THEOLOGIA

CATHOLICA LATINA

S T U D I A

UNIVERSITATIS BABEŞ-BOLYAI

THEOLOGIA CATHOLICA LATINA

2

C O N T E N T S

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES IN THE SEPTUAGINT: SABBATH COMMANDMENTS AND THEIR POSSIBLE THEOLOGICAL MESSAGE AND BACKGROUND[1]

OTTILIA LUKÁCS[2]

Abstract: The Septuagint offers valuable insights into the theology of Hellenistic Judaism. Keeping in mind that each translation is at the same time an interpretation, the translator(s) of the Septuagint provide a new (theological) interpretation or adaptation of the Hebrew Scriptures to the readers. The translation may reflect the community's understanding of certain issues, in this case the Sabbath. This paper aims at scrutinizing the possible theological and/or ideological understanding of the Sabbath commandment reflected by the process of translation, on the one hand. On the other hand, it explores whether the translator(s) noticed the literary and redactional relationship between these Sabbath commandments, undeniably present in the Hebrew texts. This investigation applies the "content related criteria" developed by Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn as well as the "theological(ly motivated) exegesis" proposed by Emmanuel Tov.

Keywords: Septuagint, Sabbath commandment (Ex 20,8-11; 23,12; 34,21; 31,12-17; 35,2; Lev 23,3; Dt 5,12-15), translation techniques.

Studying the Literalness of the Translation Technique: Three Approaches

The Septuagint (LXX) is the product of the earliest Jewish endeavour to translate the Hebrew Bible in the Hellenistic cultural milieu. Therefore, studying the process of translation bears a paramount importance. It is especially interesting to focus on the way in which the translators conveyed to their readers

---

[1] The present article is reworked version of the Hungarian conference paper: Lukács Ottilia, "A szombatparancsokban megmutatkozó fordítástechnikák: lehetséges teológiai üzenet és ihletettség," in *Az alexandriai Biblia. Nemzet- és felekezetközi tanulmányok a görög Ószövetségről,* eds. Zoltán Oláh and György Papp (Budapest, Kolozsvár: SZIT, Verbum, 2019), 161-194.

[2] Lecturer in Hebrew Bible and Biblical Hebrew, Episcopal Theological College of Pécs (Hungary), Praesidium member of the European Society for Catholic Theology, member of the European Society of Biblical Studies. Contact: lukacs.ottilia@pphf.hu.

the message of the Hebrew parent text, more precisely the meaning that they have grasped. Hence, there is little wonder that the study of translation techniques has a long tradition in Septuagint studies.

The exploration of the translation techniques reveals two key concepts, *viz.* two approaches: the "literal" and the "free" (or "paraphrastic") translations of the Hebrew text: the translator(s) are guided by faithfulness to the text or make use of the freedom of translation.[3] The "literal" translation follows faithfully the Hebrew *Vorlage*, and produces a very accurate, almost mechanical translation. Contrary to this tendency, the "free" translation reflects a linguistic, grammatical, and exegetical freedom. The LXX translation can be subsumed thus under the following four categories: *very* or *relatively literal* translation, *very* or *relatively free* translation.[4] Several scholars,[5] however, have recently emphasised a

---

[3] Emanuel TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015, 18–31; Emanuel TOV and Benjamin G. WRIGHT, "Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of the Translation Units in the Septuagint," in *The Greek Bible and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Emanuel Tov, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 219–237; James BARR, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979, 279–325; Benjamin G. WRIGHT, "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX", in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986*, edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 311–335 (311–314); Galen MARQUIS, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel", in *Sixth Congress* [above], edited by Claude E. Cox, 405–424; Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, "Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint", in *Helsinki Perspective on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, 43–63 (43–52); Hans AUSLOOS and Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, "Content Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique", in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung (LXX.D) Wuppertal, 23–27 July 2008*, edited by Kraus Wolfgang and Martin Karrer, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 357–376.

[4] AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, "Content-Related Criteria," 1–2; Barr, *Typology*, 279–325; Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 149–187; Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called 'Plagues Narrative' in Exodus 7,14–11,10*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, 108–110.

more conscious distinction between the categories of "literalness" and "faithfulness": "Indeed, a very literal translation does not imply a very faithful translation and a free translation is not *ipso facto* a less faithful translation".[6] In other words, a translation categorized as "free", at the same time, can be very faithful to its *Vorlage*. *Vice versa*, a "literal translation" can be less faithful. The endeavour to understand these categories and their relationship, i.e., the translation technique of the LXX, implies three different methodological approaches.

The "quantitative approach" (introduced by James Barr and further elaborated by Emanuel Tov, Benjamin G. Wright. and Galen Marquis), departs from the "literalness" of a translation. Studying the degree of the literal rendering, the approach focuses on the translation technique of the LXX, described with statistical data. For instance, Tov proposes several *criteria for the analysis of literal renderings*:[7] (1) *internal consistency* in the choice of translation equivalents, e.g. studying the degree of 'stereotyping' or 'stereotyped rendering' on the basis of statistical distribution of renderings in the books of the LXX [CATSS database],[8] (2) *segmentation*: *the representation of the constituents of Hebrew words by individual Greek equivalents*, e.g., the literal translator's tendency "to segment Hebrew words into meaningful elements, which were then represented by their individual Greek equivalents";[9] (3) *word-order*: the translator attempted to preserve the Hebrew word order as much as possible; (4) *quantitative representation* (correspondence): the endeavour to find a Greek equivalent to each Hebrew element (partially related to the stereotyped rendering); (5) *linguistic adequacy of lexical choices:* this criterion corresponds only partly to the *analysis of literal renderings* since every translation attempts to transpose the message of the original text into another linguistic-cultural context, resulting in the relatively subjective choice of words. Hence, each translation involves interpreta-

---

5   Anneli AEJMELAEUS, "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint", in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 361–380 (362–363).

6   AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, "Content Related Criteria", 362.

7   TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 17–29.

8   Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Study Bibliography

9   TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 23.

tion and exegesis.[10] Consequently, the "quantitative approach" aims at exploring the "literalness" of rendering with statistical data.

The "qualitative approach", also known as that of the "Finnish school" (introduced by Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Raija Sollamo, Anneli Aejmelaus[11]) emphasises the freedom of translation and focus on the Greek rendering of certain Hebrew linguistic and grammatical features. This approach explores linguistic phenomena (e.g., syntax and translation of grammatical structures, idiomatic Greek) and argues that faithfulness cannot be described with statistical data. In other words, the representatives of this approach explore the translator's attitude towards the Hebrew *Vorlage*: does he tend to be "very literal", producing a non-idiomatic translation, or does he tend to be "literal" and yet "faithful", producing a more accurate, idiomatic Greek translation.[12]

Considering this background, Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn argue that these methodological approaches complement each other and propose their combination. They have developed a third methodological approach based on "the content-oriented analyses of the LXX technique"[13], and they have defined "content-related criteria". The text-based analysis broadens the grammatical and linguistic focuses of the qualitative approach by taking into account specific criteria based on the content of the text. This innovative approach illuminates the translator's creativity, the translation techniques used to render

---

10 Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 21–24.

11 See for instance Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account," in id., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993, 116–130; id., "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint," in *Sixth Congress*, edited by Claude E. Cox, 361–380; Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Der Gebrauch des Genitivus Absolutus in der Septuaginta", in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987. FS Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen* (AASF Series B 237), edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987, 175–180; Raija Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch", in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea. V. Congreso de la IOSCS*, edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos, Madrid: Arias Montano, 1985, 101–113.

12 Cf. the presentation of the Finnish school by Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Content-Related Criteria," 364–367.

13 Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Content-Related Criteria", 368.

"difficult cases", problematic Hebrew lexemes in their context, by studying the semantic adequacy, lexical and grammatical accuracy. The attitude towards the *Vorlage* and the translation techniques are examined in very specific cases, such as the Hebrew jargon-defined vocabulary, aetiologies, proper names, common nouns, wordplays, puns, or *hapax legomena*.[14]

Against this methodological background, this paper proposes a concrete example for the application the content-related criteria, exploring the LXX translation of the Sabbath reference in the Sabbath commandments. We will study the way in which the translator(s) handled the name of the Sabbath day, an example of a special or "difficult" case. I use the plural "Sabbath-commandments" based on my earlier research on the literary and redactional development of the Sabbath-commandment in the Pentateuch (Torah).[15] Developing a criterion to track a form or a model of the Sabbath commandments recurring outside of the Decalogue (Ex 20,1-17 and Dt 5,6-21), I have distinguished two forms of the Sabbath commandments in the Pentateuch, presented in a 'relative chronological' order[16], from the lest to the most developed one. I have called the first the long form or the *core commandment*, שבת / ששת ימים תעבד וביום השביעי תשבת (Ex 34,21; 23,12; 20,8-11; Dt 5,12-15; Lev 23,3; Ex 35,2-3; 31,12-17) and the second the short form, את־שבתתי תשמרו (Lev 19,3b.30a; 26,2; Ex 31,13).

---

[14] See further Hans AUSLOOS, "LXX's Rendering of Hebrew Proper Names and the Characterization of the Translation Technique of the Book of Judges", in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls, FS Raija Sollamo*, edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 53–71; Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, "Flora in Cantico Canticorum. Towards a More Precise Characterisation of Translation Technique in the LXX of Song of Songs", in *Scripture in Transition*, 27–52; EAD., *A Plague of Texts?*, 96–125; AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, "Characterizing the LXX Translation of Judges on the Basis of Content-Related Criteria: The Greek Rendering of Hebrew Absolute *Hapax Legomena* in Judges 3,12-30," in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books*, edited by Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Jullio Trebolle Barrera, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, 171–192 (171–173).

[15] Ottilia LUKÁCS, *Sabbath in the Making: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation of the Sabbath Commandment*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020.

[16] The term "relative chronology" is borrowed from Reinhard G. KRATZ, "Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate", in *The Pentateuch: International Perspective on Current Research*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, Baruch J. Schwartz, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, 31–61 (51, 53, 58–59).

Here I discuss the names used for the seventh day and their rendering in Greek in the light of their immediate contexts, in the Sabbath commandments. The redactional, literary and theological development of the Sabbath commandments is also reflected by the names used for the Sabbath in the Hebrew Bible.[17] As a consequence, the references to the Sabbath day bear a theological, ideological perspective. The question is therefore whether this perspective is also reflected in the LXX, and if so, what do we learn of the theological and ideological understanding of the Sabbath in the LXX? Can we speak with Emanuel Tov of a "theological exegesis" or a "theologically motivated exegesis"[18] in the Greek translation of the Sabbath commandments or we find only semantic and linguistic correspondences?

The Sabbath Commandments

Ex 34,21

שֵׁ֤שֶׁת	ἓξ
יָמִים֙	ἡμέρας
תַּֽעֲבֹ֔ד	ἐργᾷ
וּ	τῇ δὲ
בַּיּ֧וֹם	----
הַשְּׁבִיעִ֛י	ἑβδόμῃ
תִּשְׁבֹּ֑ת	καταπαύσεις [2x]

My core-commandment refers to the seven-day period as a sequence of six working days followed by the seventh day as rest day or Sabbath day. Although Ex 34,21 and Ex 23,12 are not commonly referred to as Sabbath commandments, in my relative chronology they are the first two, because they contain the *core-commandment*.

The demand to observe the seventh day rest is expressed in the Hebrew with the verb שׁבת. The translator renders this with καταπαύω which can be considered as a faithful rendering:

---

17 Lukács, *Sabbath in the Making*, 43-45.

18 Emanuel Tov, "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint", in id., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 257–269 (258).

שֵׁשֶׁת ימים תעבד וביום השביעי **תשבת**
ἓξ ἡμέρας ἐργᾷ, τῇ δὲ ἑβδόμῃ **καταπαύσεις**·

The LXX proposes a literal translation, although the Rahlfs-Hanhart edition differs from the Wever-(Göttingen-)edition. In the former there is no Greek translation for וביום: we read only τῇ δὲ ἑβδόμῃ, as opposed to the Göttingen-edition, which matches the MT: τῇ δὲ **ἡμέρα** τῇ ἑβδόμῃ καταπαύσεις (cf. **וביום** השביעי תשבד). Using the terminology proposed by B. Lemmelijn, the rendering of Ex 34,21 is relatively literal, as we find here a 'minus'. Referring to 'minus' and 'plus' I wish to avoid for the moment the assessment of the Greek translation, inevitably found in the use of the classical 'omission' or 'addition', leaving aside the question of the differences resulting from a different *Vorlage*.[19]

Ex 23,12

שֵׁשֶׁת	ἓξ
יָמִים	ἡμέρας
תַּעֲשֶׂה	ποιήσεις
מַעֲשֶׂיךָ	τὰ ἔργα σου
וּ	----
בַיּוֹם	τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
תִּשְׁבֹּת	ἀνάπαυσις
לְמַעַן	ἵνα
יָנוּחַ	ἀναπαύσηται
...	
וְיִנָּפֵשׁ	καὶ ἵνα ἀναψύξῃ

LXX Ex 23,12 also reflects some textual variants. First, it renders the Hebrew verb עשה with the verb ποιέω preserving its meaning;[20] nonetheless, the noun

---

[19] LEMMELIJN, *A Plague of Texts?*, 23–25.

[20] Johan LUST, Erik EYNIKEL and Katrin HAUSPIE, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ³2015: "ποιέω⁺," 501–502: to do, make, create, build, perform, execute, sacrifice [Ex 31,16!] etc. For more details see also Takamitsu MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets the Septuagint*, Leuven: Peeters, 2002, "ποιέω," 466–468: to perform actions, to do something and affect somebody, to fashion, construct manufacture, to engage oneself in and effect, to act upon etc. It should be noted that we encounter the same

מעשׂה is rendered by ἔργον.[21] Although based on the quantitative approach ἔργον may be the literal translation, from the perspective of the "content related criteria" it is both faithful and free translation, because it does not preserve the Hebrew pun תעשׂה מעשׂיך. This translation is surprising, because the Greek has two possible terms to render the noun מעשׂה, i.e., ποίημα (*work, deed, act*) or ποίησις (*fabrication, creation, work, fulfilling/performing of the law*),[22] which would allow the translation of the Hebrew pun. Second, the LXX renders the verb שׁבת with a noun in nominative feminine singular, ἀνάπαυσις (*repose, rest, stopping, cessation, free from tiring actions*).[23] Thus, it faithfully renders the meaning of the Hebrew verb, but it differs grammatically (noun instead of verb). This rendering is surprising because: (1) the previous commandment has the verb καταπαύω, (2) the noun ἀνάπαυσις has the verbal form, ἀναπαύω, that could have been used. Moreover, the translator uses this verb to render the verb נוח. Thus, the Greek translation uses the same root for two different verbs: the noun ἀνάπαυσις for the verb שׁבת and the verb ἀναπαύω for the verb נוח. This may mean both freedom of translation and theological exegesis. It should also be mentioned at this point that the verb σαββατίζω, the Hebrew loanword שׁבת,[24] is attested in the LXX (cf. Ex 16,30; Lev 23,32). Thus, presumably the translator(s) did not see any connection between the two commandments, nei-

---

rendering in the case of Ex 31,16 [the last Sabbath commandment on our relative chronology]: עשׂה is rendered by the verb ποιέω. In this context, however, the verb ποιέω expresses most likely the idea of celebration or observing the feast of Sabbath.

[21] LUST *et al.*, "ἔργον, -ου⁺", 241: *work, deed, occupation*. Muraoka adds to this list the *cultic activity*. I would like to highlight Muraoka's statistics, namely, ἔργον is used to render the noun מעשׂה [60x], מלאכה [55x], עודה [31x] etc. MURAOKA, "ἔργον, -ου", 228–229.

[22] LUST *et al.*, "ποίημα, -ατος⁺", 502: work, deed, act or "ποίησις, -εως⁺": fabrication, creation, creation, work, fulfilling / performing of the law. Cf. MURAOKA, "ποίησις", 469.

[23] Cf. LUST *et al.*, "ἀνάπαυσις, -εως⁺", 42; Albert PIETERSMA and Benjamin G. WRIGHT (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, 23 ἀναπαύω: to give rest, to refresh, to abide, to quiet, to take rest. Cf. Lust *et al.*, "ἀναπαύω⁺", 42. See also MURAOKA, "ἀναπαύω", 32: (1) to put an end to; (2) to give rest; (3) to take rest, leave off working (e.g., Ex 23,12), (4) to stop moving and come to rest; and (5) to be / become free from agitation. From Muraoka's short statistics transpires that ἀναπαύω is a typical rendering of the verb נוח [4x]. cf. MURAOKA, "ἀνάπαυσις, -εως", 32.

[24] LUST *et al.*, "σαββατίζω⁺", 546.

ther between these commandments and the rest of the Sabbath commandment, though the Hebrew texts are clearly related.

It should also be mentioned that the LXX has a plus, i.e., the subordinating conjunction ἵνα appears twice: once as a rendering of למען which introduces the first verb of resting (ἀναπαύω) and a second time when it introduces the second verb (ἀναψύχω) in the motivation clause. Therefore, it creates a parallel formulation and a rhythm within the motivational clause, pointing to a skilled translator to whom stylistic features were important.

Ex 20,8-11

The Sabbath commandment of the Decalogue, the "classical" Sabbath commandment is handed down in two versions, Ex 20,8-11 and Dt 5,12-15. The redactional and literary critical analysis of the relationship between these two commandments is beyond the scope of this paper, therefore I focus only on the words referring to the Sabbath day. There are three references to this day:

v. 8

אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת	τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων

v. 10

וְיוֹם	τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
שַׁבָּת	σάββατα
לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου

v. 11

וַיָּנַח	καὶ κατέπαυσεν
בַּיּוֹם	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ·
עַל־כֵּן	διὰ τοῦτο
בֵּרַךְ	εὐλόγησεν
יְהוָה	κύριος
אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת	τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην
וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ	καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν

A closer look at the structure of Ex 20,8-11 shows that vv. 8 and 11 are designed to form the frame of the commandment (introduction and conclusion,

respectively). This frame, however, could be set apart as a commandment on its own. Theoretically speaking, v. 8 could be the introduction of the commandment and v. 11 could be the theological motivation. Nevertheless, the style and the phraseology of these two verses is very closely related. In v. 8, the Israelite is commanded to remember (זכר) the Sabbath day (את־יום השבת) and to consecrate it (לקדשו); likewise, v. 11 states that God blessed (ברך) the Sabbath day (את־יום השבת) and consecrated it (ויקדשהו). Then v. 11 opens with כי, the conjunction applied to introduce the idea of reasoning in a causal clause that follows the main clause.[25] Most likely this commandment is the result of the Priestly redactional work which combined the traditions of the week and that of the Sabbath.

The first commandment (vv. 8 and 11) uses the expression יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, 'Sabbath day' both in v. 8 and v. 11 and prescribes the sanctification of the seventh day by rest, just as the LORD did on the seventh day of the creation (cf. Gen 2,2-3). The Greek translation, however, does not reflect consistency in the rendering. On the one hand, it renders יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת by τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων 'Sabbath day' in v. 8, and by τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην 'the seventh day' in v. 11, on the other hand. Both renderings can be considered faithful, and even literal, nevertheless, it should be underlined that two different translation techniques are reflected. In the first case (v. 8), the translator opted for the easiest solution with some changes and offered a transliteration of the noun שַׁבָּת. The latter rendering, however, combines two traditions, the seventh day rest (the week cycle of 6+1 days) and the Sabbath tradition. Obviously, the Greek translation repeats the expression that is used to designate the seventh day of creation ביום השביעי / τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην in v. 11 (cf. Gen 2,2). Contrary to the Hebrew, in the Greek translation we encounter the phenomenon of exegetical homogenization: the LORD rested on the seventh day and as a consequence He consecrated it. The translation is faithful, but at the same time it expresses the freedom of the translator when he decides to use τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην to avoid the more literal rendering τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων. This could be an example of theological exegesis: the motivation of the Sabbath commandment in v. 11 apparently draws on the creation narrative (Gen 2,1-3), where the expression יום השביעי ('seventh day') is used con-

---

[25] William L. HOLLADAY, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament,* Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988, "כי", 155. Bill T. ARNOLD, John H. CHOI, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 149.

sequently both in the Hebrew version and in the Septuagint. As a consequence, we can highlight two different tendencies in the two traditions. On the one hand, the Hebrew text uses יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת twice in order to integrate more adequately the frame of the Sabbath commandment in Ex 20,8-11. On the other hand, the translator opts for more a consequent translation and remains faithful to the theology of the creation narrative, the 'first Sabbath', in Gen 2 and presumably in Ex 16, too. Thus, the approach of 'context-related criteria' illuminates again the Greek translation.

The second commandment (vv. 9-10) incorporates the *core commandment*. The morphological change attested by the root שבת involves an ideological change as well. שׁבת does not stand alone, rather it appears to be attached to the name of God, i.e., שׁבת ליהוה אלהיך: the seventh day does not merely imply rest, but it has to be dedicated to God. In other words, the root שׁבת underwent a crucial development: from prescribing rest on the seventh day[26] to the Sabbath day dedicated to the LORD. Moreover, this development considerably affects the seventh day as well, which becomes a feast day or more precisely a holy day. Moreover, the Greek rendering σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου ('Sabbath to the LORD your God') is a faithful and literal translation.

Furthermore, it should be mentioned that within my relative chronology, the root שבת is attested as a noun starting from the Decalogues. Therefore, it seems crucial to begin the discussion concerning the vocabulary with a short survey on the root שׁבת.

Its verbal form reflects a rather small number of occurrences in the Pentateuch (18x) in comparison with the rest of the Hebrew Bible (55x). In the Pentateuch, the meanings of the verb שׁבת can be divided into three groups according to its semantic field. First, it is a conventional verb for the principle of *rest, cease, come to an end* (in the *qal* [27x] and *niphal* [4x]) and its causative version (*hiphil* stem) expresses the act of *removing, destroying, putting to an end* (Ex 5,5; 12,15). The second meaning covers the rest on the seventh day: God's rest on the seventh day of creation (Gen 2,2.3; Ex 31,17) and human beings' rest on the seventh day of the week (Ex 16,30; 23,12; 34,21[2x], Lev 23,32 [*Yom Kippur*]).[27]

---

[26] It must be noted, however, that the use of שבת to prescribe resting on the seventh day reflects already a further development of the root in Hebrew. Cf. Ernst Haag, "שבת", *TDOT* 14, Grand Rapids, MI, Cambridge UK: Eerdmans 2004, 381–386.

[27] Cf. Hans RECHENMACHER, "*šabbat[t]* – Nominalform und Etymologie", *ZAH* 9 (1996) 199–203 (202); Ina WILLI-PLEIN, "Anmerkungen zu Wortform und Semantik des Sab-

The third meaning refers to the rest of the land during the Sabbatical year (Lev 25,2; 26,34.35[2x]). This short survey shows that the basic meanings of the verb שבת are to *cease, come to an end, finish* and there is a tendency to apply this verb to the idea of *rest* in the Pentateuch (12 out of 18 occurrences).[28] The idea of rest is linked either to the seventh day, Sabbath day or to the Sabbatical year. In line with Ernst Haag, we can conclude that the meanings *to rest, keep or observe the* Sabbath represent the specialized meaning, in the sense of *to celebrate* that developed in Hebrew in the light of the Sabbath institution.[29] Moreover, the use of this verb for the rest on the seventh day or on the Sabbath day belongs particularly to Exodus, and to the Sabbath commandments.

Second, the noun שבת is well attested in the Pentateuch (out of the 112 occurrences, 47 are in the Pentateuch). Despite the highest number of occurrences in Leviticus (25x)[30], the noun שבת occurs only five times in the context of the Sabbath commandment, mainly in the context of the Sabbatical year.[31] Unlike Leviticus, in Exodus (15x), the noun שבת is recurrent in the Sabbath commandments and in Ex 16, which narrates the first Sabbath observed by the Israelites

---

bat," *ZAH* 10 (1997) 201–206 (202–203); Ernst JENNI, "Lexikalisch-semantische Strukturunterschiede: hebräisch ḤDL – deutsch 'aufhören / unterlassen'", *ZAH* 7 (1994) 124–132 (128) (the verb שבת is characterized as "Negationsverb"); BDB, "שבת", 991.

[28] Cf. Ernst HAAG, "שָׁבַת", *TDOT* XIV, 382–384; id., "שַׁבָּת", *TDOT* 14, 387–397 (389); Fritz Stolz, "שבת", *TLOT* 3, 1611–1617 (1612–1613); Francis BROWN, Samuel R. DRIVER and Charles A. BRIGGS, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers* (BDB), Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 122008; "שָׁבַת", 991–992; HOLLADAY, "שָׁבַת", 360: 1. *cease, stop, be at a standstill*; 2. *stop working, take a holiday*; DCH VIII, "שבת I", 254–258; BDB, "שבת", 991: 1. *cease, desist, rest*; 2. *desist from labour, rest*. Cf. RECHENMACHER, "šabbat[t]," 202; WILLI-PLEIN, "Anmerkungen", 202–203; Jenni, "Lexikalisch-semantische Strukturunterschiede", 128: JENNI characterizes שבת as "Negationsverb".

[29] HAAG, "שָׁבַת," 385–386.

[30] Lev 16,31; 19,3.30; 23,3[2x].11.15[2x].16.32[2x].38; 24,8[2x]; 25,2.4[2x].6.8[2x]; 26,2.34[2x].35.43 (= Holiness Code).

[31] Sabbath commandments: Lev 19,3.30; 23,3[2x];26,2; the idea of complete rest on a feast: Lev 16,31; 23,32[2x]; the Sabbath day is merely mentioned in various contexts: Lev 23,11.15[2x].16.38; 24,8[2x]; in the context of the Sabbatical year: Lev 25,2.4[2x].6.8[2x]; 26,34[2x].35.43; cf. David J.A. CLINES, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* [DCH] 8, Sheffield: Phoenix, 2011, "שַׁבָּת", 258–261.

within the manna narrative.[32] In Numbers it appears in the instructions regarding sacrifices on the Sabbath day (3x)[33] and once in the short story of a man who was put to death because he had collected sticks on the Sabbath day (15,32). In Deuteronomy, it occurs only in the Decalogue (Dt 5,12.14.15). Finally, it is worth mentioning that the noun שבת is hardly attested in Genesis. To sum up, similar to its verbal form, שבת is mainly represented in Exodus and Leviticus, and it seems to be the favoured noun of Exodus for the name of the seventh day.

Against this background, I suggest that the Sabbath commandments reflect not only the morphological change regarding the root שבת but they also witness the extra meaning of this root, i.e., the idea of rest or observance of the Sabbath on the seventh day. It should also be stressed that the additional meaning of *rest* can be primarily traced back to the institution of the week (Ex 34,21; 23,12). In light of the Sabbath institution, the root שבת developed further and became the name of the seventh day of the week, denoting the established Sabbath institution at the same time. This understanding of the Sabbath as institution (feast day) transpires from the Greek translations as well: for instance, the preference for the transliterations in vv. 8 and 10 may designate the use of σάββατα as technical term for the seventh day (names used for the Sabbath feast).

Before moving on, it is important to refer briefly to the Greek renderings of the Hebrew noun שַׁבָּת. Remarkably, the Greek translator employs the plural form of (τὰ) σάββατα as the rendering of the singular noun שַׁבָּת. Furthermore, the plural σάββατα could be considered as the transliteration of the Aramaic שבתא 'Sabbath'. If it is true, then we are facing the phenomenon of "etymological understanding" or "etymological exegesis"[34] discussed by Tov, which presupposes etymological considerations behind the translation. Tov notes that the translators' etymological exegesis or etymological search for meaning of difficult words often has an Aramaic background.[35] However, it is also possible that the translator con-

---

[32] Sabbath commandments (11x): Ex 20,8.10.11; 31,13.14.15[2x].16[2x]; 35,2.3; and Ex 16,23.25.26.29 (4x).

[33] Num 28,9.10[2x].

[34] For a detailed discussion of "etymological exegesis" see further Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 188–190. Cf. Hans AUSLOOS and Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, "Etymological Translations in the Septuagint," in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of Septuagint, LXX.H 3: Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2016, 193–201.

[35] TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 196.

sidered the noun שַׁבָּת as *terminus technicus* and did not even try to translate it. This procedure might be a good example for the stereotypical rendering of the proper noun, the noun of the feast day. In the light of the content-related criteria we can assume that the translator faced a difficult word and he opted for the easiest solution, i.e. the transliteration, although he also had other options, like the simple translation or etymological rendering. The transliteration itself is a proof that the Hebrew word penetrated the culture of Greek-speaking Jewish community and was used to refer to the feast of Sabbath.

Dt 5,12-15

v. 12

| אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת | τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων |

v. 14

וְיוֹם	τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
שַׁבָּת	σάββατα
לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου

v. 15

לַעֲשׂוֹת	φυλάσσεσθαι
אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת	τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων
----	καὶ ἁγιάζειν αὐτήν

In spite of the fact that the two MT Decalogues include the two versions of the same tradition, we discover many divergences between them both on the level of theology and text. We can say without exaggeration that the two Sabbath commandments include the highest number of divergences. The discussion of these divergences and of the literary link between the two Decalogical Sabbath commandments, goes however beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, I mention briefly only a few relevant information. First, the redactional activity points towards a very skilled redactor-scribe, mindful of the fine details. This carefulness is reflected by the consistent use of the vocabulary (יהוה, צוה, אלהיך, יום השבת) as well as the ideology of the text (e.g., the Sabbath commandment is directly from God; the use of the verb שמר in inf. abs. that occurs only in Dt to express the idea of obligation or observance in legal context [cf. "em-

phatic imperative"[36]]). Similar carefulness is noticeable in the Greek text in the case of the reference to the Sabbath day, i.e., LXX Dt 5,12-15 reflects a stronger faithfulness *vis-à-vis* Ex 20,8-11. For instance, אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת is rendered by τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων in vv. 12 and 15.

Lev 23,3

וּבַיּוֹם	καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן	σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις
מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ	κλητὴ ἁγία
----	τῷ κυρίῳ
...	
שַׁבָּת הִוא	σάββατά ἐστιν
לַיהוָה	τῷ κυρίῳ

In this commandment, we must highlight two textual variants: the translation of שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן with σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις and the plus τῷ κυρίῳ.

The rendering of the name of the Sabbath with σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις can be considered as a free, yet faithful translation. However, two things come to the fore: first, different translation techniques are applied to render the two components of the Hebrew name. The noun שַׁבָּת is rendered or rather transliterated as σάββατα (cf. the previous Sabbath commandments), whereas the noun שַׁבָּתוֹן is translated with the noun ἀνάπαυσις. The noun ἀνάπαυσις is in fact a literal and faithful translation, nevertheless, the translator's decision of "root-linked [etymological] rendering"[37] is surprising as the noun σάββατα was at his disposal. It should also be mentioned that the noun ἀνάπαυσις occurs in the Sabbath commandment of Ex 23,12 (*supra*) as the translation of the verb שׁבת.

---

[36] For the inf. abs. in the sense of the imperative see also Dt 16,1 (שָׁמוֹר) and 24,9 (זָכוֹר), cf. Ex 20,8.11. On the "emphatic imperative", see further John D.W. Watts, "Infinitive Absolute as Imperative and the Interpretation of Ex 20:8," *ZAW 74* (1962) 141–145; John I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3), Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987, 277; Carmel McCarthy, *Deuteronomy* (BHQ), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, 67.

[37] Ausloos and Lemmelijn, "Etymological Translations", 195.

The peculiarity of this translation is emphasized by the fact that שבתון reveals the same meaning as שֶׁבֶת, *abstention from work, rest*,[38] and it could be considered the sufformative form of the root שׁבת.[39] The sufformative form (*qatalān*) is formed of *qatal + ān* (קְטָלוֹן) and is the form of abstract nouns, e.g., רְעָבוֹן (*famine*). שַׁבָּתוֹן is the only sufformative that preserves the primitive first vowel 'a', probably under the influence of the noun שַׁבָּת.[40] As Propp shows:

> Like other nouns of the pattern *qiṭṭâlôn* (< *qaṭṭālōn*), *šabbātôn* denotes a concrete example or the condition of its root meaning, in this case *šbt* 'cease, rest'. In other words, *šabbātôn* means something like "quintessential cessation", (The reason we do not find the expected evolution *šabbatōn > *šibbātôn was doubtless the influence of *šabbāt* 'Sabbath.') To call the Sabbath a "Sabbatical" provides emphasis through tautology. […] *Šabbāt šabbātôn* is also coordinated with *qōdeš* 'Holiness' ([Ex] 16,23; 31,15; 35,2; Lev 23,3), evoking the phrase *qōdeš qŏdāšîm* 'Holiness of Holinesses.'[41]

---

[38] BDB, "שַׁבָּתוֹן", 992: "sabbath observance, sabbatism"; Johnstone, *Exodus 20-40,* 339: "complete rest"; Durham, *Exodus,* 411: "*the sabbath of sabbath-rest, set apart for Yahweh*"; Hendrik L. Bosman, "שבת", *NIDOTTE* 4, 1157–1163 (1157): "*šabbātôn* is a denom. nom., and the suffix *-ôn* probably indicates an abstract meaning, 'restfulness'. […] This derivation from the *šabbāt* designates the weekly Sabbath (Ex 16,23; 31,15; 35,2; Lev 23,3), the Day of Atonement (Lev 16,31; 23,32), the sabbatical year (Lev 25,4-5), the day of rest commemorated by trumpets (Lev 23,34), and the first and eighth day of the Feast of Succoth (Lev 23,39)." Stolz, "שבת", *TLOT*, 1297–1302 (1298); Ernst Haag, "שַׁבָּת", *TDOT* 14, 387–397; Hasel, "Sabbath", 849: "Sabbath feast."

[39] *DCH* 8, "שַׁבָּת", 259, 262: Clines translates "special sabbath", "(special) sabbath (observance)": 1. "(special) day of sabbath (observance)", e.g., Lev 16,31; 23,3.24.39; Ex 16,23; 31,15; 35,2; 2. "(special) year of sabbath (observance)", e.g., Lev 25,4.5. Thus, he suggests the translation "*a sabbath of special sabbath observance, a holy convocation*" for Lev 23,3. *Cf.* Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus* (JPS Torah Commentary), Philadelphia, New York, Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989, 155; Bosman, "שבת", 1160: "The paronomastic construction *šabbāt šabbātôn* has the function of superlative to indicate that all forms of labor are prohibited."

[40] Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SB 27), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, ²2008, 240–241.

[41] William H.C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A), New York: Doubleday, 2006, 493. Propp translates "Sabbatical Sabbath" for the combined formula. In the case of presenting the pattern development, Propp

Consequently, שבת שבתון is to be understood as a superlative, i.e., "the most restful rest", "the absolute day of rest"[42] or "one individual and particular שַׁבָּת",[43] Against this background, one can safely assume that the combined formula שבת שבתון belongs to the same tradition or scribal-redactional activity.[44] Even if Lev 23,3 displays a shorter formula since it does not include ליהוה, it can still be ascribed to this tradition or scribal–redactional activity. All the more so since its LXX version includes the τῷ κυρίῳ which corresponds to ליהוה and hence, it reflects a *Vorlage* which might have contained ליהוה. It should not be excluded that the harmonizing tendency of the Greek translator(s) lies behind the formula τῷ κυρίῳ considering its other occurrences.

Against this background, we may conclude that the use of שבת שבתון for the Sabbath reveals a further interpretation of the seventh day, classifying it among God's appointed festivals and holy convocations (cf. Lev 23,2: מקראי קדש /

---

draws on Barth's study. See further Jacob BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen,* Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894, 324. Furthermore, Lettinga categorizes the suffix -ān (> -ōn) as the primary marker of abstract nouns and of diminutive. See further J. P. LETTINGA, Takamitsu MURAOKA, *Grammatica van het bijbels Hebreeuws: Elfde, gecorrigeerde editie*, Leiden: Brill, 2000, 43.

[42] HAAG, "שַׁבָּת", 387–397 (389); BDB, "שַׁבָּת שַׁבָּתוֹן", 992: "sabbath of sabbatic observance"; Holladay, "שַׁבָּת שַׁבָּתוֹן", 360: "*the most solemn sabbath*"; Jacob MILGROM, *Leviticus 23–27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3B), New York: Doubleday, 2000, 1959; Thomas HIEKE, *Levitikus 16–27* (HThKAT), Freiburg: Herder, 2014, 886: שַׁבָּתוֹן "völlige Ruhe" and שַׁבָּת שַׁבָּתוֹן "ein »Schabbat völliger Ruhe« (als Superlativ)." Willi-Plein characterizes שַׁבָּתוֹן as an abstract noun ("Abstraktbildung") and situates it in the cultic context: "Ohne ausdrückliche Verbindung mit dem Sabbat kann aber šbtwn auch des Ausbleiben anderer mit einem kultischen Anla »nicht vereinbarer Dinge oder Aktivitäten bezeichnen, nämlich im Zusammenhangen mit Festrandtagen (Lev 25,24.39), mit dem Sabbatjahr (Lev 25,5) und mit dem Ausbleiben des Manna (Ex 16,23)". See further WILLI-PLEIN, "Anmerkungen", 201; Karl ELLIGER, *Leviticus* (HAT 1/4), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966, 313.

[43] Ludwig KOEHLER and Walter BAUMGARTNER, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: Brill, 1958, 1411.

[44] Hieke assumes that "Der Begriff *šabbātōn* ist eine priesterliche Prägung, die den verschieden gelagerten Verboten der Arbeitsruhe korrespondiert: *šabbātōn* steht immer dort, wo auch »jegliche Dienstarbeit« (*melæʾkæt ʿabodā*) verboten wird – die etwas mildere Form, die nach Ex 12,16 die persönliche Zubereitung des Essens noch erlaubt." See further HIEKE, *Levitikus 16–27*, 886.

κλητὰς ἁγίας and מועדי / ἑορταί μου).[45] The Greek translation, however, does not transmit the superlative understanding of שבת שבתון or at least, the rendering σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις is not as eye-catching.

---

[45] LEVINE, *Leviticus*, 154: "There is, however, a problem in using the term *moʿed* with reference to the Sabbath. Elsewhere in the ritual legislation it usually designates an annual occurrence. A *moʿed* occurs at the same time each year; its annual dates must be "fixed." There is, however, no need to "fix" the time of the Sabbath, which is not, strictly speaking, a calendrical phenomenon, as Rashi has pointed out. Furthermore, biblical usage regularly differentiates between *shabbat,* "the Sabbath," and *moʿed*, as in verses 37-38 of our chapter [Lev 23,37-38], which speaks of the "set times of the LORD" as being "apart from the sabbaths of the LORD." Accordingly, the use of *moʿed* for the Sabbath is most likely to be explained by the influence of the language of verse 4 [Lev 23,4] upon that of verse 2 [Lev 23,3]." Cf. DCH V, "מועד", 179–182: (1) *appointment, meeting;* (2) *meeting place;* (3) *appointed time, due season;* (4) *festival, time of appointed feast, of national festival* (included sabbath and new moon) = *calendar of festivals* [Lev 23,2.4.37.44]; (5) *agreement, appointed signal.* Clines notes that the Sabbath and the new moon are listed into the festival or calendars of festival as מועד in several places though this is not a usual way to refer the Sabbath or to the new moon. See also H. KOCH, "מועד – *môʿēd*," *TDOT* 8, 167–173: "The term has long been used to refer to the appointed time and place of the more important cultic celebrations, i.e., feasts of worship. [...] Yet in the majority of OT passages [...] it refers to the time of the (three) great annual festivals (Lev. 23:2ff.; Nu. 10:10; 15:3; 28:2; 29:39; 2 Ch. 8:13; Ps. 75:3[2]; Isa 1:14; Lam. 1:4; 2:7,22; Ezek. 36:38; 44:24; 45:17; 46:9,11; Hos 9:5; Zeph. 3:18; Zech. 8:19; cf. Dt. 31:10). [...] In its statements about the cultic festivals as *môʿᵃdîm*, the lexeme occurs surprisingly often together with the terms "sabbath and new moon" (Lev. 23:2ff.; Nu. 10:10; 1 Chr. 23:31; 2 Chr. 2:3[4]; 31,3; Isa. 1:14; Lam. 2:6; Hos. 2:13[11]; cf. Ezek. 36:38; 46:9,11; Hos. 9:5), so that the Sabbath and new moon, while apparently not referring to a *môʿēd*, do designate a closely related quantity. [...] However, it is not only about the natural cycle that these *môʿēd*-times are thrown into relief; at the same time, they represent those days when God approaches Israel as Creator and meets with his cultic community. Such times are thus filled with holiness (qdš, Ps. 73:4f.; Lev. 23:2ff. and *passim*), and such occasions are marked by solemn convocations (qrʿ, Lev. 23:2ff.; Nu. 16:2; Lam. 1:4,15; 2:22 and *passim*)." [p. 170] Bosman also distinguishes two usages of this term: (a) a non-cultic use: determined, appointed place or time (e.g., Gen 17,21; Jer 8,7); and (b) cultic use: referring to the religious festivals (e.g., Lev 23,2; 4,44; Isa 1,14; Ezek 36,38; 44,24; 45,17; Hos 2,9[11]). Interestingly, Bosman lists the Sabbath among the most important OT feasts without highlighting the inappropriate or strange association of the Sabbath with the term מועד. See further Hendrik L. BOSMAN, "מועד", *NIDOTTE* 2, 871–873.

Ex 35,2

וּבַיּוֹם	τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
יִהְיֶה	----
לָכֶם	----
---	κατάπαυσις
קֹדֶשׁ	ἅγιον
שַׁבַּת	σάββατα
שַׁבָּתוֹן	ἀνάπαυσις
לַיהוָה	κυρίῳ

In the Septuagint version of Ex 35,2, we may notice several textual variants over against the Hebrew text. The expression קדש שבת שבתון ליהוה, the well-defined name of the Sabbath day highlights the theological importance of the day. Obviously, the translation of this expression challenged the knowledge and creativity of the translator. Hence, the translator opted for the simple solution which resulted in four nouns (all in nominative): (1) κατάπαυσις ('rest')[46], which is a 'plus' noun *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew version, (2) ἅγιον ('[something] holy'), (3) σάββατα ('Sabbaths'), and (4) ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ ('rest, repose for the LORD').[47] Thus, this can be translated as 'a rest, something holy, Sabbaths, a repose for the LORD' over against the Hebrew expression that could be translated as 'a holy Sabbath of solemn rest to the LORD'. Consequently, we have here a very free and faithful translation with two variants, presumably due to the complexity of the Hebrew expression: (1) יִהְיֶה לָכֶם '[it] should to you' is not translated, i.e., it is a 'minus', but (2) the noun κατάπαυσις is a 'plus'. The presence of κατάπαυσις is striking: on the one hand, it complicates the rendering of the Hebrew expression which is in itself very complex; on the other hand, it is almost unnecessary since it is the synonym of ἀνάπαυσις.

Ex 31,12-17
v. 13

אַךְ	≠	Ὁρᾶτε
----		καὶ

---

[46] LUST et al., "κατάπαυσις, -εως+", 322. Cf. MURAOKA, "κατάπαυσις, -εως", 302.

[47] LUST et al., "ἀνάπαυσις, -εως+", 42. Cf. MURAOKA, "ἀνάπαυσις, -εως", 32 [typical rendering of מנח, מְנוּחָה and שַׁבָּת].

אֶת־		---
שַׁבְּתֹתַי		τὰ σάββατά μου
תִּשְׁמֹרוּ		φυλάξεσθε

v. 14

אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת		τὰ σάββατα
כִּי		ὅτι
קֹדֶשׁ		ἅγιον
הִוא		τοῦτό
לָכֶם	≠	ἐστιν κυρίου ὑμῖν

v. 15 (core-commandment)

וּבְיוֹם		τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי		τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
שַׁבַּת		σάββατα
שַׁבָּתוֹן		ἀνάπαυσις
קֹדֶשׁ		ἁγία
לַיהוָה		τῷ κυρίῳ
...		...
בְּיוֹם		τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשַּׁבָּת	≠	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ

v. 16

אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת		τὰ σάββατα
לַעֲשׂוֹת		ποιεῖν
אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת	≠	αὐτὰ
לְדֹרֹתָם		εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν
בְּרִית		διαθήκη
עוֹלָם		αἰώνιος

v. 17

אוֹת הִוא לְעֹלָם	σημεῖόν ἐστιν αἰώνιον
וּבְיוֹם	καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
שָׁבַת	ἐπαύσατο
וַיִּנָּפַשׁ	καὶ κατέπαυσεν

The excessively complex structure and content of this Sabbath command-ment should be highlighted. A closer examination shows that Ex 31,12-17 is a collection of Sabbath commandments, which includes the elements of the pre-

viously discussed commandments. This holds true for the names used for the Sabbath day and remarkably, to their Greek renderings.

In v. 13 (= the first commandment of the collection), the commandment is expressed by the verb שׁמר in imp. 2nd pers. pl.[48] *vis-à-vis* the LXX version, which applies two verbs and reflects a different word-order: ὁράω (imp. 2nd pers. pl.) opens the commandment and φυλάσσω (fut. mid. ind. 2nd pers. pl.) is found at the end of it. The verb φυλάσσω is the stereotypical rendering of שׁמר, therefore, ὁράω should be considered the 'plus' material of the LXX. The verb ὁράω[49] might have been introduced to serve together with the conj. καί as an appropriate translation of the emphatic adverb אַך. The translation of שַׁבְּתֹתַי 'my sabbaths', however, is rendered faithfully: τὰ σάββατά μου (n.acc.pl.).

As for the rest of the Sabbath references, we can observe the following tendencies present in the Greek translation. Similarly to the previous commandments, the Hebrew singular noun (הַ)שַׁבָּת ('[the] Sabbath') is rendered consistently by the plural τὰ σάββατα (vv. 14.15.16). This rendering might reflect the translators' freedom or theology since all Hebrew traditions (the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Qumran scrolls) use the singular שַׁבָּת. In v. 14 (= the second commandment of the collection) a striking textual variant is detectable: the LXX has ὅτι ἅγιον τοῦτό ἐστιν κυρίου ὑμῖν *vis-à-vis* כי קדש הוא לכם ('it is holy for your LORD' and 'for it is holy for you', respectively). Accordingly, the Hebrew text argues that the Sabbath should be kept because it is holy for the community, the בני ישראל ('sons of Israel' in Ex 31,12-17). Unlike the theology or ideology of the Hebrew text, the Septuagint translator states that the Sabbath should be observed because it is holy for the LORD. This is the mark of theologically motivated exegesis.

The Sabbath reference in v. 15 (= the *core-commandment* of the collection) is closely connected to the previously discussed Sabbath commandment in Ex 35,2:

Ex 31,15 שׁבת שׁבתון קדשׁ ליהוה
Ex 35,2 קדשׁ שׁבת שׁבתון ליהוה

Ex 31,15 σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ
Ex 35,2 κατάπαυσις, ἅγιον, σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ

---

48 It was categorized as the short form of the Sabbath commandment, attested only in the Holiness Legislation (Lev 19,3.30; 26,2) as well as Ex 31,13.

49 LUST *et al.*, "ὁράω", 443; MURAOKA, "ὁράω", 502503.

It has been argued that this expression is the elaborated name of the Sabbath commandment. Contrary to LXX Ex 35,2, however, we encounter a 'better' or more faithful translation in LXX Ex 31,15. For instance, the term קֹדֶשׁ is rendered by the adjective ἅγιος, and the noun κατάπαυσις, the 'plus' material of Ex 35,2, does not occur here: 'on the seventh day there is Sabbath, a holy rest to the LORD.' Similarly to Ex 35,2, the singular שַׁבָּת is rendered by the plural σάββατα and the noun שבתון by the noun ἀνάπαυσις. It is remarkable that the שבת occurs twice in this verse, nevertheless, the second time the construction of בְּיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת 'on the Sabbath day' is translated with τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ 'on the seventh day'. This difference might be explained by the stereotyped nature of the two references, namely, the rendering of שבת שבתון by the σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις and of the יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת by the τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ (cf. Ex 20,11).

In v. 16 (= the fourth commandment of the collection), the Sabbath reference corresponds to the previously discussed translation, i.e., the expression אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת (sg.) is rendered by the τὰ σάββατα (pl.). There is, however, a slight textual variant, which is presumably meant to contribute to a more idiomatic translation: the construction אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת is attested twice in MT, whereas the second time it is substituted with the personal pronoun αὐτά in neutral plural, corresponding to τὰ σάββατα (pl.) in the LXX.

V. 17 includes the motivation of the Sabbath commandment in Ex 31,12-17 and recalls the seventh day of creation similarly to the Decalogical Sabbath commandment in Ex 20,11. In contrast to Ex 20,11, the verb שבת is applied (cf. Gen 2,2-3) and translated with the verb παύω. It should also be reiterated that in the case of Ex 34,21 and Ex 23,12 the verb שבת is rendered by the verb καταπαύσεις and by the noun ἀνάπαυσις, respectively.

In sum, the Septuagint version of the Sabbath commandment in Ex 31,12-17 reflects a faithful translation. The translation techniques points towards a skilled translator aware of the conventional terms used to translate the Sabbath references. Among others, the harmonization and theological adaptation found in vv.14-15 should be underlined: ἅγιον τοῦτό ἐστιν κυρίου ὑμῖν and ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ.

Conclusion

Being the product of Hellenistic Judaism, the Septuagint provides valuable insights into the translation work and theology of the early Greek speaking Jew-

ish community. Every translation is at the same time an interpretation. The translator of the Septuagint provides a new (theological) interpretation or adaptation of the Hebrew Scriptures to the readers, on the one hand. On the other hand, the translation may reflect the community's understanding of certain issues in this case the Sabbath. This paper has aimed to scrutinize the possible theological and/or ideological understanding of the Sabbath commandment reflected by the process of translation. Furthermore, I wanted to explore whether the translator(s) noticed the literary and redactional relationship between these Sabbath commandments, undeniably present in the Hebrew text. In order to explore these possible intentions, we have relied on the "content related criteria" developed by Ausloos and Lemmelijn and the "theological(ly motivated) exegesis" proposed by Tov.

The analysis of the main features of the Greek Sabbath commandments has highlighted different tendencies in the translation of the names or references to the Sabbath in these texts. These examples reflect the translators endeavour to find a suitable Greek equivalent for the Sabbath day, which deeply engrained in the ancient Israelite cultural and religious life. The main task of the translators was to transpose an institution developed within a very specific Judean community into a Jewish, yet completely different cultural milieu.

Regarding the translation technique employed in the Sabbath commandments, in certain cases, the translators provided a very literal translation, in other cases they opted for the simplest solution of transliteration. In other instances, we can identify a theologically motivated translation. These observations allow a number of remarks. First, in the case of the verb שבת we cannot speak about consistent renderings; the verb is translated with the verb καταπαύω in Ex 34,21, the noun ἀνάπαυσις in Ex 23,12 and the verb παύω in Ex 31,17. Second, contrary to its verbal cognate, the noun שבת (sg.) is rendered consistently by the plural σάββατα: (a) the reference יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת occurs only three times, only in the Decalogical Sabbath commandments, and is translated with τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων (Ex 20,8; Dt 5,12.15); (b) the expression שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ is attested again only in the Decalogues, and is rendered in both cases by the faithful translation σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου (Ex 20,10; Dt 5,14). The following reference that should be highlighted, שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, is rendered by σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις (Lev 23,3). The same expression translates its expanded versions, שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה (Ex 31,15) and קֹדֶשׁ שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן לַיהוָה (Ex 35,2) as well, although the translations of the expanded versions differ considerably. At this

point, the rendering of the singular noun שבת by the plural from σάββατα should also be emphasized.

Against this background, we can observe that although the basic structure of the *core commandment* is preserved in the Greek renderings, the different renderings of the verb שבת show that the translators did not see a strong relationship between the commandments. Moreover, the close literary and redactional relationship between the two identified forms of the Sabbath commandments in the Hebrew Pentateuch does not appear in the Septuagint. The consistency in the rendering of the Sabbath references, however, indicates that the plural form σάββατα might have been the widespread or accepted name to the Sabbath feast. Furthermore, this usage may imply the weekly observance of the Sabbath. As a concluding remark, I would like to underline the impact of the Sabbath commandment on the Hellenistic cultural milieu beyond the immediate community that produced and received the Greek translation(s) of the Torah. First, translating the Sabbath commandments enriched the Greek vocabulary with the term σάββατον (pl. σάββατα). Second, the observance of the Sabbath introduced the cycle 6+1 of days, known today as the week, into the Hellenistic cultural and social milieu.

Bibliography

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account", in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993, 116–130.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint", in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 361–380.

Arnold, Bill T. and John H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Etymological Translations in the Septuagint", in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of Septuagint, LXX.H 3: Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2016, 193–201.

Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Characterizing the LXX Translation of Judges on the Basis of Content-Related Criteria: The Greek Rendering of He-

brew Absolute *Hapax Legomena* in Judges 3,12-30", in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (BETL 246), edited by Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Jullio Trebolle Barrera, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, 171–192.

Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Content Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique", in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* 2. *Internationale Fachtagung (LXX.D) Wuppertal, 23-27 July 2008*, edited by Kraus Wolfgang and Martin Karrer, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 357–376.

Ausloos, Hans, "LXX's Rendering of Hebrew Proper Names and the Characterization of the Translation Technique of the Book of Judges", in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls, FS Raija Sollamo* (JSJSup 126), edited by A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 53–71.

Barr, James, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Barth, Jacob, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894.

Bosman, Hendrik L., "מועד", *New International Dictionary of the Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 2, edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Paternoster, 1996, 871–873.

Bosman, Hendrik L., "שבת", *New International Dictionary of the Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 4, edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Paternoster, 1997, 1157–1163.

Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, Charles A. Briggs (eds.), *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, [12]2008.

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* 8, Sheffield: Phoenix, 2011.

Durham, John I., *Exodus* (WBC 3), Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.

Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, Heinz-Josef Fabry (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 14, Grand Rapids, MI, Cambridge UK: Eerdmans, 2004.

Elliger, Karl, *Leviticus* (HAT 1/4), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966.

Hieke, Thomas, *Levitikus 16-27* (HThKAT), Freiburg: Herder, 2014.

Holladay, William L. (ed.). *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.

Jenni, Ernst, "Lexikalisch-semantische Strukturunterschiede: hebräisch ḤDL – deutsch 'aufhören/unterlassen'", *ZAH 7 (*1994), 124–132.

Joüon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SB 27), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, ²2008.

Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: Brill, 1958.

Kratz, Reinhard G., "Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate", in *The Pentateuch: International Perspective on Current Research* (FAT 78), edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, Baruch J. Schwartz, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, 31–61.

Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, "Flora in Cantico Canticorum. Towards a More Precise Characterisation of Translation Technique in the LXX of Song of Songs", in *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea scrolls in honour of Raija Sollamo* (JSJSup 126), edited by Jutta Jokiranta, Raija Sollamo, Anssi Voitila, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008, 27–52.

Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, "Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint", in *Helsinki Perspective on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999* (PFES 82), edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, 43–63.

Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called 'Plagues Narrative' in Exodus 7,14–11,10* (OTS 56), Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2009.

Lettinga, Jan Pieter, Takamitsu Muraoka (with W. Th. Peursen), *Grammatica van het bijbels Hebreeuws: Elfde, gecorrigeerde editie*, Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Levine, Baruch A., *Leviticus* (The JPS Torah Commentary), Philadelphia, New York, Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989.

Lukács, Ottilia, *Sabbath in the Making: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation of the Sabbath Commandment*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ³2015.

Marquis, Galen, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel", in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 405–424.

McCarthy, Carmel, *Deuteronomy* (BHQ), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

Milgrom, Jacob, *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* vol. 3B (AB), New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets the Septuagint*, Leuven: Peeters, 2002.

Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright (eds.). *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Propp, William H.C., *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A), New York: Doubleday, 2006.

Rechenmacher, Hans, "*šabbat[t]* – Nominalform und Etymologie", *ZAH* 9 (1996) 199–203.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari, "Der Gebrauch des Genitivus Absolutus in der Septuaginta", In *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987. FS Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen* (AASF Series B 237), edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo, 175-180, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch", in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea. V. Congreso de la IOSCS* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34), edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos, Madrid: Arias Montano, 1985, 101–113.

Stolz, Fritz, "שבת", *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* 3, edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, translated by Mark E. Biddle, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997, 1611–1617.

Tov, Emanuel, "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint", in id., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 257–269.

Tov, Emanuel, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research, Third Edition, Completely Revised and Expanded*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

Tov, Emanuel and Benjamin G. Wright, "Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of the Translation Units in the Septuagint", in *The Greek Bible and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Emmanuel Tov, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 219–237.

Watts, John D.W., "Infinitive Absolute as Imperative and the Interpretation of Ex 20:8", *ZAW 74* (1962) 141–145.

Willi-Plein, Ina, "Anmerkungen zu Wortform und Semantik des Sabbat", *ZAH* 10 (1997) 201–206.

Wright, Benjamin G., "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX", in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 311–335.

BIBLICAL PERFORMANCE CRITICISM
UND DAS MARKUSEVANGELIUM

Martin Meiser[1]

Abstract: New Testament texts were mostly not read silently but heard aloud. Accordingly, some of them, especially the Gospel of Mark, still bear the traces of this form of communication and are also calculated to do so. The listeners reacted with emotional statements. The new Biblical Performance Criticism that has emerged in the USA makes these insights the basis of interpretation, in distinction from approaches that are too strongly literary. The present article seeks to raise the profit of this interpretation for textual interpretation and tries to integrate the insights of Biblical Performance Criticism into conventional exegesis of the Gospel of Mark.

Keywords: Gospel of Mark, Biblical Performance Criticism, Narrative Criticism, Ancient anti-Christian critique

In jüngster Zeit erfreut sich vor allem in den angelsächsischen Ländern der *Biblical Performance Criticism* als Alternative zu herkömmlichen Auslegungszugängen einer wachsenden Beliebtheit. Der Ausgangspunkt dieses Ansatzes ist in aller Kürze wie folgt zu beschreiben: Die später im Neuen Testament versammelten Texte wie das Markusevangelium wurden nicht im Stillen privat gelesen, sondern in der gemeindlichen oder außergemeindlichen Öffentlichkeit laut vorgetragen[2] (vgl. 1Thess 5,27; Mk 13,14). Vor allem von David Rhoads (Lutheran School of Chicago) ist dieser Ansatz zu einem interdisziplinären Zugang ausgebaut worden, der mit historischen, ethnographischen und sozialwissenschaftlichen Ansätzen vernetzt ist und *rhetorical criticism*, *reader-response criticism*, *inculturation hermeneutics* und *post-colonial interpretations* berücksichtigt.[3] Mittlerweile gibt es

---

[1] Professor für Neues Testament, Universität des Saarlandes, Fachrichtung Evangelische Theologie. martin.meiser@mx.uni-saarland.de

[2] Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11–12*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989, 30; Whitney Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel. First-Century Performance of Mark*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2003, 1; Ernst Wendland, „Performance Criticism: Assumptions, Applications, and Assessment", *TsIsC Talk* 65 (2008) 1–11 (3).

[3] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 1–2.

eine eigene von David Rhoads betriebene Homepage[4] und eine eigene, ebenfalls von ihm herausgegebene Buchreihe „*Biblical Performance Criticism*", veröffentlicht durch den Verlag Wipf & Stock in Eugene (Oregon). Als wichtige Vertreter sind neben David Rhoads auch Mary Ann Beavis, Holly Hearon, Tom Boomershine, J. Eugene Botha, Pieter J.J. Botha, Joanna Dewey, Peter Perry und Whitney Shiner zu benennen. Im deutschen Sprachraum ist es vor allem Cilliers Breytenbach, durch den dieser Ansatz aufgenommen wurde.[5] Mittlerweile ist es auch schon zu ersten durchlaufenden Kommentierungen des Markusevangeliums bzw. größerer Einheiten dessen gekommen.[6] Es ist kein Zufall, dass dieser Zugang wiederholt am Markusevangelium ausprobiert wurde, handelt es sich hier doch um das augenscheinlich am wenigsten literarisch durchgestaltete Evangelium im Vergleich zu den Evangelien nach Lukas und Matthäus.[7] Aber auch zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie und zur paulinischen Literatur gibt es Arbeiten im Rahmen dieses Ansatzes.[8] Einige seiner Vertreter haben selbst Erfahrungen mit *Performances* des

---

[4] https://www.biblicalperformancecriticism.org, konsultiert zwischen 08.10.2022 und 15.10.2022

[5] Cilliers Breytenbach, "Die literarischen Entwürfe der Evangelien und ihr Verhältnis zum historischen Jesus", in *Jesus Handbuch*, hrsg. v. Jens Schröter und Christine Jacobi, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 75–86, passim.

[6] Richard A. Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story*, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001, passim; Thomas E. Boomershine, *The Messiah of Peace: A Performance-Criticism Commentary on Mark's Passion-resurrection Narrative*, Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015, passim.

[7] Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 48; Antoinette Clark Wire, *The Case for Mark Composed in Performance*, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011, 80–84.

[8] Zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie vgl. William Doan, Terry Giles, *Prophets, Performances, and Power. Performance Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, London – New York: T&T Clark, 2005, passim; zu Paulus vgl. Pieter J.J. Botha, "Letter Writing and Oral Communication: Suggested Implications for Paul's Letter to the Galatians", *Scriptura* 42 (1992) 17–34, passim; ders., "The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence", in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, hrsg. v. Stanley E. Porter und Thomas H. Olbricht, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, 409–428, passim; Casey W. Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999; John D. Harvey, *Listening to the Text: Oral Patterning of Paul's Letters*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, passim; Bernhard Oestreich, *Performance Criticism of the Pauline Letters*, Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2016.

Markusevangeliums gemacht, sei es mit Aufführungen des Gesamtevangeliums[9], sei es mit Aufführungen einzelner Partien.[10] Aufnahmen u.a. von Max McLean in englischer Sprache sind auch auf Youtube verfügbar.[11]

Manchen Vertreterinnen und Vertretern geht es nicht um eine Addition des *Performance Criticism* zu anderen herkömmlichen Methoden historisch-kritischer Exegese, sondern um einen Paradigmenwechsel[12], der im Gegensatz zur klassischen Bibelexegese die Psychodynamik oraler Kulturen ernstnimmt.[13] Allerdings zeigt der Blick in die Praxis einiger Arbeiten aus diesem Umfeld, dass herkömmliche Anschauungen etwa über perikopenübergreifende intratextuelle Bezüge durchaus weitergeführt werden können.[14]

1. Ausgangspunkte des Biblical Performance Criticism

Der genannte Ansatz sucht Genese und Funktion der Evangelien aufgrund von Einsichten in antike Kommunikationsprozesse zu verstehen und versteht die Texte als Teil eines Kommunikationszusammenhangs. Daher ist es sinnvoll, zunächst die historischen und sozialgeschichtlichen Kontexte zu präsentieren, bevor deren Wirkung in den einzelnen Texten selbst zu Worte kommen kann.

---

[9] SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 6–7, 136–137; David RHOADS, „Performing the Gospel of Mark", in ders., *Reading Mark, Engaging the Gospel*, Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2004, 176–201 (176).

[10] SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 6–7, 136–137.

[11] Eingesehen am 13.10.2022.

[12] Pieter J.J. BOTHA, „The Spelling Eye and the Listening Ear. Oral Poetics and New Testament Writings", *Scriptura* 117 (2018) 1–18 (3); David RHOADS, "Biblical Performance Criticism: Performance as Research," *OrT* 25 (2010) 157–198 (164); vgl. das *Series Foreword* der Reihe *Biblical Performance Criticism*.

[13] Bereits 1977 wurde diese Forderung erhoben, vgl. Walter J. ONG, *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness*, Ithaca, NY – London: Cornell University Press, 1977, 231.

[14] BOOMERSHINE, *Messiah*, passim. Auch Joanna DEWEY bietet Erläuterungen, die nicht an ihre Theorie gekoppelt sind, dass es keinen einheitlichen Autor gibt, die vielmehr schon in traditioneller Exegese möglich sind: Mk 8,22-26 erinnere an 7,31-37 zurück, Mk 9,14-27 an beide vorangegangenen Erzählungen; vgl. DEWEY, „Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative of Mark", *Interpretation* 43 (1989) 32–44 (40–41), 8,27-29 an 6,14-16 („Oral Methods", 41–42).

1.1. Kontextindizien

Das Markusevangelium wurde in einer gewissen Öffentlichkeit vorgetragen, sei es vor einem noch nicht für den Glauben gewonnen Publikum[15], sei es innerhalb einer Jesusgruppe, etwa in der Hausgemeinde oder der allgemeinen Gemeindeversammlung.[16] Gerade gemeindeinterne Aufführungen sind einzuordnen in allgemeine antike Anschauungen über die Sinnhaftigkeit des gruppeninternen Erzählens solcher Geschichten. Mit ihnen ließ sich vor allem Erziehung und Normvermittlung leisten; sie konstruierten einen Heterokosmos, in den sich die Gruppe hingestellt sieht, mit seinen eigenen Regeln, und können Gruppenbewusstsein konstituieren; sie fungieren als Adaption, Bekräftigung und Neuformulierung traditioneller Werte.[17]

Analogien zur antiken rhetorischen Praxis legen nahe, dass die bzw. der Vortragende die jetzt im Text dargestellten Gesten der Berührung etc. mitvollzogen und die Stimmlage je nach dargestellter Person geändert hat.[18] Eine *Performance* des Markusevangeliums setzte wohl, anders als in heutiger herkömmlicher Theaterpraxis, nicht zwingend das Auswendiglernen eines Skriptes voraus, zumal nicht jede Performerin oder jeder Performer unbedingt des Lesens mächtig gewesen sein muss. Eine halb-spontane, inspirierte *Performance*, die die Memorierung des Inhaltes, nicht des Wortlautes voraussetzt, sei das für die Aufführungs-

---

[15] Boomershine, *Messiah*, 13. Er rechnet mit einer Zuhörerschaft i.W. von Diasporajuden, die den Anspruch der Christusgläubigen mehrheitlich nicht geteilt haben. Auf jüdische Hörerschaft führen die vielen Schriftzitate. Die Zuhörerschaft sollte während der Aufführung zum Glauben an die Messianität Jesu geführt werden; ihnen nahegelegt, von der Identifikation mit den Nebenfiguren incl. der Volksmassen zur Identifikation mit der Rolle der Jünger zu finden. Joanna Dewey rechnet mit beiden Szenarien (*The Oral Ethos of the Early Church: Speaking, Writing, and the Gospel of Mark*, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013, 160). Auch bei Hans Klein (*Der Mensch zwischen Himmel und Erde. Jesus nach dem Zeugnis der Evangelien*, Sibiu: Honterus, 2021, 18–19) sind Überlegungen dieser Art fruchtbar, wenn er einerseits Markus als Missionar und Leiter einer Schule für Missionare ansieht, andererseits festhält, dass der erste Teil des Markusevangeliums eher der Werbung für den Jesusglauben, der zweite Teil der Vertiefung dieses Glaubens dient.

[16] Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 49–51 (mit Abwägung verschiedener Möglichkeiten: Privathäusern, Geschäften, Werkstätten und Verweis auf Origenes, *Cels.* III 55, SC 136, 128); Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 3.

[17] Botha, „Spelling Eye", 8.

[18] Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 135–137.

praxis der Evangelien Naheliegende.[19] Neuere Studien zum Grad der Literazität in Palästina haben ergeben, dass entgegen bisherigen Annahmen dieser Grad kaum höher war als sonst im Imperium Romanum.[20] Die meisten Performer dürften ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται (Apg 4,13) gewesen sein[21], ebenso die meisten Christen der folgenden Jahrhunderte.[22] Als Haftpunkte dieser Praxis werden teils Galiläa, teils das Nebeneinander von galiläischen Kreisen von Frauen und des Hauses der Maria in Jerusalem (Apg 12,12) benannt.[23]

Wie ist der Weg vom mündlichen Vortrag zur Verschriftung und Weiterverbreitung zu denken? Pieter Botha stellt ein Dreistufenmodell vor: Am Anfang stand die mündliche *Performance*, sodann erfolgt die Komposition des Evangeliums in Form der *Performance* und der Publikation von Manuskripten, als dritte Stufe ist die Weiterverbreitung des Evangeliums mit Hilfe von beidem, Manuskripten und Performances zu benennen.[24] Für die dann doch erfolgende Verschriftung mag es mehrere Gründe geben: 1. Ein *Performer* erstellt ein Manuskript zur eigenen Vorbereitung; 2. Ein *Performer* verschriftlicht nachträglich seine Performances; 3. Ein *Performer* stirbt, und ein literarisch interessierter Hörer oder vielleicht auch ein Verwandter oder Schüler will die Erzählung festhalten; 4. Die Gruppe sucht, literarisch gebildete Schichten für sich zu gewinnen.[25] Aber

---

[19] Dewey, *Oral Ethos*, 145–156; Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 112. Als Großsegmente, die für sich memoriert werden konnten und damit auch die Struktur des Markusevangeliums generieren, kommen bei Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 115–116, Mk 1,1-15; 1,16–3,35; 4,1–34; 4,35–8,26; 8,27–10,52; 11–12; 13; 14,1–16,8 zu stehen, was im zweiten Teil (ab Mk 8,27) traditionelle Gliederungen bestätigt. Dewey, „Oral Methods", 39, hat Mk 1,16-45; 2,1–3,6; 4,1–34; 8,27–9,13; 12,1-40; 13,5b-37 als mögliche Segmente mündlicher Kompositionsstrukturen benannt.

[20] Richard A. Horsley, "Oral and Written Aspects of the Emergence of the Gospel of Mark as Scripture", *Oral Tradition* 25 (2010) 93–114 (97).

[21] Horsley, „Emergence", 94.

[22] Walter J. Ong, „Text as Interpretation: Mark and After", *Semeia* 39 (1987) 7–26 (18), mit Verweis auf die unwillkürliche Oberschicht-Orientierung bisheriger Historiographie.

[23] Ersteres Horsley, „Emergence", 100, mit Verweis auf Mk 14,28; 16,7, letzteres Wire, *Case*, 177–186.

[24] Pieter J.J. Botha, "The Gospel of Mark, Orality Studies and Performance Criticism. Opening Windows on Jesus Traditions", *Religion and Theology* 25 (2018) 350–393 (384).

[25] Die letzten beiden Gründe werden von Wire, *Case*, 56, favorisiert.

ein Schreiber steht selbst in dieser Aufführungspraxis und schreibt den Text bzw. Teile davon nicht am Anfang, sondern während seiner Tätigkeit als *Performer.*[26]

Unterschiedliche beantwortet wird die Frage, ob man überhaupt sinnvoll von einem Autor sprechen kann. Einige denken den Autor als einen, der selbst als *Performer* tätig ist und Erzählzyklen wie Erzähltechniken „in seiner literarischen Erzählung lediglich aufgegriffen und verfeinert hat"[27]; andere wenden sich dezidiert von einem Autorenkonzept ab.[28]

Das Publikum dürfte mit den Inhalten der heute bekannten Evangelientexte weit überwiegend durch Hören vertraut geworden sein.[29] Die Zuhörenden waren keine modernen distanzierten akademischen Leser, sondern haben sich (im Idealfall) völlig auf die ihnen dargebotene erzählte Welt eingelassen[30] und haben vermutlich durch Stellungnahmen in den Gang der Darbietung eingegriffen[31], was wiederum auf die Textgestalt nachfolgender Aufführungen Einfluss haben

---

[26] Wire, *Case*, 57–58.

[27] Cilliers Breytenbach, "Das Evangelium nach Markus – Verschlüsselte Performanz?", in ders., *The Gospel According to Mark as Episodic Narrative*, Leiden: Brill, 2021, 468–497 (492). – Manchmal geht es hier wie in anderen Forschungsrichtungen ohne Phantastik nicht ab. Danila Oder (*The Two Gospels of Mark*, Domus, 2019), behauptet, so der Klappentext, das Markusevangelium gehe auf eine Schöpfung der Nichte des Kaisers Domitian namens Flavia Domitilla zurück, die viele der Szenen in ihrem Privattheater zwischen 90 und 95 aufgeführt habe; diese Szenen seien dann in überarbeiteter Form durch Markus zu dem geworden, was wir heute als Markusevangelium kennen.

[28] Wire, *Case*, 4–6; Sandra Huebenthal, "Das Markusevangelium als Gründungsgeschichte verstehen", *ZNT* 47 (2021) 89–99 (98–99).

[29] Kelly R. Iverson, "Oral Fixation or Oral Correction? A Response to Larry Hurtado", *NTS* 62 (2016) 183–200 (198). Demgegenüber hat die Frage, ob die Aufführenden Manuskripte verwendeten oder nicht, weniger Gewicht.

[30] Boomershine, *Messiah*, 12. Zu bedenken ist, dass einerseits Lesen und Sehen/Hören eines Textes dessen Wahrnehmung innerhalb des eigenen *map of mind* bedeutet, dass jedoch die Aktivierungsprozesse dieses *map of mind* im konkreten Fall unterschiedlich verlaufen können, je nachdem, ob man liest oder an einer *Performance* teilnimmt (Howard Mancing, „See the Play, Read the Book", in *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, hrsg. v. Bruce McConachie und F. Elizabeth Hart, London: Routledge, 2006, 189–206 (189): „seeing and knowing is not the same thing as reading and knowing").

[31] Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 4–5.

konnte.[32] Entsprechend war die „bombastische"[33] Rhetorik des Markusevangeliums darauf berechnet, dass Emotionen angesprochen wurden.[34] Wir haben die unterschiedliche Wertung von Emotionen in der Philosophie und in der Rhetorik zu bedenken; in philosophischen Texten sind Emotionen verpönt; rhetorische Tradition sagt, dass der Redner Emotionen erwecken muss, um Zustimmung bei seinen Hörern zu erreichen.[35]

Vermutungen und Einsichten des *Biblical Performance Criticism*, den äußeren Rahmen dieser Aufführungen der Evangelien betreffend, haben Konsequenzen auch für die Frage der Gattung des Markusevangeliums. Einerseits verlieren Debatten über Zuweisungen an Biographie oder Historiographie an sachlichem Grund[36], andererseits wird von der gedachten Aufführungspraxis her die Frage sinnvoller, welchen anderen (halb-)öffentlichen Veranstaltungen die Aufführung der Evangelien zugeordnet werden kann. Damals wie heute gilt, dass nicht jede und jeder alles lesen oder hören will, was sie oder er lesen oder hören könnte, dass sich vielmehr in der Auswahl der Rezeptionsobjekte gesellschaftliches Selbstverständnis und gesellschaftliche Abgrenzung widerspiegelt. Auch in antiken elitären Schichten wird man manches nicht gelesen[37] und vorgelesen wie auch an

---

[32] Kelly R. IVERSON, *Performing Early Christian Literature. Audience Experience and Interpretation of the Gospels*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021, 44–45.

[33] BOTHA, „Gospel of Mark", 381.

[34] In künstlerisch-musikalischen Umsetzungen der Passionstexte z.B. bei Johann Sebastian Bach und Georg Philipp Telemann galt ebenfalls der Einbezug von Emotionen als angemessen, eine reinigende Wirkung auf die Zuhörer zu erzielen; dazu vgl. Martin MEISER, "Johannes-Passionen bei Johann Sebastian Bach und Georg Philipp Telemann. Libretti im Vergleich", in *Musikwissenschaft und Theologie im Dialog. Johann Sebastian Bachs „h-Moll-Messe" und „Johannes-Passion"*, Hg. Dominik Höink, Andreas Jacob, Hildesheim: Olms, 2020, 333–361.

[35] SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 67, verweist auf Cicero, Fin. IV 3,7 und Epiktet, Diss. III 23,28–30.37. Werner H. KELBER, "Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space", *Semeia* 65 (1994) 139–167 (163), gibt zu bedenken, dass die durch Europäische Aufklärung geprägte Exegese wenig sensitiv ist für Emotionen.

[36] HUEBENTHAL, „Gründungsgeschichte", 96.

[37] Vgl. die antike Kritik an der Unbildung der Christen. Auch Julian Apostatas ἀνέγνων ἔγνων κατέγνων („ich vernahm, verstand, verwarf") beinhaltet textpragmatisch die Abgrenzung von einer weiteren inhaltlichen Beschäftigung mit den neutestamentlichen Schriften.

mancher Performance nicht teilgenommen haben.[38] Hinsichtlich der Evangelien wird gelegentlich eine Lesepraxis wie bei Novellen vermutet, einer Gattung, die in hellenistischer Zeit sehr in Blüte stand.[39]

Ein solcher Ansatz bindet ekklesiale Evidenzen und Konsequenzen in die Kontextindizien ein. Zum einen betrifft dies das Verhältnis zwischen dem performenden Individuum und der Gruppe. Eine mögliche Position ist: Das Markusevangelium ist ein Text, der im Raum einer Gemeinschaft entstanden, durch deren Wertvorstellungen geformt und in der Gruppe als Ausdruck ihres Selbstverständnisses und ihrer Erinnerung akzeptiert wurde; Wahrheit ist in diesem Zusammenhang „soziale Übereinkunft."[40] Die literarische Freiheit des Autors war insofern eingeschränkt, als „sich der Gruppenkonsens in der Darstellung wiederfinden muss".[41]

Zum andern betrifft dies die Stellung der Textkritik in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft jenseits der approximativen Feststellung dessen, was von der Exegetin und dem Exegeten als Text ausgelegt werden soll. Traditionelle Textkritik sieht die Textüberlieferung neutestamentlicher Schriften, wie sie uns anfangsweise ab der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jhdts., etwas deutlicher im 3. Jhdt. und nochmals deutlicher ab dem 4. und 5. Jhdt. greifbar wird, in zeitlichem wie vor allem sachlichen Abstand zu den Entstehungsbedingungen der Texte selbst. Hier ist bei manchen Vertretern des Performance Criticism ein Neueinsatz gegeben: die wiederholte mündliche Aufführung des Markusevangeliums im zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert spiegelt sich in ihren Divergenzen im Detail auch in den Divergenzen der frühesten Handschriften wider, die also nicht als Schreiberversehen zu beurteilen sind. So erübrigt sich die Suche nach einem möglichst frühen konsistenten Markustext.[42] Textkritik berührt sich sodann mit der Kanonfrage: Nur die wiederholte mündliche Aufführung des Markusevangeliums im zweiten und

---

[38] William JOHNSON, "Towards a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity", *American Journal of Philology* 121 (2000) 593–627 (602–603).

[39] Mary A. TOLBERT, *Sowing the Gospel. Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989, 70–78.

[40] HUEBENTHAL, „Gründungsgeschichte", 92.

[41] HUEBENTHAL, „Gründungsgeschichte", 94.

[42] David PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 212; Joanna DEWEY, „The Survival of Mark's Gospel: A Good Story", *JBL* 123 (2004) 495–507 (505–507); WIRE, *Case*, 39.

dritten Jahrhundert habe das Markusevangelium überhaupt für die Eliten der sich heranbildenden Großkirche interessant und als kanonisierbar erwiesen.[43]

1.2. Textindizien

Jede mündliche Performance des Markusevangeliums war im Detail anders, wenngleich der Handlungsstrang im Wesentlichen derselbe blieb. Das gilt für die Gesamtaufführung als solche als auch für die Wiedergabe einzelner Ereignisse bzw. Erinnerungen, ermöglicht durch die Variabilität innerhalb eines prinzipiell gleichbleibenden Gattungsschemas.[44] Jede *Performance* vergeht im Augenblick ihres Entstehens; der vorliegende Markustext kann aber auf Spuren seiner Verwendung in einzelnen *Performances* befragt werden.[45] Solche Spuren einer Entstehung und Tradierung im Rahmen des *Performance Criticism* sind auf Mikro- wie auf Makroebene des Evangelientextes zu erkennen. Die Mikroebene, also die Ebene innerhalb der einzelnen Perikope, betreffen neben dem beschränkten Wortschatz im Allgemeinen[46] und der konkreten Sichtbarkeit des Erzählten sowie seines Hintergrundes[47] vor allem Wortwiederholungen, direkte Rede[48], Diminutiva[49], doppelte Verneinung, Interjektionen, wie sie auch für die Umgangssprache der Koine typisch sind[50], ferner Ausdrücke des emotionalen Involviertseins[51], auf der Ebene der Syntax Parataxe und inkonsistente Deixis.[52] Auch Abweichungen

---

[43] HORSLEY, „Emergence", 110.

[44] Werner H. KELBER, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997, 49.

[45] BREYTENBACH, „Evangelium", 470–472.

[46] WIRE, *Case*, 85f.

[47] DEWEY, „Oral Methods", 36.

[48] KELBER, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 65, WIRE, *Case*, 77.

[49] RHOADS, „Performing", 198. Für Mk 7,24–30 benennt er θυγάτριον, κυνάριον, ψιχία, παιδία. Jenseits der Perikope ist beispielsweise auf πλοινάριον (3,9), κοράσιον (5,41f.; 6,22.28), ἰχθύδιον (8,7) zu verweisen.

[50] Marius REISER, *Sprache und literarische Formen des Neuen Testaments. Eine Einführung*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001, 58–64.

[51] BOTHA, „Spelling Eye", 11. SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 69, verweist neben den üblichen Belegen Mk 1,41 etc. darauf, dass im Markusevangelium mehrfach unterschiedliche Emotionen direkt nebeneinandergestellt werden (Mk 4,11-13; 6,28-30; 8,29-33).

[52] BOTHA, „Spelling Eye", 11.

bei Schriftzitaten von der uns bekannten Textform und Mischzitate lassen eher auf *oral memorial* schließen als auf schriftliche Vorlagen.[53] Auf Makroebene sind der episodische Charakter und die Wahl der Gattung Chrie[54] sowie das perikopenverbindende καί[55] zu benennen, ferner die Tatsache, dass bestimme Spannungsbögen nicht durchgehend zu einem Höhepunkt geführt werden[56], ferner szenische Wiederholungen[57], triadische Strukturen und markinische Sandwichtechnik[58], Stichwortanschlüsse und Inklusionen[59], ebenfalls ungeschickte Nachträge wie Mk 2,15; 3,30. Im kontrastiven Zusammenhang mit Mk 1,1 wurden das sog. Messiasgeheimnis bei Markus als Versuch verstanden, Interesse zu erwecken und aufrechtzuerhalten – die im Zuge des *Narrative Criticism* entwickelte Erkenntnis, dass die meisten Zuhörer den Inhalt des Evangeliums kennen und gegenüber vielen Erzählfiguren hinsichtlich ihres Wissens privilegiert sind, konnte auch im Rahmen des *Biblical Performance Criticism* nutzbar gemacht werden.[60]

2. Beobachtungen zur Forschungsgeschichte

Das Auftreten dieses neuen Ansatzes ist nicht mehr in erster Linie durch Reflexion von Textdetails der Evangelientexte veranlasst, sondern durch Reflexion auf die äußeren Formen, in denen diese Texte kommuniziert wurden, trifft aber zugleich auf einen bestimmten kritischen Punkt klassischer Exegese.

Der klassische Verbund der form- und redaktionskritischen Methode sah die Weitergabe der Jesusüberlieferung in einem mehrstufigen Prozess: Am Anfang

---

[53] HORSLEY, „Emergence", 98, mit Verweis auf Mk 1,2f.; 4,12; 7,6f.; 11,17; 14,27.

[54] BREYTENBACH, „Evangelium", 474, ersteres auch KELBER, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 69.

[55] KELBER, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 65; DEWEY, „Oral Methods", 37; WIRE, *Case*, 82–84.

[56] DEWEY, „Oral Methods", 37f.: Der Konflikt zwischen Jesus und den jüdischen Eliten kommt in Mk 3,6 zu einem ersten Höhepunkt, wird aber i.W. erst in Mk 11,18; 12,12 wieder aufgenommen.

[57] Elisabeth STRUTHERS MALBON, „Echoes and Foreshadowing in Mark 4-8: Reading and Rereading", *JBL* 112 (1993) 211–230 (229–230); Joanna DEWEY, "Mark as Interwoven Tapestry: Forecasts and Echoes for a Listening Audience", *CBQ* 53 (1991) 221–231; WENDLAND, „Performance Criticism", 4; BOTHA, „Spelling Eye", 11.

[58] KELBER, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 66; HORSLEY, „Emergence", 106.

[59] Vgl. das Motiv des Weges in Mk 8,27; 10,52 (BREYTENBACH, „Evangelium", 492) bzw. das Motiv der Nachfolge in Mk 8,34; 10,52.

[60] IVERSON, *Performing*, 66.

stand die mündliche Tradition, die (u.U. nach mehreren Teilsammlungen) in einer zweiten Phase erstmals von Markus verschriftlicht wurde, woraus dann in einer dritten Phase Lukas und Matthäus unter gewissen Änderungen der Abfolge wie der Theologie teilweise ihre Stoffe entnahmen. Daneben wurde zunehmend auch mit der Weiterführung mündlicher Überlieferung gerechnet, auch unter dem Eindruck, dass die Jesusüberlieferungen in den ältesten nachneutestamentlichen Schriften keineswegs als literarische Übernahme aus den kanonisch gewordenen Evangelien erklärt werden können.[61] Völlig divergierende Ergebnisse hinsichtlich der Frage des markinischen Eigenanteils und der markinischen Stellung zu der ihm vorausliegenden Tradition sowie die Einsicht in die grundlegende Divergenz schriftlicher und mündlicher Tradierung führten zum Ende der klassischen Redaktionskritik, so dass für die Erklärung vor allem des Markusevangeliums die Frage nach dessen Bezug zu Jesus von Nazaret „für eine Forschungsgeneration völlig aus dem Blick geriet.“[62] Jesusforschung und Evangelienforschung entwickelten sich voneinander weg. Geschichts- und kulturwissenschaftliche Einflüsse führten in der Jesusforschung dazu, dass hier das erinnerungstheoretische Paradigma leitend wurde[63], während literaturwissenschaftliche und rezeptionsästhetische Einflüsse in der Evangelienforschung zu einem breiten Strom narrativer Analysen geführt haben.

Die Neuerung des *Biblical Performance Criticism* besteht darin, auch in der zweiten Phase, der Textgenerierung der heutigen Evangelientexte, der mündlichen *Performance* und der Rezeption durch das Hören einen entscheidenden Beitrag zuzumessen.[64] Die Theorie wiederholter Aufführungen ließ für manche

---

[61]   Kelber, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 93.

[62]   Breytenbach, „Entwürfe“, 81.

[63]   Jens Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas*, Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997, 3.

[64]   Rudolf Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [10]1995, 347, konnte noch statuieren: „Eine prinzipielle Grenze zwischen der mündlichen und der schriftlichen Überlieferung gib es nicht“. Kelber, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 91 insistierte hingegen auf der grundlegenden Differenz zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit der Traditionswiedergabe, wenngleich Kelber durch aus um die Prägung des Markusevangeliums durch die mündliche Traditionsstufe wusste, die er neben den oben beschriebenen Phänomenen (64–69) auch in der Wahl der Gattungen „heroic stories“, „polarization stories“, „didactic stories“ und „parabolic stories“ (46–64) gegeben sah – dadurch ist Kelber ja auch einer der Ahnherren des Biblical Performance Criticism

(nicht für alle) Vertreterinnen und Vertreter dieses Ansatzes die Frage nach der Person eines einzigen Autors obsolet werden, wenngleich auch weiterhin perikopenübergreifende narratologische Beobachtungen in die Rekonstruktion des Sinngehaltes der Evangelientexte einfließen konnten.

Peter Perry hat die Geschichte des *Biblical Performance Criticism* dargestellt[65]: Er unterscheidet zwei Phasen. *Biblical Performance Criticism* 1.0 war durch drei Bewegungen gekennzeichnet: 1. Einfluss der Folkloristik und Studium der Evangelientexte hinsichtlich Prosopopoiia, Parataxe, Ringkomposition; 2. Die Herausarbeitung der Differenz zwischen mündlichen und schriftlichen Kulturen und die Annahme, dass die Texte selbst der face-to-face-Kommunikation subordiniert waren und auf diese Kommunikationsform hin gestaltet wurden. 3. Eigene Erfahrungen als Performer mit dem Ziel, sich in die Lage antiker Performer hineinversetzen zu können.[66]

Kritik von außen (dazu s.u.) bezog sich damals auf die strikte Trennung von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit und die Unterschätzung der Textualität in der Antike sowie auf die Feststellung, Ringkompositionen etc. seien als solche schon der Ausweis für den Entwurf eines Textes hin auf mündliche Kommunikation. Kritik von innen bewirkte, dass die Radikalität früherer Selbstabgrenzung von früheren Leseweisen mittlerweile einer differenzierten Betrachtung gewichen ist. Für den *Biblical Performance Criticism* 2.0 (beginnend ab 2007, intensiviert ab 2014), macht Perry sechs verschiedene Interessen aus: 1. Sorgfältige Beschreibung antiker Kommunikationsprozesse; 2. Klärung des Verhältnisses von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit; 3. Erkundung der Dynamik des sozialen Gedächtnisses; 4. Analyse der möglichen akustischen Wirkung auf der Grundlage neuerer Kenntnisse über die Aussprache des Griechischen; 5. Auswirkungen des *Biblical Performance Criticism* auf Übersetzungstheorie. 6. Erprobung gegenwärtiger Performances. For-

---

geworden. Nach ONG, „Text", 22, bestand noch bis zur Betonung des privaten Lesens der Heiligen Schrift durch die Reformatoren ein „free flow between orality and literacy in the Church, despite the centrality of the biblical text". Es scheint, als würde mit dem Biblical Performance Criticism die Grenzlinie nicht mehr von der Schriftlichkeit hin zur Mündlichkeit, sondern umgekehrt von der Mündlichkeit zur Schriftlichkeit hin durchbrochen, wenigstens was die Fragestellungen in der Textanalyse betrifft.

[65] Eine weitere forschungsgeschichtliche Darstellung hat BOTHA, „Gospel of Mark", vorgelegt, der die Ansätze von Joanna Dewey, Antoinette Wire, Whitney Shiner und David Rhoads bespricht.

[66] Peter S. PERRY, „Biblical Performance Criticism: Survey and Prospects", *Religions* 10 (2019) N° 117, 2–3.

schungsbedarf sieht Perry in dreierlei Richtung, in der Verknüpfung des *rhetorical criticism* mit der Gedächtnisforschung, in der Erforschung von Machtverhältnissen in der Komposition, Performance und Rezeption von Traditionen und in der methodisch geordneten Grundlegung hinsichtlich der Frage, wie gegenwärtige Performances hilfreich sein können für die Beschreibung antiker Performances.[67]

3. Die Leistungskraft dieses Ansatzes

Die Leistungskraft dieses Ansatzes berührt textexterne wie textinterne Aspekte, Aspekte, die das historische und soziale Umfeld der Kommunikation dieser Texte bzw. der in ihnen enthaltenen Stoffe betrifft, als auch die Analyse dieser Texte selbst.

3.1. Textexterne Aspekte

Der hier vorgestellte Ansatz hat zumindest ein neues Nachdenken über das historische, kulturelle und sozialgeschichtliche Umfeld der internen wie externen Kommunikationsformen seitens der ersten Jesusanhängerinnen und Jesusanhänger aus sich herausgesetzt. Er dürfte deren Lebenswelt näherkommen als eine Zugangsweise, die zu sehr nach Analogie moderner akademischen Studierens und Kommunizierens geformt ist. Für den kulturellen und sozialen Kontext fordert die Frage nach verschiedenen Arten von öffentlichen Lesungen neue Aufmerksamkeit, für die Praxis öffentlicher Aufführungen wird das Augenmerk vor allem auf die Emotionalität gelenkt, von der Vortrag wie Rezeption des Markusevangeliums bzw. einzelner seiner Segmente oder Vorstufen geprägt sind. Wissenschaftspraktisch ist ein erhöhtes Maß an Zusammenarbeit auch mit Disziplinen zu erwarten, die bisher noch nicht im Horizont neutestamentlicher Exegese standen wie Theaterwissenschaft etc.

3.2. Textinterne Aspekte

Textinterne Aspekte betreffen die Gestaltung der Einzelperikopen wie die Durchgestaltung des Markusevangeliums insgesamt.

1. Auf der Ebene der Einzelperikopen kann man umgangssprachliche Stilistik erklären, ferner begründen, warum sich im Markustext keine Erläuterungen zu bestimmten Personen (Pontius Pilatus, Alexander, Rufus), Örtlichkeiten (die

---

[67] PERRY, „Biblical Performance Criticism", 4–5.

Dörfer und kleinen Städte rund um den See Genezareth[68]) oder Sachverhalten (Gottesherrschaft; Menschensohn) finden – der Vortragende konnte das im mündlichen Vortrag bei Bedarf ergänzen. Die Schweigegebote nach den Heilungen, die in der erzählten Welt wenig sinnvoll sind, bekommen ihren Sinn in der Welt der Performances.[69] Rhetorische Strategien scheinen auf, die für eine mündliche Aufführung berechnet sind, aber auch für heutige Analyse des Textes nutzbar gemacht werden können.[70] Dadurch kann die Frage nach der Textpragmatik der einzelnen Perikopen vertieft werden.

2. Auf der Ebene der Durchgestaltung des Markusevangeliums insgesamt wurden intratextuelle Spannungen erklärt, dass z.B. Mk 4,33f. wieder eine vorangegangene öffentliche Belehrung durch Jesus voraussetzt, obwohl Mk 4,10 den Übergang zur Jüngerbelehrung signalisiert.[71] Auch lässt sich die verschiedenartige Ausgestaltung von Perikopen allein schon hinsichtlich der Ausführlichkeit erklären, wie der Vergleich zwischen Mk 1,29–31 und Mk 7,31–37 nahelegt.[72] Manche Rahmung wird sich eher der Tradition verdanken, gerade, wenn Markus Ortsangaben bietet, die theologisch nichts austragen.[73]

---

[68] Bei Nazaret muss hingegen in Mk 1,9 extra gesagt werden, dass es zu Galiläa gehört.

[69] Nach Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 166, will Markus eine unmittelbare Reaktion der Zuhörenden unterbinden und dadurch verhindern, dass Jesus ausschließlich als Wundertäter wahrgenommen wird. Das läuft wieder auf eine Deutung im Sinne einer kreuzestheologisch gefassten Messiasgeheimnistheorie hinaus.

[70] Dafür nur ein Beispiel: Kelly R. Iverson, „A Centurion's 'Confession': A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39", *JBL* 130 (2011) 329–350 (348), macht darauf aufmerksam, dass die Erwähnung der Kreuzigung in Mk 15,24 sehr kurz gehalten ist, anders als das Referat der Verspottung in Mk 15,29–32, um das emotionale Mitleiden der Hörerinnen und Hörer mit Jesus zu evozieren. Man kann ergänzen: Auch die Gläubigen hatten nicht sofort unter körperlichen Folterungen zu leiden, wohl aber unter sozialer Ausgrenzung, die mit einer Verspottung christlicher Wahrheitsansprüche angesichts des Kreuzestodes Jesu einhergehen konnte (vgl. dazu schon 1Kor 1,23).

[71] Dewey, „Oral Methods", 35.

[72] Die stilistisch relativ einheitliche Durchgestaltung ist nicht zwingend ein Gegenargument; hier kann es sich um den Niederschlag des persönlichen Vortragsstils des Verfassers handeln.

[73] Hans Klein, „Zur Methode der Erforschung vormarkinischer Quellen", in *The Synoptic Gospels*, hrsg. v. Camille Focant, Leuven: Peeters, 1993, 503–517 (511), mit Verweis auf Mk 4,1f.: Die Lokalisierung der Szene am See hat mit den folgenden Parabeln nichts zu

Theologisch kann der Ansatz verdeutlichen, dass das Markusevangelium eine traditionsgebundene Erzählung sein will[74], allerdings darf das nicht mit der Feststellung einzelner vormarkinischer Traditionen im Wortlaut verwechselt werden – deren Rekonstruktion ist uns, anders als man es in der klassischen Formgeschichte dachte, aufgrund der Vergänglichkeit der mündlichen Traditionsform a limine verwehrt.[75]

Veranschaulichen lässt sich die Leistungskraft dieses Ansatzes auch für eine Kommentierung. Die Performerin oder der Performer muss die Charaktere sowie das In- und Nacheinander der einzelnen Handlungs- und Sprechakte und deren jeweiligen Charakter innerhalb einer Szene ähnlich wie eine Schauspielerin oder ein Schauspieler im Theater im Detail durchplanen; dabei können auch zunächst scheinbar unwichtige Details von Bedeutung sein. Auf dieser Basis eine Perikope zu kommentieren, setzt ein Sich-Hineinversetzen in diesen Text voraus, in die Rolle des Performers, in die Erzählfiguren und in das imaginierte Publikum, auf intellektueller wie auf emotionaler Ebene, fremde und eigene Zustimmung wie fremde und eigene Vorbehalte mitzubedenken und u.U. auch zu äußern. Welche Emotionen werden geweckt, welche Erwartungshaltungen des Publikums geweckt und dann bestätigt oder durchbrochen?

David Rhoads hat aufgrund seiner eigenen *Performance*-Praxis zu Mk 7,24-30 Überlegungen angestellt, wie die syrophönizische Frau in der Aufführung zu vergegenwärtigen ist:

> Despite Jesus' efforts to hide, she finds him. Despite her origins, she asks him. Despite his refusal, she persists. … The question for the performer is how to display her actions or say her lines. To decide this, one has to think through the text. When she falls at his feet, is she kneeling or prostrate? What is her attitude in speaking? What is the subtext? … How do you express her attitude by gesture and posture? How can the characterization convey the way she upstages Jesus with her proverbial response to his cryptic allegory?[76]

Für die Ebene der praktischen Applikation ließe sich fruchtbar machen, dass die Frau, um ihr Ziel zu erreichen, zur Überwindung großer Hindernisse bereit ist, wie

---

tun, ist eher durch Mk 2,13 vorbereitet, das seinerseits ein Motiv aufgreift, das in der Jesusüberlieferung als allgemeines Motiv erinnert wird.

[74] WIRE, *Case*, 4–6.

[75] So auch BREYTENBACH, „Evangelium", 471–472.

[76] RHOADS, „Performing", 193.

das übrigens auch bei anderen Heilungserzählungen (Mk 5,25-34; 10,46-52) geschildert wird. Historisch-kritisch ließe sich fragen, ob die Häufigkeit dieses Motives zusammenhängt mit der Erwägung, dass die ursprünglichen Hörerinnen und Hörer, meist den unteren Gesellschaftsschichten entstammend, ebensolche Erfahrungen zu machen hatten bzw. ihrerseits durch Hartnäckigkeit bereits kleine Erfolge erzielen konnten.

4. Offene Fragen

Offene Fragen wurden von Vertretern dieser Richtung bereits selbst formuliert[77], vor allem von Ernst Wendland, aber auch von Pieter Botha. Sie betreffen historische, theologische und textanalytische Probleme. Im Folgenden wird jeweils zuerst die Selbstreflexion der Vertreter dieses Ansatzes präsentiert, bevor sich weitere Anfragen anschließen. Die folgenden Ausführungen haben nicht das Ziel der Widerlegung, sondern des Weiterdenkens.

4.1. Historische Fragen

Historische Probleme betreffen die Frage unserer Zugangsmöglichkeiten zu einer Praxis, die per definitionem uns ein großes Stück weit verschlossen bleibt,[78] und zwar hinsichtlich des kulturellen wie des sozialen Kontextes, der Praxis wie der Inhalte der Performances.

1. Hinsichtlich des kulturellen Kontextes wird schon zwischen den Vertretern dieses Ansatzes kontrovers diskutiert, ob leises privates Lesen und Schriftlichkeit in der Antike tatsächlich eine so geringe Rolle gespielt haben.[79] Pieter Botha gibt zu bedenken, dass mit einer starren Opposition Mündlichkeit vs. Schriftlichkeit

---

[77] Kelly R. Iverson, „Oral Fixation", 187, gegen Larry W. Hurtado, "Oral Fixation and New Testament Studies? 'Orality', 'Performance' and Reading Texts in Early Christianity", *NTS* 60 (2014) 321–340. Grobe Vereinfachungen der Forschungsgeschichte gilt es zu vermeiden, so zu Recht Iverson, „Oral Fixation", 186.

[78] Breytenbach, „Evangelium", 470–471. Vgl. auch Kelber, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 130: Die Verschriftlichung bringt eine „alienation of living words" mit sich. Das wird auch von Holly E. Hearon, „The Implications of Orality for Study of the Biblical Texts", in *Performing the Gospel. Orality, Memory, and Mark*, hrsg. v. Richard A. Horsley *et al.*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press: 2006, 3–20 (8–9), selbstkritisch vermerkt.

[79] Auch von Exegetinnen und Exegeten außerhalb dieses Kreises sind Gegenstimmen zu erwarten; vgl. Nick Elder, *Gospel Media: Reading, Writing, and Circulating Jesus Traditions*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, passim (wird 2023 erscheinen; der Verfasser hielt

in der Antike nicht zu rechnen ist.[80] Gegen vereinfachende Polemik ist festzuhalten, dass eine Reihe von Gelehrten, die den Ansatz des *Performance Criticism* vertreten, durchaus davon ausgehen, dass Performer, die des Lesens fähig waren, tatsächlich Manuskripte verwendet haben und dass man im Niveau der Literarität unterscheiden muss zwischen der Fähigkeit des Lesens und Schreibens für den Alltagsgebrauch und der Möglichkeit der Wahrnehmung literarisch komplexerer Texte wie der Evangelien.[81] Der Austausch von Handschriften innerhalb von Gruppen von Jesusgläubigen ist schon in Kol 4,16; Hermas, Vis. 2,4.2f. (8,2f.) belegt.[82] Papias wird bei Eusebius als jemand geschildert, der eher der mündlichen Überlieferung vertraut hat als schriftlichen Aufzeichnungen und sich als Sammler mündlicher Überlieferung einen Namen gemacht hat.[83] „Wissbegierige Leser"[84] wird es aber nicht erst zur Zeit des Eusebius von Caesarea gegeben haben. Mindestens in späterer Zeit gilt das Markusevangelium als eine durch Zuhörer der Lehren des Petrus, die an der ungeschriebenen Lehre noch nicht genug hatten, veranlasste „schriftliche Erinnerung an die mündlich vorgetragene Lehre".[85]

2. Hinsichtlich des sozialen Kontextes ist unbestreitbar, dass die meisten Rezipierenden der Evangelientexte durch mündliche Aufführung mit diesen Texten vertraut wurden. Die Schwierigkeit, diese Erkenntnis in der konkreten exegetischen Arbeit fruchtbar zu machen, besteht darin, dass es einen erheblichen Unterschied ausmachen dürfte, ob die Evangelien in Performances vor der eigenen Gruppe oder vor einem noch nicht für die eigene Botschaft gewonnenen Publikum dargeboten wurden. Wiederum gilt es, auf textinterne Indizien zu achten.

---

aber einen entsprechenden Vortrag während des International Meeting der Society of Biblical Literature in Salzburg, 2022: „The Gospels as Diverse Reading Events").

[80] „Speech and writing are present and influential in 'traditional' cultures, as significant oral modes of communication that persist powerfully in communities acquiring and practising literacy" (Botha, „Spelling Eye", 6).

[81] Dewey, *Oral Ethos*, 6; Iverson, „Oral Fixation", 187, 192.

[82] Vgl. aber schon 1Kor 7,1: „Wovon ihr mir geschrieben habt …".

[83] Eusebius von Caesarea, *H.e.* III 39,4.11, GCS 9/1, 286, 290.

[84] Eusebius von Caesarea, *H.e.* III 39,14, GCS 9/1, 290. Aristides, *Apol.* 2,7; 16,5 (jeweils Teilüberlieferung, Goodspeed 4.22), setzt die potentielle Verfügbarkeit von Evangelienschriften ebenfalls voraus.

[85] Eusebius von Caesarea, *H.e.* II 15,1, GCS 9/1, 140: διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσας … διδασκαλίας.

Die Hörerinnen und Hörer dürften, je nach sozialem Kontext der Aufführung, auf Mk 5,13 einerseits, auf Mk 13,13; 14,24 andererseits unterschiedlich reagiert haben.[86] Inwieweit war welche Reaktion in welchem Kontext der *performance* sozial akzeptiert?[87] Wie lange war es innerhalb einer Gemeindeversammlung möglich, auf Mk 4,35-41[88] oder Mk 8,14-21 als humorvoller Darstellung des Jün-

---

[86] Christentumskritische Skepsis bei den Wundererzählungen der Evangelien steht bei Justin, *1. Apol.* 22,6, SC 507, 192 im Hintergrund, wenn Justin auf die Analogien zur Asklepiostradition verweist. Zu Mk 5,13 setzt die antike Christentumskritik Gelächter als Reaktion voraus (Makarios Magnes, *Apocr.* III 4,11, TU 169, 114); Mk 6,45-52 gilt als „lächerliches Märchen" (Makarios Magnes, *Apocr.* III 6,3, TU 169, 120), als „Kindergeschichte" (Makarios Magnes, *Apocr.* III 6,4, TU 169, 122). Der bei Makarios Magnes genannte Christentumskritiker hatte vermutlich den Text des Markusevangeliums vor sich; aber auch der mündliche Vortrag des Markusevangeliums konnte ähnliche Reaktionen nichtgläubiger Zuhörer hervorrufen. Antike und mittelalterliche christliche Exegese konnte der Stelle hingegen durchaus Ernsthaftes entnehmen, etwa den Gedanken, dass Christus den Dämonen erlaubt, in die Schweine hineinzugehen, um zu zeigen, dass Dämonen nicht von sich aus, sondern nur aufgrund der Erlaubnis Christi dazu in der Lage wären, und dass die Bewohner der Gegend seine Macht zu erkennen lernten (Johannes Chrysostomus, *Hom. Matt.* 28,2, PG 57, 354) oder dass er die von Dämonen Gequälten vor Suizid bewahren will (Theophylakt, *In Matt.*, PG 123, 225 A). Hilarion muss die Möglichkeit, dass man zugleich viele Dämonen aus einem Menschen austreiben könne, mit der Episode von der Schweineherde Mk 5,11-13 begründet haben (Hieronymus, *Vit. Hil.* 23, PL 23, 40 C). Die genannten Autoren berühren die Frage nicht, ob Mk 5,13 bzw. Mt 8,32 nicht lächerlich wirken könnte.

[87] SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 72, vermutet zu Recht, dass die Zuhörenden die vom Markusevangelium ausgelöste Erregung negativer Emotionen gegen die jüdischen Eliten geteilt haben (zu ergänzen wäre, dass auch Herodes Antipas in Mk 6,16 eher als lächerlich gezeichnet wird, wenn er zwischen Johannes dem Täufer und Jesus nicht unterscheidet). Damit ist aber noch nicht entschieden, ob die Zuhörenden diese Emotionen von einem Standpunkt Jesusgläubiger aus entwickelt haben (was man aus anderen Gründen für wahrscheinlich halten kann, s.u.) oder von einem allgemeinen griechisch-römischen Antijudaismus aus.

[88] Mit dem Effekt, dass ein Eindruck der Komik erzeugt wird, rechnet SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 96. Die Gegenüberstellung „verderben – retten" findet sich mit diesen Begriffen mehrfach in der Komödie, Aristophanes, *Nub.* 1177; *Ach.* 71; Menander, *Frgm.* 767 (840).

gerunverständnisses zu reagieren?[89] Wird man Außenstehenden gegenüber von dem Misserfolg Jesu in Nazareth[90] oder der Verleugnung des Petrus erzählen, wo er sich von einer in der sozialen Hierarchie niedrig stehenden Frau beschämen lassen muss?[91] Wie steht es hier mit der Gethsemane-Perikope[92], wie mit den eucharistischen Worten?[93] Natürlich wird man sich als Exegetin oder Exeget mit innerer emotionaler und auch kirchlicher Bindung klar sein müssen, dass man auch selbst keinen Zugang ohne intellektuelles Vorverstehen wie emotionale Vorprägung hat. Aber die Frage bleibt, in welcher Kommunikationssituation der

---

[89] Kelly R. Iverson, „Incongruity, Humor, and Mark: Performance and the Use of Laughter in the Second Gospel (Mark 8.14–21)", *NTS* 59 (2013) 2–19 (10–11), mit Verweis auf den Widerspruch zwischen dem wörtlichen Verständnis des Themas Brot bei den Jüngern (Mk 8,14.16, wobei auch hier eine Spannung besteht: die Jünger diskutieren, dass sie kein Brot dabeihaben, obwohl sie doch, so V. 14, ein Brot bei sich haben) und dem übertragenen Verständnis dessen bei Jesus (Mk 8,15), was die syrophönizische Frau im Gegensatz zu den Jüngern sehr wohl verstanden hatte. Der Evangelist verwendet den Humor, um an das Publikum, das sich zunächst von den Jüngern durchaus unterschieden wusste, die Frage zu richten, ob das eigene Verständnis Jesu sich wirklich von dem der Jünger unterscheidet (Iverson, „Incongruity", 18f.).

[90] Mk 6,5a ist so formuliert, dass Außenstehende aus der Wendung οὐκ ἐδύνατο ein Makel der Beschämung Jesu folgern können. Matthäus hat diese Formulierung in Mt 13,58 vermieden.

[91] Bei Origenes, *Cels*. II 18, SC 132, 332, wird die Tatsache der Verleugnung durch Petrus tatsächlich als Argument gegen die christlichen Wahrheitsansprüche geltend gemacht: Wenn Jesus im Voraus wusste, dass Petrus ihn verleugnen und Judas ihn verraten würde, warum hat Jesus das nicht verhindert? Wenn von Petrus und Judas das jedoch erzählt wird, obwohl Jesus sie zuvor gewarnt hatte und sie dazu nicht mehr fähig waren, werden beide Erzählungen für Celsus als lügnerische Erfindung erwiesen (Origenes, *Cels*. II 19, SC 132, 334). Für Gläubige ist eher zu erwarten, dass die Charakterisierung des Petrus hier wie in Mk 9,5 eher dazu führt, dass sie in dem problematischen Verhalten des Petrus Gefahren für ihr eigenes Verhalten erkennen und mit Petrus eher Mitleid haben als dass sie ihn verurteilen (Thomas E. Boomershine, "Peter's Denial as Polemic or Confession: The Implication of Media Theory for Biblical Hermeneutics", *Semeia* 39 (1987) 47–68 (59); Iverson, *Performing*, 83–84).

[92] Vgl. die Vorbehalte des Christentumskritikers Celsus bei Origenes, *Cels*. II 24, SC 132, 348 und insgesamt dazu Meiser, „Jesus' suffering", 230.235f.

[93] Vgl. die durch Athenagoras, *Leg.* 35,1–2, PTS 31, 108–110; Tertullian, *Apol.* 7,1, CCSL 1, 98 referierten Vorwürfe des Kannibalismus.

Markustext die größte Leistungskraft erreicht hat, und da ist eine Gesamtaufführung im einem in-group-Kontext doch wahrscheinlicher als eine Aufführung in einem out-group-Kontext.

Dass keine Aufführung gleich der anderen war, ist theoretisch sicher richtig und wird es in der Anfangszeit auch tatsächlich gewesen sein[94], doch setzt – so zumindest ein Argument in der Diskussion – der unabhängig voneinander erfolgende Zugriff des Lukas wie des Matthäus in Vielem einen relativ stabilen Markustext voraus.[95]

3. Hinsichtlich der Praxis fragt Ernst Wendland zu Recht, ob die wenigen Hinweise auf antike Performances ausreichen, um ein plausibles Bild für die Weitergabe biblischer Themen und Erzählungen fruchtbar zu machen? Dadurch, dass die moderne Exegetin und der moderne Exeget nur noch die schriftlichen Texte vor sich haben, ist ihnen der Zugang zur Vortragsweise der Performer und zur Reaktion des Publikums versperrt; beides lässt sich nur aus methodisch schwierig kontrollierbarer Analogie erschließen.[96] Inwieweit ist es möglich, einen biblischen Text zu verstehen, wenn man nicht mehr erschließen kann, wie er vorgetragen wurde (vgl. die bekannten Probleme Mk 15,2[97] oder Joh 18,38)?[98]

4. Was die Inhalte betrifft, wird man daran erinnern, dass es neben den Aufführungen des Gesamtevangeliums wohl gerade in der eigenen Gruppe auch die

---

[94] Kaum zu entscheiden ist die Frage, ob bzw. ab wann man neben der zu vermutenden Verwendung einzelner Sätze des Jesustradition in Gemeindedebatten auch ritualisierte Formen der Verlesung vorgenommen hat, wie sie Justin, *1. Apol.* 67, 3–5, SC 507, 308–310 erkennen lässt (so auch Botha, „Gospel of Mark", 355 Anm. 21).

[95] Spencer, Rez. Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 148.

[96] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 6–7.

[97] Iverson, *Performing*. 24: Es ist unklar, ob Jesu Antwort als Bestätigung oder als Dissoziierung gedacht ist (im Sinne von „das sagst du, aber nicht ich").

[98] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 5 Haben umgekehrt biblische Autoren solche Schwierigkeiten bereits vorausschauend berücksichtigt (Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 5–6)? Mit Iverson, „Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39", 333, lässt sich feststellen, dass der Markustext durchaus implizite Anweisungen enthält, wie ein Sprechakt zu verstehen ist, vgl. die Begriffe bzw. Wendungen ἐπετίμησεν in Mk 1,25, ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει in Mk 8,12, ἵνα ἀγρεύσωσιν in Mk 12,13. Iverson bietet im Folgenden eine hilfreiche Liste der verschiedenen *verba dicendi* und Verben der zu erwartenden Reaktion, die den Performern wie den Zuhörenden Hinweise auf das angemessene Verständnis geben.

Verwendung einzelner Passagen zur Beantwortung halachischer wie ethischer Fragen im mündlichen Vortrag gegeben haben wird.[99] Das wiederum hat Auswirkungen auf die neuzeitliche wissenschaftliche Praxis hinsichtlich der Frage der Kompositionsanalyse und der Kommentierung. Allerdings zeigt sich erneut, dass die klassische formgeschichtliche Frage nach dem jeweiligen „Sitz im Leben" einer Gattung nach wie vor kaum beantwortet werden kann.

4.2. Theologische Fragen

Auch hier hat bereits Ernst Wendland, einer der Vertreter dieses Ansatzes, entscheidende Fragen gestellt.

1. Welche Freiheit konnte sich der Performer vor allem im Falle des Vortrages von Apostelbriefen nehmen? Kam ihnen bereits ein höheres ekklesiales Gewicht zu?[100] Fühlten sich die Performer im Zustand der Inspiration während ihrer Performance? Verstanden sie sich als innovative Performer oder als traditionstreue Verkündiger der göttlichen Botschaft?[101] Eine weitere Frage ergibt sich: Steht Matthäus mit seinen deutlichen halachischen Abweichungen von Markus – vgl. die Tilgung von Mk 7,19fine in Mt 15,17 und den Zusatz in Mt 24,20 gegenüber Mk 13,18 – ihm als Einzelperson oder als Repräsentant einer konkurrierenden Gruppe gegenüber?[102] Nicht verhindert haben die Evangelientexte den innerchristlichen Pluralismus, in der 3. und 4. Generation ohne Ausnahme von allen

---

[99] Verschiedene denkbare Anlässe (Passionsgedenken, Taufe) werden auch bei Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 49, als mögliche Haftpunkte einer Aufführung des Markusevangeliums genannt. Es ist schwer nachzuweisen, ob dabei jeweils das gesamte Markusevangelium oder nur die entsprechenden Abschnitte (Mk 14,1–16,8) oder nur die entsprechenden Perikopen aufgeführt wurden.

[100] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 5.

[101] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 7. Im ersteren Sinn votiert Sandra Huebenthal, „Kollektives Gedächtnis, kultureller Rahmen und das Markusevangelium", in *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century. Method and Meaning*, hrsg. v. Geert van Oyen, Leuven: Peeters, 2019, 217–250 (238). Schon antike Christentumskritiker meinten, die Evangelisten hätten Selbsterfundenes aufgeschrieben (vgl. Origenes, *Cels.* II 15.26, SC 132, 324.354; Makarios Magnes, *Apocr.* II 12,1, TU 169, 42).

[102] Matthias Konradt, „Das Matthäusevangelium als judenchristlicher Gegenentwurf zum Markusevangelium", in id., *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 43–68; Huebenthal, „Kollektives Gedächtnis", 242.

als Problem empfunden, aber ebenfalls ohne Ausnahme von niemandem mit konsensorientierten Lösungsversuchen zu überwinden gesucht.[103]

2. Inwieweit waren die Tradenten schriftlicher neutestamentlicher Texte von der jüdischen Hochschätzung des feststehenden Wortlautes heiliger Texte beeinflusst?[104] Wie beeinflussen verschiedene Form der Intertextualität die Theorie und Praxis des *Performance Criticism*? Wie sind Performer, wie ist das Publikum mit Schriftzitaten und Allusionen umgegangen?[105] Die meisten Hörerinnen und Hörer werden um den Ritus der Verlesung heiliger Texte in der Synagoge gewusst haben. Andererseits und zusätzlich ist von der Septuagintaforschung her einzuwenden, dass es schon zur Zeit der Evangelienentstehung und davor eine gewisse Pluralität der heiligen Texte Israels gab, vor allem das Nebeneinander des sog. *Old Greek* und hebraisierender Rezensionen.[106] Als Begründung für Differenzen zwischen Prä- und Folgetext kommt also nicht nur der Verweis auf den Einfluss der mündlichen Präsentationsform z.B. im Gottesdienst in Frage.

3. Auch Stilformen wie Parataxe und direkte Rede sind kein Beweis, dass in einem schriftlichen Textstück eine mündliche Tradition unverändert wiedergegeben wurde, da in der Antike auch schriftlich vorliegende Texte für die mündliche Wiedergabe konzipiert wurden.[107] Ist es vernünftig zu sagen, dass es vor der Kanonisierung keinen feststehenden Text etwa eines Evangeliums etc. gegeben hat?[108] Schon die herkömmliche Zweiquellentheorie stellt diese Ansicht durchaus in Frage.

---

[103] Gruppenübergreifend werden analoge Erfahrungen geäußert: Theologische Gegensätze verfestigen sich (1Joh 2,19; Jud 4); das Gespräch zwischen den Gruppen bleibt fruchtlos (vgl. Apk 2,21; Tit 3,20); man erfährt Ablehnung durch andersdenkende Christen (3Joh 9) und mahnt daher ebenfalls zur Distanz (2Tim 3,5; 2Joh 10f.; Apk 2,24f.; Did 11,2; IgnTrall 9,1 u.ö.).

[104] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 5.

[105] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 6.

[106] Vgl. u.a. Siegfried Kreuzer, „Textformen, Urtext und Bearbeitungen in der Septuaginta der Königebücher", in *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*, hrsg. v. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, Marcus Sigismund, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 18–37 (22–23).

[107] Alan Kirk, „Tradition and Memory in the Gospel of Peter", in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus. Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*, hrsg. v. Thomas J. Kraus, und Tobias Nicklas, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007, 135–158 (141).

[108] Wendland, „Performance Criticism", 6.

4.3. Textanalytische Fragen

1. Offen bleibt die Länge der Sequenzierungen der Performances. Liegt sie, wie Lukas und Matthäus bezeugen, im Bereich einzelner Perikopen[109] oder in größeren zusammenhängenden Abschnitten[110] oder in Aufführungen des Gesamttextes?[111] Die Antwort auf die Frage nach den Sequenzierungen ist nicht unerheblich, da eine Perikope durch die Einordnung in einen größeren Zusammenhang nochmals neue Sinndimensionen hinzugewinnen kann.[112]

2. Manche Texte sind kaum für einen mündlichen Vortrag entworfen (Mk 1,1[113]; 7,3f., schließlich die Parenthese ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω in Mk 13,14, wenn man sie auf den Leser des Markusevangeliums bezieht[114]) oder setzen den Wortlaut oder die Anordnung anderer Markustexte voraus, so dass hier der Evangelist zumindest bei der Verschriftlichung nachgearbeitet hat (Mk 8,1-10 im Verhältnis zu Mk 6,34-44; Mk 8,14-21; Mk 12,34c – danach fragt von den Eliten und vom Volk tatsächlich keiner Jesus mehr), oder sind längere Schriftzitate, die recht auffällig mit dem Septuagintatext übereinstimmen (Mk 12,10f.), zumal angesichts der mindestens für die erzählte Welt gebrauchten Einleitung „habt ihr nicht gelesen".[115] Ist Mk 15,39 wirklich von Haus aus als Erinnerungstext intendiert gewesen – oder trägt er erst in einer Aufführung nach der Verschriftlichung zu einem Gruppenkonsens bei, der sich der Wahrheit der eigenen Überzeugung

---

[109] Lukas und Matthäus haben Interkalationen innerhalb einzelner Perikopen wie Mk 5,21-43 übernommen, aber nicht die Verschachtelungen kompletter Perikopen wie Mk 6,14-29 zwischen Mk 6,6-13 und Mk 6,30-44.

[110] Nach BREYTENBACH, „Evangelium", 492 könnten größere Sequenzen wie Mk 1,16–3,12; 3,13–6,31 die Segmente größerer *Performances* gewesen sein.

[111] BOOMERSHINE, *Messiah*, 15, rechnet mit Gesamtaufführungen, die ca. zwei Stunden dauerten; ähnlich WENDLAND, „Performance Criticism", 3. DEWEY, „Oral Methods", 33, will zeigen, dass nicht nur Einzelepisoden, sondern die Komposition des Markusevangeliums als Ganze den Prinzipien der Mündlichkeit verpflichtet ist.

[112] HUEBENTHAL, *Markusevangelium*, 157.

[113] Allerdings verweist SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 162, auf die rhythmische Qualität des Verses, hervorgerufen durch die mehrmalige gleichlautende Genitivendung.

[114] DEWEY, „Oral Methods", 35, bezieht die Parenthese auf den Leser des Buches Daniel. Dann ist sie auch in einem mündlichen Vortrag verständlich.

[115] Gudrun GUTTENBERGER, „Markus als Schriftgelehrter", in *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century. Method and Meaning*, hrsg. v. Geert van Oyen, Leuven: Peeters, 2019, 171–216 (174, 185).

durch dieses *testimonium externum* versichert und zugleich einen wirksamen Kontrast zu der Verspottung Mk 15,29-32 aufbaut?[116]

3. *Performance Criticism* wäre missverstanden, wenn man die mit den einzelnen Performances immer auch wachsende Reflexion der Performerin oder des Performers außer Acht ließe.[117] Die Makrokomposition lässt sich in manchem nur schwer ohne vorhergehende Reflexion im Zuge einer verschrifteten Disposition erklären. Darauf verweisen die Schriftzitate, aber auch Gegebenheiten der Disposition, etwa der Umstand, dass die Regelung längerfristiger, nicht immer speziell jüdisch-halachisch geregelten Lebensbeziehungen just in dem Groß-Abschnitt erscheint, der durch die drei Leidensankündigungen zusammengehalten ist und dass diese an die Jünger gerichteten Leidensankündigungen just nach dem Christusbekenntnis des Petrus eingestellt worden sind.

5. Konsequenzen für das Verständnis des Markusevangeliums

Das Anliegen der folgenden Ausführungen ist es, unter Berücksichtigung der Stärken des vorgestellten Ansatzes und der offenen Fragen ein plausibles Integrativmodell für das Verständnis des Markusevangeliums zu entwickeln. Ein Gegensatz zwischen *Biblical Performance Criticism* und herkömmlicher Exegese muss nicht bestehen.[118] Integration in ein Bündel historisch-kritischer Methoden kann freilich nicht Beliebigkeit bedeuten. Einerseits ist nicht nur der mündliche Ursprung der Traditionen, sondern auch die primär mündliche Form ihrer späteren Weitergabe zu betonen, andererseits gilt: Was wir haben, ist der Text – fast nichts davor und wenig danach.[119]

5.1. Biblical Performance Criticism und die sprachliche Durchgestaltung des Markustextes

Der Ansatz des *Biblical Performance Criticism* setzt zu Recht mündliche Performances des Markustextes in griechischer Sprache voraus, denn dessen sprachliche Durchgestaltung ist jenseits möglicher, aber nicht mehr zu rekonstruierender

---

[116] So zu Recht IVERSON, „Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39", 349, wie teilweise auch SHINER, *Proclaiming*, 153.

[117] Bemerkenswert ist hier der Satz von BULTMANN, *Geschichte*, 347: „die Redaktion des Traditionsgutes setzt nicht erst mit der schriftlichen Fixierung ein."

[118] BOTHA, „Gospel of Mark", 381.

[119] Die Worte „*fast* nichts davor" beziehen sich darauf, dass einzelne markinische Worte Parallelen in Q oder im koptischen Thomasevangelium haben.

aramäischer Vorstufen einzelner Traditionselemente in Griechisch erfolgt. Das zeigen mehrere Beobachtungen:

1. Nachgestellte Partikel, die im Aramäischen kein Äquivalent haben, begegnen nicht nur in den erzählenden Partien, sondern auch in der Wiedergabe der Worte Jesu. Das betrifft die Partikel δέ[120], γάρ[121], μέν[122] und οὖν.[123] Die Häufigkeit von δέ in Jesusreden zeigt, dass Traditionen mit unterschiedlichen geographischen Haftpunkten gleichermaßen betroffen sein konnten. In Jesusreden begegnen manchmal auch typisch griechische Konstruktionen wie die Vorausnahme des Genitivattributes[124], die Trennung des Attributs vom Bezugswort[125], der substantivierte Artikel[126] oder die geschlossene Wortstellung.[127] Nur manche Jesusworte bleiben von solchen Phänomenen unberührt.[128]

2. Viele Perikopen-Einleitungen unterschiedlicher Gattungen sind entweder als Gen. abs.[129] oder als Partizipialkonstruktion im Nominativ gestaltet[130], wiederum unterschiedliche mögliche Haftpunkte der Traditionen übergreifend. Für die erstgenannte Konstruktion gibt es ebenfalls kein aramäisches Äquivalent.

Diese Einheitlichkeit der Durchgestaltung spricht keineswegs gegen die These, dass der Autor des heute vorliegenden Textes selbst zu dem Kreis der münd-

---

[120] Mk 2,20.21; 3,29; 4,15; 7,11; 10,6.31.40.43; 11,17; 12,26.44; 13,7.9.14.17.18 etc.

[121] Mk 1,38; 4,22.25; 7,10.21.27; 8,35.36.37.38; 9,39.40.41.49; 10,14.27.45; 12,25.44; 13,8.11.19.22.

[122] Mk 12,5; 14,21.38 sowie in Mk 4,4; 9,12 ohne folgendes δέ.

[123] Mk 10,9; 13,35.

[124] Mk 2,5.9.

[125] Mk 3,28; 4,30; 7,18.20.

[126] Mk 8,33; 13,14.16.

[127] Mk 7,15; 13,17.

[128] Mk 1,17; 2,27.

[129] Vgl. u.a. Mk 1,32 (Summarium); Mk 5,21 (Heilungserzählung); Mk 8,1 (Speisungserzählung); Mk 10,17 (Apophthegma); Mk 13,3 (Endzeitrede); Mk 14,3.17.22.43 (Passionsgeschichte).

[130] Vgl. u.a. Mk 1,16 (Berufungserzählung); Mk 1,29 (Heilungserzählung); Mk 7,24; 9,14 (Exorzismus); Mk 10,1 (Summarium); Mk 12,28.35.41 (Apophthegmen); Mk 14,26 (Passionsgeschichte). Vgl. auch das einleitende καὶ ἔρχονται in Mk 8,22 (Bethsaida); Mk 10,46 (Jericho); Mk 14,32 (Passionsgeschichte).

lichen Performer gehört haben wird.[131] Sie erschwert aber die Vorstellung, dass hier nicht nur ein einzelner Autor am Werk war.

Markus war vielleicht, wie später Papias[132], Sammler verschiedener mündlicher Überlieferungen unterschiedlicher Überlieferungsträger[133] mit unterschiedlichen geographischen Haftpunkten, die er, vielleicht als Lehrer in der Gemeinde, wiederholt zu Gehör gebracht hat.[134] Ob aus Eigeninitiative oder veranlasst durch andere[135], wird er, vielleicht in mehreren Anläufen[136], die Überlieferung verschriftlicht[137] und auf Basis dieser Verschriftlichung weiterhin Performances geleitet haben.[138] Eine Gesamtaufführung scheint mir eher in einer in-group-Situation wahrscheinlich als vor Außenstehenden; darauf deutet die Aufnahme von Mk 6,1-6a; Mk 14,10f.22-24.66-72, aber auch Mk 4,11.34.[139] Denkbar ist, dass Markus für verschiedene Performances Stoffe ausgewählt bzw. ausgelassen hat. Das könnte das Nebeneinander von Stellen wie Mk 5,11-13 einerseits, Mk 13,13; 14,24 andererseits erklären.

---

[131] Auch Klein, „Methode", 511, betont die größere Nähe des Evangelisten Markus zur mündlichen Tradition im Vergleich zu Lukas und Matthäus und verweist auf „Merkmale von Erzählfreude" bei Texten wie Mk 5,1-20.21-43; 11,1-10; 12,1-9.

[132] Eusebius, *H.e.* III 39,11, GCS 9/1, 290.

[133] Dies könnte etwa die Unterschiede der Ausgestaltung formgeschichtlich vergleichbarer Texte wie Mk 1,29-31 einerseits; 7,31-37; 9,14-29 andererseits erklären.

[134] Wire, *Case*, 57–58; Breytenbach, „Evangelium", 475.

[135] Neben Papias vgl. auch Ephrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant, 247: *Et occasiones provocaverunt eos, et scripserunt.*

[136] Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 121. Wir haben natürlich keine Möglichkeit mehr, verschiedene Entwicklungsstufen des jetzt vorhandenen schriftlichen Textes festzustellen.

[137] Whitney Shiner, „Memory Technology and the Composition of Mark", in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark*, hrsg. v. Richard A. Horsley *et al.*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006, 147–165 (164); Wire, *Case*, 50–51.

[138] Dass Markus das von ihm niedergeschriebene Evangelium selbst gepredigt haben soll, berichtet Eusebius, *H.e.* II 16,1, GCS 9/1, 140: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ δὴ καὶ συνεγράψατο κηρῦξαι.

[139] Der Matthäustext trägt durch Kürzungen der Erzählteile in manchen Wundergeschichten und durch eine andere Charakterzeichnung schon eher das Gepräge einer Verlesung in einem etwas dem Liturgischen angenäherten Rahmen (obwohl Mk 5,13 in Mt 8,32 – wie auch in Lk 8,33 – übernommen wurde; in Mt 9,30 wird eine Gefühlsregung wie Mk 1,41f. geschildert).

Das Markusevangelium basiert auf Leistungen des semantischen wie des episodischen Gedächtnisses[140], mit Hilfe dessen Ereignisse kreativ erinnert werden, enthält aber in seiner jetzigen Gestalt nicht unmittelbar „die Aufzeichnungen von individuellen Zeugen erlebter Ereignisse".[141] Eine Rekonstruktion des Wortlautes vormarkinischer Tradition ist nicht möglich.

5.2. Das Markusevangelium als Text

Das Markusevangelium liegt als schriftlicher Text vor, der von anderen im mündlichen Vortrag, aber (auch) als schriftlicher Text rezipiert wurde. So ist nach den Bedingungen und Ergebnissen der Umwandlung in *literary memory* zu fragen.[142]

Das Individuum des Autors sieht man vor allem in Motiven und Kompositionsprinzipien am Werk, die den Konsens einer Gruppe erzeugen wollen, aber nicht unbedingt von vornherein widerspiegeln. Zu nennen ist das Jüngerunverständnismotiv, das sich zunächst auf das Verstehen der Parabeln Jesu, die Verlässlichkeit der helfenden Macht Jesu und die Hinterfragung bisher geltender Halacha bezieht, dann aber auf die Einsicht in die Notwendigkeit seines Leidens und die ethischen Konsequenzen der Jüngerschaft. Zu nennen sind kataphorische Elemente, die sich auf Elemente zukünftig im Verhältnis zur erzählten Zeit beziehen (Mk 2,20; 9,28f.33-50; 9,1; 10,38f.; 13,9-13).[143] Zu nennen ist ebenfalls die Funktionsbestimmung des Gottessohntitels in Mk 9,7. Sie ist wohl mündlich vorgetragen worden, spiegelt aber eher die Reflexion auf die Verbindlichkeit der Worte Jesu wider, die Markus schriftlich der Nachwelt einschärfen wollte. Zu verweisen ist weiterhin auf die Schrift-Zitate und Anspielungen. So gewiss von der intensiven Beheimatung der Jesus-Gruppe in der Heiligen Schrift Israels aus-

---

[140] Vgl. dazu IVERSON, *Performing*, 139–181; Martin MEISER, „Die Jesus-Remembered-Debatte", *Sacra Scripta* 16 (2018) 150–177 (159–165).

[141] BREYTENBACH, „Entwürfe", 83.

[142] BECKER, Gedächtnistheorie, 102.

[143] Das betrifft auch Mk 3,1-5 im Verhältnis zu Mk 2,23-28: In Mk 2,23-28 muss sich die Gruppe der Anhänger Jesus noch für ihre Sabbathalacha rechtfertigen; Mk 3,1-6 hingegen ist ein Streitgespräch mit umgekehrten Rollen. Die Sabbathalacha der Jesus-Gruppe gilt bereits als Normalfall, demgegenüber die Herzensverstockung (Mk 3,5) der Diskussionspartner Jesu sich rechtfertigen muss.

zugehen ist, so gewiss ist es notwendig, dass jemand diese Beheimatung reflektierend sammelt, herstellt und literarisch organisiert.[144]

Im Folgenden ist zu zeigen, wie Markus durch intensive Reflexion seinen Text so gestaltet, dass er überhaupt für andere verwendbar wurde.

5.3. Das Markusevangelium als Text für andere Performer

Im heutigen Markustext fallen einige kurze Notizen auf, die Markus als Performer nicht für sich selbst, sondern für andere eingetragen haben dürfte, die in manchen Details seine Wissensvoraussetzungen nicht teilen. Zu nennen sind neben den bekannten Übersetzungen aus dem Aramäischen folgende Stellen:

– die Angabe, dass Nazareth in Galiläa liegt Mk 1,9,

– die Erklärung des t.t. κοινός durch ἄνιπτος Mk 7,2,

– die Verweise auf jüdische Reinheitspraxis Mk 7,3f.,

– die Währungsumrechnung Mk 12,42,

– der Verweis auf die Leugnung der Auferstehung durch die Sadduzäer Mk 12,18,

– der Verweis auf die Funktion der nicht näher bezeichneten αὐλή als Praetorium Mk 15,16.[145]

– der Verweis darauf, dass der „Rüsttag" der Tag vor dem Sabbat ist Mk 15,42.

Diese Notizen betreffen äußerliche Sachverhalte, die für Nichtjuden bzw. außerhalb des syropalästinischen Großraums lebende Rezipierende, Hörer oder andere Performer, möglicherweise erst erklärt werden mussten. All das musste Markus nicht für sich selbst notieren. Lukas und Matthäus als zwei dieser anderen Lehrer, denen das Markus-Manuskript zur Verfügung stand, haben manches in ihren Manuskripten denn auch nicht übernommen.[146]

---

[144] GUTTENBERGER, „Markus", 171 spricht von einer „Schriftgelehrsamkeit" des Markusevangeliums.

[145] Als Gegensatz dazu vgl. die Notiz ἐν τῇ στάσει in Mk 15,7, die nicht weiter erklärt wird. Erst spätere müssen rätseln, um welchen Aufstand es sich gehandelt haben könnte.

[146] So lässt Matthäus z.B. Mk 7,3f. aus, während er, ähnlich wie Lukas, Mk 12,18 beibehält; Lukas hat die aramäischen Ausdrücke nicht übernommen. Andererseits erklären auch Lukas und Matthäus manches nicht, was bei Markus schon nicht erklärt wurde, etwa die Wendungen „Gottesherrschaft", „Gottessohn" und „Menschensohn" oder den Christustitel. Pontius Pilatus wird hingegen mit Titel eingeführt (Mt 27,1; Lk 3,2 ἡγεμών), Herodes Antipas richtig als Tetrarch (Lk 3,2; Mt 14,1) statt als König (Mk 6,14).

Bibliographie

Antike Texte

Aristides, Apologie, in: Edgar J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten. Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914, repr. 1984, 2–23.

Aristophanes, with the English Translation of Benjamin Bickley Rogers, Vol. I (LCL 178), London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924, repr. 1967.

Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* (PTS 3), hrsg. v. Miroslav Marcovich, Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 1990.

Éphrem, *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant, version Arménienne* traduite par Louis Leloir (CSCO 145), Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1954.

Eusebius von Caesarea, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, hrsg. v. Eduard Schwartz, Theodor Mommsen, Bd. 1: Bücher I bis V (GCS 9/1), Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903.

Hieronymus, *Vita Hilarionis*, PL 23, 29A–54A.

Johannes Chrysostomus, *Homiliae in Matthaeum*, hom. 1–44, PG 57, hom. 45–90, PG 58.

Justin, *Apologie pour les Chrétiens*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, hrsg. v. Charles Munier (SC 507), Paris: Cerf, 2006.

Makarios Magnes, *Apokritikos*. Kritische Ausgabe mit deutscher Übersetzung (TU 169), hrsg. v. Ulrich Volp, Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter, 2013.

Menander, *Reliquiae*, hrsg. v. Alfred Koerte, Pars II, Leipzig: Teubner, 1959.

Origenes, *Contre Celse*, introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Marcel Borret, 1: Livres 1–2 (SC 132), Paris: Cerf, 1967; 2: Livres 3–4 (SC 136), Paris: Cerf, 1968.

Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, cura et studio E. Dekkers (CCSL 1), Turnhout: Brepols, 1954, 77–171.

Theophylakt, *Enarratio in Evangelium Matthaei*, PG 123, 139A–488 A.

Sekundärliteratur

Beavis, Mary Ann, *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11–12* (JSNTSS 33), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Becker, Eve-Marie, „Gedächtnistheorie und Literaturgeschichte in der Interpretation des Markusevangeliums", *ZNT* 47 (2021) 101–106.

Boomershine, Thomas E., *The Messiah of Peace: A Performance-Criticism Commentary on Mark's Passion-resurrection Narrative* (Biblical Performance Criticism 12), Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015.

Boomershine, Thomas E., „Peter's Denial as Polemic or Confession: The Implication of Media Theory for Biblical Hermeneutics", *Semeia* 39 (1987) 47–68.

Botha, Pieter J.J., „Letter Writing and Oral Communication: Suggested Implications for Paul's Letter to the Galatians", *Scriptura* 42 (1992) 17–34.

Botha, Pieter J.J., „The Gospel of Mark, Orality Studies and Performance Criticism. Opening Windows on Jesus Traditions", *Religion and Theology* 25 (2018) 350–393.

Botha, Pieter J.J., „The Spelling Eye and the Listening Ear. Oral Poetics and New Testament Writings", *Scriptura* 117 (2018) 1–18.

Botha, Pieter J.J., „The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence", in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, hrsg. v. Stanley E. Porter und Thomas H. Olbricht, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, 409–428.

Breytenbach, Cilliers, „Die literarischen Entwürfe der Evangelien und ihr Verhältnis zum historischen Jesus", in *Jesus Handbuch*, hrsg. v. Jens Schröter, Christine Jacobi unter Mitarbeit von Lena Nogossek, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 75–86.

Breytenbach, Cilliers, „Das Evangelium nach Markus – Verschlüsselte Performanz?", in ders., *The Gospel According to Mark as Episodic Narrative* (NovTSup 182), Leiden – Boston: Brill 2021, 468–497.

Bultmann, Rudolf, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (FRLANT 29), hrsg. v. Gerd Theißen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [10]1995.

Davis, Casey W., *Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (JSNTSS 172), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Dewey, Joanna, „Mark as Interwoven Tapestry: Forecasts and Echoes for a Listening Audience", *CBQ* 53 (1991) 221–231.

Dewey, Joanna, *The Oral Ethos of the Early Church: Speaking, Writing, and the Gospel of Mark* (Biblical Performance Criticism 8), Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013.

Dewey, Joanna, „Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative of Mark", *Interpretation* 43 (1989) 32–44.

Dewey, Joanna, „The Survival of Mark's Gospel: A Good Story", *JBL* 123 (2004) 495–507.

Doan, William; Terry Giles, *Prophets, Performances, and Power. Performance Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, London – New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Elder, Nick, *Gospel Media: Reading, Writing, and Circulating Jesus Traditions*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2023.

Guttenberger, Gudrun, „Markus als Schriftgelehrter", in *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century. Method and Meaning* (BEThL 301), hrsg. v. Geert van Oyen, Leuven: Peeters, 2019, 171–216.

Harvey, John D., *Listening to the Text: Oral Patterning of Paul's Letters*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Hearon, Holly E., „The Implications of Orality for Study of the Biblical Texts", in *Performing the Gospel. Orality, Memory, and Mark*, hrsg. v. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan Draper und John Miles Foley, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press: 2006, 3–20.

Horsley, Richard A., *Hearing the Whole Story*, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Horsley, Richard A., „Oral and Written Aspects of the Emergence of the Gospel of Mark as Scripture", *Oral Tradition* 25 (2010) 93–114.

Hurtado, Larry W., „Oral Fixation and New Testament Studies? 'Orality', 'Performance' and Reading Texts in Early Christianity", *NTS* 60 (2014) 321–340.

Huebenthal, Sandra, „Kollektives Gedächtnis, kultureller Rahmen und das Markusevangelium", in *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century. Method and Meaning* (BEThL 301), hrsg. v. Geert van Oyen, Leuven: Peeters, 2019, 217–250.

Huebenthal, Sandra, *Das Markusevangelium als kollektives Gedächtnis* (FRLANT 253), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

Huebenthal, Sandra, „Das Markusevangelium als Gründungsgeschichte verstehen", *ZNT* 47 (2021) 89–99.

Iverson, Kelly R., „A Centurion's 'Confession': A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39", *JBL* 130 (2011) 329–350.

Iverson, Kelly R., „Incongruity, Humor, and Mark: Performance and the Use of Laughter in the Second Gospel (Mark 8.14–21)", *NTS* 59 (2013) 2–19.

Iverson, Kelly R., „Oral Fixation or Oral Correction? A Response to Larry Hurtado", *NTS* 62 (2016) 183–200.

Iverson, Kelly R., *Performing Early Christian Literature. Audience Experience and Interpretation of the Gospels*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Johnson, William, „Towards a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity", *American Journal of Philology* 121 (2000) 593–627.

Kelber, Werner H., „Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space", *Semeia* 65 (1994) 139–167.

Kelber, Werner H., *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*; with a new introduction by the author, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Kirk, Alan, „Tradition and Memory in the Gospel of Peter", in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus. Text, Kontexte, Intertexte* (TU 158), hrsg. v. Thomas J. Kraus und Tobias Nicklas, Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, 2007, 135–158.

Klein, Hans, *Der Mensch zwischen Himmel und Erde. Jesus nach dem Zeugnis der Evangelien*, Sibiu / Hermannstadt: Honterus, 2021.

Klein, Hans, „Zur Methode der Erforschung vormarkinischer Quellen" (BETL 110), in *The Synoptic Gospels*, hrsg. v. Camille Focant, Leuven: Peeters, 1993, 503–517.

Konradt, Matthias, „Das Matthäusevangelium als judenchristlicher Gegenentwurf zum Markusevangelium", in ders., *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium* (WUNT 358), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 43–68.

Kreuzer, Siegfried, „Textformen, Urtext und Bearbeitungen in der Septuaginta der Königebücher" (WUNT 286), in *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*, hrsg. v. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser und Marcus Sigismund, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 18–37.

Malbon, Elisabeth Struthers, „Echoes and Foreshadowing in Mark 4-8: Reading and Rereading", *JBL* 112 (1993) 211–230.

Mancing, Howard, „See the Play, Read the Book", in *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn* (Routledge Advances in Theatre and Performance Studies), hrsg. v. Bruce McConachie und F. Elizabeth Hart, London: Routledge, 2006, 189–206.

Meiser, Martin, „Jesus' Suffering and Ethics: Patristic Exegesis Reconsidered", in *Gelitten – Gestorben – Auferstanden: Passions- und Ostertraditionen im frühen Christentum* (WUNT II 273), hrsg. v. Andreas Merkt, Tobias Nicklas und Joseph Verheyden, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 225–238.

Meiser, Martin, „Die Jesus-Remembered-Debatte", *Sacra Scripta* 16 (2018) 150–177.

Meiser, Martin, „Johannes-Passionen bei Johann Sebastian Bach und Georg Philipp Telemann. Libretti im Vergleich", in *Musikwissenschaft und Theologie im Dialog. Johann Sebastian Bachs „h-Moll-Messe" und „Johannes-Passion"*, hrsg. v. Dominik Höink und Andreas Jacob, Hildesheim: Olms, 2020, 333–361.

Oder, Danila, *The Two Gospels of Mark: Performance and Text*, Domus Press [Eigendruck im Selbstverlag], 2019.

Oestreich, Bernhard, *Performance Criticism of the Pauline Letters*, übers. Lindsay Elias, Brent Blum (Biblical Performance Criticism 12), Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2016.

Ong, Walter J., *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness*, Ithaca, NY – London: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Ong, Walter J., „Text as Interpretation: Mark and After", *Semeia* 39 (1987) 7–26.

Parker, David, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Perry, Peter S., „Biblical Performance Criticism: Survey and Prospects", *Religions* 10 (2019) Nº 117, https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10020117.

Reiser, Marius, *Sprache und literarische Formen des Neuen Testaments. Eine Einführung* (UTB 2197), Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001.

Rhoads, David, „Biblical Performance Criticism: Performance as Research", *OrT* 25 (2010) 157–198.

Rhoads, David, „Performing the Gospel of Mark", in ders., *Reading Mark, Engaging the Gospel*, Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2004, 176–201.

Schröter, Jens, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas* (WMANT 76), Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997.

Shiner, Whitney, „Memory Technology and the Composition of Mark", in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark*, hrsg. v. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper und John Miles Foley, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006, 147–165.

Shiner, Whitney, *Proclaiming the Gospel. First-Century Performance of Mark*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Spencer, Patrick E., Rez. Whitney Shiner, Proclaiming the Gospel, *SCJ* 8 (2005) 146–149.

Tolbert, Mary A., *Sowing the Gospel. Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Wendland, Ernst, „Performance Criticism: Assumptions, Applications, and Assessment", *TsIsC Talk* 65 (2008) 1–11.

Wire, Antoinette Clark, *The Case for Mark Composed in Performance* (Biblical Performance Criticism 3), Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011.

"WHEN HE ARRIVED IN ROME, HE EAGERLY SEARCHED FOR ME!" (2 TIM 1,17) FRIENDS, FOES, AND NETWORKS IN 2 TIMOTHY

Korinna Zamfir[1]

Abstract. The antagonistic discourse of 2 Timothy divides the community into two camps: the truthful believers and the heterodox opponents of Paul. Emphasis on cohesion, on the strong links between Paul and friends and delineation from those depicted as dangerous outsiders strengthen group identity. However, perspectives from network theory show that Christ-believers did not belong to impermeable camps. Proximity, multiplex social relations (shared family, neighbourhood, or occupational ties, worship, and commensality) created opportunities for communication and exchange. Weak ties bridged the gap between various clusters, shaping networks akin to small worlds, allowing for interactions across partisan lines and for more inclusive forms of identity.
Keywords: 2 Timothy, opponents, network theory, small world.

2 Timothy names a remarkable number of persons, close friends, co-workers and acquaintances of Paul and Timothy, as well as heterodox teachers, deserters, and utter enemies. In the narrative world of the epistle, which advances a particular interpretation of Paul several decades after his lifetime, the characters and personal details are incorporated in an antagonistic discourse. This creates group identity and allegiance to contemporary leaders by contrasting the orthodox, faithful disciples to the heterodox, disloyal camp. Scholarly discussions quite often take this position for granted, focusing on the opponents, and attempting to reconstruct their presumed heterodox teachings.

This paper will follow a different track. Taking distance from this polarizing discourse, I will focus instead on connections and interactions. As the epistle postdates Paul, the characters, and their interactions (inspired by earlier epistles

---

1   Professor of Biblical Studies, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania / Research fellow, Discipline Group Old and New Testament, University of Stellenbosch / Adjunct Fellow, Centre for Advanced Studies Beyond the Canon, University of Regensburg. Contact: emilia.zamfir@ubbcluj.ro; kori_zamfir@yahoo.com.

and traditions close to Acts, or fictitious) may not be used to identify historical events. But within the narrative world, beyond the dichotomic perspective, they point to a complex network, which may provide a sense of what relationships may have looked like in early communities of Christ-believers. The characters, whether historical, like Paul, Timothy, Prisca and Aquila, Luke, and others, or fictitious, are envisaged as connected by many ties, on the move between the cities of Asia Minor, Macedonia, Achaia, Dalmatia, and Rome, interacting, cooperating, working, struggling, clashing, or fleeing.

This image of a complex network has struck me while exploring the opponents in 2 Timothy with an eye to Chantal Mouffe's agonistic interpretation of the political.[2] Mouffe argues that antagonisms are inherent to society and have a decisive role in constructing collective identity. The confrontation of conflicting, irreconcilable perspectives is a power struggle aiming to impose a certain order. These antagonistic relationships, Mouffe maintains, lead to the definition of a collective identity, grounded precisely on difference and opposition, on friend-foe relationships.[3] Obviously, setting up boundaries has a decisive role in the construal of identity.[4] In that sense, 2 Timothy emphasises indeed antagonism and exclusion, and delineates the group of orthodox believers from those labelled as heterodox and immoral, as adversaries to be avoided. Two distinct camps seem to be strictly set apart. But when analysing the characters in relation to geographic information, a very different picture starts to emerge.

In what follows, I will attempt to retrieve the web of relationships imagined by 2 Timothy in the light of network theory, to propose a more nuanced perspective on the way early communities functioned. I will argue that representations of a community, which define belonging and exclusion along the lines of orthodoxy and heterodoxy are overly (and probably intentionally) simplistic. Network theory helps deconstructing this antagonistic understanding of the group, show-

[2] "'Beware of him, for he strongly opposed our message!' Antagonisms and Identity-Construction in 2 Timothy", in *Antagonismen in neutestamentlichen Schriften. Studien zur Neuformulierung der "Gegnerfrage" jenseits des Historismus* (Beyond Historicism – New Testament Studies Today), ed. Stefan Alkier, Leiden: Brill, 2021, 162–173.

[3] Chantal MOUFFE, *Agonistik. Die Welt politisch denken*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, ²2016, 21–43 (24–26, 31, 39); ead., "Democratic Politics and Conflict: An Agonistic Approach", *Política común* 9 (2016) http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/pc.12322227.0009.011.

[4] Judith M. LIEU, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*, Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, 98.

ing how the discourse overemphasises the bonds between certain nodes in the network, while overlooking others and obscuring thereby the complexity of ties that cross the border of the two imaginary camps.

Fundamentals of network theory

Network theory comprises a broad spectrum of approaches sharing the insight that biological, physical, social / sociocultural aggregates are networks (mathematically speaking, graphs), in which individual elements (nodes, vertices) connected by ties (edges, links) interact and allow the diffusion of contents (flows).[5] As intuitive and self-evident as this seems, network theory is not a commonplace, but relies on mathematical/statistical models. Social sciences use the theory to understand and model social networks and phenomena pertaining to human interactions.

In any network, nodes have various numbers of connections (various degrees). Some nodes may be well connected, sharing with others a large number of ties, accounting thus for the higher degree of *density* of a network or a cluster.[6] Density also involves a high degree of overlap between shared connections: an overlap between the mutual acquaintances and friends of two nodes or individuals. Highly connected nodes have a high degree of *centrality*; they may be described

---

[5] On the fundamentals and the numerous applications of network theory: Albert-László Barabási, *Linked. The New Science of Networks*, Cambridge, MA: Perseus, 2002; Albert-László Barabási, with Márton Pósfai, *Network Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Stephen P. Borgatti, Virginie Lopez-Kidwell, "Network Theory", *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*, ed. John Scott and Peter J. Carrington, Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, 2011, 40–54; Anna Collar, "Network Theory and Religious Innovation", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22.1 (2007), 149–162 (150–155); John S. Kloppenborg, "Social Networks and the Dissemination of Elective Cults", *Early Christianity* 10.2 (2019) 121–156 (129–132). Its use in social studies represents only a tiny part of its applicability. Network theory is employed in epidemiology, computer science, ecology, economics, finances, labour market studies, analyses of cultural networks, of citations in scholarly works, of the spread of information and news etc.

[6] On the density of a network, as depending on the number of connections: Mark S. Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties", *American Journal of Sociology* 78.6 (1973) 1360–1380 (1370); id., "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited", *Sociological Theory* 1 (1983) 201–233 (201–202); Kloppenborg, "Social Networks", 130.

as hubs. Certain nodes may be interconnected through multiple bonds, through several forms of social connections, a feature called *multiplexity*.[7] Multiplexity usually results in *strong ties*. Ties facilitate exchange and the flow of positive or negative contents. Strong ties involve sharing more time, more commonalities and resources. Strong ties create closed and stable networks or cliques (a term without pejorative sense here), translated into a high clustering coefficient. The efficacy and speed with which flows pass from a node to others largely depend on the length of the path, i.e. the distance between two nodes.

One of the influential models explaining the distant spread of content was proposed by Mark Granovetter, who emphasised the importance or 'strength' of weak ties in bridging loosely connected networks and allowing for the diffusion of information, innovation, and resources between networks.[8] Although it may seem counterintuitive, he found that weak ties, not strong ones – acquaintances, not close friends – contribute foremost to the dissemination of information outside one's own network, as they function as bridges between networks.[9]

Another important paradigm, the *small world model* of Duncan Watts and Steven Strogatz indicates that even in large networks where most members would be poorly connected ('sparse networks'), where nodes would have only a few lateral links to their neighbours, the addition of small number of weak links, of 'short cuts' to distant nodes increases considerably the connectedness of the network.[10] In social networks, the *average path length*, the average number of links in the shortest path between two nodes, represents the average number of friendship ties in the shortest sequence connecting two individuals.[11] The less connections are required to reach another individual, the shortest the path is,

---

[7]   Lois M. Verbrugge, "Multiplexity in Adult Friendships", *Social Forces* 57.4 (1979) 1286–1309; Kloppenborg, "Social Networks", 130.

[8]   "The Strength of Weak Ties", esp. 1364–1366, 1370–1371; id., "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited", 201–233; Barabási, *Linked*, 42–44.

[9]   Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited", 222; Barabási, *Linked*, 42–44.

[10]   Duncan J. Watts, Steven H. Strogatz, "Collective Dynamics of "Small–World" Networks", *Nature* 393 (1998) 440–442; Barabási, *Linked*, 49–53. Only a very small number of such short cuts would be sufficient to produce, through random rewiring, a highly clustered network (graph), with short path length, typical for the small-world model. On "short cuts": Watts, Strogatz, "Collective Dynamics", 441, fig. 1.

[11]   Watts, Strogatz, "Collective Dynamics", 441, fig. 2.

and the easier it becomes for information to spread. The clustering coefficient, on the other hand, indicates the degree to which any friends of a member are also friends of each other.[12]

Several points emerge from this discussion. a) Women are thought to have lesser mental capacities; therefore they are less suited for education. b) The education of women is subject to derision and contempt. Learned women are commonly considered vain, conceited, and ridiculous, a reason for which girls should not receive (too much) instruction. c) Women need to be taught in order to fulfil their fundamental role: to be able to manage their household, support their husband and raise their children. d) Appropriate household management is fundamental for a well-ordered human existence, for society as a whole; therefore the role of women is essential. e) Women should be educated because their virtue is equal to that of men, courage, a typically male virtue, included.

The network flow model of Stephen Borgatti and Virginie Lopez-Kidwell envisages the social network as an infrastructure consisting of similarities, social relations and interactions, which allow the transmission of flows (flows may be positive, like information, knowledge, or resources, or negative, such as diseases or gossip).[13] *Similarities* are the first requisite; they comprise physical and social proximity (a shared space and belonging to the same group or social category), as well as immaterial correspondences like shared values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. Similarities effect *social relations*: these are connected to certain roles (pertaining to kinship or institutional relations) or express a cognitive or affective relationing, like knowing or (dis)liking someone. While role-based social relations are in certain sense public and more or less symmetrical, cognitive / affective relations are private and may be asymmetrical. Social roles lead to *interactions*, i.e., events such as verbal interaction (communication / talking with the other, or fighting with someone), commensality, trade or other. Interactions make the transmission of content, i.e., the flow, possible. Flows include the exchange of resources, information, but also diseases within the network.[14] While it may be self-evident, it is worth emphasising here the importance of spatial / physical proximity for relations and interactions to develop. Proximity enhances communication, a point that will be important for our topic.

---

12 WATTS, STROGATZ, "Collective Dynamics", 441.
13 BORGATTI, LOPEZ-KIDWELL, "Network Theory", 44–45.
14 BORGATTI, LOPEZ-KIDWELL, "Network Theory", 44–45.

Networks are dynamic structures, subject to change and loss. They may grow, through the addition of new nodes and links, but they may also break down. Thus, removing a critical number of nodes and/or links leads to the network breaking down into several smaller, disconnected clusters, a phenomenon known as percolation.[15] As Barabási remarks, "once the fraction of removed nodes reaches a critical threshold, the network abruptly breaks into disconnected components. In other words, random node failures induce a *phase transition from a connected to a fragmented network*."[16]

Network theory has been used successfully in recent years to explain the spread of religious innovation in general,[17] and the adoption of belief in Christ in particular. Thus, John Kloppenborg has shown in two important articles and in his recent book on *Christ's Associations* (2019) how occupational and religious networks (professional guilds and cult groups) provided opportunities for the dissemination of the Christ-cult, through both local and translocal (weak) links.[18] Spatial proximity played an important role, as it facilitated the creation of networks.[19] Members of associations were often bound through multiple links (through kinship, professional, religious and ethnic bonds, gender, legal status etc.), and ties of friendship, affection and trust played a major part.[20] Belonging to several associations increased the likelihood that a cult would spread. Patronage, spatial contiguity, and travel for trade allowed associations to intersect, and this must have been true for the early communities of Christ-believers, as well.[21] Kloppenborg insists on the social gain, the acquisition of symbolic capital associated with the network. "Network structure facilitates the flow of certain properties, most importantly social capital, trust, a sense of belonging and worth, and

---

[15] Barabási, *Network Science*, Section 8.2.

[16] Barabási, *Network Science*, 277 (emphases mine).

[17] For the role of networks in the dissemination of ancient cults see also: Collar, "Network Theory and Religious Innovation", 149–162; for contemporary cults, already Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, "Networks of Faith: Interpersonal Bonds and Recruitment to Cults and Sects", *AJS* 85.6 (1980) 1376–1395.

[18] Kloppenborg, "Social Networks", 121–56; id., "Recruitment to Elective Cults: Network Structure and Ecology", *NTS* 66 (2020) 323–350; id., *Christ's Associations. Connecting and Belonging in the Ancient City*, New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 2019.

[19] Kloppenborg, "Social Networks", 144–147.

[20] Kloppenborg, *Christ's Associations*, 56.

[21] Kloppenborg, "Social Networks", 140–149.

competences or skills relevant to the nature of the network."[22] Acquiring social capital plays an important role in recruitment to cults.[23] Beyond social and material gain, belonging creates a powerful corporate identity.[24]

Building on these insights, I will attempt to reconstruct the network(s) presupposed by 2 Timothy, focusing notably on a few issues: the impact of spatial proximity on communication and the creation of ties, the influence of weak links and the small world model on understanding the relationships and interactions between members, and the role of the antagonistic discourse in inducing percolation and a phase transition from a connected to a fragmented network.

I shall argue that all those mentioned in the epistle belong to a complex network where most of the individuals are connected to various degrees. The author overlooks the connections between certain members of the group, symbolically cuts off the ties between characters, depicting them as belonging to entirely different spheres, as either orthodox or heterodox, as pious or evil. The discourse aims thus to produce a phase transition resulting in the disconnection between the 'orthodox' and the 'heterodox' cluster.

Perspectives from network theory. Friends and foes of Paul as nodes of networks

Close reading: Connected and on the move

The close reading of 2 Timothy reveals a net of people connected to Paul and Timothy. They are envisaged on the move between the various points of a wide geographic network, which comprises Rome and the cities in Asia Minor (notably Ephesus, but also Miletus and Troas, and further East, the cities of Galatia), Achaia, Macedonia and Dalmatia. They are all nodes of a large social network, connected to various degrees among each other, as well. Onesiphorus, who has rendered abundant service to the Apostle at the time he was in Ephesus, hastens to visit Paul in his Roman captivity (1,16-18; 4,19). Given the way the recollection of past interactions between Paul and Onesiphorus is formulated ("you know very well"), Timothy is also envisaged as someone who has been in contact with

---

[22] KLOPPENBORG, *Christ's Associations*, 56; see also 95 ("Social capital is an 'emergent' feature of social networks, in the sense that it "'emerges' in network relationships.").

[23] KLOPPENBORG, "Social Networks", 127–129; "Recruitment", 341–342.

[24] KLOPPENBORG, *Christ's Associations*, 143.

Onesiphorus earlier in Ephesus.[25] Timothy himself should hasten to join Paul who suffers heroically in his captivity (4,9.21), but not before taking with him Mark, who had also been serviceable to Paul (4,11), and stopping on his way in Troas, to fetch Paul's cloak and book rolls he had left at Carpus' (4,13). Paul lets Timothy know that he has sent Tychicus to Ephesus, probably to replace him during his absence (4,12).[26] Tychicus will become thus a reference point for all those in Ephesus.[27] Among the collaborators in Ephesus we also find Prisca and Aquila (4,19) and the unnamed faithful men to which Timothy should entrust the deposit (2,2). We also learn of former friends of Paul who have turned into deserters: 'all those in Asia', in particular Phygelus and Hermogenes (1,15).

In Rome, allegedly only Luke (4,11) is on the side of Paul, a detail contradicted a little later by the reference to the numerous Roman believers sending greetings to Timothy, both named (Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, Claudia) and unnamed (the probably gender-inclusive ἀδελφοί; 4,21).[28] At any rate, several others have been earlier in Rome, but left, for good or bad reasons: Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia, probably to preach the Gospel,[29] while Demas deserted the Apostle out of love for this world, going to Thessalonica (4,10).[30]

---

[25] Not only the narrative of 1 Timothy, but, more importantly, 1 Cor 4,17; 16,10 suggest a stay of both Paul and Timothy in Ephesus (also Acts 19,22). As Timothy is the co-sender of the two genuine captivity letters, Philippians and Philemon, this may indicate the same, in case we go with an Ephesian provenance (at least for Phil), but the question is highly disputed.

[26] Alfons WEISER notes the concern to underscore the geographic breadth of Paul's apostolic-missionary network and his concern for ensuring continuity. *Der zweite Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XVI/1) Düsseldorf: Benzinger / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003, 318.

[27] Tychicus seems to play a similar role in Tit 3,12, as one of those who could replace Titus during his absence.

[28] On the problems related to the identification of the various names: Raymond F. COLLINS, *1&2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary* (NTL), Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002, 179–181.

[29] Lorenz OBERLINNER, *Die Pastoralbriefe. II. Kommentar zum zweiten Timotheusbrief* (HThKNT XI/2), Freiburg: Herder, 1995, 169; I. Howard MARSHALL, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, 816; Walter L. LIEFELD, *1 & 2 Timothy, Titus*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999, 297.

[30] OBERLINNER, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 169. Demas' failure is all the more serious, as it occurs at a dramatic moment, when Paul is facing martyrdom. LIEFELD believes Thessalonica may have been his home (*1 & 2 Timothy, Titus*, 297).

We also learn of other friends in various other locations, like Erastus in Corinth, and Trophimus, left behind in Miletus (4,20). Relatives are mentioned, too, – the mother and grandmother of Timothy, Eunice and Lois (1,5), the household of Onesiphorus (1,16; 4,19), and the families of the γυναικάρια (3,7).

But other characters also emerge, as opponents (ἀντιδιατιθεμένοι, 2,25; cf. 4,15) and enemies of Paul and Timothy. False teachers, like Hymenaeus and Philetus (2,17) are named,[31] aside the men who intrude into households and take hold of the ignorant women (3,6-7), and other unnamed false teachers (4,3). Alexander, the coppersmith, is singled out as someone who has done a lot of harm to Paul and to the teaching; Timothy is therefore instructed to be on guard against him (4,14-15).[32] The nature of the harm he inflicted on Paul (probably during his stay in Ephesus) remains unknown, but his antagonising Paul expects divine judgement.[33]

If we focus merely on the discourse of the epistle, we are left with the impression of two distinct camps with very different values and attitudes, with little, if anything to share with each other. Paul, Timothy and friends, the trusted collaborators and true believers are models of faith and morality, epitomised by the virtue of piety (3,12). Conversely, an elaborate polemic (3,2-9.13) describes the opponents, heterodox teachers and foes as deceitful, displaying piety, but lacking its power, burdened with the worst sins. The charges undermine their credibility, by questioning their moral integrity (2,16.18; 3,2-7.13) and their teachings (3,8;

---

[31] Philetus is otherwise unknown. On Hymenaeus and Philetus: Jürgen Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XV), Zürich: Benzinger / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988, 105 (Hymenaeus as ordained leader); Oberlinner, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 97–98; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 413, 751.

[32] 1 Timothy 1.20 names (an) Alexander with Hymenaeus. While the name was rather common, it is striking that both epistles to Timothy condemn an Alexander. It makes sense to connect these passages to (the tradition in) Acts 19 about the riot of the Ephesian silversmiths (cf. 19,33, where the role of Alexander is unclear). On the identity of the Alexanders named in 1 and 2 Timothy: Oberlinner, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 175–176 (although essentially, a paradigmatic character); Weiser, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 322–323; Collins, *1&2 Timothy and Titus*, 284–285; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 413, 821; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, 105 (an ordained minister).

[33] Ceslas Spicq suspected that he had arranged for the arrest of Paul in Ephesus and would have continued his pursuit against Paul in Rome, acting as Judas against Jesus. *Épîtres pastorales* II, Paris: Gabalda, 1969, 816–817. However, this is essentially guesswork.

4,3-4), expectedly deterring others from joining them, and strengthening cohesion around the leaders the author seeks to confirm.[34] Timothy and the faithful disciples are repeatedly contrasted to the latter group and invited to dissociate themselves from these (2,14.16.23; 3,5; 4,15).

Network theory, however, sheds a quite different light on the situation. All these characters belong in fact to several clusters of a broad social network, interconnected through multiple ties, firstly within their own group, but also beyond that, through shared religious beliefs,[35] friendship, in some cases a common provenance, ethnic belonging, kinship, neighbourhood, and probably also professional ties (which would have involved belonging to various professional associations). Thus, while the epistle understandably focuses on shared spiritual values, other relationships also connected members of the early Christ-cult. Multiplexity resulting from shared values and multiple social connections obviously strengthens the ties and implicitly the cohesion of the groups or clusters. Beyond spiritual values proper, two particular aspects may be considered: sharing at table and occupational ties.

Worship at table[36] played a central role in the life of a community and in identity formation. Importantly, proximity during worship and commensality would have allowed for interaction: shared (cultic) meals would have brought many of the members to the same table. Venues must have been various – certainly not only houses, but workshops of artisans, shops, shared spaces in *insulae*, *taber-*

---

[34] On polemics against the opponents in the Pastoral Epistles: Ceslas Spicq, *Épîtres pastorales* I, Paris: Gabalda, 1969, 86–88; Robert J. Karris, "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles", *JBL* 92.4 (1973), 549–564; Andrie du Toit, "Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography", *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. Du Toit, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007, 45–56; Martin Dibelius, Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972, 8.

[35] These include the Gospel of Paul (1,8.10; 2.8), belief in divine election by grace (1,9), in the manifestation and resurrection of Christ, in future resurrection and immortality (1,10; 2,8.18), the final epiphany (Parousia) of Christ and divine judgement (4,1.8), holding to the good deposit of faith (1,12.14), and dedication to Christ.

[36] On the concept: Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist. The Banquet in the Early Christian World*, Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2003, 176, 179.

nae, or rented spaces (as in the case of other associations).[37] Most of these spaces would have allowed people to intersect on various occasions, not only during worship proper. It is easy to imagine that working in a common space, frequenting a shop or living in the same *insula* would have allowed people to share information about a forthcoming worship at table. As worship and commensality played a major role in creating close ties, unsurprisingly, the most drastic way to severe ties was the exclusion of members from such occasions. While not spelled out, the exclusion of Hymenaeus and Alexander from the community (1 Tim 1,20, both characters also found in 2 Timothy) must have meant precisely the exclusion from worship and commensality.[38]

Occupation may also be considered as a factor creating ties within the community and building bridges to other networks. While this was not an issue of interest for the author, at any given time some community members would have shared the same occupation or trade and could have belonged to the same guild. 2 Timothy does not mention the occupation of Aquila and Prisca (4,19) but Acts 18,3 refers to them as tentmakers (σκηνοποιόι), an occupation they have apparently shared with Paul. Lampe thinks that Aquila manufactured tents for private use and did not belong to an association of *tabernacularii* that would have provided tents for the army.[39] Whatever their background, in the light of Acts at least three people seem to share the same occupation. 2 Timothy identifies Alexander as χαλκεύς (a coppersmith or, more generally, a metalworker).[40] He is thus pos-

---

[37] On venues: Edward ADAMS, *The Earliest Christian Meeting Places – Almost Exclusively Houses?* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), esp. 137–202 (for the PE: 37–39). See also KLOPPENBORG, *Christ's Association*s, esp. 104–105, 116–119; David G. HORRELL, "Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre", *NTS* 50 (2004) 349–369.

[38] MARSHALL, *Pastoral Epistles*, 414: handing one over to Satan (cf. 1 Cor 5.5) must have become standard language denoting excommunication from the church. Also Benjamin FIORE, *The Pastoral Epistles* (SP 12), Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007, 52 (exclusion from the community).

[39] Peter LAMPE, *From Paul to Valentinus. Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003, 187–189.

[40] A New Testament hapax, in the LXX χαλκεύς designates a variety of metalworkers (Gen 4,22; Isa 41,7; 54,16; 2 Chr 24,12; Neh 3,32; Sir 38,28).

sibly envisaged as belonging to a guild of metalworkers in Ephesus.[41] Again, it is not the historical accuracy that matters, but the way characters are envisioned as linked to others through occupational ties. Regardless of whether this Alexander existed, metalworkers were very probably among the Christ-believers in Ephesus, given the importance of the occupation in the city and in the region.

Given the fictitious setting, we cannot be sure that all these characters are historical or that the narrated events are genuine. In fact, it is extremely hazardous to attempt to reconstruct communities and historical interactions from prescriptive texts, which are meant to construct reality.[42] But the historicity of these details is not really relevant for the argument. Regardless of the veracity of the names or other details, what matters is that the narrative world puts forward interpersonal relations, conflicts, travels, and encounters – social relations and interactions (Borgatti, Lopez–Kidwell) –, ultimately a picture that allows the modelling of a network. And networks match reality far better than an antagonizing discourse. Thinking in terms of networks raises awareness about the complexity of the relationships between early Christ-believers. It makes us realize that those envisaged here as faithful to Paul cannot be really disconnected from those labelled as opponents or heterodox teachers. While singled out as outsiders, the 'opponents' also belong to the network, alongside those regarded as orthodox and loyal. These two groups may be envisaged to a point as two distinct clusters of a network, but they are not, as the author would have it, two disconnected networks.

---

[41] Mikael TELLBE, *Christ-believers in Ephesus: A Textual Analysis of Early Christian Identity Formation in a Local Perspective*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 77, n. 83. The character in 2 Timothy may have resulted from the conflation of Demetrios, the silversmith and Alexander (Acts 19,24.33). On (a guild of) metalworkers (χαλκεις) in Ephesus in relation with the temple of Artemis: IEph 1384A [=PH247846], probably from the reign of Trajan. MARSHALL assumes that he belonged to a guild of coppersmiths in Troas (cf. CIG 3639=I.Alexandreia Troas 122), *Pastoral Epistles*, 821 (following Jerome Quinn). Kloppenborg mentions further guilds of metalworkers in other regions: I.Beroia 27, naming a coppersmith and goldsmiths among the devotees of Theos Hypsistos (*Christ's Associations*, 76), a *syntechnia* of coppersmiths in Hierapolis (ibid., 35, 272).

[42] On texts producing communal identity and constructions of reality: LIEU, *Christian Identity*, 27–30, 37.

Paul and Timothy – a strong, multiplex, central tie

The letter focuses on Paul and Timothy. The two main characters, although set apart by physical distance, are closely bound by intense friendship related to a long common history, a shared mission and longstanding collaboration in the service of the Gospel, by ties of fictive kinship (Timothy is the beloved child of the apostle, 1,2; 2,1), and knowledge of the other's family (1,5). They share the same beliefs and values: they identify as athletes of faith and soldiers of Christ (2,1.3-6), ready to suffer hardship, without being ashamed of the chains of the Apostle (1,8.12; 2,15, cf. also Onesiphorus, 1,16-18). Shared recollections and emotions also bring them together: Paul remembers Timothy in his prayers, conjuring up his tears and sincere faith (1,3-5), and reminds him to rekindle in himself the gift of God that lives in him through Paul's laying on of hands (1,6). All these considered, Paul and Timothy are connected by a strong tie. Their relation is also characterized by multiplexity.

The strong, multiplex tie connecting Paul and Timothy also involves the significant overlap of their connections: *many of the acquaintances of either Paul, Timothy or other close friends are quite likely acquaintances of each other as well.* (In the Pastoral Epistles, the same is true for the relationships between other characters as well, such as Onesiphorus, Titus, Luke and Mark.) This intuitive observation is confirmed by the numerous names and details Paul mentions to Timothy as part of a shared knowledge. They are thus very highly connected nodes or hubs, with a major role in transmitting information within their network.[43] In other words, the link between Paul and Timothy is characterized by centrality. This link is first and foremost one that provides for cohesion within the group. But each of them also has a very large number of stronger or weaker ties with numerous persons in various other geographic locations.

While the other persons are treated as marginal actors, with a positive or negative relationship to Paul and Timothy, an analysis of the relationships of these persons, taking geography as a starting point, will result in a quite different picture.

---

[43] On highly connected nodes or hubs: Collar, "Network Theory", 152, Kloppenborg, "Recruitment", 327–328.

Troas as hub and the importance of weak links

On his road to Rome, Timothy encountering Carpus in Troas may seem an irrelevant detail, but a look at the map reveals that all those who were at some point in Ephesus/Asia (like Prisca and Aquila, Onesiphorus, possibly Mark) and had to travel to Rome or to Athens and Corinth via Macedonia, necessarily passed through Troas. Alexandria Troas became a Roman colony enjoying *ius italicum* under Augustus, a development that contributed to the importance of the city. The Roman harbour, somewhat smaller than that of Ephesus, but slightly larger than Cenchrae, was located at the intersection of major sea-roads, one stretching to Macedonia (Thessalonica), Athens and Rome, the other connecting the Black Sea to southern Asia Minor and the Eastern Mediterranean.[44] Troas was therefore an important hub for travellers and trade, almost impossible to circumvent for anyone travelling to these destinations.[45] From this perspective, Carpus (4,13, whether a real person or a literary character standing for persons with such role) becomes much more important than a chance keeper of cloaks and scrolls. In terms of network analysis, the ties of various persons to Carpus are probably weak links: they involve travelling people who encounter him occasionally, perhaps on the recommendation of mutual acquaintances. But precisely such links become important bridges between networks situated geographically apart, which facilitate the transmission of information, ideas and material support.[46] More significantly, Carpus had to be known to many of those travelling over Troas, *whether friends of foes* of Paul and Timothy. As mobility could hardly be an attribute of those of the 'orthodox' camp, those belonging to the 'orthodox' and the 'heterodox' group shared at least one acquaintance (one 'Carpus'), who

---

[44] Stefan Feuser, "The Roman Harbour of Alexandria Troas, Turkey", *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 40.2 (2010) 256–273 (256, 257, 259, 271). On the importance of the city see also Elmar Schwertheim, "Die Beinahe-Hauptstadt des Römischen Reiches: Neue Forschungen und Ausgrabungen in Alexandreia Troas (Türkei) erhellen die Geschichte der antiken Stadt", *Antike Welt* 36.4 (2005) 63–68.

[45] This is also reflected in the genuine epistles: according to 2 Cor 2,12-13, Paul had searched for Titus in Troas.

[46] On the importance of weak ties in transmitting information, innovation, and resources, and their role of bridges between networks: Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties", esp. 1364–1366, 1370–1371; id., "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited", 201–233; Barabási, *Linked*, 42–44.

not only mediated between distant locations, but was also a bridge between the two postulated camps.

The Ephesian 'corpus permixtum'

The situation in Ephesus is even more telling. Aside Paul and Timothy, with obvious ties to the city,[47] as seen, 2 Timothy places here Onesiphorus and his household, Tychicus and probably Mark.[48] Prisca and Aquila are also (inaccurately) located in Ephesus.[49] We could also add with some caution Trophimus (whom Paul has left ill in Miletus; 4,20), as Acts 21,29 calls him 'the Ephesian'.[50] Most likely Hermogenes and Phygelus (singled out from "all those in Asia" who have abandoned Paul) are also (imagined as) based in Ephesus.[51] Hymenaeus and Philetus, who allegedly "deviated from the truth by saying that resurrection has already taken place" (2,17–18), should also be located here. Otherwise, they would not fall under the 'jurisdiction' of Timothy, who had to settle the matters in Ephesus. Paul's worst enemy, Alexander, should also be searched for in Ephesus, given Paul's advice to Timothy to beware of him.

Considering all these characters, it becomes clear that Ephesus is not only a hub for Paul's (past) ministry, for Timothy and friends, but also the location of

---

[47] Cf. 1 Tim 1,3, not to mention the genuine epistles (1 Cor 15,32; 16,8.10) and Acts 18–19.

[48] LAMPE, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 159. According to MARSHALL, he must have been with Timothy or in a place would pass in his way (*Pastoral Epistles*, 818). Michael THEOBALD assumes instead that he would have been located in Colossae, cf. Col 4,10: *Israel-Vergessenheit in den Pastoralbriefen. Ein neuer Vorschlag zu ihrer historisch-theologischen Verortung im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ignatius-Briefe* (SBS 229), Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2016, 184). But this would have meant quite a detour for Timothy.

[49] Rom 16,3 indicates that they were in Rome before Paul had reached the city. Rightly, LAMPE, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 159; WEISER: *2. Timotheus*, 329–330 (adding other inconsistencies regarding the personalia of ch. 4). The detail could have reminded readers of 1 Cor 16,19; cf. also Acts 18,18–19.

[50] LAMPE, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 159.

[51] It would make little sense to look for a different city, given the centrality of Ephesus in the mission of Paul in all extant traditions.) Leaving aside the question of historicity, the text alludes to an event that has occurred while Paul was in Asia (Ephesus) than to one that has happened in Rome. OBERLINNER, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 57–58.

those who appear as antagonists of Paul. It is difficult to assess the size of the various groups and house churches in Ephesus around the turn of the century.[52] Most probably different communities existed, reclaiming different founding or leading figures, loosely connected among each other, counting a few dozens of people. This corresponds to Paul Trebilco's assessment of the relationships between various groups, based on Peter Lampe's concept of *fractionation*.[53] Several smaller groups of Christ-believers or house churches co-existed, without central coordination, but most certainly not entirely separated and unconnected. They had to have some knowledge of each other and share some information, a situation Trebilco calls "structural fractionation but with (only) some links between groups".[54] Although this 'fractionation' refers to house churches and does not fol-

---

[52] On the difficulty to estimate the number of members in early communities, an issue largely related to the place where groups assembled for worship, i.e. the available space and implicitly the economic status of first-century Christ-believers: KLOPPENBORG, *Christ's Associations*, 98–123. For Corinth in the lifetime of Paul Kloppenborg approximates between 15–30 members (106), less than the ca. 50 calculated by J. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983, 155–158. For Ephesus, Stefan WITETSCHECK reckons with several smaller assemblies of 10–15 people (*Ephesische Enthüllungen* 1. *Frühe Christen in einer antiken Großstadt. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach den Kontexten der Johannesapokalypse* (BiTS), Leuven: Peeters, 2008, 377–378). Tellbe advances a broad range, between 500–2000 believers at the end of the first century, out of ca. 200000 inhabitants, based on a survey of scholarly positions, with Thomas ROBINSON (*The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*, Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen, 1988) at the lower end, and Mattias GÜNTHER (*Die Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Ephesus*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995) advancing the higher number. Communities arguably had little awareness about each other (*Christ-believers in Ephesus*, 47). 2000, however, seems far too high. David A. DeSilva counts ca. 0,5% of the population, representing a "very modest success", which would result in 1000–1200 Christians in 40–48 groups, with an average of 25 persons in a house church (*A Week in the Life of Ephesus*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2020, 77).

[53] LAMPE, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 357–365; Paul TREBILCO, "Studying "Fractionation" in Earliest Christianity in Rome and Ephesus", *Reflections on the Early Christian History of Religion – Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 81), ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and Jörg Frey, Leiden: Brill, 2013, 293–333 (notably his option 2; esp. 298–307).

[54] "In option 2 the house churches are independent, but knowledgeable about each other's existence. There would be some cooperation between house churches, involving matters

low the doctrinal divide, Trebilco also mentions it with respect to the opponents challenged by the Pastoral Epistles. While helpful, this model unintendedly preserves the appearance that belonging, interaction and opposition occurred with the conservation of the boundary between the 'orthodox' and the 'heterodox'. However, quite certainly, people located in Ephesus, belonging to groups reclaiming the heritage of Paul, were not connected only within their own cluster, and isolated from all those belonging to the other groups. (I refer here strictly to different Pauline groups, without including those associated with the Johannine writings, or other founding figures.)

Staying with the narrative of 2 Timothy, this means that we find in the same Ephesian setting people as different as Timothy *and* Alexander, Onesiphorus *as well as* Hymenaeus and Philetus, Prisca and Aquila, *as well as* Hermogenes and Phygelus, perhaps Mark *as well as* the teachers who intrude into households, and their 'victims', the 'silly little women'. No doubt, some people may have belonged to denser clusters, in which members were bound by strong ties, as friends with similar views and values, providing for higher cohesion. But it is highly unlikely that ties connected only the 'good' and the 'evil' among each other, within their respective clusters. In any comparable network, at least some people located in the same area are connected. Proximity increases interactions, communication and enhances the creation of ties beyond the borders of one's own group. The same must have been true for people belonging to the Ephesian network.

Looking beyond the aspect of proximity, the small world model indicates that only a few weak links to persons outside the reference-group (outside the cluster), would increase the connectedness (the clustering coefficient) of the network. It is not difficult to imagine that at any given time at least a few people were connected through weak links with other persons outside their cluster. Consequently, they necessarily interacted and possibly shared interests and sympathies across 'camps' with at least some people. And precisely the weak links were responsible for the flow of information, perhaps religious innovation (alternative interpreta-

---

such as each knowing details of when and where other groups met (and so, for example, instructing visitors about this), and the passing on of information from one group to the next. This would not imply formal relationships and coordination between leaders." (TREBILCO, "Studying "Fractionation"", 298). Fractionation may be misleading to a point, as it may suggest a secondary fragmentation that breaks off an initial unity, but this is not the point. Conversely, Trebilco argues for a gradual development from loose connections to a higher degree of unitary coordination.

tions of certain matters that came to be labelled as heterodox). In fact, the very injunctions to Timothy to avoid such people make sense precisely when ties and contacts are taken for granted.

The antagonising discourse conceals and attempts to dismantle this complex Ephesian network. The 'friends of Paul' are expected to avoid and beware of those labelled as foes (the 'Alexanders'). In terms of network analysis, this corresponds to the phenomenon of percolation: the removal of a critical number of nodes from the network by severing some ties will break down the network into several unconnected clusters, a phase transition from a connected network to a disconnected one. At this point the divisive discourse becomes reality.

The elusive Roman network

In Rome the focus is on Paul, those with him (Luke) and those joining the apostle there (Onesiphorus, Timothy, Mark). The city is a hub connecting Roman believers (Eubulus, Pudens, Linus and Claudia, and the unnamed brothers and sisters, 4,21) with those coming from different parts of the Empire, and those who have spent some time there, but have recently departed (Demas, Crescens, Titus). A competent reader would also remember some of the names mentioned in Rom 16. Yet, interestingly we hear nothing of Epaenetus ("the first convert in Asia", 16,5, possibly also from Ephesus[55]), Mary, Andronicus and Junia, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Apelles, the household of Aristobulus, Herodion, the household of Narcissus, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus and his mother, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, Philologus, Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas (vv. 5-15), let alone of Junia from Chenchreae/Corinth (16,1–2), who had also visited Rome. We ignore the reasons for which 2 Timothy does not mention any of these collaborators and friends of Paul but introduces unknown characters of little consequence in 4,21.[56] Probably, naming prominent collaborators would have eclipsed Paul as the apostle with unique authority. A plethora of friends would have also contradicted the image of the solitary apostle

---

[55] Peter Stuhlmacher, *Brief an die Römer*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, 220; Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 159.

[56] Theobald argues that the author of the PE knew a shorter version of Romans, that did not include chs. 15–16 (*Israel–Vergessenheit*, 146–151). But some references are best explained by a knowledge of these chapters (e.g., 4.20, as allusion to Rom 16,23; 4,10 as a reference to Rom 15,19).

facing death (almost) fully abandoned. Yet, remembering the persons known from Romans highlights the probable breadth and density of the Roman network at any given time.

What matters most is that Paul and Timothy, as well as people like Onesiphorus, Luke, Mark, Titus, Demas and Crescens are emblematic figures who remind of the links between believers in Rome, Ephesus and the various other areas mentioned earlier.[57] This creates a significant interconnectedness between networks separated by long distance. And while this is not explicitly stated, it would be entirely unrealistic to imagine that only the friends of Paul in Rome and Ephesus could be connected, whereas the Ephesians labelled as antagonists and foes could not have been linked to the Roman believers. Why should we imagine that (people like) Hymenaeus and Philetus, Hermogenes and Phygelus or Alexander did not have acquaintances between the brothers and sisters in Rome?

The picture may be further complicated by asking about Paul's potential foes in Rome. For some reason, 2 Timothy does not mention any such characters. Demas, for the worst, has abandoned Paul, but is not portrayed as his enemy. Yet, a look at Rom 16,17–20 reminds of those whom the historical Paul regarded as opponents, who had taught a flawed doctrine and created divisions. In 2 Timothy the battlefield between orthodoxy and heresy seems thus to have moved entirely to Ephesus. Rome is dominated by the lofty person of the Apostle, yet another unlikely representation of the Roman communities.

Peripheral (?) networks

In spite of its importance in the Pauline mission, Corinth appears only marginally in 2 Timothy, in a fleeting reference to Erastus who remained in the city (4,20; an intertextual allusion to Rom 16,23). But to a competent reader the names of Prisca, Aquila and Erastus may also evoke Corinth as another significant network, comprising all those who have stayed in the city: Titus (cf. 2 Corinthians), Apollos (1 Cor 3,4-6; 16,12), Crispus, Gaius and the household of Stephanas (1 Cor 1,14-16, Rom 16,23), as well as Timothy, Lucius, Jason, Sosipater, Tertius and Quartus (Rom 16,21-22).

---

[57] Luke, Mark and Demas are taken from Phlm 24 and Col 4,14. For some reason, Aristarchus and Ephaphras (Phlm 23–24) are omitted.

The brief references to Titus travelling to Dalmatia and Crescens to Galatia, meant to emphasise the breadth of the Pauline mission, continued now by his faithful collaborators, point indirectly to further networks. These characters seem to function as weak links widening even more the net of connections. Crescens, otherwise unknown, is connected to one of the major areas of Pauline mission.[58] Conversely, a major character, Titus is dispatched to Dalmatia, a territory not mentioned elsewhere under this name. 'Dalmatia' probably conjures up Paul's mission up to Illyricum (Rom 15,19).[59] (The changed designation may reflect the division of the province of Illyricum into Dalmatia in the South and Pannonia in the North.[60]) Demas' flight to Thessalonica evokes another important network of the Christ-cult.

It is not difficult to imagine that at the turn of the century numerous connections existed between Corinth, Ephesus and Rome, but also the cities of Galatia, Macedonia and perhaps as far as Dalmatia. These links hardly respected the boundaries between friends and opponents of Paul.

It would be quite impressive to visualise all the names linked to different regions as nodes sharing various connections within a network (even when some of these characters may be fictitious, and, in the same time, we ignore so many

---

[58] However, THEOBALD seems to prefer the variant reading "Gallia", preserved in the ℵ and C (*Israel-Vergessenheit*, 206–207, following Timo GLASER, *Paulus als Briefroman erzählt. Studien zum antiken Briefroman und seiner christlichen Rezeption in den Pastoralbriefen* (NTOA 76), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009, 254. WEISER, conversely, thinks that the *v.l.* is not well attested (*Der zweite Brief an Timotheus*, 318, n. 9).

[59] WEISER, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 318, n. 10; OBERLINNER, *2. Timotheusbrief*, 169. Conversely, THEOBALD assumes that since the author knew a shorter version of Romans, the reference to Dalmatia would not rely on Rom 15.19: *Israel-Vergessenheit*, 207–208; also 146–151.

[60] The date of the division of Roman Illyricum is disputed. Daniel DZINO favours an early Tiberian period, but notes that Pannonia was still called Illyricum in 60 (*Illyricum in Roman Politics 229 BC–AD 68*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 159-160). Marjeta ŠAŠEL-KOS argues that the two parts were "officially called Dalmatia and Pannonia at the latest under Vespasian": "Illyria and Illyrians", *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah09128; see also her "Pannonia or Lower Illyricum?", *Tyche. Beitrage zur Alten Geschichte, Paryrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (2010) 123–130. It would be interesting to know whether the shift from Illyricum (Rom 15.19) to Dalmatia (2 Tim 4.10) reflects awareness of the changing name.

other names of real people). Individuals like those named here – as residents or as travellers, created a vast social network, which had a major role in transmitting versions of the Gospel through local as well as translocal links.

Conclusion

The antagonistic discourse of 2 Timothy splits the community into two camps. The orthodox, truthful leaders and believers should have nothing to share with those labelled as heterodox: the latter are portrayed as sinners, as opponents and enemies of Paul and of the Gospel. By emphasising the strong links between Paul, Timothy, and friends, the author aims to create closed and stable clusters (cliques). Emphasis on cohesion strengthens group identity,[61] further consolidated by the refusal of ties with those depicted as dangerous outsiders. However, both the friends and the antagonists of Paul and Timothy in Ephesus and elsewhere, far from belonging to impermeable camps, shared many more connections than the author would allow. Physical proximity, multiplex social relations – shared family, neighbourhood, or occupational ties, worship, and commensality – created opportunities for interaction and exchange. Early groups of Christ-believers necessarily included members with weak ties bridging the gap between various clusters, responsible for shaping networks more akin to a small world, allowing for interactions across partisan lines and for more inclusive forms of identity. No doubt, they also facilitated the diffusion of ideas and different perspectives on faith matters.

The geographic perspective shows that weak ties were also decisive in connecting networks in different cities, constructing a large geographic network stretching between Ephesus, Troas, Miletus, Thessalonica, Rome, Corinth and the cities of Galatia and Dalmatia and elsewhere, turning the Empire itself into a small world.

Polemical texts blur the distinction between an antagonising discourse and a more complex reality where people do not belong to strictly separated, impermeable groups, but may be bound by ties across camps. To be sure, discourse is able to produce a divisive reality: to put it in network terminology, it may induce percolation and a phase transition from a connected network to fragmented, un-

---

[61] On the relationship between group identity and strong ties: Collar, "Network Theory", 151.

connected groups. Words matter. They have the power to bring people together or to divide.

Bibliography

Adams, Edward, *The Earliest Christian Meeting Places – Almost Exclusively Houses?*, London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Barabási, Albert-László, *Linked. The New Science of Networks*, Cambridge, MA: Perseus, 2002.

Barabási, Albert-László, with Márton Pósfai, *Network Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Borgatti, Stephen P., Virginie Lopez-Kidwell, "Network Theory", *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*, ed. John Scott and Peter J. Carrington, Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, 2011, 40–54.

Collar, Anna, "Network Theory and Religious Innovation", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22.1 (2007) 149–162.

Collins, Raymond F., *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary* (NTL), Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

DeSilva, David A., *A Week in the Life of Ephesus*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2020.

Dibelius, Martin, Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

du Toit, Andrie, "Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography", in *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. Du Toit, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007, 45–56.

Dzino, Daniel, *Illyricum in Roman Politics 229 BC–AD 68*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Feuser, Stefan, "The Roman Harbour of Alexandria Troas, Turkey", *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 40.2 (2010) 256–273.

Fiore, Benjamin, *The Pastoral Epistles* (SP 12), Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.

Granovetter, Mark S., "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited", *Sociological Theory* 1 (1983) 201–33.

Granovetter, Mark S., "The Strength of Weak Ties", *American Journal of Sociology* 78.6 (1973) 1360–1380.

Horrell, David G., "Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre", *NTS* 50 (2004) 349–369.

Karris, Robert J., "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles", *JBL* 92.4 (1973) 549–564.

Kloppenborg, John S., "Recruitment to Elective Cults: Network Structure and Ecology", *NTS* 66 (2020) 323–350.

Kloppenborg, John S., "Social Networks and the Dissemination of Elective Cults", Early Christianity 10.2 (2019) 121–156.

Kloppenborg, John S., *Christ's Associations. Connecting and Belonging in the Ancient City*, New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 2019.

Lampe, Peter, From *Paul to Valentinus. Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003.

Liefeld, Walter L., *1 & 2 Timothy, Titus*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999.

Lieu, Judith M., *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Marshall, I. Howard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (ICC), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

Mouffe, Chantal, "Democratic Politics and Conflict: An Agonistic Approach", *Política común* 9 (2016) http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/pc.12322227.0009.011.

Mouffe, Chantal, *Agonistik. Die Welt politisch denken*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, ²2016, 21–43.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983.

Oberlinner, Lorenz, *Die Pastoralbriefe* II. *Kommentar zum zweiten Timotheusbrief* (HThKNT XI/2); Freiburg: Herder, 1995.

Robinson, Thomas A., *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*, Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1988.

Roloff, Jürgen, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XV), Zürich: Benzinger / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988.

Šašel-Kos, Marjeta, "Illyria and Illyrians", *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah09128.

Šašel-Kos, Marjeta, "Pannonia or Lower Illyricum?", *Tyche. Beitrage zur Alten Geschichte, Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (2010) 123–130.

Schwertheim, Elmar, "Die Beinahe-Hauptstadt des Römischen Reiches: Neue Forschungen und Ausgrabungen in Alexandreia Troas (Türkei) erhellen die Geschichte der antiken Stadt", *Antike Welt* 36.4 (2005) 63–68.

Smith, Dennis E., From Symposium to Eucharist. The Banquet in the Early Christian World (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2003).

Spicq, Ceslas, *Épîtres pastorales* I–II, Paris: Gabalda, 1969.

Stark, Rodney, William Sims Bainbridge, "Networks of Faith: Interpersonal Bonds and Recruitment to Cults and Sects", *AJS* 85.6 (1980) 1376–1395.

Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Brief an die Römer*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Tellbe, Mikael, *Christ-believers in Ephesus: A Textual Analysis of Early Christian Identity Formation in a Local Perspective* (WUNT 2.242), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Theobald, Michael, *Israel-Vergessenheit in den Pastoralbriefen. Ein neuer Vorschlag zu ihrer historisch-theologischen Verortung im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ignatius-Briefe* (SBS 229), Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2016.

Trebilco, Paul, "Studying "Fractionation" in Earliest Christianity in Rome and Ephesus", in *Reflections on the Early Christian History of Religion – Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 81), ed. Cilliers Breytenbach, Jörg Frey, Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Verbrugge, Lois M., "Multiplexity in Adult Friendships", *Social Forces* 57.4 (1979) 1286–1309.

Watts, Duncan J., Steven H. Strogatz, "Collective Dynamics of "Small-World" Networks", *Nature* 393 (1998) 440–442.

Weiser, Alfons, *Der zweite Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XVI/1), Düsseldorf: Benzinger / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003.

Witetscheck, Stefan, *Ephesische Enthüllungen 1. Frühe Christen in einer antiken Großstadt. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach den Kontexten der Johannesapokalypse* (BiTS), Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

Zamfir, Korinna, "'Beware of him, for he strongly opposed our message!' in Antagonisms and Identity-Construction in 2 Timothy", in *Antagonismen in neutestamentlichen Schriften. Studien zur Neuformulierung der "Gegnerfrage" jenseits des Historismus* (Beyond Historicism – New Testament Studies Today), ed. Stefan Alkier, Leiden: Brill, 2021), 162–173.

EIN BISCHOF WIRD ABT UND ERHÄLT ERST DAMIT EINE HERDE (SC 41)
EINIGE BESONDERHEITEN DER WAHL VON ASZTRIK VÁRSZEGI OSB ZUM ERZABT VON PANNONHALMA AUS LITURGIE-EKKLESIO-LOGISCHER SICHT

Norbert Nagy[1]

Abstract. The Benedictine monks of Pannonhalma (Hungary) decided 1991 to elect as their new Archabbot the then Auxiliary Bishop Asztrik Várszegi OSB of Esztergom-Budapest. With this extraordinary move we can witness how a (Titular) Bishop without pastoral jurisdiction receives his own flock (SC 41) by being elected to lead Hungary's oldest monastery and only Territorial Abbey. This paper presents some remarkable liturgical and ecclesiological aspects of the liturgy, in which Bishop Asztrik was introduced as new Archabbot and Ordinary of his local Church. Also interesting is the fact, that he was elected by members of the Order with a solemn vow, both clerics and lay brothers, and later confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff. For the synodal process, initiated by Pope Francis, the way of selecting bishops is a key theme. Bishop Asztrik's election and appointment could be a striking example for how lay people in the future can get a more active and direct role in selecting their shepherds.
Keywords: Bishop, titular bishop, abbot, shepherd, local church, territorial abbey, Pannonhalma, ecclesiology, synodality, (s)election of bishops, *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, *Pontificale Romanum*, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

Die Liturgiekonstitution des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils bezeichnet den Bischof als «Hohenpriester seiner Herde, von dem das Leben seiner Gläubigen in Christus gewissermaßen ausgeht und abhängt». Mit Herde ist an dieser Stelle «das Bistum, in dessen Mittelpunkt der Bischof steht» gemeint, bzw. «das heilige Gottesvolk», das als Kirche «auf eine vorzügliche Weise dann sichtbar wird», wenn es «voll und tätig [...] an derselben Eucharistiefeier» teilnimmt, in der den

---

[1]   Norbert Nagy, Theologe, Katholische Kirche im Kanton Zürich, Schweiz. Kontakt: norbert.nagy@gmx.ch.

Vorsitz der Bischof hat, der wiederum von «seinem Presbyterium und den Dienern des Altars» umgeben ist (SC 41).[2]

Gilt dieses liturgie-ekklesiologische Konstrukt des Konzils, das auch als Maßstab für die Einheit der Ortskirche wirken soll, für alle Bischöfe? Die Frage ist insofern interessant, weil es Bischöfe gibt, die zwar «mit der Fülle des Weihesakramentes ausgezeichnet» (LG 28) sind, trotzdem über keine Herde verfügen. Zu dieser Gruppe von «Hohenpriestern» gehören die Titular(erz-)bischöfe, die meistens als Weihbischöfe in einem Bistum oder als Mitarbeiter der römischen Kurie tätig sind. Im Folgenden wird ein besonderer Fall dargestellt, in dem ein Titularbischof eine Herde erhält, diese aber in einer ganz außergewöhnlichen Weise. Es handelt sich um Asztrik Várszegi OSB[3], den 86. Erzabt von Pannonhalma (1991–2018), dem ältesten Kloster Ungarns.

Bischöfe werden nicht selten aus den Reihen der Ordensleute ernannt.[4] Es gibt auch zahlreiche Beispiele dafür, dass Äbte zum bischöflichen Dienst in der

---

[2] Vgl. *Dokumente zur Erneuerung der Liturgie [DEL]* Bd. 1: *Dokumente des Apostolischen Stuhls 1963–1997,* hg. von Heinrich RENNINGS unter Mitarbeit von Martin KLÖCKENER. 2., um Aktualisierungen ergänzte Auflage, Kevelaer – Fribourg: Butzon & Becker, 2002, Nr. 41.

[3] Asztrik Várszegi wurde als Imre Várszegi 1946 in Sopron geboren. Er trat 1964 in das 996 gegründete Benediktinerkloster von Pannonhalma ein und studierte dort Theologie. 1971 wurde er zum Priester geweiht. Von 1978 bis 1986 war er Magister und Präfekt der Novizen, ab 1985 Prior von Pannonhalma. Am 23. Dezember 1988 ernannte ihn Papst Johannes Paul II. zum Titularbischof von Culusi und zum Weihbischof im Erzbistum Esztergom-Budapest. Er empfing die Bischofsweihe am 11. Februar 1989. Am 5. Januar 1991 wurde er vom Konvent des Klosters zum Erzabt und damit zum Ordinarius der Gebietsabtei von Pannonhalma gewählt. Seine Wahl wurde von Papst Johannes Paul II. bestätigt, der ihn mit einer apostolischen Bulle zum Ordinarius der Gebietsabtei ernannte. Die feierliche Einsetzung als Erzabt fand am 27. August 1991 in der Abteikirche statt. Er bekleidete beide Ämter bis zu seiner Emeritierung im Jahr 2018. Vgl. *Curriculum vitae*, in *Episcopus, Archiabbas benedictinus, historicus ecclesiae. Tanulmányok Várszegi Asztrik 70. születésnapjára* [FS zum 70. Geburtstag von Erzabt Asztrik Várszegi] (METEM 85), hg. von Ádám Somorjai, István Zombori, Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, 2016, 601–602.

[4] Aus dem schweizerischen Kontext ist der Fall des Dominikaners Charles Morerod beispielhaft dafür, der das westschweizerische Bistum Lausanne-Genf-Freiburg seit 2011 als Diözesanbischof leitet.

Kirche berufen werden.[5] Kaum sind jedoch in der Kirchengeschichte der Neuzeit solche Fälle bekannt, wie jener von Bischof Asztrik Várszegi OSB. Die Besonderheit der Laufbahn dieses Benediktiners von Pannonhalma[6] besteht in der außergewöhnlichen Reihenfolge seiner Ämter und Dienste, welche jeweils ganz unterschiedliche ekklesiologische Fragen aufwerfen. Zum einen ist die Tatsache interessant, dass Weihbischof Asztrik auch nach seiner Ernennung zum Ordinarius einer Ortskirche Titularbischof geblieben ist. Zum anderen lohnt es sich die Wahl, bzw. die *Postulatio*[7] an sich, näher anzuschauen, denn an dieser waren nebst Ordenspriester (Kleriker) auch Ordensbrüder (Laien) beteiligt. Schließlich zeigt aus liturgiewissenschaftlicher Perspektive auch die Einsetzungsfeier, die in Rahmen dieser Studie kurz dargestellt wird, einige Besonderheiten auf. Wie kam es zu diesem wahren liturgie-ekklesiologischen und kirchenrechtlichen Unikat der neueren Kirchengeschichte?

Am 23. Dezember 1988 wurde der Benediktinerpater Asztrik Várszegi von Papst Johannes Paul II. zum Weihbischof in dem von Kardinal László Paskai OFM (1927–2015) geleiteten Erzbistum Esztergom-Budapest ernannt. Als Titularbistum wurde ihm die ehemalige west-afrikanische Diözese Culusi zugewiesen, die in der Antike in der römischen Provinz *Africa proconsularis* lag und zur Kirchenprovinz Karthago gehörte. Eine Bischofsernennung, die zwar für die Kirchengeschichte Ungarns im Zusammenhang mit dem bevorstehenden Fall des Eisernen Vorhangs

---

[5] Hierfür können als schweizerische Beispiele aus der Gegenwart der Benediktinermönch von Uznach, Marian Eleganti, der von 1999 bis zu seiner Ernennung als Weibischof des Bistums Chur in 2009 Abt seiner Klostergemeinschaft war, und der ehemalige Augustinerprobst der Kongregation vom Grossen Sankt Bernhard Jean-Marie Lovey, der seit 2014 Diözesanbischof des Bistums Sitten ist, genannt werden.

[6] Zur Geschichte des Klosters und der Wahl der Äbte von Pannonhalma: Johannes-Gábriel Hatala-Pataky, *Zur Geschichte der Entstehung der besonderen Rechtsstellung der Gebietsabtei von Pannonhalma innerhalb der ungarischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis heute. Ein rechtsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Darstellung der Entwicklung der besonderen Privilegien der Erzabtei von Pannonhalma*, Wien, 1996; Asztrik Várszegi, „Die Wahl des Erzabtes bei den ungarischen Benediktinern im 20. Jahrhundert", *Erbe und Auftrag* 94 (2018) 167–178; ders., „Pannonhalma: die Rolle eines ungarischen Klosters", *Ost-West* 21 (2020) 55–62.

[7] Da Asztrik Várszegi im Zeitpunkt der Wahl zum Erzabt Bischof und nicht mehr Mitglied des Konvents von Pannonhalma war, wurde beim Heiligen Stuhl in Form einer Postulation um seine Ernennung zum Erzabt gebeten.

in Ostmitteleuropa ein wichtiges Ereignis darstellte, ist Jahrzehnte später im Rahmen dieser Studie aus einem anderen Grund erwähnenswert. Denn einige Jahre nach seiner Bischofsweihe wurde Várszegi nach dem Rücktritt des damaligen Erzabtes András Szennay (1921–2012) als Titularbischof von Culusi und Weihbischof des Erzbistums Esztergom-Budapest, als ein Hoherpriester *ohne* Herde, in einem aussergewöhnlichen Schritt im Jahr 1991 zum Abt seines ehemaligen Klosters, von dem er sich bereits infolge seiner Ernennung zum Weihbischof verabschiedet hatte, gewählt, bzw. postuliert. Da aber Pannonhalma nicht nur die älteste Benediktinerabtei der ungarischen Benediktinerkongregation ist, sondern seit 1803 als Gebietsabtei den anderen Bistümern gleichgestellt ist[8], leitet der jeweilige Erzabt diese kleine Diözese als Ordinarius und ist Hoherpriester seiner Herde (SC 41), einer Teilkirche, die gegenwärtig fünfzehn Pfarreien umfasst und somit die grösste Gebietsabtei der katholischen Kirche ist.[9]

Nach der Wahl von Bischof Várszegi zum neuen Abt der Benediktiner von Pannonhalma, eine Wahl, an der sich alle Mitglieder der Gemeinschaft mit ewiger Profess, Kleriker und Laien, beteiligt hatten, stellte sich die Frage, in welcher Form, wenn überhaupt, eine Abtsweihe stattfinden sollte. Schließlich handelte es sich um einen Bischof, der «mit der Fülle des Weihesakramentes ausgezeichnet» (LG 26) war, der nun den neuen Abt des Klosters stellte. Für eine solche Variante gab es im *Ordo benedictionis abbatis* keine Hinweise. Im Zuge der Vorbereitung auf die Feier ließ man sich vom *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* inspirieren, dessen VII. Kapitel auch den Fall regelt, wenn ein Bischof seinen Dienst in einem anderen Bistum weiterführt. Da er bereits geweiht wurde, wurde selbstverständlich die Ordination nicht wiederholt, aber der Abschnitt *De Episcopi receptione in sua cathedrali ecclesia* sieht eine Empfangnahme in seiner neuen Kathedrale im Rahmen einer feierlichen Bischofsmesse vor.[10]

---

8   Mehr dazu im Beitrag von Johan Ickx, „A Pannonhalmi Szent Márton Apátság Főapátjának privilégiumai. Vatikáni levéltári iratok az 1802. évi visszaállításhoz", in *Episcopus, Archiabbas benedictinus, historicus ecclesiae. Tanulmányok Várszegi Asztrik 70. születésnapjára* [FS zum 70. Geburtstag von Erzabt Asztrik Várszegi] (METEM 85), Hg. von Ádám Somorjai, István Zombori, Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, 2016, 63–82.

9   Vgl. *Annuario Pontificio*, Vatikanstadt, 2019, 1016.

10 *Caeremoniale Episcoporum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatum*, Editio typica, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1984, 1141–1148, 268–269.

Analog zu dieser Liturgie wurde die Einsetzung von Bischof Várszegi zum 86. Abt von Pannonhalma als *De receptione abbatis territorialis Sancti Martini in Monte Pannoniae* konzipiert und fand am 27. August 1991 in der Abteikirche statt. In dieser Feier spielten drei liturgische Akteure eine zentrale Rolle: der emeritierte Erzabt András Szennay, der die Homilie hielt und dem neuen Erzabt die Benediktsregel und den Hirtenstab überreichte, der damalige Apostolische Nuntius in Ungarn, Erzbischof Angelo Acerbi, der der *benedictio abbatis* vorstand und einen Ring Bischof Várszegi übergab, sowie Asztrik Várszegi, der als neuer «Hohepriester seiner Herde» der Feier als Hauptzelebrant vorstand. Da Pannonhalma als Gebietsabtei exempt ist, d. h. keinem anderen (Erz-)Bistum unterstellt ist, war die Anwesenheit des Nuntius als Ausdruck der direkten Verbundenheit mit Rom zu verstehen. Die Allerheiligenlitanei wurde weggelassen. Eine Überreichung der Mitra war ebenfalls nicht vorgesehen, da Erzabt Várszegi bereits bei seiner Bischofsweihe die Mitra übertragen wurde. Nach der Übergabe des Hirtenstabes nahm er den Sitz des Vorstehers ein und leitete im Einklang mit den Vorschriften für Feier der Abtsweihe[11] als Hauptzelebrant die Eucharistiefeier.

Untersucht man den Ablauf dieser Feier aus liturgie-ekklesiologischer Perspektive, so fallen einige Dinge auf. Zwar beinhaltet der *Ordo benedictionis abbatis et abbatissae* einige Hinweise für den Fall, dass ein Abt einer Gebietsabtei benediziert wird, jedoch schweigt das Pontifikale an dieser Stelle zur Rolle des abtretenden Abtes, der diese Ortskirche als Ordinarius geleitet hatte. Bei der liturgischen Feier der Einsetzung von Erzabt Várszegi war es sein Vorgänger, Erzabt Szennay, der ihm den Hirtenstab überreichte und nicht etwa der Nuntius, dem jedoch trotzdem eine erhebliche Rolle in der Feier zukam. Diese Lösung des Miteinbezugs des scheidenden Erzabtes in die Feier ist positiv zu bewerten. Der emeritierte Erzabt und Ordinarius übergibt seinem Nachfolger den Hirtenstab und damit zeichenhaft seine Jurisdiktion über die Klostergemeinschaft und die Gebietsabtei.

Bei der weiteren Untersuchung der Liturgie vom 27. August 1991 fällt auch ein begründungswürdiges Element auf. Nach dem von Nuntius Acerbi vorgetragenen Gebet über den neuen Erzabt, welches der zweiten *Oratio* aus dem *Ordo bene-*

---

[11] Vgl. *Pontificale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum, auctoritate Pauli PP VI promulgatum. Ordo benedictionis abbatis et abbatissae.* Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970, 28, 18.

dictionis abbatis et abbatissae[12] entsprach, wurde nicht wie vorgesehen zuerst die Benediktsregel überreicht, sondern ein Ring. Nicht nur die verkehrte Reihenfolge ist fragwürdig, sondern auch die Überreichung des Ringes wirft im Fall eines geweihten Bischofs Fragen auf. Vergleicht man diese Feier mit der Einführung eines Bischofs oder Weihbischofs als Diözesanbischof in einem neuen Bistum, findet man keine Wiederholung der Ringüberreichung, da diese bereits in der Feier der Bischofsweihe enthalten ist. Nur der Hirtenstab wird übergeben, der Ring jedoch nicht. Weihbischof Várszegi erhielt ebenfalls einen Ring bei seiner Bischofsweihe, den die Bischöfe als «Zeichen deiner Treue» tragen und sich dabei verpflichten «die Braut Christi, die Kirche vor jedem Schaden [zu] bewahren»[13]. Da an dieser Stelle offensichtlich die universale Kirche und nicht nur eine konkrete Ortskirche gemeint ist, ist aus dieser Sicht heraus eine Übergabe eines zweiten Ringes im Fall von Bischof Várszegi als neuer Erzabt und Ordinarius einer Gebietsabtei überflüssig gewesen. Allein die feierliche Übergabe des Hirtenstabes durch den Vorgänger in diesem Amt wäre hinreichend und ekklesiologisch betrachtet genügend gewesen.

Schließlich soll noch auf einen Punkt aufmerksam gemacht werden, der ebenfalls zur Komplexität der Wahl eines Bischofs zum Erzabt bzw. Ordinarius einer Gebietsabtei gehört. Übernimmt ein Titularbischof die Leitung einer Ortskirche, wird sein Titularsitz vakant, da er nun den Sitz einer anderen (nichttitularen) Diözese innehat. Im Fall des damaligen Weihbischofs von Esztergom-Budapest und Titularbischofs von Culusi, Asztrik Várszegi, konnte diese übliche Vorgehensweise nicht umgesetzt werden. Er wurde als Titularbischof von Culusi zum Erzabt gewählt und mit einer apostolischen Bulle von Johannes Paul II. zum Ordinarius der Gebietsabtei von Pannonhalma ernannt. Da aber sein eigentliches Jurisdiktionsgebiet, die Territorialabtei Pannohalma, kein Bischofssitz war, konnte er als geweihter Bischof seinen Titularsitz von Culusi beibehalten und zudem Ordinarius der Gebietsabtei werden. Dieser Aspekt spielte auch später

---

[12] Vgl. *Ordo benedictionis abbatis et abbatissae*, 51, 26.

13 Vgl. *Pontificale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II reno¬vatum, auctoritate Pauli PP. VI editum, Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum. De ordina¬tione episcopi, presbyterorum et diaconorum.* Editio typica altera, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1990, 1, 1. Deutscher Text: *Die Weihe des Bischofs, der Priester und der Diakone. Pontifikale* Bd. 1. (Pastoralliturgische Reihe in Verbindung mit der Zeitschrift «Gottesdienst»), Hg. von den Liturgischen Instituten Salzburg – Trier – Zürich – Freiburg, 1994, 42, 44.

eine wesentliche, sakramententheologische Rolle, z. B. bei der Weihe der Diakone und Priester seiner Gebietsabtei. Andere Territorialäbte, die keine Bischofsweihe erhalten, müssen für diese Feier einen Bischof bitten, da sie selbst kein Weihevollmacht haben, auch wenn sie Ordinarien einer Ortskirche sind. Erzabt und Titularbischof Várszegi hingegen konnte als Ordinarius seine Kandidaten für die Diakonen- und Priesterweihe nicht nur ausbilden lassen, sondern ihnen das Sakrament der Ordination auch spenden, eine weitere Besonderheit, die sich in diesem Fall hervortut.

Was diese Wahl, bzw. *Postulatio* zu einem seltenen und ekklesiologisch gesehen durchaus interessanten Fall in der neueren Kirchengeschichte machte, war einerseits, dass ein Bischof zum Abt gewählt wurde (und nicht umgekehrt), und andererseits die Tatsache, dass sich an der Wahl gemäß der benediktinischen Tradition, alle Mönche mit ewiger Profess beteiligen konnten, sowohl Kleriker als auch Laien. Somit wurde ein neuer Erzabt, der aber auch Ordinarius einer Ortskirche ist, von Ordensmitgliedern, die nicht dem Klerikerstand angehörten, rechtmäßig mitgewählt. Der Kandidat war sogar ein Titularbischof, ein Hoherpriester *ohne* Herde, der nun nach seiner Wahl zum Erzabt und durch das päpstliche Mandat zum «Hohenpriester (s)einer Herde» (SC 41) wurde.

Im Rahmen des von Papst Franziskus anfangs Oktober 2021 angestoßenen synodalen Prozesses wird oft über das Auswahlverfahren der Bischöfe diskutiert und nach neuen Wegen gesucht. Die Wahl und Ernennung von Asztrik Várszegi zum Erzabt und Ordinarius der Gebietsabtei Pannonhalma zeigt, dass es eine breitere Beteiligung des Gottesvolkes in ein solches Verfahren durchaus möglich ist. Abgesehen von der Eigenart des Falls Várszegi, dieser könnte ein Modell für ein neues Verhältnis zwischen Hirten und Herde in der Kirche der unmittelbaren Zukunft sein. Denn die Aussage der Liturgiekonstitution zur Rolle des Bischofs im Leben der Ortskirche, von dem «das Leben seiner Gläubigen in Christus gewissermaßen ausgeht und abhängt» (SC 41) bedingt eine Neuausrichtung des Auswahlverfahrens der Bischöfe. Ganz im Sinne der Synodalität sollte künftig der Einbezug der Stimmen der «Gläubigen», also des Gottesvolkes, einer Ortskirche, in den Prozess der Bischofsernennungen, ermöglicht werden. Eine breitere Beteiligung der Gottesvolkes würde nicht nur zu einer grösseren Akzeptanz der neuernannten Bischöfe, sondern zu einer veränderten und aus sakramententheologischer und liturgie-ekklesiologischer Perspektive verbesserten Wahrnehmung ihrer Gestalt im Leben «ihrer Herde» führen. Bischöfe, die in Bistümern

oft als Funktionäre und hohe Würdenträger wahrgenommen werden, könnten viel mehr als «Hohepriester» (*Pontifex maximus* / Brückenbauer) und als Hirten in Erscheinung treten.

Bibliographie

Annuario Pontificio, Vatikanstadt, 2019.

Caeremoniale Episcoporum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatum. Editio typica, Vatikanstadt: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1984.

De ordinatione episcopi, presbyterorum et diaconorum. Editio typica altera, Vatikanstadt: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1990.

Die Weihe des Bischofs, der Priester und der Diakone. Pontifikale Bd. 1, hg. von den Liturgischen Instituten Salzburg – Trier – Zürich (Pastoralliturgische Reihe in Verbindung mit der Zeitschrift «Gottesdienst»), Freiburg, 1994.

Pontificale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum, auctoritate Pauli PP VI promulgatum. Ordo benedictionis abbatis et abbatissae, Vatikanstadt: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970.

Pontificale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II renovatum, auctoritate Pauli PP. VI editum, Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum. De ordinatione episcopi, presbyterorum et diaconorum. Editio typica altera, Vatikanstadt: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 199.

Dokumente zur Erneuerung der Liturgie. Bd. 1: *Dokumente des Apostolischen Stuhls 1963–1997,* hg. von Heinrich Rennings unter Mitarbeit von Martin Klöckener, 2., um Aktualisierungen ergänzte Auflage, Kevelaer – Fribourg: Butzon & Bercker, 2002.

Hatala-Pataky, Johannes-Gábriel, *Zur Geschichte der Entstehung der besonderen Rechtsstellung der Gebietsabtei von Pannonhalma innerhalb der ungarischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis heute. Ein rechtsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Darstellung der Entwicklung der besonderen Privilegien der Erzabtei von Pannonhalma*, Wien, 1996.

Várszegi Asztrik, „Die Wahl des Erzabtes bei den ungarischen Benediktinern im 20. Jahrhundert", *Erbe und Auftrag* 94 (2018) 167–178.

Várszegi Asztrik, „Pannonhalma: die Rolle eines ungarischen Klosters", *Ost-West* 21 (2020) 55–62.

Johan Ickx, „A Pannonhalmi Szent Márton Apátság Főapátjának privilégiumai. Vatikáni levéltári iratok az 1802. évi visszaállításhoz", in *Episcopus, Archiabbas*

benedictinus, historicus ecclesiae. Tanulmányok Várszegi Asztrik 70. születésnapjára [FS zum 70. Geburtstag von Erzabt Asztrik Várszegi] (METEM 85), hg. von Ádám Somorjai, István Zombori, Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, 2016, 63–82.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ALBA IULIA IN THE ROMANIAN ECCLESIAL STRUCTURES IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD

Szabolcs András[1]

Abstract. This paper addresses the changes that took place after World War I in the life of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Alba Iulia led by Bishop Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. This was the only new diocese in Romania to retain all the historical territory it had previously held in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, whereas all others that have suffered significant territorial losses. The Roman Catholic Church in Transylvania was largely ethnically Hungarian. The diocese was thus faced with the challenge of integrating in the Romanian ecclesiastical-administrative structures, while preserving its religious and ethnic characteristics. We are witnessing here the beginning of a "diplomatic game" between the Romanian Government, the Holy See and Bishop Mailáth. The issue at stake for the Roman Catholic Church in Transylvania was the preservation of confessional and ethnic identity in a new political framework. The integration culminated with the signing of the Concordat between Romania and the Holy See in 1927, but the road to the completion of this document is marked by many interesting developments, which provide an insight in the challenges of preserving confessional and ethnic identity while accommodating to new political circumstances and redefining the mission of a Catholic Church belonging to an ethnic minority.
Keywords: Concordat, Holy See, Romania, Bishop Mailáth, Transylvania, Catholic Church, Hungarian minority.

Introduction

The self-understanding and mission of religious institutions is strongly shaped by political realities. I will address this issue on the example of the Roman Catho-

---

[1]   Lecturer, PhD, Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Roman Catholic Theology, and doctoral student at the Population Studies and History of Minorities Doctoral School. Email: andras.szabolcs@ubbcluj.ro.

lic Diocese of Alba Iulia in the aftermath of World War I. This large bishopric, previously part of Hungary under the name of Diocese of Transylvania, was compelled to adapt to the new political and social realities resulting from its integration into Romania.[2] Aside adjustments to the new political framework, the diocese was also required to redefine its identity and mission. In what follows I will explore this process discussing firstly the issues raised by the name of the institution, and then turn to the changes involving the political role of the bishop, largely based on documents from the Archdiocesan Archives of Alba Iulia.

Preliminary considerations

The Roman Catholic Diocese of Alba Iulia developed certain historical particularities worth considering before discussing the way the interwar circumstances shaped the identity and functioning of the institution. These concerned mainly the relationship between the bishop and lay institutions, leading to the increased role of the latter, and emerged in the Principality of Transylvania in the post-Reformation era.[3] Although Transylvanian Catholics represented one of the four recognised denominations (*religio recepta*) and were not formally prohibited to practice their faith, during the Reformed Principality they were deprived of the right to have a bishop.[4] In this ecclesiastical vacuum, the Catholic nobility

---

[2] On the contemporary history of the Diocese of Alba Iulia see Janice Broun, "The Catholic Church in Romania", in *Christianity Under Stress* II: *Catholicism and Politics in Communist Societies*, edited by Pedro Ramet, Durham – London: Duke University Press, 1990, 207–212.

[3] On the Principality of Transylvania: István Keul, *Early Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe: Ethnic Diversity, Denominational Plurality and Corporative Politics in the Principality of Transylvania (1526-1691)* (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 143) (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions), Leiden: Brill, 2009 (from a Protestant perspective),

[4] Károly Veszely, *Erdélyi egyháztörténeti adatok* III. *Erdélynek a XVI és XVII században országgyűlésileg hozott, vallást tárgyazó törvénycikkei*, Kolozsvár, 1860, 240–241; Antonius Jakab, *De hierarchia Ecclesiae Transsylvaniensis tempore principatus (1527–1697)* (doctoral dissertation), Roma: Pontificia Università Lateranense, 2000; Antal Jakab, "Az erdélyi római katolikus püspöki szék betöltésének vitája a 17. században [The Controversy Regarding the Nomination of a Transylvanian Roman-Catholic Bishop in the 17th Century]", *Erdélyi Múzeum* 49 (1944) 5–20; Keul, *Early Modern Religious Communi-*

undertook the responsibility to manage church-related, mostly financial matters, notably through the establishment of the Catholic Status. This institution managed church property and endowments, established and subsidised Catholic schools, and provided for the subsistence of the clergy.[5] The Catholic Status continued to function after the integration of Transylvania into the Habsburg Empire and the restoration of the episcopate. This created a rather particular situation in the Catholic Church, as the bishop administered a significant part of the church property and part of the Catholic schools in partnership with an essentially lay organization. While Rome was not particularly favourable to this model of church management, it nevertheless accepted it. Within the political and ecclesial realities of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the Catholic Church in Transylvania benefited from this model of administration, when the State sought full control over the educational network, confessional schools included.[6] The private nature of the Status limited the powers of the Hungarian State in Transylvania and this led to political controversies between Budapest, Alba Iulia, and Rome. These concerned in particular the oversight of Church-owned property, notably that of forest estates.[7]

In ecclesial circles, this Transylvanian model stirred discussions about the idea of Catholic autonomy that would allow a local church to become independent of state regulations. Such issues provoked intense socio-political debate in Hungarian society.

These precedents show that the position of the Roman Catholic bishop of Transylvania was peculiar. He enjoyed a special status among the bishops even

---

ties, 60–61, 86–87, 129, 149, 178–183, 209–218 (from a markedly Protestant perspective, mentioning only in passing the fact that the Diet of Bistritz, 1610, prohibited Catholics to have a bishop, a condition that lasted up to 1713, and severely restricted Catholic religious practice in several towns).

[5] László Holló, "The Impact of Reformation in the Transylvanian Diocese and the Beginnings of Catholic Revival", *Studia Theologia Catholica Latina* 2 (2019) 35–72.

[6] For a detailed discussion of the role of the Catholic Status in acquiring autonomy: László Holló, "Die Römisch-Katholische Autonomie von Siebenbürgen: Der Siebenbürgische Römisch-Katholische Status", *Studia Theologia Catholica Latina* 2 (2012) 3–24. The Catholic Status functioned up to the mid-20th century under various forms of organization.

[7] Krisztián Tóth, "Az Erdélyi Római Katolikus Státus igazgatótanácsának 1873-as újjáalakulása és dualizmus kori tevékenységi köre", *Studia Theologica Transylvaniensia* 2 (2021) 331–360.

while the province was part of Hungary, and this granted him a certain degree of autonomy from the state. What matters here is not the ethnic nature of the state, but the stance of the bishop in relation to political authorities with a certain political-ideological orientation.[8]

In the interwar period under consideration in this essay, the diocese was led by bishop Gustáv Károly Mailáth. He was not of Transylvanian descent but came from a family of counts from southern Hungary. Nonetheless, as head of the Transylvanian diocese, he strove to defend the particular status of his diocese already prior to 1918, especially in the matter of schools.[9] Hungarian church historians call him the bishop of schools, because even after the Eötvös education reform[10] he struggled to preserve the autonomy of Catholic education and had an important role in founding confessional schools. He continued these efforts after World War I, as well. Thus, the Diocese of Transylvania was headed by a bishop concerned with the social, economic, and educational autonomy of the Church, attempting to limit the interference of the State in the affairs of the Church.

The integration of the Diocese of Transylvanian into the Romanian ecclesiastical structures

In the following, I will briefly examine the integration of the Diocese of Transylvania into the Romanian Catholic Church.[11] To start with, I will address the

---

[8] Gábor Adriányi, *A katolikus egyház története a 20. században Kelet-, Közép-Kelet és Dél-Kelet Európában*, Budapest: Kairosz, 2005, 180.

[9] Mailáth's brief biography see Marton József-Jakabffy Tamás, *Az erdélyi katolicizmus századai,* Kolozsvár: Gloria, 1999, 99–103.

[10] The reform of József Eötvös (1868) modernised the Hungarian education system. Zoltán András Szabó, Imre Garai and András Németh "The History of Education in Hungary from the Mid-Nineteenth Century to Present Day", *Paedagogica Historica* (2022), DOI: 10.1080/00309230.2022.2090849. However, the Church opposed it because it established state control over denominational schools. Kálmán Attila Szabó, "Bevezetés", in Attila Kálmán Szabó (ed.), *Az erdélyi magyar tanító- és óvóképzés évszázadai 1777-2000,* Marosvásárhely: Mentor, 2009, 55–69.

[11] The organisation of the Catholic Church in Romania was closely linked to the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen dynasty. The presence of the Catholic Church in the Orthodox-majority country was important to King Charles I, but it was not until 1883 that the Archdiocese of Bucharest and the Bishopric of Iaşi were established. Ofelia Miloş,

change of the name of the diocese, from that of Transylvania to that of Alba Iulia (after the bishop's residence), based on the documents. The change of the name was politically motivated, as it indicated the intention to break its traditional ties with the Catholic Church of Hungary.

The Diocese of Transylvania was founded by King Stephen of Hungary around 1009. Due to the special status of the province, the diocese was named after the region rather than the episcopal see, and it was subordinate to the Archdiocese of Kalocsa (Hungary).[12] In accordance with this tradition, Károly Gusztáv Mailáth always signed documents as Bishop of Transylvania.

The change in the name of the diocese in the first years following the war was not yet settled. Before the Treaty of Trianon,[13] in a letter to Mailáth, issued on 10 November 1919, the Agrarian Council of Alba County asked him, as Bishop of Alba Iulia, to allot part of the lands of the bishopric to the population to prevent

---

România şi Sfântul Scaun în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea, Doctoral thesis, Cluj-Napoca: Babeş-Bolyai University, 2008, 278 (published: Bucureşti: Expert, 2010).

[12] Konrád Szántó, *A katolikus egyház története* I, Budapest: Ecclesia, 1983, 314. Even after the Treaty of Versailles, the Archbishop of Kalocsa considered it important to deal with Transylvanian affairs, and he intervened by the Archbishop of Esztergom and Rome several times to represent the Transylvanian Catholics. Beke Margit (ed.), *A Magyar Katolikus Püspökkari tanácskozások története és jegyzőkönyvei 1919 – 1944 között* I., München – Budapest: Aurora, 1992, 427.

[13] Hungarian public opinion holds France as such (i.e. the entire French society) responsible for the outcome of the Treaty of Trianon. However, documents from the Archdiocese of Esztergom confirm that French bishops intervened on behalf of Hungary: "Votre Éminence a bien voulu me transmettre une lettre du Cardinal Primat de Hongrie, [qui] vous demande d'intervenir afin d'empêcher si possible le morcellement de la Hongrie, tel qu'il résulterait des dernier accords diplomatique avec Tchécoslovaquie, la Roumanie et l'Autriche. Les représentants du Gouvernement Hongrois sont à Paris pour discuter avec la conférence de la Paix les termes du traité avec la Hongrie. Ils ne manqueront pas de faire valoir les arguments qui peuvent militer en faveur de leur pays, mais il est impossible de revenir sur des accords qui ont reçu la signature des Puissances et dont quelques-uns [sont] déjà exécutés. Pour moi, je serais toujours heureux d'être votre interprète pour qu'il soit tenu compte, dans la mesure du possible, des considérations que son Éminence le Primat de Hongrie a fait valoir auprès de vous". *Letter of Jules Cambon to Léon-Adolphe Amette, Archbishop of Paris*, Archive of the Archbishopric of Esztergom-Budapest (hereafter AAEBp), 672/1920 D/c, 20.01.1920.

a possible uprising.[14] The matter was eventually concluded by the agrarian reform that deprived the diocese of a significant part of its estates.[15]

The inconsistency in the naming of the Diocese and the ambiguity of its relation with the ecclesial structures of Romania persists in the drafts of the Concordat with the Holy See. After the end of the war, the negotiations between Romania and the Holy See concerning a future Concordat,[16] which had begun under Carol I, resumed. Both the bishopric and the Hungarian side[17] followed these

---

[14] *Letter of Agrarian Council of Alba County* in: Archive of the Archbishopric of Alba Iulia (hereafter AAAI), I.13.e. Different documents, 161/919, 13.11.1919.

[15] As a result of the agrarian reform, the Transylvanian bishopric lost a large part of its estates, for which the Hungarian government tried to intercede with the Holy See: „Just recently, I have had enough opportunity to put the anti-Hungarian and anti-church policies of the Romanians in perspective. In connection with the Glattfelder case, I not only handed over the bishop's incriminated pastoral letter, accompanied by appropriate commentary, to both the Secretary of State and Mgr. Borgongini (I also communicated it to several other Cardinals), but I also gave a little lecture on the way in which the Romanians were carrying out the land reform in Transylvania (...) I therefore prepared the ground as best I could for a worthy reception for the Foreign Minister" – wrote ambassador to Vatican József Somssich. *The cause of Gyula Glattfelder bishop of Csanád*, National Archives of Hungary, Documents of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (hereafter NAH), K105, Embassy at Vatican, Box 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 2039/pol., 15.05.1923.

[16] For a thorough discussion of the negotiations for the Concordat and the historical background, see Mózes Nóda, "The Historical, Political and Ecclesiastical Background of the 1927 Concordat between the Vatican and Romania", *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 9.27 (2010) 281–301, id., *Biserica Romano-Catolică din Transilvania în perioada interbelică*, Cluj-Napoca: Studium, 2008.

[17] For a long time, the Hungarian government hoped that the Holy See would use its international influence to restore the Hungarian Church to its pre-war status, thus challenging the Versailles system. This is evidenced by a letter from the Hungarian Ambassador to the Holy See, Somssich, in 1922: „Schioppa nuntius itt van. Néhány nap előtt volt a Szentatyánál audientián. Azt mesélte nekem, hogy az audientia lefolyásával nagyon meg van elégedve, és hogy sok szeretetet és megértést talált a Szentatyánál Magyarország és a magyar ügyek iránt. A nuntius különösen arra helyezett súlyt, hogy az elszakadt részeknek az egyházhoz való viszonylatában minden a régiben maradjon, és azt a benyomást nyerte hogy Ő Szentsége hajlandó a mi ebbeli kívánságunkat a lehetőség szerint teljesíteni." [Nuncio Schioppa is here. A few days ago, he had an audience with the Holy Father. He told me that he was very pleased with the way the audience went and that he

negotiations with great interest. They usually received drafts of the text and commented on them. Here, too, the name and boundaries of the diocese and its place within the Romanian ecclesiastical structure are recurrent topics.

In the first post-war drafts of the Concordat, the diocese appears as Diocesis Transyvaniensis/Alba Iulia, directly subordinated to Rome, alongside that of Csanád (Timişoara), Gran Varadino (Oradea) and Satu Mare, not as suffragan bishopric of the Archdiocese of Bucharest.[18] The opinion written in Italian on the margin of the draft also uses the designations Transylvania and Alba Julia interchangeably; it focuses on the way the diocese could retain its autonomy. Already the draft suggests that the four newly annexed dioceses should be merged, with Timişoara merging with Alba Iulia and Oradea with Satu Mare.[19] This would have had the advantage of extending the ecclesiastical autonomy of the Diocese of Transylvania to that of Timişoara. The Bucharest government endorsed the merger because it resulted in fewer Latin than Greek bishops. The continuation of

---

found a lot of love and understanding for Hungary and Hungarian affairs with the Holy Father. The Nuncio was particularly anxious that everything should remain as it was in the relations of the lost parts with the Church, and he got the impression that His Holiness was willing to fulfil our wishes in this respect as far as possible.] *Msrg. Schioppa római látogatása*, NAH, K105, Embassy at Vatican, Box 35, 1929–1932, 19.01.1922.

[18] The majority of the believers in the Archdiocese of Bucharest were also Hungarian, which caused further tension between the Archbishop of Bucharest and the Bishop of Alba Iulia. *A bukaresti katolikus egyházmegye magyar anyanyelvű híveinek*, NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, Box 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania, 2584/pol., 02.05.1922.

[19] The archival sources indicate that the Hungarian part also raised the idea of merging the truncated bishoprics: "The Hungarian side has asked the Vatican to unite the truncated parts of Oradea and Satu Mare with Csanád under Bishop Glattfelder, but Barcza considers it a bad idea, because it contradicts the view that historical dioceses should be preserved even in truncated form. […] I emphasized very emphatically to Gasparri that this proposal is not prejudicial to our principled position and is merely a challenging de facto solution. This, of course, the Cardinal smilingly acknowledged. Now the situation is that what we asked for has not been granted, because the Vatican will appoint two separate administrators for the two parts in question, but with our proposal we have set a precedent which I believe will be used against us. So we ourselves have given the Vatican a weapon which it will use against us on occasion (quite logically) and we have received nothing." Letter of Ambassador György Barcza to Archbishop János Csiszárik, published by Tusor Péter (ed.) *Magyarország és a római Szentszék (Források és távlatok)*, Róma – Budapest: Gondolat, 2012, 200–201.

the Transylvanian Catholic Status within the Romanian legal framed remained uncertain and required further discussions, notably in relation to questions concerning ecclesiastical property.

In 1921, several versions of the Concordat were drafted. All share the alternating naming of the diocese, the focus on confessional schools and education, and concern for ecclesiastical autonomy. The drafts refer now to different possible mergers of the four annexed dioceses into two. Autonomy concerns mainly the preservation of the Catholic Status and its property, as well as cultural autonomy, probably referring to confessional education. To this end, the Diocese of Transylvania would be subordinated directly to Rome instead of the Archbishopric of Bucharest. The Archdiocese of Esztergom, Hungary also responded to the draft, opposing the transferal of the see of the Greek Catholic Archdiocese from Blaj to Cluj, arguing that the majority of the population did not belong to that denomination, and it also opposed the merger of the four bishoprics.[20]

In the same period, the Inter-confessional Council was established, joining the bishops of the Transylvanian Catholic, Unitarian, and Reformed Churches. The council met a number of times in the 1920s, attempting to act jointly on issues concerning the Hungarian-speaking churches, particularly on education-related matters. Perhaps the most significant result of this initiative was that the Hungarian bishops were able to mobilize the representatives and senators of the Hungarian Party on nationality and church issues. In this respect, the activity of Elemér Gyárfás stands out (I will return to this later on). Both in the Inter-confessional Council and on other occasions, Mailáth stressed that his title was Bishop of Transylvania. In a 1926 letter to Secretary of State Pietro Gasparri[21]

---

[20] The Hungarian government was also opposed to the merger of the bishoprics, and constantly instructed its ambassador to the Vatican to protest by the Holy See against the plans. State Secretary Gasparri denied any such intention. Letter of Somssich to Minister of Foreign Affairs Gusztáv Gratz, NAH, Embassy to Vatican Box 40: 1920–1929, R2 Romania, 135, 25.03.1921.

[21] As a later ambassador's report reveals, the Hungarian government considered Gasparri both pro-French and anti-Hungarian: „From the point of view of the large number of Hungarian Catholics living in neighbouring states, it is very important here to observe and record how the Holy See's relations with the various Petite-Entente states evolve over time and through events. These observations then mirror the Vatican's attitude towards the Hungarian minorities. (…) The Cardinal Secretary of State himself has no small part to play in this. While his predecessor Cardinal Gasparri was decidedly pro-French and

on the status of the Concordat, he explicitly demanded that name of the diocese retained the designation of Transylvania, because the title of Alba Iulia referred to the Greek Catholic Archbishop.

The controversy over the name of the diocese was finally settled by the Concordat in 1927.[22] This established an archdiocese for the Latin rite in Bucharest, with four suffragan bishoprics. The bishopric of Transylvania was now officially designated as the Diocese of Alba Iulia, and it lost jurisdiction over the Armenian Catholic parishes.[23] The Diocese of Timişoara, which resulted from the large Hungarian Diocese of Csanád, retained its autonomy, but the Diocese of Oradea was merged into that of of Satu Mare.

The name change from Diocese of Transylvania to that of Alba Iulia also indicated that the Romanian government did not intend to recognise the autonomy of the Catholic Status and its role in managing the property of this Diocese. With the Concordat a *patrimonium sacrum* was established, which comprised the merged and common property of the Catholic Church of the Latin and Greek rite. The partial autonomy of the Status was restored by the Accord of 1932 the Holy See and Romania.

---

only in the last years of his official activity did, he slowly switch to a more objective approach, his successor Cardinal Pacelli has a completely different mentality. A Szentszék viszonya a Kis-entente államokhoz, NAH, K105 Vatican Documents, Box 35: 1929 – 1932. Kiesentente, 48/pol., 06.05.1932.

[22] The documents of the Hungarian Foreign Ministry testify that Transylvanian Catholics were left out of the final formulation of the Concordat: "The [Transylvanian] delegation will be received by His Holiness this morning, but there will be little political discussion. The delegates have informed me that they do not intend to visit the Romanian Ambassador to the Vatican, Mr Pennescu. I did not inform the delegation that the Romanian Concordat had in fact been signed by both parties and that only the Romanian ratification was needed for its entry into force, nor did I give them the information which Mgr. Borgongini had given me, since the Deputy State Secretary had at the time asked me very emphatically to treat the information he had given me on this subject with the utmost secrecy." – wrote ambassador György Barcza. *Az erdélyi katolikus küldöttsége Rómában*, NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, Box 39: 1920 – 1931. R1 Romania, 779/pol., 8.11.1927.

[23] The bishopric of Gherla was created for the Armenian Catholics, but the attempt failed because the faithful were native Hungarian speakers and insisted on the bishopric of Alba Iulia, so the appointed bishop did not occupy his place.

The renaming of the bishopric of Csanád to that of Timișoara was also related to the division of the former Diocese of Csanád belonging to Hungary into two new dioceses and the removal of bishop Gyula Glattfelder. The Holy See complied with the request of King Ferdinand I that bishop Glattfelder leave Romania, following his protest against the land reform.[24] Glattfelder moved the new see of the Diocese of Csanád to Szeged. De facto this meant that the diocese with the see in Timișoara was a new ecclesial entity.

The merger of the Diocese of Oradea into that of Satu Mare was politically motivated: part of the large property of the former was to be nationalized or redistributed within the Church.

The question of political representation

In addition to the issue of renaming, the question of political representation may also shed light on the integration of the Diocese of Transylvania into the Romanian legal frame and on the way it redefined its mission, to include the political representation of the Hungarian minority. As early as 1925, the idea of Mailáth representing the Hungarians in the Romanian parliament was raised, but at that time the bishop rejected it and recommended Elemér Gyárfás, the lay president of the Catholic Status, for the position.[25]

---

[24] Bishop Gyula Glattfelder protested against the 1921 land reform in a circular letter, and called on the faithful to resist. King Ferdinand, who had previously been on friendly terms with the bishop, took the circular as a personal insult and broke off relations with the bishop. Taking advantage of this, the Romanian government demanded that Glattfelder leave the country. Despite the protests of the Hungarian government, the Holy See agreed to Bucharest's request, and Glattfelder moved his see to Szeged (Hungary). Szabolcs András, "New Details Regarding the Expulsion of Bishop Gyula Glattfelder from Romania", *Studia Theologia Catholica Latina*, 61.1 (2016) 87–98.

[25] „With the death of Senator Géza Szőts, it would be nice if a Catholic man who speaks Romanian well could be elected to Parliament in his place. Who would that be? Are you of legal age to run for office?" *Mailáth's letter to Gyárfás*, AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters, 26.02.1925. In virtue of the stipulations of the 1923-Constitution, Mailáth represented the Roman Catholic Church in the Romanian Parliament as ex officio senator, in his capacity of oldest bishop. In 1925, the debate on the new electoral law began. The Romanian government intended to replace Mailáth with the Archbishop of Bucharest. Mailáth proposed instead that Gyárfás take his place.

The Romanian electoral law provided for the political representation of each Church by a bishop, as senator. In the Roman Catholic Church, according to customary law, the position was supposed to be held by the most senior member of the episcopate, thus Mailáth became senator.[26] However, following his appointment as Archbishop of Bucharest, with the support of the government Alexandru Cisar claimed this right for himself, arguing that he held the highest position in the Romanian Catholic Church. In 1926, the Holy See attempted to settle the matter under customary law.[27]

His intention did not materialise, and Archbishop Cisar became senator in 1926. Gyárfás was elected senator on the list of the Hungarian Party in 1927.

[26] Previously, Mailáth was already a member of the Senate; in this capacity he spoke out on the grievances of the Hungarian community, provoking the disapproval of the government. Archbishop Cisar, conversely, was more in line with the politics of Bucharest. In one of his famous speeches, Mailáth objected to the consequences of the agrarian reform and the educational reform: "The measures of the government so far attacked the basis of our Catholic institutions: based on the Agrarian Law, the state expropriated the estates assigned to their maintenance without providing compensation. Only the Averescu government once gave our secondary schools an aid of 800,000 lei, compared to which we received nearly four million in aid from the state each year. The Catholic Church was ignored everywhere in the allocation of expropriated properties, so much so that although the large estates of the Transylvanian Roman Catholic State were also expropriated, 118 parishes and 71 affiliated churches did not even receive a small part that was due to them by law. Thus, the Catholic churches lost seven and a half thousand acres of land, which they should have received according to the provisions of the agrarian law." Salacz Gábor, *A magyar katolikus egyház a szomszédos államok uralma alatt*, München: Aurora, 1975, 59.

[27] The Secretariat of the Hungarian Embassy at the Holy See also confirmed that the situation was unpleasant for Rome and was therefore treated as an internal matter: "The Office of the Secretary of State has stated that, as regards the relationship between Archbishop Cisar and Bishop Mailáth, it does not consider the former to be the most senior Romanian representative of the Church of Rome, which means, in other words, that despite their title and the rank of archbishop and their seat in Bucharest, the two diocesan princes hold a coordinated position in the eyes of the Holy See. This response was intended to avoid the possibility of invoking the Vatican as an excuse in the event of a possible anti-Mailáth decision by the Bucharest government. Apart from this seemingly neutral but in fact pro-Mailáth statement, no other action was taken by the Office of the Secretary of State, and the senatorial case is here seen as a purely Romanian domestic

Mailáth turned for help to his friend, Elemér Gyárfás, the lay president of the Status, whom he had nominated for senatorship after the death of Géza Szőcs.[28] Gyárfás was elected senator of the National Hungarian Party in 1926. The senatorship of the Transylvanian bishop was questioned in the summer of the same year. "The question arose and became acute" – Gyárfás wrote to Mailáth –, "when Archbishop Cisar petitioned the Minister of Religious Affairs in a letter dated 10 June, to issue a certificate stating that on the basis of the Electoral Law, and in view of the fact that he was the head of more than 1,200,000 Latin Catholics in Romania, he was the highest ranking among the Catholic bishops and as the head of the Catholic Church he was entitled to a senatorial seat."[29] Gyárfás also reported on his negotiations with Vasile Goldiş, minister of religious affairs, who also opposed Cisar's demand, arguing that he did not represent the Catholics, but Rome, but contended that he was entitled to the senatorial seat by virtue of his rank as archbishop. Minister of internal affairs Octavian Goga suggested that obtaining the support of the King might offer Bishop Mailáth a chance to preserve his senatorial seat. Gyárfás also pondered on the political chances of succeeding, provided Mailáth would have been backed by fourteen deputies and senators of the National Hungarian Part and perhaps four or five German deputies.

Mailáth wished to deal the issue privately, avoiding turning it into a subject of public discussion. Gyárfás conversely argued that the only way to influence the government was to acquire public support for the bishop. Mailáth suggested to

---

matter." *The matter of the senatorship of Majláth, Bishop of Transylvania*, NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, Box 39: 1920 – 1931. R1 Romania, 60/pol. 18.09.1926.

[28] Géza Szőcs was first a senator of the Hungarian Party and then of the National Liberal Party.

[29] *Letter Elemér Gyárfás to Mailáth* AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. 16.06.1926. In the letter, Gyárfás also sets out the Minister's response: „Goldis, on the other hand, who was already well acquainted with the issue and was visibly influenced by it, stubbornly insisted on his position that the archbishop was more than the bishop, and that he was therefore obliged to give the archbishop priority over the bishop. To my objection that, if he was so sure, he should put the matter to the nuncio, he replied that it was an internal affair of the Romanian state, and that they could not take delegated authority in the matter of senatorial eligibility." Gyárfás also reports that he has discussed this issue with other ministers, but that the bishop himself has to submit a request to claim the senatorial seat. The government is divided on this issue, which could be a chance for Mailáth.

ask the intervention of the Holy See, who would nominate by the government the person who should be entrusted with the representation of the Catholic Church in Senate after listening to the position of the heads of the Latin Catholic dioceses. "The government also gives Muslims the opportunity to designate a senator themselves (...)", the bishop argued. "For my part, I will also make this proposal to the Holy See through the Nuncio, but I cannot go any further, lest the whole action should appear to be a personal matter."[30] On 30 October 1926, Mailáth submitted a formal request to the Presidency of the Senate to establish that he was entitled to the Senatorial seat on the basis of the Constitution, the Electoral Law and customary law.[31] In December, the bishop was informing the President of the Catholic Status that Prime Minister Ion I.C. Brătianu[32] supported Cisar as senator, but was not opposed to Mailáth becoming a senator on a different legal ground.[33]

---

[30] *Mailáth's letter to Gyárfás,* AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. 17.06.1926.

[31] "(…) by virtue of the rights arising from the old Constitution and in my quality as an eparchial bishop, I was and still am a member by right in the Senate of Romania. The new Constitution modified the old provisions concerning the representation of the confessions in the country's parliament for the future, granting a seat in the senate to the Catholic Church of the Latin rite, for the oldest and largest diocese in rank. But the new constitution did not touch the earned rights and provisions and refers – according to legal principles – only to those bishops, who in the future will enter the senate of the country without depriving of their seat those bishops who already had earned rights […]." *Letter to the President of the Senate,* AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly. Mailáth, a.1. Letters. 30.10.1926.

[32] Ion I.C. Brătianu was a prominent Romanian politician, head of the National Liberal Party, and five times Prime Minister (1909–1910; 1914–1918; 1918–1919; 1922–1926, and 1927).

[33] „For his part, Brătianu considers the Archbishop of Bucharest to be the most suitable person to represent the Latin Church in the Senate as the archbishop of the country's capital, as a quasi-higher-ranking head of the Church. Brătianu, for his part, would like me, as a former senator, to remain on the same seat as the archbishop, and would not object to this, if it could be reconciled with the constitution. (…) I would only do this at the request and appeasement of the minorities, so that we do not neglect any attempt to assert our rights." *Mailáth's letter to Gyárfás,* AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. 03.12.1926.

As much as Mailáth attempted to avoid making his senatorship a matter of public debate, the daily *Cuvântul* reported in a sarcastic article that the irredentist bishop could not preserve his political office, lacking even the support of Rome in the matter: "Our newspaper reported last week that Bishop Mailath, who was 'recovering' in Hungary[34], intervened 'through the usual channels' to be appointed Archbishop of Alba Iulia, with jurisdiction over the Roman Catholic bishops over the mountains [the Carpathians, i.e. from Transylvania]. (...) Following the alarm we sounded, the Romanian government notified the Vatican that it could not approve the plans of Bishop Mailath."[35] As this article shows, the Holy See heeded the request of the Romanian government, all the more as it had already made it clear to the Hungarian government, which wished to intervene by the Romanian authorities, that it considers the issue to be an internal matter of Romania. The Romanian government achieved thus an important success: although it could not expel Bishop Mailáth from Transylvania, as it did with Bishop Glattfelder of Csanád, it at least managed to remove him from political life, and subordinate him to the Archbishop of Bucharest, loyal to Romanian interests.

Concluding remarks

Following World War I and the new political realities ensuing from the Treaty of Trianon, the situation of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Transylvania / Alba Iulia, largely made up of ethnic Hungarians, was determined by two factors: the development of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Romania[36] and

---

[34] Archbishop Raymund Netzhammer confirms that Mailáth was indeed ill and was treated in Hungary. Raymund Netzhammer, *Bischof in Rumänien: im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat und Vatikan*, II (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks 771), edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer in collaboration with Krista Zach, München: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 1996 (în Romanian: Raymund Netzhammer, *Episcop în România* II, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 2005, 1426.

[35] "Auxiliarii cu drept de succesiune ai episcopului Majlath", *Cuvântul*, 15.01.1927.

[36] Hungarian-speaking Roman Catholics believed that the policy of the Holy See was centred on supporting Greek Catholics in the hope that eventually the whole of Romania would convert to the Catholic Church: „The Vatican's international policy may also think that by building up Romania it can gain more influence on the territory of the Greek Eastern Church, as from there it will gain a new, young and energetic country for the Ro-

the intention of the government to reorganize the Catholic Church within a new ecclesial, political, and ethnic framework. In this changed situation, the Roman Catholic Church in Transylvania attempted to provide not only for pastoral care but also for the political representation of the Hungarian minority in Romania. The Holy See faced a difficult challenge. On the one hand, Catholics of Latin rite from a territory belonging now to a different country expected the Vatican to voice its support for their ecclesial and political struggle. On the other hand, the prospect of a Concordat with Romania demanded the Holy See to acquiesce to the requests of the government. Diplomatic considerations often took precedence over the pleas of Roman Catholic bishops.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Archives of the Archbishopric of Alba Iulia:

Letter of Elemér Gyárfás to Bishop Gusztáv Károly Mailáth, AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. 16.06.1926.

Letter of the Agrarian Council of Alba County to Bishop Gusztáv Károly Mailáth, AAAI, I.13.e. Various documents, 161/919.13.11.1919.

---

man Catholic Church precisely through the Greek Catholics. It has already been pointed out that the political inclination of the Greek Catholics will not favour this calculation, and the development of Romania so far is an example of the failure of the Roman Catholic Church to gain ground there." AAEBP, Az erdélyi rom. kath. közönség memoranduma az elszakítás ellen, 1407/1920.51, 01.05.1920. This perception is confirmed by Raymund Netzhammer, archbishop of Bucharest between 1905–1924. A Benedictine monk of the Abbey of Einsiedeln. Netzhammer was appointed archbishop of Bucharest by Pope Pius X (1905). His uncompromising stance amidst complicated religious, political, and ethnic circumstances angered Romanian political authorities. He was therefore compelled to resign, on the advice of Pope Pius XI. His diary, published posthumously, is an invaluable source of information on the political and ecclesial circumstances in Romania. Raymund Netzhammer, *Bischof in Rumänien: im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat und Vatikan*, I–II (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks 70–71), edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer in collaboration with Krista Zach, München: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 1995–1996.

Letter to Senate's President, AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. a.1. Letters. 30.10.1926.

Letter of Bishop Mailáth to Elemér Gyárfás, AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. a.1. Letters. 26 02.1925.

Letter of Bishop Mailáth to Elemér Gyárfás, AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. a.1. Letters. 17.06.1926.

Letter of Bishop Mailáth to Elemér Gyárfás, AAAI, V.5. Personal legacy of Gusztáv Károly Mailáth. a.1. Letters. a.1. Letters. 03.12.1926.

Archives of the Archbishopric of Esztergom-Budapest:

Az erdélyi rom. kath. közönség memoranduma az elszakítás ellen [Memorandum of the Roman Catholic community against the break-up], AAEBP, 1407/1920.51. 01.05.1920.

Letter of Jules Cambon to Léon-Adolphe Amette, Archbishop of Paris, AAEBp, 672/1920 D/c. 20.01.1920.

National Archives of Hungary, Documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

A bukaresti katolikus egyházmegye magyar anyanyelvű híveinek [To the Hungarian-speaking faithful of the Catholic Diocese of Bucharest], NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, 39. box: 1920–1931. R1 Romania, 2584/pol. 02. 05. 1922.

Az erdélyi katolikusok küldöttsége Rómában [The Transylvanian Catholic delegation in Rome], NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, 39. box: 1920–1931. R1 Romania, 779/pol. 8.11.1927.

Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye [The case of Bishop Gyula Glattfelder of Csanád], NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, 39. box: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 2039/pol. 15.05.1923.

Majláth erdélyi püspök szenátorsága [Senatorship of Bishop Mailáth of Transylvania], NAH, K105 Embassy at Vatican, 39. box: 1920–1931. R1 Romania, 60/pol. 18.09.1926.

Msrg. Schioppa római látogatása [Visit of Msgr. Schioppa to Rome], NAH, K105, Embassy at Vatican, 35. box, 1929–1932. 19.01.1922.

Journal article:

*, "Auxiliarii cu drept de succesiune ai episcopului Majlath" [Auxiliaries with right of succession to Bishop Majlath], *Cuvântul* 15.01.1927.

Secondary sources

Adriányi Gábor, *A katolikus egyház története a 20. században Kelet-, Közép-Kelet és Dél-Kelet Európában,* Budapest: Kairosz, 2005.

András Szabolcs, "New Details Regarding the Expulsion of Bishop Gyula Glattfelder from Romania", *Studia Theologia Catholica Latina* 1 (2016) 87–98.

Beke Margit (ed.), *A Magyar Katolikus Püspökkari tanácskozások története és jegyzőkönyvei 1919–1944 között,* vol. I., München – Budapest: Aurora, 1992.

Broun, Janice, The Catholic Church in Romania, in *Christianity Under Stress* II: *Catholicism and Politics in Communist Societies*, edited by Pedro Ramet, Durham – London: Duke University Press, 1990, 207–212.

Holló László, "Die Römisch-Katholische Autonomie von Siebenbürgen: Der Siebenbürgische Römisch-Katholische Status", *Studia Theologia Catholica Latina* 2 (2012) 3–24.

Holló László, "The Impact of Reformation in the Transylvanian Diocese and the Beginnings of Catholic Revival", *Studia Theologia Catholica Latina* 2 (2019) 35–72.

Jakab Antal, "Az erdélyi római katolikus püspöki szék betöltésének vitája a 17. században", *Erdélyi Múzeum* 49 (1944) 5–20.

Jakab Antonius, *De hierarchia Ecclesiae Transsylvaniensis tempore principatus (1527–1697)* (doctoral dissertation), Roma: Pontificia Università Lateranense, 2000.

Keul István, *Early Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe: Ethnic Diversity, Denominational Plurality and Corporative Politics in the Principality of Transylvania (1526-1691)* (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 143) (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions), Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Marton József and Jakabffy Tamás, *Az erdélyi katolicizmus századai,* Kolozsvár: Gloria, 1999.

Miloş, Ofelia, *România şi Sfântul Scaun în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea,* Bucureşti: Expert, 2010.

Netzhammer, Raymund, *Bischof in Rumänien: im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat und Vatikan*, II (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks 771), edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer in collaboration with Krista Zach, München: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 1996.

Netzhammer, Raymund, *Episcop în România,* Vol. II, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

Nóda Mózes, *Biserica Romano-Catolică din Transilvania în perioada interbelică*, Cluj-Napoca: Studium, 2008.

Nóda Mózes, "The Historical, Political and Ecclesiastical Background of the 1927 Concordat between the Vatican and Romania", *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 9.27 (2010) 281–301.

Salacz Gábor, *A magyar katolikus egyház a szomszédos államok uralma alatt*, München: Aurora, 1975.

Szabó K. Attila (ed.), *Az erdélyi magyar tanító- és óvóképzés évszázadai 1777-2000,* Marosvásárhely: Mentor, 2009, 55–69.

Szántó Konrád, *A katolikus egyház története,* vol. I, Budapest: Ecclesia, 1983.

Tóth Krisztián, Az Erdélyi Római Katolikus Státus igazgatótanácsának 1873-as újjáalakulása és dualizmus kori tevékenységi köre, *Studia Theologica Transylvaniensia* 24.2 (2021) 331–360.

Tusor Péter (ed.) *Magyarország és a római Szentszék (Források és távlatok)*, Róma-Budapest: Gondolat, 2012.

Veszely Károly, *Erdélyi egyháztörténeti adatok* III. *Erdélynek a XVI és XVII században országgyűlésileg hozott, vallást tárgyazó törvénycikkei*, Kolozsvár, 1860.

BOOK REVIEW

Gusztáv Kovács, *Thought Experiments in Ethics,* Pécs: Episcopal Theological College of Pécs, 2021, 291 pp., ISBN 978-615-5579-28-8.

Gusztáv Kovács is professor of ethics at the Episcopal Theological College of Pécs. This volume is the result of his teaching experience and research, as well as his conversations with colleagues from the international scholarly community and students. The author argues convincingly that thought experiments are useful tools for teaching ethics, more generally for reflecting upon ethical principles and behaviour. They are imaginary scenarios that may be used to explore complex ethical problems. They raise questions, pose dilemmas, they engage the listener / reader, encouraging discussion and debate. They can be helpful for illustrating ethical questions, for shaping the moral thinking of students, while also allowing them to learn about themselves, their own values and (potential) choices.

One of the shared features of thought experiments is that they tell a story. Storytelling engages listeners or readers, inviting them to identify with characters, to look at apparently merely theoretical issues from a different perspective. They challenge preconceptions and create a certain distance from previously held convictions about what is right and wrong. They appeal to our moral intuition.

Kovács highlights the importance of storytelling for ethics on the parable of the Good Samaritan, looking at the history of its reception and on the manner it opens new horizons, by creating a dilemma, through an (incomplete) analogy and by appealing to the intuition of the listeners. (Later on, he will discuss another biblical narrative, the parable of Nathan in 2 Sam 12.)

The volume revisits some classical thought experiments used in ethics: Robert Nozick's experience (or pleasure) machine, the last man on earth argument (devised by Richard Sylvan and Richard Routley), the trolley problem of Philippa Foot and Judith Jarvis Thomson, and the violinist analogy used by Judith Jarvis Thomson to address the ethical implications of abortion. To these Gusztáv Kovács adds a significant piece of Hungarian literature and filmography, *The Fifth Seal*. I highlight here only this latter, less known example. *The Fifth Seal* (*Az ötödik pecsét*, 1976) by Zoltán Fábri is based on the 1963 homonymous novel of Ferenc Sánta. The narrative is set during World War II and the grim years of the rule of national socialist Arrow Cross Party in Hungary. The conversation of a group of friends turns

into a thought experiment. One of the main characters (Miklós Gyuricza) invites his friends to ponder on a serious ethical dilemma. Should they be reborn, they would be compelled to choose between living as a powerful but cruel and amoral tyrant or as the slave he constantly torments and humiliates but who preserves his dignity and moral integrity. The debate will eventually turn into a drama. The thought experiment materialises, reversing the positions held by the conversant parties. Those who have identified with the tyrant will eventually preserve their moral integrity even at the cost of their life. The author of this thought experiment apparently turns into the despicable tyrant of his story, causing suffering to an innocent victim of the Arrow Cross executioners, in order to remain alive. Yet, the viewers realise that his choice eventually saved the life of the Jewish children he sheltered. The complex plot, the conversations and debates, the unexpected turns make *The Fifth Seal* an outstanding example of thought experiment.

Kovács discusses in detail the essential features of thought experiments and their main types. He examines their pragmatics, the ways they work, and analyses their applicability in practical philosophy and bioethics. He also addresses the weaknesses of thought experiments and the scholarly critique they raise.

Thought experiments are highly stimulating; they induce students, more generally all those who attempt to understand the oft-hidden resorts of ethical behaviour, the value judgments, dilemmas, and difficult choices we may face when attempting to make moral decisions, to think about the complexity of ethical choices. At the same time, thinking of the particular examples presented in this volume, one may also perceive certain limitations of thought experiments. Such is, for one, the artificiality of the story and the radicality of the ethical dilemma (as in the trolley problem and the violinist analogy, the *tertium non datur*, which seems to demand listeners to choose between two extreme, equally problematic options. In fact, one of the merits of *The Fifth Seal* consists precisely in showing that persons and their decisions are far more complex and complicated; they are not unequivocally blameless victims or wicked perpetrators, and real life situations are far more complex. Including *The Fifth Seal* in the discussion of thought experiments, Kovács has a significant contribution to the topic.

The volume authored by Gusztáv Kovács is particularly useful for those who teach or study ethics, but it also proves to be an exciting reading for anyone interested in ethical reflection.

Korinna Zamfir