the thorn tree in vv. 16-20 refers to Abimelech: v. 15f (מִן־הָאֶטָד) // v. 20b (מֵאֲבִימֶלֶךְ).

[C] and [C'] mean *weyiqtol* form and continue wish/curse in future tense and volitive mood. Verses 15g and 20c begin with the identical *weyiqtol* form (וְתֹאכַל). The difference between the verses is the direct object introduced by the sign אֶת: v. 15g (אֶת־אֲרָזֵי הַלְּבָנוֹן) // v. 20c (אֶת־בְּעֲלֵי שָׂקָם וְאֶת־בֵּית מְלוּא).

Thus, through parallelism, the vv. 16-20 redactor interprets the cedars of Lebanon as the lords (לַעֲצֵי) of Shechem and Beth Millo. Verses 20d.e seem to have been added later to express the idea of retribution (like v. 19c).

v. 15e		but if not,
v. 15f	[Y] → [X]	let fire come out of the thorn tree
v. 15g		and devour the cedars of Lebanon.
v. 20a		but if not,
v. 20b	[Y] → [X]	let fire come out from Abimelech,
v. 20c		and devour the lords of Shechem and Beth Millo.

### 3 Poetics of Jotham's Speech (Judg 9:7g-20) in the Context of the Text Structure

As noted earlier, Jotham's statement consists of a short introduction, a fable, and a concluding speech. Their structure has already been discussed, but poetic elements contained in both the fable and the speech reveal further ways of organizing the text.

#### 3.1 Poetics of Jotham's fable in the context of the text structure

As for the fable, the BHS edits it as poetry<sup>19</sup>, but not the rest of the speech. According to Walter Gross, vv. 16-20 is more representative of prose, while in his opinion the fable (vv. 8-15) is presented as poetry<sup>20</sup>. This was noticed by Wilfred Watson, who sees in vv. 8-15 the determinants that classify the text as poetry: parallelisms in various forms, chiasmic patterns, and gender-matched parallelism<sup>21</sup>. Marco Adinolfi<sup>22</sup> has a similar opinion. Daniel Diffey<sup>23</sup> also speaks of the poetic nature of Jotham's fable. Karin Schöpflin<sup>24</sup> claims that if someone

<sup>19</sup> But BHQ does not. BHQ states that all three most important codices (*Leningradensis*, *Aleppensis* and *Cairensis*) consider Judg 9:8-15 as prose.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. GROSS, *Richter*, 487-488.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 47-48.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. ADINOLFI, *Originalità*, 328.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. DIFFEY, *Gideon's Response*, 250.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. SCHÖPFLIN, *Jotham's Speech*, 3.



does not consider it to be poetry, they must admit that it is at least very formalized prose. Thus, in this part of the work, the fable of Jotham will be discussed in terms of its poetic features.

### Chiasmus in Jotham's fable (vv. 8-15) – gender pattern

Jotham's fable contains a chiasmus based on the gender of the Hebrew names of trees<sup>25</sup>. One can infer through the ABB'A' pattern that the writer is also creating a 2+2 chiasmus (double masculine + feminine)<sup>26</sup>. Chiasmus is not confined to the couplet. W. Watson names it "chiasmus in long passages" and gives an example of a verse pattern in gender chiasmus combined with a refrain-like structure<sup>27</sup>:

vv. 8b.9a	A	masculine	olive tree	זֵית
vv. 10a.11a	B	feminine	fig tree	תְּאֵנָה
vv. 12a.13a	B'	feminine	vine	נֶפֶן
vv. 14a.15a.(15f)	A'	masculine	thorn tree	אֶטֶד

The word "vine" (נֶפֶן) can be both masculine and feminine in Hebrew. In the fable, it is feminine because a verb in the feminine appears at the beginning of v. 13 (וּתְאֵמָר). The choice of feminine gender for the vine seems to be not accidental, as it reveals the intention to create a chiastic structure. According to W. Watson, masculine/feminine patterns can also help divide a poem into stanzas in Hebrew poetry<sup>28</sup>. Other examples of the division of a poem into stanzas using a masculine/feminine pattern are given by this scholar in Jer 2:2-3 and Mic 7:8-10. The division of Jotham's fable into stanzas is as follows: introduction (Judg 9:8a); stanza I – olive tree (vv. 8b-10); stanza II – fig tree (v. 11); stanza III – vine (vv. 12-13); stanza IV – thorn tree (vv. 14-15a); conclusion (vv. 15b.c.d).

The primary function of chiasmus is to relieve the monotony of continuous parallelisms in poetry. However, at a higher level of text organization, chiasmus can serve as a structure that influences the overall shape of a poem or poetic subunit.

Referring to the chiasmus of Jotham's fable, W. Watson believes that, whether strophic or within a stanza, the chiasmus suggests that lines previously

<sup>25</sup> Cf. JANZEN, Gideon's house, 467.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. BAKER, *Hollow Men*, 85.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 206.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 164, 220.

considered as prose should be reclassified as a verse of poetry<sup>29</sup>. On this basis, he divides Jotham's fable into four stanzas. He notices that a chiasmic masculine/feminine pattern is used throughout the four stanzas, resulting in the following sequence: king – queen – queen – king<sup>30</sup>:

([מְלֹכָה] מְלֹכָה) v. 8c // (מְלִכִי) v. 10c // ([מְלִכִי] מְלֹכָה) v. 12c // (מְלִיךָ) v. 14c

[A]	m	[מְלֹכָה] מְלֹכָה	to be king (m.)	v. 8c
[B]	f	מְלִכִי	to be king (f.)	v. 10c
[A']	f	[מְלִכִי] מְלֹכָה	to be king (f.)	v. 12c
[B']	m	מְלִיךָ	to be king (m.)	v. 14c

The four stanzas follow the chiasmus according to the masculine/feminine pattern. Each of the four stanzas has two strophes: searching for a new candidate, and the candidate's answer. The answer of the thorn tree is included in the ending of the fable. The first strophe of each stanza contains the same kind of X – Y – X chiasmus, where Y stands for the king and X stands for each of the successive candidates.

Stanza	X	Y	X
Stanza I	olive v. 8b	to king (m.) v. 8c	olive v. 9a
Stanza II	fig tree v. 10a	to king (f.) v. 10c	fig tree v. 11a
Stanza III	vine v. 12a	to king (f.) v. 12c	vine v. 13a
Stanza IV	thorn tree v. 14a	to king (m.) v. 14c	thorn tree v. 15a

### The split-member chiasmus in v. 8a and v. 15b

R. Boling underlines the similarity of the verses 8a and 15b, respectively marking the beginning and end of the original fable<sup>31</sup>. In v. 15, the sequence of the second and third elements is changed. This forms a kind of chiasmus that creates a sandwich structure (inclusion) surrounding the trees' dispute. The chiasmus has the very interesting structure of A – (B – C) // A' – (C' – B'). The

<sup>29</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 52; WATSON, *Traditional Techniques*, 356-357.

<sup>30</sup> Semilar "king-queen" pattern is clearly visible in the Book of Esther: 5:3.6.8; 7:2.3; 8:5.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. WEBB, *The Book of Judges*, 276; BOLING, *Judges*, 173.

theory of biblical poetry refers to this as a split-member chiasmus<sup>32</sup>. In the table below, [A] denotes the topic of anointing (משח), [B] denotes the wording עליהם, and [C] denotes king (מלך). This is also marked in the table below for subsequent pairs.

- v. 8a                    מלך עליהם למשח    הלוד הלוכו העצים למשח    to anoint – over them – a king
- v. 15b                  אם באמת אתם משחים אתי למלך עליכם    anointing – a king – over you

### The refrain-like structure in the first strophe of each stanza

“You come and be KING/QUEEN over us” forms part of the refrain-like structure in the first strophe of each stanza. There is parallelism of imperatives between the stanzas. The refrain-like structure that W. Watson speaks of<sup>33</sup> is present in vv. 8c.10c.12c.14c in the trees’ call to come and reign.

מלזכה [מלכה] עלינו:    | |    v. 8c

לכי-את    | |    v. 10b

מלכי עלינו:    | |    v. 10c

לכי-את    | |    v. 12b

מלזכי [מלכי] עלינו:    | |    v. 12c

לך אתה    | |    v. 14b

מלך-עלינו:    | |    v. 14c

It must be noted that what does not occur in v. 8 and what does occur in the corresponding verses in vv. 10b.12b.14b is the preceding call “come you!” (הלך). This gives a poetic anaphoric<sup>34</sup> expression that connects with vv. 10.12.14 through the similarity of “to go” (הלך) and “to reign” (מלך). However, it only appears in the case of the fig tree, the vine, and the thorn tree:

<sup>32</sup> A similar structural chiasmus can be observed e.g. in Prov 7:21 or Ps 7:17, and also, interestingly, at the level of the letters eg. in the model (A – B) – C // (B’ – A’) – C’ in Isa 61:3: פאר תחת אפר. Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 203.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 206.

<sup>34</sup> Anaphora is an identical opening of cola or higher-level textual units. Cf. FOKKELMAN, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 225.

v. 10b	לְכִי	qal impv. 2 f. sg.	fig tree	f
v. 12b	לְכִי	qal impv. 2 f. sg.	vine	f
v. 14b	לְךָ	qal impv. 2 m. sg.	thorn tree	m

The trees do not encourage the olive tree to come in v. 8. Perhaps the *paragoricum* was used to express the trees' polite request at the beginning, but after the first refusal they were no longer as polite as they were initially. This may explain their desperation in the final choice of the thorn tree.

### Syntax merismus (Niccacci's "merismo aspettuale")

The parallelism of the second strophes of stanzas I – II – III has interesting internal parallelism. At the beginning of vv. 9b.11b.13b, the phrase *הֲחִדְדִּיתִי* (adv. interrog. הֲ + qal perf. 1 c. sg. of *חָדַל*)<sup>35</sup> can always be found, which as the anteriority of the future means "Should I have to give up?" At the beginning of vv. 9c.11c.13c, *וְהִלְכֶתִי* is always found, which as *weqatal* is interpreted as the future indicative.

According to Niccacci-Geiger's syntax, the action taken in vv. 9c.11c.13c is set in the foreground. However, if these passages are treated as poetry, then the merismus device in Niccacci's syntax, *merismo aspettuale*, can be applied<sup>36</sup>. Therefore, in relation to the future, *qatal* means an action prior to *weqatal*. *Qatal* and *weqatal* can be placed in the future axis, and then *qatal* expresses anteriority (like *futurum exactum*). One could then translate *הֲחִדְדִּיתִי* as "Should I have to give up (my product)?" In fact, *qatal* in a surprised question in vv. 9b.11b.13b can be explained as a case of the future perfect<sup>37</sup> – the possibility of doing an action that will be a condition for a future action<sup>38</sup>.

### Parallelism in the second strophe of stanzas

The parallelism between the second strophe of stanzas I – II – III is very interesting. It includes a response by each candidate for king. The parallelism is not visible in the last stanza, number IV, because the answer of the thorn tree belongs to the end of the fable and contains its moral, which, in order to be

<sup>35</sup> Also verbal stem *hophal* has been considered in this text by some scholars as contracted with the interrogative adverb. Cf. BDB, 293.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. NICCACCI, *Sintassi*, 232-271.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. GKC, § 112.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. KUGEL, *Biblical Poetry*, 32.

noticed, must be different from the earlier statements. The parallelism is clearly visible in the structure of each of these statements in stanzas I – II – III, which can be abbreviated as “Should I have to give up my x and will I come to wave over the trees?” where x is the product of each tree. There is parallelism between vv. 9b-b<sup>2</sup>.11b.13b and between vv. 9c.11c.13c, in which each of these verses is identical:

$$\text{vv. 9b-b}^2 // \text{v. 11b} // \text{v. 13b} \\ \text{v. 9c} = \text{v. 11c} = \text{v. 13c}.$$

## Stanza I

הַחֲדַלְתִּי	אֶת־דְּשָׁנִי	*		v. 9b
אֱלֹהִים וְאֲנָשִׁים	אֶשְׁר־בִּי יִכְבְּדוּ			v. 9b <sup>2</sup>
	וְהִלַּכְתִּי לְנוּעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים:			v. 9c

## Stanza II

הַחֲדַלְתִּי	אֶת־מִתְקֵי	וְאֶת־תְּנוּבַת־יְהוּדָה	*		v. 11b
	וְהִלַּכְתִּי לְנוּעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים:			v. 11c	

## Stanza III

אֱלֹהִים וְאֲנָשִׁים	הַמְשַׁמַּח	אֶת־תִּירוּשֵׁי	הַחֲדַלְתִּי	*		v. 13b
						v. 13c

A comparison can be made between the meaning of vv. 9b-b<sup>2</sup> and v. 13b, where there was no need to introduce a conjunction because of the participle (הַמְשַׁמַּח).

One can also observe the chiasmic structure A – B – A’ between vv. 9b-b<sup>2</sup>.11b.13b because the phrase (אֱלֹהִים וְאֲנָשִׁים) appears in v. 9b<sup>2</sup> and v. 13b, while in v. 11b it does not.

A	v. 9b	אֱלֹהִים וְאֲנָשִׁים
B	v. 11b	
A’	v. 13b	אֱלֹהִים וְאֲנָשִׁים

It must be noted that the product of each tree is masculine, which introduces another gender parallelism. Only the second product of the fig tree is feminine. In the text, the possessive suffix of 1 person singular is added to each of the products.

olive (m)	(m) דְּשָׁנִי	
fig tree (f)	(m) מִתְקֵי	(f) תְּנוּבָה
vine (f)	(m) תִּירוּשֵׁי	

### **Antithesis parallelism in the composite structure of Jotham's fable (vv. 8-15)**

In his study, Jože Krašovec points out that there are both shorter and longer antitheses in associations: term // counter-term, sentence // counter-sentence, strophe // counter-strophe, scene // counter-scene. The poetic device of antithesis can be a higher unifying principle to create a composite structure<sup>39</sup>:

Stanza [I]	olive oil	it anoints the skin/body
Stanza [II]	fig	it feeds the body
Stanza [III]	wine	it waters the body
Stanza [IV]	thorn	it wounds the skin/body

This type of unifying structure using antithesis can be observed in the chiasmus of Jotham's fable. It can be considered on the basis of gender pattern (as was shown earlier), as well as on the basis of antithesis. Stanza I and stanza IV create an antithesis in which the first product of the tree (olive oil) heals the skin and the second product (thorn) cuts the skin. The first product anoints the body, while the second product damages the body.

Stanza II and stanza III contain a slightly different antithesis – the first product feeds the body (fig), and the second product waters the body (wine). The tables below summarize these parallelisms:

Stanza [I]	olive oil	it anoints the skin/body
Stanza [IV]	thorn	it wounds the skin/body
Stanza [II]	fig	it feeds the body
Stanza [III]	wine	it waters the body

### **Asyndetic connection between verses**

Thus far, no general theory of poetry or holistic approach has been developed, and similarly there is no such theory for Hebrew poetry. However, there are certain common features that make up the cohesive character of poetic techniques. One such feature is asyndeton (omitting the conjunction between clauses)<sup>40</sup>, found between v. 10b and v. 10c, v. 12b and v. 12c and v. 14b and v. 14c.

The examined text of the fable displays many poetic characteristics. The boundaries of the fable are marked by the split-member chiasmus in v. 8a and

<sup>39</sup> Cf. KRAŠOVEC, *Antithetic Structure*, 139

<sup>40</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Traditional Techniques*, 22.

v. 15b, while its main part is formed by the masculine/feminine pattern within vv. 8-15. Additionally, this masculine/feminine pattern is interwoven by the refrain-like structure in the first strophe of each stanza. The same time there is the antithesis parallelism of products of the trees: olive oil – thorn and fig – wine. What is more, the syntax merismus lends a poetic character. One can also observe asyndetic connection between verses and the parallelism in the second strophe of stanzas which underlines the poetic features of the text.

### **3.2 *The poetics of Jotham's speech in the structure of Judg 9:16-20***

The poetics of vv. 16-20, in contrast to vv. 8-15, are expressed primarily through antithetic parallelism in vv. 17-18 and vv. 19-20. Antithesis is much more characteristic of poetry than prose, which describes events and comparisons sequentially and thus uses synonymy more often; poetry, on the other hand, expresses thoughts through parataxis and sudden transitions and thus favors opposites<sup>41</sup>. Antithetic parallelisms in Holy Scripture are innumerable, especially in Proverbs 10–29. In his study, J. Krašovec quotes biblical units of all sizes that are clearly antithetic. He also notes the presence of antithetic parallelisms in Judg 9:17-18 and vv. 19-20. The symbol // below designates the antithetic relationship within single units of antithesis<sup>42</sup>: v. 17 // v. 18; v. 19 // v. 20.

V. 17 describes how Jotham's father risked his life fighting to defend the inhabitants of Shechem and finally rescued them, an act for which he was "rewarded" by the Shechemites through rebellion, the murder of his descendants, and the selection of the murderer of his sons as king, described in the antithesis of v. 18.

v. 17a	$\alpha 1$	for my father had fought for you,
v. 17b	$\alpha 2$	and he risked his life,
v. 17c	$\alpha 3$	and rescued you from the hand of Midian;
v. 18a	$\beta 1$	but you rose up against my father's house that day,
v. 18b	$\beta 2$	and you killed his sons, seventy men on one stone,
vv. 18c.18d	$\beta 3$	and you made Abimelech, the son of his slave woman, king over the lords of Shechem, because he was your brother

<sup>41</sup> Cf. KRAŠOVEC, *Antithetic Structure*, 140.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. KRAŠOVEC, *Antithetic Structure*, 124.

V. 19, which speaks of joy, is contrasted with v. 20, which speaks of destruction. The antithesis v. 19 // v. 20 is additionally constructed on the basis of the chiasmus A – B – B' – A':

A the joy of the lords of Shechem because of Abimelech //  
 B the joy of Abimelech because of the lords of Shechem  
 //  
 B' fire from Abimelech will devour the lords of Shechem and Beth Millo //  
 A' fire from the lords of Shechem and from Beth Millo will devour  
 Abimelech

lords of Shechem → Abimelech	X → Y
Abimelech → lords of Shechem	Y → X
Abimelech → lords of Shechem	Y → X
lords of Shechem → Abimelech	X → Y

Moreover, the antithesis v. 19 // v. 20 includes parallelism based on retribution: [A] // [B] and [B'] // [A']. The topic of retribution is one of the main themes of Judg 9. One should also note the internal chiasmuses in each verse based on the direction of the transfer of joy in v. 19 and the direction of the transfer of destruction in v. 20:

v. 19: X → Y – Y → X

v. 20: Y → X – X → Y.

v. 19a			and if you have acted in truth and in integrity with Jerubbaal and with his house this day,
v. 19b	X → Y	A	rejoice in Abimelech,
v. 19c	Y → X	B	and let him also rejoice in you;
v. 20a			but if not,
v. 20b.c	Y → X	B'	let fire come out from Abimelech, and devour the lords of Shechem and Beth Millo
v. 20d.e	X → Y	A'	and let fire come out from the lords of Shechem and from Beth Millo, and devour Abimelech.

Antithetic parallelisms can be observed also in the main part of Jotham's speech (vv. 16-20). This seems to have been intended by the redactor of the text,



who furnished the second part of Jotham's statement with poetic features so that it would match the poetic character of the first part i.e. the fable.

### **3.3 Other poetic constructions and rhetorical figures in the structure of Judg 9:7g-20**

After discussing the morphological and syntactic levels, which build the basis for the interpretation of the text's structure, the next level is rhetoric. Therefore, in this part of the study, I will present the rhetorical figures contained in vv. 7g-20, which also influence its structure.

#### **The topic of kingship: Play on the word מֶלֶךְ in Jotham's speech**

The theme of kingship is certainly prominent in Judg 9, especially vv. 6-20. Throughout Jotham's speech, the root מֶלֶךְ occurs eight times (vv. 8bis.10.12.14.15.16.18). It also appears three times before Jotham's speech in v. 6 (וַיִּמְלִיכוּ אֶת-אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ לְמֶלֶךְ). This is a play on words and preparation for the special fable about choosing the king of the trees. These are the only appearances of a verb and noun with the stem מֶלֶךְ throughout Judg 9. As this stem appears in the name of the main character of Judg 9, Abimelech, whose name means "My father is king", this points to kingship as the main topic in the story<sup>43</sup>.

#### **Play on the word בַּעַל in Jotham's speech**

V. 15g and v. 20c contain a semantic parallelism. In the Middle East, the Lebanese cedar is the most natural, even proverbial, candidate for lord (בַּעַל) and king of the trees, just as the lion is the proverbial king of the animals<sup>44</sup>. Although cedars are mentioned at the end of the fable, they do not appear as candidate for king. What distinguishes the cedar from other trees in the fable is its lack of edible fruit. Even the thorn tree (*Ziziphus spina-christi*) produces small edible fruit. In this sense, the lords (בַּעַל) of Shechem who instigated the murder of Jotham's brothers are also fruitless.

The appearance of the word *baal* is an allusion that W. Watson indicates as a poetic device. Baal means husband or ruler, but can also refer to the god Baal. Watson would even tell his students to find this allusion in Judg 9: just as

<sup>43</sup> Cf. OESTE, *Legitimacy*, 132.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. MALY, *The Jotham Fable*, 302.

the cedar is the baal of the trees, so the rulers of Shechem are the baals of the city<sup>45</sup>. It is no coincidence that this word is used, as all of chapter 9 refers to the Baal worship common in Shechem and its temples (vv. 4.46). Moreover, Abimelech's name is also an allusion and a riddle because it means "my father is king" and his father's name is Jerubbaal, which contains the name of Baal. Therefore, v. 20c is a poetic allusion to the destruction of a foreign cult and its followers, which is exactly what happens to the inhabitants of Shechem in the temple of Baal in vv. 42-46 and to Abimelech in vv. 50-57.

### Play on words and assonance in v. 7g

The introduction to the fable and at the same time to the speech is a neat couplet beginning with the same verb שמע: **שָׁמְעוּ אֱלֹהֵי בְעֵלֵי שֶׁכֶם וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהֵיכֶם**: **אֱלֹהֵיכֶם**. At the same time, there are similar-sounding words **אֱלֹהֵיכֶם**, **אֱלֹהֵיכֶם** and **אֱלֹהֵיכֶם** which, through their assonance, give the impression of a word game.

### Alliteration in v. 8a

Edgar Jans<sup>46</sup> draws attention to the characteristic alliteration at the very beginning of the fable. In v. 8a the first three words begin with ה: **הַלֹּדֶף הִלְכוּ הָעֵצִים**.

### Play on words and assonance between **הַלֹּדֶף הִלְכוּ** in v. 8a and **בָּאֲמַת אֲתָם** in v. 15b

It should be added that the parallelism between 8a and 15b contains another common element: expressions using the verb "to come". Both phrases contain a play on words and assonance: in the case of v. 8b, it is the syntactic structure of the infinitive absolute + verb, while in v. 15b it is based on the surprising similarity of the words **בָּאֲמַת** and **אֲתָם**.

v. 8a                    **הַלֹּדֶף הִלְכוּ הָעֵצִים לְמַשַׁח עָלֵיהֶם מֶלֶךְ**

v. 15b                    **אִם בָּאֲמַת אֲתָם מְשַׁחִים אֶתִּי לְמֶלֶךְ עָלֵיכֶם**

<sup>45</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 303.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. JANS, *Abimelech*, 145.

### Assonance between מִשַׁח in vv. 8a.15b and שָׂמַח in vv. 13b.19b

Vv. 8a.15b contain the only appearance of the verb “to anoint” (מִשַׁח) in the Book of Judges. The word מִשַׁח (to anoint) in the abovementioned vv. 8a.15b sounds similar to שָׂמַח (to rejoice) in v. 13b (but also v. 19b)<sup>47</sup>. This poetic device is known as assonance.

### Assonance between imperatives of הֵלֵךְ in vv. 10b.12b.14b and מִלֵּךְ in vv. 10c.12c.14c

Additionally, in vv. 10bc.12bc.14bc one can observe the similarity between the 2 sg imperatives “to come” (הֵלֵךְ) and “to reign” (מִלֵּךְ), an example of the use of assonance. Perhaps a play on words based on similar sounds of words can explain why trees walk in the fable.

vv. 10bc	לְבִי	מְלִכִי
vv. 12bc	לְבִי	מְלוֹכִי [מְלִכִי]
vv. 14bc	לְדָךְ	מְלִדָךְ

### Assonance of הֲחִדְלִיתִי in vv. 9b.11b.13b and וְהִלַּכְתִּי in vv. 9c.11c.13c

The poetic device of assonance can be found in the similar sound of the words הֲחִדְלִיתִי and וְהִלַּכְתִּי. The verbs חָדַל and הֵלֵךְ are both in 1 sg, and the verbs in vv. 9b.11b.13b are preceded by the question particle הֲ.

### Merismus and polar word pairs in vv. 9.13 (אֱלֹהִים וְאָנָשִׁים) as poetic devices

The phrase “God(s) and men” (אֱלֹהִים וְאָנָשִׁים) could be a merismus, a poetic device that takes the form of opposites being used to express the whole in abbreviated form. Just as the expression “body and soul” stands for “the whole person”, “gods and people” means “the whole world”. The important point is that in merismus, regardless of form, it is not the individual elements that count, but rather what they symbolize together as a whole<sup>48</sup>.

The most abridged form of merismus is the use of polar word pairs (e.g. heaven // earth), that is, those which express the two extremes of one reality. The same is true of the example under discussion, in which “man” means the most

<sup>47</sup> Cf. O’CONNOR, Judges, 140.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 321.

important living being on earth, while “God” is the most important being in heaven<sup>49</sup>.

In the similarity of words אֱלֹהִים ~ אֲנָשִׁים, it is worth noting their intentional, poetic parallelism: the same number of letters and syllables, the same first – penultimate – final letters, and the same end-vowels: *holem* and *hireq*.

### Hendiadys (מֶתֶק and תְּנוּבָה) and metonymy (תְּנוּבָה) in v. 11b

The fig tree in v. 11b offers a double outcome: sweetness and a good product (אֶת־מֶתֶקִי וְאֶת־תְּנוּבָתִי הַטּוֹבָה)<sup>50</sup>. Since two nouns with similar meanings are juxtaposed, here one has the poetic device called hendiadys. It is an expression with two separate words, usually nouns joined by a conjunction to express a single but complex idea. This poetic device is very often used in biblical Hebrew<sup>51</sup>. An important aspect of hendiadys is that its components are no longer considered separately, but rather as a single combined unit.

It is worth noting that to emphasize the whole, two different kinds of terms are used: masculine (מֶתֶק) and feminine (תְּנוּבָה). This is an example of gender-matched hendiadys.

One should also note the appearance of the poetic device of metonymy in v. 11b through the use of the word מֶתֶק (sweetness in place of fruit). Metonymy is a figure of speech based on a shift in meaning: something is stated, but a broader or similar concept is meant, as when “the crown” is used to refer to the king<sup>52</sup>.

### Poetic proverb in vv. 15fg: Metrical pattern and personification

The cedars of Lebanon אֲרָזֵי הַלְבָּנוֹן appear at the end of v. 15g in a kind of proverb that matches the most frequent metrical pattern of proverbs, the 3-3 couplet<sup>53</sup>: וְתֹאכַל אֶת־אֲרָזֵי הַלְבָּנוֹן ◦ תִּצְאָ אֵשׁ מִן־הָאֵטָד. The expression “the fire will devour you” is an example of personification. Flame is often portrayed as

<sup>49</sup> Cf. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Manuale*, 106.

<sup>50</sup> Because of the ambiguity, Tg Judg 9:11 puts cake made of dried figs in place of the product (תְּנוּבָה) of the fig tree: “Shall I indeed give up my sweetness and my desirable cake of dried figs and go to exercise kingship over the trees?”. Cf. SMELIK, *Targum*, 523-524.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 324-325.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. FOKKELMAN, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 227.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. LINDARS, *Jotham Fable*, 359.

consuming an object like a person might consume food<sup>54</sup>. Fire is the biblical symbol of destruction, and in Jer 29:22 it is the image of destruction brought by the king.

### Irony as a poetic device, Oxymoron

In an ironic statement, the literal meaning is exactly the opposite of what should be understood. In the case of oral statements, an important role is played by the intonation of the voice and body gestures, which are indicative of ironic intentions<sup>55</sup>. In the case of written text, the most important thing is context. Judg 9 is an example of intense irony<sup>56</sup>, and this has already been described in many articles and studies, such as the book by L. Klein<sup>57</sup>. Irony can also be found in vv. 7-20.

According to W. Watson, the main effect of irony is to increase the distance between the speaker and the listener<sup>58</sup>, which in the case of Judg 9 is additionally expressed by the physical distance between the inhabitants of Shechem and Jotham, who proclaim his fable from the top or side of Mount Gerizim<sup>59</sup>.

Ann Vater Salomon<sup>60</sup> believes that because of its hidden irony, the fable is a satire on the kingship itself and was perhaps structured several hundred years after the events which it describes, possibly in the time of the exile. In this case, it would be intended to show the foolishness of kingship (*die Unsinnigkeit des*

---

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Lev 6:3; 10:2; 16:25; Num 16:35; Deut 4:24; 5:22; Judg 9:15; 1 Kgs 18:38; 2 Kgs 1:10.12.14; 2 Chr 7:1; Isa 5:24; 10:17; 30:27.30; 33:14; Amos 1:4.7.10.12.14; 2:2.5; 5:6.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 306-307.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. CROWN, *Reinterpretation*, 91. The irony can be noticed from the stupidity of the Shechemites, brothers of Abimelech, who should have learned from the massacre on the sons of Gideon how Abimelech treated his brothers. Cf. SCHIPPER, *Parables*, 25. One can find the irony in the description of Abimelech's attack on Shechem: the drunken and still hungover Gaal makes himself believe that the attacking army of Abimelech is a shifting shadow of a mountain (vv. 28.36). The irony of fate can be seen when Abimelech who killed 70 brothers on one stone was killed by a stone himself (vv. 5.53). It seems to be ironic that a woman who uses household appliances kills Abimelech the warrior, thus increasing his shame.

<sup>57</sup> KLEIN, *The Triumph*.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 307.

<sup>59</sup> R. Boling believes it was lower on the slope at a place called Tananir, about 300 meters from ancient Shechem. Cf. BOLING, *Bronze Age Buildings*, 103.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. VATER SALOMON, *Fable*, 121, 125.

*Königtums*)<sup>61</sup>. The moral would be that only a useless person (symbolized by the thorn tree) would ever accept the office of king. In v. 15d (“If you really anoint me king over you, come! Refuge under my shade!”), the moral contains a powerful dose of irony: the elected king offers something that he does not have – shade and protection<sup>62</sup>. This suggests the use of another poetic device – the oxymoron, i.e. the expressive combination of contradicting terms<sup>63</sup>. If the fruit trees realize that they were not designed for the role of kingship, should the thorn tree not come to the same realization even more quickly<sup>64</sup>? The fable may also have been intended to mock people who do not know how to choose the right king<sup>65</sup>.

The sequence in vv. 19-20 corresponds to the sequence of blessings and curses in the covenant in the Book of Deuteronomy. Deut 28:1-14 includes blessings, and vv. 15-44 includes curses<sup>66</sup>. One ought to note that according to God's command, the blessings were to be spoken from Mount Gerizim and the curses from Mount Ebal (cf. 27:12-13), with Shechem located between them. The reference to the words of this covenant explains the conditional clause in Jotham's exhortation.

Judg 9:19a “and if (אִם) you will really listen...” cf. Deut 28:1

Judg 9:20a “and if not (אִם־לֹא)...” cf. Deut 28:15

Barry Webb notes the evident irony contained in the formula of the blessing in Judg 9:19<sup>67</sup>. The irony is obvious because the crime is undeniable. The formula of the curse in Jotham's speech in v. 20 expresses the desire that Abimelech and the Shechemites become the cause of death for one another. The mutually destructive relationship and destructive anger of the two parties is prefigured at the end of the fable in vv. 15fg through the symbol of fire<sup>68</sup>. In v. 57, it is clear that this is directly interpreted by the narrator as a curse because the author uses the word קָלְלָהּ.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. KOGLER, *Bibellexikon*, 292.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. FRITZ, *Abimelech*, 140.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. FOKKELMAN, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 227. Presumoning Assyrian's *Sitz im Leben* of Jotham's fable, one can also find a poetic device of homophone. In Assirian, *šillu* (shadow, shade) has a near-homophone in *šillû*. Its meaning is “thorn”. Cf. BAKER, *Hollow Men*, 265.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. O'CONNELL, *The Rhetoric*, 165.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. O'CONNELL, *The Rhetoric*, 164.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. OESTE, *Legitimacy*, 114.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. WEBB, *The Book of Judges*, 274.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. HILL, *Non-Proverbial Wisdom*, 267; LINDARS, *Jotham Fable*, 356.

According to W. Watson, irony is also common in poetic idol polemics<sup>69</sup>, as is confirmed by statements against the baals of Shechem (cf. v. 20c), which in fact represent utterances *versus* the god Baal, who was worshiped in Shechem.

In Jotham's oration, one can find many poetic devices and rhetorical figures. Poetic constructions such as assonance, play on words, polar word pairs, merismus, metrical pattern, and irony allow thoughts and feelings to be expressed in a suggestive and original way.

## 4 Conclusion

The well-thought-out structure of Jotham's speech was reinforced with elements of poetry. The poetic devices presented in this study represent a high level of the art of eloquence, which serves to convey persuasive content. These units have a poetic character as indicated by structural characteristics such as division into stanzas and strophes, a refrain-like structure, parallelism between stanzas and strophes, a similar number of syllables in stanzas, three-and-four structure, triple structures, asyndetic connection, metrical pattern (3-3 couplet), structural chiasmus, split-member chiasmus, antithetic chiasmus, and gender pattern.

Moreover, poetic constructions and rhetorical figures strengthen the poetic character of Jotham's oration; these include anaphora, assonance, play on words, hendiadys, metonymy, merismus, polar word pairs, oxymorons, homophones, allusions, and ironic statements.

According to G. Fraser, "The difference between verse and prose or speech is not that verse has rhythm and prose and speech have not, but that in verse a rhythmical unit, the line, is superimposed upon the grammatical unit of all discourse, the sentence"<sup>70</sup>.

This seems to be the case with the text in question. The structure, well-thought-out parallelisms, and rhetorical devices used lead us to consider Judg 9:7g-20 as being akin to poetry lending a solemn tone to the words against the wrongdoer.

In my opinion, the author's idea for composing the speech in this way serves to present Jotham as a kind of prophet speaking the monologue, publicly revealing crimes and admonishing evildoers. Jotham's message contains

---

<sup>69</sup> Cf. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 311.

<sup>70</sup> FRASER, *Metre*, 1-2.

a prophecy also in the sense of announcing what will happen in v. 57. Additionally, the fight against the baals (of Shechem) is a kind of semantic game, as it evokes the image of prophets fighting the worship of Baal. In the prophetic biblical texts, the transition between prose and poetry is fluid, and poetry serves to evoke strong emotions that amplify the prophetic message. Therefore, Jotham in Judg 9 is the prototype of the prophet, just as Abimelech is the prototype of the king.

### Bibliography

- ADINOLFI, Marco: Originalità dell'apologo di Jotham (Giud. 9, 8–15), *RivBib* 7 (1959) 322-342.
- ALONSO SCHÖKEL, Luis: *Manuale di poetica ebraica* (BiBi 1). Translated by A. Nepi, Brescia: Queriniana, 1989.
- ÁLVAREZ BARREDO, Miguel: Abimelec: Paradigma de una actitud autónoma ante Dios. Estudio literario de Jue 9, *Car.* 17/1 (2001) 1-66.
- ASSIS, Elie: *Self-Interest or Communal Interest: An Ideology of Leadership in the Gideon, Abimelech and Jephthah Narratives (Judg 6–12)* (VTSup 106), Leiden – Boston (MA): Brill, 2005.
- BAKER, Robin: *Hollow Men, Strange Women: Riddles, Codes and Otherness in the Book of Judges* (BiInS 143), Leiden – Boston (MA): Brill, 2016.
- BLENKINSOPP, Joseph: Structure and Style in Judges 13–16, *JBL* 82/1 (1963) 65-76.
- BLUEDORN, Wolfgang: *Yahweh versus Baalism: A Theological Reading of the Gideon-Abimelech Narrative* (JSOTSup 329), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- BOLING, Robert: Bronze Age Buildings at the Shechem High Place: ASOR Excavations at Tananir, *BA* 32/4 (1969) 81-103.
- BOLING, Robert: *Judges. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (AB 7), Garden City – New York (NY): Doubleday & Company, 1975.
- BRETTLER, Marc Zvi: *The Book of Judges* (OTR), London – New York (NY): Routledge, 2001.
- BUTLER, Trent: *Judges* (WBC 8), Nashville (TN): Thomas Nelson Inc, 2009.
- CLIFTON, Bruno: Discerning the Literal Sense: Bringing together Biblical Scholarship and Dogmatic Theology, *NV* 19/1 (2021) 251-267.
- CROWN, Alan: A Reinterpretation of Judges IX in the Light of Its Humour, *AbrN* 3 (1962) 90-98.
- DIFFEY, Daniel: *Gideon's Response and Jotham's Fable: Two Antimonarchial Texts in a Pro-Monarchial Book?* Ph.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville (KY), 2013.
- DUBOVSKÝ, Peter: Fable-Metaphors in Judges 9 and 2 Kings 14: Tracing Ancient Metaphor-Mapping. In: Blažej Štrba – Miroslav Varšo (eds.): *Tvoje oči videli. Štúdie venované*



- Georgovi Braulikovi, OSB (StBiSlSup 5)*, Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 2021, 59-77.
- FOKKELMAN, Jan: *Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide*. Translated by I. Smit, Louisville (KY) – London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- FRASER, George: *Metre, Rhyme and Free Verse*, London: Routledge, 1970.
- FRITZ, Volkmar: Abimelech und Sichem in Jdc. ix, *VT* 32/2 (1982) 129-144.
- GEIGER, Gregor: *Text-linguistic Analysis: Appendix to “Biblical Hebrew Text Grammar”*, Jerusalem (forthcoming).
- GROSS, Walter: *Richter (HThKAT)*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder, 2009.
- GUNKEL, Hermann: *Das Märchen im Alten Testament (RV II 23/26)*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1917.
- HILL, Andrew: Non-Proverbial Wisdom. In: D. Brent Sandy – Ronald L. Giese (eds.): *Cracking Old Testament Codes: A Guide to Interpreting the Literary Genres of the Old Testament*, Nashville (TN): Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995, 255-280.
- IRWIN, Brian: Not Just Any King: Abimelech, the Northern Monarchy, and the Final Form of Judges, *JBL* 131/3 (2012) 443-454.
- JANS, Edgar: *Abimelech und sein Königtum: Diachrone und synchrone Untersuchungen zu Ri 9 (ATSAT 66)*, St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag Erzabtei St. Ottilien, 2001.
- JANZEN, David: Gideon’s house as the 708: A proposal for reading Jotham’s fable, *CBQ* 74/3 (2012) 465-475.
- JANZEN, Gerald: A Certain Woman in the Rhetoric of Judges 9, *JSOT* 38 (1987) 33-37.
- KLEIN, Lillian: *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges (JSOTSup 68)*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- KOGLER, Franz (ed.): *Herders neues Bibellexikon*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder 2008.
- KRAŠOVEC, Jože: *Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry (VTSup 35)*, Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- KUGEL, James: *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*, New Haven (NY) – London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- LINDARS, Barnabas: Jotham Fable – A New Form-Critical Analysis, *JTS* 24/2 (1973) 355-366.
- MALY, Eugene: The Jotham Fable – Anti-Monarchical?, *CBQ* 22/3 (1960) 299-305.
- MARTINS, Francisco: «Faut-il que nous soyons gouvernés par un roi ?». *Le fable des arbres (Jg 9,8-15) entre la satire et l’apologie*, *ETR* 93/2 (2018) 209-224.
- NICCACCI, Alviero: *Sintassi del verbo ebraico nella prosa biblica classica. Seconda edizione riveduta e ampliata a cura di Gregor Geiger (SBFA 88)*, Milano: Edizioni Terra Santa, 2020.
- O’CONNELL, Robert: *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges (VTSup 63)*, Leiden – New York (NY) – Köln: Brill, 1996.
- O’CONNOR, Michael: Judges. In: Raymond E. Brown – Joseph A. Fitzmyer – Roland E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, London – Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Geoffrey Chapman, 1990, 132-144.

- OESTE, Gordon: *Legitimacy, Illegitimacy, and the Right to Rule: Windows on Abimelech's Rise and Demise in Judges 9* (LHBOTS 546), London – New York (NY): T & T Clark, 2011.
- PENNA, Angelo: *Giudici e Rut*, Torino: Marietti, 1963.
- RICHTER, Wolfgang: *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* (BBB 18), Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag GmbH, 1963.
- SASSON, Jack: *Judges 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYB 6D), New Haven (CT) – London: Yale University Press, 2014.
- SCHIPPER, Jeremy: *Parables and Conflict in the Hebrew Bible*, New York (NY): Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- SCHÖPFLIN, Karin: Jotham's Speech and Fable as Prophetic Comment on Abimelech's Story: The Genesis of Judges 9, *SJOT* 18/1 (2004) 3-22.
- SMELIK, Willem (ed.), *The Targum of Judges* (OTS 36), Leiden – New York (NY) – Köln: Brill 1995.
- TSAMUDI, Yosef: המשל יותם והרטוריקה של המשל יותם, *BM* 29/3 (1984) 245-248.
- VATER SALOMON, Ann: Fable. In: George Coats (ed.): *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable: Narrative Forms in Old Testament Literature* (JSOTSup 35), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985, 114-125.
- WATSON, Wilfred: *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques* (JSOTSup 26), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985.
- WATSON, Wilfred: *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse* (JSOTSup 170), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- WEBB, Barry: *The Book of Judges* (NICOT), Grand Rapids (MI) – Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012.
- WHITMAN, Jon: Fable and Fact – Judging the Language of Scripture (Judges 9:8–15) from Antiquity to Modernity, *HTR* 113/2 (2020) 149-185.
- WONG, Gregory: *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study* (VTSup 111), Leiden – Boston (MA): Brill, 2006.

### Summary


Not only Jotham's fable (Judg 9:8-15), but his entire speech (9:7g-20) has poetic features. The main aim of the article is to establish the structural and rhetorical poetry characteristics in this text. The structural characteristics include the following: chiasmus (antithetic, structural, split-member), gender pattern, metrical pattern, refrain-like structure, and three-and-four pattern. The following poetic constructions and rhetorical figures give Jotham's oration a poetic character: anaphora, assonance, hendiadys, homophone, merismus, metonymy, oxymoron, parallelisms (syntactic and antithetical) play on words, and polar word pairs.

*Keywords:* Jotham's fable, Poetry, Parallelism, Chiasmus, Literary Devices.

*Zhrnutie*

Nielen Joatamova bájka (Sdc 9,8-15), ale celá jeho reč (9,7g-20) má poetické črty. Hlavným cieľom článku je predstrieť štruktúrne a rétorické poetické charakteristiky daného biblického textu. Štruktúrne charakteristiky zahŕňajú nasledovné: chiazmus (antitetický, štruktúrally, rozdvojený-člen), rodové vzory, metrické vzory, refrénovitu štruktúru a troj- a štvoritý vzor. Nasledovné poetické konštrukcie a rétorické figúry dodávajú Joatamovej reči poetický ráz: anafora, asonancia, hendiadys, homofón, merizmus, metonýmia, oxymorón, paralelizmus (syntaktický a antitetický), hra slov a významovo protichodné slovné páry.

*Kľúčové slová:* Joatamova bájka, poézia, paralelizmus, chiazmus, literárne prostriedky.

Tomasz Koszarek  
Stary Dom Polski – Old City  
Al Battikh 18  
P.O.B. 20256  
9120202 JERUSALEM, Israel  
koszarek.tomasz@gmail.com  
 0009-0009-6096-0111

# ἄγνοια in Wis 14:22

Lionel Goh Yeh Cheng

## Introduction

In the Book of Wisdom which extols the virtues and the necessity for wisdom, ignorance (ἄγνοια)<sup>1</sup> – its darker counterpart – lurks no less ubiquitously. Ignorance is important because it is diametrically opposed to the main subject matter of the book. It serves to accentuate wisdom by means of contrast. This antithetical pair wisdom-ignorance occurs as a theme throughout the book, in a more prolonged and sustained manner than the rhetorical figure of *synkrisis* in Wis 10–19<sup>2</sup>. While wisdom has been the subject of numerous studies, ignorance (ἄγνοια) on the other hand has not received as much attention.

ἄγνοια occurs twice in the Book of Wisdom (14:22 and 17:12). While 17:12 ἄγνοια means a lack of knowledge or information, the context of 14:22 suggests that the same word occurring here means more than that. Maurice Gilbert noted that all commentators agree that the meaning of “knowledge of God”<sup>3</sup> (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν, 14:22) is not simply a speculative knowledge<sup>4</sup>, hence its opposite – ignorance (ἄγνοια) – should likewise not refer to a lack of speculative knowledge. But what this exactly means has not been explained.

To ascertain the meaning of ἄγνοια in 14:22, a cursory look into the theme of ignorance will first be made, followed by a study of ἄγνοια in the LXX and in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Greek text of Wisdom is taken from ZIEGLER (ed.), *Sapientia Salomonis*, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> For references on the study of the *synkrisis* in Wisdom, see MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 261, n. 5. Though many scholars accept the number of these antithetical pairs (“diptychs”) as seven, others propose to read five, such as WRIGHT, *The Structure*, 165-184. Beyond this rhetorical device, there exist in the broader tapestry of the book other antithetical pairs of concepts/words occurring as motifs, such as pious and impious (see MCCASHEN, *The Impious*, 1-33), creation/life and death, good and evil (see SUN, *Flowers of Evil*, 108-121), light and darkness, etc.

<sup>3</sup> All English translations are taken from the NETS, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>4</sup> GILBERT, *La Connaissance*, 194.

Wisdom. A comparison with *ἀμαθία* follows, since both words occur in ancient Greek philosophy, sharing the same semantic field and at times used interchangeably. This comparison is based on the generally accepted viewpoint that the Book of Wisdom was influenced by Greek philosophy<sup>5</sup>. However far from subscribing to one particular school of thought, Wisdom appropriates a variety of philosophical traditions, without systematically developing these appropriations but instead creatively utilizing it in its Judaic framework and content<sup>6</sup>.

### Ignorance in the Book of Wisdom

The theme of ignorance occurs throughout the Book of Wisdom. In the first division<sup>7</sup> of the Book of Wisdom (Wis 1–6) the impious are presented as ignorant of the plans of God (4:17; 5:7), of the destiny of the pious man (3:2; 5:4), and even ignorant of their own lives and fate (5:4.6). In the second section (Wis 7–9) the author as Solomon claims to be inferior in knowledge (*ἐλάσσων ἐν συνέσει*, 9:5) and is ignorant of wisdom as the bearer of all good things (*ἡγγόουν δὲ αὐτήν γενέτιν εἶναι τούτων*, 7:12). In the third section (Wis 10–19), idolaters and especially the Egyptians are disparagingly described as foolish and ignorant (11:15; 12:24; 15:5.14.18; 17:8; 18:19; 19:3.14).

---

<sup>5</sup> All recent commentaries acknowledge and dedicate parts of its study to the Greek and philosophical influences on the Book of Wisdom, for example VILCHEZ-LINDEZ, *Sapienza*, 76-85; WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 25-58, 279; MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 36-40; SCHMITT, *Weisheit*, 8-10; CONTI, *Sapienza*, 38-41; BIZZETTI, *Sapienza*, 124-153, who studies in greater detail the literary influences of the Greek and Roman classics. To these are also articles such as the collection of essays in GILBERT, *La Sapienza di Salomone*; and more specific studies such as LANGE, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 293-302; STERLING, *The Love of Wisdom*, 198-213; and BARRIER, *Middle Platonism*, 122-130 just to name a few.

<sup>6</sup> Sterling's study of how Wisdom used philosophical traditions and his pertinent description of this process as "dialectical appropriation... that subordinates and transforms" (STERLING, *The Love of Wisdom*, 212-213) is particularly helpful.

<sup>7</sup> The tripartite division of the Book of Wisdom is generally accepted by modern scholars. However, the exact limits regarding where the verses end or begin the sections, vary from author to author. For a study of the various proposals to the division of this section, and the justification of a tripartite division, see GILBERT, *La Critique*, 245-257.

Typical of the style of Wisdom, the author employs a variety of words within the semantic field of “ignorance” to carry the message across<sup>8</sup>. The author does not restrict himself to any particular term such as ἄγνοια which only occurs twice (14:22 and 17:12). The other words used include those that denote lack of knowledge and incapacity to know (ἄγνοια, 14:22; 17:12; ἀγνοέω, 5:12; 7:12; 12:10; 14:18; 15:11; 18:19; 19:14; ἀγνωσία, 13:1; ἀσύνετος, 1:5; 11:15), but also words that connote the result of this lack of knowledge, namely foolishness (ἄφρων, 1:3; 3:2.12; 5:4; 12:24; 14:11; 15:5.14; ἀφροσύνη, 10:8; 12:23), and stupidity (μάταιος, 13:1; 15:8; ἄνοια, 15:18; 19:3). There is also the negation or negative use of σοφία (3:11), ἐπιγινώσκω (5:7; 13:1), σύνεσις (9:5), φρονέω (14:13), οἶδα (13:1) and νοέω (4:14.17). They occur in all three parts of the book, although notably less in the second section which is the eulogy to wisdom (Wis 6–9)<sup>9</sup>. More importantly in the style of Wisdom, ignorance is also conveyed in descriptive narratives and authorial comments without recourse to specific words like ἄγνοια.

Whether it is the state of ignorance or the consequence of this state, both of which the author perceives as one indivisible reality, the Book of Wisdom weaves its discourse through comment, diatribe, sarcasm and exhortation so as to persuade its readers to embrace wisdom by contrasting it with ignorance.

While ignorance is found throughout the Book of Wisdom, of particular interest to our study is the digression Wis 13–15<sup>10</sup> where ἄγνοια occurs in 14:22.

---

<sup>8</sup> The same can be noted for “wisdom” and “knowledge,” where various Greek words of the same semantic field are employed. KOLARCIK, *The Ambiguity*, 36 noted the use of many synonyms in Greek for “death” (ἄδης, ἀπωλεία, ἔκβασις, ἔξοδος, θάνατος, ὄλεθρος, τέλος) which he accounts for deliberate ambiguity in meaning. He also cited a list of synonyms and antonyms of “justice” (KOLARCIK, *The Ambiguity*, 34). WITTE, *God and Evil*, 256 points to δικαιοσύνη and νόμος as synonyms for Torah. All these lists clearly mark the style of Wisdom. Studies on Wisdom that are published in modern languages often use one word to translate many different words used in the original Greek, hence at times giving a false impression that only one Greek word is being referred to.

<sup>9</sup> GILBERT, *La Connaissance*, 197.

<sup>10</sup> The identification of Wis 13–15 as a literary unit in the form of a digression is generally accepted by modern scholars. See MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 260, 322; CONTI, *Sapienza*, 159; GILBERT, *La Critique*, xvii; SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, 148; SISTI, *Sapienza*, 314. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 11 calls it an excursus, while SCHMITT, *Weisheit*, 8 calls it an interpolation (“Einschaltung”).

## Ignorance in Wis 13–15

Wisdom 13–15 is identified as a literary unit that deviates from the main topic of wisdom’s role in the Exodus; a digression expounding idolatry as a manifestation of ignorance, which is the antithesis of wisdom<sup>11</sup>. This ignorance is manifested, not resulted, in idolatry. The digression opens with the “ignorant” (μάταιοι, 13:1) who do not know God and it closes with the “most foolish” (ἀφρονέστατοι, 15:14) whose “lack of intelligence” (ἄνοια, 15:18)<sup>12</sup> imply their ignorance of God by worshipping idols.

This unit can be divided into three sections (13:1-9; 13:10-15:13; 15:14-19)<sup>13</sup>. Each section describes a group of idolaters worse than the preceding one. The first type of idolaters in 13:1-9 can be described as nature worshippers. Awed by nature’s “power and working” (δύναμιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν, 13:4) and “greatness and beauty” (μεγέθους καὶ καλλονῆς, 13:5), these people consider creatures as gods and worship them. The author of Wisdom calls these idolaters “foolish by nature” (μάταιοι... φύσει). They are excusable for their mistaken beliefs, though not entirely. This group of people demonstrates the ignorance of those who cannot distinguish between the creator and the created cosmos<sup>14</sup>.

The second type of idolaters is treated in great detail from 13:10 to 15:13. They are accused of worshipping things that they have created with their own hands. The reason for this is either to remember of some person’s life or seeking benefits in life. This earns the author’s scorn and disdain because the object of worship is itself a lifeless product of human invention in contrast to the human it is meant to represent or the life it is meant to protect. The example of a woodworker is firstly employed. The extent of this ludicrous situation is expressed in the explanation of the origin of idolatry (14:12-21). This leads to a

<sup>11</sup> MCGLYNN, *Divine Judgement*, 132.

<sup>12</sup> While ἄνοια means stupidity, folly and/or lack of understanding (HTLS, s.v. ἀνόητος, ἄνοια, ἄνοος, 792-794), here it means the lack of knowledge (or relationship, see HTLS, s.v. ἀνόητος, ἄνοια, ἄνοος, 792-794) of God but not a lack of skill knowledge, since the potter in 15:7-17 is capable of creating objects comparable to those of gold, silver and bronze, and quite adept in making a profit (v. 12); and the painter (vv. 5.9) is capable of stirring the passions of men by his coloring; but both contrast with the righteous in vv. 2-3 because they do not know God (v. 11), nor God’s might or know that they do not belong to God.

<sup>13</sup> MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 323-326, has studied the literary structures that justify these three units; hence I will not deal with it in this paper.

<sup>14</sup> WITTE, *God and Evil*, 264.

more somber note describing the evil of such foolishness bearing upon human society (14:22-31). It is here that ἄγνοια is used in the phrase the “great war of ignorance.” The mocking disdain for idolaters is reprised in 15:7-13 with the example of the potter. Throughout this section, the idolaters of manmade images are scoffed for their folly not by use of any specific word but by the description of their actions, attitudes and choices. This is unmistakably conveyed in the antithetical statements regarding the woodworker in 13:17-19 “for health he calls upon that which is weak, for life he prays to that which is dead”, and in respect to the potter in 15:8 “he molds a futile (μάταιον) god out of the same clay, he who a little before came into being out of the earth.” This group demonstrates the ignorance of those who cannot distinguish between God the giver of life and humanity’s created life<sup>15</sup>.

The third category consists of the Egyptians (15:14-19)<sup>16</sup>, the worst in the categories of idolaters because they commit zoolatry – the worship of animals. They are reviled in 15:18 as “most senseless”<sup>17</sup> (ἀφρονέστατος), “when compared for lack of intelligence (ἄνοια), they are worse than all others.” They demonstrate the ignorance of those who cannot distinguish between God the giver of life and lifeless objects and senseless animals<sup>18</sup>.

There is a progression of gravity<sup>19</sup> both in the nature of idolatry and ignorance in the three categories presented. Wis 13-15 amply illustrates ἄγνοια in 14:22 through its manifestation in idolatry.

Within this framework of Wis 13–15, ἄγνοια occurs in the phrase ἀγνοίας πολέμῳ in 14:22. Wisdom 14:22 together with 14:27, form an *inclusio* regarding the evil of idolatry<sup>20</sup>, with its central section (14:23-26) made up of the

<sup>15</sup> WITTE, *God and Evil*, 264.

<sup>16</sup> Although nameless in the text, it is acknowledged by scholars that this set of persons refer to the Egyptians as suggested by their association with zoolatry (cf. 11:15-16; 12:24-27; 16:1); a reference that is also addressed in other contemporaneous literature. See MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 298-299, 303, 370-372; SCARPAT, *Sapienza*, 2, 410-411; *Sapienza*, 3, 15; WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 231-233, 289-291; SCHMITT, *Weisheit*, 56, 68; SISTI, *Sapienza*, 293, 352-357; MCGLYNN, *Divine Judgement*, 165-166; GILBERT, *La Critique*, 225, 232-234, 238-243.

<sup>17</sup> My translation.

<sup>18</sup> WITTE, *God and Evil*, 265.

<sup>19</sup> Or conversely “a descending scale of sympathy” as MCGLYNN, *Divine Judgement*, 137 puts it.

<sup>20</sup> GILBERT, *La Critique*, 165.



“catalogue of vices”<sup>21</sup> that characterizes this evil. Each vice manifests an evil that is wrongly considered good. They are the τὰ τσσαῦτα κακά that illustrate the macabre designation as “peace” (εἰρήνην προσαγορεύουσιν). The moral depravity of these evil acts *per se* is not the point here, but rather its being construed as “peace” is. If its intrinsic moral aberration is appalling, how much more grotesque when it is considered good! This intensifies the idea of the “great war” that ἄγνοια engenders.

In Wis 14:22, ἄγνοια occurs immediately after the phrase “knowledge of God” (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν), forming an antithetical pair<sup>22</sup>. Both phrases present the two possible states of human life: one with the knowledge of God that brings peace (εἰρήνη, 3:2), and the other with ignorance that results in war. The ignorance of God was already introduced in 13:1 as θεοῦ ἀγνωσία hence it is not a new concept in Wis 14. This contrast of knowledge and ignorance of God was even earlier demonstrated in the first part of the book that recounts the encounter of the impious and the righteous (Wis 1–5)<sup>23</sup>. The knowledge of God is associated with the righteous (2:13) but the impious are ignorant and they perpetrate evils (2:10-20; 5:6-7).

From this context, it appears that ἄγνοια refers to an absence of information regarding God. Does it concord with its occurrences in other texts of the LXX, or does it mean something different?

---

<sup>21</sup> GILBERT, *La Critique*, 164 and later MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 352 call it a “catalogue of vices”. WINSTON, *Wisdom*, 280 refers to it as a catalogue of crimes. More appropriately the list is a partial sample of the evils that are deemed as peace. While most scholars refer to this list as the moral and social consequences of idolatry, the emphasis is rather on the unnatural and abhorrent confusion of these evils for peace.

<sup>22</sup> SISTI, *Sapienza*, 337; MAZZINGHI, *Wisdom*, 358. The theme of the knowledge of God has been well studied as noted by GILBERT, *La Connaissance*, 191-210.

<sup>23</sup> A literary device coined by REESE, *Hellenistic Influence*, 123-140 as flashbacks or variously called by others as links, repetitions and echoes that serve to unite the book thematically.

## ἄγνοια in Wis 14:22 – the Problem

ἄγνοια does refer to a lack of knowledge or information<sup>24</sup> in the LXX. More specifically, three times it is associated with the ignorance about God<sup>25</sup>, as ἄγνοια is used in 14:22. However, a more common meaning of ἄγνοια is employed in the LXX that refers to “an unwitting mistake”<sup>26</sup> of a ritual or legal nature “with a moral nuance”<sup>27</sup>. This definition of an inadvertent transgression is used 20 times<sup>28</sup> out of the total 28 occurrences of this word, showing its predominant definition. ἄγνοια in 14:22 appears to also fit this meaning as both ritual (idolatry) and moral (list of evils in 14:23-26) aspects are present. But is ἄγνοια an “unwitting mistake” devoid of wilfulness?

That ἄγνοια in 14:22 refers to a lack of knowledge can be inferred from previous chapters of Wisdom, such as in 2:22 when the impious are said to not know (οὐκ ἔγνωσαν) the mysteries of God; in 5:7 they did not know (οὐκ ἔγνωμεν) the way of the Lord; also, in 5:12 the infinitive ἀγνοῆσαι designates the impious’ absence of knowledge regarding the path of an arrow; and in 7:12 when Solomon declares he did not know (ἠγνόουν) wisdom was the bearer of good things. The verses that lead up to 14:22 also express such a paucity of knowledge or information, e.g. 12:10 when God was not ignorant (οὐκ ἀγνοῶν) of the Canaanites’ evil origins; 12:27 “they saw and recognized as the true God the one whom before they denied knowing,” that expressing a wilfulness in ignorance; 13:1 “[A]ll human beings who were ignorant of God”; 13:3 “Let them know how much better than these is the Sovereign Lord,” and in 14:18 the ignorant (ἀγνοοῦντας) are accused of promoting idolatry, because these perpetrators are ignorant (ἠγνόησεν, 15:11) of their creator. It is this meaning of ἄγνοια that 17:12

<sup>24</sup> Dan 4:30a.30cbis; 4 Macc 1:5; 2:24; Wis 17:12 and Ps.Sol. 18:4 in SWETE (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek*.

<sup>25</sup> See Dan 4:30a and 30cbis in SWETE (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek*, 532.

<sup>26</sup> HTLS 1, s.v. ἄγνοια, 118-119.

<sup>27</sup> GELS, s.v. ἄγνοια, 7.

<sup>28</sup> Gen 26:10; Lev 5:18, 22:14; 2Paraleipomenon 28:13; 1Esdras 8:75; 9:20; Ps 24:7; Ecc 5:5; Sir 23:3; 28:7; Ps.Sol. 3:8; 13:7; Ez 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; 46:20; Dan 6:5; 6:23; 9:16; and 1Kgs 14:24 with reference to a vow.

assumes whereby a lack of knowledge or information regarding the cause of torments (τὴν βάσανον αἰτίας)<sup>29</sup> becomes a bane and a lamentable misfortune.

However, if ἄγνοια were merely the lack of knowledge or the incapacity to know, then the erroneous identification of evil for peace would not be a malicious, willful act but instead is an excusable fault that does not warrant the vigorous censure of the author in the verses and chapter following 14:22. Gilbert’s remark mentioned at the beginning of this article stands; if knowledge means more than speculative knowledge, then wisdom’s antithesis, ἄγνοια, must also mean more than an absence or deficiency of the same.

It becomes apparent when ἄγνοια in 14:22 is understood within the many examples that show that it is more than just a simple absence of intelligence and information, or the capacity thereof. Ignorance is not an abstraction but an incarnation of actions, choices, conduct and attitudes. It entails something more than a mere negation of wisdom. The following examples point to it: The “foolish by nature” (μάταιοι φύσει, 13:1) are capable of recognizing, in the sense of coming to realization. In 13:9 “they had the power to know (εἰδέναι) so much that they could investigate the world”. They are also capable of fine craftsmanship (εὐμαθῶς, 13:11), even striving to outdo goldsmiths and silversmiths (15:9). The carpenter is skilful (13:11) with “experienced knowledge”<sup>30</sup> (ἐμπειρία συνέσεως, 13:13)<sup>31</sup>. Wisdom 15:4 speaks of human skill although perverted (κακότεχνος ἐπίνοια, 15:4). In the first five chapters of the book, the impious who are condemned as foolish or ignorant, are capable of “journey through trackless wastes” (5:7) thus demonstrating skill and knowledge; of reasoning albeit “not rightly” (οὐκ ὀρθῶς, 2:1; ἐλογίσαντο, 2:21; 3:10); of planning their lives (2:2-9); even capable of recognizing their errors (5:4-13).

These descriptions do not reveal a lack of knowledge or skill, nor a deficiency in cognitive capabilities. On the contrary these people are wise inasmuch as they possess reason and skill in various degrees. The impious are in fact wise. In 2:22 they “neither hope for a reward for holiness; nor discern

<sup>29</sup> So SCHMITT, *Weisheit*, 75; CONTI, *Sapienza*, 192; VILCHEZ-LINDEZ, *Sapienza*, 502. WINSTON, *Wisdom*, 302 considers ἄγνοια to be linked to πλείονα λογίζεται (“ignorance of greater concern”). SCARPAT, *Sapienza* 3, 225 does not translate ἄγνοια at all.

<sup>30</sup> My translation.

<sup>31</sup> So RAHLFS – HANHART (eds.), *Septuaginta* which follows the corrected text in S, noted by Zeigler (Wis 13:13.140). Zeigler himself prefers the earlier reading ἀνέσεως following BS\*A.

recompense for blameless souls.” It is not that they are unaware of a reward for holiness and a blameless life, but rather they despise/reject (ἐξουθενῶν, 3:11) such a possibility. It is a refusal to know. Indeed, the ignorance of God in 13:1 is explained in the previous verse as a deliberate refusal to know or denial in knowing (ἤρνοῦντο εἰδέναι, 12:27), and not a simple lack of information regarding God. The author of Wisdom judges this claim as foolishness in 3:1-12. What then is ἄγνοια to mean in 14:22?

At this point it is necessary to mention that the distinction and incompatibility between skill knowledge and a higher knowledge of ethical values that Socrates makes<sup>32</sup>, is not applicable in the Book of Wisdom because from Wis 13:9 the author claims that skill knowledge can lead to the higher knowledge, which is God.

Ἄγνοια differs therefore from its popular usage in the LXX mentioned at the beginning of this section because it does not simply mean a lack of knowledge or an absence of wilfulness in 14:22. To further elucidate its meaning in 14:22, ἄγνοια will now be compared with ἀμαθία that belongs to the same semantic field, used in some Platonic and Stoic works.

### Ἀμαθία as Ignorance

The pair of wisdom-ignorance features quite prominently in ancient philosophic discourse. One needs only to recall Socrates’ constant claim to ignorance, which was ironically his wisdom; and later neoplatonic discussion of it.

In *Alcibiades* 1.118a Socrates declares αὕτη ἄρα ἡ ἄγνοια τῶν κακῶν αἰτία καὶ ἡ ἐπονείδιστος ἀμαθία “Then this ignorance is a cause of evils, and is the discreditable sort of stupidity”<sup>33</sup>, a phrase that reflects Wis 14:22 in expressing ignorance as the source of evil. Later, Epictetus according to Arrian’s *Discourses* would also echo this idea: ἐξ ἐκείνου πάντα τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ ἀτυχήματα παρὰ ταύτην τὴν ἄγνοιαν γεγένηται<sup>34</sup>. In the phrase uttered by Socrates above, an

<sup>32</sup> Socrates distinguishes ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία which he claims he possesses (*Apology* 20d) – a debased form of knowledge that consists of skills and crafts, from another higher form of knowledge of ethics and virtues that he advocates everyone to attain. Despite his claim to ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία, Socrates insists he is ignorant; see BETT, Socratic Ignorance, 220.

<sup>33</sup> PLATO, *Alcibiades* I.118a (LCL 201, 154).

<sup>34</sup> ARRIAN, *Discourses* II.xxiv.20 (LCL 131, 426).

interesting word is used: *ἀμαθία*. Socrates in this section of the dialogue, tries to lead Alcibiades to the realization that the latter was not merely lacking knowledge (*ἄγνοια*) but was “co-habiting” (*συνοικέω*) with *ἀμαθία* of the most extreme kind<sup>35</sup>; namely rendering “those who do not know but think they do”. Socrates restates this *ἀμαθία* directly to Alcibiades: “you are not only ignorant (*ἀγνοέω*) of the greatest things, but while not knowing them you think that you do?”<sup>36</sup> In this passage, *ἀμαθία* seems to be an extreme form of *ἄγνοια*. Both words denote ignorance but *ἀμαθία* entails a more profound and disturbing aspect. It is ignorance with delusions of wisdom. Alcibiades was no simpleton, certainly not ignorant in the sense of not having received an education or was mentally incapable of knowing. Ignorance here does not mean a lack of knowledge. He was a distinguished statesman and military general. Yet he could not possibly know everything that could be known in his world; but still, he thinks he does. The ignorance that Socrates accuses Alcibiades of is namely, despite having knowledge and information, he does not admit his limitations but deludes himself to be wise.

The *ἀμαθία*, as a severe form of *ἄγνοια*, is also attested and explicitly defined in the later work the *Sophist* 229b-c. The Eleatic Stranger elucidates to Theaetetus a great and severe form of ignorance different from “the others” that is named *ἀμαθία*. It is to think that one knows when in fact one does not know<sup>37</sup>. While *ἄγνοια* is a simple lack of information, *ἀμαθία* is “a serious form of illusion”<sup>38</sup> that “hinders us from being aware of our lack of knowledge”<sup>39</sup>. This description fits the ignorant people engaged in idolatry in Wis 13–15. As was shown above, the ignorant idolaters are not lacking knowledge, but rather illuded by their knowledge. By not acknowledging the limits of their knowledge, they believe to be doing the right thing, namely praying to idols. *ἄγνοια* in Wis 14:22b seems to acquire the meaning of *ἀμαθία*.

---

<sup>35</sup> PLATO, *Alcibiades* I.118c (LCL 201, 154).

<sup>36</sup> PLATO, *Alcibiades* I.118b (LCL 201, 154).

<sup>37</sup> PLATO, *Sophist* 229c (LCL 123, 310.312).

<sup>38</sup> CUSINATO, *At the Origins of Evil*, 226.

<sup>39</sup> CUSINATO, *At the Origins of Evil*, 205.

## Ἄμαθία as Double Ignorance

In the much later work of Plato, the *Laws*, IX.863c, ἀμαθία and ἄγνοια are used in the same phrase again. Here the Athenian Stranger demonstrates to Cleinias of Crete the third cause of sins, which is subdivided into two types; ἄγνοια – understood “in its simple form” as the lack of knowledge or information – and another “double” form in which ignorance of being ignorant is coupled with the “conceit of wisdom” (τὸ δὲ διπλοῦν, ὅταν ἀμαθαίνῃ τις μὴ μόνον ἀγνοῖα συνεχόμενος ἀλλὰ καὶ δόξῃ σοφίας)<sup>40</sup> meaning one does not know that one does not know but nevertheless imagines that he knows. Here a new aspect of ἀμαθία is expounded: a double ignorance. It is still considered as an intensification of ἄγνοια just like its meaning in *Alcibiades*. In the words of the Athenian Stranger, ἀμαθία is self-deception, by considering one’s ignorance as wisdom. The same idea is repeated in *Laws*, V.732: “τὸ τὴν ἀμαθίαν τὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ δοκεῖν σοφίαν εἶναι γέγονε πᾶσιν.”<sup>41</sup> Such a definition goes beyond the “simple form” of lack of knowledge that ἄγνοια means. As double ignorance, ἀμαθία is incapable of distinguishing good from evil, and even confuses one for the other because it lives in its own world of false knowledge and pretense. It misinforms itself and happily believes in this misinformation as truth and good. This seems to be the crime in Wis 14:22 in which living in ignorance, the idolaters designate evil as good. The aspect of [self] deception (δόλος) and senseless thought (λογισμός ἀσύνητος) was mentioned in Wis 1:5 as contrary to and incompatible with wisdom. The impious will confess their self-deception by regretting their pride in a knowledge that was in reality ignorance (5:2-13). The meaning of ἀμαθία seems to be intended in the use of ἄγνοια in Wis 14:22b.

Such an intended meaning of ἀμαθία is more profound than ἄγνοια, which is the simple lack of knowledge that can be recognized and rectified. Ἄμαθία is a sickness and a disease of the soul. Indeed, centuries after Plato, the neoplatonic Proclus Lycius comments on the *Alcibiades* in which he explained that this διπλή ἄγνοια is a positive evil and not merely an absence of great good (ἄγνοια or οὐκ ἐπιστάιτο)<sup>42</sup>. Danielle A. Layne, who studied this concept in detail<sup>43</sup>, affirms the same conclusion in Proclus’ neoplatonic interpretation of Socrates. She states

<sup>40</sup> PLATO, *Laws* IX.863c (LCL 192, 232).

<sup>41</sup> PLATO, *Laws* V.732 (LCL 187, 338).

<sup>42</sup> PROCLUS, *Alcibiades* I.290 in PROCLUS, *Sur le Premier Alcibiade*, 190.

<sup>43</sup> LAYNE, *From Irony to Enigma*, 73-90; LAYNE, *Involuntary Evil*, 27-53.

that this double ignorance has “explicit association ... with evil or grave error”<sup>44</sup>. Its evil lies in the fact that despite not lacking information but rather due to the lack of will-power or mental rigor<sup>45</sup>, one fails wittingly or unwittingly to see one’s own limit to knowledge and deceives and convinces oneself to be knowledgeable.

These aspects of ἀμαθία are apparent in Wis 14:22 when ἄγνοια is used. It is not only the refusal to recognize the truth (12:27) though one is capable of such intellectual activity, but to assert one’s ignorance as wisdom, hence justifying the identification of evil with peace. The great war that ignorance generates is that of ἀμαθία whose meaning is much more complex than that of a mere lack of knowledge or information.

Nevertheless, while sharing the same semantic field, ἀμαθία and ἄγνοια remain two distinct words. Have they ever been used interchangeably?

### Ἄγνοια and ἀμαθία in Greek Philosophy

In his work, Plato shows that the distinction between ἄγνοια and ἀμαθία is not absolute. In *Theages* 123d<sup>46</sup>, Socrates questions Theages whether a charioteer’s skill is σοφία or ἀμαθία. In this phrase, one would expect ἄγνοια that expresses the lack of an acquired competence or skill knowledge, rather than ἀμαθία. Likewise, the Stranger in the *Sophist* 228c.d explicates that ἄγνοια is not simply the lack of knowledge or skill but “an aberration of the soul that aims at truth” (τό γε μὴν ἄγνοεῖν ἐστὶν ἐπ’ ἀλήθειαν ὀρμωμένης ψυχῆς...),<sup>47</sup> a meaning that is usually defined as ἀμαθία as shown above.

Verity Harte noted that Socrates uses ἄγνοια and ἀμαθία interchangeably in the *Republic*<sup>48</sup>. She argues that ἄγνοια “cannot always be used to mean the simple absence of knowledge” by demonstrating that ἄγνοια in *Republic* 5 is a “substantive vicious counterpart to knowledge”<sup>49</sup>, not unlike ἀμαθία described by Layne above.

---

<sup>44</sup> LAYNE, *Involuntary Evil*, 31.

<sup>45</sup> BOSSI, *Amathia*, 112.

<sup>46</sup> PLATO, *Theages* 123d (LCL 201, 354).

<sup>47</sup> PLATO, *The Sophist* 228c.d (LCL 123, 308). See also HARTE, *Plato’s Politics*, 150.

<sup>48</sup> HARTE, *Plato’s Politics*, 141-142.

<sup>49</sup> HARTE, *Plato’s Politics*, 142.

In Euripides' *Bacchae* 490, Pentheus' stubborn ignorance is described as ἀμαθία. Dionysius later explicates that Pentheus does not know why he lives, what he does or who he is (*Bacchae* 505)<sup>50</sup>. It is exactly in like manner that Epictetus describes his unwelcomed fan in *Discourses* II.24.19: "who does not know who he is, and what he is born for, and what sort of a world this is that he exists in..."<sup>51</sup> Epictetus uses ἄγνοια, but the noun means the same as ἀμαθία in Euripides.

In the later epoch of Greek philosophy, Proclus' neoplatonic understanding of the double ignorance (but also the single type), exhibits an interchangeability of both terms. Proclus uses at times (διπλῆ) ἀμαθία<sup>52</sup> and elsewhere he employs (διπλῆ) ἄγνοια<sup>53</sup>, thus he demonstrates the enduring usage of this phenomenon of interchangeability.

Greek philosophical literature provides us with sufficient evidence that ἀμαθία and ἄγνοια share the same meaning to a certain extent, but they are not identical. Each word retains its own particular meaning but both share sufficient common ground that enables them to be used interchangeably.

### Ἀμαθία as ἄγνοια in the LXX

In the LXX, ἀμαθία occurs once, coincidentally with ἄγνοια, in the Psalm of Solomon 18:4 ἀμαθίας ἐν ἄγνοία. An obvious wordplay is intended here – the foolishness or folly caused by ignorance. Here ἀμαθία does not literally mean "unlearned," "unteachable" or "ignorant" as in devoid of knowledge but it means the consequence of such a void, namely "foolishness" or "folly." In any case, both words ἀμαθία and ἄγνοια are different etymologically but there is a semantic overlapping which makes the wordplay delightful and appealing. It is a figure of speech of the *synonymia* type<sup>54</sup> that involves the repetition of synonymous words that intensify the meaning and emotion of statement. These synonymous words share a loose or relaxed equivalence<sup>55</sup> that are not always absolutely in full

<sup>50</sup> EURIPIDES, *Bacchae* (LCL 495, 56); TEWKSBURY, *Suffering*, 72.

<sup>51</sup> ARRIAN, *Discourses*, II.xxiv.19 (LCL 131, 427).

<sup>52</sup> PROCLUS, *Alcibiades* I.189-191.201 in PROCLUS, *Sur le Premier Alcibiade*, 249-250, 258; see also LAYNE, *Involuntary Evil*, 30-31.

<sup>53</sup> PROCLUS, *Alcibiades* I.189-191.193.200-201.290 in PROCLUS, *Sur le Premier Alcibiade*, 249-250, 252, 257-258, 329; see also LAYNE, *Involuntary Evil*, 30-31.

<sup>54</sup> LAUSBERG, *Handbook*, § 649-656, 292-295.

<sup>55</sup> LAUSBERG, *Handbook*, § 651, 293.



agreement in meaning<sup>56</sup>, but share semantic similarities that are sufficiently obvious that any reader would be able to understand the play of words and its intensifying effect.

In *Apology* 22e<sup>57</sup> Socrates uses a similar *figura ἀμαθῆς τὴν ἀμαθίαν* which serves as an antithesis to σοφὸς ὢν τὴν... σοφίαν in the same verse. Socrates, having been claimed by the Oracle that he is the wisest of men, compares himself with the skilful poets and artisans/craftsmen (τοὺς χειροτέχνους) and concludes that he does not possess the skill/wisdom that they possess<sup>58</sup>. Still, he is wiser than them. Though possessing only one skill or talent, they assume they know everything and thus delude themselves to be wise. Socrates, on the contrary, proclaims himself to be ignorant. These skilled poets and craftsmen fool themselves and hence they are ignorant in [their] ignorance (ἀμαθῆς τὴν ἀμαθίαν). Here ἀμαθία means ignorance despite having knowledge of a skill. Both phrases are rhetorical figures of speech – *polyptoton* – that utilizes words of the same roots but with different inflection<sup>59</sup>. The repetition too serves to intensify both meaning and emotion of the statement, just like the case in Ps.Sol. 18:4 cited above.

Ps.Sol. 18:4 and *Apology* 22e are variant forms of the same rhetorical device whose purpose of repetition is to intensify emotions. For this to be effective, the repeated or preceding word must share sufficient commonality of meaning with the succeeding word, even if both are etymologically different. This unique use of ἀμαθία with ἄγνοια in the LXX, constructed in this rhetorical figure of speech of *polyptoton* reveals that both words share a common meaning, probably due to influence by Stoic philosophy as suggested by Eberhard Bons<sup>60</sup> or simply because both words developed from a common intellectual milieu of Alexandria during the Greco-Roman era.

---

<sup>56</sup> LAUSBERG, *Handbook*, § 651, 293.

<sup>57</sup> PLATO, *Apology* 22 (LCL 36, 86).

<sup>58</sup> Compare the wisdom (skill) of the woodworker and potter in Wis 13–14.

<sup>59</sup> LAUSBERG, *Handbook*, § 638.3β', § 640-641, 287.

<sup>60</sup> BONS, *Philosophical Vocabulary*, 49-58.

## Conclusion

“The great war” in Wis 14:22 is not engendered by a want of knowledge of God, as ἄγνοια is commonly understood. It is rather in spite of having knowledge (as evidenced in the context of 14:22), that one deludes oneself to be perfect and hence prone to self-deception even to the extent of confounding evil/war with peace. One becomes convinced in the rightness of one’s thoughts and actions because of being ignorant of one’s own ignorance. Such conviction causes not only a war that affects society but also a war within oneself, as Proclus noted regarding Alcibiades’ ἀμαθία: “Alcibiades is revealed as at war with himself and under the impression that he knows what he does not know, and blaming others...”<sup>61</sup>

The whole contention of Wis 14:22 is not a deficiency in the knowledge of God but a mistaken – or in the preferred term used by Wisdom – “strayed” knowledge (πλανᾶσθαι περὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν). There is knowledge, but it is warped. This kind of ignorance is ἀμαθία; and the above study has shown that ἀμαθία and ἄγνοια were used interchangeably in Plato’s works as well as in stoic and neoplatonic teachings. Such an understanding would mark the application of ἄγνοια in 14:22b as different from its usage elsewhere in the LXX.

By assuming the meaning of ἀμαθία, ἄγνοια in Wis 14:22 takes on the aspect of culpability and wilfulness that it normally does not have.<sup>62</sup> Such an understanding consequently explains the reason why the idolaters are blameless yet still culpable and punishable in 14:6-8. In addition, by understanding evil acts as the result of ἀμαθία, the magnanimity and forbearance of God in his treatment of the impious, the Egyptians and the Canaanites in the Book of Wisdom are explained too. Surely, in the eyes of the author of Wisdom these Gentiles committed atrocities, but they acted under the erroneous impression as if they were doing the right thing. God’s punishment aims to educate them to see the truth. Thereby, God’s punitive act is of pedagogical rather than of a retributive nature.

<sup>61</sup> PROCLUS, Alcibiades I.288, in PROCLUS, *Sur le Premier Alcibiade*, 189.

<sup>62</sup> HTLS 1, s.v. ἄγνοια, 118.

## Bibliography

- ARRIAN: *Discourses of Epictetus* (LCL 131). Translated by W.A. Oldfather, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 1967.
- BARRIER, Jeremy Wade: Middle Platonism in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Comparison of Wisdom to Plutarch of Chaeroneia, *JSP* 32.3 (March 2023) 122-130.
- BETT, Richard: Socratic Ignorance. In: Donald R. Morrison (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 215-236.
- BIZZETTI, Paolo: *Il Libro della Sapienza: struttura e genere letterario*, Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1984.
- BONS, Eberhard: Philosophical Vocabulary in the Psalms of Solomon: The Case of Ps. Sol. 9:4. In: Eberhard Bons – Patrick Pouchelle (eds.): *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology* (SBLEJL 40), Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015, 49-58.
- BOSSI, Beatriz: *Amathia, Akrasia and the Power of Knowledge in the Laws: Break or Unity?*, *Hermathena* 169 (Winter 2000) 99-114.
- CONTI, Martino: *Sapienza: versione, introduzione, note*, Milan: Edizione San Paolo, 1996.
- CUSINATO, Guido: At the Origins of Evil. *Amathia* and excessive *philautia* in a passage of Plato's "Laws", *Thaumazein* 9/1 (2021). [Accessed 12-04-2024]. DOI: 10.13136/thau.v9i1.162.
- EURIPIDES: *Bacchae, Iphigenia at Aulis, Rhesus* (LCL 495). Translated by David Kovacs, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 2002.
- GILBERT, Maurice: *La Critique des Dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse* (AnBib 53), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973.
- GILBERT, Maurice: La Connaissance de Dieu selon le Livre de la Sagesse. In: Joseph Coppens (ed.): *La Notion Biblique de Dieu : le dieu de la Bible et le dieu des philosophes* (BETL 41), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985, 191-210.
- GILBERT, Maurice: *La Sapienza di Salomone* (Bibbia e preghiera), 2 vols., Rome: Edizione ADP, 1995.
- HARTE, Verity: Plato's Politics of Ignorance. In: Verity Harte – Melissa Lane (eds.): *Politeia in Greek and Roman Philosophy*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 139-154.
- KOLARCIK, Michael: *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1–6* (AnBib 127), Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- LANGE, Stella: The Wisdom of Solomon and Plato, *JBL* 55/4 (1936) 293-302.
- LAYNE, Danielle A.: Involuntary Evil and the Socratic Problem of Double Ignorance in Proclus, *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 9 (2015) 27-53.
- LAYNE, Danielle A.: From Irony to Enigma: Discovering Double Ignorance and Socrates' Divine Knowledge, *Methexis* XXIII (2010) 73-90.
- LAUSBERG, Heinrich: *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- MAZZINGHI, Luca: *Wisdom* (IECOD), Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 2019.
- MCCASHEN, Grayden: The Impious and their Impiety in Wisdom of Solomon, *JSJ* 54 (2023) 1-33.
- MCGLYNN, Moyna: *Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom* (WUNT2 139), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- MURAOKA, Takamitsu: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009. (= GELS)
- PASSONI DELL'ACQUA, Anna – CAMPIGLIO, Andrea – VILLA, Paolo: ἄγνοια. In: Eberhard Bons (ed.): *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint. Vol. 1: Alpha-Gamma*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 116-122. (= HTLS)
- PIETERSMA, Albert – WRIGHT, Benjamin G. (eds): *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. (= NETS)
- PLATO: *Alcibiades* (LCL 201). Translated by W.R.M. Lamb, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 1964.
- PLATO: *Apology* (LCL 36). Translated by Harold North Fowler, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 1977.
- PLATO: *Laws V* (LCL 187). Translated by R. G. Bury, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 1967.
- PLATO: *Laws IX* (LCL 192). Translated by R.G. Bury, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 1968.
- PLATO: *Theages* (LCL 201). Translated by W.R.M. Lamb, London – Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd – Harvard University Press, 1964.
- PLATO: *The Sophist* (LCL 123). Translated by Harold N. Fowler, Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press – William Heinemann Ltd., 1987.
- PROCLUS: *Alcibiades I*. Translated by William O'Neill, Berlin: Springer-Science + Business Media B.V., <sup>2</sup>1971.
- PROCLUS: *Sur le Premier Alcibiade de Platon II*. Translated by A. Ph. Segonds, Paris: Société d'Édition *Les Belles Lettres*, 1986.
- RAHLFS, Alfred – HANHART, Robert (eds.): *Septuaginta: Editio altera*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- REESE, James M.: *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences*, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970.
- SCARPAT, Giuseppe: *Libro della Sapienza*, Vol. III, Brescia: Paideia, 1999.
- SCHMITT, Armin: *Weisheit* (NEB.NT), Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1989.
- SISTI, Adalberto: *Il Libro della Sapienza*, Assisi: Edizione Portiuncola, 1992.
- STERLING, Gregory E.: The Love of Wisdom: Middle Platonism and Stoicism in the Wisdom of Solomon. In: Troels Engberg-Pedersen (ed.): *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, 198-213.
- SUN, Jiani: Flowers of Evil: Constructing the Wicked in Wisdom of Solomon, *JSP* 31.2 (2021) 108-121.
- SWETE, Henry Barclay (ed.): *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, Vol. III, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.

- TEWKSBURY, Ian: *Suffering in the Body Politic*, *ΠΙΘΟΣ – Pithos* 12 (Spring 2013) 69-78.
- VÍLCHEZ-LÍNDEZ, José: *Sapienza* (ComBib), Rome: Edizione Borla, 1990.
- WINSTON, David: *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43), New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- WITTE, Marcus: *God and Evil in the Book of Wisdom*. In: Scott C. Jones – Christine Roy Yoder (eds.): *When the Morning Stars Sang: Essays in Honor of Choon Leong Seow on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (BZAW 500), Berlin – Munich – Boston: de Gruyter, 2018, 255-270.
- WRIGHT, Addison G.: *The Structure of Wisdom* 11-19, *Bib* 48 (1967) 165-184.
- ZIEGLER, Joseph (ed.): *Sapientia Salomonis* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum XII/1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

### Summary


In Wis 14:22 ignorance (*ἄγνοια*) is said to generate a great war, but what type of ignorance does *ἄγνοια* mean particularly in this verse? Rather than a mere lack of knowledge or information, or a capacity thereof, there is sufficient contextual evidence to show that *ἄγνοια* in 14:22 has a different meaning. A comparison with *ἀμαθία* from ancient Greek philosophy shows that both it and *ἄγνοια* are used interchangeably; with *ἄγνοια* assuming the meaning of *ἀμαθία*. The paper proposes that *ἄγνοια* in Wis 14:22 should be understood as *ἀμαθία*.

*Key words:* Wisdom, Wis 14:22, Ignorance, *agnoia*, *amathia*.

### Zhrnutie

V Knihe múdrosti 14,22 sa hovorí, že neznalosť (*ἄγνοια*) vedie veľkú vojnu, ale aký typ neznalosti v tomto verši znamená termín *ἄγνοια*? Než len nedostatok vedomostí alebo informácií, či z nich vyplývajúcej chýbajúcej schopnosti, kontext nám dostatočne ukazuje, že *ἄγνοια* má v 14,22 iný význam. Porovnanie s *ἀμαθία* zo starovekej gréckej filozofie ukazuje, že obidva termíny, *ἀμαθία* a *ἄγνοια*, sú navzájom zameniteľné; že výraz *ἄγνοια* preberá význam *ἀμαθία*. Štúdia navrhuje, že *ἄγνοια* v Múd 14,22 má byť chápaná vo význame *ἀμαθία*.

*Kľúčové slová:* Kniha múdrosti, Múd 14,22, neznalosť, *agnoia*, *amathia*.

Lionel Goh Yeh Cheng  
 Comenius University Bratislava  
 Faculty of Roman Catholic Theology of Cyril and Methodius  
 Kapitulská 26  
 814 58 BRATISLAVA, Slovakia  
 gyclionel@gmail.com  
 0009-0004-8766-7242

## Apoštol Pavol pred členmi veľrady v Sk 23,1-5

Interpretácia biblického textu: Rétoricko-intonačný aspekt

*Pavol Farkaš*

V tomto príspevku sa sústreďíme na textový fragment v Sk 23,1-5, kde máme začiatok vypočúvania apoštola Pavla pred členmi židovskej veľrady a zameriame sa na jeho dynamickú reakciu, totiž hlavne na slová, ktoré adresoval veľkňazovi, respektíve prítomným členom veľrady. Poukážeme na rôzne významy, ktoré môžu mať jeho slová v závislosti na intonácii. Perikopa v slovenskom preklade<sup>1</sup> znie:

<sup>1</sup> Pavol sa uprene zahľadel na veľradu a povedal: „Bratia, ja som si počínal podľa najlepšieho svedomia pred Bohom až do dnešného dňa.“

<sup>2</sup> Tu veľkňaz Ananiáš rozkázal tým, čo stáli pri ňom, aby ho udreli po ústach. <sup>3</sup> Vtedy mu Pavol povedal: „Boh udrie teba, ty obielená stena! Sediš tu, aby si ma súdil podľa zákona, a proti zákonu ma kážeš biť?“

<sup>4</sup> Tí, čo tam stáli, povedali: „Božiemu veľkňazovi zlorečíš?“ <sup>5</sup> Pavol vravel: „Nevedel som, bratia, že je to veľkňaz; veď je napísané: ‚Kniežaťu svojho ľudu nebudeš zlorečiť.‘“ (Sk 23,1-5)

Z textovo-kritického hľadiska<sup>2</sup> je táto pasáž v Skutkoch apoštolov dobre zachovaná a nevykazuje žiadne podstatné textové varianty<sup>3</sup>. Skúmaný text Sk 23,1-5 možno pokladať za typický príklad viacerých historických, filologických a exegetických, ťažko riešiteľných problémov. Jerwell uvádza celý rad nezrovnalostí a zvláštností, ktoré vedú odborníkov ku skeptickému postoj, čo sa týka historickej spoľahlivosti opísaných udalostí, napríklad prečo sám stotník nevypočúval apoštola Pavla. Stotník nemohol zvoliť zasadnutie veľrady

---

<sup>1</sup> Preklad podľa: *Biblia. Sväté písmo Starého i Nového zákona*, Trnava: Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Podľa NESTLE, Eberhard – ALAND, Kurt: *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> Vo v. 1 je v niektorých rukopisoch zmenený slovosled slov *ὁ Παῦλος τῷ συνεδρίῳ*, a v niektorých rukopisoch je vynechaný gramatický člen pred menom *Παῦλος*. Vo v. 2 má *ᾤ*<sup>74</sup> namiesto slovesa *ἐπέταξεν* sloveso *παρηγγειλεν* a v C (etc.) je variant *εκελευσεν*. Tieto varianty nepredstavujú podstatný významový rozdiel.

a nemohol sa ani zúčastňovať na jej zasadnutiach. Pavol ako obvinený nemohol prehovoriť ako prvý. Z kontextu vyplýva, že to bol veľkňaz, kto nariadil Pavla biť, načo Pavol vyriekol slová „kliatby“ – alebo skôr proroctva, ako ich chápe mnoho vykladačov, ale následne sa mu hneď aj ospravedlnil<sup>4</sup>.

Názory biblistov na historicitu textu Sk 23,1-5 sa rôznia, a to predovšetkým z dôvodu Pavlovej „iniciatívy“ pred členmi židovskej veľrady<sup>5</sup>. V tomto príspevku sa však nesústredíme primárne na historický, ale predovšetkým na rétoricko-intonačný rozmer niektorých častí skúmaného textového fragmentu.

Veľkňaz Ananiáš, syn Nedebejov, ktorý tu vystupuje, bol aj politicky významnou osobou, ktorého vymenoval Herodes z Chalkidy do úradu okolo roku 47 po Kr., a podobne ako väčšina veľkňazov tohto obdobia, aj on bol saducejom. Okolo roku 52 ho sýrsky legát Quadratus poslal do Ríma, kde ho obvinili z podnecovania nepokojov v Judsku, ale bol oslobodený. Aj po svojom zosadení v roku 57 – 58 mal veľkú autoritu, bol však zavraždený pri vypuknutí povstania v roku 66 prívržencami vodcu zelótov Menahema. Jeho syn Eleazar, veliteľ chrámovej stráže, sa mu potom pomstil.

Pavlove slová v tejto perikope „Boh udrie teba“ – *τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ θεός* – niektorí autori interpretovali ako prorockú predpoveď, a keď Ananiáša o deväť rokov neskôr zabili povstalci, chápali to ako naplnenie tejto predpovede<sup>6</sup>.

K reakcii apoštola Pavla, totiž k jeho slovám na adresu veľkňaza „obielená stena“ – *τοῖχε κεκοιμημένε* – možno ako paralelný text uviesť slová z Matúšovho evanjelia Mt 23,27, kde je pekný vonkajšok hrobov v kontraste s nečistým obsahom vo vnútri<sup>7</sup>. Text však možno dať do súvislosti aj s múrom zatretým vakovkou, spomenutou v starozákonnom texte Ez 13,10-16, ktorý síce vypadal dosť stabilne, ale zrútil sa pod vplyvom búrlivého vetra. Je však tiež možné, že v Sk 23,3 nejde o žiadnu konkrétnu biblickú alúziu.

<sup>4</sup> JERVELL, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 558.

<sup>5</sup> MUSSNER, *Apostelgeschichte*, 137: „Daß Lk hier ‚literarisch‘ und nicht ‚historisch‘ arbeitet, zeigt sich gleich darin, daß Paulus die Verhandlung eröffnet“. PESCH, *Atti degli apostoli*, 831: „Nonostante il cumulo di inverosimiglianze storiche... la scena quasi grottesca in cui Paolo come un astuto stratega, mette uno contro l'altro i partiti del sinedrio, non può essere considerata completamente una creazione libera di Luca.“

<sup>6</sup> BRUCE, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 464; OMERZU, *Der Prozeß des Paulus*, 392-393.

<sup>7</sup> PRUŽINSKÝ, *Skutky svätých apoštolov*, 244: „Tieto slová nevyjadrujú nejaký neodôvodnený hnev alebo zlobu, ale iba hodnotenie postoja vysokopostaveného človeka, ktorý namiesto Zákomom určenej spravodlivosti sa dopúšťa hrubosti a nespravodlivosti...“

Nemožno si nevšimnúť podobný kontext v súvislosti s vypočúvaním Ježiša u veľkňaza Annáša, ako ho opisuje evanjelista Ján (Jn 18,22), a poukázať na podobné slová, sprevádzané tiež úderom na tvár. Autor Skutkov apoštolov zrejme vedome vytvoril k štvrtému evanjeliu paralelnú scénu medzi údelom Majstra a jeho učeníka<sup>8</sup>.

Pri komparácii vypočúvania Ježiša Krista u veľkňaza Annáša, ktorý v tom čase už nebol úradujúcim veľkňazom, a vypočúvania apoštola Pavla pred Ananiášom a členmi veľrady si možno všimnúť aj podobnosť mien veľkňazov.

V súvislosti s Ježišovými slovami „Opýtaj sa tých, ktorí počuli, čo som im hovoril!“ (Jn 18,21) treba poznamenať, že v neskoršom židovskom práve platil princíp, podľa ktorého sa obvinenému nemali klásť kompromitujúce otázky bez svedkov. Je teda možné, že Ježiš požadoval formálny proces so svedkami, ktorý by zodpovedal vtedajším zvyklostiam<sup>9</sup>. U veľkňaza Annáša došlo k dramatizácii deja<sup>10</sup>: „Ako to povedal, jeden zo sluhov, čo tam stál, udrel Ježiša po tvári a povedal: Tak odpovedáš veľkňazovi?“ (Jn 18,22). Scéna odráža aj významný teologický moment: smutná skutočnosť, že ľudia odmietajú Krista a jeho zjavenie, je jasne vyjadrená v dvoch obrazoch: sluha ho *udrel* po tvári a vonku, vo veľkňazovom dvore ho jeho vlastný učeník *zaprel*. Všeobecne sa uznáva, že udrieť nejakého človeka po tvári nemá za cieľ spôsobiť mu bolesť, ale ponížiť ho. Možno povedať, že táto sluhova reakcia sa nachádza v *centre* perikopy o slove a upozornil na to hlavne anglický komentátor Westcott v 19. storočí.

<sup>20</sup> Ježiš mu odpovedal: „Ja som verejne *hovoril* svetu. Vždy som učil v synagóge a v chráme, kde sa schádzajú všetci Židia, a nič som *nehovoril* tajne.“<sup>21</sup> Prečo sa pýtaš mňa? Opýtaj sa tých, ktorí počuli, čo som im *hovoril*! Oni vedia, čo som *hovoril*.<sup>22</sup> „Sluha *udrel* Ježiša po tvári.“<sup>23</sup> Ježiš mu odvetil: „Ak som zle *povedal*, dokáž, čo bolo zlé, ale ak dobre, prečo ma biješ?!“<sup>24</sup> A tak ho Annáš zviazaného poslal k veľkňazovi Kajfášovi. (Jn 18,20-24)

Dôvodom na takúto reakciu sluhu mohlo byť hlavne to, že v podobných prípadoch sa od obvinených a vypočúvaných osôb očakávalo, že budú pokorní, že si prípadne pokľaknú a budú prosiť o milosť alebo o mierny trest. Ak Ježiš v tejto scéne stál pred Annášom dôstojne kráľovsky (a takto je vyobrazený v priebehu celých pašii v Evanjeliu podľa Jána), potom to prítomných mohlo

<sup>8</sup> BRUCE, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 464; OMERZU, *Der Prozeß des Paulus*, 395.

<sup>9</sup> BROWN, *Giovanni*, 1015.

<sup>10</sup> FARKAŠ, *Textologické a teologické aspekty*, 36.



iritovať, provokovať a mohlo to viesť k takej reakcii sluhu, ako nám ju evanjelista zaznamenal. V prípade vypočúvania apoštola Pavla bol dôvod k úderu po tvári zrejme odlišný, ako nám to naznačuje aj literárny kontext. Pavol nielenže oslovil prítomných členov veľrady „bratia“<sup>11</sup>, ale vôbec nepočkal, aby bol vyzvaný, a teda aby dostal možnosť predniesť svoju reč. Pre porovnanie možno spomenúť Pavlovu obranu pred kráľom Agrippom, ktorá začala kráľovými slovami: „Dovoľuje sa ti hovoriť na svoju obranu“ (ἐπιτρέπεταί σοι, Sk 26,1), ale aj jeho tzv. „reč na schodoch“, keď veliteľ „dovolil“ (ἐπιτρέψαντος, Sk 21,40), aby Pavol prehovoril k Židom. Pavol pred veľradou podľa Sk 23,1 začal svoj prejav celý nadšený a bez akejkoľvek výzvy či dovolenia.

Apoštol Pavol podľa verša 23,5 povedal: „Nevedel som, bratia, že je to veľkňaz; ved’ je napísané: ‚Kniežat’u svojho ľudu nebudeš zlorečiť.‘“ (ἔφη τε ὁ Παῦλος· οὐκ ᾔδειν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ἀρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς.) Viacerí cirkevní spisovatelia v minulosti vystúpili na obranu apoštola Pavla v súvislosti s incidentom zaznamenaným v Sk 23,1-5 napriek tomu, že sa nezhodujú v tom, v čom vlastne spočíval Pavlov úmysel a aký mal byť presný význam jeho slov. Ján Zlatoústý naznačuje, že Pavol nevedel, že je to veľkňaz, keďže sa vrátil po svojej dlhej neprítomnosti v Jeruzaleme, nemal nepretržitý styk so Židmi (Scholion k Sk 23, 1-2)<sup>12</sup>.

Odborníci uvádzajú rôzne príčiny, prečo apoštol Pavol v danej situácii – podľa svedectva Skutkov apoštolov – nespoznal veľkňaza. Príčinou mohol byť napríklad jeho slabý zrak alebo zmena veľkňazov od Pavlovej poslednej návštevy v Jeruzaleme, prípadne sa z Pavlovej strany pripúšťa aj istá možná irónia v takomto zmysle: „nemyslel som si, že človek, ktorý takto hovorí, mohol by byť veľkňazom“<sup>13</sup>. Pružinský k tomu ešte poznamenáva: „V zhromaždení veľrady sa veľkňaz neodlišoval ničím pozoruhodným, ani odevom, a nemusel predsedáť konkrétnemu rokovaniu veľrady.“<sup>14</sup>

Ján Kalvín, podobne ako Augustín, hovorí o irónii v zmysle „nie som schopný rozpoznať v tomto človeku nič kňazské“. Alebo inými slovami, Pavol

<sup>11</sup> PRUŽINSKÝ, *Skutky svätých apoštolov*, 244: Veľkňazovi „sa nepáčilo, že Pavel oslovil prítomných členov veľrady titulom bratia, čo je možné povedať len voči seberovným. Pavel však sa necítil nižším, lebo kedysi sám bol členom tejto veľrady“.

<sup>12</sup> HORNÍK – PARSONS, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 227-228.

<sup>13</sup> BRUCE, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 464; CONZELMANN, *Acts of the Apostles*, 192.

<sup>14</sup> PRUŽINSKÝ, *Skutky svätých apoštolov*, 245.

sa nedopustil žiadneho priestupku voči veľkňazovi, pretože Ananiášovo správanie nebolo hodné úradu Božieho veľkňaza<sup>15</sup>.

Významný biblista Luis Alonso-Schökel často používal v taliančine slovo „illocuzione“<sup>16</sup>, ale aj termín „intonazione“ a neustále zdôrazňoval ich význam pri správnom pochopení posolstva biblického textu. Daný pojem pravdepodobne najlepšie vystihuje v slovenčine práve slovo intonácia, ktoré je definované ako „súbor a súhra prozodických prostriedkov a ich využívanie v reči. Prejavuje sa úpravou (modulovaním) radu segmentov: hlások, slabík, slov, vetných úsekov, viet čiže melódiou reči, prízvukom, dôrazom, tempom reči, timbrom, pauzami“<sup>17</sup>.

Významný exegeta a mních Béda Ctihodný (8. storočie) sa odvolával na gramatickú stránku tohto úryvku v Skutkoch apoštolov:

*Percutiet te deus, paries dealbate. Non perturbatione animi commotus hoc dixit, sed utique prophetando locutus est, quia figurale illud pontificium quod erat in parietis dealbati similitudine compositum percutiendum esset ac destruendum, cum iam uerum sacerdotium Christi apostolis euangelium praedicantibus aduenisset. Et inde est quod dixit: Percutiet te deus, non dixit, percutiat, indicatio utique modo hoc ipsum futurum significans, non optatio maledicens. Quam tranquillo enim animo haec diceret, sequenti responsione manifestat, dicens:...*<sup>18</sup>

Boh ťa zasiahne, ty obielená stena. To nepovedal hnaný vzrušením v duši, ale rozhodne to vyriekol ako prorok. Veď bol obrazom celého veľkňazského úradu a ten bol celý označený za podobný obielenej stene len preto, že mal byť zasiahnutý a zbúraný. Veď v apoštolskom ohlasovaní evanjelia už bolo na svete pravé Kristovo

<sup>15</sup> MARGUERAT, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 760-761. Čo sa týka princípu zakotvenému v Ex 22,18 („Kniežať u svojho ľudu nebudeš zlorečiť“), možno poznamenať, že „hoci tento biblický výrok sa týkal svetských vládcov, veľkňazi z pobabylonského obdobia sa považovali nielen za duchovných vodcov, ale aj za politických. Najmä však preto, že došlo k prerušeniu nástupníctva židovských kráľov“.

<sup>16</sup> ALONSO SCHÖKEL – BRAVO ARAGÓN, *Appunti di ermeneutica*, 117-118: „Per illocuzione intendiamo il modo di prendere la parola. ... Ebbene, il modo di prendere la parola, o illocuzione, intacca in misura notevole la comunicazione totale. Sebbene il contenuto della informazione sia equivalente, muta ciò che dice il testo. Conoscere l'illocuzione è importante, forse essenziale, per comprendere e spiegare un testo.“

<sup>17</sup> MISTRÍK, *Lingvistický slovník*, 77.

<sup>18</sup> BEDA CTIHODNÝ, *Exp. act. apost.* 23,3 (CChSL 121, 89).

kňazstvo. Preto tým povedal, že Boh ťa zasiahne a nie nech ťa zasiahne. Oznamovací spôsob tak jednoznačne naznačuje túto budúcu udalosť a nie želanie niečoho zlého. A nasledujúca odpoveď aj dokazuje, s akým pokojom v duši to hovoril. Lebo vravel... (pracovný preklad: Róbert Horka)

Intonácia pri prednese textu môže mať – a veľmi často aj má – kľúčovú rolu (podľa slov L. Alonso-Schökela: „importante, forse essenziale“<sup>19</sup>) pri pochopení, interpretácii a recepcii. Príkladom sú práve slová apoštola Pavla: „Nevedel som, bratia, že je to veľkňaz“ (Sk 23,5). Ponúkame niekoľko možností pochopenia tejto vety, bez toho, aby sa vzájomne nutne vylučovali:

1. Pavol mohol tieto slová vysloviť veľmi jednoducho, bez zvýšenia hlasu, pokojne, možno až s pocitom viny a porušenia predpisov, teda ako určité ospravedlnenie za slová, ktoré vyslovil pred členmi veľrady.
2. Apoštol Pavol mohol tieto slová vysloviť jednoducho, spontánne, takmer ako jednoduché konštatovanie svojej nevedomosti ohľadne identity veľkňaza.
3. Od zafarbenia Pavlovho hlasu závisí aj ďalšia možnosť pochopenia jeho slov, ktoré mohol vysloviť s istou dávkou irónie v zmysle: „nemyslel som si, že veľkňaz by sa mohol takto správať“.
4. V interpetačnej línii irónie až sarkazmu by sa pohybovala aj ďalšia možnosť: „... tak kto je tu vlastne veľkňaz?“. Ved' aj bývalí veľkňazi, ktorí už neboli v úrade, boli titulovaní ako veľkňazi a požívali určitú úctu medzi ľuďmi.
5. Apoštol Pavol mohol túto vetu vysloviť aj s intonáciou, ktorá mohla prezrádzať istý nezáujem o to, kto je vlastne aktuálnym veľkňazom, pretože pre neho boli omnoho dôležitejšie iné skutočnosti, akými bolo napríklad ohlasovanie zmŕtvychvstalého Krista svojim súkmeňovcom, a je to téma, ktorú aj nadhodil v nasledujúcom kontexte.
6. Pavlove slová – v závislosti od spôsobu intonácie – určite bolo možné pochopiť aj ako kritiku dekadencie veľkňazského úradu, v ktorom sa často striedali osoby pochybnej povesti.

Zmysel slov apoštola Pavla v Sk 23,5 závisí skutočne od toho, ako si predstavíme alebo ako si dokážeme predstaviť spôsob vyslovenia týchto slov. Okrem kľúčovej dôležitosti intonácie pri interpretácii v biblickej exegéze

<sup>19</sup> ALONSO SCHÖKEL – BRAVO ARAGÓN, *Appunti di ermeneutica*, 118.

chceme zdôrazniť jej význam aj pri prednese biblických textov v ekleziálnom kontexte, hlavne pri lektúre počas liturgických slávení, a teda vyzdvihnúť princíp *modus legendi – ars interpretandi*.

### Zoznam použitej literatúry

- ALONSO SCHÖKEL, Luis – BRAVO ARAGÓN, José María: *Appunti di ermeneutica*, Bologna: EDB, 1994.
- BEDA CТИHODНÝ: *Bedae Opera: Expositio Actuum apostolorum* (CChSL 121), Turnhout: Brepols, 1983.
- Biblia. Sväté písmo Starého i Nového zákona*, Trnava: Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 2014.
- BROWN, Raymond, E.: *Giovanni. Commento al Vangelo spirituale*, Assisi: Cittadella, 1979.
- BRUCE, Frederick, F.: *The Acts of the Apostles. The Greek text with introduction and commentary*, Grand Rapids, MI – Leicester: Eerdmans Publishing Company, <sup>3</sup>1990.
- CONZELMANN, Hans: *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1987.
- FARKAŠ, Pavol: *Textologické a teologické aspekty pašii v Evanjeliu podľa Jána. S komentárom Aurélie Augustína*, Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2017.
- HORNIK, Heidi J. – PARSONS, Mikeal C.: *The Acts of the Apostles through the Centuries* (WBBC), West Sussex – Malden, MA: John Wiley & Son, 2017.
- JERVELL, Jacob: *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- MARGUERAT, Daniel: *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022.
- MISTRÍK, Jozef: *Lingvistický slovník*, Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 2002.
- MUSSNER, Franz: *Apostelgeschichte* (NEB.NT), Würzburg: Echter Verlag, <sup>2</sup>1988.
- NESTLE, Eberhard – ALAND, Kurt: *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, <sup>28</sup>2012.
- OMERZU, Heike: *Der Prozeß des Paulus* (BZNW 115), Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- PESCH, Rudolph: *Atti degli apostoli*, Assisi: Cittadella editrice, 1992.
- PRUŽINSKÝ, Štefan: *Skutky svätých apoštolov* (Pravoslávne biblické komentáre 5), Prešov: Metropolitná rada Pravoslávnej cirkvi na Slovensku, 1996.

### *Zhrnutie*

V článku sa chce poukázať na rôzne možnosti interpretácie slov apoštola Pavla v kontexte perikopy Sk 23,1-5. V závislosti na intonácii sa ponúka bohatá škála významových rovín verša Sk 23,5. Ponúkli sme šesť smerov pochopenia, ktoré sa vzájomne nevylučujú: 1. ospravedlnenie, 2. jednoduché konštatovanie, 3. irónia, 4. irónia až sarkazmus, 5. nezáujem, 6. kritika. Tieto možnosti zdôrazňujú dôležitosť spôsobu prednesu biblických textov, od ktorého závisí ich výklad, celkové pochopenie a percepcia.

*Kľúčové slová:* Apoštol Pavol, Sk 23,1-5, židovská veľrada, intonácia, viacvýznamovosť textu.

### *Summary*

This article intends to highlight the various ways of interpreting the words of the Apostle Paul in the context of the pericope Acts 23:1-5. Depending on the intonation, a rich variety of planes of meaning of Acts 23:5 is offered. We have offered six directions of understanding that are not mutually exclusive: (1) apology, (2) simple statement, (3) irony, (4) irony to sarcasm, (5) disinterest, (6) criticism. These options emphasize the importance of the manner of oral presentation of biblical texts, on which their interpretation, overall understanding, and perception depend.

*Key words:* Apostle Paul, Acts 23:1-5, Jewish High Council, Intonation, Polysemy.

Pavol Farkaš  
Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave  
Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta  
Kapitulská 26  
Kňazský seminár sv. Gorazda v Nitre  
Samova 14  
949 01 Nitra, Slovensko  
farkas1@uniba.sk

## Životodarný „vietor nad vodou“

Sémantika slovies ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω od gréckych mýticko-filozofických predstáv po „Ducha Svätého, Oživovateľa“ a patristická diskusia o Gn 1,2c

*Helena Panczová*

Slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω, s viac-menej synonymným významom „dávať/tvorit' život, privádzať k životu“, majú pozoruhodné dejiny<sup>1</sup>. Ich významy v gréckej literatúre<sup>2</sup> a v Biblii, hoci patria do toho istého sémantického spektra, stoja akoby na opačných koncoch a ich významový prienik je minimálny. No kresťanskí autori<sup>3</sup> spájajú obe tradície a grécke literárne významy rezonujú aj pri diskusii biblických tém.

Tak je to aj v prípade výkladu tretej časti druhého verša prvej kapitoly knihy Genesis<sup>4</sup> – πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπέφερετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος „Boží duch/vietor sa vznášal nad vodou“<sup>5</sup>. V patristickej diskusii sa objavujú isté starobylé mýticko-filozofické predstavy o vzniku života. Tie rezonujú jednak v úvahách o tom, či πνεῦμα označuje Ducha, ducha alebo vietor, jednak v používaní slovies ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω, ktoré Otcovia používali na objasnenie výrazu ἐπέφερετο.

V kresťanskej literatúre sa bohato používa aj odvodené slovesné adjektívum ζωοποιός „tvoriaci/dávajúci život“, resp. „oživujúci“, ktoré buduje na celej sémantickej prehistórii oboch slovies. Tento výraz sa ako jeden z Božích titulov dostal aj do formulácie tzv. nicejsko-carhradského Symbolu o viere

---

<sup>1</sup> Táto práca je sprievodným výsledkom výskumu pre heslo „ζάω, ζωή etc.“ pre pripravovaný druhý zväzok diela *The Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint*, ktorého editorom je Eberhard Bons. Vydanie sa predpokladá v roku 2026.

<sup>2</sup> Pod „gréckou literatúrou“ tu rozumieme grécke literárne diela, ktoré nie sú židovské ani kresťanské.

<sup>3</sup> Pod „kresťanskou literatúrou“ a „kresťanskými autormi“ rozumieme diela a autorov pobiblického obdobia.

<sup>4</sup> Preferujem písanie „Genesis“ a nie „Genezis“, lebo variant s koncovkou -sis predstavuje aj správnu transkripciu z gréčtiny, aj výslovnosť.

<sup>5</sup> Gn 1,2c.

v „Ducha Svätého... Oživovateľa“ (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... τὸ ζωοποιόν). Preskúmame aj to, či tento liturgický prekladový ekvivalent vystihuje pointu toho, čo chceli konciloví otcovia vyjadriť.

Na nasledujúcich stranách postupne predstavíme sémantiku sloviac ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω (1) v gréckej literatúre, (2) v Biblii a (3) v kresťanskej literatúre, kde sa objaví aj adjektívum ζωοποιός. Predostrieme aj patristickú diskusiu o prvých veršoch rozprávania o stvorení (nakolko sa vzťahuje na skúmané lexémy) a jej súvislosť s formuláciou Symbolu.

## 1 Grécka literatúra

### 1.1 Sloveso ζωογονέω

Zložené sloveso ζωογονέω pozostáva z časti ζωο- (ζωο-, ζωιο-, ζω-) „živý“ a γον-, čo je jedna z podôb koreňa γεν-, γν- (v slovese γίγνομαι „rodiť sa, vznikáť“, γονεύς „rodič“) čiže „rodiť, dávať vznik“. Označuje vznik akejkoľvek formy života – predovšetkým živočíchov, no aj rastlín a bohov. V súlade so svojou etymológiou má v aktíve význam „rodiť, dávať život/vznik (živým bytostiam)“, v pasíve „rodiť sa“. Ak je použité intransitívne, znamená „vznikáť, prichádzať do života“. Používa sa o rozmnožovaní pohlavnom aj nepohlavnom a o tzv. spontánnom vzniku.

#### 1.1.1 Pôvod života na zemi a tzv. spontánnny vznik

Podľa starovekých predstáv sa život na zemi po prvýkrát objavil v bahne, v ktorom vznikli živé bytosti vrátane človeka. Toto dokladá niekoľko démokritovských zlomkov:

Δ. γεγεννημένα εἶναι τὰ ζῶια συστάσει † εἰδεεναστρον [1. εἰδέων ἀνάρθρων] πρῶτον τοῦ ὕγροῦ ζωογονοῦντος

Podľa Démokrita sa živé bytosti po prvýkrát zrodili zložením nestvárných prvkov, keď im bahno dalo život.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> DÉMOKRITOS, *Fragment* 139. Emendácia podľa DIELS, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 379. Grécke literárne texty citujem podľa znenia, ktoré má TLG, ak nie je uvedené inak.

Vlhké miesta „ožili“ (ζωογονουμένων δὲ τῶν ὑγρῶν) pod slnečným teplom<sup>7</sup>. No keďže sa zem postupne stávala pevnejšou, strácala svoju schopnosť „rodiť“ väčšie zvieratá (μηκέτι δύνασθαι μηδὲν τῶν μειζόνων ζωογονεῖν), ktoré potom zostali odkázané na svoje vlastné možnosti<sup>8</sup>.

Okrem pôsobenia teplého slnka na vlhkú zem myslitelia videli aj iné možné vplyvy. Vznik života sa vysvetľoval aj ako zmiešanie protikladných prvkov – krv vykastrovaného Urána, ktorá dopadla na zem, t. j. spojenie neba a zeme<sup>9</sup>; alebo boli zapojené všetky štyri základné prvky vesmíru: zem, vzduch, oheň a voda<sup>10</sup>.

V babylonskej verzii, keď bola ešte len temnota a voda, zrodili sa prvotné monštrá (ζῶα τερατώδη... ζωογονεῖσθαι)<sup>11</sup>. Podľa egyptskej verzie však život vznikol v Egypte vďaka zúrodňujúcej vode Nílu, ktorý udržuje všetky živé bytosti. Dokonca aj „dnes“ sa v Thébaide občas rodia myši vo veľkých húfoch, pričom niektoré z nich ešte nie sú plne sformované a namiesto časti tela majú hrudu hliny. Len v tejto krajine je možné vidieť, ako isté živé bytosti prichádzajú do života (ζωογονούμενα) takýmto podivuhodným spôsobom<sup>12</sup>.

Táto mýtická predstava, že život vznikol spontánne zo zeme, sa v klasickom období už všeobecne zavrhovala. No jej pozostatky zostali u Aristotela, ktorý akceptoval spontánnu vznik v prípade hmyzu a malých zvierat. Keďže ich spôsob rozmnožovania bol v staroveku neznámy, predpokladalo sa, že sa rodili v prírodných prvkoch ako zem, bahno, hnoj, rastliny, hnojivé látky, za primiešania dažďovej vody atď. Tento proces vyzerá ako hnutie (σῆψις), ale v skutočnosti je to varenie (πεπτόμενον). Vyžaduje si vodu a teplo duševného princípu, ktorý má πνεῦμα a ktorý je prítomný vo vode aj vo vzduchu<sup>13</sup>.

Theofrástos vo svojich botanických spisoch používa ζωογονέω na opis zvláštneho druhu choroby rastlín, keď sa okolo zasiatych semien a v nich objavujú červy. Príroda dáva vznik týmto bytostiam (ἢ φύσις ζωογονεῖ), keď je buď priveľa alebo primálo živín, počasie je buď príliš daždivé alebo prisuché,

<sup>7</sup> DÉMOKRITOS, *Fragment 5* = DIODÓROS SICÍLSKY, *Bibliotheca historica* 1.7.4.

<sup>8</sup> DÉMOKRITOS, *Fragment 5* = DIODÓROS SICÍLSKY, *Bibliotheca historica* 1.7.6.

<sup>9</sup> CHRÝSIPPOS, *Fragment 1088: Scholia Hesiod. Theogonia* 459.

<sup>10</sup> LÚKIÁNOS, *Amores* 19.

<sup>11</sup> BERÓSSOS, *Babyloniaca: Fragment 1a*.

<sup>12</sup> HEKATÁIOS, *Fragment 25* = DIODÓROS SICÍLSKY, *Bibliotheca historica* 1.10.1-3.

<sup>13</sup> ARISTOTELÉS, *De generatione animalium* III.11 762a – 763b.



alebo zrážky neprichádzajú v pravý čas.<sup>14</sup> Takéto bytosti sa objavujú aj v skladovaných semenách – s výnimkou cíceru, ktorý jediný nedáva vznik ničomu (μόνος γὰρ οὗτος οὐ ζωογονεῖ)<sup>15</sup>.

### 1.1.2 Pohlavné rozmnožovanie

Sloveso ζωογονέω sa bežne používa aj na označenie pohlavného rozmnožovania (často je synonymné so ζωοτοκέω „rodiť živé potomstvo“) v jeho rozmanitých špecifických prípadoch:

1. „rodiť živé/životaschopné potomstvo“ – o živočíšnych druhoch, ktoré sa môžu krížiť, ako napr. vlci a psi<sup>16</sup>;
2. „byť živorodý“, rodiť potomstvo, ktoré je životaschopné hneď od začiatku – na rozdiel od napr. vajcorodých. Toto je dôvod, prečo je netopier pokladaný za štvornožca, hoci lieta ako vtáky<sup>17</sup>;
3. „liahnuť sa“ – pasívne o zrode potomstva po predbežnom štádiu vajca, ikry alebo larvy, napr. ikry uložené v bahne sa vyliahnú, „prídu k životu“ (ζωογονεῖται)<sup>18</sup>. Autorom neunikla dôležitosť prostredia, ktoré vajíčka živí a privádza ich k zrelosti a do okamihu úplného narodenia (ἐκτρέφει τὰ ὠὰ καὶ τελειοῖ καὶ ὅλως ζωογονεῖ)<sup>19</sup>;
4. „mať potomstvo“ akýmkoľvek spôsobom: (v Thessálii) sa hady množia tak veľmi (ἄφεις ζωογονηθῆναι τοσούτους), že keby ich bociany nežrali, ľudia by museli odísť<sup>20</sup>;
5. „počať“: „Mužské semeno je ako démiurg a počiatok procesu. Semeno padne do maternice a zmieša sa s najčistejším ženským sekretom. Lebo nie všetok ženský krvavý sekret je užitočný na počatie (πρὸς τὸ ζωογονῆσαι), ale iba jeho časť.“<sup>21</sup>

<sup>14</sup> THEOFRÁSTOS, *De causis plantarum* 3.22.3, porov. *De causis plantarum* 3.24.3.

<sup>15</sup> THEOFRÁSTOS, *Historia plantarum* 8.11.2.

<sup>16</sup> DIODÓROS SICÍLSKY, *Bibliotheca historica* 1.88.6 = HEKATAIOS, *Fragment* 25.

<sup>17</sup> ARISTOFANÉS GRAMMATIKOS, *Aristophanis historiae animalium epitome* 2.442, *Supplementum Aristotelicum* 1.

<sup>18</sup> ARISTOTELÉS, *Fragment* 311.

<sup>19</sup> THEOFRÁSTOS, *De causis plantarum* 4.15.2.

<sup>20</sup> ARISTOTELÉS, *Mirabilia animalium* 23, 832a14.

<sup>21</sup> ARISTOFANÉS GRAMMATIKOS, *Aristophanis historiae animalium epitome* 1.63.

6. Zaradujeme sem aj prípady rozmnožovania z mýtického kontextu, hoci je diskutabilné, či ide o pohlavný spôsob. Myšlienka tehotenstva a pôrodu je prítomná v príbehu o Diovi a zrode Pallas Athény. Keď Héfaistos rozsekol Diovu hlavu, ktorá mu spôsobovala ukrutné bolesti, ukázala sa príčina: „Je pochopiteľné, že si bol mrzutý, keď si pod mozgovými blanami bol tehotný (ζωογονῶν) s takýmto veľkým dievčaťom, ktoré je navyše v plnej zbroji.“<sup>22</sup>

No mýtus o Héliovi a bohyni Rhodos a jej ostrove bola pôvodne pravdepodobne prípadom spontánneho kozmogonického<sup>23</sup> zrodu (vlhká zem a vplyv slnka), ktorý bol neskôr interpretovaný v personifikovanej podobe: Na počiatku bol ostrov bahnistý a mäkký. No Hélios vysušil nadbytočnú vlhkosť a priviedol zem k pôrodu (ἀναξηράναντα τὴν πολλὴν ὑγρότητα ζωογονῆσαι τὴν γῆν). Tak sa zrodili Héliovny, Héliove dcéry, a autochtónny ľud<sup>24</sup>. Zdá sa, že tu je sloveso ζωογονέω použité v kauzatívnom zmysle („urobil, že porodila“), blízkym významu „oplodniť“. Ten bol však spravidla vyjadrovaný slovesom ζωοποιέω (o tom nižšie).

### 1.1.3 Ďalšie významy

V literárnych textoch je doložený ešte jeden význam, hoci zriedkavý: „udržať pri živote“. Nachádzame ho u Ezopa. Pastier viedol ovce do košiara a chcel spolu s nimi zavrieť aj vlka. Keď to uvidel pes, povedal mu: „Keď ho necháš vstúpiť do košiara, ako chceš, aby tvoje stádo zostalo nažive?“ (Πῶς... ποιμνία βούλει σοι τοῦ ζωογονεῖσθαι;) <sup>25</sup>.

## 1.2 Sloveso ζωοποιέω

Zložené sloveso ζωοποιέω pozostáva z časti ζωο- (ζωο-) „živý“ a ποιέω „robiť“. Do veľkej miery je synonymné so ζωογονέω, ale je zriedkavejšie a má menší sémantický záber. V súlade s agentívnym významom svojho druhého komponentu sa používa len v tých prípadoch rodenia/plodenia, kde sa dá vidieť nejaký druh agentivity. Komponent -ποιέω si zachováva svoj význam.

<sup>22</sup> LÚKIÁNOS, *Dialogi deorum* 8[13].

<sup>23</sup> „Kozmogonický“ azda nie je najvhodnejší výraz, ale nepoznám nič lepšie na označenie prvotného vzniku života.

<sup>24</sup> ZÉNÓN HISTORIKOS, *Fragment* 1.

<sup>25</sup> EZOP (AISOPOS), *Fabulae* 318aliter.

### 1.2.1 Pôvod života na zemi a tzv. spontánny vznik

Sloveso ζωοποιέω sa vyskytuje v kontexte pôvodu života. No ak sloveso ζωογονέω so svojím intranzitívnym potenciálom umožňovalo prezentovať tento proces ako úplne spontánny, sloveso ζωοποιέω sa nachádza len v prípade, ak je prítomný vplyv slnka (a jeho tepla), ktoré je buď priamy zdroj života (αἴτιος „príčina“), alebo ho stimuluje. Pýthagorás – podľa Diogena Laertia – popíeral možnosť spontánneho vzniku života a pokladal slnko za to, čo podnecuje život vo všetkom (ζωοποιεῖν πάντα)<sup>26</sup>. Podľa Diodóra Sicílskeho slnko dáva vznik nielen zvieratám rozmanitých tvarov a farieb,<sup>27</sup> ale aj spôsobuje všetko sfarbenie v prírode: „slnko, zdroj života, spolupôsobí v tvorbe každého druhu“ (συνεργήσαντος ἡλίου τοῦ ζωοποιούντος τὰς ἐκάστων μορφάς) a je „príčina a tvorca“ (ὑπάρχειν αἴτιον καὶ δημιουργόν)<sup>28</sup>.

Theofrástos je jediný autor, ktorý používa sloveso ζωοποιέω aj v kontexte spontánneho vzniku v biológii, synonymne so ζωογονέω, keď opisuje spomenuté červy ako chorobu rastlín: „teplo akosi spôsobuje vznik živých bytostí“ (ζωοποιεῖ πως ἢ θερμότης), keď prispieva k rozkladu koreňa<sup>29</sup>. K tomuto fenoménu prispieva aj kvalita semien: „rozklad sladkých vecí dáva vznik živým bytostiam (= červom)“ (ζωοποιεῖ δὲ σηπόμενα τὰ γλυκέα)<sup>30</sup>.

### 1.2.2 Pohlavné rozmnožovanie

V kontexte pohlavného rozmnožovania sa sloveso ζωοποιέω používa len v dvoch prípadoch, kde je agentivita azda trochu zreteľnejšia – pri dohliadaní na liahnutie a pri oplodnení:

1. „priviesť k vyliahnutiu“: „Lúčne pavúky kladú svoje vajíčka do siete a na nej sedia, až kým ich neprivedú k vyliahnutiu“ (ἐπιάζουσαι ζωοποιοῦσιν)<sup>31</sup>. V tomto prípade je sloveso tranzitívne a kauzatívne v zmysle „priviesť k vyliahnutiu“. No Theofrástos používa toto sloveso aj intranzitívne na opis procesu: „vajíčka (τὰ γὰρ ὠά) ... sa živia a dospievajú, niektoré v sladkej vode alebo v mori, iné v zemi

<sup>26</sup> DIOGENÉS LAERTIOS, *Vitae philosophorum* 8.1.27-28.

<sup>27</sup> DIODÓROS SICÍLSKY, *Bibliotheca historica* 2.51.3.

<sup>28</sup> DIODÓROS SICÍLSKY, *Bibliotheca historica* 2.52.6-7.

<sup>29</sup> THEOFRÁSTOS, *De causis plantarum* 3.22.4.

<sup>30</sup> THEOFRÁSTOS, *De causis plantarum* 4.14.4-5, porov. aj 4.12.12, 5.18.2 (ζωοποιία).

<sup>31</sup> ARISTOTELÉS, *Historia animalium* 5.27, 555b9.

alebo vo vzduchu, a prijímaním týchto prvkov do seba prichádzajú k vyliahnutiu” (ταῦτα δεχόμενα ζωοποιεῖ)<sup>32</sup>;

2. „oplodniť“: „samec plodí potomstvo jednoducho silou spočívajúcou v jeho semene“ (τῆ δυνάμει τῆ ἐν τῆ γονῆ ζωοποιεῖν)<sup>33</sup>.

### 1.2.3 Ďalšie významy

Pri slovese ζωοποιέω je doložený aj zriedkavý kauzatívny význam „oživiť“. Nachádzame ho na dvoch miestach:

1. Lúkiános spomína príbeh o mužoch na Mesiáci, ktorí nemajú ženy:

Svoje deti nosia nie v bruchu, ale v lýtku. Keď dôjde k počatiu, lýtko začne napúchať. Po istom čase ho rozrežú a vyberú dieťa, ktoré je mŕtve, ale oni ho oživia tak, že ho s otvorenými ústami nastaví proti vetru (ἐκθέντες δὲ αὐτὰ πρὸς τὸν ἄνεμον κεχηνότα ζωοποιοῦσιν).<sup>34</sup>

V tomto prípade ide o dodanie života do existujúcej matérie.

2. Metafyzický význam nachádzame až v neskorej antike, kde novoplatonik Damaskios píše o Bytí:

Bude samoživé (αὐτόζων), pretože dáva život samo sebe a neprijíma ho od niekoho iného (ὅπερ ἑαυτὸ ζωοποιεῖ καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρωθεν μόνον δέχεται τὴν ζωήν).<sup>35</sup>

### 1.3 Zhrnutie: ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω v gréckej literatúre

Slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω majú dve hlavné oblasti použitia. Vyjadrujú mýticko-filozofické predstavy o pôvode života na zemi, čo malo presah aj do biológie a myšlienke o spontánnom vzniku istých živočíšnych druhov. Potom sa používajú aj na označenie rôznych typov pohlavného rozmnožovania. Tretia oblasť významov, ktorá sa týka „zachovania života“ (ζωογονέω), resp. „oživenia“ (ζωοποιέω), je v literárnych prameňoch slabo doložená, no vyskytuje sa. Za pozornosť stojí aj to, že ζωοποιέω si zachováva význam agentivity.

<sup>32</sup> THEOPRÁSTOS, *De causis plantarum* 4.6.4.

<sup>33</sup> ARISTOTELÉS, *De generatione animalium* 730a2.

<sup>34</sup> LÚKIÁNOS, *Verae historiae* 1.22.

<sup>35</sup> DAMASKIOS, *De principiis* 78 [I.173-174].

## 2 Biblia

### 2.1 Septuaginta

Keď sa pozrieme na fungovanie slovies ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω v Septuaginte (LXX), akoby sme prišli do iného sveta. Dominantný význam gréckych literárnych textov „dávať (biologický) život“ sa tu prakticky nevyskytuje. Slovesá ζωογονέω (11 výskytov) a ζωοποιέω (6 výskytov) vyjadrujú „zachovať nažive“ alebo „oživiť“. Obe slovesá sú väčšinou prekladovým ekvivalentom hebrejského חיב „žiť, byť nažive“<sup>36</sup> v jeho intenzívnom a kauzatívnom kmeni (*piel* a *hifil*) práve s uvedenými významami<sup>37</sup>.

#### 2.1.1 Sloveso ζωογονέω

Biologický význam je doložený len na jednom mieste, Lv 11,47, kde ide o inštrukcie ohľadom čistých a nečistých zvierat a sloveso ζωογονέω je tu dvakrát v tvare participia s významom „živorodý“ (hebrejsky „živočích“). Všade inde ζωογονέω zodpovedá slovesu.

V jednej z prvých epizód Exodu pôrodné baby dostali príkaz zabíjať novorodených hebrejských chlapcov, ale dievčatá „nechať nažive“. Ony však „nechali nažive“ všetkých (Ex 1,17.18.22). V historických knihách sa toto sloveso nachádza vo vojenskom kontexte (Sdc 8,19; 1Krl' 27,9.11; 3Krl' 20,31; 4Krl' 7,4) a vyjadruje „ušetrenie života“ nepriateľa, napr. 1Krl' 27,9:

ἔτυπτε τὴν γῆν καὶ οὐκ ἐζωογονεῖ ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα  
(Dávid) udrel na krajinu a neponechal nažive muža ani ženu.

Sloveso ζωογονέω má väčšinou za podmet ľudí. Len na jednom mieste je podmetom Boh – v Anninej piesni (1Krl' 2,6):

Κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ, κατὰγει εἰς ἄδου καὶ ἀνάγει  
Pán usmrcuje aj oživuje, privádza dolu do Hádu a vyvádza (odtiaľ).

<sup>36</sup> HATCH – REDPATH, *A Concordance*, 599-601.

<sup>37</sup> Jeho ďalším prekladovým ekvivalentom je ζωοργέω „zajať živého, zachovať nažive“. Podrobnejšiu diskusiu (aj o možnej konvergencii významov) porov. PANCZOVÁ, Stal sa z Petra v Lk 5,10 naozaj „lovec ľudí“?, *StBiSl* 16/1 (2024) 103-115.

### 2.1.2 Sloveso ζωοποιέω

Pri slovese ζωοποιέω pozorujeme tie isté významy ako pri ζωογονέω, ale pri podmete je opačné zastúpenie činiteľov. Sloveso ζωοποιέω má jeden výskyt vo vojenskom kontexte – týka sa mladých žien, ktorých životy boli pri vyhladzovacej kampani ušetrené (Sdc 21,14):

ἐπέστρεψεν Βενιαμιν πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ... καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς οἱ υἱοὶ  
Ἰσραηλ τὰς γυναῖκας ἃς ἐζωοποίησαν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἰαβις Γαλααδ

(Kmeň) Benjamín sa vrátil k synom Izraela... a synovia Izraela im dali ženy z dcér Jabeša v Gileáde, ktoré ponechali nažive.

V ostatných prípadoch má toto sloveso ako podmet Boha. Je to Boh, kto rozhoduje o veciach života a smrti – kráľ nemôže vyliečiť malomocenstvo (4Krl' 5,7), preto kladie rečnícku otázku:

μὴ θεὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ θανατῶσαι καὶ ζωοποιῆσαι;  
Vari som ja Boh, aby som usmrcoval a oživoval?

Boh síce zosiela na ľud trápene a ťažkosti, ale zároveň ich udržiava nažive či ich následne privádza naspäť k životu (Ž 70[71],20):

ὅσας ἔδειξάς μοι θλίψεις πολλὰς καὶ κακάς, καὶ ἐπιστρέψας ἐζωοποίησάς με,  
καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀβύσσων τῆς γῆς πάλιν ἀνήγαγές με

Ukázal si mi mnohé ťažké súženia, ale potom si ma znova oživil,  
a z hlbín zeme si ma znova vyviedol nahor.

Boh udržiava nažive všetko (Neh 9,6). Alternatívne je to múdrosť, čo udržiava svojho nositeľa nažive (Kaz 7,12). Boh nenechá nažive bezbožného (Jób 36,6).

Verš Neh 9,6 je pozoruhodný<sup>38</sup> tým, že je to jediné miesto, kde je kozmogonický kontext a mohli by sme tam vidieť klasický význam tohto slovesa:

σὺ εἶ αὐτὸς κύριος μόνος, σὺ ἐποίησας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ... τὴν γῆν ...  
καὶ σὺ ζωοποιεῖς τὰ πάντα

Ty jediný si Pán, ty si utvoril nebo a ... zem ...  
a ty dávaš život všetkému.

<sup>38</sup> BADLÍKOVÁ – ŠTRBA, Štruktúra modlitby, 33.

### 2.1.3 Zhrnutie používania v LXX

Slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω sú v LXX do veľkej miery synonymné, no ich sémantický záber je – oproti literárnym textom – posunutý. Dominujú dva významy: 1. „zachovať nažive“, t. j. neusmrtiť, 2. „oživiť, znova priviesť k životu“ – o mŕtvych a chorých prinavrátených k životu a zdraviu. Pozoruhodná je istá tendencia používať ζωογονέω s podmetom človeka a ζωοποιέω s podmetom Boha.

## 2.2 Nový zákon

V Novom zákone sa slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω vyskytujú 3× resp. 11× (+ 2× συζωοποιέω). Je tu zreteľný posun vo frekvencii smerom k ζωοποιέω.

### 2.2.1 Sloveso ζωογονέω

Sloveso ζωογονέω v jednom prípade odkazuje na epizódu z Exodu o novorodených deťoch a ich zachovaní nažive (Sk 7,19). Ďalší výskyt sa týka zachovania svojej duše pre večný život (Lk 17,33).

Jedenkrát má ako podmet Boha (1Tim 6,13). Toto miesto je jediné v NZ, ktoré sa dá chápať v širokom zmysle ako kozmogonické:

ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα  
pred Bohom, ktorý dáva život všetkému.<sup>39</sup>

### 2.2.2 Sloveso ζωοποιέω

Sloveso ζωοποιέω má silnú tendenciu mať ako podmet Boha, resp. Ježiša alebo Ducha. Jediný iný podmet je zákon, ktorého schopnosť dávať život či udržiavať nažive je popretá (Gal 3:21). Toto sloveso často označuje kriesenie mŕtvych (Jn 5,21 [2×], Rim 4,17; 8,11; 1Kor 15,22.36.45; 1Pt 3,18).

No význam sa postupne presúva od nádeje na fyzické vzkriesenie smerom ku zvýšeniu kvality tohto života skrze odpustenie hriechov vďaka Kristovi (συζωοποιέω: Ef 2,5; Kol 2,13). Sloveso sa používa aj metaforicky o opozícii medzi duchom, ktorý dáva život, a telom (Jn 6,63) alebo literou (2Kor 3,6), ktoré túto životodarnú schopnosť nemajú.

<sup>39</sup> Viaceré rukopisy majú ζωοποιέω – predovšetkým *Codex Sinaiticus* a mnohé minuskulové rukopisy tzv. byzantského textového typu.

### 2.2.3 Zhrnutie používania v NT

Slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω v NZ pokračujú v smere, ktorý vytýčila LXX. Doložené sú oba významy LXX – „zachovať nažive“ aj „oživiť“ –, no s miernou variáciou. Zachovanie biologického života, ktoré tvorilo väčšinu výskytov v LXX, je v NZ iba v jednom prípade a aj to je reflexia Exodu. Ak v NZ ide o zachovanie života, je to spravidla život nadprirodzený. To isté sa týka významu „oživiť“, ktorý tiež môže označovať nielen vrátenie mŕtvych do života, ale aj zvýšenie kvality existujúceho života. S týmto posunom významu nepochybne súvisí aj to, že podmetom je – až na výnimky – Boh (Ježiš, duch).

Klasické významy v Biblii – LXX aj NZ – takmer absentujú. Čiastočne to môže byť spôsobené iným obsahovým zameraním (absencia biologických debát je v Biblii pochopiteľná). No pozoruhodná je aj neprítomnosť kozmogonického kontextu (v najširšom zmysle). Máme iba dve miesta, ktoré sa dotýkajú tohto klasického významu – ζωοποιέω v Neh 9,6 a ζωογονέω v 1Tim 6,13. No nie je isté, či hovoria o pôvode života, alebo „len“ o jeho zachovaní/udržaní.

## 3 Kresťanská literatúra

Gréci kresťanskí autori budujú na oboch tradíciách, ktoré zdedili, na biblickej aj klasickej, a kreatívne ich kombinujú. Používajú obe slovesá, ζωογονέω aj ζωοποιέω<sup>40</sup>, pričom ich podmetom je spravidla Boh (Otec, Syn, Duch), ktorý dáva, zachováva či vracia život prirodzený (biologický) aj nadprirodzený.

### 3.1 Adjektívum ζωοποιός

Pozoruhodné je to, že v kresťanských textoch – literárnych aj – dokumentárnych – sa objavuje (v starších textoch ojedinelé) slovesné adjektívum ζωοποιός „tvoriaci/dávajúci život“, resp. „oživujúci“. Má štandardnú formáciu aj význam. Spravidla sa týka niektorej božskej osoby, resp. niektorého aspektu Božieho pôsobenia (križ, chlieb, voda).

Ako jeden z Božích titulov označuje ζωοποιός dva aspekty: Boha ako tvorcu života a ako udržiavateľa života. Význam „zachovania života“ je pri slovesách ζωοποιέω a ζωογονέω v Biblii dobre doložený. No vzniká otázka, či pri

<sup>40</sup> LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 597-598.



tých dvoch miestach, kde sú použité v kozmogonickom kontexte (Neh 9,6; 1 Tim 6,13), ide „iba“ o udržiavanie života alebo aj o jeho stvorenie. Tomu sa venovali exegéti a teológovia, keď sa v rámci trinitárnych diskusií museli zamýšľať, či svet stvoril iba Boh-Otec alebo na tom mal účasť aj Syn a Duch. Nakoniec dospeli k názoru, že to bola celá Božia Trojica. To sa prejavuje aj v používaní a sémantike adjektíva ζωοποιός.

Cyriľ Alexandrijský (1. polovica 5. storočia) zhrnuje vieru Cirkvi takto:

Všetci vyznávajú jedného Boha, ktorý je nad všetkým, pre všetko a vo všetkom, bez počiatku a neviditeľný, nezrodený, neporušiteľný, život a tvorca života (ζωήν και ζωοποιόν), stvoriteľ neba a zeme a všetkého, čo je v nich.<sup>41</sup>

O stvoriteľskej aktivite Otca nikdy nebolo pochýb. Božstvo druhej božskej osoby a rovnosť Syna s Otcom dokázali mnohými spôsobmi mnohí veľkí teológovia bojujúci proti arianizmu. Uvedme len ďalšiu Cyriľovu brilantnú formuláciu, v ktorej sa vyskytuje sloveso ζωοποιέω a v ktorej hovorí o prirodzenosti božského Logu:

Dokonalý je v dokonalom a z dokonalého robí dokonalé dobré, tvorí ich a dáva im život (ἐργάζεται και δημιουργεῖ και ζωοποιεῖ).<sup>42</sup>

Prítomnosť a deľbu práce medzi tromi božskými osobami predstavuje Cyriľ, keď vykladá teologický význam opisu stvorenia v prvých veršoch knihy Genesis:

(Rozprávanie ohlasuje) Boha, skrze ktorého všetko prišlo ku zrodu – mám na mysli jeho živé a jednopodstatné Slovo a životodarného (ζωοποιόν) Ducha, ktorý je v Bohu a z neho a ktorý je skrze Syna vysielaný ku stvoreniu. (...) Ukazuje, že skrze živé Slovo všemohúceho Boha prišlo ku vzniku všetko, čo nikdy nebolo, a má život (ζωογονεῖται) v Duchu.<sup>43</sup>

Pri stvorení bola prítomná celá Trojica. Boh totiž stvoril svet tak, že vypovedal Slovo, t. j. povedal „nech je“ svetlo a ostatné veci, a tak vzniklo svetlo a ostatné veci, zatiaľ čo Duch „sa vznášal nad vodou“<sup>44</sup>. O pôsobení tohto Ducha Cyriľ píše:

<sup>41</sup> CYRIL ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Contra Julianum* 1.40 (SC 322, 184).

<sup>42</sup> CYRIL ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Contra Julianum* 1.46 (SC 322, 198).

<sup>43</sup> CYRIL ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Contra Julianum* 1.28 (SC 322, 160-162).

<sup>44</sup> Gn 1,2c.

Boží Duch dáva život (ζωογονεῖ) všetkému. Veď aj on je Život svojou prirodzenosťou, lebo je zo života Otca.<sup>45</sup>

Pri výklade verša Gn 1,2c sa pristavíme podrobnejšie. Pri jeho exegéze sa totiž – ako vidno – objavujú lexémy ζωογονέω a ζωοποιός. A nielen to. Vynára sa aj ich starobylý význam z kozmogonického kontextu.

### 3.2 *Debata o Gn 1,2c*

Na počiatku Boh „utvoril“ (ἐποίησεν) nebo a zem<sup>46</sup>.

Zem bola neviditeľná a nestvárnená,  
tma bola nad priepasťou  
a Boží duch sa vznášal nad vodou  
(πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος).<sup>47</sup>

To sú úvodné verše knihy Genesis podľa LXX. Exegéti si tu kládli dve otázky: Čo označuje πνεῦμα θεοῦ? Nie je totiž nesporné, že ide o tretiu božskú osobu, ako to interpretoval Cyril vo vyššie uvedenom úryvku. A čo znamená ἐπεφέρετο? Základný význam je „niesť sa nad niečím, vznášať sa“. Ale čo to znamená na tomto mieste?

#### 3.2.1 πνεῦμα θεοῦ

Výraz πνεῦμα môže označovať buď „ducha/Ducha“ alebo „vietor“. Uvedieme názory dvoch exegétov, ktorí zhrňujú tradíciu.

Bazil Veľký (4. stor.), jeden z kappadóckych otcov, vo svojich homíliách na šesť dní stvorenia *Hexaéméron* to vykladá nasledovne:

„A Duch Boží“, hovorí, „sa vznášal ponad vodu.“ Azda toto slovo „duch“ (πνεῦμα) označuje vanutie vzduchu (ἀήρ); pochop, že svätopisec ti vyratúva časti kozmu, pričom uvádza, že Boh stvoril nebo, zem, vodu i vzduch a že tento vzduch sa šíril a plynul. Azda – čo je však pravdepodobnejšie a prikláňali sa k tomu naši predchodcovia – tento Boží duch je Duch Svätý, pretože hodno mať na pamäti, že Písmo špecificky a prednostne vyhradzuje toto slovo práve preňho a že Boží duch nie je nič iné ako ten Svätý Duch, ktorý naplňa božskú a blaženú

<sup>45</sup> CYRIL ALEXANDRIJSKÝ, *Contra Julianum* 2.27 (SC 322, 260-262).

<sup>46</sup> Gn 1,1 (LXX).

<sup>47</sup> Gn 1,2 (LXX).

Trojiču. Ak si osvojiš túto mienku, zistíš, že si tým získal obzvlášť veľa.<sup>48</sup>

Podrobnejšie to vykladá Diodóros z Tarzu (4. stor.), jeden z popredných predstaviteľov antiochijskej exegetickej školy, vo svojom výklade knihy Genezis, z ktorého sa, žiaľ, zachovali len zlomky:

Pokiaľ ide o význam výrazu τὸ πνεῦμα, ak ho niekto chce chápať ako „vietor“ (ἄνεμος), nerobí chybu. Vietor je totiž spojený s vodami: jednak z nich pochádza a vzniká ich pohybom, jednak mení ich prirodzenosť. Mohol by sa nazývať „Božím“, lebo je dielom Boha. Ale prívlastok „Boží“ dostal vietor predovšetkým preto, že sa autorom zdalo príliš veľké dávať mu schopnosť zohrievať a privádzať k životu vodu (τὸ θάλπειν καὶ ζωογονεῖν τὸ ὕδωρ), a tak príčinu tohto javu pripísali Stvoriteľovi všetkého.

No ak by niekto tvrdil, že ten výraz, ktorý použil Mojžiš, označuje Svätého Ducha Utešiteľa, takisto by sa nemýlil. Duch totiž tvorí všetko (κοσμητικὸν τῶν ὄντων). Výraz „duch Boha“ môže tiež označovať Božiu energiu (ἐνέργεια = pôsobenie): energia sa totiž inak nazýva aj „duch“. Ani tento názor nie je zavrhnutiahodný.<sup>49</sup>

### 3.2.2 ἐπεφέρετο

Pri výklade významu slovesa ἐπεφέρετο exegéti skúmajú jeho semitské korene<sup>50</sup> a zároveň zapájajú grécku filozofiu. Diodóros z Tarzu uvádza:

Hebrejský výraz, ktorého prekladom je ἐπεφέρετο, vyjadruje to, keď kvočka sedí na vajíčkach a svojimi krídlami sa ich jemne dotýka, aby ich priviedla k životu; rovnako sa aj Duch vznášal na vodami a zohrieval ich, aby ožili (καθάπερ ὄρνις ὡς θάλπει ταῖς πτέρυξι ἀπαλῶς

<sup>48</sup> BAZIL VEĽKÝ, *Hexaemeron* 2.6. Grécky text: (SC 26, 166-168), slovenský preklad Daniel Škoviera, 199-200.

<sup>49</sup> DIODÓROS Z TARZU, *Fragmenta in Gen.* 1.2 (PG 33, 1563C).

<sup>50</sup> Ten semitský rozmer je pozoruhodný, lebo ani súčasní vedci si nie sú istí, čo vlastne to hebrejské sloveso pôvodiny znamená. Ide o zriedkavý koreň חָפַח („chvieť“) v tvare piel (חָפַחְךָ), ktoré na tomto mieste (Gn 1,2) opatrne prekladajú ako „chvejivo sa vznášať“ (KOEHLER – BAUMGARTNER, *Lexicon*, 886-887). Tento tvar nachádzame aj v Dt 32,11, kde sa týka orla, ktorý chráni svoje mláďatá v hniezde. LXX na tomto mieste interpretuje pomerne voľne slovesom ἐπιποθέω „túžiť za niečím“, tu asi vo význame „preukazovať lásku, s láskou sa starať“ (MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 278).

ἐφαπτομένη εἰς τὸ ζωογονεῖν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπεφέρετο τοῖς ὕδασι ζωοθαλποῦν).<sup>51</sup>

Podobný výklad nachádzame aj u Bazila:

Ako sa tento Duch vznášal ponad vodu? Poviem ti teraz nie svoj vlastný výklad, ale výklad istého Sýrčana, muža, ktorému bola múdrosť tohto sveta o to vzdialenejšia, o čo bližšie mal k poznaniu pravých hodnôt. On hovoril, že v sýrčine je tento výraz výstižnejší a vďaka príbuznosti s hebrejčinou sa naozaj oveľa viac približuje k myšlienke Písem. Význam tohto výroku je potom takýto:

Slovom „vznášal“ (podľa neho) vykladá sa spojenie „zohrieval a oživoval“ prirodzenú substanciu vôd (συνέθαλπε, καὶ ἐζωογόνει τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν), pričom sa vychádza z obrazu sediacej kvočky, ktorá pod seba uložila vajíčka a zohrieva ich, ako keby do nich vpúšťala nejakú oživujúcu silu (κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωαζούσης ὄρνιθος, καὶ ζωτικὴν τινα δύναμιν ἐνείσης τοῖς ὑποθαλπομένοις). Asi taký zmysel, vravia, sa jasne črtá za týmto výrazom. „Duch sa vznášal“ čiže pripravoval substanciu vody na rodenie živých bytostí (πρὸς ζωογονίαν τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος φύσιν παρασκευάζοντος). A tak stačí vychádzať z tohto miesta, aby sa preukázalo to, čo niektorí pokladajú za otázne, že totiž Duch Svätý sa zúčastňuje na stvoriteľskej činorodosti (οὐδὲ τῆς δημιουργικῆς ἐνεργείας τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀπολείπεται).<sup>52</sup>

Obraz, ktorý nám exegeti predkladajú, je duch/vietor, ktorý svojím teplom zohrieva vodu, a tak umožňuje vznik života. V Diodórovej verzii táto „kvočka“ len sedí na „vajíčkach“, ktoré už v sebe majú život a potrebujú len teplo, aby sa vyliahli. V Bazilovej verzii do „vajíčok“ aj vpúšťa oživujúcu silu. Oba varianty obrazu však okrem sýrskej exegetickej tradície privádzajú do kresťanskej teologickej diskusie aj ozvenu gréckych mýtcko-filozofických predstáv o vzniku života pôsobením tepla/teplého vzduchu na vlhkú zem.

### 3.3 Duch „Oživovateľ“ v Nicejsko-carhradskom kréde

S týmto exegetickým pozadím sa môžeme teraz pozrieť na formuláciu tzv. nicejsko-carhradského vyznania viery o Svätom Duchu. Nicejský snem (prvý ekumenický v roku 325) sa o tretej božskej osobe vyjadril veľmi stručne:

<sup>51</sup> DIODÓROS Z TARZU, *Fragmenta in Genesim* 1.2 (PG 33, 1563C).

<sup>52</sup> BAZIL VEEKÝ, *Hexaemeron* 2.6. Grécky text: (SC 26, 168-170), slovenský preklad Daniel Škoviera, 200.

„(Veríme...) vo Svätého Ducha“<sup>53</sup> (τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα)<sup>54</sup>. V priebehu 4. storočia sa však kresťanská teológia vrátane pneumatológie výrazne rozvinula, a tak nasledujúci koncil v Konštantínopole/Carihrade (2. ekumenický v roku 381) podal formuláciu kréda obohatenú o viacero pojmov<sup>55</sup>. Jedným z nich bol aj náš skúmaný výraz: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... τὸ ζωοποιόν „(Veríme...) v Ducha Svätého... Oživovateľa“ (liturgický preklad)<sup>56</sup>.

Na mieste je otázka slovenského prekladu adjektíva ζωοποιός. Zatiaľ sme dali prednosť ekvivalentu „oživujúci“, resp. „oživovateľ“, ak je spodstatnené. Tento výraz vychádza z tradície slovenských biblických prekladov. Všetky naše hlavné preklady (SSV, SEB, SEP) majú „oživovať“<sup>57</sup> ako ekvivalent tvarov gréckeho ζωοποιέω. Botekov preklad (BOT) v Jeruzalemskej Biblii však varuje medzi „oživovať“ a „dávať život“<sup>58</sup>.

No v neskoršej kresťanskej tvorbe – ako sme videli – sa ζωοποιός, ζωοποιέω a ζωογονέω používajú v kontexte stvorenia sveta a stvoriteľskej aktivity. To je význam, ktorý by mal rezonovať aj vo Vyznaní viery. Konštantínopolský snem totiž (okrem iného) potvrdil božstvo Ducha a jeho rovnosť s Otcom a Synom. To je vyjadrené aj v novej formulácii: Veríme εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον<sup>59</sup>, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν „v Ducha, ktorý je Svätý, Pán a Tvorca/Darca života“<sup>60</sup>. Tituly ἅγιος, κύριος a ζωοποιός patria nielen Otcovi a Synovi, ale aj Duchu. Svätý Duch nie je podriadená osoba, ale – ako pokračuje Symbolon – „jemu sa zároveň vzdáva tá istá poklona a sláva ako Otcovi a Synovi.“

<sup>53</sup> Porov. *Dokumenty prvých dvoch ekumenických snemov* (preklad, úvod a vysvetlivky Marcel Gajdoš).

<sup>54</sup> [https://earlychurchtexts.com/main/nicaea/creed\\_of\\_nicaea.shtml](https://earlychurchtexts.com/main/nicaea/creed_of_nicaea.shtml).

<sup>55</sup> [https://earlychurchtexts.com/main/constantinople/creed\\_of\\_constantinople.shtml](https://earlychurchtexts.com/main/constantinople/creed_of_constantinople.shtml).

<sup>56</sup> Preklad ζωοποιόν ako „Oživovateľ“ je v rímsko-katolíckom liturgickom vyznaní viery. *Katechizmus Katolíckej cirkvi* (s. 53-54) tento text uvádza ako nicejsko-carihradské vyznanie viery, hoci nejde o pôvodnú formuláciu (je tu doplnené, že Duch Svätý vychádza nielen z Otca, ale aj zo Syna).

<sup>57</sup> S príležitostným „ožiť“ v prípade pasívnych tvarov (1Kor 15,22.36).

<sup>58</sup> Jn 6,63; Rim 4,17; 8,11; 1Kor 15,45; 2Kor 3,6.

<sup>59</sup> NB syntax: už nie je τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ale τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Tento slovosled zdôrazňuje svätosť Ducha. Porov. *Dokumenty prvých dvoch ekumenických snemov*, 39, pozn. 3.

<sup>60</sup> „Tvorca života“ je ekvivalent, ktorý veľmi správne uprednostnil Marcel Gajdoš vo svojom preklade. Porov. *Dokumenty prvých dvoch ekumenických snemov*, 31.

## 4 Záver

Slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω, viac-menej synonymné „dávať život, privádzať k životu“, majú fascinujúcu históriu. V gréckej literatúre sa používali jednak v kontexte mýticko-filozofických predstáv o pôvode života na zemi, jednak v biológii, kde označovali rôzne typy rozmnožovania.

V LXX však tieto oblasti takmer úplne absentujú. Tu sa dostávajú do popredia dva iné významy: „zachovať nažive“, a „oživiť, znova priviesť k životu“. NZ pokračuje v tomto smere s tým rozdielom, že život, o ktorom sa tu hovorí, je väčšinou nadprirodzený.

Kresťanskí autori budujú nielen na biblickej tradícii, ktorá dominuje, ale aj na dedičstve gréckej literatúry. Znova sa objavujú slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω so svojim kozmogonickým významom, a to v diskusii o stvorení sveta a o účasti Ducha na ňom. Sloveso vo verši Gn 1,2c (πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπέφερετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος) bolo vykladané ako pôsobenie tepla, ktoré umožňuje vznik života vo vode.

Slovesné adjektívum ζωοποιός sa dostalo do nicejsko-carhradského vyznania viery ako jeden z titulov Svätého Ducha. Jedným z cieľov 2. ekumenického koncilu bolo potvrdenie božstva Ducha a jeho rovnosti s Otcom a Synom, čo reflektovala aj nová formulácia, ktorej súčasťou je toto adjektívum: τὸ πνεῦμα... τὸ ζωοποιόν. V liturgickom preklade je tento titul preložený ako „Oživovateľ“, no presnejší ekvivalent by bol „Tvorca/Darca života“, ktorý vyjadruje vieru Cirkvi v jeho spoluúčasť na stvorení sveta.

## Zoznam použitej literatúry

### *Pramene a preklady*

- BASILE DE CÉSARÉE: *Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron*. Texte grec, introduction et traduction de Stanislas Giet (SC 26), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1949.
- SV. BAZIL VEĽKÝ: *Listy II (r. 375 – 378). Hexaéméron*. Preklad, úvodná štúdia a vysvetlivky Daniel Škoviera (BACH, edičný rad Patrimonium 2), Prešov: Petra, 2002.
- Biblia: Slovenský ekumenický preklad s deuterokánonickými knihami*. 4. (2. opravené) vydanie. 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)
- CYRILLE D'ALEXANDRIE: *Contre Julien (livres 1 et 2), Tome 1*. Introduction, texte critique, tradition et notes par Paul Burguière et Pierre Évieux (SC 322), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985.

- DIELS, Hermann: *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und Deutsch*. Erster Band, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, <sup>2</sup>1906.
- DIODORUS TARSENSIS: *Fragmenta ex catenis: in Genesin*. In *Cyrilli Hierosolymitani Opera quae exstant omnia* (PG 33), J.-P. Migne editore. Parisiis: Garnier, 1857, stłpce 1561 – 1580.
- Dokumenty prvých dvoch ekumenických snemov*. Preklad, úvod a vysvetlivky Marcel Gajdoš, (BACH, edičný rad Fontes 1), Prešov: Petra, 1999.
- Early Church Texts*. [naposledy cit. 2023-08-19] Dostupné na internete: <https://earlychurchtexts.com/main/homepage/homepage.shtml>.
- Katechizmus Katolíckej cirkvi*, Trnava: Spolok svätého Vojtecha, 1999.
- NESTLE, Eberhard et al. (eds.): *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, <sup>28</sup>2012.
- RAHLFS, Alfred (ed.): *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- 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)
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. The University of California [online], [naposledy cit. 2023-08-19]. Dostupné na internete: <https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>. (= TLG)
- Sekundárna literatúra*
- BADLÍKOVÁ, Zuzana – ŠTRBA, Blažej: Štruktúra modlitby v Neh 9,5–10,1. Nový návrh, *StBiSl* 14/1 (2022) 11-48.
- HATCH, Edwin – HENRY, A. Redpath: *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.
- KOEHLER, Ludwig – BAUMGARTNER, Walter: *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros*, Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- LAMPE, G. W. H.: *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- MURAOKA, Takamitsu: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009.
- PANCZOVÁ, Helena: Stal sa z Petra v Lk 5,10 naozaj „lovec ľuďí“? O sémantike slovesa ζωγράφω, *StBiSl* 16/1 (2024) 103-115.

### Zhrnutie


V gréckej literatúre sa slovesá ζωογονέω a ζωοποιέω používali v kontexte mýticko-filozofických predstáv o pôvode života na zemi: „dávať život, privádzať k životu“. V biblickej gréčtine však majú posunutý význam „zachovať nažive“, a „oživiť, znova priviesť k životu“. Neskorší kresťanskí autori síce budujú na biblickej tradícii, ale znova používajú aj kozmogonický význam týchto sloves, a to v diskusii o stvorení sveta a o účasti Svätého Ducha na ňom (Gn 1,2c: πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος). Na toto poukazuje aj slovesné adjektívum ζωοποιός v nicejsko-carhradskom vyznaní viery ako jeden z nových titulov Svätého Ducha.

*Kľúčové slová:* grécka lexikografia, vznik života, Genesis (Gn 1,2c), Svätý Duch, nicejsko-carhradské vyznanie viery.

### Summary

In the Greek literature, the verbs ζωογονέω and ζωοποιέω were used in the context of mythic-philosophical ideas about the origin of life on earth: “give life, produce life”. In biblical Greek, their meanings are shifted: “keep alive” and “revive, bring (back) to life”. Later Christian authors build on the biblical tradition, but they reuse the cosmogonic meaning of these verbs, namely in the debate about the creation of the world and the part the Holy Spirit played in it (Gen 1:2c: πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος). The verbal adjective ζωοποιός in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, used as one of the new titles of the Holy Spirit, pointed to this.

*Key words:* Greek Lexicography, Origin of Life, Genesis (Gen 1:2c), Holy Spirit, Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

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

---

---

**BRAULIK, Georg – LOHFINK, Norbert: *Die Rhetorik der Moserede in Deuteronomium 1 – 4* (Österreichische biblische Studien 55), Berlin et al.: Peter Lang, 2022. 212 s. ISBN 978-3-631-87348-9.**

Vedecká monografia *Die Rhetorik der Moserede in Deuteronomium 1 – 4* je 55. zväzkom známej rakúskej biblickej edície *Österreichische Biblische Studien*, ktorej editorom je vychýrený expert na Deuteronomium profesor Georg Braulik a ktorej vydavateľom je dnes už celosvetovo známe vydavateľstvo Peter Lang. Monografia svojím obsahom, zameraním i cieľom nadväzuje na 53. zväzok tej istej edície, v ktorom sa svetoznáma dvojica expertov na Deuteronomium benediktín Georg Braulik a jezuita Norbert Lohfink zaoberala a skúmala jazyk a literárnu formu Knihy Deuteronomium ako celku<sup>1</sup>. Miroslav Varšo vo svojej recenzii predstavil knihu podrobnejšie<sup>2</sup>. Tu recenzovaný 55. zväzok edície pochádza z rúk dvojice spomenutých výnimočných znalcov Deuterómia, z ktorej druhého v alfabetickom poradí jezuitu Norberta Lohfinka si Boh povolal k sebe ako prvého, a to 23. 9. 2024 – presne na začiatku jesene tohto roka, v jeho 96. roku života<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> BRAULIK, Georg – LOHFINK, Norbert: *Sprache und literarische Gestalt des Buches Deuteronomium. Beobachtungen und Studien* (ÖBS 53); Berlin et al.: Peter Lang, 2021.

<sup>2</sup> VARŠO, Miroslav: Recenzia Braulik, Georg – Lohfink, Norbert, *Sprache und literarische Gestalt des Buches Deuteronomium. Beobachtungen und Studien* (ÖBS 52), *StBiSl* 14/1 (2022) 115-122.

<sup>3</sup> P. Norbert Lohfink SJ in München verstorben [online], [cit. 23-10-2024]. Dostupné: <https://www.jesuiten.org/news/p-norbert-lohfink-sj-in-muenchen-verstorben>.

Monografia predstavuje úvodný prehľad prvej Mojžišovej reči ako celku. Nejde teda o komentár po veršoch, ale o výskum rétorickej dynamiky tejto Mojžišovej reči, ktorá zaberá takmer celé štyri kapitoly. Ako píše autori v úvode: „Na naše vlastné prekvapenie sme si pomaly uvedomovali, že sa pozeráme na rétorické majstrovské dielo. Mojžiš otvára deň svojej smrti prvotriednou rečou. Jeho poslucháči – celý vtedajší zhromaždený izraelský ľud – sú vtiahnutí do udalostí tohto veľkého dňa, v ktorom večer Boh dovolí rečníkovi z rána, aby sa sám pozeral z vrcholu hory na celú zasľúbenú krajinu, ktorú má Izrael čoskoro dostať za svoju zem, a potom ho vezme k sebe do smrti“ (s. 5).

Keďže Mojžišova prvá reč nebola doposiaľ „preskúmaná z hľadiska rétoriky podľa všetkých pravidiel tohto umenia... [preto sa autori] pokúsili predložiť skutočne dôkladnú analýzu textových faktov, z ktorej napokon vznikla celá kniha“ (s. 5). Monografia je dôkladnou synchronnou analýzou textových faktov bez hypotetických predlôh dejín textu. Za zmienku stojí dôraz, ktorý autori dávajú na akustickú stránku rétoriky. Bez nej sa seriózná rétorika nezaobíde a v prípade už mŕtvej biblickej hebrejčiny zostane táto stránka rétoriky iba čiastočne známa<sup>4</sup>, a to vďaka kantilačnej technike písania masoretského hebrejského textu. Braulik sa tejto problematike podrobne venoval v predchádzajúcich štúdiách, z ktorých v predloženej monografii autori predkladajú iba výsledky.

Knihá má dve podstatné časti. V prvej sa skúma Mojžišovo rozprávačské umenie v pohľade na minulosť v 1,6–3,29 (s. 9 – 129), kým v druhej časti je výskum upriamený na rétoriku Mojžišovej reči pred celým Izraelom v 4,1–40 (s. 131 – 194), zameranej na súčasnosť. Záverečná kapitola monografie je zaujímavá svojimi konklúziami (s. 195 – 198). Po nej nasleduje zoznam použitej literatúry (s. 199 – 206) a register citovaných autorov (s. 207 – 208), po ktorom vydavateľ vložil zoznam všetkých monografií z edície *Österreichische Biblische Studien* (s. 209 – 212).

Knihá Deuteronomium obsahuje 22 Mojžišových rečí, ktoré zodpovedajú počtu hebrejskej abecedy a ktoré v podstate tvoria skoro celú knihu (s výnimkou kapitol 31 a 34 a občasných vstupov rozprávača). Tieto Mojžišove reči majú rôznu dĺžku, pričom monografia sa po stránke obsahu zaoberá len prvou z nich.

---

<sup>4</sup> Na problematiku akustickej stránky iného (mŕtveho) biblického jazyka – biblickej gréčtiny – upozornil Pavol Farkaš v štúdiu v tomto zväzku časopisu: Apoštol Pavol pred členmi veľrady v Sk 23,1-5. Interpretácia biblického textu: Rétoricko-intonačný aspekt, *StBiSl* 16/2 (2024) 248-255.

Ide o tú, ktorá sa nachádza v Dt 1,6–4,40 a ktorá súčasne tvorí takmer celý obsah prvej zo štyroch hlavných častí knihy (s. 9).

Rozdelenie monografie na dve časti kopíruje obsah i delenie veľkej debutovej Mojžišovej reči na dve nerovnako veľké textové jednotky. V prvej časti (1,6–3,29) robí Mojžiš prehľad predchádzajúcich dejín s výberom udalostí, ktoré sú rozhodujúce preto, aby ich pripomenul práve v deň Deuteronómia, ktorý nastáva, najprv retrospektívne a potom v druhej časti (4,1–40) jeho reči nasleduje výhľadový úvod do nadchádzajúcich udalostí toho istého dňa.

Obe časti monografie majú po tri kapitoly, v ktorých sú dve časti Mojžišovej reči podrobené literárnej analýze na rozličných úrovniach. Autori v nich odkrývajú sofistikovanú rétorickú kompozíciu Mojžišovej reči a jej fascinujúcu textovú, obsahovú a literárnu kompaktnosť a eleganciu. Nejde však o samoúčel rétoriky. Autori poukazujú jednak na viacnásobný význam Mojžišovej reči, ktorá slúži na formálne otvorenie všeobecného zhromaždenia ľudu na uzavretie zmluvy a predstavenie jej obsahu a jednak na jej náučný rozmer pre zhromaždenie v tom, že Mojžišova reč im má pomôcť pochopiť dokument zmluvy, ale aj nasledujúce kapitoly v knihe (porov. Dt 5–28, s. 195).

*Prvá časť* začína kapitolou zameranou na naratívnu analýzu Mojžišovho rozprávania v 1,6–3,29 (s. 11 – 74). Autori rozlíšili desať analytických rovín. Skúmajú napríklad jedinečné Mojžišovo rozprávanie v 1. os. sg., syntaktické špecifiká sloviess, fabulu a jej vypracovanie, dramaturgiu rozprávania, zoskupenia menších rečí po kompozičnej stránke, alebo Mojžišovu vinu ako hnaciú silu dynamiky príbehu a pod. Druhá kapitola (s. 75 – 93) naopak pomerne podrobne analyzuje medzitulky rozprávača (2,10–12.20–23; 3,5[?].9.11.13–14). Tretia kapitola (s. 93 – 129) sa zaoberá ďalšími formami jazykového prepojenia ako sú napríklad rámcujúce prvky, jazykové signály, ktoré majú vďaka svojej opakovanosti charakter leitmotívov, či leitmotívy, ktoré predstavujú samostatné systémy usporiadania medzi sebou, ďalšie sekundárne štruktúry textu, ktoré prebiehajú popri nich a podporujú ich. Napriek podrobnej analýze si autori nenárokujú na úplnosť všetkých jednotiacich elementov (porov. s. 93).

*Druhá časť* monografie je upriamená na druhú časť Mojžišovej reči, v ktorej sa Mojžiš obracia na zhromaždenie celého Izraela, aby mu odovzdal vedenie Izraela. Druhá časť sa začína štvrtou kapitolou monografie (s. 131 – 137) a zaoberá sa literárnymi prepojeniami medzi druhou časťou Mojžišovej reči (4,1–40) s jej prvou časťou (1,6–3,29). Piata kapitola (s. 139 – 178) sa zaoberá štruktúrou vv. 4,1–40 (s. 179 – 194). V tejto kapitole je okrem iného pozoruhodné aj odôvodnenie a rozdelenie tejto časti na dva typy štruktúr. V dvojdielnej

štruktúre je dôraz položený najprv na parenézu o zákone (vv. 1-8) a potom je parenéza zameraná na hlavné prikázanie (vv. 9-40, s. 146 – 154), kým v trojdielnej štruktúre medzi úvodom (vv. 1-8) a záverom (vv. 32-40) sa nachádza stredová perikopa, v ktorej dominujú slovesá „prejsť“ עבר (cez Jordán) a „vziať do vlastníctva“ ירש (zem), (vv. 9-31). Súčasne autori kompetentne a odvážne diskutujú aj odôvodnenosť, resp. slabiny iných typov významných štruktúr navrhnutých učencami (K. Baltzer, D. J. McCarthy, S. A. Geller, J. Taschner, C. T. Begg, E. Otto, s. 162 – 178). V poslednej šiestej kapitole (s. 179 – 194) autori predkladajú ďalšie zjednocujúce jazykové prvky Dt 4. K takýmto leitmotívovým prvkom radia niektoré špecifické slovesá, substantíva, či slovné spojenia, pomenovania Boha i tzv. „kontinuálny posun horizontu“, ktorý súvisí s oboma navrhovanými štruktúrami textu, ale nie je s nimi identický.

V záverečnej kapitole s názvom Rétorické ciele autori pozoruhodne zrealizovali to, čo zdôrazňoval Mojžiš v Dt 4, keď vysvetľoval dôležitosť Horebu. Nerobili sumár analyzovaného, ale prostredníctvom Mojžiša obrátili pozornosť čitateľa na dôležitosť Desatora a zmluvy. Mojžiš chcel v 4. kapitole „predovšetkým vopred objasniť dva aspekty: výklad začiatku Desatora, spojený so správnym chápaním Boha, a prorocké rozšírenie podmienených požehnaní a prekliatí v Tóre na neskoršiu históriu, ktorá napriek nim uznáva možné obnovenie Božieho milosrdenstva s Izraelom do budúcnosti“ (s. 195).

Braulik a Lohfink argumentovali, že Mojžišovi poslucháči nie sú iba exodová generácia putujúca púšťou, ale sú to tí, čo neodpadli od Pána a majú sa stať učiacimi sa i učiteľmi. Žiadna takáto generácia nesmie zabudnúť na udalosti a slová z teofánie a „predovšetkým má odovzdávať trvalú bázeň pred Pánom“ (s. 196). To je predpokladom a základom Desatora, ktoré Izraelu sprostredkoval Boh sám a ktoré ho zaviazal zachovávať vo svojej zmluve. Rovnako pozoruhodná je autormi odkrytá Mojžišova argumentácia o tom, že zákaz vyobrazovania Boha úzko súvisí so zákazom cudzích bohov a keďže Boha Izraela nikto nikdy nevidel, žiadne obrazy pozemských viditeľných skutočností ho nemôžu predstavovať (s. 197). Navyše údajné obrazy JHVH sú preto iba kultovými predmetmi cudzích bohov, ktorých uctievanie je Izraelu výslovne zakázané, pretože Izrael má priamy vzťah s JHVH prostredníctvom svojich dejín oslobodenia z Egypta. Preto Mojžiš výslovne popiera božskosť kultových obrazov (s. 197).

V monografii badať, ako autori stavajú na svojich mnohých a znamenitých predchádzajúcich štúdiách, ktoré síce necitujú (čo by možno sťažilo čítanie), ale z ktorých predkladajú kľúčové argumentačné kroky a závery s tým cieľom, aby

vyzdvihli premyslenú teologickú koherenciu v dvoch častiach prvej Mojžišovej reči. Recenzent môže iba žasnúť nad množstvom poznania autorov v predmetnej problematike a nad súvislosťami, ktorých výsledkom je odkrytie jedinečnosti jediného pravého Boha a jeho vzťahu s Izraelom. Preto recenzent ako učiaci sa môže a chce vyjadriť poďakovanie za výsledné dielo velikánov Braulika a Lohfinka, ktorým obohatili synchronný výskum Mojžišovej rétoriky. To, že kurzíva v kapitolách 1, 3 a 4 je trochu iná ako kurzíva v kapitolách 2, 5 a 6, je asi nechcená typografická variácia a s obsahovou brilantnosťou Mojžiša, ktorú rovnako brilantne podkryla dvojica výnimočných znalcov Deuteronomia, je absolútne zanedbateľná. Avšak monografia o rétorike prvej Mojžišovej reči v Deuteronomiu zostane absolútne nevyhnutná pre ďalší výskum Dt 1–4.

*Blažej Štrba*  
*Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave*  
*Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta*  
*Samova 12*  
*949 01 Nitra*  
*Slovenská republika*

**NOWAK, M. Wojciech, EC: *Pustynia. Biblijne mijsce spotkania s Bogiem*, Krakow: Wydawnictwo Benedyktynów Tyniec, 2019. 399 s. ISBN 978-83-8205-306-7.**

Púšť je v Biblii miestom, kde sa udiali dôležité momenty dejín spásy. V nej sa zjavuje Božie slovo, v nej môže človek stretnúť Boha, v púšti Boh dáva Izraelu svojich desať slov – Dekalóg. V tichu kamaldulskej pustovne dozrievalo táto biblická monografia M. Wojciecha Nowaka, vypracovaná pod vedením prof. T. M. Dąbeka, OSB. Autor, sám žijúci v pustyni – pustovni – v púšti, študuje tému púšte z rôznych pohľadov, vychádzajúc z biblických textov. Predovšetkým študuje tie texty, ktoré hovoria o púšti a o pobyte či prebývaní ľudí v púšti, ktorých Boh povolával, aby splnili určité poslanie, alebo ktorí sa v púšti ukrývali a tam sa mohli stretnúť s Pánom, Bohom Izraela. Púšť v Biblii vidí ako miesto, kde Boh pripravoval ľudí na ich zapojenie do plánu spásy, ktorá sa týkala tak ľudu Izraela, ako aj celého ľudstva.

Podľa autora, hoci je téma púšte v Biblii častá, jej štúdiu a doceneniu jej úlohy v dejinách spásy sa nevenuje dostatočná pozornosť. Východiskovými podnetmi pre jej rozsiahle štúdium boli základné práce významných poľských

biblištv: S. Hałas, SCJ: *Pustynia miejscem próby i spotkania s Bogiem. Wybrane zagadnienia biblijnej teologii pustyni* (Krakow, 1999); T. M. Dąbek, OSB: *Motyw pustyni w biblijnych dziełach ludu Bożego* (Z Tradycji Mniszej 61; Krakow, 2015); J.W. Koralewski: *Mądrość pustyni. Życie pustelnicze od monastycyzmu przedchrześcijańskiego do VI wieku* (Poznań, 2010). Ako hovorí sám autor, hlavným zámerom práce je štúdium témy púšte, jej podstatných znakov a hľadanie podnetov na pustovnícky život (s. 25). Preto sa vo svojej práci zameriava najprv na postavy mužov, ktorých život je spojený s púšťou, potom prechádza cez posolstvo múdroslovných kníh, aby prešiel k prorockým výrokom týkajúcich sa študovanej problematiky.

Samotné slovo púšť nám pripomína, že ide o územia ťažko prístupné na bežný život s ťažkými podmienkami na prežitie, ktoré vyžadujú sebazápor, často železnú vôľu. Mnohorakosť a rôznosť biblických textov hovoriacich o púšti sú príčinou rôznorodosti vedeckých prístupov a pohľadov. Ide tu napr. o rôzny spôsob videnia úlohy púšte v Božích plánoch spásy, o zložitost' symboliky, ktorá z toho vychádza, o rozličnosť osudov ľudí, ktorí v púšti kratší či dlhší čas pobývali. Autor v tomto diele ako hlavné kritérium prístupu k téme púšte berie pustovnícky pohľad a z toho vyplývajúce otázky: kontakt s Bohom v samote, asketické výzvy života v púšti, nadprirodzené ovocie prebývania v tom prostredí, najmä z hľadiska plodného svedectva viery, a to všetko z hľadiska štúdia prehĺbenia osobného vzťahu s Bohom v samote. Texty na analýzu autor vybral z celej Biblie, pričom niektoré analyzuje podrobne, na iné odkazuje v duchu *scrutatio* v rámci *Lectio divina*, typického pre mníšsky životný štýl. Analýza textov je nasmerovaná na chápanie podmienok života v púšti a samote a na to, ako môžu vplývať na život modlitby. Ako uvádza sám autor, používa historicko-kritickú a filologickú biblickú metódu (s. 36). Zásadou autora je pohybovať sa okolo asketických aspektov života a z toho vyplývajúceho vierohodného svedectva života (s. 32). Dielo má päť častí, ktoré sú delené na kapitoly a podkapitoly.

Prvá časť (s. 39 – 98) s názvom *Púšť z náboženského pohľadu – rozsah použitia témy púšte v Biblii* čitateľovi poskytne základný pohľad na výskyt témy púšte v celej Biblii. Vychádza zo základných zemepisných informácií a z toho v Biblii vyplývajúcich teologických významov, ktoré sú dôležité na porozumenie Božieho zjavenia sa. Prvá časť je zakončená zdôraznením výchovného významu púšte v oboch zákonoch. Okrem načrtnutia bohatstva témy púšte v Biblii má táto úvodná časť pomôcť čitateľovi ľahšie chápať rozbor samostatných otázok a textov v nasledujúcich častiach. Má tiež pomôcť pochopiť, prečo sa spomínanie na blahoslavený čas pobytu Izraela v púšti, ktorý

bol sprevádzaný mocnou rukou Boha, často stávalo podnetom v duchovnej a náboženskej obrode vyvoleného národa. V tejto časti nájdeme vybrané prvky kresťanskej duchovnosti púšte.

V druhej, najrozsiahlejšej časti *Porozumenie svedectva púšte v Starom zákone* (s. 99 – 194) autor už hlbšie vniká do konkrétnych udalostí dejín spásy a súčasne sa usiluje vysvetliť metaforické obrazy púšte v Starom zákone. Čitateľ si všimne, že autor sa zameriava na príklady dôležité z pohľadu pustovníckeho života. S týmto hermeneutickým kľúčom sa pozerá na osudy patriarchov, povolanie Mojžiša, strasti putovania Izraela v púšti, misiu Eliáša atď. Na podklade opísaných faktov autor hľadá ich duchovný význam. Samostatne sa venuje otázkam zničenia Sodomy a Gomory v protiklade s témou premeny pustého a neúrodného miesta na produktívnu krajinu a záhradu.

V tretej časti *Svedectvo o téme púšte v žalmoch* (s. 195 – 258) sa autor venuje analýze Knihy žalmov podľa jej piatich častí. Autor vychádza nielen zo samostatného postavenia a významu Knihy žalmov v Písme, ale aj z jej mimoriadneho postavenia v živote modliaceho sa Božieho ľudu Izraela i v liturgii Cirkvi, a to najmä v živote mníchov, pre ktorých je Žaltár „každodenným chlebom“. Dôležitým podnetom pre autora je výskyt témy púšte v jednotlivých žalmoch, a to najmä z pohľadu duchovného významu, tak pre život jednotlivca, ako aj spoločenstva.

Zostávajúce dve časti sú venované pohľadu na púšť v Novom zákone a jej duchovnému významu. Štvrtá časť *Púšť v Novom zákone* (s. 259 – 312) sa pokúša nielen o prehľad témy púšte v Novom zákone, ale aj o spojitost a nadväznosť používania témy púšte v oboch častiach Biblie.

Piata časť *Naplnenie Písma – púšť v živote Jána Krstiteľa a Ježiša* (s. 313 – 364) sa sústreďuje na proroctvá Starého zákona, ktoré sa naplnili v živote Mesiáša a jeho predchodcu. Priblížený je najprv spôsob účinkovania Jána Krstiteľa, proroka z púšte, a následne účinkovania Ježiša a jeho učeníkov. Zdôrazňuje, ako sa téma púšte u Ježiša mení na tému pustého – osamelého miesta. Autor pozerá na túto tému so zorného pohľadu vzorov, ktoré sú dané kresťanovi na nasledovanie a ktoré mu môžu pomôcť byť pripravený darovať svoj život v službe Ježišovi Kristovi a blížnym.

Publikácia môže čitateľovi pripomenúť, a aj pomôcť nasledovať hlavný cieľ života každého človeka: usilovať sa o jednotu s Bohom a neustále vzdávanie mu chvály celým svojím životom, cez nasledovanie Zmŕtvychvstalého. Nedá sa to bez prebývania v tichu púšte – pustého, osamelého miesta v srdci človeka, kde Boží Duch hovorí a kde je ticho vlastným jazykom, ktorý používa Boh, aby

hovoril s človekom. Dielo môže pomôcť v hľadaní ticha a samoty vstupovať do hĺbky prebývania s Bohom. Pohľad na biblické postavy vychovávané k duchovnosti púšte, ukazuje, že napriek meniacim sa dobám, nestráca charizma kontemplatívneho spôsobu života nič na aktuálnosti ani v súčasnosti. Pobyt v púšti – na pustom mieste v samote a mlčaní – pomáha v radostnom bezpodmienečnom odovzdaní života Pánovi a pri zjednotení sa s ním. Takto založený základný vertikálny vzťah jednotlivca môže dať základ efektívnej jednoty na horizontálnej úrovni medzi ľuďmi. Dosiahnutie vnútorného ticha sa stáva kľúčovým momentom a prostriedkom, ktorý umožňuje človeku putovať po ceste k jedinému a skutočnému cieľu, ktorým je Boh – dobro samo.

Autor Wojciech M. Nowak, EC, predtým než sa stal kamaldulským pustovníkom, kňazom a študujúcim Sväté písmo, bol uznávaným chirurgom. Toto jeho povolanie a talent sa prejavujú aj v tomto diele v podrobnej harmonickej analýze a syntéze témy púšte ako miesta stretania sa s Bohom. Jeho dielo odporúčam všetkým, ktorí chcú tému púšte v Biblii poznať a pozrieť sa na ňu aj z pohľadu mníšskeho stretania sa s Bohom v samote a tichu. Zároveň s radosťou môžem konštatovať, že sa pripravuje slovenský preklad toho vydareného diela.

*Anton J. Solčiansky  
Farnosť Skalka nad Váhom  
Skalka I/41  
913 31 Skalka nad Váhom  
Slovenská republika*

**ŠTRBA, Blažej: *Jozue v Knihe Exodus. Exegetický výskum literárnej postavy* (StBiSISup 7), Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 2023. 194 s. ISBN 978-80-223-5683-1.**

Monografia je knižnou podobou habilitačnej práce predloženej na Rímskokatolíckej cyrilometodskej bohosloveckej fakulte Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave. Nepreskúmaná téma literárnej postavy Jozueho v Knihe Exodus už od počiatku dáva exegetickému výskumu novátorský charakter. Nie je náhodou, že toto biele miesto vo výskume objavil autor monografie. Literárnej postave Jozueho sa venuje celé desaťročia, o čom svedčia významné, naprieč vedeckou obcou akceptované publikácie. Ich spoločnou črtou je zdôrazňovanie dôležitosti postavy



Jozueho vnímaného skôr okrajovo aj napriek tomu, že je po ňom pomenovaná celá kniha<sup>1</sup>.

Predmetom výskumu sú štyri state z Knihy Exodus (Ex 17,8-16; 24,12-18; 32,15-19; 33,7-11), v ktorých sa objavuje postava Jozueho menovite spomenutého príznačných sedemkrát. Autor venuje pozornosť predovšetkým literárnemu profilu Jozueho, pričom ho odhaľuje ako nositeľa tradície a teológie.

V úvode je zrozumiteľne predstavená metodológia výskumu textov s dôrazom na synchronný prístup. Pozostáva zo štyroch krokov: vymedzenia state, pracovného prekladu s dôrazom na rozbor syntaxe, pri ktorom sa prejavuje autorova vynikajúca znalosť hebrejčiny, ďalej v stanovení štruktúry perikopy a dôslednej analýzy času, priestoru a dynamiky deja pomocou revidovanej metodológie biblickej naratívnej analýzy, ktorej dôsledné uplatnenie na skúmaných textoch privádza novým, vždy presne a precízne odôvodneným záverom. Posledným krokom je diachronická úvaha.

Krátkosť prvej kapitoly venovanej doterajšiemu stavu problematiky je podmienená už spomínanou absenciou témy v doterajšom výskume, čo je prekvapivé najmä v prípade rozsiahlejších štúdií venovaných Jozueho postave.

Nasledujúce štyri kapitoly majú rovnakú štruktúru, preto sa k nim možno vyjadriť súhrnne.

Vymedzenie textu je v niektorých prípadoch náročné vzhľadom na širší kontext, ktorý môže v istej miere vplývať aj na význam skúmanej perikopy. Príkladom je včlenenie state o Mojžišovom a Jozueho výstupe k Božiemu vrchu v Ex 24,12-18 do druhého veľkého bloku 24,12–32,19, pričom práve zmienka o prítomnosti Jozueho radí text k rámcu bloku a tým Jozueho popri Mojžišovi definuje ako rozhodujúcu postavu s dosahom na význam a pochopenie ťažiskových tém rozprávaného textu (s. 47). Navrhovaná štruktúra textu má vplyv aj na odlišné členenie kapitol 32–34 všeobecne považovaných za vrcholné SZ vyjadrenie témy Božieho odpustenia a vnímaných ako jeden blok<sup>2</sup>. Autor tému neštandardne a prekvapivo označuje za „podružnú a podradenú téme Božej prítomnosti medzi

---

<sup>1</sup> ŠTRBA, Blažej: *Take Off Your Sandals from Your Feet! An Exegetical Study of Josh 5,13-15* (ÖBS 32), Frankfurt am Main – Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien: Peter Lang, 2008; Joshua's Leadership into the Promised Land Epitomized in Luke 23:42, *LA* 64 (2015) 273-285; Why is Joshua among the Prophets like Moses, *LA* 70 (2021) 33-65; Joshua's Profile at the Descent from Mount Sinai, *LA* 72 (2022) 141-178.

<sup>2</sup> CHILDS, Brevard: *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL), Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974, 557; DOHMEN, Christoph: *Exodus 19–40* (HThKAT), Freiburg – Basel: Herder, 2004, 281-283; TIŇO, Jozef: *Exodus* (KSZ 3), Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2013, 869-870.

ľudom“ (pozn. 127, s. 47). Jeho argumentácia z pohľadu celkovej kompozície má svoje opodstatnenie.

Po vymedzení textu na rad prichádza textová analýza pozostávajúca z pracovného prekladu a poznámok k syntaxi. Rozsiahly poznámkový aparát poukazuje na precíznu prácu s textom a jeho rôznymi variantmi v kumránskych, gréckych, aramejských, latinských a sýrskych textoch. Pri diskutabilných alebo významných pojmoch sa autor nespolieha iba na informácie zo slovníkov, ale neváha urobiť samostatný výskum výskytu slova v celom SZ s vyhodnotením a zdôvodnením vlastného prekladu, ako napr. označenie Jozueho ako *מְשֻׁרֵת* „jeho (Mojžišovho) služobníka“ (Ex 24,13, s. 75) s dôrazom na osobnú angažovanosť, ak narazí na nepreskúmanú syntagmu, venuje jej aj podkapitolu (2.2.2.1 Syntagma *מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם* „spod neba“ s. 25 – 27). Syntaktické poznámky svedčia o vynikajúcej znalosti hebrejskej syntaxe, výsledkom sú nové čítania podložené presvedčivými argumentmi.

Literárny rozbor vybraných statí patrí k ťažiskovým momentom publikácie pre prínosné nové výklady ťažko zrozumiteľných textov. Príkladom je netradičná interpretácia Ex 32,17-18<sup>3</sup>, podľa ktorej sú obidva verše Jozueho rečou, nie dialógom medzi Jozuem a Mojžišom, ako sa zvyčajne text chápe<sup>4</sup>. Okrem toho, že nová interpretácia robí ťažko zrozumiteľný text pochopiteľným, vykresľuje aj postavu Jozueho v novom svetle, v akom ho doterajšie výklady neprezentovali. Zo zdanlivo okrajovej poznámky o prítomnosti Jozueho na hore vystupuje samostatný charakter presahujúci samotnú naráciu (s. 95 – 100). Presvedčivá sedemnásobná argumentácia neštandardného výkladu (s. 97 – 98) korešponduje so symbolikou čísla sedem v biblickej narácii, napríklad v prvej skúmanej stati Ex 17,8-16, ktorej kompozíciu charakterizuje „numerickoliterárny zámer“ (s. 35, porov. aj s. 45, 86, 116, 136-137, 143). Dôležitými argumentmi pri zdôvodňovaní nových interpretácií sú vynikajúce objavy vyplývajúce z pozorného čítania textu (*close reading*). Príkladom je rovnaká terminológia v Jozueho prejave pri zostupe z vrchu (Ex 32,18) a v stati o bitke s Amalekitmi (17,8-16). Zhodné výrazové prostriedky poukazujú na Jozueho ako na toho, kto rozpráva (s. 98). Pozorné čítanie umožnilo aj rozpoznanie kľúčovej úlohy spojenia *תַּחַת הַרְרָה* „pod vrchom“ ako kontrastného vyjadrenia uzatvorenia zmluvy (24,4) a jej opakom, rozbitím tabúl = zrušenie zmluvy (32,19) v rovnakom pomyselnom priestore (s. 102, 116). Autor pri naratívnej analýze pracuje s rôznymi zornými uhlami a fokalizáciou. V tejto súvislosti je pozoruhodné, aký vplyv na význam textu má aj polozenie otázky, resp. perspektíva, s akou sa k skúmanému textu pristupuje. Príkladom je desať Mojžišových výstupov na horu a úloha jeho

<sup>3</sup> Zásadné objavy prezentované v štúdií: ŠTRBA, *Joshua's Profile*, 141-178.

<sup>4</sup> DOHMEN, *Exodus 19–40*, 306-307; TIŇO, *Exodus*, 841; podobne rabínsky výklad (*Exodus Rabba* 41,1).

sprievodcov. Kým v štúdiu zameranej na Mojžiša ako hlavnú postavu slúžia Áron, traja kňazi, sedemdesiat starších a Jozue na posilnenie a podporu Mojžišovej úlohy<sup>5</sup>, v aktuálnej monografii zameranej na Jozueho tie isté postavy posilňujú rolu Jozueho v rozprávani. Jozue, Mojžišov pomocník, sa spomedzi ostatných sprevádzajúcich vyníma špeciálnym privilégium. Je pri Mojžišovi najčastejšie a nakoniec aj jediný. Jozueho status sa po vyhodnotení miesta aj času sprevádzajúcich Mojžiša pri výstupe javí ako vyzdvihnutie pred staršími. Zatiaľ čo starší a Áron Mojžiša sprevádzajú príležitostne, Jozue sa javí ako „spoľahlivý a stály Mojžišov asistent“ (s. 80), hypoteticky aj ako garant vyučovania v budúcnosti (s. 79).

V závere jednotlivých kapitol sa nachádzajú diachronické úvahy. Stručné, no výstižné podanie odráža výbornú orientáciu autora knihy aj v zložitých väčšinou hypotetických názoroch množstva autorov. Výsledkom úvah nie je len hlbšie pochopenie redakčného vývoja skúmaných rozprávani, ale hlavne prínos k profilácii osobnosti Jozueho. Ukazuje sa, že postava Jozueho redakčnými aktivitami postupne nadobúdala na význame pod vplyvom formujúcej sa Knihy Jozue v prípade Ex 17,8-16, kde sa Jozue prezentuje ako vodcovský typ v harmónii s Mojžišovskou kultovou tradíciou (s. 42 – 43). Podobne slúži zvýrazneniu Jozueho konania v Ex 32,15-19, ktoré vystupuje do popredia na pozadí state Dt 9,15-17, kde sa ešte Jozue nespomína (s. 117 – 118). Aj predstavenie Jozueho ako Núnovho syna (Ex 33,10-11) v súvislosti s textami Knihy Numeri z neskorého poexilového obdobia poukazuje na jeho dôveryhodnosť a spoľahlivosť vo veci komunikácie Božieho učenia na spôsob prorokov (s. 145 – 146).

Výskum literárnej postavy Jozueho v Knihe Exodus sa vyznačuje exaktnosťou, vynikajúcim uplatnením talianskej revidovanej biblickej naratívnej analýzy. Výsledkom sú nové objavy a interpretácie skúmaných textov. Najväčším prínosom je Jozueho literárna profilácia, ktorú napriek jej náznakovej prítomnosti v textoch doteraz nik nedokázal vyskladať v komplexnosti ponúkanej monografiou. Navyše je výskum formulovaný zrozumiteľným a pestovaným jazykom. Ostáva sa len tešiť na ďalšie štúdie podobného charakteru, keďže autor monografiu predstavuje ako prípravu na výskum Jozueho profilu aj v ďalších knihách Pentateuchu (s. 10).

Miroslav Varšo  
Spoločenskovedný ústav CSPV SAV v. v. i.  
Karpatská 5  
040 01 Košice  
Slovenská republika

---

<sup>5</sup> ŠTRBA, Blažej: Ten Times on Sinai. In: Blažej Štrba – Miroslav Varšo (eds.): *Tvoje oči videli. Štúdie venované Georgovi Braulikovi, OSB (StBiSISup 5)*, Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2021, 33.

**86. medzinárodné stretnutie Katolíckej  
biblickej asociácie Ameriky  
3. – 6. augusta 2024, Washington**

Je dlhoročnou tradíciou, že v strede letných prázdnin sa koná medzinárodné stretnutie Katolíckej biblickej asociácie Ameriky (*Catholic Biblical Association of America* [ďalej CBAA]) a hostujúce univerzity sa striedajú od východného pobrežia USA po západné. V tomto roku 2024 sa stretnutie konalo v dňoch 3. – 6. augusta vo Washingtone a hostovala ho Katolícka univerzita Ameriky.

Medzinárodné stretnutie má vždy štyri typy vedecko-odborných stretnutí: 1. dlhodobé pracovné skupiny (*task forces*), 2. pokračujúci seminár (*continuing seminar*), 3. hlavné veľké prednášky (*general sessions*) a 4. výskumné práce (*research papers*). Táto variácia stretnutí ponúka viacero možností ako pre pasívnych, tak aj aktívnych účastníkov. Dlhodobé *pracovné skupiny* sú vytvorené na obdobie piatich rokov, počas ktorých na téme spoločne pracuje malá skupinka expertov. Ako zvyčajne na stretnutí mali k dispozícii tri plné doobedia, počas ktorých mohli predstaviť svoj výskum a mali čas aj na debatu. Druhý typ stretnutia, tzv. *pokračujúci seminár* je aktívny iba na danom stretnutí a tiež ide o malú skupinku expertov, ktorá počas troch doobedí predkladá svoj vopred pripravený výskum a debatuje aj s inými účastníkmi, ktorí sa na daný seminár zapíšu ako pasívni účastníci. Oba spomenuté typy stretnutí ponúkajú aj pasívnym účastníkom možnosť vniknúť do určitej špecifickej problematiky. Keďže sú simultánne, účastník musí vopred urobiť voľbu, na ktoré stretnutie sa zapíše. Hlavné veľké prednášky v počte jedna až tri na každý deň sú vyhľadávané väčšinou účastníkov. Poobedia sú venované výskumným prácam jednotlivcov, pričom prednášajúci môžu predostrieť výsledky svojho vlastného výskumu bez akýchkoľvek nárokov, ale s vynikajúcou možnosťou spätnej väzby od

prítomných. Keďže tak ako doobeda aj viaceré poobedňajšie prednášky sú simultánne, poslucháči si musia urobiť voľbu podľa vlastného záujmu. Ich rozhodnutie o voľbe prednášky často ovplyvňuje meno prednášateľa, zaujímavosť či prítťažlivosť témy. CBAA ponúka viacero možností výskumu a grantov aj pre biblistov z iných častí sveta.

Jednou zo zaujímavostí tohtoročného stretnutia bola úvodná panelová diskusia štyroch znalcov, ktorá bola zameraná na tému *Biblia a Korán: pedagogické perspektívy a vedecké sondy* (!). Mená a najmä názvy hlavných prednášok boli pomerne výrečné, a tak aj prítťažlivé: Denise D. Hopkins: *Zúfale hľadanie hrdinov: Ezdráš a Nehemiáš znovu preskúmaní*, Christopher W. Skinner: *Ježiš, Mesiáš a Boží Syn: Kaleidoskopický prístup k Markovej kristológii*, Malka Z. Simkovich: *Judejský vynález diaspóry v helenistickej ére*, Vãn Than Nguyẽn, SVD: *Lukášova námorná plavba a strokotanie lode v Skutkoch apoštolov 27: skutočnosť alebo fikcia?*, Amy-Jill Levine: *Oy-Angelion: Prečo a ako kresťanské kázanie a vyučovanie stále podporuje nenávisť voči Židom*, Shelly Matthews: *Ženy a prázdny hrob: Historické a historiografické otázky*.

Pracovné (dlhodobé) skupiny boli len tri – *Nová feministická biblická kritika* (od r. 1989; v roku 2023 premenovaná), *Zaobranie sa prezentáciou Židov a judaizmu v katolíckej exegéze, homiletike a katechéze* (od r. 2019) a *Krst v Pavlových listoch* (od r. 2024). Pokračujúcich seminárov na rôzne témy bolo viacero. Uvádzame ich v chronologickom poradí od roku ich vzniku, avšak každý rok je problematika daného seminára iná, resp. neviaže sa na predchádzajúci rok: *Božstvo v starovekom Izraeli* (1998), *Hebrejská poézia* (1999), *Deuterokánonické knihy* (2010), *Jánovo evanjelium a listy* (2019), *Pavlove listy* (2021; v roku 2023 premenované), *Izaiáš a Dvanásť* (2022), *Judaizmus druhého chrámu a počiatky kresťanstva* (2024), *Biblická intertextualita: jej metodológia, história a realizácia* (2024).

Počas medzinárodného stretnutia sa okrem vedecko-akademických stretnutí konajú aj menšie organizačné stretnutia CBBA, príp. redakčnej rady časopisu *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (CBQ), či redakčnej rady edície *Catholic Biblical Quarterly-Monograph Series* (CBQMS) a novej edície *Catholic Biblical Quarterly Imprints* (CBQ Imprints, resp. CBQI), založenej v r. 2020.

Zo Slovenska sa stretnutia aktívne zúčastnil riadny člen CBAA Blažej Štrba s výskumnou prednáškou *Desať Mojžišových výstupov na Sinaj?* Celé podujatie ako zvyčajne ponúka jedinečnú možnosť stretnúť mnohých expertov

z rôznych biblických sekcií, a tak vnímať aktuálne diskusie a biblické problémy, s ktorými sa postretajú kolegovia aj v rôznych častiach sveta. Budúce 87. stretnutie CBAA sa bude konať 2. – 5. augusta 2025 na *Loyla University* v Chicagu v štáte Illinois.

*Blažej Štrba*  
*Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave*  
*Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta*  
*Samova 12*  
*949 01 Nitra*

## Slovo a miesta

### 24. – 27. septembra 2024, Jeruzalem

Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SBF) zorganizovalo v dňoch 23. – 27. septembra 2024 pri príležitosti záveru osláv 100. výročia od svojho založenia medzinárodnú vedeckú konferenciu s názvom *La Parola e i luoghi* [Slovo a miesta]. Usporiadaná bola najmä pre exalumnov a iba hlavní prednášajúci boli z iných inštitúcií. Konferencia zahŕňala dva rôzne typy stretnutí, čím reflektovala na storočné vedecko-odborné pôsobenie SBF. Kým prvý typ stretnutí bol prednáškový o biblických textoch a miestach, druhým typom boli poobedňajšie topografické exkurzie biblických miest. Plánovaná 4-dňová konferencia bola napokon trošku ukrátená z dôvodu zhoršujúcej sa napätej vojenskej situácie medzi Izraelom a Hizballáhom, a tak bola počas konferencie posledná piatková exkurzia do Galiley zrušená.

Medzi dvadsiatkou prednášajúcich boli traja hlavní prednášatelia z iných svetoznámych biblických inštitúcií: rektor Pápežského biblického inštitútu z Ríma jezuita Peter Dubovský s prednáškou *Šalamúnova intronizácia vo svetle rituálov intronizácie v SBV*, dominikán Anthony Giambone a profesor z jeruzalemskej francúzskej biblickej inštitúcie *École biblique et archéologique française* s prednáškou *Evanjeliová periegeza: Lukáš/Skutky apoštolov a locus evanjelia* a posledný známy prednášateľ bol domáci a emeritný profesor Hebrejskej univerzity Emanuel Tov s prednáškou *Textová jednota piatich kníh Tóry*. Okrem ďalších prednášok, ktoré boli poväčšine zamerané na textovú biblickú problematiku a sprevádzané diskusiami, oživením konferencie boli už spomenuté topografické exkurzie. Na konferencii vystúpil aj autor tejto správy

s príspevkom *Kamene v texte Knihy Jozue*. Príspevky z konferencie budú publikované v známom fakultnom časopise *Liber Annuus*.

SBF v Jeruzaleme je od roku 2001 špecializovanou Fakultou biblických vied a archeológie, ktorá je súčasťou Pápežskej univerzity Antonianum so sídlom v Ríme. V Jeruzaleme na SBF študovalo viacero Slovákov ako napr. Anton Tyrol, Ján Záh, Peter Fedor, Ľubomír Fabčín, František Trstenský, Iveta Strenková, Igor Hanko, Milan Diheneščík, Karol Švarz, Peter Olás a krátkodobo niektorí ďalší.

*Blažej Štrba*  
*Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave*  
*Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta*  
*Samova 12*  
*949 01 Nitra*

## **Sila slabých a slabosť silných v Biblii**

**22. – 24. novembra 2024, Badín**

Občianske združenie Cleopas v spolupráci s Rímskokatolíckou cyrilometodskou bohosloveckou fakultou Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave zorganizovali v dňoch 22. – 24. novembra 2024 v priestoroch Domu Xaver v Badíne tematický odborný biblický seminár s názvom *Sila slabých a slabosť silných v Biblii*. Seminár sa konal v rámci interdisciplinárneho projektu APVV-23-0509 *Paradigmatická zmena v chápaní vojny a ozbrojených konfliktov z teologicko-historickej a právnej perspektívy riešeného na Univerzite Komenského v Bratislave (2024 – 2028)*. Intenzívne biblické sústreďenie pre záujemcov o Bibliu a historicko-tematické problematiky s ňou spojené malo aj umeleckú stránku. Súčasťou tohto duchovno-poznávacieho seminára bolo totiž predstavenie nového obrazu od akademickej maliarky Dariny Gladišovej s názvom *Jehošua*, ktoré do víkendovej akcie zapadlo umelecky aj tematicky. Prednášková časť pozostávala so siedmich biblických prednášok zameraných na problematiku sily a slabosti, bezmocnosti a násilia, nenásilia i vojen. So svojimi prednáškami vystúpili Pavol Farkaš: *Evanjelium podľa Lukáša: svedectvo o Božej moci v živote ľudí*; Jozef Jančovič: *Slabí sa opášu silou (1Sam 2,4)*. *Sila slabých na pozadí vojny a zápasu*; Martina Korytiaková: *Moc, bezmocnosť a všemocnosť v Knihe Judita alebo o tom, ako je rozum silný a svaly slabé*; Blažej Štrba: *Zneužitá moc u vodcov a sila slabých matiek a Pokušenie moci u Ježiša a*

*obava zo slabosti u učeníkov; Milan Tomaga: Padnúť do Pánovej ruky alebo do ruky človeka? Analýza Dávidovej voľby v 1Krn 21,9-17 a konfrontácia s Ježišovou predpoveďou utrpenia v Lk 9,43b-45. Na seminári vystúpil aj hosť z Kamerunu Joel Minsi s prednáškou Sila ľudí, ich slabosť, videnie Boha alebo jeho neprítomnosť v Gn 1–11. Abstrakty z príspevkov boli zverejnené vo vydanom sprievodcovi<sup>1</sup>. Viac ako sedemdesiatka prítomných sa aktívne podieľala na diskusiách a tiež na duchovnej časti programu.*

Zuzana Očkajáková  
Pittsburgská 8  
010 08 Žilina

## **Príčiny a dôsledky vojen a ozbrojených konfliktov, úvodný workshop**

### **5. decembra 2024, Bratislava**

Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta (RKCMBF) v spolupráci s Právnickou fakultou (PF) Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave zorganizovali 5. decembra 2024 úvodný workshop tematicky venovaný *Príčinám a dôsledkom vojen a ozbrojených konfliktov*. Podujatie bolo súčasťou prebiehajúceho vedeckého projektu APVV-23-0509 *Paradigmatická zmena v chápaní vojny a ozbrojených konfliktov z teologicko-historickej a právnej perspektívy riešeného na Univerzite Komenského v Bratislave (2024–2028)*. Workshop sa uskutočnil v priestoroch centra Martineum v Bratislave. Po registrácii účastníkov a ich privítaní Jozefom Jančovičom, hlavným riešiteľom projektu a zároveň dekanom RKCMBF, nasledoval program rozdelený do štyroch tematických častí: I. Príčiny a podmienky vzniku vojen (*jus ad bellum*); II. Legitimita vojenského ťaženia (*jus in bello*); III. Dôsledky vojen (*jus post bellum*); IV. Prevencia vojen podporujúca *jus contra bellum*. Každá sekcia bola moderovaná odborníkmi z riešiteľského tímu: Pavlom Farkašom, Lukášom Marečkom, Tiborom Reimerom, a Emíliou Hrabovec.

---

<sup>1</sup> Porov. ŠTRBA, Blažej (ed.): *Sila slabých a slabosť silných v Biblii. Predadventný víkend s Bibliou*, 22. – 24. novembra 2024. *Tematický odborný biblický seminár*, Badín: Cleopas, 2024, 10-17.



Prednášatelia z oboch fakúlt zapojených do riešenia projektu najprv prezentovali svoje príspevky v prvých troch doobedňajších sekciách (M. Korytiaková, J. Jančovič, O. Ružička, B. Štrba, R. Horka, L. Golovko, L. Mareček, E. Hrabovec, M. Vivoda). Poobedie bolo venované príspevkom štvrtej sekcie (T. Reimer, P. Farkaš, O. Gavendová, V. Thurzo). Program bol zavŕšený spoločnou diskusiou a záverečným slovom. Príspevky, ktoré odzneli v rámci workshopu, budú následne publikované vo forme spoločného vedeckého výstupu.

*Martina Korytiaková*  
*Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave*  
*Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta*  
*Kapitulská 26*  
*814 58 Bratislava*

## **Nominácia na Cenu Jozefa Búdu 2023–2024**

Redakčná rada časopisu *Studia Biblica Slovaca* otvorila nomináciu na Cenu Jozefa Búdu za roky 2023 – 2024. Ocenenie dostane osobnosť pôsobia v oblasti exegézy a exegetického skúmania Svätého písma. Dôležitým kritériom je odborná a vedecká práca aspoň v jednej z daných biblických oblastí – filologická, historická, exegetická a teologická. Návrhy môžete posielat' na mailovú adresu [redakcia@biblica.sk](mailto:redakcia@biblica.sk) do 15. januára 2025.

Redakcia *StBiSl*

## **ERRATA**

---

---

*Studia Biblica Slovaca*, ročník XVI (2024), číslo 1

Nesprávne znenie názvu štúdie na s. 22 je:

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

Správne znenie štúdie je:

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

## Studia Biblica Slovaca – Supplementum



1. Blažej ŠTRBA: *Bibliografická 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