The Biblical Annals

January 2026 volume 16 (73) no. 1

THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN KUL 1918

e-ISSN: 2451-2168
ISSN: 2083-2222

The Biblical Annals

volume 16 (73) no. 1

INSTITUTE OF BIBLICAL STUDIES KUL
Lublin 2026

THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN
FACULTY OF THEOLOGY
The Institute of Biblical Studies

The Biblical Annals is the official scholarly journal of the Institute of Biblical Studies at the Faculty of Theology, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. It is dedicated to biblical studies and it is divided into the following sections: Old Testament, Intertestamental Literature, New Testament, Varia, Review Articles, Book Reviews, and Biblical News. The journal covers fields of research such as biblical archeology, history, exegesis, philology, hermeneutics, literary studies, studies on culture and religion, and theological studies.

e-ISSN: 2451-2168
ISSN: 2083-2222

The Biblical Annals, as the journal of the Institute of Biblical Studies, has been published since 1963 by the Institute of Biblical Studies, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland. From its founding, it has been issued under these previous titles: (1) Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne, fascicle 1 "Pismo Święte" (ISSN 0035-7723), 1963–1990; (2) Roczniki Teologiczne, fascicle 1 "Pismo Święte" (ISSN 12331457), 1991–2008; and (3) Roczniki Biblijne (ISSN 2080-8518), 2009–2010. The periodical is a research journal and appears four times a year. The only reference edition of the quarterly is the digital version which is available on-line at https://czasopisma.kul.pl/ba.

The quarterly is indexed in: SCOPUS, Web of Science, ATLA Catholic Periodical and Literature Index (ATLA CPLI), ATLA Religion Database® (ATLA RDBR), ATLAS, ATLAS plus, Biblioteka Nauki (Library of Science), Central European Journal of Social Siences and Humanities (CEJSH), Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS), Arianta, Baza Artykułow Biblistyki Polskiej (BABP), Humanities Journals (BazHum), Index Copernicus (IC), Index Theologicus (IxTheo), New Testament Abstracts (NTA), Old Testament Abstracts (OTA), POL-Index, Polska Bibliografia Naukowa (PBN), Repozytorium Instytucjonalne KUL.

Publisher: The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin,
Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland

Publishing house: Wydawnictwo KUL, ul. Konstantynów 1H, 20-708 Lublin,
e-mail: wydawnictwo@kul.pl, website: http://wydawnictwo.kul.lublin.pl

Typesetting: Jarosław Łukasik
Cover design: Agnieszka Gawryszuk
Proofreader for Polish texts: Paula Ulidowska

Information about submitting articles and book reviews: Manuscripts submitted for publication in The Biblical Annals should conform to the directions given in "Author Guidelines" on http://czasopisma.kul.pl/ba/about/submissions and are to be sent to the editorial board via the same website (follow the link for "Online Submissions").

Review copies: Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the sender (regardless of whether a review of the book is published), unless such material is sent at the specific request of the editors of The Biblical Annals. Books for review should be addressed.

Table of Contents

Articles

Reviews

Articles

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 1–25

Critical Editing and Philological Analysis of the First Chapters of Trito-Isaiah (Isa 56–57) Based on the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Coptic Manuscripts in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint

Tomasz Bartłomiej Bąk
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
tomasz.bak@kul.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0328-0282

ABSTRACT: This article presents a critical edition and philological analysis of the first two chapters of Trito-Isaiah (Isa 56–57), drawing primarily on the Coptic manuscript sa 52.2 alongside other extant manuscripts in the Sahidic dialect. The initial section provides an overview of the relevant portion of codex sa 52 (M 568) containing the text under study, followed by a concise list and description of additional manuscripts that preserve at least some verses from Isa 56–57. The core of the article features the Coptic text in the Sahidic dialect, accompanied by an English translation. A tabular comparison highlights deviations between the Sahidic text and the Greek Septuagint, its source, including additions, omissions, lexical variations, and semantic shifts in the Coptic translation. The final section addresses complex philological challenges, whether inherent to the Coptic text or arising from its relationship to the Septuagint, aiming to resolve interpretive difficulties.

KEYWORDS: Coptic language, Sahidic dialect, Book of Isaiah, Trito-Isaiah, sa 52 (M 568), CLM 205, edition of Isa 56–57

This study focuses on the Sahidic edition of the first two chapters of the Book of Trito-Isaiah (Isa 56–57). The third part of the Book of Isaiah (Isa 56–66) introduces the reader to the period immediately following the return of the first group of Babylonian exiles to Palestine. This is the time directly preceding the times of Ezra and Nehemiah and the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple. This part of the book is set against the historical background of events taking place between 538 and 520 BC. Trito-Isaiah constitutes a collection of prophecies, probably originating from the prophet's disciples. That is the reason for their heterogeneous nature. The nation of Israel is in a difficult situation. National and religious life has to be rebuilt after captivity. The intentions of those returning to the land of their ancestors have not materialised as expected. One can sense in the book an atmosphere of disillusionment and despondency. The nation disregards the Law of God. The author therefore calls for an improvement in customs.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.17338 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

The first exhortation of the first chapter of Trito-Isaiah: 'Keep judgment; do righteousness' (Isa 56:1) may be a summary of the entire work. The author desires salvation for all. He excludes neither foreigners nor the previously despised eunuchs, provided they keep the Law (Isa 56:2–8). A special emphasis is placed on keeping the Sabbath (vv. 2 and 6). Failure to keep the Law of God may result in attacks from pagan nations who are compared to wild animals (Isa 56:9–12).

Chapter 57 carries an atmosphere of sadness and disappointment. Many of the righteous fall into extreme misery through the fault of the nation's leaders (vv. 1–2). Idolatry is widespread. Many indulge in witchcraft, not even shrinking back from offering children as sacrifice (vv. 3–6). Some of the nation fell into fornication (vv. 7–8) and tried to enter into alliance with pagan states (vv. 9–10). The worship that is due to the true God was redirected to false gods (vv. 11–13). Despite the sins of his people, God does not want to be angry forever (vv. 14–18). Those who mourned the fall of the nation will eventually sing a song of joy (v. 19). Only the wicked, compared to the stormy sea, will be denied peace (vv. 20–21).

The study of the following chapters of Isaiah in the Sahidic dialect is a continuation of previous work.[1] The edition of the Coptic text will be based mainly on the Sahidic manuscript numbered sa 52[2] in Schüssler's compilation (M 568 in the Depuydt compilation),[3] which is to be found under the number CLM 205 at the Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature website.[4] This work is based on both the photographic edition (referred to as a *facsimile*), provided by the Vatican Library, and the microfilm, provided by the Morgan Library in New York. For several years now, black-and-white photographs of the Library's Coptic collection have been available at https://archive.org/details/PhantoouLibrary.[5] Colour reproductions are also available as part of the Digital Edition of the Coptic Old Testament (DECOT) project at http://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace.[6] Comparing chapters Isa 56–57 of the analysed manuscript with its electronic edition in DECOT, at least one discrepancy can be noted. In line 29 of the left column on page 115, f. 57^{r} (Copt. ⲡⲓⲍ) in the DECOT edition, one can

---

1 The edition of the text of Proto-Isaiah (Isa 1–39) based on manuscript sa 52 is available in: T. Bąk, *Proto-Isaiah in the Sahidic Dialect of the Coptic Language. Critical Edition on the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Witnesses* (PO 251 [57.3]; Turnhout: Brepols 2020) 343–660. Subsequent chapters of Deutero-Isaiah are compiled in *Isa 40*, *Isa 41*, *Isa 42:1–44,5*, *Isa 44:6–45:25*, *Isa 46–48*, *Isa 49–50*, *Isa 51–52*, *Isa 53*, *Isa 54–55*.

2 K. Schüssler, *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: sa 49–92* (Biblia Coptica 1/3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998) 17–19.

3 History and description of the manuscript in Bąk, *Proto-Isaiah in the Sahidic Dialect*, 13–28. See also L. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (CIM, IV Oriental Series 1; Leuven: Peeters 1993) 20–22.

4 See https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts/205 [access: 10.02.2025].

5 The verse Isa 56:1 begins at: https://archive.org/details/PhantoouLibrary/m568%20Combined%20%28Bookmarked%29/page/n113/mode/2up?view=theater [access: 10.02.2025].

6 See the manuscript website: https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace/?docID=622008 [access: 10.02.2025].

read ⲛⲛⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ̄,[7] while in the manuscript sa 52 one finds ⲛⲛⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ (lit. 'in the place of sleep').

While editions of individual Isaiah manuscripts exist, as exemplified by the current DECOT project, a critical edition of the Sahidic text of Isaiah has not been published anywhere to date. Thus far, no one has compared the Sahidic text with the Greek Septuagint, providing the basis for the Coptic translations. The present study fills this gap. The Sahidic text edition can be used for further exegetical studies of the Book of Isaiah. It may also assist in biblical textual criticism by revealing the reception history of the biblical text in the first centuries of Christianity.

The numbering of folios in this study is in line with the *facsimile* numbering applied by the Vatican Library. Since the numbering featured on the Digital Edition of the Coptic Old Testament website does not correspond to the *facsimile* edition, the original Coptic page numbers will also be indicated in this article to avoid ambiguity.

This study combines features of both the diplomatic edition of manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and its critical edition. Apart from the preferred manuscript, sa 52, from the Pierpont Morgan collection, editions of all other currently available Coptic manuscripts in the Sahidic dialect, which include at least some Isa 54–55 verses, will also be considered. Symbols in the critical apparatus (exclamation mark in superscript: ⁱ) will suggest reading more similar to the Greek text of the LXX. In the preparation of the text of Isa 56–57, as was done in the editing of earlier chapters, diacritical signs (superlinear stroke, trema) and division marks (middle point) found in the manuscript of sa 52 have been rendered. However, supralinear strokes have not been completed where the manuscript does not contain them, and one would expect them in the standard notation. The *nomina sacra* are also not written out in full.

The manuscript represents a non-standard supralineation system, as already noted by Depuydt ('superlineation: non-standard').[8] This is a common feature of Fayyum manuscripts. In addition to the standard Sahidic supralineation, in sa 52 some letters are marked with a dot where the Sahidic system would place a dash. This is particularly true of the initial letter ⲙ̇ of the direct object and the genitive ⲛ̇. The present edition retains this non-standard system. The dot system is characteristic of the so-called 'Touton style'.[9]

---

7 See https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace/?docID=622008 [access: 10.02.2025].

8 Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts*, 21.

9 Touton is an ancient city of Tebtunis located in the southern part of the Fayyum. In the ninth and tenth centuries, a Christian scriptorium existed there, where numerous Sahidic manuscripts were produced. Some of these were donated to the nearby monastery of the Archangel Michael at Phantoou (el-Hamuli). Some 80 manuscripts from Touton were also discovered at the White Monastery near Sohag. The manuscript sa 52 is slightly earlier and can hardly be unequivocally classified as 'Touton style' On the one hand, the supralinear dots and the obelos with two dots are characteristic of this style. On the other hand, the manuscript of sa 52 lacks the dots over autosyllabic vowels of the ⲉ̇ ⲃⲟⲗ type most characteristic of Touton (see C. Nakano, "Indices d'une chronologie relative des manuscrits coptes copies à Toutôn (Fayoum)," *JCoptS* 8 [2006] 149, and also: https://apps.lib.umich.edu/online-exhibits/exhibits/show/coptic-manuscripts/manuscripts-copied-in-touton [access: 11.02.2025]).

The critical edition and philological analysis of the selected passage will include the following elements: (1) a general description of the folios of sa 52 manuscript containing the text of Isa 56–57, (2) a presentation of the Coptic text based on the sa 52 manuscript taking other available witnesses into account, (3) English translation,[10] (4) a list of disparities between the Greek text of the LXX[11] and its Coptic translation, and (5) an analysis of more challenging philological phenomena observed in the Coptic chapters of Isa 56–57.

1. General Information about Isa 56–57 in the sa 52 Manuscript

The text of Isa 56–57 begins on page 114 (f. 56^{v}, Copt. ⲡⲓⲍ), line 23 of the left column, and ends on page 117, f. 58^{r} (Copt. ⲡⲓⲏ) in line 7 of the right column. The two prepared chapters thus occupy just over six columns of text. As has already been noted many times in the study of earlier chapters, the folios of the manuscript have not been chosen particularly carefully. Their shape is not always even, as exemplified by page 114 (f. 56^{v}, Copt. ⲡⲓⲍ), which on the left tapers significantly downward. This causes the left column of text to become increasingly narrow. Its last line contains only 10 letters.

One of the worst leaves is marked with the Coptic numbers ⲡⲓⲏ (117, f. 58^{r}) and ⲡⲕ (118, f. 58^{v}). Page ⲡⲓⲏ contains verses Isa 57:15b–21. The right side of this page is very irregular and tapers downwards. The shape of the page results in only 8 letters in line 30 of the right column. In addition, at the level of lines 7 to 13 on the right side of the right column, there is a perforation of a few centimetres. Such a damaged leaf was used by the scribe from the very beginning. In fact, neither its shape nor the perforation causes any shortcomings in the text. The scribe adapts the number of letters on each line to the space available. At one point, at the end of the left column on page 114 (f. 56^{v}, Copt. ⲡⲓⲍ) he wrote the last three letters ⲙⲟⲩ under the column to complete the word ⲭⲁϩⲙⲟⲩ. A similar manner of ending words under the column could already be observed on earlier leaves of the manuscript.

Errors, corrected by the author of the manuscript, can be observed in several places in the text. In the second line of the right column on page 114 (f. 56^{v}, Copt. ⲡⲓⲍ) in the expression ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲓⲣⲉ ('so as not to do') one erased letter can be seen before the verb ⲉⲓⲣⲉ. Presumably there was an ⲉ there. A dittography error was thus removed.

In the ninth line of the right column on page 114 (f. 56^{v}, Copt. ⲡⲓⲍ) in the expression ⲙ̄ⲡⲡ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ ('let not the eunuch'), the definite article of the masculine singular ⲡ was added in the superscript, which in the edition analysed is written as ⲙ̄ⲡⲡ̄ⲧⲣⲉ\ⲡ/ⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ.

---

10 In order to show more clearly the differences between the Septuagint and the Coptic text, the English translation is based on the NETS translation. Differences in the Coptic translation are indicated in italics.

11 The article uses Ziegler's critical edition: J. Ziegler (ed.), *Septuagint. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum*. XIV. *Isaias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1939).

As in earlier chapters, in the text of Isa 56–57 the final letter ⲛ is sometimes written as a horizontal line in superscript. In all cases, this is the last letter in a line of text. This can be observed:

- in line 4 of the left column on page 115, f. 57r [Copt. ⲡⲓ̅ⲍ̅] in the word ⲉϩⲟⲩ(ⲛ),
- in line 20 of the left column on page 115, f. 57r [Copt. ⲡⲓ̅ⲍ̅] in the word ⲛⲁⲅⲣ̈ⲓⲟ(ⲛ),
- in line 15 of the left column on page 117, f. 58r [Copt. ⲡⲓ̅ⲏ̅] in the word ⲡⲉ(ⲛ) ⲧⲁ̈ⲧⲁⲙⲓ̈ⲉ; it is rather unusual situation when ⲛ is written as a horizontal line in the middle of a word,
- in line 32 of the left column on page 117, f. 58r [Copt. ⲡⲓ̅ⲏ̅] in the word ⲉ̄ϩⲟⲩ(ⲛ).

Despite various imperfections, the text of chapters Isa 56–57 in sa 52 manuscript is very well preserved. Its reading does not pose any problem.

2. List of Manuscripts Containing the Text of Isa 56–57 in the Sahidic Dialect of the Coptic Language

Verses of chapters 56–57 of the Book of Isaiah can be found in several other manuscripts, not as complete as sa 52. With regard to the names of the manuscripts, precedence will be given to the designations used in Schüssler's study.[12] References to electronic collections will be provided where possible. Some Isa 56–57 verses can be found in the following manuscripts:

Sa 41.18 (= CLM 450[13] = DECOT sa 2058 [Doc ID 622058]): fragment of a codex, consisting of five folios numbered 157–161.[14] Their shelfmark: **Paris, BN, Copte 129[3] fol. 157–161**. The folios are part of codex sa 41, which contains the text of the Book of Isaiah. The vast majority of it has been destroyed. The individual leaves of the sa 41 manuscript are scattered all over the world. They can be found in Paris, London, Vatican City, Vienna, and Cairo.[15] The sa 41.18 fragment contains the text of **Isa 55:9–60:8**. The fragment included in sa 41.18 has been edited by Hebbelynck,[16] and it can be inferred from this that the text of the fragment of **Isa 55:9–13** of interest is very well preserved.

---

12 K. Schüssler, *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament* (Biblia Coptica 1/1–4/4; Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz 1995–2012).

13 Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature (see https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/ [access: 27.02.2025]).

14 See K. Schüssler, *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: sa 21–48* (Biblia Coptica 1/2; Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz 1996) 81.

15 Schüssler, *Sa 21–48*, 74. For details, see also https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts/450 (access: 27.02.2025).

16 A. Hebbelynck, "Fragments inédits de la version sahidique d'Isaïe. I. Fragments de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris," *Mus* 14 (1913) 197–219 (the text of Isa 56–57 on pp. 198–207). Electronic edition also available at DECOT: https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace/?docID=622058 (access: 27.02.2025).

The manuscript is estimated to date to the 9th[17] or 10th[18] century. The parchment was included in Vaschalde's list.[19] As the sa 41 manuscript contains numerous passages from earlier chapters of Isaiah, it has already been used more than once in our critical editing of sa 52.[20]

Sa 48 (= CLM 40 = LDAB 108542 = DECOT sa 2004 [Doc ID 622004] = TM 108542):[21] a papyrus codex, kept at the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana in Cologny in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland, designated as Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. It includes the text of **Isa 47:1–51:17** and **Isa 52:4–66:24**. Its fragments have already been used in the study of earlier chapters of Deutero-Isaiah.[22] The manuscript was edited by R. Kasser in 1965.[23] This study will use the edition of chapters **Isa 56–57**.[24]

The manuscript is dated to the 4th century,[25] more specifically to 375–450.[26] Due to its early origins, it is an invaluable aid in the edition of parts of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah and the entire Book of Trito-Isaiah.[27]

Sa 108^{L} (= CLM 3288 = DECOT sa 16L [Doc ID 620016]): the manuscript is a bilingual [Coptic-Arabic] lectionary from the White Monastery in Sohag. Currently, it is kept in the Vatican Library. The Coptic text is predominant.[28] A fairly large number of passages is specifically from Isaiah,[29] although of the chapters Isa 56–57 of interest here, only one verse **Isa 56:1** can be found in the Lectionary. It is found on leaf number 84^{r} and was read on Thursday at the ninth liturgical hour (ⲧⲁ̅ⲡ̅ⲑ̅ ⲙ̅ⲡⲧⲟⲩ ⲙ̅ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛ).[30]

---

17 P. Nagel, "Studien zur Textüberlieferung des sahidishen Alten Testaments, Teil IB: Der Stand der Wiederherstellung der alttestamentlichen Kodizes der Sammlung Borgia (Cod. XVII – XXX)," *ZÄS* 111 (1984) 148.

18 W.C. Till, "Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien. Katalog der koptischen Bibelbruchstücke. Die Pergamente," *ZNW* 39 (1940) 16 (Nr 52).

19 A. Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible," *RB* 29 (1920) 248.

20 See Bąk, *Proto-Isaiah in the Sahidic Dialect*, 362–363; sa 41.13 in: *Isa 40*, 76–77; sa 41.13 in: *Isa 41*, 67; sa 41.14 and sa 41.15 in: *Isa 42:1–44:5*, 45–46; sa 41.15, sa 41.16 and sa 41.17 in: *Isa 44:6–45:25*, 535–536; sa 41.17 in: *Isa 46–48*, 603–604; sa 41.18 in: *Isa 54–55*, 63–64.

21 See https://www.trismegistos.org/ [access: 11.02.2025].

22 See *Isa 46–48*, 604–605 (also, a more detailed description of the sa 48 manuscript can be found there), as well as *Isa 49–50*, 7–8, *Isa 51–52*, 22, *Isa 53*, 863.

23 R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Esaïe XLVII,1-LXVI,24* (Cologny – Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana 1965). Electronic edition of the manuscript also available at DECOT: https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace/?docID=622004 [access: 27.02.2025].

24 Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII*, 102–117.

25 Schüssler, *Sa 21–48*, 106. The same dating is also on the website: https://bodmerlab.unige.ch/fr/constellations/papyri/barcode/1072205362 [access: 25.02.2025].

26 See https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts/40 [access: 25.02.2025].

27 For more information, see K. Schüssler, *Das sahidishe Alte und Neue Testament: sa 1–20* (Biblia Coptica 1/1; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1995) 106; and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII*, 7–33.

28 A detailed description of the lectionary is provided in Bąk, *Isa 46–48*, 605 (footnote 30).

29 A detailed list of verses from the Book of Isaiah is provided in Schüssler, *Sa 93–120*, 50–51.

30 See Schüssler, *Sa 93–120*, 57.

The dating of the manuscript oscillates between the 12th and 14th centuries.[31] The text was edited by Amélineau[32] and Ciasca, who designated the manuscript as IC.[33] An electronic edition can also be accessed on the DECOT website.[34] Manuscript sa 108^{L} has already been used several times in the preparation of the critical edition of the earlier chapters of Isaiah.[35]

P. Mon. Epiph. 27 (= CLM 1601 = LDAB 112535 = TM 112535): ostracon, 6th to 7th century,[36] found in the Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes. Currently held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition in New York: **MMA 12. 180. 216 (Ostr.): sa**^{exc}. Contains selected passages from various chapters of Isaiah: Isa 40:1–2; 50:4–5a; 57:1, 13–14; 59:21; 62:10; 64:4–5. This study is interested in the passage **Isa 57:1.13–14**. A brief description of the manuscript can be found in a study by Crum.[37] This is also where edition of the text can be found.[38] The manuscript has already been used for editions of earlier fragments of Deutero-Isaiah.[39]

CLM 3469 (= TM 111691 = DECOT 2028 [Doc ID 622028]) is one of three Sahidic codices discovered by Polish archaeologists in 2005 on the hill of Sheikh Abd el-Qurna

---

31 Henri Hyvernat ("Étude sur les versions coptes de la Bible. II. – Ce qui nous est parvenu des versions ég yptiennes," *RB* 5 [1896] 548–549) argues in favour of the earliest date, falling around the 12th/13th century. George W. Horner estimates that the lectionary was created 'not earlier than the thirteenth [century]' (*The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic, with Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Literal English Translation*. III. *The Gospel of S. John* [Oxford: Clarendon Press 1911] 383); Paulinus J. Balestri moves this date to the 13th or 14th century (*Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*. III. *Novum Testamentum* [Roma: Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide 1904] LXI); Augustinus Ciasca opts for the late 14th century (*Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani iussu et sumptibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide studio P. Augustini Ciasca ordinis Eremitarum S. Agostini edita* [Roma: Typis S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide 1885] I, XXVII); Alfred Rahlfs speaks of ca. 1400 (*Die alttestamentlichen Lektionen der griechischen Kirche* [MSU 5; Berlin: Weidmann 1915] 163). The DECOT website states 'before 1443 AD' (see https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-catalog?docID=620016 [access: 26.02.2025]).

32 É. Amélineau, "Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Écriture (Ancien Testament)," *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 9 (1887) 126.

33 Ciasca, *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta*, II, 243.

34 See https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace/?docID=620016 [access: 23.02.2025].

35 See Bąk, *Proto-Isaiah in the Sahidic Dialect*, 364–365; *Isa 40*, 77–78; *Isa 46–48*, 605–606; *Isa 49–50*, 9–10; *Isa 51–52*, 23; *Isa 53*, 864.

36 See http://papyri.info/dclp/112535# [access: 4.02.2025].

37 W.E. Crum – H.G. Evelyn White, *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes.* II. *Coptic Ostraca and Papyri Edited with Translations and Commentaries by W. E. Crum. Greek Ostraca and Papyri Edited with Translations and Commentaries by H. G. Evelyn White* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 1926) 158. Electronic access: https://libmma.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15324coll10/id/166336 [access: 4.02.2025].

38 Crum, *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes*, II, 6–7. Electronic access: https://libmma.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15324coll10/id/166184 [access: 4.02.2025].

39 See Bąk, *Isa 40*, 79 (designated as MMA 12); *Isa 49–50*, 12.

in Western Thebes, which is why it is often referred to as the *Qurna Isaiah*.[40] It is currently stored in the museum in Cairo (shelfmark 13446). The manuscript is a parchment codex and contains the last part of the Book of Isaiah, or more precisely, chapters **47:14–66:24**. The codex is heavily damaged. The spine of the codex and its stitching have been completely destroyed, causing some of the folios to take the form of detached leaves.[41] 'The leaves were cockled and distorted and the edges demonstrated several cracks and tears. Severe iron gall ink corrosion has caused losses in text areas and burned the parchment.'[42] A. Suciu attributes the origin of the code to the late 7th or early 8th century.[43] More detailed information on the manuscript can be found on the Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature website.[44] An edition of the codex is available in electronic form on the DECOT website.[45]

SER 258: two more verses of **Isa 56:6b*–7*** are included in Vaschalde's list[46] under the category 'Autres collections'. They are designated as **SER 258**, which is an abbreviation for 'Sammlung Erzherzog Rainer'. The text was edited by Wessely who designated it K 9683.[47] The above passage is not mentioned either in Schüssler's *Biblia Coptica* or in the DECOT electronic database. The verses are not an exact quotation from Isaiah. The text is preserved fragmentarily and only a few words belonging to verse 7 can be identified from it: ⲉ̄ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉϫⲙ ⲡⲁⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ and [ϫ]ⲉ ⲡⲏⲓ̈ ⲙⲡⲉⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲛⲛϩⲉⲑⲛ̣ⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ. The notation of this short passage is entirely consistent with the sa 52 manuscript that is of interest to this study.

To illustrate the contents of individual manuscripts better, the occurrence of the verses from Isa 46–48 is presented in the table where:
– an 'x' means the occurrence of the entire verse,
– an '(x)' means the occurrence of only a fragment of a particular verse,
– a blank space in the table means the given verse is absent in the manuscript.

---

40 For more about the discovery itself, see T. Górecki, "Sheikh Abd el-Gurna," *Seventy Years of Polish Archaeology in Egypt* (ed. E. Laskowska-Kusztal) (Warsaw: PCMA 2007) 186–187; T. Górecki – E. Wipszycka, "Scoperta di tre codici in un eremo a Sheikh el-Gurna (TT 1151–1152): il contesto archeologico," *Adamantius* 24 (2018) 118–132.

41 See A. Suciu, "The Sahidic Tripartite Isaiah: Origins and Transmission within the Coptic Manuscript Culture," *APF* 66/2 (2020) 381–382.

42 A. Thommée, "The Gurna manuscripts (hermitage in MMA 1152) conservation report, 2010," *PAM* 22 (2013) 204.

43 Suciu, "The Sahidic Tripartite Isaiah," 383.

44 See https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts/3469 [access: 3.02.2025].

45 See https://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/manuscript-workspace/?docID=622028 [access: 12.02.2025].

46 Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible," 249.

47 C. Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts* (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 15; Leipzig: Haessel 1914) IV, no. 258d.

The contents of the manuscripts are as follows:

Isa 56

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Sa 41.18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sa 48	x	x	(x).	x	x	(x).	x	x	x	x	x
Sa 52	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sa 108^{L}	x										
CLM 3469	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).
SER 258							(x).				

Isa 57

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Sa 41.18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sa 48	x	x	x	(x).	x	(x).	x	x	x	(x).	x
Sa 52	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
P. Mon. Epiph 27	(x).										
CLM 3469	x	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	x	(x).	x	(x).	(x).
SER 258											

	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Sa 41.18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sa 48	x	(x).	(x).	(x).	x	(x).	(x).	(x).	(x).	x
Sa 52	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
P. Mon. Epiph 27		(x).	(x).							
CLM 3469	(x).									
SER 258										

3. The Sahidic Text of Isa 56–57

As in the case of the previous chapters, the following signs have been introduced in the edition of the Coptic text:

< > pointed brackets to indicate that the text has been completed so that it can be properly understood,

{ } braces to indicate the scribe's redundant letters (frequently being the effect of dittography),

> sign to indicate the lack of the given form in the manuscript whose number is given beside it,

! exclamation mark in superscript to suggest a more correct reading,

(**N**) to show the places in which the letter **N**, occurring at the end of the line, was signalised by a stroke (**N** supralinear),

\ / sign to indicate the letter added subsequently by the scribe above the line,

/ \ sign to indicate the letter added subsequently by the scribe below the line.[48]

48 Cf. Bąk, *Isa 46–48*, 609.

The text of Isa 56–57 in the Sahidic dialect of the Coptic language reads as follows:

Chapter 56

v. 1 ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲭⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ· ⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ ⲉⲡⲥⲁⲡ· ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ· ⲁⲡⲁⲟⲩ-ⲭⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲥⲱⲛ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ̄ⲉⲓ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡⲁⲛⲁ ⲥⲱⲗⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ·[v. 1]

v. 2 ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲧ̄ϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲟ<ⲗ>ⲭ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ ⲉⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲭⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲥⲓⲭ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲥⲛ̄ⲭⲓ ⲛⲥⲟⲛⲥ·[v. 2]

v. 3 ⲙⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲡⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲟ ⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲥⲏⲛ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲙⲏⲱⲁⲕ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲣⲭⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̀ⲡⲉϥⲗⲁⲟⲥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉ\ⲡ/ⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ ⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲛ̄ⲅ ⲟⲩⲱⲉ ⲉϥⲱⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ·[v. 3]

v. 4 ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲭⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ· ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ ⲉ̀ⲛⲁⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲁⲅⲙⲁ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲥⲱⲧⲡ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲱⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲥⲟⲗⲭⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ·[v. 4]

v. 5 ⲧⲛⲁⲭⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉ̄ⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲛⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲥⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲏⲓ̈· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲥⲟⲃⲧ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲧⲡ̄· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲉⲓⲧ· ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲉⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲥⲓ̈ ⲱⲉⲉⲣⲉ· ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲛⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉⲥ· ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲱⲭⲛ̄·[v. 5]

v. 6 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲟ ⲉⲧⲥⲏⲛ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲣ ⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲁⲗ ⲛⲁϥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ· ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲱⲟⲡⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧ· ⲥⲓ̈ ⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲥⲥⲓⲙⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ <ⲛ>ⲉⲧⲥⲁ (Page 115, f. 57[r] [Copt. ⲢⲒⲤ]) ⲣⲉⲥ ⲉⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲭⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲗⲭ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ·[v. 6]

v. 7 ⲧⲛⲁⲭⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲥⲟⲩ(ⲛ) ⲉⲡⲁⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲣⲉⲩⲟⲩⲛⲟϥ ⲥⲙ ⲡⲏⲓ̈ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲱⲗⲏⲗ· ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲱⲉ· ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲱⲏⲡ ⲉⲥⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ· ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲡⲁⲏⲓ̈ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲏⲓ̈ ⲙⲡⲉⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲛⲛⲥⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ·[v. 7]

LVI

v. 1 ⲭⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ: + ⲭⲉ sa 48, sa 108[L] | ⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ: ⲁⲣⲉⲥ sa 48 | ⲁⲡⲁⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ̈: ⲁ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ̈ sa 108[L], ⲁ[ⲡⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ] CLM 3469 | ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡⲁⲛⲁ: ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲡⲁⲛⲁ sa 108[L] (Amélineau błędnie: ⲉⲓⲣⲁ ⲡⲁⲛⲁ), [ⲉⲧⲣⲁ]ⲡ̣[ⲁⲛⲁ] CLM 3469

v. 2 ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ[2]: > sa 48 | ⲉⲧⲥⲟ<ⲗ>ⲭ: ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲗⲭ̄ sa 41.18, sa 48, [ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲗⲭ] CLM 3469 | ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ[1,2]: ⲉⲧⲁⲣⲉⲥ sa 48 | ⲉⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ: ⲓⲉⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ sa 41.18, sa 48, ⲉⲛⲁ[ⲥⲁⲃⲃⲁ]ⲧ̣ⲟⲛ CLM 3469 | ⲛⲥⲛ̄ⲭⲓ: ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲛⲭⲓ sa 48, [ⲛⲥⲉⲛ]ⲭⲓ CLM 3469

v. 3 ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲣⲭⲧ: [ⲁⲣ]ⲁ ⲡⲟⲣⲭⲧ sa 48 | ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉ\ⲡ/ⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ: ⲙⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ sa 41.18, sa 48 | ⲉⲩⲱⲟⲩ-ⲱⲟⲩ (= CLM 3469): ⲉⲩⲱⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ sa 41.18

v. 4 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ: ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ CLM 3469 | ⲛ̄ⲛⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ sa 41.18, sa 48, ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ CLM 3469 | ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ: ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ sa 41.18, CLM 3469, ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲣⲉⲥ sa 48 | ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ: ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲁⲑⲩⲕⲏ sa 41.18

v. 5 ⲉⲱⲏⲣⲉ: ⲛ̄ⲱⲏⲣⲉ sa 41.18

v. 6 ⲉⲣ ⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲁⲗ ⲛⲁϥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲙⲉⲣ ⲉⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ: > sa 41.18 ('omis par *homoeoteleuton*' [Hebbelynck, "Fragments inédits," 200]) | <ⲛ>ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ: ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉⲥ sa 41.18, ⲛⲉⲧⲁⲣⲉ[ⲥ] sa 48 | ⲉⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲁ-ⲧⲟⲛ: ⲉ̄ⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ sa 41.18, sa 48, [ⲉⲛⲁ]ⲧ̣ⲁ[ⲃⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ] CLM 3469 | ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ: ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲁⲑⲩⲕⲏ sa 41.18

v. 7 ⲡⲏⲓ̈[1,2,3]: ⲡⲏⲉⲓ sa 48 | ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲱⲗⲏⲗ: ⲙ̄[ⲡⲁⲱⲏⲗ] CLM 3469 | ⲉⲭⲙ̄: ⲉⲭⲛ̄ sa 48 | ⲙⲡⲉⲱⲗⲏⲗ: ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲱ\ⲗ/ⲏⲗ sa 48

v. 8 ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲧⲥⲱⲟⲩⲍ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲛⲉⲧϫⲟⲟⲣⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲏⲗ̄· ϫⲉ ⲑⲛⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩⲍ ⲉϫⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ·[v. 8]

v. 9 ⲛⲉⲑⲩⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲅⲣⲓⲟ(ⲛ) ⲁⲙⲏⲓⲛ ⲟⲩⲱⲙ· ⲛⲉⲑⲩⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲥⲱⲱⲉ[v. 9]

v. 10 ⲁⲙⲏⲓⲛ ⲁⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁⲩⲣ ⲃⲗⲗⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ· ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲛⲧ· ⲍⲛⲟⲩⲍⲟⲟⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲟ<ⲛ>ⲱ ⲛⲉ· ⲉⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲁⲍⲙⲉⲕ· ⲉⲩⲡⲱⲱⲣⲉ ⲛ{ⲛ}ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ̄· ⲉⲩⲙⲉ ⲛϫⲓ ⲣⲓⲕⲣⲓⲕⲉ·[v. 10]

v. 11 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲍⲉⲛⲟⲩⲍⲟⲟⲣ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲧⲃⲁⲗ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ· ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲓ̈· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲍⲉⲛ-ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲃⲉ· ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲁⲍⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲛⲉⲩⲍⲓⲟⲟⲩⲉ· ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲓⲛⲉ·[v. 11]

Chapter 57

v. 1 ⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲱϫⲛ̄· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲫⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲍⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲍⲏⲧ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲩⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲧ ⲛ̄ⲍⲧⲏⲩ· ⲁⲩⲩ<ⲓ> ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ <ⲛ>ⲛⲁⲍⲣⲙ̄ ⲡϫⲓ̈ ⲛⲥⲟⲛⲥ·[v. 1]

v. 2 ⲧⲉⲩⲕⲁⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲍⲛ ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ· ⲁⲩⲩⲓⲧⲩ ⲛⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ·[v. 2]

v. 3 ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲍⲱⲛ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲓ̈ⲙⲁ ⲛⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ· ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲍⲓ̈ ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ·[v. 3]

v. 4 ⲍⲛ ⲟⲩ ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲫⲁ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲛ̀ⲓ̈ⲙ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲗⲁⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲛ̀ⲓ̈ⲙ· ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ· ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲛ̀{ⲛ} ⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲛ[v. 4]

---

v. 8 ⲛⲛⲉⲧϫⲟⲟⲣⲉ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧϫⲟⲟⲣ sa 41.18, ⲛ̄[ⲛⲉⲧ]ϫⲟⲟ[ⲣⲉ] CLM 3469 | ⲉϫⲱ: ⲏ̄ⲉ̄ϫⲱϥ sa 41.18, sa 48, [ⲉϫⲱ]ϥ CLM 3469

v. 9 ⲛⲉⲑⲩⲣⲓⲟⲛ[1,2]: ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ sa 41.18, sa 48, [ⲛⲉ]ⲑⲩ[ⲣⲓⲟⲛ] CLM 3469 | ⲁⲙⲏⲓⲛ: ⲁ̄ⲙⲏⲓ̈ⲧⲛ̄ sa 41.18, ⲁⲙⲏⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ sa 48 | ⲛⲧⲥⲱⲱⲉ: ⲧⲥⲱⲱⲉ sa 48

v. 10 ⲁⲙⲏⲓⲛ: ⲁ̄ⲙⲏⲉⲓⲛ̀ sa 41.18, ⲁⲙⲏⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ sa 48 | ⲉⲥⲛⲧ: ⲏ̄ⲥⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲍⲏⲧ sa 41.18, ⲉⲥⲛ̄ ⲍⲏⲧ sa 48, ⲉⲥⲛ̄ⲍⲏⲧ CLM 3469 | ⲍⲛⲟⲩⲍⲟⲟⲣ: ⲍⲉⲛⲟⲩⲍⲟⲟⲣ sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲉⲩⲟ<ⲛ>ⲱ ⲛⲉ: ⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲛⲱ sa 41.18, ⲏⲉⲩⲟⲛⲱ ⲛⲉ sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲉⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ: ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ CLM 3469 | ⲉⲟⲩⲁⲍⲙⲉⲕ: ⲏⲉⲩⲁⲍⲃⲉⲕ sa 41.18, sa 48, ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲍⲃⲉⲕ CLM 3469 | ⲛ{ⲛ}ⲙⲙⲁ: ⲛ̄ⲙⲙⲁ sa 41.18, sa 48 | ⲛⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ: ⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ̄ sa 48 | ⲣⲓⲕⲣⲓⲕⲉ: ⲣⲉⲕⲣⲓⲕⲉ sa 41.18, sa 48, CLM 3469

v. 11 ⲧⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ: ⲛⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ sa 48 | ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ[1,2]: ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ̄ sa 41.18 | ⲁⲩⲱ[2]: > sa 48 | ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲁⲍⲟⲩ: ⲁⲩ\ⲟⲩ/ⲁⲁⲍⲟⲩ sa 48

LVII

v. 1 ⲉⲑⲉ: ⲛⲑⲉ sa 48, P.Mon.Epiph 27, CLM 3469 | ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ: ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲩⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ: [ⲁⲩⲩⲓ ⲛⲍⲉ]ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ P.Mon.Epiph 27 | ⲙⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ[1]: ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ sa 48 | ⲁⲩⲩ<ⲓ>: ⲁⲩⲩⲓ sa 41.18, sa 48, CLM 3469 | <ⲛ>ⲛⲁⲍⲣⲙ̄: ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲍⲣⲙ̄ sa 41.18, CLM 3469, ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲍⲣⲛ̄ sa 48

v. 2 ⲧⲉⲩⲕⲁⲓⲥⲉ: ⲧⲉⲩⲕⲁⲉⲓⲥⲉ sa 41.18, sa 48, ⲧ̣ⲉⲩⲕⲁ̣ⲓ̈[ⲥ]ⲉ̣ CLM 3469

v. 3 ⲉⲡⲓ̈ⲙⲁ: ⲏⲉⲡⲉⲓ̈ⲙⲁ sa 41.18, ⲉⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ sa 48, ⲉⲡ[ⲉⲓⲙⲁ] CLM 3469 | ⲛⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ: ⲏⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ sa 48, [ⲛⲁ]ⲛⲟ[ⲙⲟⲥ] CLM 3469

v. 4 ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲫⲁ: ⲏⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲩⲫⲁ sa 41.18, ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲧⲣ[ⲩⲫⲁ] sa 48, [ⲁⲧⲉ]ⲧⲛ̣ⲧ[ⲣⲩ]ⲫⲁ CLM 3469 | ⲁⲩⲱ[1]: > sa 48, | ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲉ: ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲉ sa 48 (! DECOT: ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲉ) | ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲗⲁⲥ: ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲥ (*sic*) sa 41.18 | ⲛ{ⲛ}ⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲛ: ⲏⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲛ sa 41.18, ⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲟ[ⲙⲟⲛ] sa 48

v. 5 ⲉⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲁ ⲉⲛⲱϩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲓ̈ⲃⲉⲥ· ⲉⲧⲕⲱⲛ̄ⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲱϩⲣⲉ ⲉⲛ ⲛⲉⲓⲁ· ⲛⲧⲙϩⲧⲉ ⲛ{ⲛ}̄ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ·[v. 5]

v. 6 ⲧⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲙⲉⲣ̈ⲓⲥ· ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲕⲗϩⲣⲟⲥ· ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲱⲱ (Page 116, f. 57[v] [Copt.ⲣ̄ⲓϩ]) ⲛⲉ ⲉ̄ⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲍⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲁⲗⲟ ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲍⲉⲛ-ⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ· ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ†ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓ̈ⲥ·[v. 6]

v. 7 ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲧⲕ̄ ⲍⲓ̈ⲭⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲟ<ⲟ>ⲩ ⲉⲫⲭⲟⲥⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲫⲍⲗⲟⲩⲗⲱⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲁⲗⲟ ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓ̈ⲁ·[v. 7]

v. 8 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲍⲓ̈ ⲡⲁⲍⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲉⲥⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣⲟ· ⲉⲣⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲣⲱ-ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ̈ ⲉⲣⲁⲥⲛ ⲟⲩⲍⲟⲩⲟ· ⲁⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ ⲛⲙⲙⲉ·[v. 8]

v. 9 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲧⲁⲱⲁ ⲛⲧⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛ̈ⲓⲁ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲧⲁⲱⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲩ ⲙⲙⲟ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲭⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲍⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲓ̈ⲱⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲱ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲧⲟ ⲁⲑⲃⲃⲓ̈ⲟ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲱⲁ ⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ[v. 9]

v. 10 ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲱ· ⲁⲍⲓⲥⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ †ⲛⲁⲕⲁ ⲧⲟⲟⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ· ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲉⲥⲙⲥⲟⲙ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ̈· ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲧⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲉⲡⲥⲱⲡⲧ·[v. 10]

v. 11 ⲛⲧⲁⲣ̄ ⲍⲟⲧⲉ ⲍⲏⲧ̄ⲫ ⲛⲛⲓ̈ⲙ· ⲁⲣ̄ ⲍⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲭⲓ̈ ⲥⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣ̄ ⲡⲁⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ· ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲁⲁⲧ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ· ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲍⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲍⲏⲧ· ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲍⲱ ⲉⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟ †ⲛⲁⲟⲃⲱⲧ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲣ̄ ⲍⲟⲧⲉ ⲍⲏⲧ·[v. 11]

v. 12 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲍⲱ †ⲛⲁⲭⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲇⲓ̈ⲕⲁⲓ̈ⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲛⲁ† ⲍⲏⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ ⲁⲛ·[v. 12]

---

v. 5 ⲍⲉⲛⲱϩⲛ: ⲍⲛ̄ⲱϩⲛ ⲉⲩⲟ sa 41.18, ⲍⲉⲛ[ⲱϩⲛ] CLM 3469 | ⲛ̄ⲍⲁⲓ̈ⲃⲉⲥ: ⲛ̄ⲍⲁⲉⲓⲃⲉⲥ sa 48, ⲛ̣ⲍⲁⲓ̈[ⲃⲉⲥ] CLM 3469 | ⲛ{ⲛ}̄ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ: ⲛⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ sa 41.18, ⲛ̣ⲛ̣ⲉ̣ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ sa 48, [ⲛ]̄ⲙⲡⲉ[ⲧⲣⲁ] CLM 3469

v. 6 ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ: ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲱⲛ sa 41.18 | ⲛⲍⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧⲛ: ⲛ̄ⲍⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱ̄ⲧⲛ sa 41.18 | ⲛⲍⲉⲛⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ: ⲛ̄ⲍⲛ̄ⲑⲩⲥⲓ̈ⲁ sa 41.18 | ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲇⲉ: ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲥⲉ sa 41.18, sa 48

v. 7 ⲟⲩⲧⲟ<ⲟ>ⲩ: ⲟⲩⲧⲟⲟⲩ sa 41.18, sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲉⲫⲍⲗⲟⲩⲗⲱⲟⲩ: ⲉⲫⲍⲗⲟⲗⲱⲟⲩ CLM 3469 | ⲛⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓ̈ⲁ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓ̈ⲁ sa 41.18

v. 8 ⲁⲕⲱ: ⲁⲣⲕⲱ sa 41.18 (! DECOT: ⲁⲕⲱ), ⲉⲕⲱ CLM 3469 | ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲩⲉ sa 48 | ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲉⲥⲣⲟ: ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲥⲣⲟ sa 48 | ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣⲟ: ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲏⲓ sa 41.18 | ⲙⲙⲟⲓ: ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲉⲓ sa 48 | ⲉⲣⲁⲥⲛ: ⲉⲣⲛⲁⲥⲛ sa 41.18 | ⲟⲩⲍⲟⲩⲟ: ⲍⲟⲩⲟ sa 48 | ⲁⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ: ⲁⲣⲙⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲧⲕ sa 41.18

v. 9 ⲁⲧⲁⲱⲁ: ⲁⲣⲧⲁⲱⲟ sa 41.18, ˈⲁⲧⲁⲱⲟ sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲁⲧⲁⲱⲉ: ⲁⲣⲧⲁⲱⲉ sa 41.18 | ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲩ: ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲟⲩ sa 48 | ⲁⲭⲟⲟⲩ: ⲁⲣⲭⲟⲟⲩ sa 41.18 | ⲛ̄ⲍⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲓ̈ⲱⲓ̈ⲛⲉ: ⲛ̄ⲍⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓ̈ⲱⲓ̈ⲛⲉ sa 41.18, ⲛ̄ⲍⲉⲛⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲱⲓⲛⲉ sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲡⲃⲟⲗ: ⲙ̄ⲡⲃⲟⲗ sa 48 | ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲱ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲟⲱ sa 48 | ⲁⲕⲧⲟ: ⲁⲣⲕ̄ⲧⲟ sa 41.18 | ⲁⲑⲃⲃⲓ̈ⲟ: ⲁⲣⲑⲃⲃⲓ̈ⲟ sa 41.18, ⲁⲑ̄ⲃⲉⲓⲟ CLM 3469

v. 10 ⲛⲟⲩⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ: ⲛⲟⲩⲍⲓⲟⲟⲩ CLM 3469 | ⲁⲍⲓⲥⲉ: ⲁⲣⲍⲓ̈ⲥⲉ sa 41.18 | ⲉⲓⲉⲥⲙⲥⲟⲙ: ⲉⲓ̈ⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲟⲙ sa 41.18, ⲉⲉⲓⲥⲙ̄[ⲥⲟⲙ] sa 48 | ⲁⲓ̈ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ: ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲣ̄ ⲛⲁⲓ sa 48 | ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲉⲡⲥⲱⲡⲧ: ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲥⲱ̄ⲡⲧ sa 48, ⲙ̄ⲡ[ⲉⲥⲡ] ⲥⲱⲡ[ⲧ] CLM 3469

v. 11 ⲛⲧⲁⲣ̄ ⲍⲟⲧⲉ: ⲛⲧⲟ ⲧⲣ̄ⲣⲉ sa 41.18 (! DECOT: ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ̣ⲧⲣ̄ⲣⲉ), ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲣ̄ ⲣⲉ sa 48, [ⲛ]ⲧⲁⲧ[ⲣⲣⲉ] CLM 3469 | ⲁⲣ̄ ⲍⲟⲧⲉ: ⲁⲣⲣ̄ⲍⲟⲧⲉ sa 41.18 | ⲁⲩⲱ[1]: > sa 48 | ⲁⲭⲓ̈ ⲥⲟⲗ: ⲁⲣⲭⲓ̈ⲥⲟⲗ sa 41.18 | ⲉⲣⲟⲓ: ⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓ sa 48 | ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲁⲁⲧ: ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲕⲁⲁⲧ (*sic*) sa 41.18, + ⲛⲉ sa 48 | ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ: ˈⲍⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ sa 41.18, sa 48 | ⲉⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ: ⲉⲉⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ sa 48

v. 12 ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲛⲁ†: ⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲛⲁ† sa 41.18, ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲛⲁ† sa 48, [ⲉⲧⲉ]ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ[ⲛⲁ†] CLM 3469

v. 13 ⲉⲣⲱⲁⲛⲱⲱ ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲩ· ⲙⲁⲣⲟⲩⲧⲟⲩⲭⲟ ⲍⲛ ⲧⲟⲩⲑⲗⲓ̈ⲯⲓ̈ⲥ· ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲡⲧⲏⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ<ⲓ>ⲧⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲍⲁⲧⲏⲩ ⲛ<ⲁ>ⲑⲗⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ· ⲛⲉⲧⲕⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲍⲧⲏⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲛⲁⲭⲡⲟ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲍ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· [v. 13]

v. 14 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲧ̄ⲃⲃⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲙ̄ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲩⲓ̈ ⲛⲛⲉⲭⲣⲟⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲛ ⲛⲉⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲗⲗⲁⲟⲥ· [v. 14]

v. 15 ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓ̈ⲥ ⲭⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ· ⲡⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲍ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ ⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉⲍ· ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ (Page 117, f. 58[r] [Copt. ⲢⲒⲑ]) ⲡⲉⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓ̈ⲥ ⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ ⲍⲛ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· ⲡⲉⲧⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲍⲁⲣⲱⲍⲏⲧ ⲛ̄ⲛⲍⲏⲧ ⲱⲏⲙ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛⲍ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲩⲩ ⲍⲙ ⲡⲉⲩⲍⲏⲧ· [v. 15]

v. 16 <ⲛ>ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲭⲓ̈ ⲕⲃⲟ ⲙ̇ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲛ ⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉⲍ· ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥⲥ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲛ ⲱⲁ ⲃⲟⲗ· ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲡⲛ̀ⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲏⲩ ⲉ̄ⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲓ̈ⲧⲟⲟⲧ· ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ(ⲛ)ⲧⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲁⲙⲓ̈ⲉ ⲛⲓ̈ⲃⲉ ⲛⲓ̈ⲙ· [v. 16]

v. 17 ⲁ̈ⲓⲗⲩⲡⲏ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁ̈ⲓⲡⲁⲧⲁⲥⲥⲉ ⲙ̇ⲙⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁ̈ⲓⲕⲧⲟ ⲙ̇ⲡⲁⲍⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̇ⲙⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲗⲩⲡⲏ· ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲟⲱⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲕⲙ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲙ̄ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲩⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ· [v. 17]

v. 18 ⲁ̈ⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁ̈ⲓⲧⲁⲗⲥⲟⲩ· ⲁ̈ⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁ̈ⲓⲧ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲟⲗⲥ̄ⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉ· [v. 18]

v. 19 ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲉ̄ⲭⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ· ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲍⲏⲛ ⲉ̄ⲍⲟⲩ(ⲛ)· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓ̈ⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁⲗⲥⲟⲟⲩ·

v. 20 ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲁⲩⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲛⲣⲉⲩⲭⲓ̈ ⲛⲥⲟⲛ̄ⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲍⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲛⲉⲩⲥⲙⲥⲟⲙ ⲛⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ· [v. 20]

v. 21 ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲛⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓ̈ⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ·

---

v. 13 ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲩ: ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲟⲩ sa 48 | ⲧⲟⲩⲑⲗⲓ̈ⲯⲓ̈ⲥ: ⲧⲟⲩⲑⲗⲓⲯⲉⲓⲥ sa 48 | ⲡⲧⲏⲩ: ⲡⲧⲏⲟⲩ sa 48 | ⲛⲁⲩ<ⲓ>ⲧⲟⲩ: ⲛⲁⲩⲓⲧⲟⲩ sa 41.18, sa 48, ⲛⲁⲩⲓ[ⲧⲟⲩ] CLM 3469 | ⲟⲩⲍⲁⲧⲏⲩ: ⲟⲩⲍⲁⲧⲏⲟⲩ sa 48, [ⲟⲩ]ⲍⲁ[ⲧⲏⲩ] CLM 3469 | ⲛ<ⲁ>ⲑⲗⲟⲟⲩ: ⲛⲁⲑⲗⲟⲟⲩ sa 41.18, ⲛⲁⲧⲍⲗⲟⲟⲩ sa 48, [ⲛⲁⲧⲍ]ⲗⲟ[ⲟⲩ] CLM 3469 | ⲉⲣⲟⲓ: [ⲉⲣⲟ]ⲉⲓ sa 48, [ⲉⲣⲟ]ⲓ P.Mon.Epiph. 27 | ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ: ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓ sa 48

v. 14 ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲭⲟⲟⲥ: ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲭⲟⲟ *sic!* P.Mon.Epiph 27 | ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ: ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛ̣[ⲉⲍⲓⲏ] sa 48 | ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲛ ⲛⲉⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ: ⲝⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲓ̈ ⲧⲉⲍⲓ̈ⲏ sa 41.18, CLM 3469, ⲝⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲍⲓⲏ sa 48 | ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲩⲓ: ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲧⲛⲩⲓ P.Mon.Epiph 27

v. 15 ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲍ: ⲥⲡⲉ̣ⲧ̣[ⲟⲩⲏⲍ] sa 48 | ⲛⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ: ⲛⲉⲭⲟⲥⲉ CLM 3469 | ⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ: ⲡⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ sa 48 | ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ ⲍⲛ: + ⲡⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ· ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲍⲛ sa 41.18 | ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲍⲁⲣⲱⲍⲏⲧ: ⲛⲟⲩⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲧ̄ⲍⲁⲣⲱⲏⲧ sa 48 | ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲱⲩ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲱⲩ sa 48 (! DECOT: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲱⲩ)

v. 16 <ⲛ>ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲭⲓ̈ ⲕⲃⲟ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲭⲓ̈ ⲝⲕⲃⲁ sa 41.18, CLM 3469, ⲛ̄ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲕⲃⲁ sa 48 | ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥⲥ: ⲛ̄ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥ̄ⲥ sa 48, ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥ̄ⲥ CLM 3469 | ⲁⲛⲟⲕ: pr. ⲝⲁⲩⲱ sa 41.18, sa 48, CLM 3469 | ⲡⲉ(ⲛ)ⲧⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲁⲙⲓ̈ⲉ: ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ CLM 3469 | ⲛⲓ̈ⲃⲉ: ⲛⲓⲫⲉ sa 48, CLM 3469

v. 17 ⲁ̈ⲓⲗⲩⲡⲏ: ⲁⲉⲓⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ sa 48, ⲁ̈ⲓⲗⲩⲡⲉ̣ⲓ̈ CLM 3469 | ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ: ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ sa 48 | ⲁ̈ⲓⲡⲁⲧⲁⲥⲥⲉ: ⲁⲉⲓ–ⲡⲁⲧⲁⲥⲥⲉ sa 48 | ⲁ̈ⲓⲕⲧⲟ: ⲁⲉⲓⲕⲧⲟ sa 48, ⲁ̈ⲓⲕⲧ̣[ⲟ] CLM 3469 | ⲁⲩⲗⲩⲡⲏ: ⲁⲩⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ sa 48, [ⲁⲩ]ⲗⲩⲡⲉ̣[ⲓ] CLM 3469

v. 18 ⲉ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲍⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ: + ⲁⲩⲱ sa 48 | ⲁ̈ⲓⲧⲁⲗⲥⲟⲩ: ⲁⲉⲓ[ⲧⲁⲗ]ⲥⲟⲩ sa 48 | ⲁ̈ⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ: ⲁⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ sa 48 | ⲁ̈ⲓⲧ: ⲁⲉⲓⲧ sa 48

v. 20 ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲁⲩⲓ: ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲙ [ⲛⲁⲩⲓ] sa 48 | ⲛⲛⲉⲩⲥⲙⲥⲟⲙ: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲱ ⲥⲙ ⲥⲟⲙ sa 48 | ⲛⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ: ⲛ̄ⲙⲧⲟⲛ sa 41.18, ⲉⲙ̄[ⲧ]ⲟⲛ sa 48, [ⲉ]ⲙⲧⲟⲛ CLM 3469

4. English Translation of Isa 56–57

The English translation of Isa 56–57 from the Sahidic dialect of the Coptic language reads as follows:[49]

Chapter 56

v. 1 This is what the Lord says: Keep judgment;[50] do righteousness,[51] for my salvation has drawn near to arrive and my mercy to be revealed.

v. 2 Happy is the man who does these things, the person who holds them fast, who keeps *my*[52] sabbaths so as not to profane them,[53] and watches his hands so as not to do wrong.

v. 3 Let not the alien who clings to the Lord say, 'So then the Lord will separate me from his people,' and let not the eunuch say, 'I am a dry tree.'

v. 4 This is what the Lord says *to the eunuchs*:[54] As many as keep my *commands*[55] and choose the things that I want and hold fast my covenant,

v. 5 *I will bring them into my holy mountain and*[56] I will give to them, in my house and within my wall, *a chosen and*[57] esteemed place, better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name, and it shall not fail.

v. 6 And to the aliens who cling to the Lord, to be subject to him, to love the name of the Lord, so that they may be his male and female slaves – and as for *them*[58] who keep my sabbaths so as not to profane them[59] and hold fast my covenant –

v. 7 I will bring them into my holy mountain and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their whole burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be acceptable on my altar, for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations[60] –

v. 8 said the Lord, who gathers the dispersed of Israel – for I will gather to *you*[61] a gathering.

v. 9 All you wild animals that live in the fields, all you wild animals of the forest, come here; eat!

---

49 In translating the text using NETS, the same principles were applied as in the translation of the previous chapters (cf. e.g. Bąk, *Isa 46–48*, 614).
50 Lit. *the* judgment → T 5.
51 Lit. *the* righteousness → T 5.
52 NETS: *the* → T 5.
53 Lit. *Tchem* om. in the LXX (μὴ βεβηλοῦν) → T 1.
54 See the commentary.
55 NETS: *sabbaths* → T 3.
56 Om. in NETS → T 1.
57 Om. in NETS → T 1.
58 NETS: *all* → T 3.
59 Lit. *them* om. in the LXX (μὴ βεβηλοῦν) → T 1.
60 Tr. → T 6.
61 NETS: to *him* → T 3; see also the commentary.

v. 10 *Come*,[62] observe that all have become totally blind; they have not learned how to *bark*;[63] they are all silent[64] dogs; they *are not* able to[65] *answer*;[66]dreaming in bed, loving to slumber.

v. 11 The dogs[67] are shameless in their soul[68], not knowing satisfaction. *And*[69] they are evil, not knowing understanding. They have all followed their own ways, each in *his own*[70] manner.

Chapter 57

v. 1 Observe how the righteous has perished, and no one takes it to *his*[71] heart; righteous men are being taken away, and no one takes notice, for the righteous has been taken away from the presence of unrighteousness;[72]

v. 2 his burial will be in peace; he has been taken away from their[73] midst.

v. 3 But as for you, draw near here, you *sons of the lawless*,[74] you offspring of adulterers and of a whore.

v. 4 In what have you indulged? And against whom have you opened your mouth wide? And against whom have you let loose your tongue? Are you not children of destruction, *the*[75] lawless offspring

v. 5 who[76] call on[77] their[78] idols under *shady*[79] trees, slaughtering their children in the ravines, among the rocks.

v. 6 That is your portion; that is your lot; *from* them[80] you have poured out libations, and to them you have brought a sacrifice. Shall I not therefore be angry for these things? *said the Lord*.[81]

v. 7 *There was your bed upon a high and lofty mountain*,[82] and there you brought up *a sacrifice*.[83]

v. 8 Behind[84] the posts of your door you have set up *a memorial*.[85] You supposed that if you should desert me, you would obtain something greater. You have loved those who lay with you

---

62 Om. in NETS → T 1.
63 NETS: how to think → T 3.
64 See the commentary.
65 NETS: they *will not be* able to → T 7.
66 NETS: to *bark* → T 3.
67 Lit. *And* the dogs (LXX: καὶ = sa 52).
68 LXX lit. in *the* soul → T 5.
69 LXX: καὶ = sa 52.
70 NETS: *the same* → T 7.
71 Om. in NETS → T 5.
72 Tr. in the LXX → T 6.
73 Lit. *their* om. in the LXX (ἐκ τοῦ μέσου) = Sa.
74 NETS: *lawless sons* → T 7.
75 NETS: *a* lawless offspring → T 5.
76 NETS: *You are the ones* who → T 7.
77 Om. prep. ἐπί → T 4.
78 Lit. *their* om in the LXX (τὰ εἴδωλα) = Sa.
79 NETS: *thick* → T 3.
80 NETS: *and* to them → T 2, T 4.
81 Om. in NETS → T 1.
82 Tr. in the LXX → T 6.
83 NETS: *your sacrifices* → T 7. See the commentary.
84 Lit. *And* behind (LXX: καὶ ὀπίσω = Copt.).
85 Tr. in Copt. → T 6. NETS: *your memorials* → T 7, see the commentary.

v. 9 and multiplied[86] your fornication with them, and you have made many those who were far from you and sent ambassadors beyond your borders, and you turned away and were *very*[87] humbled even to Hades.

v. 10 You grew weary with your long journeys, but you did not say, '*Now*[88] I will cease to regain strength, *because I have accomplished these things*.'[89] Therefore you[90] did not entreat me.

v. 11 Of whom were you cautious and afraid, and you lied to me and did not remember me, nor did you take me into your[91] *thoughts*[92] or into your heart? And when I see you, I disregard[93] you, and you have not feared me.

v. 12 And I will declare my righteousness and your evils, which will not help you.

v. 13 When you cry out *to them*,[94] let them deliver you in your affliction! For the wind will take all of these, and a tempest will carry them[95] away. But those who cling to me shall possess the earth and inherit my holy mountain.

v. 14 And they shall say, 'Cleanse the ways before him, and remove the obstructions from my people's *ways*.'[96]

v. 15 This is what the[97] Lord says, the Most High, who dwells forever in lofty places – Holy among the holy ones is his name, the Lord Most High who rests among the holy ones and gives patience to the faint-hearted[98] and gives life to those who are broken of heart:[99]

v. 16 I will not punish you forever, nor will I always be angry with you, for a spirit shall go forth from me, and[100] I have made every breath.

v. 17 Because of sin I grieved him a little while;[101] *and*[102] I struck him and turned my face away from him, and[103] he was grieved and went on sullen *in my presence*[104] in his ways.

v. 18 I have seen his ways, and[105] I healed him and[106] comforted him, yes,[107] gave him true comfort –

v. 19 peace upon peace to those that are far and to those that are near. And the Lord said, I will heal them.

---

86 See the commentary.
87 Om. in NETS → T 1.
88 Om. in NETS → T 1.
89 NETS: *Because you have accomplished these things* → T 7.
90 See the commentary.
91 Lit. *your* om. in the LXX → T 1.
92 NETS: *thought* → T 7.
93 Lit. I *will* disregard → T 7.
94 Om. in NETS → T 1.
95 Lit. *them* om. in the LXX → T 1.
96 NETS: *way* → T 7.
97 Lit. *the* om. in the LXX → T 5.
98 Tr. → T 6.
99 Lit. *in their heart* → T 4.
100 Lit. *and* om. in sa 52 → T 2.
101 Tr. → T 6.
102 LXX: καί (= sa 52).
103 Lit. *and* om. in sa 52 → T 2.
104 Om. in the LXX → T 1.
105 Lit. *and* om. in sa 52 → T 2.
106 Lit. *and* om. in sa 52 → T 2.
107 Lit. *and* (LXX: καί = sa 52).

v. 20 But thus *the wave will take those who work iniquity*[108] and they shall not be able to rest.

v. 21 There is no rejoicing for the impious, said the Lord God.

5. Tables of Language Differences

The differences between the text of the Septuagint and its Coptic translation will be presented in the following order: additions (Table 1), omissions found in the Coptic text (Table 2), the use of different vocabulary (Table 3), changes of prepositions (Table 4) and articles (Table 5), changes in word order (Table 6) and semantic changes (Table 7). The last table shows the Greek borrowings appearing in the Coptic text of Isa 53 (Table 8).[109]

Table 1. Additions in the Coptic text

Verse	Septuagint text	Coptic text
56:2	μὴ βεβηλοῦν: so as not to profane	ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲁϩⲙⲟⲩ: so as not to profane *them* (Ziegler: + αυτα Co)
56:5	δώσω αὐτοῖς: I will give to them	pr. ϯⲛⲁϫⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· ⲁⲩⲱ: *I will bring them into my holy mountain and* (Ziegler: εισαξω αυτους εις το ορος το αγιον μου και Co)
56:5	τόπον ὀνομαστόν: an esteemed place	pr. ⲉⲫⲥⲟⲧⲡ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ: *a chosen and* (Ziegler: εκλεκτον και Sa)
56:6	μὴ βεβηλοῦν: so as not to profane	ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲁϩⲙⲟⲩ: so as not to profane *them* (Ziegler: + αυτα Co)
56:10	ἴδετε: observe!	pr. ⲁⲙⲏⲓⲛ: *come!* (Ziegler: pr. δευτε Sa)
57:6	fin.]	+ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ: *said the Lord* (Ziegler: + λεγει κυριος Sa)
57:9	ἐταπεινώθης: you were humbled	ⲁⲑⲃⲃⲓⲟ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ: you were *very* humbled (Ziegler: + σφοδρα Sa)
57:10	παύσομαι: I will cease	ϯⲛⲁⲕⲁ ⲧⲟⲟⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ: *Now* I will cease (Ziegler: pr. νυν Sa)
57:11	εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν: into thought	ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ: into *your* (pl.) thought (Ziegler: + σου Co)
57:13	ὅταν ἀναβοήσῃς: when you cry out	ⲉⲣⲱⲁⲛⲱⲱ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲩ: when you cry out *to them* (> Ziegler)
57:13	ἀποίσει: it will carry [them] away	ⲛ<ⲁ>ⲑⲗⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ: it will carry *them* away (Ziegler: + αυτους Co)
57:17	στυγνός: sullen	+ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲙ̄ⲧⲟ: in my presence (Ziegler: + ενωπιον μου Sa)

108 NETS: *shall the unrighteous be tossed like waves* → T 2, see the commentary.

109 The addition of a proximal complement in a Coptic text, or an article where the Greek does not have one, can often result from the structure of the Coptic language itself. Although it lends a fuller meaning than in the Greek text and may come as a consequence of reflection on the meaning of a sentence, it often does not make a significant contribution to the history of the transmission of the Greek text. Similarly, the order of words in a sentence may be the result of Coptic phrase construction. For remarks concerning the tables, see also Bąk, *Isa 41*, 76.

Table 2. Omissions in the Coptic text

57:6	κἀκείνοις[1]: *and* to them	om. καὶ (Zieger: εκ(ε)ινοις Co)
57:16	καί	om. in sa 52 (> Ziegler); pr. ⲁⲩⲱ sa 41.18, sa 48, CLM 3469 (= LXX)
57:17	καί[3]	om. in sa 52 (> Ziegler)
57:18	καί[1,2]	om. in sa 52 (> Ziegler)

Table 3. Changes of words

56:4	τὰ σάββατά μου: my sabbaths	ⲉⲛⲁⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲁⲅⲙⲁ: my commands (Ziegler: προσταγματα Co)
56:6	πάντας τοὺς φυλασσομένους: for *all* who keep	<ⲛ>ⲉⲧϩⲁⲣⲉϩ: for *them* who keep (Ziegler: om. πάντας Sa)
56:8	συνάξω ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν: I will gather *to him*	ϯⲛⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲭⲱ: I will gather *to you* (Ziegler: επ᾽αυτους = CLM 3469: [ⲉⲭⲱ]ⲩ), sa 41.18, sa 48 = LXX
56:10	οὐκ ἔγνωσαν φρονῆσαι: they have not learned how *to think*	ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲟⲛⲧ: they have not learned how *to bark* (> Ziegler)
56:10	οὐ δυνήσονται ὑλακτεῖν: they will not be able *to bark*	ⲉⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲁϩⲙⲉϥ: they are not able *to answer* (> Ziegler)
57:5	ὑπὸ δένδρα δασέα: under thick trees	ϩⲁ ϩⲉⲛⲱϩⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲓⲃⲉⲥ: under *shady* trees (> Ziegler)

Table 4. Changes of prepositions

57:5	οἱ παρακαλοῦντες ἐπὶ τὰ εἴδωλα: who call on their idols	ⲉⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ: who call on their idols (Ziegler: om. ἐπί Co)
57:6	κἀκείνοις: *to* them	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ: *from* them (> Ziegler)
57:15	τοῖς συντετριμμένοις τὴν καρδίαν: to those who are broken of heart	ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲱϥ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲩϩⲏⲧ: lit. to those who are broken *in their* heart (> Ziegler)

Table 5. Changes of articles

56:1	κρίσιν: judgment	ⲉⲡϩⲁⲡ: lit. *the* judgment (> Ziegler)
56:1	δικαιοσύνην: righteousness	ⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ: lit. *the* righteousness (> Ziegler)
56:2	τὰ σάββατα: the sabbaths	ⲉⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ: *my* sabbaths (Ziegler: μου Sa)
56:8	συνάξω ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν: I will gather to *him*	ϯⲛⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲭⲱ: I will gather to *you* (fem.) (< Ziegler); in sa 41.18 and sa 48: ⲉ̄ⲭⲱϥ (= LXX); see the commentary
56:11	τῇ ψυχῇ: in the soul	ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ: in *their* soul (> Ziegler)
57:1	τῇ καρδίᾳ: [in] the heart	ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ: in *his* heart (> Ziegler)
57:4	σπέρμα: an offspring	ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ: *the* offspring (> Ziegler)
57:15	κύριος: Lord	ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ: *the* Lord (> Ziegler)

Table 6. Changes in word order

56:7	ὁ γὰρ οἶκός μου[1] / οἶκος προσευχῆς[2] / κληθήσεται[3] / πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν[4]: for my house[1] / shall be called[3] / a house of prayer[2] / for all the nations[4]	ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ[3] / ⲉⲡⲁϩⲓ[1] / ϫⲉ ⲡϩⲏ̈ ⲙⲡⲉⲱⲗϩⲁ[2] / ⲛⲛϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ[4] (> Ziegler)
57:1	ἀπὸ γὰρ προσώπου ἀδικίας[1] / ἦρται ὁ δίκαιος[2]: for the righteous has been taken away[2] / from the presence of unrighteousness[1]	ⲁⲩⲫ<ⲓ> ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲡⲁ̈ⲓ̈ⲕⲁ̈ⲓ̈ⲟⲥ[2] / <ⲛ>ⲛⲁϩⲣⲏ̄ ⲡϫⲓ̈ ⲛⲥⲟⲛⲥ[1] (> Ziegler)
57:7	ἐπ᾽ ὄρος ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον[1] / ἐκεῖ σου ἡ κοίτη[2]: upon a high and lofty mountain[1], / there was your bed[2]	ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲧⲕ[2] / ϩⲓ̈ϫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲟ<ⲟ>ⲩ ⲉⲫϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲫϩⲗⲟⲩⲗⲱⲟⲩ[1]: *there was your bed*[2] / *upon a high and lofty mountain*[1] (> Ziegler)
57:8	καὶ ὀπίσω τῶν σταθμῶν τῆς θύρας σου[1] / ἔθηκας μνημόσυνά σου[2]: behind the posts of your door[1] / you have set up your memorials[2]	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ[2] / ϩⲓ̈ ⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲉⲟⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣⲟ[1] (> Ziegler)
57:15	ὀλιγοψύχοις[1] / διδοὺς[2] / μακροθυμίαν[3]: who gives[2] / patience[3] / to the faint-hearted[1]	ⲡⲉⲧⲧ[2] / ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧϩⲁⲣⲱϩⲧ[3] / ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ ⲱⲏⲙ[1] (> Ziegler)
57:17	δι᾽ ἁμαρτίαν[1] / βραχύ τι[2] / ἐλύπησα αὐτὸν[3]: because of sin[1] / I grieved him[3] / a little while[2]	ⲁ̈ⲓ̈ⲁⲩⲡⲏ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ[3] / ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ[2] / ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ[1] (> Ziegler)

Table 7. Semantic changes

56:10	οὐ δυνήσονται: they *will not be* able to	ⲉⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ: they *are not* able to (> Ziegler)
56:11	κατὰ τὸ αὐτό: in the same manner	ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧⲉϥⲙⲏ̈ⲛⲉ: in *his own* manner (Ziegler: κατα το εαυτου Co)
57:3	υἱοὶ ἄνομοι: lawless sons	ⲛⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ: sons of the lawless (> Ziegler), in sa 48: ⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ (= LXX)
57:5	οἱ παρακαλοῦντες: [you are] the ones who call	ⲉⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ: who call (> Ziegler)
57:7	θυσίας: sacrifices	ⲛⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓ̈ⲁ: a sacrifice (in Acc.) (Ziegler: + σου Sa), see the commentary
57:8	μνημόσυνά σου: your memorials	ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ: a memorial (in Acc.) (Ziegler: μνημοσυνον Bo, without any reference to Sa), see the commentary
57:10	ὅτι ἔπραξας ταῦτα: because *you* have accomplished these things	ϫⲉ ⲁ̈ⲓ̈ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ: because *I* have accomplished these things (Ziegler: επραξα Co)
57:11	εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν: into [your] *thought*	ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ: into your (pl.) *thoughts* (> Ziegler); in sa 41.18, sa 48: ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ (= LXX)
57:11	παρορῶ: I disregard	ⲧⲛⲁⲟⲃⲱⲧ: I *will* disregard (> Ziegler)
57:13	ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ: from the *way*	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲛⲉϩⲓ̈ⲟⲟⲩⲉ: from the *ways* (> Ziegler); in sa 41.18, CLM 3469: ⲉ̄ⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓ̈ ⲧⲉϩⲓ̈ⲏ or in sa 48: ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ (= LXX)
57:20	κλυδωνισθήσονται: *they will be tossed here and there by waves*	ⲡϩⲟⲉⲓⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲁϥⲓ: *the wave will take* (> Ziegler)

Table 8. Greek words in the Coptic text

56:9	ἅγριος	ⲁⲅⲣⲒⲟⲛ
57:3 57:4	ἄνομος	ⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲛ
57:21	ἀσεβής	ⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ
56:1; 57:1, 16	γάρ	ⲅⲁⲣ
57:3, 6, 13, 20	δέ	ⲇⲉ
56:4, 6	διαθήκη	ⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ
57:1 (3x)	δίκαιος	ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ
56:1; 57:12	δικαιοσύνη	ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ
56:7	ἔθνος	ⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ
57:5	εἴδωλον	ⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ
57:2, 19 (2x)	εἰρήνη	ⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ
56:9 (2x)	θηρίον	ⲑⲩⲣⲓⲟⲛ
57:13	θλῖψις	ⲑⲗⲓⲯⲓⲥ
57:6 57:7	θυσία	ⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ
56:7	θυσιαστήριον	ⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ
56:8	Ισραηλ	ⲡⲓⲏⲗ
57:13	κληρονομέω	ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ
57:6	κλῆρος	ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲥ
56:3; 57:14	λαός	ⲗⲁⲟⲥ
57:17 (2x)	λυπέω	ⲗⲩⲡⲏ
57:6	μερίς	ⲙⲉⲣⲒⲥ
57:11 (2x), 16	οὐδέ	ⲟⲩⲇⲉ
57:5, 18	παρακαλέω	ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ
57:17	πατάσσω	ⲡⲁⲧⲁⲥⲥⲉ
57:5	πέτρα	ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ
57:16	πνεῦμα	ⲡⲛⲁ
56:11	πονηρός	ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ
57:9	πορνεία	ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲒⲁ
57:3	πόρνη	ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ
56:4	πρόσταγμα	ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲁⲅⲙⲁ
56:2, 6	σάββατον	ⲥⲁⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ
57:3, 4	σπέρμα	ⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ
56:8	συναγωγή	ⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ
56:11	ψυχή	ⲯⲩⲭⲏ

6. The Analysis of Selected Philological Questions Found in Isa 56–57

The last part of the paper analyses the more difficult philological questions found in Isa 56–57 concerning two areas. The first results from differences between the Sahidic manuscripts, which have been indicated in the critical apparatus of the Coptic text. The second relates to how the Greek text of the Septuagint is read and translated into the Coptic language. The philological issues requiring commentary are found in the following verses:

Isa 56:4

The Coptic text might suggest a slightly different division of the initial part of the verse. The Septuagint translators read the Greek τάδε λέγει κύριος τοῖς εὐνούχοις as 'This is what the Lord says: To the eunuchs...'. The Coptic notation ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲭⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲥⲓⲟⲩⲣ· suggests putting the colon a little further and reading this part of the verse as 'This is what the Lord says to the eunuchs:' If the Coptic text had included the particle ⲭⲉ, the reading of the verse would have been even more unambiguous.

Isa 56:5

Coptic addition at the beginning of the verse ϯⲛⲁⲭⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ· ⲁⲩⲱ ('I will bring them into my holy mountain and') is an exact repetition of the beginning of verse 7.

Isa 56:8

The Coptic translation ϯⲛⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲭⲱ ('I will gather to *you*') is not an exact translation of the Greek text συνάξω ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν ('I will gather to *him*'). It is also difficult to say to whom the singular second-person feminine preposition ⲉⲭⲱ refers. The manuscripts that remain most faithful to the Septuagint are sa 41.18 and sa 48, which read ⲉ̄ⲭⲱⲩ ('to him'). The reading [ⲉⲭⲱ]ⲩ found in the heavily damaged witness CLM 3469 may be a translation of several Greek manuscripts that read επ᾽αυτους. The English translation of the verse proposed in this article remains faithful to the sa 52 manuscript.

Isa 56:10

The sa 52 manuscript reads ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲟⲟⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲟⲱ ⲛⲉ· ⲉⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲁϩⲙⲉⲩ, which can be literally translated 'they are all *many* dogs*;* they are not able to answer.' However, such a sentence does not make much sense. Other Coptic manuscripts read ⲉⲩⲟⲛⲱ, derived from the verb ⲱⲛⲱ ('be astonished', 'be dazed' but also 'be dumb'[110]). The ⲉⲩⲟ<ⲛ>ⲱ reading gives the sentence the meaning: 'they are all *silent* dogs; they are not able to answer.' It is also a correct translation of the Greek πάντες κύνες ἐνεοί.

---

110 W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1939; reprint: Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock 2005) 525a.

Isa 57:7

The Greek text κἀκεῖ ἀνεβίβασας θυσίας can be literally translated as 'and there you brought up sacrifices.' In the NETS translation, there is 'your sacrifices', which is a translation of only some of the manuscripts listed in Ziegler's critical apparatus. The reading of sa 52: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲁⲗⲟ ⲉⲣⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ends with the noun ⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ, preceded by the singular indefinite article ⲟⲩ– and the letter ⲛ–, denoting the direct object of the verb ⲧⲁⲗⲟ ('to lift', 'to offer up'[111]). Therefore, the text of sa 52 can be understood literally as follows 'and there you brought up a sacrifice.' Ziegler's critical apparatus states that the Sahidic manuscripts correspond to the Greek version θυσίας + σου ('your sacrifices'), which is not true. Only sa 41.18 contains a similar reading: ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ but here too, there is the plural possessive article ⲛⲟⲩ–, which does not correspond to the Greek σου in the singular. Manuscripts sa 48 and CLM 3469 contain a version that is consistent with the sa 52 manuscript discussed here. There is therefore no reason to add the possessive pronoun 'your' in the text and in the translation.

Sa 57:8

In this verse, the issue is very similar to that described above in Isa 57:7. The manuscript reading of sa 52: ⲁⲕⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ('you have set up *a memorial*') does not correspond exactly with the LXX version: ἔθηκας μνημόσυνά σου ('you have set up your memorials'). Since the manuscripts of sa 41.18 and CLM 3469 read according to sa 52, there is no need to introduce the reading contained in sa 48: ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲙⲉⲩⲉ ('your memorials').

Isa 57:9

The verb ⲧⲁϣⲁ, found in the sa 52 manuscript, is a form derived from the Fayyumic dialect. In the Sahidic dialect, the form ⲧⲁϣⲟ should occur.[112]

Isa 57:10

There is an observation in Ziegler's critical apparatus indicating the omission of the pronoun συ in the Coptic translations. It is difficult to agree with this observation. Both our manuscript sa 52 and sa 41.18 and sa 48 contain the 2nd person singular pronoun of the feminine ⲛⲧⲟ.

Isa 57:20

The beginning of the verse in Coptic is translated slightly differently. Whereas in the LXX the subject of the sentence is 'the wicked' (οἱ ἄδικοι), in Coptic the role of the subject is 'the wave' (ⲡϩⲟⲉⲓⲙ). In Greek, 'the wicked will be tossed here and there by waves.' In the Coptic translation, it is 'the wave will take away those who do iniquity.'

---

111 Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 408a.

112 Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 452b.

Editing the first two chapters of Trito-Isaiah (Isa 56–57) in the Sahidic dialect reveals several differences between the Septuagint text and its Coptic translation. The omission of Isa 56:12, for instance, underscores the well-established observation that the Coptic translator relied solely on the Greek text, without reference to the Hebrew original. While these variations between the Septuagint and the Coptic translation do not substantially alter the pronunciation of the edited chapters, they offer valuable insight into how Coptic-speaking Christians received the Greek biblical message. This study aims to support further philological and theological research on Trito-Isaiah by presenting available editions of the Sahidic text – emphasising manuscript sa 52 – alongside a comparison with Septuagint manuscripts and an analysis of challenging passages.

Bibliography

Amélineau, É., "Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Écriture (Ancien Testament)," *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 9 (1887) 101–130.

Bąk, T., "A Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the First Chapter of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40) on the Basis of the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) in Light of Other Coptic Manuscripts Written in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 9/1 (2019) 73–100 (= *Isa 40*).

Bąk, T., "A Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the Second Chapter of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 41) on the Basis of the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) in Light of Other Coptic Manuscripts Written in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 10/1 (2020) 63–91 (= *Isa 41*).

Bąk, T., "A Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the Text of Isa 42:1–44:5 on the Basis of the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Coptic Manuscripts Written in the Sahidic Dialect of Coptic and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 10/2 (2020) 225–260 (= *Isa 42:1–44:5*).

Bąk, T., "A Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the Text of Isa 44:6–45:25 Based on the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568), Other Manuscripts Written in the Sahidic Coptic Dialect, and on the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *Verbum Vitae* 38/2 (2020) 529–563 (= *Isa 44:6–45:25*).

Bąk, T., *Proto-Isaiah in the Sahidic Dialect of the Coptic Language. Critical Edition on the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Witnesses* (Patrologia Orientalis 251 [57.3]; Turnhout: Brepols 2020).

Bąk, T., "A Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the Text of Isa 46–48 on the Basis of the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and other Coptic Manuscripts in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 11/4 (2021) 597–635 (= *Isa 46–48*).

Bąk, T., "Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of Isa 49–50 based on Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Coptic Manuscripts in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 13/1 (2023) 1–36 (= *Isa 49–50*).

Bąk, T., "Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the Isa 53 Text Based on the Coptic Manuscript of sa 52 (M 568) and Other Coptic Manuscripts of the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *Verbum Vitae* 41/4 (2023) 859–879 (= *Isa 53*).

Bąk, T., "Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of Isa 51–52 based on Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Coptic Manuscripts in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 14/1 (2024) 17–46 (= *Isa 51–52*).

Bąk, T., "Critical Edition and Philological Analysis of the Last Chapters of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 54–55) Based on the Coptic Manuscript sa 52 (M 568) and Other Coptic Manuscripts in the Sahidic Dialect and the Greek Text of the Septuagint," *The Biblical Annals* 15/1 (2025) 59–83 (= *Isa 54–55*).

Balestri, P.J., *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani.* III. *Novum Testamentum* (Roma: Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide 1904).

Ciasca, A., *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani iussu et sumptibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide studio P. Augustini Ciasca ordinis Eremitarum S. Agostini edita* (Roma: Typis S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide 1885–1889) I–II.

Crum, W.E., *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1939; reprint: Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock 2005).

Crum, W.E. – Evelyn White, H.G., *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes*. II. *Coptic Ostraca and Papyri Edited with Translations and Commentaries by W.E. Crum. Greek Ostraca and Papyri Edited with Translations and Commentaries by H.G. Evelyn White* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 1926).

Depuydt, L., *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (Corpus van verluchte handschriften 4. Oriental Series 1; Leuven: Peeters 1993).

Górecki, T., "Sheikh Abd el-Gurna," *Seventy Years of Polish Archaeology in Egypt* (ed. E. Laskowska-Kusztal) (Warsaw: Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology 2007) 183–190.

Górecki, T. – Wipszycka, E., "Scoperta di tre codici in un eremo a Sheikh el-Gurna (TT 1151–1152): il contesto archeologico," *Adamantius* 24 (2018) 118–132.

Hebbelynck, A., "Fragments inédits de la version sahidique d'Isaïe. I. Fragments de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris," *Muséon* 14 (1913) 177–227.

Hyvernat, H., "Étude sur les versions coptes de la Bible. II. – Ce qui nous est parvenu des versions égyptiennes," *Revue Biblique* 5 (1896) 540–569.

Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Esaïe XLVII,1–LXVI,24* (Cologny – Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana 1965).

Layton, B., *A Coptic Grammar. With Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect. Second Edition, Revised and Expanded. With an Index of Citations* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2004).

Lust, J. – Eynikel, E. – Hauspie, K., *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2003).

Nagel, P., "Studien zur Textüberlieferung des sahidischen Alten Testaments, Teil IB: Der Stand der Wiederherstellung der alttestamentlichen Kodizes der Sammlung Borgia (Cod. XVII – XXX)," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 111 (1984) 138–164.

Nakano, C., "Indices d'une chronologie relative des manuscrits coptes copies à Toutôn (Fayoum)," *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006) 147–159.

Pietersma, A. –Wright, B.G. (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press 2007) (= NETS).

Rahlfs, A., *Die alttestamentlichen Lektionen der griechischen Kirche* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 5; Berlin: Weidmann 1915).

Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2006).

Schüssler, K., *Das sahidishe Alte und Neue Testament: sa 1–20* (Biblia Coptica 1/1; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1995).

Schüssler, K., *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: sa 21–48* (Biblia Coptica 1/2; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1996).

Schüssler, K., *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: sa 49–92* (Biblia Coptica 1/3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998).

Schüssler, K., *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: sa 93–120* (Biblia Coptica 1/4; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2000).

Schüssler, K., *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: sa 185–260* (Biblia Coptica 2/2; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2015).

Suciu, A., "The Sahidic Tripartite Isaiah: Origins and Transmission within the Coptic Manuscript Culture," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 66/2 (2020) 377–406.

Thommée, A., "The Gurna manuscripts (hermitage in MMA 1152) conservation report, 2010," *Polish Archaeology in the Mediterranean* 22 (2013) 199–208.

Till, W.C., "Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien. Katalog der koptischen Bibelbruchstücke. Die Pergamente," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 39 (1940) 1–57.

Till, W.C., "La séparation des mots en copte," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 60 (1960) 151–170.

Vaschalde, A., "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible," *Revue Biblique* 29 (1920) 241–258.

Wessely, C., *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts* (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 15; Leipzig: Haessel 1914) IV.

Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum*. XIV. *Isaias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1939).

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 27–42

The Presence and the Role of Senses in Proto-Apocalyptic Book of Joel

Joanna Nowińska
University of Silesia in Katowice
joanna.nowinska@us.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6386-1268

ABSTRACT: The proto-apocalyptic Book of Joel attracts attention with a multitude of sensory references. They not only provide the dynamics of the text but also create an experience of interpersonal contact that is elusive in cursory reading. The synergy in which they remain and the mutual reinforcement raise the question of the role of the senses in the process of persuasion undertaken in the apocalyptic context and text. Analyses of the semantic layer, with the application of the methods of literary analysis, with reference also to the theory of affect, conducted on the biblical text in synchronicity, reveal the radical turns of thought, marked by references to the senses, as well as counterpoints highlighting the main points of the message. They make it possible to perceive the various stages of the communicative exchange, its coherence, and the specificity of affect, where the removal of blockages in the interpersonal relationship is located. The application of the guidelines of the theory of affect reveals, among other things, the space of perception offered in the Book of Joel through references to the senses, in accordance with the culture of the recipient. The power of persuasion, pointing to the active work of God, conveyed through the language of the senses, becomes graspable to the recipient who experiences trauma and adversity.

KEYWORDS: Book of Joel, apocalyptic, senses, persuasion, affect

In the last two decades of the 21st century, literary scholarship concerning sensory perception has expanded to encompass biblical text. This analysis is carried out in terms of the presence of sensory responses,[1] references to the sense organs,[2] metaphors in which senses play a role in particular passages of Scripture,[3] their number, and the specificity of their representation resulting from the cultural image of the world.[4] These works develop in bib-

The research activities co-financed by the funds granted under the Research Excellence Initiative of the University of Silesia in Katowice.

1 See: A. Schellenberg – T. Krüger (eds.), *Sounding Sensory Profiles in the Ancient Near East* (ANEM 25; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2019) 55–214.

2 See: M.J.C. Warren, "Tasting the Little Scroll: A Sensory Analysis of Divine Interaction in Revelation 10:8–10," *JSNT* 40/1 (2017) 101–119; D.A. Kurek-Chomycz, "The Fragrance of Her Perfume: The Significance of Sense Imagery in John's Account of the Anointing in Bethany," *NovT* 52/4 (2010) 334–354.

3 See: N.L. Tilford, *Sensing World, Sensing Wisdom: The Cognitive Foundation of Biblical Metaphors* (AIL 31; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2017).

4 See: Y. Avrahami, *The Senses of Scripture: Sensory Perception in the Hebrew Bible* (LHBOTS 545; New York: Clark 2012); Y. Avrahami, "The Study of Sensory Perception in the Hebrew Bible: Notes on Method," *HBAI* 5/1 (2016) 3–22.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.17860 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

lical studies in parallel with the interest in the question of emotions.[5] Actually, the focus on sensory references in the text came forth from the attention to emotions, as a natural consequence of the search for stimuli which evoke the given feelings described in the pages of Scripture. Both lines are very relevant to the study of biblical apocalypticism, which developed out of prophetic literature as a reaction to a threat affecting Jewish identity – and consequently national, cultural, and religious identity. It transcended the external, territorial state framework by becoming the aggressor against each individual by virtue of his ethnic and religious affiliation. Not surprisingly, it evoked extreme emotions among the Israelites – fear, insecurity and desire to escape. As they had taken control of the individual's functioning, they made it impossible to perceive any cognitive message through traditional persuasion channels – because they simply made it unreliable. What was needed, therefore, was to interact at the level of stimuli that was perceived sensorially, and thus earlier than the moment when emotions were born. Hence, in apocalyptic texts, there is such a large number of references to elements implying sensory reactions. Through their help and mediation, the message had a chance to become effective. The variety of sensory references is due to the specificity of each book and is conditioned by its *leitmotif*. The lightness with which the authors of apocalyptic texts use them is due to their cultural roots, especially orality, as well as the peculiarities of everyday functioning – very close to the earth/nature, from where they also draw – based on observation – inspiration for literary images. The verbal workshop grew out of prophetic and wisdom texts, from which apocalyptic literature as a genre also originated.[6] Among the books of the Old Testament, the Book of Joel is considered proto-apocalyptic[7] – this classification is recognized by authorities in the field such as J.J. Collins.[8]

This paper examines the sensory references in the Book of Joel, exploring their distinct characteristics and highlighting features typical of apocalyptic contexts. It proposes a role for the senses in shaping the text, and investigates their function in the persuasive process, drawing on affect theory. The analysis adopts a synchronic approach to the text.

---

5 See: R. Egger-Wenzel – J. Corley (eds.), *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2011; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2012); F.S. Spencer (ed.), *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature* (RBS 90; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2017); K.M. Hockey, *The Role of Emotion in 1 Peter* (SNTSMS 173; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019); F. Mirguet, "What Is an 'Emotion' in the Hebrew Bible? An Experience that Exceeds Most Contemporary Concepts," *BibInt* 24/4–5 (2016) 442–465.

6 R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apokaliptyka u progu ery chrześcijańskiej," *RBL* 41/1 (1988) 56.

7 This designation of the Book follows the terminology established by leading exegetes in the field like J.J. Collins and S.L. Cook (S.L. Cook, "Apocalyptic Prophecy," *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* [ed. J.J. Collins] [New York: Oxford University Press 2014] 25).

8 For the argumentation regarding the classification of the Book of Joel as proto-apocalyptic, see S.L. Cook, "Apocalyptic Prophecy," 25; also: O. Plöger, in S.L. Cook, *Prophesy & Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1991) 7; J.R. Strazicich, *Joel's Use of Scripture and the Scripture's Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (BibInt 82; Leiden: Brill 2007) 99, 101.

1. Context for Sensory References – Literary Specificity of the Book of Joel

Y. Avrahami, based on the biblical idea of vitality/life, singles out the senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch, speech and movement/kinesthetics in the cultural outlook of the biblical authors.[9] Observation and science indicate that the synergy between them repeatedly makes it difficult to qualify the experience unequivocally. For this reason, it seems reasonable to speak of multisensory approaches to the Bible as well. This is almost perfectly realised in the Book of Joel. Its *leitmotif* seems to be the raid of locusts, which is compared to the invasion of an army,[10] which passes into the image of the day of the Lord by way of penetration.[11] The first of them is a threat against which the ancient Semites were completely powerless; no means of deterring these insects were developed, only the wind that brought them could also take them elsewhere.[12] Most often, however, locusts left the area only after completely devouring the vegetation, which led to natural disaster. The depiction of several phases of the development of these insects in Joel 1:4 ('What was left of the gazam ate the locusts, and what was left of the locusts ate the jelek, and what was left of the jelek ate the chasil'), indicates the great duration of this plague and its intensification. The multiplicity of references to almost all the senses is not surprising – the image even enforces them.

Of similar origin in this regard is the parallel image of the invaders in Joel 2:1–11, which reflects the experience of danger through historical or para-historical references. Both images also open up spaces of social interaction and relationship with God and introduce new sensory references. Shifting attention to God, however, does not mean immediately understanding/accepting His guidance, due to intense emotions. Attempts to grasp His presence in the face of danger are culturally characterised and thus presented in a manner emblematic of ancient Israel, with an emphasis on His lordship over every event. However, there is no room initially for interpersonal closeness. This is born only slowly as a result of turning to Him and to a dialogue with Him,[13] and is reinforced by sensory experience, described in Joel 2:19–3:5. The last chapter of this Book is the transformation of the world system, the restoration of order, and hence there are also many references to kinetics. Paradoxically, the main event described in it is the so-called Judgment in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

---

9 Y. Avrahami, *The Senses of Scripture: Sensory Perception in the Hebrew Bible*, 67–77.

10 According to M. Szmajdziński, this motif dominates the first two chapters of the Book of Joel ("Blitzkrieg w Jl 2,1–11," *StLov* 16 [2014] 269).

11 E. Assisi, *The Book of Joel: A Prophet between Calamity and Hope* (LHBOTS 581; London: Bloomsbury – Clark 2013) 27–31; see also J. Lemański, "Nadzieja zbawienia dla wzywających imienia Pana (Jl 3,1–5)," *VV* 9 (2006) 33.

12 H.W. Górska, "Rodzaje wiatru występujące w opisie plagi szarańczy (Wj 10,13.19). Charakterystyka zjawisk meteorologicznych oraz analiza zmian wprowadzonych w Septuagincie i Wulgacie," *STHŚO* 40/2 (2020) 17–20.

13 J. Barker, *From the Depths of Despair to the Promise of Presence: A Rhetorical Reading of the Book of Joel* (Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures 11; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2014) 268.

The Book of Joel, as a proto-apocalyptic text, has a clear prophetic feature. An argument corroborating this is the opening formula, in the form of the Word of the Lord to Joel, son of Petuel (Joel 1:1), an appeal for a change in functioning (Joel 1:5), and repentance toward God (Joel 1:13–15).

On the borderline between prophecy and apocalypticism lies the Day of the Lord motif present in the Book of Joel,[14] which is heavily explored by Amos, Isaiah, Micah, and Zephaniah. Its role and saturation of events, however, depends on the context in which it is sometimes mentioned – from fear, triggered by guilt over the wrongs done to people (Amos 5:18–20) to joy at the presence of God (Isa 61:2). In its cosmic contexts, as in Joel, it gains an apocalyptic trait, going beyond references to interactions at the level of nations/states. Rich imagery is also common, although its specificity already differentiates these types of biblical literature. The mention of God-given communication in visions, prophecies and dreams unites the two genres. Extremely intense sensuality to the point of being excessive in perception, as marked by repetition (Joel 1:4) and the accumulation of terms (as in Joel 2:5), is, however, only characteristic of apocalyptic literature.

The discussion regarding the date of origin of the Book of Joel varies between the view that the Book was redacted in the seventh century BCE, through convictions locating it in the period just before or during the Babylonian captivity. Others argue that the Book should be dated within the 4th–3rd centuries BCE, yet this is hardly plausible.[15] It is worth noting, however, that the apocalyptic feature of a given biblical text does not reflect only the experience of the era and therefore of the entire nation, but can also reflect individual or group experiences. This type of literature does not derive from the era, but at its core is the specificity of experience. The apocalyptic character of the Book of Joel is supported by the specificity of the threat – all-encompassing and insurmountable. In the face of danger man stands in total powerlessness. This is depicted in the image of a locust raid, the motif of judgment carried out over all nations (Joel 4:2, 12, 14), the cosmic transformation of created reality (Joel 2:10; 3:4; 4:15), and a theophany enacted through natural phenomena (Joel 4:16), as well as the motif of the harvest-press-vats (Joel 4:13) and war with an army of skyrocketing proportions (Joel 2:2), which is subordinate to and directed by God (Joel 2:11).

Based on the arguments regarding content, as well as language, it seems reasonable to consider the Book of Joel as belonging to the early or developing apocalyptic literature in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, the analysis of the presence and role of the senses will be conducted, with special attention to their importance in affecting a traumatized human being who experiences a threat from which he has no chance or way to defend himself.

---

14 According to T. Lyons, it has two contrasting portraits here ("Interpretation and Structure in Joel," *JIBS* 1/1 [2014] 102); cf. I. Balla, "The Role of God's Mighty Acts in Joel: The Book of Joel as an Example of Trauma Literature," *BA* 11/1 (2021) 68, 70.

15 More see: E. Assisi, "The Date and Meaning of the Book of Joel," *VT* 61/2 (2011) 163–183.

2. Vocabulary Describing the Senses in the Book of Joel

An analysis of the Book of Joel in terms of references to the senses surprises us by their number. However, this fact has found little interest in contemporary exegesis, except of Brady Alan Beard's doctoral thesis, which has as its subject the search for iconic references in artefacts to better visualize and understand the images of the Book of Joel.[16]

Attention is drawn to the multitude of terms related to the sense of speech. This indicates a strong interpersonal and relational feature. The operation of this sense is represented by terms that can be combined into several groups. The first is a rich vocabulary of complaining, lamenting, and crying. They express a strong sensory reaction (perception?) to the destruction of reality and the danger resulting from it. Two terms, derived from the same core, are located here: בכה – weep, bewail, emblematic of situations of stress and pain (Joel 1:5; 2:17) and בכי – weeping, semantically related (Joel 2:12). In addition to these, mention should be made of the onomatopoeia יָלַל (Joel 1:5, 11, 13) and the suggestive מְסַפֵּד (wailing – Joel 2:12), counted as sonorant based on the sound of the stem. There is also no shortage of terms related to the context of death, mourning, such as lament, אלה (Joel 1:8) and אבל, used in describing reactions to the death of loved ones. The latter in Joel 1:9, 10 represents a reaction to the desolation of the land and the resulting lack of sacrificial matter.

The second group of speech sense expressions is formed by words more marked by interpersonal reference, such as קרא (call, proclaim – Joel 1:14, 19; 2:15; 3:5), זעק (cry, cry out, call – Joel 1:14) – and accompanying it, captured by the sense of hearing, the roaring of animals אָנַח. Attention is drawn to the inclusion of the first of these – by reference to God – in the act of saving life – this is seen in Joel 3:5:

> But everyone who calls upon [אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא] the name of the Lord shall be saved, for there shall be deliverance in mount Zion and in Jerusalem, as the Lord foretold, and among the saved will be those whom the Lord has called [אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה קֹרֵא].

On the borderline between the second and third groups are the words connected with communication: דבר, describing perceptions of God's actions (Joel 1:1; 2:11; 4:8), and אמר, pertaining to both God's actions (Joel 2:19; 3:5) and man's actions (Joel 2:17bis; 4:10).

The third category consists of terms describing the activity of the sense of speech, arising from God's initiative. Located here are: ספר, meaning to relate, to count, to convert (Joel 1:3), נבא (to prophesy – Joel 3:1). It is noteworthy that, in Joel 2:17, there is an invitation or even a call to activate the sense of speech – both בכה and אמר (twice). Utterance changes consciousness relieves the tension caused by the threat. On the other hand,

16 B.A. Beard, "Seeing Visions with the Prophet: Toward an Iconographic Hermeneutic of Joel," 2023, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371306846_Seeing_Visions_with_the_Prophet_Toward_an_Iconographic_Hermeneutic_of_Joel [access: 10.09.2024].

the mention of God's דבר, perceived by the people with the sense of hearing (implicitly evidenced by the reactions) from the first verse of the Book, with an emphasis on the dynamism inherent in this word, also through the proclamation by that God's authority over every threat (Joel 2:11) and with an emphasis on its causality (Joel 4:8), allows us to grasp with the senses the message of security and the support that God represents. The guarantee of communicative exchange, which is enriched by cognition, is provided by the reference to prophecy (נבא) as a result of the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel 3:1.

A strong sensory experience is also offered by שאג (roar) – the intensive vocalisation accompanying the theophany of Joel 4:16. It is related semantically, and perhaps more so in Joel contextually, to the term voice – קוֹל. The latter, which is several times grasped by the senses, flows both from the threatening phenomenon and from God. Significant, however, is the predominance of the evocation of the second: it is located in the space of communication with that which causes danger and shows God's power (Joel 2:5); it also accompanies, as elevated, intensified, God's direct/sensory input in Joel 4:16.

The activity of the sense of speech is described not only in terms of the present but also gains its place in the future. Attention is drawn to the placement there of הלל – the activity of blessing God (Joel 2:26) and נבא – prophecy (Joel 3:1). In those acts, speech, explored so mournfully in the first two chapters of the Book, will find its new shape. The response of the sense of speech to the threat enables to reduce its power by phasing and verbalising those threats. It is located in two spaces: the relationship with God (including a cultic context) and within the community of Israel, which is expressed by the convening of all states of the community.

Thomas Lyons, studying the phenomenon of voice by analysing the grammatical forms of verbs, notes in the Book of Joel transitions in the initial part of the Book from the commanding mode concerning the collective to the personal lament of the prophet, and then, in the second part, the introduction of declarative modes centred around the theme of deliverance.[17]

The heightened tension experienced by the Book's characters is indicated by just two references to the sense of hearing, both contained in Joel 1:2. Their sequence – first שמע (Joel 1:2 שִׁמְעוּ־זֹאת), followed by וְהַאֲזִינוּ, suggests the sender's perception of the disability, the weakness of the recipients, and moving to a more fundamental level: the encouragement of the recipients to make a decision and activate their ears. Exploration of the sense of speech seems much more liberating than listening, which is why such a negligible percentage of activation of this sense.

Undeniably, the sense of kinetics dominates the analysed Book, as shown by the number of terms associated with it. Interesting conclusions can be drawn by looking at their semantics. One can see, among them, terms pertaining to calm movement itself, such as בוא (Joel 1:13, 15, 21; 2:9; 3:4; 4:5, 11, 13), הלך (Joel 2:7, 8; 4:18), יצא (with an accent on going out – Joel 2:16; 4:18), עבר (pass over – Joel 4:17). These describe both the movement of

17 Lyons, "Interpretation and Structure in Joel," 97, 99, 100.

the people – in the stimulus view (בוא – Joel 1:13; 4:11; 4:13; יצא – Joel 2:16) and the act (בוא – Joel 2:9; 4:5; הלך – Joel 2:7, 8; עבר – Joel 4:17), but also the phenomena and timing of God's entry into the history of the world (בוא – Joel 1:15; 2:1; 3:4; הלך – Joel 4:18; יצא – Joel 4:18). H. Vosburgh sees here the aspect of revival and the changing of spatial and chronological distance.[18]

In the second and third chapters of the Book, this movement is intensified through such concepts as: רוץ (run – Joel 2:4, 7, 9), שׁקק (run about, rush – Joel 2:9), פליטה (escape – Joel 2:3; 3:5), מלט (slip away – Joel 3:5), רקד (skip about – Joel 2:5), and חול / חיל (whirl, dance – Joel 2:6). It is noteworthy that the contexts for all these words in the Book of Joel describe a threat experienced by man. Its perception through the sense of kinetics illustrates the power of its impact. In Joel 4:11, the biblical author introduces a term related to the same sense: עוׁש (come to help – Joel 4:11), highlighting the feature of interpersonal and relational orientation.

The biblical author, referring to the sense of kinetics, also introduces the concepts of contrasted words indicating ascending: עלה (Joel 1:6; 2:7, 9, 20; 4:9, 12), עור (Joel 4:7, 9, 12) and descending, downward movement – ירד (Joel 2:23; 4:2). They involve not only the aspect of conquest, but also the growth of negative elements perceived through the other senses – taste, smell and sight (such as rot and suffocation – עלה in Joel 2:20). They also include a mental awakening, a 'poking' (עור – Joel 4:12). The descent described by ירד is, in both texts (Joel 2:23; 4:2), a sensory reaction as a result of God's action.

References to the sense of kinetics within the Book of Joel also include the vocabulary of gathering, collecting, such as אסף (Joel 1:14; 2:10, 16; 4:15) – with the aspect of pooling, inbreeding – and קבץ (Joel 2:6, 16; 4:2, 11). Both describe the perception by sense of kinetics of the action of two collective entities: people and heavenly bodies. There also appears a verb concerning ordering ערך (Joel 2:5) perceived by the sense of kinetics. There are also terms with the opposite semantics, such as dividing, breaking up: פזר (Joel 4:2) and חלק (Joel 4:2). They occur together in the same verse and have as their object first the people (פזר) and then the land (חלק). There is also a semantically correlated פרשׂ (spread out – Joel 2:2), allowing us to capture the movement of people, which is similar to mist.

The mention of dripping is also noteworthy, as it introduces a completely different movement with a different specificity: נטף (Joel 4:18). When juxtaposed in this verse with the double הלך and יצא, it gives a very remarkable growing semantic and sensory gradation present in these dynamics.

The term שׁוב, with its characteristic multi-faceted reference growing from turn back, return (Joel 2:12–14; 4:1, 4, 7), also appears among the terms related to perception through the sense of kinetics. It refers to both the movements of man (Joel 2:12, 13) and God (Joel 2:14; 4:1, 4, 7). It is noteworthy that the latter predominates, which demonstrates the greater dynamism of God's actions, directly aimed at man, and therefore His greater involvement.

18 H. Vosburgh, "The Day of the Lord in the Book of Joel," *JODT* 24/69 (2020) 161–178.

The term שׁלח (send – Joel 2:19, 25; 4:13), and even more נגשׁ (approach – Joel 4:9) opens another semantic pool of concepts indirectly related to the sense of kinetics, more registered by the sense of touch (in the proxemic aspect) – such as: רחק (be, or become, far, distant – Joel 2:20; 4:6) or קרב/קרוב (near – Joel 1:15; 2:1). They are compatible with the Book's essential conviction of God's Presence in the midst of Israel.[19] Human movement is marked only in Joel 4:9 (נגשׁ) and Joel 4:13 (שׁלח), the other places describe God's actions.

The Book of Joel also contains terms opposed to kinetics, which show its absence, like ישׁב (sit, remain, dwell – Joel 1:2, 14; 2:1; 4:12, 20) or שׁכן (settle down, abide – Joel 4:17, 21). They describe the status of people (ישׁב – Joel 1:2, 14; 2:1) and of God (ישׁב – Joel 4:12, 20; שׁכן – Joel 4:17, 21). In the latter case, they bring with the experience of stability and stopping. As a whole, this perception makes it possible to recognise points of reference.

The consistency in the biblical author's introduction to references to the sense of touch is surprising. Through it, one perceives the experience of cutting off, taking away (כרת): wine from the mouth (Joel 1:5), food (Joel 1:16), offerings from the temple (Joel 1:9), and tearing (קרע) redirected from garments to hearts (Joel 2:13). The absence of בצע (cutting off), associated with wounds, can also be noted. This reveals an element of exhibition/exposure, and at the same time, a change of condition/state – by virtue of graspable, and therefore conscious references. Classical experiences perceived by this sense, like pressing (דחק) or falling (נפל), are mentioned as absent (Joel 2:8 – 'They will not jostle one another, each will go his own way. And though they encounter weapons, they will not be wounded'). Only the taking (לקח), directly related to touching of jewels by Tyre, Sidon, and the Philistines (Joel 4:5), is recorded, as well as the touch of the human body, marked in the imagery of the girding by the priests (Joel 1:13) and the girding with a sackcloth (חֲגֹ֣רְת־שָׂ֔ק) by a virgin (Joel 1:8). This last element suggests the strength of the stimulus – the unpleasant cloth is drawn closer to the skin. The aim of wearing sackcloth, according to the Israel tradition, is to redirect thoughts toward God. On the other hand, the mention of a mouth that has had its wine taken away gives the experience of a touch taken away and a taste taken away in Joel 1:5, and thus the loss of memory of these experiences.

Granting of the Spirit, which is relevant and reflexive in the narrative of the Book, is also described by means of a reference to the sense of touch through the verb שׁפך (to pour out). It guarantees the breadth of the action encompassing the whole person, and at the same time, the real grasp of Him by the endowed subjects. The abundance, the aspect of washing, cleansing, refreshing and revitalising, is also apparent here. These sensations intensify sensory memory, perpetuating the experience and giving it the power to affect consciousness in the future.

The awe-inspiring experience of being eaten (אכל) or total destruction dominates the image of locusts (Joel 1:4, 6). There is mention of teeth – compared to those of a lion – and molar teeth (Joel 1:6), which also makes the perception even more acute. This is paralleled by the image of drinking and alcoholic stupor, which leads to a disruption of consciousness

19 Assisi, "The Date and Meaning of the Book of Joel," 173–174.

(Joel 1:5). It is difficult to find the trait of taste in these references – it is removed in favour of touch and kinetics. The only suggestion of taste seems to take place in Joel 4:3, where the familiar term שׁתה from Joel 1:5 appears.

The visual stimuli invoked in the Book of Joel set a typically apocalyptic mood. The activity of ראה itself is mentioned only in reference to a vision (חִזָּיוֹן) in Joel 3:1. The sense of sight captures landscapes such as the change/fluctuations of the light of the sun and moon and stars (Joel 2:10; 4:15), up to the complete plunge of the sun into darkness (Joel 3:4), the change of the colour of the moon (Joel 3:4). It registers the spread of the hostile reality like that of the morning aurora (שׁחר – Joel 2:2); in Joel 2 it is compared to an army. M. Szmajdziński sees in the term שׁחר a reference to the reflection of light in the wings of locusts.[20]

Two pairs of terms, perceived by the sense of sight: חֹשֶׁךְ (darkness) and אֲפֵלָה, and עָנָן and עֲרָפֶל accentuate successively two experiences of the inability of the sense of sight to work properly – first, due to the lack of access to the image, further, because of blurred shapes, and thus they lead to intensification of the experience of anxiety.[21] A noteworthy element, grasped by the sense of sight, is תִּימָרָה – smoke resembling the shape of a palm tree or mushroom.[22]

Obviously, the sense of sight registers both the threat – like its appearance (threat/locusts), similar to that of horses (כְּמַרְאֵה סוּסִים מַרְאֵהוּ; Joel 2:4), the destruction of nature (Joel 1:7 – 'He made my vineyard a wilderness, and my fig tree he hacked down: he bare them utterly and forsook them, so that their branches turned white'), but also the renewal of vegetation (Joel 2:22 – 'The pasture on the steppe is covered with green, for the trees bear fruit again, the fig tree and the vine bear fruit'). The emphasis on the sense of sight by the use of the term מַרְאֶה – sight, appearance, in the former of these texts, it suggests a deliberate reference to the senses made by the biblical author. The term could readily be omitted without compromising the content, however, now it allows us to grasp the prominence of sensuality in this text. This is also confirmed by the four enumerations of the rebirth of flora (Joel 1:7). The synergy of sight with touch and smell as experiential elements of this reality is implicit.

3. Synergy of the Senses within Images in the Book of Joel

The most common interaction in the text occurs between the senses of touch, sight, and kinetics. This is interesting, because these are the senses that allow full freedom in the act of perception. It is impossible to escape from olfactory sensation, or speech, or taste at any given time.

20 Szmajdziński, "Blitzkrieg w Jl 2,1–11," 280.
21 Szmajdziński, "Blitzkrieg w Jl 2,1–11," 276.
22 Lemański, "Nadzieja zbawienia dla wzywających Imienia Pana (Jl 3,-55)," 38.

The synergy of touch and sight takes place in the perception of heaven and earth, shaken by the actions of a hostile reality (Joel 2:10), and the wilderness, which is the result of the presence of locusts (Joel 1:7, 11, 12, 15, 17). Interestingly, the latter set is dominated by the use of touch, which is perceived in relation to cutting off, deprivation (for example: 'He made my vineyard a wilderness, and my fig tree he hacked down: he stripped them completely and abandoned them, so that their branches turned white' – Joel 1:7). A number of verbs that combine the sense of touch and sight appear here, such as: קָצַף (a snapping or splintering in Joel 1:7), חשׂף (strip off, strip in Joel 1:7), שׁלךְ (throw, fling, cast in Joel 1:7), שׁדד (devastate, ruin in Joel 1:10), יבשׁ (be dry, dried up in Joel 1:10, 12, 17, 20), אבד (perish in Joel 1:11), שׁוֹד (violence, devastation, ruin in Joel 1:15), and שְׁמָמָה (a devastation, waste in Joel 2:20).

An extremely evocative image, in the perception of which both sight and touch are involved, is the desert (מִדְבָּר) – e.g., in Joel 4:19, subjected additionally in Joel 1:19, 20; 2:3 to the action of fire, which causes activation of the sense of smell. The synergy of these senses, albeit in a slightly different context, is shown in Joel 1:17: 'The grains have rotted under their sods, the gums are destroyed, the granaries are demolished, for the grain has withered.'

Through the interaction of the senses of touch and sight, it is also possible to grasp the image of fulfilment (מלא) and completeness (שׂוּק). This is very significant in the Book of Joel, because of the hope it brings when it refers successively to the grain and the winepress (Joel 2:24). A term from the same semantic pool, שׁלם, describes the manner of recompense, the fulfilment of the lack that God will make for Israel (Joel 2:25). It is accompanied by an experience of satisfaction, satiation on all levels (שׂבע), which is offered by God in Joel 2:19, 26.

Touch and kinetics meet in the imagery of transforming ploughshares into swords and sickles into javelins in Joel 4:10. They are accompanied – in the name of the synergy of the senses – by a commentary using the sense of speech, which can be grasped by the sense of hearing. In contrast, Joel 1:10 depicts, by means of touch, sight, and the sense of speech, the landscape with crops ravaged by locusts ('Desolate is the field, in mourning is the land, for the grain is desolate, the must has dried up, the olive tree has withered' – Joel 1:10), and in Joel 1:20 ('Even the animals of the field sigh longingly to You, for the streams of water have dried up, and fire has consumed the pastures of the steppe'). This synergy makes the images strongly evocative and sets the created realities in a communicative space – since the earth is assigned the activity of mournful wailing (אבל – Joel 1:10), and the animals the attitude of longing (ערג – Joel 1:20).

From the intersection of kinetics and touch, we have רעשׁ, describing an earthquake in Joel 4:16 – and רגז, another word transferring the experience of shock, quake, to the speech space – in Joel 2:1, 10. It also has its softer/milder form נדח – impel, thrust, in Joel 2:20 and תקע – thrust, blast, in reference to the shofar in Joel 2:1. It is worth noting that each of these phenomena is also perceived with the sense of hearing. The phenomenon that adds to the aforementioned senses the sense of sight is אֵשׁ – fire flame – לְהָבָה (fire in action?, consuming?) and the verb להט – blaze up, flame – associated with it (Joel 1:19, 20; 2:3, 5; 3:3).

The synergy of touch and kinetics takes place in the term שׁפך, describing the pouring out of the Spirit (Joel 3:1) and the shedding of blood (Joel 4:19). Interestingly, in the latter image, it dominates the olfactory experience. Also, עבשׁ is a polysensory term and it describes the rotting of grains in Joel 1:17. It combines visual, olfactory, and tactile experiences, which is intensified by another term depicting perception by the sense of kinetics – שׁמם – be desolated, appalled, and הרס – throw down.

A remarkable sensory connection takes place in Joel 2:5, in the image of fire (אֵשׁ), whose flame (לֶהָבָה) has its own voice (קוֹל), an individualized sound. Visual perception merges with auditory perception; kinetic experience is also strong here, due to the dynamics of the flame.

The synergy of sight and smell occurs in the perception of the signs of Joel 3:3, which are in the sky and on the earth: blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. Such a variety of connections leaves no doubt about the role of the senses in the arrangement of the entire Book.

4. The Senses and the Construction of the Text

The analysis of sensory references in the Book of Joel shows the presence of contrasting images which function in relation to each other according to the references: problem – solution/cure of the problem. This is evident in the motif of drought, drying up, evident especially in Joel 1 (but also in Joel 4:19), which passes into the image of the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel 3:1, mountains dripping with must, and hills overflowing with milk, and the filling of streams with water (Joel 4:18). It is remarkable that these contours are not merely background to the desolation caused by the locusts and then the abundance offered by God (cf. Joel 2:19). They go far beyond, not only by virtue of the number and variety of words, but also by virtue of the contexts – the outpouring of the Spirit is more than rain falling on a field (Joel 2:23), although this one has an anticipatory function. Sensory perception makes it possible to grasp the intensiveness of the contrast – as in the juxtaposition of Eden with the desolate desert (מִדְבַּר שְׁמָמָה) in Joel 2:3. It is meant to allow one to perceive the change, the destruction in the second image of the attack of the horsemen, which is parallel to the one of the locusts.

The biblical author of Joel performs a delicate balancing act, particularly in Joel 4 (and, to a lesser extent, in Joel 2), weaving together the experiences of offering and giving/receiving to emphasise the theme of reciprocal interactions. The sense of kinetics and motion emerges most prominently in this dynamic, especially in the Book's final chapter. These conclusions are confirmed by Lyons in the study of the Book's structure, based on grammatical forms, conducted and contrasted with other currents. He speaks of positive redirection and contrast as the governing semantic structure in the Book of Joel.[23]

23 Lyons, "Interpretation and Structure in Joel," 100.

The leading senses explored throughout the Book are kinetics and speech. In the latter, its subjects change – from presenting the people who are complaining, shouting and crying, the biblical author moves on to showing the voice of God and His words. Intensification of sensations perceived through the sense of speech takes place in the first two chapters. At the beginning of the Book there is a kinetic stagnation of the people; there is no reaction of this sense, while there is an intensified activity of the sense of speech. Instead, they perceive with their sense of sight, hearing, touch, and perhaps smell the movement of locusts and armies, which gets more intense in the second chapter.[24] In the second part of the Book, the contrast related to the sense of kinetics concerns the sitting posture of God and the movement of the people perceived with the same senses. Such a sequence allows us to draw a conclusion about the increasing mobility of the people in the Book and its confrontation with the stable but effective intervention of God, with movement which is ordered and correlated with the verbal message. It is worth noting the changes within the movement, the sudden turns in the last chapter of the Book; it is intended to illustrate an active exchange, an interaction perceived through the senses of sight and speech. The *theatrum* is space, not just land (cf. Joel 4:15, 16), but it is graspable by the senses.[25]

The multiple references to the activity of consuming, eating (אכל) by locusts (Joel 1:4 – 3 times; 2:25), by fire (Joel 1:19, 20; 2:3, 5), by an unknown entity (Joel 1:16), creates not only an atmosphere of total destruction, but implicates the feeling of the existence of forces that are fundamentally all-consuming and progressive. This gives rise to a sense of danger from which one cannot escape, which acts like a bulldozer. However, the author does not leave the recipient without hope: he juxtaposes the devouring by locusts with the vision of eating and man being satiated by God's action (Joel 2:25–26).[26] This perspective is typical of apocalyptic texts.

It is significant that, with such an elaborate sensuality, there is no mention of any of the sensory organs throughout the Book – the only reference can be seen with the verb אזן (Joel 1:2) through its stem.

5. The Senses and the Process of Persuasion

The introduction of such intense sensory perception by the biblical author of the Book of Joel enables recipients to recognise the correlation between his experiences, captured stimuli, and the content of the Book. Thus, it provides a so-called emotional valve, allows one to recognise the universality of experiences, and gain hope for their transience or resolution of difficulties. Above all, however, the sensual coherence created during the reception of the text makes it possible to register the content – God's message. In traumatic situations,

24 Szmajdziński, "Blitzkrieg w Jl 2,1–11," 270.

25 Lemański, "Nadzieja zbawienia dla wzywających Imienia Pana (Jl 3,1–5)," 38.

26 K. Scott, "Time and the Locust Plagues in the Book of Joel and the Sefire Inscriptions," *CBQ* 85/1 (2023) 28.

its transmission is possible at every level, but perception may happen only through the senses. The Book of Joel makes this possible perfectly – the proof is the emotional experience that any viewer receives by simply reading this text in translation.

The number of references to the sense of speech creates an atmosphere of active interpersonal exchange, shows the stages of perception, the phases of communication, and, in this way, it expresses approval for any human condition. In parallel, the developing kinetic terminology builds an awareness of movement, change, a kind of whirlpool of events, but also of the transformations that take place in them – and not all of them are dependent on human decisions or acts. Touch, taste, and – marginally – smell, sanction the importance and seriousness of registering reality at these levels, and liberate from communication blockages (tangibility allows for a change in the channel of perception and language of transmission, allowing for renewed efforts and exchanges in the relationship).

It is noteworthy that, with the help of sensual references, the recipient's attention is gradually shifted to God. First, He is present as the Summoned, with the cry (קרא) in Joel 1:14, 19, and אמר in Joel 2:17; from Joel 2:19 on, He becomes an Interlocutor, so that in Joel 3:5 the proclamation can be made: 'But everyone who calls on (אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא) the name of the Lord shall be saved (יִמָּלֵט).' The word מלט in niphal, suggesting an escape provided by God, becomes a turning point here; it opens up a pool of sensory stimuli, the perception of which shows specific divine intervention in the defence of man/people. In this way, the senses redirect the recipients' attention to the dynamics of divine action, giving them an assurance of God's intervention in their cause, in their current situation. Neither the form nor the time of the solutions is given – what is shown is the closeness of the person of God, His relationship with the individual, and involvement in particular human situations.

6. Affect Emerging from Sensory Experience in the Book of Joel

The analysis of sensory references in the Book of Joel raises the question of affect.[27] The related new trend in biblical studies under discussion[28] seems very valuable for a better reading of the apocalyptic.[29] Noticing affect in the account of the biblical text makes it possible to see the presence of human experience before God.

The theory of affect does not identify affect with emotions.[30] Observation links affect to the senses. Affect transcends experience and has a sovereign existence as long as the

27 More about the affect theory in the Bible see: F.C. Black – J.L. Koosed (eds.), *Reading with Feeling: Affect Theory and the Bible* (SemeiaSt 95; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2019).

28 S.D. Moore, "Biblical Hermeneutics Without Interpretation? After Affect, Beyond Representation, and Other Minor Apocalypses," *Religions* 15/7 (2024) 755, https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/15/7/755 [access: 10.09.2024].

29 About the multifaceted nature of the text, see M. Kotrosits, "How Things Feel: Biblical Studies, Affect Theory, and the (Im)Personal," *Brill Research Perspectives in Biblical Interpretation* 1/1 (2016) 34.

30 B. Massumi, "Autonomia afektu," *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2013) 117.

material that evokes it lasts.[31] Thus, affect cannot be drawn from memory, but neither does it transcend actual experience while remaining independent of the subject;[32] one could debate its performative character. Affect stands, as it were, outside perception, not inside it. The perception, as such, is individual, specific, and different for each culture. It is worth noting, for example, the strangeness of the motif of the dynamics of locust voracity for the modern European. The sovereignty of affect enables each viewer to respond in accordance with his or her culture, while at the same time setting him or her immediately in the space of contact with God. This is important for properly evaluating the process of persuasion that the recipient of a biblical text enters into. In the case of the apocalyptic, it allows one to meet the affect conveyed 'in' the record and apply it, as it were, to his or her experience, time, life situation. The Book of Joel makes it possible, among other things, to confront a threat. At the same time, the affect captured from the outside helps to read, understand, and accept the recipient's own emotions. Thus, it makes the existence/appearance of such an effect acceptable – despite the intensity of sensory experience, as in the plot of the Book of Joel.

The text first leads to accepting the fact of the existence of an affect, but it does not standardise and qualify the specifics of its 'entrance' into a person. Perhaps because affect describes a possibility.[33] Also because of this, the biblical message remains always relevant.

The application of the issue of affect to the analysed sensual references in the Book of Joel is made possible by both their synesthetic specificity and their mutual transformation,[34] and their autonomy, which is extremely evident here.[35] However, those sensory references do not lead to flight from God, but to contact with Him. The theory of affect allows us to lean into the consequences of these interactions – affect leaves traces in humans and in the world.[36] It affects thinking and decision, and not just feelings – but on this subject, with regard to the Book of Joel, any informed viewer will be most competent.

Conclusion

An analysis of Joel's sensory vocabulary, when compared to other biblical texts, positions the Book prominently among its peers. Notably, its terminology closely aligns with that of Zechariah, another Old Testament apocalyptic text, though it diverges surprisingly from Daniel – a difference potentially attributable to Daniel's later composition. Joel's apocalyptic nature stands out distinctly from Zephaniah, marked by vivid sensory imagery of locusts,

31 C. Rudnicki, "Koncepcja aury immanentnej," *Estetyka i Krytyka* 30/3 (2013) 102.
32 C. Rudnicki, "Koncepcja aury immanentnej," 102.
33 M. Kotrosits, "How Things Feel: Biblical Studies, Affect Theory, and the (Im)Personal," 4.
34 B. Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Post-Contemporary Interventions; Durham – London: Duke University Press 2002) 35.
35 B. Massumi, "Autonomia afektu," 124–125.
36 F.C. Black – J.L. Koosed, "Some Ways to Read with Feeling," *Reading with Feeling*, 2.

armies, and the outpouring of the Spirit. While both Joel and Zephaniah share consistencies in their depiction of the Day of the Lord, Joel's vocabulary related to the sense of speech also echoes the Book of Lamentations. These lexical patterns reinforce the multisensory character of Joel.

Straddling the boundary between prophecy and apocalyptic, the Book of Joel unfolds as a discourse, with its sparse narrative elements serving a secondary role. Its rich sensory language not only enhances its persuasive power but also plays a crucial role in conveying its theological message. This sensory richness proves an effective communicative tool in times of crisis, breaking down barriers and enabling readers to find solace in God's supportive actions toward humanity.

Bibliography

Assisi, E., "The Date and Meaning of the Book of Joel," *Vetus Testamentum* 61/2 (2011) 163–183.

Assisi, E., *The Book of Joel: A Prophet between Calamity and Hope* (The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 581; London: Bloomsbury – Clark 2013).

Avrahami, Y., *The Senses of Scripture: Sensory Perception in the Hebrew Bible* (The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 545; New York: Clark 2012).

Avrahami, Y., "The Study of Sensory Perception in the Hebrew Bible: Notes on Method," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 5/1 (2016) 3–22.

Balla, I., "The Role of God's Mighty Acts in Joel: The Book of Joel as an Example of Trauma Literature," *The Biblical Annals* 11/1 (2021) 63–78.

Barker, J., *From the Depths of Despair to the Promise of Presence: A Rhetorical Reading of the Book of Joel* (Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures 11; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2014).

Beard, B.A., "Seeing Visions with the Prophet: Toward an Iconographic Hermeneutic of Joel," 2023, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371306846_Seeing_Visions_with_the_Prophet_Toward_an_Iconographic_Hermeneutic_of_Joel [access: 10.09.2024].

Black, F.C. – Koosed, J.L. (eds.), *Reading with Feeling: Affect Theory and the Bible* (Semeia Studies 95; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2019).

Black, F.C. – Koosed, J.L., "Some Ways to Read with Feeling," *Reading with Feeling: Affect Theory and the Bible* (eds. F.C. Black – J.L. Koosed) (Semeia Studies 95; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2019) 1–12.

Cook, S.L., *Prophesy & Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1991).

Cook, S.L., "Apocalyptic Prophecy," *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (ed. J.J. Collins) (New York: Oxford University Press 2014) 19–35.

Egger-Wenzel, R. – Corley, J. (eds.), *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2011; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2012).

Górska, H.W., "Rodzaje wiatru występujące w opisie plagi szarańczy (Wj 10,13.19). Charakterystyka zjawisk meteorologicznych oraz analiza zmian wprowadzonych w Septuagincie i Wulgacie," *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 40/2 (2020) 13–24.

Hockey, K.M., *The Role of Emotion in 1 Peter* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 173; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019).

Kotrosits, M., "How Things Feel: Biblical Studies, Affect Theory, and the (Im)Personal," *Brill Research Perspectives in Biblical Interpretation* 1/1 (2016) 1–53.

Kurek-Chomycz, D., "The Fragrance of Her Perfume: The Significance of Sense Imagery in John's Account of the Anointing in Bethany," *Novum Testamentum* 52/4 (2010) 334–354.

Lemański, J., "Nadzieja zbawienia dla wzywających imienia Pana (Jl 3,1–5)," *Verbum Vitae* 9 (2006) 33–47.

Lyons, T., "Interpretation and Structure in Joel," *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Studies* 1/1 (2014) 80–104.

Massumi, B., *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Post-Contemporary Interventions; Durham – London: Duke University Press 2002).

Massumi, B., "Autonomia afektu," *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2013) 112–135.

Mirguet, F., "What Is an 'Emotion' in the Hebrew Bible? An Experience that Exceeds Most Contemporary Concepts," *Biblical Interpretation* 24/4–5 (2016) 442–465.

Moore, S.D., "Biblical Hermeneutics Without Interpretation? After Affect, Beyond Representation, and Other Minor Apocalypses," *Religions* 15/7 (2024) 755, https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/15/7/755 [access: 10.09.2024].

Rubinkiewicz, R., "Apokaliptyka u progu ery chrześcijańskiej," *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 41/1 (1988) 51–59.

Rudnicki, C., "Koncepcja aury immanentnej," *Estetyka i Krytyka* 30/3 (2013) 99–116.

Schellenberg, A. – Krüger, T. (eds.), *Sounding Sensory Profiles in the Ancient Near East* (Ancient Near East Monographs 25; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2019).

Scott, K., "Time and the Locust Plagues in the Book of Joel and the Sefire Inscriptions," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 85/1 (2023) 19–35.

Spencer, F.S. (ed.), *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature* (Resources for Biblical Study 90; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2017).

Strazicich, J.R., *Joel's Use of Scripture and the Scripture's Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (Biblical Interpretation Series 82; Leiden: Brill 2007).

Szmajdziński, M., "Blitzkrieg w Jl 2,1–11," *Studia Loviciensia* 16 (2014) 269–301.

Tilford, N.L., *Sensing World, Sensing Wisdom: The Cognitive Foundation of Biblical Metaphors* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 31; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2017).

Vosburgh, H., "The Day of the Lord in the Book of Joel," *Journal of Dispensational Theology* 24/69 (2020) 161–178.

Warren, M.J.C., "Tasting the Little Scroll: A Sensory Analysis of Divine Interaction in Revelation 10:8–10," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40/1 (2017) 101–119.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 43–66

King David as a Righteous Man in the Light of Qumran Literature and Post-Biblical Texts of Early Judaism

Marcin Biegas
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
marcin.biegas@kul.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9860-2653

ABSTRACT: The present paper analyses the picture of David as a righteous man depicted in non-biblical Qumran texts and the literature of Early Judaism. The choice of such a broad research field results from the fact that no articles have been published so far that would examine this theme in detail based on the above compositions. Thus, undertaking this task is a justified endeavour. The paper will be divided into three parts. The first part will present the biblical background, mainly based on post-exilic literature. In the second part, fragments of four Qumran manuscripts – 4QMMT, CD, 1Q33 and 11Q5 – will be analysed. Finally, the literature of early Jewish writings containing depictions of David will be discussed. A thorough analysis of all these texts will show that David was a righteous man.

KEYWORDS: Qumran, David, Early Judaism, righteous man, 4QMMT, CD, 1Q33, 11Q5

David is one of the most important biblical heroes who has been depicted widely in the Old Testament. His youth, his ascent to the throne, and building a great dynasty are narrated by the Deuteronomist (1 and 2 Sam, 1 Kgs) and the Chronicler (1 Chr). Furthermore, David's name has been associated with several Psalms: 3–41; 51–70; 72 and 138–145; his figure also occurs in prophetic (Isa 11:1; 16:5; Jer 23:5; Ezra 37:24–25; Amos 9:11) and wisdom literature (Sir 47:8–10). David is mentioned by authors of non-biblical manuscripts at Qumran, as well as writers of texts belonging to apocryphal literature.

The multifaceted personality of David has been emphasised by a number of exegetes whose studies, based on sources from both biblical and non-biblical literature, show how David was perceived in different lights. These works present eight levels at which authors of biblical, non-biblical, and Qumran texts, as well as theologians, philosophers, and Jewish historians created the image of David. They are: 'the progenitor of the Messiah', 'victorious warrior', 'an ideal ruler and king', 'psalmist', 'prophet', 'founder of the Jerusalem cult', 'a man of piety and righteousness', and David as 'an exorcist'.[1] The present article will analyse the

1 There are several studies dedicated to this issue, e.g., A.G. Auld – C.Y.S. Hos, "The Making of David and Goliath," *JSOT* 56 (1992) 1–39; C.G. Bradley, "The Warrior-Poet of Israel. The Significance of David's Battles in Chronicles and Ben Sira," *Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honor of Pancratius C. Beentjes* (eds. J. Corley – H. van Grol) (DCLS 7; Berlin: De Gruyter 2011) 79–96; M. Biegas, "Postać Dawida w hebrajskiej wersji Psalmu 151 (11Q5)," *BA* 8/1 (2018) 5–28; M. Biegas, "Was King

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.18190 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

picture of David as a righteous man as depicted in non-biblical Qumran texts and the literature of Early Judaism. The choice of this research field results from the fact that no articles exploring this theme in detail, based on the above compositions, have been published so far. Thus, undertaking such a task is a justified endeavour.

The paper will be divided into three parts. The first part will present the biblical background, mainly based on post-exilic literature. In the second part, fragments of four Qumran manuscripts – 4QMMT, CD, 1Q33, and 11Q5 – will be analysed. Finally, the literature of early Jewish writings depicting David as a righteous man will be discussed.

David an Exorcist?," *BA* 13/4 (2023) 591–616; G. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT 1985) 84; W.H. Brownlee, "The Significance of David's Compositions," *RevQ* 5/4 (1966) 569–574; C. Coulot, "David à Qumrân," *Figures de David à travers la Bible. XVIIe congrès de l'ACFEB (Lille, 1–5 septembre 1997)* (eds. L. Desrousseaux – J. Vermeylen) (LD 177; Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1999) 315–343; W.L. Coates, "A Study of David, the Thoroughly Human Man Who Genuinely Loved God," *RExp* 99/2 (2002) 237–254; M. Daly-Denton, "David the Psalmist, Inspired Prophet: Jewish Antecedents of a New Testament Datum," *ABR* 52 (2004) 32–47; H. Debel, "The Lord Looks at the Heart (1 Sam 16, 7). 11Q Psa 151 A-B as a Variant Literary Edition of Ps 151 LXX," *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 459–473; D. Dimant, "David's Youth in the Qumran Context," *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (eds. J. Penner – K.M. Penner – C. Wassen) (STDJ 98; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2012) 97–115; J.C.R. de Roo, "David's Deeds in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 6/1 (1999) 44–65; B. Ejranaes, "David and His Two Women: An Analysis of the Two Poems in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran (11Q5)," *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (eds. A. Voitila – J. Jokiranta) (JSJS 126; Leiden: Brill 2008) 575–589; C.A. Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter – C.A. Evans) (LSTS 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997) 183–197; J.A. Fitzmyer, "David, Being Therefore a Prophet... (Acts 2:30)," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 332–339; P. Flint, "The Prophet David at Qumran," *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005) 158–167; J.L. Kugel, "David the Prophet," *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition* (ed. J.L. Kugel) (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1990) 45–55; M. Marttila, "David in the Wisdom of Ben Sira," *SJOT* 25 (2011) 29–48; J.L. Mays, "The David of the Psalms," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 40/2 (1986) 143–155; A. Pietersma, "David in the Greek Psalms," *VT* 30/2 (1980) 213–226; K.E. Pomykala, "Images of David in Early Judaism," *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. I. *Ancient Versions and Traditions* (ed. C.A. Evans) (LSTS 50; London: Clark 2004) 33–46; P. Porzig, "David in the Judean Desert: Beobachtungen an ausgewählten Qumrantexten," *David in the Desert: Tradition and Redaction in the "History of David's Rise"* (eds. H. Bezzel – R.G. Kratz) (BZAW 514; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2021) 9–33; R. Rendtorff, "The Psalms of David: David in the Psalms," *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (eds. P. Flint *et al.*) (VTSup 99; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2005) 53–65; W.M. Schniedewind, "The Davidic Dynasty and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Literature," *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceeding of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (eds. L. Schiffman – E. Tov – J. Vanderkam) (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 2000) 82–91; P. Skehan, "The Apocryphal Psalm 151," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 407–409; M. Smith, "How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151 A (11QPsa 28.3–12)," *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceeding of a Symposium held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995* (eds. T. Muraoka – J.F. Elwolde) (STDJ 26; Leiden – New York – Koln: Brill 1997) 182–208; M. Szmajdziński, "Orfeusz – Dawid – Jezus (Psalm 151)," *Orfizm i jego recepcja w literaturze, sztuce i filozofii* (ed. K. Kołakowska) (Kraków – Lublin: Homini – Wydawnictwo KUL 2011) 123–130; B.Z. Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter (11QPsalms)," *HUCA* 59 (1988) 23–72; A.C. Witt, "David, the Ruler of the Sons of His Covenant (ומושל בבני בריתו): The Expansion of Psalm 151A in 11QPsa," *JSOT* 3/1 (2014) 77–97.

1. Biblical Background

Analysing the books that make up the biblical canon, particularly those that contain the most references to this ruler, we can see a series of descriptions written in various, sometimes ambivalent, ways. These differences are most visible when comparing the Deuteronomistic narrative about David with the texts produced by the Chronicler.

Although the Books of Samuel present David as a pious and righteous man chosen by God, they do not conceal his moral failings, which take on the character of serious sins. The passage that comes to the forefront is 2 Sam 11:2–27, which describes David's adultery with Bathsheba (2 Sam 11:2–5), and then, through a series of lies and intrigues with Joab, a conscious action leading to the killing of Uriah the Hittite (Bathsheba's husband) in the battles with the Ammonites.

In post-exilic literature, chiefly in 1 Chr, there is a noticeable trend to emphasise David's traits, such as righteousness, piety, and involvement in cultic matters, while at the same time minimising his vices. According to exegetes, the Chronicler whitewashed the image of David, showing him as an ideal, crystal-clear figure. This is supported by the fact that the author of 1 Chr is silent on his adultery, murder, rebellious offspring, or the execution of Saul's family. David's only moral failure mentioned by the Chronicler is his decision to conduct a census. However, this did not prevent the author of 1 Chr from turning this infidelity to David's advantage; in this way, the ruler is presented as a model of a repentant sinner.[2] In the scene of the solemn bringing of the ark of God to Jerusalem, the Chronicler precisely described David's clothes as a robe of fine linen and a linen ephod (1 Chr 15:27), which contrasts with the account of 2 Sam 6:14, 16, 20, where David, in the account of the same event, is dancing half-naked in front of the ark. This behaviour is sharply criticised by Michal, the daughter of Saul, who, first, as the text of 2 Sam 6:16 says, despised him in her heart, and then directed a critical remark at him, pointing out that David had uncovered himself before the eyes of his servants' maids 'as any vulgar fellow might shamelessly uncover himself' (2 Sam 6:20). The Chronicler, pointing out that David was dressed properly, does so on purpose to ignore Michal's critical remark.

The author of Sirach speaks in a similar tone about David in the hymn 'In Honour of Our Ancestors' (Sir 44–50).[3] The sage depicts David just after the prophet Nathan and before speaking about King Solomon (Sir 47:2–11). Using the image of David from 1 Chr, Ben Sira shows David as the initiator of cult in Jerusalem (Sir 47:8–10), and places his figure in the concept of covenant, which is characteristic of 'Hymn in Praise of the Fathers'.[4] In that passage, special attention should be paid to vv. 8 and 11.

---

2 Pomykala, "Images of David," 44; N.G. Knoppers, "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles," *Bib* 76/4 (1995) 449–470.

3 The block of texts described as "Hymn in Praise of the Fathers" includes chapters 44–49 of the Book of Sirach. They present the history of biblical Israel. Applying his own criteria, the sage portrays the most important and positive heroes of this history.

4 J.J. Pudełko, "Dawid jako organizator kultu w Pochwale Ojców (Syr 47,8–10)," *BPTh* 10/2 (2017) 263.

In v. 8, the author focuses on David's piety and his attitude towards God. However, in the previous verses, he speaks of David's fight with Goliath and his other struggles, from which David emerges victorious ἐπεκαλέσατο γὰρ κύριον τὸν ὕψιστον – 'for he called upon the Most High' (v. 5). In v. 8, the sage stresses David's righteousness by using a synthetic parallelism. The first line of this parallelism is ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ἐξομολόγησιν ἁγίῳ ὑψίστῳ – 'in his every deed he glorified the Holy One, the Most High.' It contains the term ἐξομολόγησις, meaning 'confession, recognition, praise, adoration', and most frequently referring to proclaiming God's glory in public. In the other line of the text: ῥήματι δόξης ἐν πάσῃ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ὕμνησεν καὶ ἠγάπησεν τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτόν – 'with a word of glory he sang hymns with all his heart, and he loved his Maker,' the sage specifies the action previously expressed by the phrase δίδωμι ἐξομολόγησιν. That 'proclaiming his glory' is ῥήματι δόξης and ὕμνησεν. The phrase ῥήματι δόξης allude to the psalms composed by David, which is strongly stressed in the Qumran text of 'David's Compositions' in 11Q5,[5] while the verb ὕμνησεν indicates the act of singing hymns, songs in praise of God. This text (Sir 47:8) resembles the composition of 2 Sam 23:1–7 – 'the Last Words of David'. At the beginning of this composition, in its first two verses (2 Sam 23: 1–2), we read:

> נאם דוד בן־ישי ונאם הגבר הקם על משיח אלהי יעקב ונעים זמרות ישראל רוח יהוה דבר־בי ומלתו על־לשוני
>
> The oracle of David, son of Jesse, the oracle of the man exalted, the anointed of the God of Jacob, the singer of the psalms of Israel. The spirit of the Lord speaks through me, and his word is upon my tongue.

David describes himself as ונעים זמרות ישראל – 'singer of the psalms of Israel',[6] which corresponds to the Greek verb ὕμνησεν and phrase ῥήματι δόξης.

David's attitude is motivated by his love of God, which is evidenced in v. 8: καὶ ἠγάπησεν τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτόν. Interestingly, the Hebrew version of this text emphasises his love of God even more: בכל לבו אוהב עושׂהו 'with all his heart he loved his Maker,' which is a clear reference to another biblical text, namely Deut 6:5.[7] An essential aspect of David's character is presented in v. 8 as the love of God with all your heart is expressed in the practice of the first commandment of the Decalogue, i.e., the rejection of idolatry. Fidelity to God alone is one of David's greatest virtues, and, at the same time, a manifestation of the attitude of a righteous man, which is worth imitating.[8]

The second verse where the sage shows David as a righteous man is v. 11, which closes his praise of the ruler. Here the translator writes: κύριος ἀφεῖλεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνύψωσεν εἰς αἰῶνα τὸ κέρας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην βασιλέων καὶ θρόνον δόξης ἐν τῷ Ισραηλ – 'The Lord took away his sins, exalted his horn forever and gave him a covenant of kings and a glorious throne in Israel'

---

5 J. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 11QPsa* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon 1965) 91–93; M. Biegas, "The Division and Structure of 'David's Compositions' (11Q5)," *BA* 13/2 (2023) 319–334.

6 Pudełko, "Dawid jako organizator kultu," 275.

7 Pudełko, "Dawid jako organizator kultu," 276; Cf. Deut 10:12; 11:13; 13:4; 30:6.

8 Pudełko, "Dawid jako organizator kultu," 276.

In this verse, we can see God's four actions as rewards for David's righteousness. These actions in favour of David have to do with cleansing him from his sins: κύριος ἀφεῖλεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ, exalting him – ἀνύψωσεν εἰς αἰῶνα τὸ κέρας αὐτοῦ, entering into a covenant with him – ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην βασιλέων, and consolidating his dynasty, his throne – θρόνον δόξης ἐν τῷ Ισραηλ. Some exegetes see here an announcement of a Messianic character, although, as G. Xeravits rightly notes, the final verse (Sir 47:11) concerns the praise of the historical David as a righteous, religious, and ideal man. In this way, the sage follows the general intention of the entire 'Hymn in Praise of the Fathers', where, in almost every case (except some priestly issues, e.g., the case of Pinchas), the author speaks without any future or even eschatological overtones.[9] Thus, the content of v. 11 would be a poetical re-reading of the fragments of the Deuteronomist's writings, i.e., 2 Sam 12:13, 24–25, and 2 Sam 7.

The next passage (1 Macc), in which the author follows the trend of idealising David in the post-exilic books, is a fragment of Mattathias's death speech, combining the postulate of fidelity to the law and covenant, which are characteristic of the attitude of righteousness. This is accomplished by recalling the most important figures from the history of Israel. The examples of great figures in the history of Israel given in vv. 51–61, presented in chronological order, have a common ground for consideration, which is the experience of great difficulties in their lives, which they overcame through the power of faith in God's righteousness.[10] Between the content referring to Caleb (Num 13–14) and Elijah (1 Kgs and 2 Kgs), the author inserts one sentence about David: Δαυιδ ἐν τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ ἐκληρονόμησεν θρόνον βασιλείας εἰς αἰῶνας – 'David through his mercy inherited a throne of kingdom forever' (1 Macc 2:57). Analysing this verse, we can conclude that the author of 1 Macc regarded the promise of 2 Sam 7 as the most important event in David's life. Here, the essential element is the noun ἔλεος, usually rendered as 'mercy, compassion'. Placing the noun in this verse, the author might have wanted to refer to the events from David's life, when his actions were motivated by this attitude. The references especially concern the mercy shown to Jonathan's house (1 Sam 20:14–15; 2 Sam 9:1) and to Hanun, king of the Ammonites (2 Sam 10:2; 1 Chr 19:2). In this context, it is worth mentioning the fact that David spared Saul's life (1 Sam 26:9–12) or that he helped Mephibosheth, son of Jonathan (2 Sam 9:7). Moreover, we should recall the episode when David did not revenge and retaliate against Shimei who had cursed him (2 Sam 16:5–14), or against Absalom (2 Sam 18:5). The noun ἔλεος in 1 Macc 2:57 may also refer to the fragment of the song of thanksgiving, which the Deuteronomist included in 2 Sam 22:21–25 (cf. Ps 18).[11] Although there is no mention of mercy or eternal throne, the author depicts David as a righteous man by using twice the Hebrew expression גמלני יהוה כצדקתי – 'the Lord rewarded me according to my

9 G.G. Xeravits, *From Qumran to the Synagogues: Selected Studies on Ancient Judaism* (DCLS 43; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2019) 54–55.

10 J. Nawrot, *Pierwsza Księga Machabejska (Rozdziały 1,1–6,16). Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (NKB.ST 14/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2016) 532–535.

11 Nawrot, *Pierwsza Księga Machabejska (Rozdziały 1,1–6,16)*, 542.

righteousness' (v. 21) and וישב יהוה לי כצדקתי – 'the Lord has recompensed me according to my righteousness' (v. 25).

Therefore, taking into consideration the content of these Deuteronomistic fragments, the presence of the noun ἔλεος in 1 Macc 2:57 refers to the attitude of faithfulness to God, which ultimately contributed to David being rewarded.

The foregoing analysis of the biblical texts has shown that, in the post-exilic books, there was a noticeable tendency to present David as a righteous man. This trend intensified at the beginning of the third century BC, when the compositions discovered in the Judean Desert began to be redacted. Hence, the next group of texts in which the problem posed in the title of the present paper should be examined is the Qumran manuscripts.

2. Qumran Manuscripts

The Dead Sea Scrolls include several references to the figure of David, namely CD, 1QM, 4Q161, 4Q174, 4Q177, 4Q252, 4Q285, 4Q397, 4Q398, 4Q457b, 4Q479, 4Q504, 4Q522, 6Q9, 11Q5, 11Q11, 11Q13 and 11Q14.[12] C. Evans divides these manuscripts, the content of which is related to David, into three categories. The first category includes those passages that refer to David as a historical figure. The second category comprises those manuscripts that emphasise David's individual virtues. The last category presents David in an eschatological perspective.[13] Four of these manuscripts; 4Q398 (4QMMT), CD, 1QM, and 11Q5 deserve special attention because they include material associating David with justice.

2.1. 4QMMT

The first manuscript that is thematically related to David as a righteous king is 4QMMT. It is a polemical document originating at Qumran. According to the authors of its critical edition, 4QMMT was originally composed of four sections: an opening formula (now completely lost); a calendar of a 364-day year; a list of more than 20 halakhot, most of which refer to the community; and an epilogue concerning the theme of the separation of the community from other people, including a message calling on the addressee to adopt the legal order of the community.[14] Based on a palaeographical analysis, 4Q398 is dated to the first part of the Herodian era, which limits the period of its origin: from the end of the first century BCE to the beginning of the first century CE.[15] At the end of part C, vv. 25–26, the passage in Table 1 can be found.

12 Porzig, "David in the Judean Desert," 10–11.
13 Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 183–197.
14 E. Qimron – J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.* V. *Miqsat Ma'aśeh ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon 1994) 1.
15 Qimron – Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4*, 21–25.

Table 1. 4QMMT E (C) (= 4Q398 25–26) and its English translation[16]

Hebrew text		Line
[נשו]א עונות זכור [את] דויד שהיא איש חסדים [ו]אף		25
היא [נ]צל מצרות רבות ונסלוח לו ואף [ ]		26
Translation		
25	[forgiv]en (their) sins. Remember David, who was a man of merciful acts, [and]	
26	he, too, [was] freed from many afflictions and was forgiven. [ ]	

This fragment emphasises these features of David, which, in the opinion of its author, are worth imitating. According to Coulot,[17] in order to encourage the addressees to cultivate positive attitudes, the author of 4QMMT presented David as a law-abiding king who was distinguished by righteous deeds, thanks to which he avoided many afflictions in his life and received forgiveness of the sins he had committed.

First of all, we should note the syntagma איש חסדים related to David in l. 25. In the Hebrew Bible, the word חסד usually means loyalty, faithfulness, proofs, and deeds of mercy and grace.[18] In the context of righteous deeds, this noun commonly refers to God (e.g., Ps 21:8; 33:5; 52:10; 103:17; 136:1–26). However, it can also be used with reference to man's righteous acts. An example of such a text is Neh 13:14, in which, depicting the acts of the governor (Nehemiah) in purely cultic matters out of love for the temple, the Chronicler puts in Nehemiah's mouth a request to God to remember his righteous deeds (חסדי).[19] Reading 4QMMT alone, the reader does not learn what pious deeds of David the author meant. Thus, Evans suggests connecting the syntagma איש חסדים (4Q398) with the episodes in 2 Sam 9:7; 10:2 and Isa 55:3. In the first text, the noun חסד appears in the context of the meeting between King David and Merib-baal, son of Jonathan, son of Saul. David guarantees Merib-baal safety, contrary to the custom of the current ruler killing the family of the previous ruler. David not only grants Merib-baal the grace to spare his life but also decides to show him mercy (חסד) for the sake of his father, Jonathan. This means that David is prepared to show kindness, which the Deuteronomist mentions later in this verse. In turn, as we read in 2 Sam 10:2, David decides to do good (חסד) to Hanun, new king of the Ammonites, just as his father Nahash dealt loyally (חסד) with him. In Isa 55:3,[20] Deutero-Isaiah uses the noun חסד to remind people of the covenant of David (2Sam 7).The message of this verse expresses the conviction that God will bestow his graces on the nation for the sake of David. Moreover, the expression איש חסדים should be considered in the light of 2 Chr 32:32; 35:26, where the author, referring to the positive aspects of power exercised

16 Qimron – Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4*, 60.

17 Coulot, "David à Qumrân," 315–343.

18 *DCH* III, 277–281.

19 H. Langkammer, *Księgi Ezdrasza – Nehemiasza. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz – ekskursy* (PŚST 2/3; Poznań – Warszawa: Pallottinum 1971) 289–290.

20 The same expression as in Isa 55:3 is used in 2 Chr 6:42, with a slightly different orthography.

by the Judean kings Hezekiah and Josiah, summarises their deeds by using the same noun (חסדיו).[21]

In 4QMMT C, l. 26, there is the expression צל מצרות רבות [נ] – 'he was freed from many afflictions,' and, as a consequence of the above syntagma, it is understood by being referred to the Deuteronomist, who used the word נצל, meaning 'be saved' and 'be freed', depicting a few events from David's history. In 1 Sam 17:32–37, David, speaking to Saul just before his fight with Goliath, tells the king that he had to protect sheep in the deserted pastures of Palestine. While protecting the sheep entrusted to him, it often happened that God saved him (הצלני) from the paw of the lion and the bear; further on, David expressed confidence that in the same way God would save him (יצילני) from the Philistine (v. 37).[22] Another example can be found in 1 Sam 26:24, which is a part of the narrative of Saul's third expedition against David (1 Sam 26:1–26). At the end of this pericope, the author relates a conversation between Saul and David, stating that David did not kill the king, since he respected the dignity of the Lord's anointed. David proved to be a righteous man, for he neither acted deceitfully, nor took the opportunity to kill his king. For the sake of this, David expected justice by being freed (יצלני)[23] from all his afflictions, in particular he expected protection for his life.[24]

The final element in l. 26 (4Q398) is the forgiveness of David's sins. The biblical text says that the king committed several sins, the gravest one being his affair with Bathsheba (2 Sam 11:1–5), treacherously causing the death of her husband Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam 11:6–25), and ordering a census (2 Sam 24). These sins, after serving the punishment, were forgiven him, as Sirach mentions in the 'Hymn in Praise of the Fathers', at the end of the pericope dedicated to David (Sir 47:11).

Referring, among other things, to these historical facts from David's life, the author of 4Q398 suggests that, if the addressees act like David, they can expect similar results in their lives.[25]

2.2. CD = Damascus Document

The Damascus Document, found in the Cairo Geniza, is dated to the second century BCE.[26] In its text, made up of 4Q266–273 and 5Q12 and 6Q15, one can distinguish two parts. The first part, which includes columns I–VIII and XIX–XX, form the so-called 'Admonition'. It is an account of the history of Israel, containing lists of punishments sent to the

21 Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 189.

22 Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 189.

23 In 1 Sam 26: 24 appears a similar construction צרה נצל. This construction brings this biblical text closest to the Qumran record.

24 J. Łach, *Księgi Samuela. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz – ekskursy* (PŚST 4/1; Poznań: Pallottinum 1973) 285; the word נצל in reference to David still appears in 2 Sam 12:7; 2 Sam 22:1; 2 Sam 22:18, 49. These contexts have a generalising character.

25 Coulot, "David à Qumrân," 337–338.

26 B.Z. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document. The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (STDJ 56; Leiden: Brill 2007) 3–4.

nation, and acts of salvation of selected groups. Here, the author calls all who know righteousness and who enter the Covenant, encouraging them to walk in the way of God as members of the new Covenant in the 'land of Damascus'. The second part, which includes columns IX–XVI, called 'Laws', contains sets of rules ordering the life of the community.[27] The laws concern, among others, the purity of priests and offerings, diseases, marriage, land cultivation, tithes, relations with gentiles, regulations for those entering into the community of covenant and oaths taken on this occasion, communal life, keeping the Sabbath, and organisation of the community.[28]

In col. V, 2–6, part of the first section of CD, there is a fragment referring to the person of David.

Table 2. CD V, 2–6 and its English translation[29]

Hebrew text	Line
לא ירבה לו נשים ודויד לא קרא בספר התורה החתום אשר	2
היה בארון כי לא [נפ] נפתח בישראל מיום מות אלעזר	3
ויהושע ויושוע והזקנים אשר עבדו את העשתרת ויטמון	4
נגלה עד עמוד צדוק ויעלו מעשי דויד מלבד דם אוריה	5
ויעזבם לו אל וגם מטמאים הם את המקדש אשר אין הם	6

	Translation
2	He should not multiply wives to himself (Deut 17:17); However, David had not read the sealed book of the law which
3	was in the ark, for it had not been [n p] opened in Israel since the day of the death of Eleazar
4	and of Jehoshua, and Joshua and the elders who worshipped Ashtaroth. One had hidden
5	the public (copy) until Zadok's entry into office. And David's deeds were perfect, except for Uriah's blood,
6	and God forgave him those. And they also defiled the temple, for they did not

This fragment forms a part of a wider argument containing a teaching about the so-called three nets in which Belial (בליעל, CD IV 15) tries to catch people, i.e., three ways of tempting people to commit such sins as fornication, wealth, and desecration of the temple. The author also criticises those who break the commandments concerning marriage. Speaking about marriage, he quotes the law from Deut 17:17: 'he must not acquire many wives for himself.' In this context, the reader should expect criticism of the ruler because David, broke this commandment by having several wives. However, immediately after the quotation from Deut 17:17, the author continues his thought, justifying David's actions. As the text says, David was unaware of the significance of his

27 G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2 ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2005) 64.

28 J. VanderKam, *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego* (trans. R. Gromacka) (Warszawa: Cyklady 1996) 64.

29 D.W. Parry – E. Tov – G.I. Clements (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. I. *Texts Concerned with Religious Law, Exegetical Texts and Parabiblical Texts*, 2 ed. (Leiden: Brill 2014) 88–89.

actions since לא קרא בספר התורה החתום – 'he had not read the sealed book of the law,' which was in the ark, for it had not been opened in Israel since the day of Eleazar's death (CD 5, 2–3).[30] The author clearly justifies David's deeds by saying that he did not have access to the book that was in the ark, which is emphasised by the term החתום, which means 'sealed', and therefore David cannot be held responsible for taking more than one wife.

Having excused David's polygamy, the author makes an intriguing statement in ll. 5–6: ויעלו מעשי דויד מלבד דם אוריה – 'And David's deeds were perfect, except for Uriah's blood.' The beginning of this sentence, in fact its first syntagma ויעלו, raises a certain interpretative problem. Different interpretations of this syntagma can be encountered in contemporary exegetical studies. All of these opinions were set out by de Roo in his article. Cook translates the whole expression ויעלו מעשי דויד as 'David's deeds were perfect'; meanwhile, Davies opts for the interpretation that David's deeds were overlooked. Garcia Martinez writes that David's deeds were exalted, while Vermes translates it to 'David's deeds were lifted up.' These versions of the syntagma ויעלו result from different understandings, considering the morphological perspective.[31] The syntagma derives from the Hebrew root עלה, which, depending on the conjugation in which it is found, takes on different meanings, usually coming down to: 'to ascend, to go up', 'to make a way', 'to be exalted', and 'to arise', etc.[32]

In l. 5, the *imperfectum* is preceded by a waw-consecutive, ויעלו, and can, from the morphological point of view, with appropriate vocalisation, be interpreted as the imperfect conjugation for *qal*, *niphal*, *piel*, *pual*, *hiphil*, and *hophal* verbs. Of the forms presented, the first thing to exclude is the *hiphil*, because this sentence lacks a direct object. The acceptance of the *piel* form is also doubtful, as it does not occur in the Hebrew Bible. However, it is attested in rabbinic literature as a transitive verb with the meaning 'to praise, to exalt, to lift up'. Nevertheless, the verb in *piel* requires a direct object. The other possibilities include accepting ויעלו as *qal*, *niphal*, *pual*, and *hophal*. The best option was proposed by Cook, who understood the form under analysis as an imperfect *qal*: David's deeds surpassed other deeds, and thus, they were perfect. This interpretation was followed by Evans who supported his view by citing two passages from the Hebrew Bible: Deut 28:43 and Prov 31:29, where the verb עלה occurs in its *qal* form. In both texts, the verb עלה is followed by the preposition על, which means 'over, above'. Thus, עלה על would be literally translated as 'to rise above', which may metaphorically be rendered as 'to be perfect'. In both texts (Deut 28:42 and Prov 31:29), we have references to someone who is superior to someone else, so he is, with a metaphorical reference, more perfect.[33]

---

30 It is highly possible that by using the phrase תורא ספר קרא, the author of the record is referring to the time between Josh 8:34 and 2 Kgs 22:8, i.e., the last time (when Eleazar was still alive) and the first time (the time of Josiah) of the 'reading of the Book of the Law'.

31 de Roo, "David's Deeds in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 45–46.

32 *DCH* VI, 400–414.

33 de Roo, "David's Deeds," 46–47; Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 187–188.

In Evans's opinion, CD 5,5 is rooted in biblical literature. This basis is 1 Sam 19:4, which is part of Jonathan's defence speech in favour of David, spoken in the presence of Saul: וידבר יהונתן בדוד טוב אל־שאול אביו ויאמר אליו אל־יחטא המלך בעבדו בדוד כי לוא חטא לך וכי מעשיו טוב לך מאד – 'Jonathan spoke well of David to his father Saul, saying to him, "The king should not sin against his servant David, because he has not sinned against you, and because his deeds have been very good to you".' In the next verse (1 Sam 19:5), Jonathan states what deeds of David he means. First, he mentions that David showed courage, risking his life, and killed the Philistine, thanks to which the Lord brought about a great victory for all Israel, and Saul saw it and rejoiced.[34]

At the end of l. 5, directly after the words showing David's prefect deeds, we read: מלבד דם אוריה – 'except for Uriah's blood'. This expression seems to be included there under the influence of 1 Kgs 15:5: אשר עשה דוד את־הישר בעיני יהוה ולא־סר מכל אשר־צוהו כל ימי חייו רק בדבר אוריה החתי; 'because David did what was right in the sight of the Lord, and did not turn aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite.'

This verse is part of the narrative where the Deuteronomist evaluates the rules of Abijjam, king of Judah (1 Kgs 15,1–8). It is clear that the author, in order to show the existing contrast between Abijam and David, characterises the former ruler as an unfaithful sinner, while the latter is presented as an example of a faithful and ideal ruler, even though his life was overshadowed by the murder of Uriah, Bathsheba's husband.

Continuing this motif, the author of CD writes at the beginning of l. 6: ויעזבם לו אל – 'and God forgave him those'. According to Cook, this text should be understood in the light of already quoted 4QMMT C 25–26, which, just for the record, states: 'Remember David, who was a man of the pious ones, [and] he, too, [was] freed from many afflictions and was forgiven.'[35]

The verb עזב, used in CD 5,6, usually means 'to leave, abandon, depart from someone', and often appears in the context of some negative action; for example, it is used for those who leave God (Deut 28:20), or God leaving his people (Deut 31:17). The context of CD suggests that, in l. 6, the verb should be understood positively, since the author clearly wants to present David in a positive light by acquitting him of an offense as serious as murder. This is also evidenced by the Hebrew construction of this part of the sentence: the verb עזב + direct object + particle ל, combined with the indirect object, seems to be an idiomatic expression meaning 'to leave something for someone, for their benefit'.[36]

2.3. 1Q33 = War Scroll (Sefer ha-Milhamah)

The Scroll of the War, the most famous eschatological work, was found in Cave 1 at Qumran. Parts of nineteen columns of the text have been preserved; fragments of six copies

34 Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 187–188.

35 Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 48–49.

36 De Roo, "David's Deeds," 58; A similar construction appears in Neh 3:34.

(4Q491–496) were recovered from Cave 4; some of these, as VanderKam argues, indicate that the text was modified and rewritten as subsequent copies were made.

This manuscript is usually dated to two periods: the Seleucid era or the period of the Roman Empire. Supporters of the dating to the Seleucid era indicate the beginning of the Maccabean revolt (165 or 164 BCE), the peak of Jonathan's military power (143 BCE), or the reign of John Hyrcanus I (135–104 BCE) as the time of its redaction. Scholars who point to the Roman period indicate that 1QM was written in the middle of the first century BCE. Yadin places the composition of the scroll between the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey (65 BCE) and the death of Herod the Great (4 BCE).[37] In turn, based on palaeographical analyses and archaeological arguments, Cross opts for dates similar to the ones suggested by Yadin.[38]

In the entire manuscript, the author discusses the course of the forty-year war that will be fought between two groups: 'the sons of light' and the opposing camp, 'the sons of darkness'. In the first column of the text, the author makes it clear that this will not be an ordinary battle, but a final clash (1QM 1, 5–9). In the manuscript, at the beginning of col. 11, there is a reference to the figure of David.[39]

Table 3. 1Q33 XI, 1–5 and its English translation[40]

Hebrew text	Line
כיא אם לכה המלחמה ובכוח ידכה רוטשו פגריהם לאין קובר ואת גולית הגתי איש גבור חיל	1
הסגרתה ביד דויד עבדכה כיא בטח בשמכה הגדול ולוא בחרב וחנית כיא לכה המלחמה ואת	2
פלשתיים הכנ[י]ע פעמים רבות בשמ קודשכה וגם ביד מלכינו הושעתנו פעמים רבות	3
בעבור רחמיכה ולוא כמעשינו אשר הרעונו ועלילות פשעינו לכה המלחמה ומאתכה הגבורה	4
ולוא לנו ...	5

	Translation
1	For the battle is yours! With the might of your hand their corpses have been torn to pieces with no-one to bury them. Goliath from Gath, gallant giant,
2	you delivered into the hands of David, your servant, for he trusted in your powerful name and not in sword or spear. For the battle is yours!
3	The Philistines you humiliated many times for your holy name. By the hand of our kings, besides, you saved us many times
4	thanks to your mercy, and not by our own deeds by which we did wrong, nor by our sinful actions. For the battle is yours! And it is from you that power comes,
5	and it is not our...

37 Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1962) 243–246.

38 F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York: Anchor Books 1961) 124; D.O. Wenthe, "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," *DSD* 5/3 (1998) 291.

39 Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 188; Porzig, "David in the Judean Desert," 28–29; Pomykala, "Images of David," 44.

40 Parry – Tov – Clements, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 258.

The quotation is the beginning of col. 11 (1Q33=1QM), in which the author teaches about the true source, from where strength and courage flow during the eschatological war. This source, as evidenced by the ending of 1.4 and the entire 1.5, is God Himself. Looking at the content of col. 11 more broadly, the author refers to four texts known from biblical literature. The first one, mentioned above, describes David's fight with Goliath (1 Sam 17), in particular 1 Sam 17:45–51. In lines 6–7, 1QM XI deals with the theme of Balaam's oracle from Num 24:17–19. In the first half of l. 10, he recalls the episode of crossing the Red Sea, or more precisely, the death of the Egyptians in the depths of the sea (Exod 14:26–28, 30–31). At the end of l. 11 and the beginning of l. 12, he alludes to Isa 31:8, which is part of a longer passage, i.e., 'Oracle against Assyria' (Isa 31:4–9).[41] All these texts are used to confirm the author's thought – the image of God as the one who, through his might and strength, is able to free man from various threats posed by people and the superpower.

In the discussed fragment (col. 11, lines 1–5),[42] God's might and strength are revealed in the life of young David, which is first emphasised at the end of l. 1, which describes Goliath, David's opponent. Goliath is איש גבור חיל; 'a gallant giant'. In this construction, there is the noun גבור, meaning 'a brave, courageous, hero,'[43] followed by another noun חיל, one of its meanings being 'might', and referring to people, when it is combined with the noun איש, it points to a 'competent, brave' man.[44] Therefore, this construction highlights, as confirmed by the narrative of 1 Sam 17, the fact that David's opponent was a gallant warrior, well trained in the art of war.

The beginning of l. 2, which continues the thought of l. 1, clearly shows that this warrior failed: הסגרתה ביד דויד עבדכה – 'you delivered into the hands of David, your servant.' The justification for such a course of events begins already in this sentence through the noun used in its content: עבד – 'servant, slave', combined with the masculine singular second person pronominal suffix. The syntagma עבדכה defines David's relationship with God. Such a term is used to define outstanding figures from the Old Testament history who enjoyed close relationships with God.[45]

Further in l. 2, the author continues his thought explaining the main cause of Goliath's failure and David's victory: כיא בטח בשמכה הגדול ולוא בחרב וחנית – 'for he trusted in your powerful name and not in sword or spear.' This justification is syntactically introduced

41 Parry – Tov – Clements, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 258–261.

42 The phrase כיא לכה המלחמה at the beginning and end of the record creates an inclusion exposing the strength of David's trust in light of the fate of God's enemies persecuting His people.

43 *DCH* II, 302–305.

44 *DCH* III, 213–215.

45 In such cases, we most frequently have the following construction: עבד + pronominal suffix, singular first person עבדי – 'my servant' or עבד + pronominal suffix, masculine singular third person עבדו – 'his servant'. This term was used to depict Abraham, Isaac, Jacob (cf. Exod 32:13; Deut 9:27), Caleb (Num 14:24), Moses (Exod 14:31; Num 12:7; Deut 34:5; Josh 1:2, 7; 9:24; 11:15), Joshua (Josh 24:29), Isaiah (Isa 20:3), David (1 Kgs 8:66; Isa 37:35; Ezek 34:23; 37:24f; Ps 78:70; 89:4, 21; 132:10; 144:10; 1 Chr 17:4, 7, 24; 2 Chr 6:15–17, 42), Elijah (2 Kgs 10:10), etc.: *DCH* VI, 215–225;

by the hebrew word כיא, here an example of a longer form found in the corpus of the Qumran manuscripts.[46] The particle is followed by the commonly used order of a verbal clause: בטח בשמכה הגדול. The first place is occupied by the verb בטח, morphologically in the perfect *qal* masculine singular third person, usually meaning 'to trust, to rely on someone',[47] defining David's conduct towards God.[48] The verb is followed by an object, which is the noun שם with the masculine singular second person suffix and the adjective גדול in *scriptio plena*. The object shows the reader the essence of the name of God. Trust in the great name of God led David to victory, even though he was doomed to defeat from the outset. Additionally, David's attitude is emphasised by the further content of 1.2, containing an indirect complement, which is syntactically a negation: ולוא בחרב וחנית – 'and not in sword or spear'. The author mentions the basic equipment of every warrior used in ancient wars. The first weapon is חרב, usually meaning 'a sword', 'a short sword, dagger' or 'stonemason's chisel'; the other noun is חנית – 'a spear'.[49] The two nouns in l. 2 seem to have been introduced on purpose, because they strongly emphasise the action expressed by the verb בטח – 'to trust'.[50] This technique allowed the author of this part of 1QM to depict David as a man who totally trusted God, i.e., a righteous man, drawing his warlike strength from the divine source.

2.4. 11Q5 = 11QPs[a]

The Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11Q5 = 11QPs[a]) comprises 49 compositions, of which seven were preserved in separate fragments (A, B, C, D, E, F),[51] while the rest in columns I–XXVIII. This manuscript is the best preserved and longest scroll containing the psalms. According to the official critical edition, it measures 4 m and 11.2 cm in length,[52] and, taking into account the additional fragments, it could have measured – according to Dahmen – between 5.30 m and 5.60 m in length.[53] Palaeographic analyses have shown that the individual compositions reflect a transitional script between the early and late Herodian eras, which allows dating 11Q5 – following Sanders' analysis – to the first half of the first century CE. These conclusions are shared by Dahmen, who narrows the palaeographic dating to the 30s–50s CE.[54]

---

46 E.D. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* (Atlanta, GA: SBL 2014) 7.

47 *DCH* II, 139–141.

48 In Psa 26:1 there is the only connection in the Bible between David (from the heading of the psalm) and trust in God + in the following verses a self-presentation by the author of the psalm.

49 *DCH* III, 271.

50 The same motif of rejecting confidence in weaponry is present in Ps 33:16–17 and 44:6–7.

51 Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 18–49.

52 Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 4.

53 U. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPsa aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2003) 25.

54 Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 6–9; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter*, 26.

In the penultimate, 27th column, there is a previously unknown work, which the editor titled 'David's Compositions'.[55] It should also be noted that 11Q5 is the only manuscript where this composition was preserved. It is located between 2 Sam 23:7 and Ps 140:1–5, occupying 10 out of the 15 lines of the entire column.

Table 4. 'David's Compositions' (11Q5 col. XXVII, 2–11) and their English translation[56]

Hebrew text	Line
ויהי דויד בן ישי חכם ואור כאור השמש וסופר	2
ונבון ותמים בכול דרכיו לפני אל ואנשים ויתן	3
לו יהוה רוח נבונה ואורה ויכתוב תהלים	4
שלושת אלפים ושש מאות ושיר לשורר לפני המזבח על עולת	5
התמיד לכול יום ויום לכול ימי השנה ארבעה וששים ושלוש	6
מאות ולקורבן השבתות שנים וחמשים שיר ולקורבן ראשי	7
החודשים ולכול ימי המועדות ולי ם הכפורים שלושים שיר	8
ויהי כול השיר אשר דבר ששה ואבעים וארבע מאות ושיר	9
לנגן על הפגועים ארבעה ויהי הכול ארבעת אלפים וחמשים	10
כול אלה דבר בנבואה אשר נתן לו מלפני העליון	11

	Translation
2	There was David, son of Jesse, wise and enlightened like the light of the sun and (was) a scribe
3	and a wise man and perfect in all his ways before God and men. The Lord gave
4	him a discerning and enlightened spirit. He wrote psalms
5	three thousand six hundred, and songs to sing before the altar over the perpetual burnt offering
6	on every day for all the days of the year – three hundred and sixty-four;
7	and for the sabbath offerings – fifty-two songs; and for the offerings of the new
8	moon and for all the days of the appointed festivals and the Day of the Atonement – thirty songs.
9	All the songs which he spoke were four hundred and forty-six, and songs
10	to perform over the possessed – four. The total was four thousand and fifty.
11	And all of these he spoke thanks to the prophecy that had been given to him from before the Most High.

55 Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 48, 91.
56 Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, PL. XVI.

Syntactic and lexical analyses allow us to distinguish a two-part literary structure in 'David's Compositions'. The first part of this structure is formed by the content of the entire 1.2 and 1.3, excluding the last word of this line, i.e., the syntagma ויתן, which functions as a predicate in the next, new sentence. In this way, the first part contains the characteristics of David himself, his genealogy, and attributes.

The second part of 'David's Compositions' opens with the already mentioned syntagma ויתן in l. 3, consisting of all the following lines in col. XXVII. It is in this part that the author indicates the scope of David's literary output, stating the number of all his psalms and songs. In addition, this section can be divided into three subdivisions:
(1) l. 3–4 – David is given a discerning and enlightened spirit,
(2) l. 4–10 – enumeration of David's psalms and songs,
(3) l. 11 – David possesses the gift of prophesy.[57]

Considering the topic of this paper, the most essential information can be found in the entire l. 3, excluding its first word (ונבון) and last word (ויתן): ותמים בכול דרכיו לפני אל ואנשים – '[David was] perfect in all his ways before God and men.'

The adjective תמים usually means: 'perfect', 'complete', 'ideal', 'without blemish', or 'without fault'.[58] It has parallels to the canonical texts, especially to Ps 18:24, 26, 33 (2 Sam 22:24, 26, 33). As Sanders notes, it is highly likely that the expression in 2 Sam 22:33: ויתר תמים דרכי – 'he makes my path ideal,' influenced the creation – in this word order – of this expression in 'David's Compositions'.[59] A similar view was presented by Dahmen, who claims that this expression was formulated based on biblical parallels. On the one hand, in the Hebrew Bible, there are texts speaking about perfection towards God, e.g., Deut 32:4, but, on the other hand, the MT contains allusions to perfection before men, traces of which can be found in Ps 119:1 and Ezek 28:15.[60]

In the structure of this expression, the most problematic thing seems to be the correct understanding of its first part: ותמים בכול דרכיו. Analysing this part of l. 3 leads us to pose the question: is it a biblical expression or a Qumran formulation? According to Dahmen, it is an example of a typical Qumran expression.[61] A similar point of view is presented by Strawn, who takes as one of his main arguments the frequency of its use in texts classified as typical Qumran compositions.[62] It is hard to disagree with the opinion of these exegetes, considering the context of the expression's application (תמים + דרך). Here, we should mention mainly the Community Rule (1QS II 2; III 9–10; IV 22; VIII 10; XVIII 21; IX 2.5.9), the War Scroll (1QM XIV 7; 4Q491 frag. 8–10 l. 5), and the Damascus Document

57 For more on the division and structure of David's Compositions, see Biegas, "Division and Structure," 319–334.
58 *DCH* VIII, 643–644.
59 Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 93.
60 Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter*, 254.
61 Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter*, 254.
62 B.A. Strawn, "David as One of the Perfect of (the) Way: On the Provenience of David's Compositions (and 11QPsa as a Whole?)," *RevQ* 24/4 (2010) 615–622.

(MS A II,15–16; 4Q266 frag. 2 l. 4; frag 5 l. 19). In addition, this expression is attested in a number of other manuscripts belonging to the Essene works.[63] Using this expression with reference to David has the effect of presenting him as an idealised figure, which is also characteristic of the post-exilic biblical books. Even more light is shed by Ps 119:1, in which the author, speaking of people whose way is blameless and perfect (תמימי־דרך), calls them 'happy', and identifies them with those who walk in the law of the Lord (בתורת יהוה).[64] Therefore, having in mind Ps 119:1, containing identical words as l. 3 from 'David's Compositions', we can risk stating that the author perceives David as a man who obeys the law of the Lord.[65] This interpretation is also confirmed by the general interpretative tendency after the Babylonian captivity, in which the figure of David became a standard against which all rulers were measured.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that בכול דרכיו לפני אל ואנשים may refer to the adjective תמים itself and may be associated with all the characteristics of David mentioned in דויד בן ישי חכם ואור כאור השמש וסופר ונבון (l. 2 and l. 3).

3. Early Jewish Writings

Traces of the image of David as a righteous man can be found in texts classified as early Jewish writings. By these, we mean *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, commonly known as Pseudo-Philo, *Antiquitates Judaicae* by Flavius Josephus, and *Apocalypse of Sophonias*.

3.1. Pseudo-Philo

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum is the first source affirming the tradition about David. Pseudo-Philo is a pseudo-epigraphic work, originally written in Hebrew in the Palestinian territory, approximately in the time of Jesus. Later, the book was translated into Greek and from Greek into Latin. Its content can be described as a paraphrase of the biblical history from the creation of the world to the death of Saul in the battle of Aphek with the Philistines. The author combines biblical and halakhic materials by mixing speeches and prayers with genealogies and short stories.[66]

In chapter 62 of *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,[67] the author, continuing the retelling of events after David's fight with Goliath, an obvious reference to 1 Sam 17, shows Saul's

63 Strawn, "David as One of the Perfect of (the) Way," 619–620.

64 S. Łach, *Księga Psalmów. Wstęp – Przekład z oryginału – komentarz – ekskursy* (PŚST 7/2; Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 506–507.

65 The Biblical places where a human way is blameless: Ezek 28:15; Ps 101:2, 6; Prov 11:20; 13:6; cf. Job 4:6.

66 D.J. Harrington (ed.), *Pseudo-Philo* (OTP 2; New York: Doubleday 1985) 297–377; J. Dvořáček, *The Son of David in Matthew's Gospel in the Light of the Solomon as Exorcist Tradition* (WUNT 2/415; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2016) 39.

67 J. Zsengellér, "David in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Reshaping the Contemporary Cultural Memory," *Figures Who Shape Scriptures, Scriptures that Shape Figures: Essays in Honour of Benjamin G. Wright III* (eds. G.G. Xeravits – G.S. Goering) (DCLS 40; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2018) 56–70.

intensifying dislike of David, which is manifested in his desire to kill Jesse's son. In the following verses, the author introduces a dialogue that took place between David and Jonathan. In this dialogue, in David's speech, we read:

> Et nunc timeo ne interficiat me, ne perdat pro me vitam suam. Sanguinem enim iustum numquam effudi, et quare anima mea persecutionem patitur? Minimus enim inter fratres meos, fui pascens oves, et quare morte periclitor? Iustus enim sum et iniquitatem non habeo, et quare pater tuus odit me? Sed iustitia patris mei adiuvat me, ut in manus patris tui non incidam? Et cum sim iuvenis et mollis dierum, in vanum Saul invidet mihi.[68]
>
> Now I fear that he will kill me and on my account lose his own life. For he will never escape the shedding of innocent blood. Why is my soul pursued? For I, the youngest among my brothers, was tending sheep, and why should I be in danger of death? For I am just and have no wickedness, and why does your father hate me? But the righteousness of my father helps me that I not fall into the hands of your father. Since I am young and tender of age, Saul envies me for no reason (62, 5).[69]

Speaking through David about the reason for Saul's envy, the author indicates that the main reason is the moral condition of Jesse's son. David is a righteous man, and there is no injustice in him. This hero is not corrupted by the court environment or through warfare, because – as v. 5 says – until now, being the youngest among his brothers, he has been pasturing his father's flock. The very information that David is the least among his brothers, and that he has tended the flock, refers to the motif and vocabulary present at the beginning of the Hebrew version of Ps 151, found in the last column of 11Q5. The words 'Iustus enim sum et iniquitatem non habeo, et quare pater tuus odit me?' are a paraphrase of David's words to Jonathan in 1 Sam 20:1.

3.2. Flavius Josephus

A significant text presenting David as a righteous man can be found in Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae*. In this quite large work, completed in 79–94 CE, the Jewish historian Josephus (37–100 CE) described in detail the historical events of the Jewish nation from its beginnings to the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans, directing his work both to gentiles and Hellenised Jews. Using the available sources, Josephus analysed them thoroughly in order to depict the main Jewish protagonists and religious groups in the light of Greek ideals.

In two chapters of Book 7, Josephus characterises David as a righteous man. The first mention of this trait of David appears in chapter 7, which contains a description of David's love for Bathsheba, who became pregnant, the death of Uriah, her husband, the parable of Nathan, the death of Bathsheba's child and the birth of Solomon. At the end of David's

68 H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* (AGJU 31; Leiden: Brill 1996) 84.

69 Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 190.

conversation with Nathan, and before the description of the death of Bathsheba's first child, Josephus includes the following text:

> Ταραχθέντος δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ συσχεθέντος ἱκανῶς καὶ μετὰ δακρύων καὶ λύπης ἀσεβῆσαι λέγοντος, ἦν γὰρ ὁμολογουμένως θεοσεβὴς καὶ μηδὲν ἁμαρτὼν ὅλως περὶ τὸν βίον ἢ τὰ περὶ τὴν Οὐρία γυναῖ κα, ᾤκτειρεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ διαλλάττεται φυλάξειν αὐτῷ.[70]
>
> When the King was troubled at these messages, and sufficiently confounded, and said with tears and sorrow, that he lived ungodly: (for he was without controversy a pious man, and guilty of no sin at all in his whole life, excepting those in the matter of Uriah) God had compassion on him, and was reconciled to him (*Ant.* 7, 153).[71]

Another image of David in this light is found in chapter 15, which relates the time before his death. David gives admonitions to his son, Solomon: on how to keep the law and how to deal with his enemies and friends. Then, Josephus depicts David's death, briefly characterises his personality, gives the details of his funeral, and the later fate of his sepulchre. Just after the narrative about the king's death, he provides an account of David's character:

> Νοῆσαί τε καὶ συνιδεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐνεστηκότων οἰκονομίας ἱκαώτατος, σώφρων ἐπιε ικὴς χρηστὸς πρὸς τοὺς ἐνσυμφοραῖς ὑπάρχοντας δίκαιος φιλάνθρωπος, ἃ μόνοις δικαιότατα βασιλεῦσιν εἶναι προσῆκε, μηδὲν ὅλως παρὰ τοσοῦτο μέγεθος ἐξουσίας ἁμαρτὼν ἢ τὸ περὶ τὴν Οὐρία γυναῖκα.[72]
>
> He was also of very great abilities in understanding, and apprehension of present and future circumstances, when he was to manage any affairs. He was prudent, and moderate, and kind to such as were under any calamities: he was righteous, and human. Which are good qualities peculiarly fit for Kings: nor was he guilty of any offence in the exercise of so great an authority, but in the business of the wife of Uriah (*Ant.* 7, 391).[73]

3.3. *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (*Apocalypse of Sophonias*)

The *Apocalypse of Sophonias* is a work attributed to the prophet Zephaniah. Its text was fragmentarily preserved in the Coptic language. It is an example of the early stage of apocalypticism, since it is dated between the first century BCE and the first century CE. According to various authors of studies dedicated to this work, there are certain similarities, in terms of its form and content, to the Ethiopian *Book of Enoch* (*1 En.*), the Slavic *Book of Enoch* (*2 En.*), the Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch* (*3 Bar.*), and the *Testament of Levi*.

The *Apocalypse of Sophonias* contains visions that take place during the heavenly journey which the visionary undertakes under the guidance of an angel. The structure of the text,

---

70 https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0526.tlg001.perseus-grc1:7.7.3 [access: 2.01.2026].

71 L. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of David," *HUCA* 60 (1989) 159.

72 https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0526.tlg001.perseus-grc1:7.15.2 [access: 2.01.2026].

73 Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of David," 138–139, 148–151.

similarly to other compositions containing the motif of an extra-terrestrial journey, is based on short episodes with frequent sudden changes of the topic or place of events.[74]

During his journey, the prophet experiences visions, staying in six different places, then he crosses a river and enters the land where the six heroes of the Old Testament are staying. There, he experiences four more visions, each accompanied by the sound of a trumpet.[75] In chapter 9, the author shows a great angel blowing a golden trumpet. Then he notes the angel's words spoken to the prophet, assuring him that he triumphed over the accuser and escaped from the abyss and Hades, and that his name is written in the Book of the Living. Then he mentions all the righteous men with whom the angel conversed: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Enoch, Elijah, and David. These outstanding heroes of the Old Testament were inscribed in the Book of the Living, and are participating in the angelic liturgy for the sake of their righteousness, being at the same time models encouraging other people to strive for communion with the six righteous men. Moreover, the author is convinced that the souls of the patriarchs and righteous men, who were brought out of Hades, can intercede for the souls of sinners.[76]

Conclusion

Based on the above analysis of the presentation of David's righteousness in three interrelated groups of Jewish compositions, the following conclusions can be drawn. The image of David as a righteous man is presented in four Qumran manuscripts. The first textual witness showing David as a righteous man is 4QMMT, or more precisely, 4Q398, where the author emphasises these features of David that were worth imitating. The second Qumran manuscript where we can find David presented in this light is the Damascus Document. Its author, justifying David's polygamy, expressly states that all his deeds were righteous, except the killing of Uriah. In 1Q33, where the author shows God as the only source of might and strength in the eschatological war, David and his fair attitude serve as one of the four examples, taken from biblical literature, in which God's might and strength were revealed. Here the author recalls an episode known from 1 Sam 17, i.e., the fight of David with Goliath. David, who was righteous trusting in the holy name of God, won the battle that was doomed to end in his defeat. The next manuscript from Qumran, containing the information about David as a righteous man, is the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 – 11Q5. In col. 27 (l. 2–11), containing the text of 'David's Compositions'. It consists of two parts. The first one (l. 2–3), including David's characteristics, his genealogy and attributes, contains the expression תמים בכול דרכיו, which points to the perfection, blamelessness and

74 A. Kuśmirek, "Apokalipsa Sofoniasza," *Pisma apokaliptyczne i testamenty* (ed. M. Parchem) (Apokryfy Starego Testamentu 2; Kraków: Enigma Press 2010) 141–142.

75 Kuśmirek, "Apokalipsa Sofoniasza," 144.

76 Kuśmirek, "Apokalipsa Sofoniasza," 147–148.

ideal life of David. In fact, these features are characteristic of a man who can be described as righteous.

Traces of David's image as a righteous man are also present in texts that create a group of early Jewish writings: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, known as Pseudo-Philo, *Antiquitates Judaicae* by Flavius Josephus, and *Apocalypse of Sophonias*. In chapter 62 of *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, there is a text dealing with the subject of Saul's dislike for David, which is manifested in his attempt to kill Jesse's son, the main reason for such an action being the moral condition of David, who considers himself a righteous man. In Book Seven of *Antiquitates Judaicae*, Flavius Josephus clearly presents David as a righteous man. First, he does so in the context of David's conversation with Nathan after the death of Bathsheba's first child. Then, David's righteousness is shown by the author in a synthetic characterisation of his personality, immediately after the description of his death and funeral.

The author of the text entitled *Apocalypse of Sophonias*, describing the prophet's extraterrestrial journey in chapter 9, lists righteous men whose names were written in the Book of the Living for their righteousness. These righteous men are: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Enoch, Elijah, and David.

Bibliography

Auld, A.G. – Hos, C.Y.S., "The Making of David and Goliath," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 56 (1992) 19–39.

Biegas, M., "Postać Dawida w hebrajskiej wersji Psalmu 151 (11Q5)," *The Biblical Annals* 8/1 (2018) 5–28.

Biegas, M., "The Division and Structure of 'David's Compositions' (11Q5)," *The Biblical Annals* 13/2 (2023) 319–334.

Biegas, M., "Was King David an Exorcist?," *The Biblical Annals* 13/4 (2023) 591–616.

Bradley, C.G., "The Warrior-Poet of Israel. The Significance of David's Battles in Chronicles and Ben Sira," *Rewriting Biblical History. Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honor of Pancratius C. Beentjes* (eds. J. Corley – H. van Grol) (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 7; Berlin: De Gruyter 2011) 79–96.

Brooke, G., *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 29; Sheffield: JSOT 1985).

Brownlee, W.H., "The Significance of David's Compositions," *Revue de Qumran* 5/4 (1966) 569–574.

Clines, D.J.A., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press 1993–2016) II–IV, VI, VIII.

Coates, W.L., "A Study of David, the Thoroughly Human Man Who Genuinely Loved God," *Review and Expositor* 99/2 (2002) 237–254.

Coulot, C., "David à Qumrân,» *Figures de David à travers la Bible. XVIIe congrès de l'ACFEB (Lille, 1–5 septembre 1997)* (eds. L. Desrousseaux – J. Vermeylen) (Lectio Divina 177; Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1999) 315–343.

Cross, F.M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York: Anchor Books 1961).

Dahmen, U., *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPsa aus Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 49; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2003).

Daly-Denton, M., "David the Psalmist, Inspired Prophet: Jewish Antecedents of a New Testament Datum," *Australian Biblical Review* 52 (2004) 32–47.

De Roo, J.C.R., "David's Deeds in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6/1 (1999) 44–65.

Debel, H., "The Lord Looks at the Heart (1 Sam 16, 7). 11Q Psa 151 A-B as a Variant Literary Edition of Ps 151 LXX," *Revue de Qumran* 23/4 (2008) 459–473.

Dimant, D., "David's Youth in the Qumran Context," *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (eds. J. Penner – K.M. Penner – C. Wassen) (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 98; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2012) 97–115.

Dvořáček, J., *The Son of David in Matthew's Gospel in the Light of the Solomon as Exorcist Tradition* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/415; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2016).

Ejranaes, B., "David and His Two Women: An Analysis of the Two Poems in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran (11Q5)," *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (eds. A. Voitila – J. Jokiranta) (Journal for the Study of the Septuagint: Supplement Series 126; Leiden: Brill 2008) 575–589.

Evans, C.A., "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter – C.A. Evans) (The Library of Second Temple Studies 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997) 183–197.

Feldman, L., "Josephus, Portrait of David," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60 (1989) 129–174.

Fitzmyer, J.A., "David, Being Therefore a Prophet... (Acts 2:30)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 34/3 (1972) 332–339.

Flint, P., "The Prophet David at Qumran," *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005) 158–167.

Harrington, D.J. (ed.), *Pseudo-Philo* (Old Testament Pseudepigrapha 2; New York: Doubleday 1985).

Jacobson, H., *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 31; Leiden: Brill 1996).

Knoppers, N.G., "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles," *Biblica* 76/4 (1995) 449–470.

Kugel, J.L., "David the Prophet," *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition* (ed. J.L. Kugel) (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1990) 45–55.

Kuśmirek, A., "Apokalipsa Sofoniasza," *Pisma apokaliptyczne i testamenty* (ed. M. Parchem) (Apokryfy Starego Testamentu 2; Kraków: Enigma 2010) 134–168.

Łach, J., *Księgi Samuela. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz – ekskursy* (Pismo Święte Starego Testamentu 4/1; Poznań: Pallottinum 1973).

Łach, S., *Księga Psalmów. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz – ekskursy* (Pismo Święte Starego Testamentu 7/2; Poznań: Pallottinum 1990).

Langkammer, H., *Księgi Ezdrasza – Nehemiasza. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz – ekskursy* (Pismo Święte Starego Testamentu 2/3; Poznań – Warszawa: Pallottinum 1971).

Marttila, M., "David in the Wisdom of Ben Sira," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 25 (2011) 29–48.

Mays, J.L., "The David of the Psalms," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 40/2 (1986) 143–155.

Nawrot, J., *Pierwsza Księga Machabejska (Rozdziały 1,1–6,16). Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Stary Testament 14/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2016).

Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2 ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2005).

Parry, D.W. –Tov, E. – Clements, G.I. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. I. *Text Concerned with Religious Law, Exegetical Texts and Parabiblical Texts*, 2 ed. (Leiden: Brill 2014).

Pietersma, A., "David in the Greek Psalms," *Vetus Testamentum* 30/2 (1980) 213–226.

Pomykala, K.E., "Images of David in Early Judaism," *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. I. *Ancient Versions and Traditions* (ed. C.A. Evans) (The Library of Second Temple Studies 50; London: Clark 2004) 33–46.

Porzig, P., "David in the Judean Desert: Beobachtungen an ausgewählten Qumrantexten," *David in the Desert: Tradition and Redaction in the "History of David's Rise"* (ed. H. Bezzel – R.G. Kratz) (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 514; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2021) 9–33.

Pudełko, J.J., "Dawid jako organizator kultu w Pochwale Ojców (Syr 47,8–10)," *Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia* 10/2 (2017) 263–283.

Qimron, E. – Strugnell, J., *Qumran Cave 4*. V. *Miqsat Ma'aśeh ha-Torah* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 10; Oxford: Clarendon 1994).

Rendtorff, R., "The Psalms of David: David in the Psalms," *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (eds. P. Flint *et al.*) (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 99; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2005) 53–65.

Reymond, E.D., *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* (Atlanta, GA: SBL 2014).

Sanders, J., *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 11QPsa* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4; Oxford: Clarendon 1965).

Schniedewind, W.M., "The Davidic Dynasty and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Literature," *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (eds. L. Schiffman – E. Tov – J. Vanderkam) (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 2000) 82–91.

Skehan, P., "The Apocryphal Psalm 151," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963) 407–409.

Smith, M., "How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151 A (11QPsa 28.3–12)," *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceeding of a Symposium held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995* (eds. T. Muraoka – J.F. Elwolde) (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26; Leiden – New York – Koln: Brill 1997) 182–208.

Strawn, B.A., "David as One of the Perfect of (the) Way: On the Provenience of David's Compositions (and 11QPsa as a Whole?)," *Revue de Qumran* 24/4 (2010) 607–626.

Szmajdziński, M., "Orfeusz – Dawid – Jezus (Psalm 151)," *Orfizm i jego recepcja w literaturze, sztuce i filozofii* (ed. K. Kołakowska) (Kraków – Lublin: Homini – Wydawnictwo KUL 2011) 123–130.

VanderKam, J., *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego* (trans. Regina Gromacka) (Warszawa: Cyklady 1996).

Wacholder, B.Z., "David's Eschatological Psalter (11QPsalms)," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 59 (1988) 23–72.

Wacholder, B.Z., *The New Damascus Document. The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 56; Leiden: Brill 2007).

Wenthe, D.O., "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5/3 (1998) 290–319.

Witt, A.C., "David, the Ruler of the Sons of His Covenant (ומושל בבני בריתו): The Expansion of Psalm 151A in 11QPsa," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 3/1 (2014) 77–97.

Xeravits, G.G., *From Qumran to the Synagogues: Selected Studies on Ancient Judaism* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 43; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2019).

Yadin, Y., *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1962).

Zsengellér, J., "David in the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Reshaping the Contemporary Cultural Memory," *Figures Who Shape Scriptures, Scriptures that Shape Figures: Essays in Honour of Benjamin G. Wright III* (eds. G.G. Xeravits – G.S. Goering) (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 40; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2018) 56–70.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 67–113

What Is the Sin of Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and Why Is It Unforgivable (Mark 3:28–30 and Parallels)?

Janusz Kręcidło
University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński in Warsaw
j.krecidlo@uksw.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0913-5513

ABSTRACT: This article is a comprehensive examination of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Despite numerous attempts to definitively answer the question of the nature of this sin in Christian history and today, it still appears to be a *crux interpretum*. The first step is to comprehensively present the *status quaestionis* and attempt to systematise existing research. The lack of consensus among scholars justifies the need to address this topic from a broader research perspective. The first step in exegetical analysis is a meticulous examination of the synoptic passages in Mark 3:28–30, Matt 12:31–32 and Luke 12:10 in their narrative contexts. This article argues that the essence of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the rejection of the revelation offered by God in Jesus Christ and of God Himself as the revealed God, i.e. apostasy. However, each Evangelist approaches this issue differently, placing emphasis on different aspects. This article also asserts that Luke, probably inspired by Q 12:10, attempts to remove this teaching from its local narrative context and make it universal. This article also examines other texts (Heb 6:4–6, 1 John 5:16, and *Gos. Thom.* 44) that broaden the theological and cultural context for interpreting the gospel teaching on blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, but they do not add much new content.

KEYWORDS: sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, Mark 3:28–30, Matt 12:31–32, Luke 12:10, Heb 6:4–6, 1 John 5:16, Q source 12:10, *Gospel of Thomas* 44

The sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, also referred to as the sin against the Holy Spirit or the unforgivable sin, is a biblical and theological issue that has been the subject of many studies. Even though this New Testament topic has been hotly debated throughout Christian history and is considered by many exegetes and faithful Christians to have been thoroughly explored, conflicting interpretations and new attempts at explanation continue to emerge. This article first presents the issue of understanding blasphemy in Old Testament Judaism. Next, we will present the *status quaestionis* of the topic of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the history of exegesis and attempt to systematise its interpretative trends. This will justify the need for this research, demonstrating that this topic remains a *crux interpretum*. The next stage will involve a detailed exegesis of three gospel pericopes (Mark 3:38–30; Matt 12:31–32; Luke 12:10) in which the theme of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit appears in literary and theological contexts. A novelty of this study compared to existing ones will also be the examination of this theme in the context of Heb 6:4–6

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.18561 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

and 1 John 5:16, as well as parallel passages from the Q source and the *Gospel of Thomas*. The final step will be an attempt at a balanced and differentiated assessment, followed by the formulation of conclusions.

1. Blasphemy in Judaism

A detailed investigation into the meaning of the gospel pericopes dealing with the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit should begin with the following question: Did this or a similar concept exist in biblical Judaism before the time of the New Testament?[1] Several passages in the Hebrew Bible address this issue. The first of these is Lev 24:10–23.[2] These verses, part of the so-called Holiness Code (chapters 17–26), refer to blasphemy against the Name of God, which is punishable by death by stoning. The blasphemy involved the son of an Israelite woman cursing the name of God (24:11):

> וַיִּקֹּב בֶּן־הָאִשָּׁה הַיִּשְׂרְאֵלִית אֶת־הַשֵּׁם וַיְקַלֵּל וַיָּבִיאוּ אֹתוֹ
>
> καὶ ἐπονομάσας ὁ υἱὸς τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς Ισραηλείτιδος τὸ ὄνομα κατηράσατο.
>
> 'The son of an Israelite woman blasphemed [וַיִּקֹּב] the Name and cursed [וַיְקַלֵּל] it.'

The act of blaspheming against the name of God is here expressed by the Hebrew verb נָקַב *nāqaḇ*, and cursing Him is rendered by קָלַל *qālal*. After committing blasphemy, the culprit was imprisoned and then, on God's orders, led outside the camp. There, all who heard the blasphemy laid their hands on his head, after which the whole congregation stoned him (Lev 24:14). After this incident, God commanded Moses to tell the Israelites that:

> Anyone who curses [קִלֵּל] God shall incur guilt. One who blasphemes [נֹקֵב] the name of the Lord shall be put to death. The whole congregation shall stone the blasphemer. Aliens as well as the native-born, when they blaspheme [נָקַב] the Name, shall be put to death (Lev 24:15–16).

The closest context to this statement is the various punishments for offences against humans and animals, among which the death penalty for the murder of a human being is the most severe (24:21). The same rules apply to both Israelites and aliens. After presenting these punishments, the author recounts how the Israelites, led by Moses, carried out the death sentence by stoning a man who had blasphemed against God (Lev 24:23).

---

1 For more on blasphemy in the OT, see S.M. Olyan, "The Sin of Blasphemy in Ancient Israel: Boundaries of the Sacred," *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2000) 85–102.

2 A more detailed explanation of this text can be found, for example, in A. Tronina, *Księga Kapłańska. Wstęp, przekład, miejsca paralelne i komentarz* (Biblia Lubelska; Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL 2021) 115–116.

A similar situation, in which a man is sentenced to death by stoning for alleged blasphemy against God, is described in 1 Kgs 21:1–16.[3] It tells the story of Naboth of Jezreel, who was falsely accused of blasphemy by Jezebel, the wife of King Ahab. The king's wife devised a plot and wrote a letter in his name to the elders and nobles of the city, accusing Naboth of blasphemy against God and the king. Naboth was put on trial, during which two false witnesses corroborated the accusation: וָמֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים בֵּרַכְתָּ [LXX: ηὐλόγησεν θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα] in 21:10. These words literally mean: 'You have blessed [בֵּרַכְתָּ] God and the king.' Naboth was deprived of the opportunity to refute the accusation or defend himself. He was immediately led outside the city and stoned.

Exod 22:27[4] contains a prohibition in the context of the regulations accompanying the narrative of the covenant at Mount Sinai (chapters 19–31):

אֱלֹהִים לֹא תְקַלֵּל וְנָשִׂיא בְּעַמְּךָ לֹא תָאֹר

Θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις, καὶ ἄρχοντας τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐ κακῶς ἐρεῖς (in LXX Exod 22:28).

'You shall not blaspheme God or curse a ruler of your people' (22:27).

The verb קָלַל *qālal* is used here to describe blasphemy against God. This blasphemy is juxtaposed with imprecating/cursing the ruler, who is the Lord's anointed one. In turn, the cursing of the ruler is rendered by the verb עָרַר *ʿārar*.

A similar situation is described in Isa 8:21:[5]

וְעָבַר בָּהּ נִקְשֶׁה וְרָעֵב וְהָיָה כִּי־יִרְעַב וְהִתְקַצַּף וְקִלֵּל בְּמַלְכּוֹ וּבֵאלֹהָיו וּפָנָה לְמָעְלָה

καὶ ἥξει ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς σκληρὰ λιμός καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἂν πεινάσητε λυπηθήσεσθε καὶ κακῶς ἐρεῖτε τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὰ παταχρα καὶ ἀναβλέψονται εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνω

'They will pass through the land, greatly distressed and hungry; when they are hungry, they will be enraged and will curse their king and their gods and turn their faces upward'.

Unlike Exod 22:27, the same verb קָלַל *qālal* is employed here to describe cursing both God and the king.

These four texts are the only ones in the Old Testament that deal with blasphemy against God and the death penalty by stoning as its consequence. There is no mention of what curses/blasphemies were uttered. Hence, some conclude that blasphemy consisted in the

---

3 See M. Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday 2001) 482–494; M.A. Sweeney, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2007) 248–255.

4 See the exegesis and interpretation of this verse in T.B. Dozeman, *Exodus* (ECC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2009) 522–524; J. Sklar, "Exodus," https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/commentary/exodus/ [access: 30.04.2025].

5 This text is well explained, for example, by J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19; New York: Doubleday 2000) 242–244; B.S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2000) 75–77.

mere utterance of the name of God.[6] This view is expressed in the Mishnah.[7] The Gemara goes even further, extending this sin to any ungodly speech about any attribute of God (e.g. Holy, Merciful, etc.).[8] However, Jewish literature makes no mention of the sin of blasphemy against the (Holy) Spirit.[9]

2. *Status quaestionis* – Suggestions for Interpreting New Testament Texts on Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the History of Exegesis

This section presents a chronological overview of how the gospel statements regarding the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit have been interpreted throughout the history of exegesis. It is impossible and unnecessary to mention and discuss in detail the opinions of all authors who have expressed their views on this subject.[10] Therefore, we will endeavour to select and present primarily interpretations that offer a new perspective, and then draw on them to produce a synthesis.

Jesus' statement about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit has moved and intrigued faithful Christians from the very beginning. The oldest post-biblical reference to her can be found in the *Didache*:[11] 'And ye shall not tempt or dispute with any prophet who speaketh in the spirit; for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven' (11:7). The context of this statement (chapter 11) is instruction on how to treat Christian teachers who enter communities. This statement suggests that it would be an unpardonable sin against the Spirit to mistreat (tempt or dispute with) a prophet who speaks in the Spirit. This means that mistreating the messenger is equivalent to opposing the Spirit that sends the prophet, and this would result in committing the unforgivable sin. For prophecy was regarded as a function (and gift) of the Holy Spirit.

Another voice on the matter is St Irenaeus of Lyons (130–200), who, like the author of the *Didache*, links the sin against the Holy Spirit to the denial of the prophetic spirit and, at the same time, considers any heretical teaching concerning the Holy Spirit an unforgivable sin.[12]

---

6 See K. Kohler – D.W. Amram, "Blasphemy," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/3354-blasphemy [access: 21.02.2025].

7 See m.*Sanh* 7:5.

8 See b.*Sanh* 56a.

9 For more, see U. Luz, *Matthew 8–20* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2001) 205–209.

10 An excellent summary, from which we have drawn here, was presented by W.W. Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9/1 (2004) 57–96.

11 The English translation by Charles H. Hoole, available online at https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/didache-hoole.html, is given in square brackets.

12 Irénée de Lyon, *Contre les hérésies*, Livre III (ed. F. Sagnard) (SC 34; Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1974) 3.11.9, 156–157.

Origen (185–254), who addresses this topic in his commentary on the Gospel of John,[13] does not define the nature of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, but claims that it can only be committed by those who have been baptised. This indicates that it is a sin exclusive to Christians. This opinion has become one of the leading interpretations in the history of the Church.

An interesting interpretation is offered by Athanasius the Great, bishop of Alexandria (296–373), who maintains that the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit committed by Jesus' Jewish opponents consists in their rejection of Christ's divinity.[14] If they blasphemed against Him as the Son of Man, the sin could be forgiven. On the other hand, to deny God revealed in His humanity is to deny the Holy Spirit, the very God revealed in Christ the Son of Man.

Cyril of Jerusalem (315–387), in his catecheses, maintained that people should be careful of their speech lest, through carelessness or ignorance, they should say something inappropriate, with which they might show dishonour to the Holy Spirit and thus condemn themselves.[15] The same opinion is expressed in the writings of Ambrose of Milan (339–397), Basil the Great (330–379), Gregory of Nyssa (330–395) and other Church Fathers of the time, who state that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which is an unforgivable sin, is any erroneous or inappropriate utterance about Him.[16]

John Chrysostom (347–407), commenting on the pericope in Matthew (Matt 12:31–32), concluded that sin against the Holy Spirit was a singular transgression committed by the Jews who claimed that Jesus cast out evil spirits by the power of Satan.[17] It can be presumed that Chrysostom did not think that the sin against the Holy Spirit could be committed after the end of Christ's earthly mission.[18] Jerome (345–420) also claimed that this was a singular sin, consisting in attributing to Jesus the power of Beelzebub. Jerome does not make a clear statement as to whether blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, understood in this way, can also be committed during the time of the Church.

Augustine of Hippo (354–430) was the Church Father who showed the strongest interest in the problem of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit as an unforgivable sin. It was such an intriguing subject for him that he returned to it several times in his writings. Augustine

---

13 See Origène, *Commentaire sur l'Évangile selon Jean* 2.6 (45–50) (ed. Cécile Blanc) (SC 120; Paris: Cerf 1966) I, 236–240.

14 See Athanasius Alexandrinus, "Epistula ad Serapionem" 4,17, *Athanasius Werke* I/1,4 (ed. K. Savvidis) (GCS N.F. 19; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2010) 583–584. We use the following Polish translation: Św. Atanazy Wielki, *Listy do Serapiona* (trans. S. Kalinkowski) (Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 2; Kraków: WAM 1996). This work is discussed in detail in W. Turek, "Grzech przeciw Duchowi Świętemu: Mt 12,31–32 w Listach do Serapiona św. Atanazego Wielkiego," *Studia Płockie* 26 (1998) 67–74. The author of the article rightly points out that these letters are the first work of the Church Fathers entirely devoted to the Holy Spirit. See *ibidem*, 67.

15 Our presentation of the topic is in line with Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 59.

16 Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 59.

17 See John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew* 41.5. We use the following translation: Św. Jan Chryzostom, *Homilie na Ewangelię według św. Mateusza. Część II: Homilie 41–90* (trans. A. Baron) (Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 23; Kraków: WAM 2001).

18 See Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 60.

devotes the most time to this issue in his homily on Matt 12:32.[19] Unlike Jerome, he does not assert that it is a matter of a singular sin committed by Jesus' opponents. Drawing on his life experience, he observes that many people blaspheme against God or His works. However, they then confess their sins, repent and return to the bosom of the Church. Therefore, he believes that Jesus is not referring to this sin in Matt 12:32. Augustine believes that the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit can be committed by those who received the Holy Spirit by accepting faith in Christ, but then renounced God and failed to convert, thereby excluding themselves from salvation. However, he asserts that a person can convert even in the very last hour of their life. Therefore, only those who persist until the end of their earthly life in rejecting the salvation offered by Christ blaspheme against the Holy Spirit. However, Augustine was not entirely satisfied with his answer and claimed that this was one of the most difficult exegetical problems in the entire Holy Scriptures:

> Fateor vobis, fratres, quia numquam audacius aliquid aut difficilius in omni scriptura divina tractavi. Ideo in contionibus populi vitavi hanc quaestionem molestissimam.
>
> [Perhaps there is no more difficult and important issue in the entire Holy Scriptures. Therefore, I confess to you that in my speeches to the people, I avoided this troublesome issue].[20]

The Middle Ages witnessed attempts to explain the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in scholastic theology, two of which we will discuss here. The first of these we owe to Peter Lombard (1100–1160), considered the father of systematic theology, as his *Libri Quattuor Sententiarum*[21] became one of the leading theology textbooks until the seventeenth century. Referring to Augustine of Hippo, Lombard claimed that sin against the Holy Spirit involves obstinate and deliberate persistence in evil. Accordingly, he identified six unforgivable sins: despair, presumption, impenitence, obstinacy, resisting the known truth, and envy of another person's spiritual good.[22] However, this theologian believed that none of these sins are unforgivable in an absolute sense (conversion is always possible).

Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) was the second of the great medieval theologians to tackle the problem of the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. In his seminal work *Summa Theologica* (written approx. 100 years after Lombard's textbook), he systematises the teachings of the Church Fathers on this subject and takes Lombard's opinion into account.[23] He suggests that the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit

---

19 See Augustinus Hipponensis, *Sermo* 71, 10,17 – 12,20 (ed. C. Lambot) (CCSL 41Aa; Turnhout: Brepols 2008) 24–30.

20 See Augustyn, *ibidem*, Kazanie 71.1 (translation by the authors).

21 A digital version is available at: https://archive.org/details/petrilombardisen01pete/page/2/mode/2up [access: 24.02.2025].

22 Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 3 ed. (Grottaferrata: Collegium S. Bonaventurae 1971–1981) I–II, passim.

23 See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 14, a. 1 (Editio Leonina. Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita) (Romae 1895) VIII, 111–112. We use the following Polish edition: Św. Tomasz z Akwinu, *Suma teologiczna*. XV. *Wiara i nadzieja, 2–2, qu. 1–22* (trans. and notes P. Bełch) (London: Katolicki Ośrodek Wydawniczy "Veritas" 1966).

should be considered threefold: (1) as a specific singular sin committed by Jesus' Jewish opponents, who alleged that His salvific acts, performed in the power of the Spirit, were, in fact, the work of Satan; (2) as a sin of persistent rejection of the salvation offered by God in Christ until the end of one's life (Augustine's concept); (3) as a sin resulting from malice/persistence in evil.[24]

The 16th-century Protestant reformers also addressed the topic of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Both Martin Luther and John Calvin rejected Augustine's interpretation of this sin as transgression committed in the last moments of a person's life, if that person died in a state of rejection of God's salvation (without conversion). They believed that a person could commit this sin at any stage of life and that it would remain unforgivable. In their view, such an unforgivable sin is the rejection of the accepted truth of the Christian faith explicitly revealed by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, it is not a sin directed against the Holy Spirit but against His action in the lives of believers. Luther claimed that this sin could be committed by both non-believers and those who had already been reborn through faith. Calvin, on the other hand, maintained that a true believer is incapable of committing this sin.

In contemporary Christianity, too, there is no consensus on how the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit should be defined. The authors either repeat proposals developed in the tradition of the Church or (rarely) attempt to present original hypotheses. These opinions can be organised into several categories, which we present here systematically.

Few authors deny the possibility of such a thing as the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. One argument in favour of this view is that it would be contrary to the nature of God, who does not condemn anyone to eternal damnation. It would also be contrary to Christ's salvific mission on earth. Such a view is presented, for example, in the 1939 edition of the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. T. Rees, in his entry on 'blasphemy', asserts that when Jesus uttered these words, he was incorrect – he was mistaken.[25] In the subsequent edition of this encyclopedia, published in 1979, the editors of the entry on 'blasphemy' maintained their position that it was impossible to commit this sin, but removed the statement that Jesus had made a mistake in uttering these words. Others dismiss the possibility of this sin, pointing out that in the Old Testament, as in Jewish intertestamental literature (e.g. Philo of Alexandria), the phrase 'unforgivable sin' is used idiomatically to refer to grave (but still pardonable) transgressions against God. Thus, following this line of thinking, when Jesus spoke of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, his listeners understood it as follows: blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a grave offence against God, much more serious than blasphemy against another human, but still

24 According to Thomas Aquinas, in this third case, God can exceptionally and miraculously overcome this malice/wickedness in a person.

25 See T. Ress, "Blasphemy," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (ed. J. Orr) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1939) I, 486. Contemporary online version: https://www.internationalstandardbible.com/B/blasphemy.html [access: 28.04.2025].

forgivable.[26] Some other researchers examining this topic believe that the historical Jesus could not have uttered words about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and that this statement was attributed to him by the Church communities that edited the Gospels.[27]

Several contemporary commentators adhere to the interpretation proposed by Augustine and prevalent in the Middle Ages. In their view, unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit involves rejecting the salvation offered by God and refusing to be reconciled with Him at death.[28] This is the dominant interpretation in the Catholic Church and is reflected in the Catechism of the Catholic Church:

> Whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin (Mark 3:29; cf. Matt 12:32; Luke 12:10).
>
> There are no limits to the mercy of God, but anyone who deliberately refuses to accept his mercy by repenting, rejects the forgiveness of his sins and the salvation offered by the Holy Spirit. Such hardness of heart can lead to final impenitence and eternal loss.[29]

The third category comprises authors who claim that the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was a concrete sin committed once, in a specific place and time, by Jesus' opponents, who accused Him of casting out evil spirits by the power of Satan. As this sin was closely linked to the rejection of Jesus' mission guided by the Holy Spirit, it can no longer be committed after His resurrection and ascension into heaven.[30] Consequently, it does not apply to Christians living in the Church of all ages.

The largest group of contemporary commentators on this subject are those who believe that the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit can be committed by people of all times in the history of salvation following the incarnation of the Son of God (both during the public ministry of Jesus and in the times of the Church). However, several differences of opinion are worth noting. Some modern exegetes adopt Athanasius' interpretation

---

26 Such an opinion is presented in a commentary on Matthew, for instance, in A.H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices* (London: Macmillan 1915; reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1980) 179.

27 Here, we name only a few representative authors from among the dozen or so who have written on this subject: R. Scroggs, "The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians," *JBL* 84/4 (1965) 361; A.J.B. Higgins, *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 39; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1980) 89; R.W. Funk – R.W. Hoover – Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York: Scribner 1993) 51, 185, 227.

28 See, for example, G. Smeaton, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Edinburgh: Clark 1882; reprint Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust 2016) 220. Smeaton is one of the few Protestant theologians who accept this interpretation. See also the Catholic commentary in J.P. Meier, *Matthew* (NTM 3; Wilmington, DE: Glazier 1980) 135–136.

29 See *Katechizm Kościoła Katolickiego*, 2 ed. (Poznań: Pallotinum 2002) 444, punkt 1864. See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, p. 1864, https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_INDEX.HTM [access: 18.06.2025].

30 See, for example, J.A. Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (An American Commentary on the New Testament; Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society 1886) 272; J. Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, 12 ed. (New York: Carlton and Porter 1856) 44. This view is currently favoured by some Protestants who support dispensationalism. For more on this trend in theology, see M. Sweetnam, *The Dispensations: God's Plan for the Ages* (Lisburn: Scripture Teaching Library 2013).

mentioned above, who claimed that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit ultimately amounts to rejecting Christ's divinity.[31] This sin offends the Holy Spirit because, by rejecting the divinity of Jesus, people reject that the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Holy Trinity, is the *Spiritus Movens* of His mission on earth. Many proponents of this interpretation believe that the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit involves apostasy, understood as abandoning the Christian faith.[32] This view is also shared by those who claim that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit does not relate to any specific transgression against God's commandments. Instead, it would involve a way of life that rejects the truth of God's revelation in the Holy Scriptures, inspired by the Holy Spirit.[33] Similar ideas are shared by scholars who argue that the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit involves rejecting the truth from God by someone who once believed in it.[34] Not far from this view are those interpreters who maintain that this sin is hatred of God and all that is related to Him.[35]

The majority of interpreters believe that the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the deliberate mislabelling of good as evil.[36] It involves the intentional and malicious rejection of good, viewing good as evil and evil as good. This sin destroys a person's ability to distinguish between good and evil, thereby precluding repentance and conversion. For this reason, it is a sin that cannot be forgiven.

Another variation of this interpretation is the denial of the Holy Spirit's activity, which results in the rejection of God's graces, which He mediates, and especially the salvific act offered by God in Jesus Christ.[37] In essence, it is a sin of unbelief that rejects salvation through the Holy Spirit. A mutation of this view is to mock the activity of the Holy Spirit and to attribute His actions to the forces of evil. Therefore, this sin essentially consists in attributing to Satan the good that is accomplished by the power of God.[38] It is not a matter of a general evaluation of God's action in human life, but of denying the Holy Spirit's action in the rebirth in faith and the sanctification of humanity, and attributing this agency to Satan.

---

31 See A. Barnes, *Barnes' Notes on the New Testament*, 8 ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel 1962) 59.

32 This view is typical of Protestant Reformed Churches that refer to John Calvin's interpretation. Two representative authors can be given as examples: W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew* (NTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1973) 528–529; E.H. Palmer, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit: The Traditional Calvinistic Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1974) 177–186. A similar view is expressed by C.K. Barrett, *Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK 1947) 106.

33 See G.C. Berkouwer, *Sin* (Studies in Dogmatics; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1971) 343–344.

34 For example, F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia 1950) I, 573.

35 See J. Müller, *Christian Doctrine of Sin* (trans. W. Urwick) (Edinburgh: Clark 1885) II, 422.

36 See Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 70. Such a view is held, for example, by E.T. Thompson, *The Gospel according to Mark and Its Meaning for Today* (Richmond, VA: John Knox 1954) 81; W. Barclay, *The Gospel of Matthew*, revised ed. (The Daily Study Bible; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 1975) II, 44; R.V.G. Tasker, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1962) 128; H.B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan 1910; reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1964) 117.

37 See, for example, W.T. Hogue, *The Holy Spirit: A Study* (Chicago, IL: Rose 1916) 386; J.O. Sanders, *The Holy Spirit of Promise: The Mission and Ministry of the Comforter* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott 1940) 135.

38 This view is supported, for example, by H.H. Hobbs, *An Exposition of the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1965) 154–155; J.F. Walvoord, *Matthew: Thy Kingdom Come* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press 1974) 89.

The systematic overview presented here is somewhat simplified and, as a result, does not cover all the nuances of each interpreter's approach. Contemporary theologians, especially those of the Protestant tradition, occasionally publish articles that present what they consider to be new and original approaches to this issue. However, other scholars believe that these proposals are mostly mere variations on existing ideas and do not offer any new perspectives.

One such attempt is, for example, the proposal by Scott N. Callaham, who seeks to demonstrate that 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit means radically rejecting the sign of the New Covenant, hence the offender experiences the covenant sanction of irrevocably being "cut off".[39] Considering the possibility of breaking the covenant with God by rejecting the Holy Spirit as the sign of the New Covenant, which results in an irreversible, deliberate and voluntary renunciation of salvation, undoubtedly brings a new perspective. However, this interpretation fits into the established trend of understanding blasphemy against the Holy Spirit as apostasy from God.

Another more recent and noteworthy proposal is presented by Myk Habets, who attempts to interpret the gospel pericopes about the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit from the perspective of Trinitarian theology.[40] The author points out that in chapter 12, Matthew argues that blasphemy against the Father (not mentioned in Matt 12:31–32: *sic!*) or the Son will be forgiven. However, it is different from deliberate rejection and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. This is because through the work of the Holy Spirit, it has been possible to reveal the messianic identity and mission of the incarnate Son of the Father. Thus, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is, in fact, the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the whole Trinity. In light of the *status quaestionis* presented above, it can be concluded that this idea does not differ from existing proposals. It has the merit of highlighting the role of the Holy Spirit as the revelator of Jesus' messianic identity and of emphasising that the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is ultimately a sin against the triune God.

The multitude of often divergent views presented by past and present interpreters, as indicated here, leads to the conclusion that there is no consensus on how to understand the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. For this reason, we consider it appropriate to explore this topic further.

3. Interpretation of Mark 3:28–30 and Parallels in the Narrative Context and the Presence of this Theme in Other Sources

It appears that the above attempts to define blasphemy against the Holy Spirit overlook the fact that Jesus' statements on this subject differ slightly in the accounts of each of the three

39 See S.N. Callaham, "Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit: Rejecting the Sign of the Covenant," *HBT* 45/1 (2023) 37.

40 See M. Habets, "Jesus, the Spirit, and the Unforgivable Sin: A Contribution from Spirit Christology," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 12/1 (2018) 39–57.

Evangelists and are placed in different narrative and theological contexts in their works. Moreover, a parallel logion worth comparing with the versions given by the Synoptics is also found in the *Gospel of Thomas*. To complete the picture, it would also be helpful to consider the version reconstructed in the hypothetical Q source. The exegetical procedure will include an explanation of these pericopes in the literary and theological context of each text. By closely examining these passages in context, we aim to highlight the differences between how each Evangelist perceives it and identify what they have in common regarding blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

Mark 3:28–30	**Matt 12:31–32**	**Luke 12:10**	**Q source 12:10**	***Gos. Thom.* 44**
[28] Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν [29] ὃς δ’ ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος. [30] ὅτι ἔλεγον Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει.	[31] Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. [32] καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ ὃς δ’ ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.	[10] Καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.	καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὃς δ’ ἂν [εἴπ]ῃ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.	ⲡⲉⲍⲉ ⲓⲥ ⲍⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲁ ⲍⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲁ ⲡ ⲉⲓⲱⲧ` ⲥⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁ ⲫ` ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲁ ⲍⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲉ ⲡ ⲩⲛⲣⲉ ⲥⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁ ⲫ` ⲡⲉⲧⲁ ⲍⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲉ ⲁ ⲡ ⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲧ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲥⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲕⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁ ⲫ` ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ ⲡ ⲕⲁⲁ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ ⲧ ⲡⲉ[41]
[28] Amen, I say to you: All things will be forgiven the sons of men, the sins and the blasphemies with which they may have blasphemed. [29] But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit has no forgiveness forever, but is guilty of an eternal sin. [30] For they were saying: He has an unclean spirit.	[31] Therefore, I say to you: Every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. [32] And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in the one to come.	[10] And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but to the one blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven.	And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him.	It is said: He who speaks something against the Father, they will forgive him, and he who speaks against the Son, they will forgive him. But he who speaks something against the Spirit, which is Pure/Holy, they will not forgive him, neither on earth nor in heaven.

3.1. Mark 3:28–30

The immediate context of Jesus’ declaration that ‘whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit has no forgiveness forever, but is guilty of an eternal sin’ (3:29) is the accusation made against Him by the scribes arrived from Jerusalem that He had made a pact with Beelzebub,

41 Critical text by M. Linssen, *The True Words of Thomas (Interactive Coptic-English Translation)* (Version 1.9.5), https://www.academia.edu/42110001/The_true_words_of_Thomas_Interactive_Coptic_English_gospel_of_Thomas_ [access: 12.02.2025]. See also B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1987) 388.

the ruler of evil spirits (3:22–30).[42] This event is part of a sequence of episodes recounted at the beginning of the Gospel of Mark. It strongly echoes the first episode (1:1–8), which recounts the activity of John the Baptist on the Jordan River: 'John appeared, baptizing in the wilderness, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins' (1:4). Right after that, he says: 'I baptized you with water, but He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit' (1:8). Immediately after this announcement by John the Baptist, Mark recounts that Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee to be baptised by John in the Jordan (1:9). As Jesus emerges from the water, the Holy Spirit descends upon Him, and the voice of the Father is heard from heaven: 'You are my beloved Son, in you I am well pleased' (1:11). Immediately following this messianic investiture, the Spirit leads Jesus out into the wilderness where, for forty days and nights, His divine sonship is tested by the Devil. These events set the stage for Jesus' subsequent activity: the reader is aware that Jesus is the beloved Son of God acting on His behalf in the Holy Spirit. Likewise, throughout the rest of the Gospel of Mark – in His teaching and miracles – Jesus acts by the power of God in the Holy Spirit.

Immediately after the temptation in the wilderness, Jesus returns to his home in Galilee (1:14) to fulfil his mission of proclaiming the kingdom of God through words and miracles in the Holy Spirit. Travelling through Galilee, Jesus teaches and heals people of various illnesses, attracting ever larger crowds. This activity is met with resistance from the scribes, who try to discredit Him in the eyes of the crowd of listeners.

The event we are analysing here fits into the narrative context presented of Jesus' teaching and working of miracles. The episode in Mark 3:28–30 is immediately preceded by the story of the calling of the twelve disciples (3:13–19) and a mention that Jesus' kindred (relatives) came to take Him away, because rumours had spread that He had lost His mind (3:20–21). This brief mention is the first element of a pattern centred on Jesus' response (3:23–29) to the accusation levelled against Him by the scribes who had come from Jerusalem, claiming that He had Beelzebub within Him and was casting out evil spirits by his power (3:22). The pattern mentioned above is as follows:[43]

A – Jesus' activity and the arrival of His relatives (3:20–21)
    B – Accusation against Jesus by the scribes (3:22)
        C – Jesus' response to the scribes (3:23–29)
    B' – The author's comment reminding about the accusation (3:30)
A' – Another mention of Jesus' relatives and His words about true kindred (3:31–35)

---

42 R. Jordan demonstrates the significance of this verse in the context of Mark 3:20–35 to the development of the Christological message of the entire Gospel of Mark ("The Significance of Mark 3:20–End for Understanding the Message of Mark's Gospel," *ExpTim* 124/5 [2013] 225–230). In contrast, E.E. Shively highlights the apocalyptic language of this pericope, viewing it as a theological diagnosis of the conflict between God and demonic forces (*Apocalyptic Imagination in the Gospel of Mark: The Literary and Theological Role of Mark 3:22–30* [BZNW 189; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2012] 348–373).

43 See A. Malina, *Ewangelia według Świętego Marka, rozdziały 1,1 – 8,26* (NKB.NT 2.1; Częstochowa: Edycja św. Pawła 2013) 246.

Immediately after this event, Mark interrupts the narrative to begin again with Jesus, the Twelve, and a large crowd at the Sea of Galilee, where He teaches them in parables (4:1–34). The Evangelist then recounts Jesus' continued journey with the disciples through Galilee (until the end of chapter nine). It was a time abundant in Jesus' teaching and spectacular miracles. Chapter 10 begins the story of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, the site of His capture, death and resurrection.

We have briefly outlined the immediate and broader context of Jesus' response to the accusation by the scribes from Jerusalem (3:28–30),[44] as it differs from the way this event is presented by the other two Synoptics, which is of considerable importance when considering the theological function of each of these statements.

The immediate context of Jesus' response to the scribes who had come from Jerusalem (3:23–29) is the accusation that 'He has Beelzebub, and by the ruler of the demons he casts out the demons' (3:22). This is a continuation of the hostility of the scribes and Pharisees, which had escalated since the beginning of His public ministry. Mark informs us in 3:22 that this time the opponents came from Jerusalem to underline their higher status and the seriousness of the accusation. They attack both Jesus personally (He has Beelzebub) and His actions (the power to cast out evil spirits). In essence, this is an accusation that Jesus performs all the miracles through the power of the ruler of demons, i.e. He is possessed by an evil spirit. This is an attack at the very heart of His identity as defined in the first chapter: the Son acting on the Father's mandate and inspired by the Holy Spirit. This identity is confirmed by the testimony of John the Baptist in 1:8 and the testimony of the voice from heaven in 1:11. These testimonies were verified during the test of identity in the wilderness (1:12–13) and in the miracles performed by Jesus up to that point.

From the perspective of cultural anthropology, the entire situation described in 3:22–30 reflects the challenge-and-response dynamic that is part of the game of honour.[45] The accusation brought against Jesus by the scribes of the Jerusalem establishment should be regarded as a very serious charge, a challenge intended to deprive Him of honour/reputation/dignity, thereby discrediting Him in the eyes of the crowds following Him and undermining His identity as the Son of God (Mark 1:1) and an exorcist acting on the authority of the Father and inspired by the Holy Spirit.[46]

In a game of honour, the accused may immediately surrender or accept the challenge, defending themselves with arguments and possibly raising the stakes. Jesus takes up the challenge. He builds his response in three stages. First, He shows the absurdity and logical

---

44 A more detailed and multifaceted view of the placement of passage 3:22–30 in the narrative of the entire Gospel of Mark can be gleaned from reading D. Rhoads – J. Dewey – D. Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, 3 ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2012).

45 This mechanism is expertly presented by B.J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3 ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2001) 25–50.

46 For more on the interpretation of Jesus' confrontation with His opponents in Mark from this perspective, see J. Kręcidło, *Honor i wstyd w interpretacji Ewangelii. Szkice z egzegezy antropologicznokulturowej* (Lingua Sacra. Monografie 1; Warszawa: Verbinum 2013) 25–80.

fallacy of His opponents' accusation by using a short parable about a kingdom divided against itself (3:23–26).[47] Second, He tells a parable about how one has to tie up a strong man to plunder his house, again showing that the accusation against Him is false (3:27). The third stage of Jesus' response is a solemn declaration, beginning with 'amen', concerning the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit (3:28–29).[48] This declaration is a legal and sapiential statement. From the perspective of the logic of honour and shame, one might expect this conflict to escalate further with Jesus' opponents raising the stakes. This should be done by responding to His explanation and accusation and formulating further accusatory arguments. However, Mark does not mention this at all. On the contrary, he merely repeats the original accusation with which the scribes provoked Jesus to respond: 'For they were saying, He has an unclean spirit' (3:30).

For readers familiar with the rules of the game of honour, it is clear that since the opponents did not raise the stakes, they acknowledged their defeat, unable to find any arguments against Jesus' apologia and the accusation made against them in the statement about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Usually, when the Evangelists recount such confrontations between Jesus and His opponents in a game of honour, they take care to make the readers aware of the audience's reaction, because according to the rules of this game, it is the witnesses who are not directly involved who give the final verdict on who has gained honour and who has lost it (which is known as the 'public court of reputation'). The author of the analysed episode immediately moves on to the story of the arrival of Jesus' relatives, which was mentioned in 3:20–21 and interrupted in order to recount Jesus' confrontation with the scribes. In doing so, the author concludes the *inclusio* with Jesus' declaration of true kindred, i.e. Jesus' true family (3:31–35),[49] leaving it up to the reader to decide on Jesus' victory in this confrontation.

Moving on to a more detailed analysis of Jesus' statement about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (3:28–29), it should be noted that the concentric structure clearly shows that these words are not addressed either to Jesus' natural family or to the crowd standing outside and inside the house where Jesus was (external *inclusio*). These declarative sentences/statements are addressed to the scribes from Jerusalem, His adversaries, who accuse Him of performing exorcisms by the power of Beelzebub.

---

47 See R.A. Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26* (WBC 34A; Waco, TX: Word Books 1989) 169–173. See also A. Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2007) 217–221. The author provides a detailed exegesis of the pericope, analysing its rhetorical structure and socio-religious context. She also draws attention to its use of parallel structures and the importance of the broader context of conflict with religious leaders.

48 A good explanation of the exegetical details can be found in the commentaries by R.A. Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26*, 173–175; J. Marcus, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New Haven, CT – London: Yale University Press 2002) 280–284; R.T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2002) 167–170; Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 229–233.

49 For a broader context, see J. Kręcidło, "Koncepcja honoru rodziny w Ewangelii wg św. Marka," *AK* 166/1 (2016) 12–26.

This observation is confirmed by Jesus' first words in 3:28: Αμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν 'Amen, I say to you.'[50] After the declarative 'amen' announcing the great importance of the words that follow, Jesus indicates their addressees: 'I say to you.' The context indicates that the addressees here are those who had levelled the most serious accusation against Him, namely that He was a servant of Beelzebub, identified with Satan. Therefore, the sin that Jesus is about to speak of can only be committed by those who would make the same accusation against Him as the scribes from Jerusalem were making at that moment.

Jesus calls this sin blasphemy (βλασφημία, βλασφημέω).[51] The basic dictionary meaning of these words is to verbally insult someone, curse them, or use abusive language towards them. In the Septuagint, this term was not restricted to referring to such behaviour directed against another person, but also against God and His representative/anointed one = king (see 2 Kgs 19:6; 1 Macc 2:6; 2 Macc 8:4; 10:35; 15:24; Dan 3:96). In such cases, the gravity of the blasphemy is much greater, and the offence is more serious and requires redress. There is also unforgivable blasphemy (see the first part of this article for more on this topic). This meaning was adopted by the authors of the New Testament (see, for example, Matt 26:65; Luke 5:21; John 10:33, 36; Rev 13:1, 5; 16:11; 17:3).

In the Gospel of Mark, the Jewish establishment repeatedly accuses Jesus of blasphemy against God. Its first instance is found in the context of the pericope we examined earlier, namely 2:7. This accusation refers to Jesus' words addressed to the paralytic he healed: 'Your sins are forgiven (verb ἀφίημι)' (2:5). The scribes present did not respond to these words verbally, but the omniscient narrator informs the reader that in their hearts (minds) they were convinced that Jesus had blasphemed, because only God alone can forgive sins (2:7). Knowing their thoughts, Jesus heals the paralytic to prove the truth of His words that He is the Son of Man who acts on God's authority and has the power to forgive sins (2:10).

In the narrative following Mark 3:22–30, i.e. 7:22, the term blasphemy appears to denote that which can make a person unclean. It is not specified whether this refers to blasphemous thoughts or words directed at a person or God.[52] Another instance of βλασφημία in reference to Jesus is found in 14:64. The context here is the trial of Jesus before the high priest, the elders, and the scribes (14:53–65). The high priest asks Jesus: Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ 'Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?' (14:61). He answers: Εγώ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 'I am; and you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven' (14:62). The high priest's reaction is to tear his clothes, after which the entire council unanimously pronounces the

50 On the uniqueness of Jesus' use of this formula in the Gospels, see J. Strugnell, "'Amen, I Say Unto You' in the Sayings of Jesus and in Early Christian Literature," *HTR* 67/2 (1974) 177–182.

51 W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3 ed. (ed. F.W. Danker) (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press 2000) 178; J.H. Thayer, "blasphémia," *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2023), https://biblehub.com/greek/988.htm [access: 29.04.2025].

52 The translator of the Polish Millennium Bible renders the noun βλασφημία as 'obelgi' [insults].

death sentence on Jesus according to Jewish law: 'You heard the blasphemy [ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας]; [...] And they all condemned him as deserving of death' (14,64). In 15:29, the verb βλασφημέω makes its last appearance in Mark in a sentence describing the abuse hurled at Jesus dying on the cross by passers-by. The chief priests and scribes also appear here (15:31), for whom this event is a falsification of His divine prerogatives: 'He saved others, himself he cannot save; the Messiah, the king of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe' (15:31b–32a).

In Mark 3:28–29, the theme of blasphemy appears three times in Jesus' declarations beginning with 'amen' addressed to those who accused Him of performing exorcisms by the power of Beelzebub (3:22). The first time, Jesus declares: πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν 'All things will be forgiven the sons of men, the sins and the blasphemies with which they may have blasphemed' (v. 28). He immediately follows it with: ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος 'But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit has no forgiveness forever, but is guilty of an eternal sin' (v. 29). As mentioned above, this remark is a declarative/sapiential statement. It does not directly refer to the accusation made by the scribes in 3:22 that Jesus was acting by the power of Beelzebub, nor does it have a strict logical connection with the two previous parables in the immediate context, which illustrate the baselessness of this accusation. However, there is no doubt that the statement is addressed to Jesus' accusers.[53] The charge of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is therefore addressed directly to them.

In the first part of this statement (v. 28), Jesus compares blasphemy in general with any other sin and declares that, like any other sin, it will be forgiven. He goes on, however, to give a special case where the sin of blasphemy cannot be forgiven. This statement becomes clearer when we relate it to Jesus' accusation of blasphemy by the scribes mentioned earlier (2:7). The reason for this accusation was that, in their view, by uttering to the paralytic the words 'your sins are forgiven you' (2:5), Jesus had blasphemed against God by ascribing to Himself God's prerogatives (2:7). In their view, Jesus' action was sacrilegious and punishable by death (see Exod 20:7; Lev 20:1–5; 21:10–15; 24:10–16; Deut 13:1–11).[54] In 3:28–29, Jesus rebukes his opponents for committing blasphemy against God, boldly attributing to Him the power and authority of Beelzebub rather than that of the one God. There is no direct indication here that this unforgivable sin of blasphemy is directed at God. However, readers of the Gospel of Mark can be certain of this, as it is indicated by the context of the previous narrative (chapters 1 and 2): John the Baptist's testimony that Jesus will baptise/act in the Holy Spirit, the voice of the Father from heaven affirming that He is His beloved Son, Jesus being led into the wilderness by the (Holy) Spirit. It should also be noted that

53 See Malina, *Ewangelia według Świętego Marka*, 253.

54 See L.W. Levy, *Treason against God: A History of the Offense of Blasphemy* (New York: Schocken Books 1981) 45–60; T. Hägerland, *Jesus and the Forgiveness of Sins: An Aspect of His Prophetic Mission* (SNTSMS 150; New York: Cambridge University Press 2011) 82–105; D. Johansson, "'Who Can Forgive Sins but God Alone?' Human and Angelic Agents, and Divine Forgiveness in Early Judaism," *JSNT* 33/4 (2011) 351–374.

in Mark's previous narrative, all Persons of the Holy Trinity appear explicitly in action. The reader should therefore have no doubt that the entire Holy Trinity – the triune God – is revealed in the words and deeds of the historical Jesus. It is by the mandate of the Father, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit and by their power that the earthly Jesus teaches and performs miracles. To accuse Him of doing exorcisms by the power of Beelzebub is therefore an audacious blasphemy against God, in whom they believe. The person of the Holy Spirit here represents God at work in the ministry of Jesus. He is the guarantor of the truthfulness of Jesus' mission. Rejection of this by the scribes is tantamount to renouncing God, namely, apostasy.

It should be noted that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is not mentioned here by Jesus as an exception to the rule that all sins and blasphemies will be forgiven (3:28). This rule is to apply to the fullest extent. However, those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, i.e. against the triune God, exclude themselves from among those whom God wishes to show forgiveness. In his commentary on this passage, Artur Malina states the following:

> Z takiego zestawienia wynika, że bluźnierstwo przeciw Duchowi Świętemu nie jest jakimś wyjątkiem w powszechnym odpuszczeniu grzechów, ograniczeniem powszechnego przebaczenia ze strony Boga czy grzechem na wieki nieodpuszczonym. Jest grzechem wiecznym tylko z tego powodu, że osoba, która bluźni przeciw Duchowi Świętemu, wyklucza się sama z Bożego działania przynoszącego bez żadnego wyjątku odpuszczenie wszystkich (*panta*) grzechów i bluźnierstw" [This comparison demonstrates that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is not an exception to God's universal forgiveness of sins, nor does it constitute a limitation on God's forgiveness, nor is it a sin that cannot be forgiven. It is an eternal sin only because the persons who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit exclude themselves from God's action of granting, without exception, forgiveness for all (*panta*) sins and blasphemies].[55]

Therefore, Jesus' logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit should not be interpreted as a unique sin, a special category, somehow excluded from God's forgiveness. It is the sin of audacious self-exclusion by attributing satanic powers to God, and thus rejecting the salvation that the triune God offers in Jesus Christ.

3.2. Matthew 12:31–32

The placement of the episode where Jesus speaks about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Matt 12:31–32) differs slightly in the Gospel of Matthew from that in the Gospel of Mark. As the structure of a text determines the interpretation of the statements it contains, it must be examined to see the implications of placing Jesus' logion in this particular context in Matthew.[56]

---

55 Malina, *Ewangelia według Świętego Marka*, 255.

56 Highly recommended monographs that analyse in detail the development of the narrative of the Gospel of Matthew include J.D. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia, MA: Fortress 1988) (of particular interest is the analysis of Matt 1–14 on pages 1–94); D.R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (JSNTSup 31; Sheffield: Almond Press 1988) (especially pages 37–108). See also A. Paciorek,

As in Mark's narrative, Jesus' statement about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is part of His teaching in Galilee, where He returned after His baptism in the Jordan and temptation in the wilderness (chapters 3–4). However, in Mark, Jesus' declaration about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is made at the beginning of His ministry. Matthew, on the other hand, moves it a little further, after Jesus had already taught the crowds repeatedly in various locations in Galilee and performed many miracles. Matthew ensures that the reader is aware that Jesus' teaching encompassed the entire region of Galilee, and that the crowds that followed Jesus came not only from Galilee but also from Judea, the Decapolis, Transjordan, and even Syria (4:12–17). 23–25) At the very beginning of His ministry (as in Mark 1:16–20), Jesus calls the first disciples (4:18–22).

Before Matthew begins to describe in detail Jesus' teaching in various places in Galilee and the miracles He performed there, he pauses to present Jesus' great speech, known as the Sermon on the Mount (chapters 5–7), which is preceded by the Eight Beatitudes (5:3–12). In this speech, Jesus conveys the fundamental principles of his teaching, which is why it has rightly come to be known as the constitution of the kingdom of God.[57] The Sermon on the Mount was delivered to the crowds and to the first disciples who had just been called. Unlike Mark, Matthew does not mention that Jesus had opponents – the scribes – at this early stage of His ministry. After delivering the extensive Sermon on the Mount, Jesus continues His teaching in various places in Galilee (chapters 8–9). In recounting this, Matthew focuses primarily on the miraculous healings and other miracles performed by Jesus (such as calming the storm on the lake: 8:23–27), which confirm His messianic identity and mission.

Another key moment in Matthew's narrative is the selection of the twelve apostles (10:1–4) and their sending out on mission (10:5–16). Jesus concludes his missionary speech with the following message: 'Behold, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves; therefore, be shrewd as serpents and innocent as doves' (10:16). From this point on, the situation becomes less idyllic. Jesus foretells the persecution of His disciples, urges them to be courageous, and points to the necessity of standing firm in their faith on His side (10:17–42). Matthew concludes this part of the narrative with the following comment: 'And it came to pass, when Jesus finished instructing his twelve disciples, he departed from there to teach and preach in their cities' (11:1). The entire eleventh chapter depicts Jesus' continued preaching in Galilee. His dissatisfaction with how His teachings and accompanying miracles are being received is emphasised. The strongest reproach comes in the word 'woe' directed at the towns that disregarded His teaching (Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum) (11:20–24). This stage ends with Jesus calling all who are weary and carrying heavy burdens to come to Him, as He will give them rest (11:28–30).

This is immediately followed by Jesus' first direct confrontation with the Pharisees, who accuse Him of allowing His disciples to pluck heads of grain on the Sabbath, thereby

---

Ewangelia według św. Mateusza, rozdziały 1–13 (NKB.NT 1.1; Częstochowa: Edycja św. Pawła 2005) 15–320.

57 For a more detailed analysis, see Kręcidło, *Honor i wstyd w interpretacji Ewangelii. Szkice z egzegezy antropologicznokulturowej*, 105–179.

breaking the religious law. Jesus refutes their accusation by referring to examples from the Scriptures where the Sabbath rest was not observed, and it was not considered a religious transgression (12:1–8). After the first charge, the Pharisees bring another accusation against Jesus, who healed a man with a paralysed (literally: withered) hand on the Sabbath. After conferring among themselves, the Pharisees decided that Jesus must be put to death (12:14). After this event, Matthew informs the reader: 'But Jesus, knowing, withdrew from there; and many followed him, and he healed them all' (12:15). At the same time, the Evangelist assures the reader that all this is happening so that the Old Testament prophecies may be fulfiled (he quotes Isa 42:1–4).[58]

After presenting scriptural evidence that Jesus is the Beloved Servant of God (12:18–21), Matthew proceeds to recount the next (third) confrontation between Jesus and His opponents, which provides the immediate context for His declaration of the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (12:22–32). As highlighted above, in the parallel text of Mark, Jesus' opponents were the scribes from Jerusalem, who brought charges against Him in response to His numerous healings: 'He has Beelzebub, and by the power of the ruler of the demons he casts out the demons' (Mark 3:22). However, Matthew does not mention the presence of the scribes, but states that Jesus' accusers are the Pharisees (as in the previous two situations in Matthew). The second significant difference is that the action of the Pharisees is directly triggered by His healing of the demon-possessed man who was both blind and mute. Matthew does not mention whether Jesus' other miracles and teachings contributed to the Pharisees' accusation in 12:31–32.

Another difference between the two narratives of this event is that Mark places Jesus' logion about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit after two parables, which are a response to the accusation of acting by the power of Beelzebub. Matthew, on the other hand, describes the situation more broadly and in a slightly different sequence. First, Jesus performs an exorcism on a man who is both blind and mute, possessed by an evil spirit. The crowds are amazed at this miracle (12:23), while the Pharisees accuse Him of casting out evil spirits by the power of Beelzebub (12:24). Jesus then responds with a parable about a kingdom divided against itself, exposing the absurdity of the accusation, parallel to Mark. Jesus concludes this brief argument by stating: 'But if by the Spirit of God I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you' (12:28). Immediately afterwards, Jesus tells the second parable found in Mark, about a strong man who must be tied up before his house can be plundered. Jesus sums up this parable and the entire episode with the statement: 'The one who is not with me is against me, and the one who does not gather with me scatters' (12:30). At least two things should be noted here. Firstly, after the apologia presented in the first parable, Jesus solemnly declares that He performs exorcisms by the power of the Spirit of God (i.e. the Holy Spirit) – and not by the power of Beelzebub,

58 On the use of this prophecy in Matt 12:18–21, see J.H. Neyrey, "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42,1–4 in Matthew 12," *Bib* 63/4 (1982) 457–473; R. Beaton, "Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew's Use of Isaiah 42:1–4?," *JSNT* 22/75 (2000) 5–23.

as His opponents allege. Moreover, these miracles should serve as a sign for everyone of the coming of the kingdom of God, whose arrival they await. Secondly, their radical rejection of Jesus and accusations that He acts by the power of Beelzebub/Satan is in fact 'scattering', i.e. acting against God Himself, whose emissary is Jesus acting by the power of the Spirit of God (12:30). Immediately afterwards, Matthew recounts Jesus' statement regarding the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, along with His explanation (12:31–37). Jesus's logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit differs slightly from Mark's account (which we will return to later), and His commentary on it is absent from that Gospel.

The immediate context in Matthew's narrative structure differs slightly from that in Mark. In Mark, after Jesus' logion on blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and the Evangelist's brief remark recalling the accusation levelled against Him by the scribes from Jerusalem, the Evangelist places Jesus' reaction to the call of His relatives (led by His mother) who wanted to see Him (3:31–35). Immediately afterwards, Mark recounts Jesus' teaching through parables (4:1–34). After Jesus' logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and the commentary on it, Matthew continues with the story of yet another challenge/accusation levelled at Jesus by the Pharisees (and also by the scribes) (12:38–42). This time, they demand that He give them a sign to prove His authority (12:38). Jesus responds that they will only receive the sign of Jonah, which He describes as the sign of the Son of Man and links to the truth of His resurrection from the dead (three days and three nights of the Son of Man in the heart of the earth: 12:40).[59] This is to be a sign of conversion for them, similar to that of Jonah, which was a sign for the people of Nineveh. Jesus' last comment on this situation – the action continues in the same place, starting with the Pharisees' accusation that He acts by the power of evil spirits – is an argument that an unclean spirit that leaves a person returns to that person with multiplied power, because it finds a house that has been swept and put in order for it. Jesus' comment at the end of this pericope (12:45b) makes it clear that He is referring to the fate of His opponents who have not accepted His teaching. The term 'unclean spirit' (Greek: τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα) in 12:43 can be understood as referring to an evil spirit in general and may refer intratextually to the spirit that possessed the man healed by Jesus in 12:22. In this way, the pericope in 12:43–45 provides a structural closure to the *inclusio*. It sets the context for interpreting Jesus' statement about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (12:31–32).[60] The final element

59 See C.S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1999) 351–353. Keener analyses Matt 12:40 in detail in the context of the sign of Jonah, referring to Old Testament parallels (Jonah 1:17) and Jewish messianic expectations. The author also discusses the historical and theological implications of the reference to 'three days and three nights' in relation to Jesus' resurrection. See also D.A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (WBC 33A; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1993) 354–357. This author analyses Matt 12:40 in the context of Jesus' polemic with the Pharisees, noting the symbolism of Jonah as a foreshadowing of His death and resurrection. The author also provides the cultural background and possible interpretations of the phrase 'three days and three nights' in Jewish tradition.

60 See R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2007) 492–494. France focuses on the allegorical message of Matt 12:43–45 and links it to the polemical context of Jesus' dispute with the Pharisees in Matt 12.

of this scene (unity of place) is the appearance of Jesus' mother and other relatives outside, and His declaration that the criterion for being part of His family is doing the will of the Father (12:46–50). In this way, Matthew returns to Mark's narrative flow and continues it similarly, recounting Jesus' teachings in parables (chapter 14).

Having pointed out the similarities and differences in the placement of Jesus' logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the narrative of the Gospel of Mark, which we consider a more primary source, and in Matthew's version of these events, we should now point out the similarities and differences in the wording of the logion itself in both Gospels. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was formulated once and unequivocally (see above). This is not the case in the Gospel of Matthew, where we can find three explanations by Jesus in the pericope 12:22–37 of what this sin consists of, each time from a slightly different perspective.[61]

In his first mention of this issue, Jesus compares Himself to the 'sons of his opponents', who also perform exorcisms, and His opponents do not accuse them of doing so by the power of Beelzebub (this theme was present in Mark): 'And if I cast out the demons by Beelzebub, by whom do your sons cast them out? But if by the Spirit of God I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you' (12:27–28). This is a compelling argument that should convince Jesus' opponents to accept the truth that the exorcisms He performs are done by the Spirit of God/Holy Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ) and are signs of the coming of the kingdom of God.

After illustrating this statement with a parable, Jesus takes up an apologetic theme, convincing His opponents that He performs exorcisms by the power of God and not Beelzebub, as His opponents allege (12:31–32).[62] By beginning his speech in v. 31 with διὰ τοῦτο (therefore), Jesus refers to the entire preceding context (starting in v. 22) and not only to the last statement in v. 30.[63] Combined with the phase λέγω ὑμῖν (I tell you) that follows immediately afterwards, these words are declarative and invite the reader to take what is said next as a binding rule. In the context of the Pharisees' accusation that Jesus acted by the power of Beelzebub, the following words should be read as a continued response to this accusation (a game for honour). In light of this event, Jesus' next words are an accusation directed at his accusers. This is the gravest of accusations, which is an adequate response to their serious charge of usurping God's prerogatives (i.e. the sin of sacrilege, punishable by death). Jesus' declaration has two parts. The first is πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται 'Every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven' (v. 31). Although

---

61 For a detailed exegesis of this pericope, see W.D. Davies – D.C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; London – New York: Clark 2004) II, 324–341; J. Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005) 492–506.

62 For a detailed explanation of the verses in question, see U. Luz, "The Unforgivable Sin: Matthew 12:31–32 and Its Theological Implications," *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005) 141–158.

63 See Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 66 (footnote 96).

it is not explicitly stated that this refers to the Holy Spirit, it is clear from the context of the previous statement in 12:28. The act of blasphemy should be understood here as a derogatory statement[64] aimed at the Holy Spirit, that is, God Himself (as explained earlier). Such a sin cannot be forgiven according to the religious laws of Judaism, which Jesus' opponents also followed.

Jesus continues with his retort (v. 31), which is an accusation against the Pharisees, His opponents in the analysed situation. This retort is also a general rule that should always apply to everyone. This is evident, as this generalisation continues the statement made earlier in v. 30. It follows that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις) (v. 31b) – this is the other side of the statement that every blasphemy and sin will be forgiven (v. 31a). Thus, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (v. 31b) is the only exception to the rule of universal forgiveness of sins by God (v. 31a).

Verse 32, a continuation of Jesus' statement, clarifies this issue as follows:

> καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι
>
> 'And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in the one to come.'

From a syntactic standpoint, this statement is composed of two complex sentences that use the *modus eventualis* syntactic structure.[65] This structure acts as a *modus realis* for the future, i.e. it presents a situation that may occur if the condition given in the subordinate clause is fulfiled. However, in the previous sentence (v. 31), the doctrine of the impossibility of forgiving sins against the (Holy) Spirit was stated in the indicative mood. The first of the two sentences in *modus eventualis* in v. 32 provides an explanation primarily concerning a hypothetical situation that could occur in the future (this is the basic use of this mode), but it can also express a general rule without being limited to individual cases. Therefore, whoever speaks a word (ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον), or blasphemes against the Son of Man (κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), will be forgiven (ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ). However, Jesus' statement later in the verse, also in the *modus eventualis*, excludes this possibility: but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit (ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου) will not be forgiven (οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ). The statement goes on to explain that such blasphemy will not be forgiven, neither in this age nor in the one to come, i.e. it will never be forgiven (οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι).

Thus, Jesus makes a clear distinction in these two sentences in v. 32 between blasphemy against the Son of Man, which is forgivable, and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit,

---

64 For more, see Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 76–77 (including footnote 99).

65 This grammatical structure is well explained in F. Blass – A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and revision R.W. Funk) (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press 1961) 182–186, 200–204; J.H. Moulton – N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. III. *Syntax* (Edinburgh: Clark 1963) 100–104, 279–283; D.B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 1996) 446–452, 477–480.

which can never be forgiven. The key to understanding this contrast is to define what blasphemy is (here): 'a word spoken' against the Son of Man. The phrase 'Son of Man' is one of Jesus' favourite self-descriptions in the Gospels. It has been subject to numerous, often contradictory, interpretations.[66] It appears that the scholars who see this self-definition as Jesus highlighting his humanity are correct. The intertextual reference to Dan 7, which speaks of the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven, is also relevant here. This figure should be linked to the messianic expectations prevalent in Judaism at the dawn of a new era. Therefore, blasphemy against Jesus as an extraordinary Man–Teacher, Miracle Worker and Messiah can be forgiven. In the second conditional sentence, this is contrasted with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which can never be forgiven. Those who interpret the phrase ὃς δ' ἂν κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου as blasphemy against the divine nature of Jesus are wrong.[67] Undoubtedly, this refers to the Holy Spirit as a Person of the Holy Trinity, by whose power the historical Jesus, the promised Messiah, teaches and heals.[68] Thus, two types of blasphemy are juxtaposed here. The first of these, although grave, can be forgiven, since it involves a verbal denial and persistent rejection of the truth that Jesus is the promised Messiah. It is therefore a sin of unbelief in His divine mission, expressed in words. Perhaps we should also consider various negative assessments of Jesus' ordinary human behaviour; for example, His perception as a glutton and drunkard in contrast to the ascetic John the Baptist (see Matt 11:16–19). However, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit cannot be forgiven, as it essentially denies that God Himself is revealed in Jesus the man by the power of the Holy Spirit. Rejecting this truth is tantamount to rejecting God and His salvific action in the world. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is, in essence, apostasy and thus cannot be forgiven.

3.3. Luke 12:10

In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus' statement about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is found in a completely different geographical and chronological context than that of Mark and Matthew. As shown above, these two Evangelists placed this statement in the context of Jesus' public activity in Galilee, each in slightly different circumstances. Luke, on the other hand, places this logion a little later in the chronological order, during Jesus' journey with his disciples to Jerusalem (starting in Luke 9:51).[69] Therefore, the situational context of this logion is different, and this fact should not be ignored in its interpretation.

Luke 9:51 makes it clear that, according to God's will, Jesus' teaching and healing ministry in Galilee has come to an end, and the second stage, which will lead to the finale, is

66 For a more detailed discussion, see J. Kręcidło, "Jezus Syn Człowieczy w ogniu współczesnej debaty egzegetycznej," *Jezus Chrystus Syn Boży i Syn Człowieczy* (ed. J. Kręcidło) (StS 6; Kraków: Wydawnictwo La Salette Księży Misjonarzy Saletynów 2015) 45–60.

67 For more on this topic, see Combs,"The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 77.

68 Combs,"The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 77.

69 The narrative aspect of this gospel is discussed, for example, by M.A. Powell, *What Are They Saying about Luke?* (New York: Paulist Press 1989) 35–76, 97–124; R.C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. I. *The Gospel according to Luke* (FF: New Testament; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1991) 1–286.

about to begin. Luke outlined this finale in the preceding context, where Jesus urges: 'Take these words into your ears: for the Son of Man is about to be delivered into the hands of men' (9:44). However, Jesus' disciples did not understand this and argued among themselves about who was the greatest (who would have the place of honour next to Him) (9:46–49). The last scene of Jesus' activity in Galilee, according to Luke, is the disciples' uncertainty whether someone outside their group, casting out evil spirits in His name, is doing something forbidden (9:49). Jesus answers firmly: 'Do not hinder; for whoever is not against you is for you' (9:50). With regard to the issue at hand, it is worth noting that the final point of the narrative of Jesus' activity in Galilee is the subject of exorcism, which was the immediate context for the previous statement about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in Mark and Matthew.

At the beginning of the new section (Jesus' journey with his disciples to Jerusalem), Luke suggests to the reader that the events unfolding are the result of God's will being fulfiled and that Jesus is consciously taking these actions: 'And it came to pass, when the days of his ascension were being fulfilled, he set his face to go to Jerusalem' (9:51). Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is recounted in considerable detail by Luke, who devotes ten chapters (ending in 19:28) to presenting Jesus' teachings and miracles. In contrast, Matthew covers it in only two chapters (19–20), and Mark in just one (10). The exegetes rightly stress that in Luke's pragmatic strategy, the chapters describing Jesus' journey to Jerusalem represent a crucial central section.[70] The broader context of Jesus' logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in Luke is the teaching on how to live by faith. A closer context that should be considered in interpreting Jesus' logion about the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the teaching on perseverance in prayer (11:1–13),[71] which ends with the words: 'If then you, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the Father from heaven give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him' (11:13). This is where the Holy Spirit comes in, who is to be seen by believers as the greatest of gifts. This teaching is illustrated by Jesus' exorcism, whereby He casts out an evil spirit from a mute man (11:14). Unspecified witnesses also accuse Jesus of doing this by the power of Beelzebub (11:15). He responds with two parables (about a kingdom divided against itself and a strong man) – parallel to the other two Synoptics, but not appearing in the immediate context of the previous (Mark) or following (Matthew) passages. After this confrontation, Jesus teaches on various matters while travelling to Jerusalem (11:24–36). He then condemns the hypocrisy of the Pharisees (11:37–44) and the lawyers (11:45–54), who reproach Him for insulting

70 This has already been noted, for example, by F.L. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, 3 ed. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1890) 283–288. See also Combs, "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," 81.

71 See J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1985) 897–911; D.L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 1996) 1037–1053.

them with His accusations against them.[72] Jesus directs the word 'woe' at each of these groups of the Jewish establishment several times.

The immediate context of Jesus' logion about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (12:10) is the pericope 12:1–12,[73] at the beginning of which He warns His disciples, in the presence of the crowds, to beware of 'the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy' (12:1). After this pericope, the narrative continues with Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, during which He carries on teaching about various matters related to faith and calls His listeners to conversion. In these subsequent teachings during the journey to Jerusalem, we do not find any significant continuation of the thoughts contained in 12:1–12.

It is worth examining the internal structure of pericope 12:1–12 in terms of the addressees of Jesus' logion in 12:10. As mentioned above, in 12:1, Jesus warns His closest disciples to beware of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. He addresses this admonition in the second person plural and continues this direct way of addressing (you) until verse 12:8a, which is already the immediate context of the logion about sin against the Holy Spirit. In 12:4, Jesus calls His disciples friends, which is a sign of great intimacy: Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου 'But I say to you, my friends.' After these words, He urges them not to be afraid, for they are important to God, so much so that even the hairs on their heads are counted (12:4–7). The last teaching addressed only to the disciples (you) is the logion about the Son of Man, also found in parallel texts in Mark and Matthew:

> Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ
>
> 'But I say to you, everyone who confesses me before men, the Son of Man will also confess him before the angels of God; but he who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God' (12:8–9).

This instruction is addressed to the disciples ('I say to you'), but it applies to everyone, as indicated by the phrases 'everyone' and 'he who'. It follows from this context that Jesus addresses this instruction to His disciples, but there is no indication that the second part of this statement, which is a warning, also applies to them, since they are His friends (12:4) who 'confess him'.[74] The meaning of the phrase 'Son of Man' does not differ from that ex-

---

72 See J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, 934–948; J. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1993) 666–677.

73 See I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1978) 511–519; J. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 675–683. In his exegesis of Luke 12:1–12, the author focuses on the literary and theological significance of the pericope in Luke's narrative. He highlights the criticism of the Pharisees' hypocrisy, the eschatological call to profess faith, and the role of the Holy Spirit in the face of persecution, with reference to parallels in Matt 10 and Mark 3. See also J.B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1997) 483–490. The author of this commentary interprets Luke 12:1–12 in a social and theological context, highlighting the contrast between the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and the authenticity of Jesus' disciples. He analyses the motives for courage, persecution, and the work of the Holy Spirit, noting their relevance to Luke's community in the face of trials.

74 See Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1007–1010; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 511–513.

plained above in the analysis of the parallel text in Matthew. Without a doubt, the closest disciples of Jesus, who are the addressees of these words about confessing the Son of Man, are His friends. It appears that this was communicated to them so that it would become part of their future teaching during the post-Paschal period.

Verse 12:10, which is often the main focus of our attention, is the climax of Jesus' argument for accepting or rejecting Him:

> Καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται
>
> 'And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but to the one blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven.'[75]

This logion juxtaposes blasphemy against the Son of Man (πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι). It is consistent in content with the second part of Jesus' parallel statement in Matt 12:32. However, while the *modus eventualis* structure was used in Matt 12:32, Luke's version uses the *modus realis* (the conjunction ἐὶ is missing in the antecedent of the conditional clause, but it should be implied here). The verbs in the logion in Luke 12:10 are in the future tense. These words refer to something that may happen in the future based on a causal relationship: blasphemy against the Son of Man will be forgiven, while blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not. From a semantic perspective, Luke 12:10 is consistent with Matt 12:32 and has the same significance. The future verb forms used in the *modus realis* in 12:10 suggest that this statement should be interpreted in the sense of the *modus eventualis* used in Matt 12:32 (see above).

After uttering this logion, which is a general rule, Jesus again addresses His disciples (you) in 12:11, returning to the direct message concerning them personally (see 12:1–8a above). This return to a direct mode of expression makes it clear that the logion in 12:10 was not an exhortation directed at them. This is also confirmed by the instruction in the last two verses of this pericope, which encourages the disciples to submit to the guidance of the Holy Spirit during the coming persecutions:

> And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not be anxious about how or what you should defend yourselves or what you should say; for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say (12:11–12).

Therefore, it is clear that the disciples, who were friends of Jesus, should not be afraid that they might blaspheme against the Holy Spirit. By placing Jesus' logion in 12:10 in the context of teaching addressed to His disciples and removing the immediate context of Jesus' confrontation with the scribes (as in Mark) or the Pharisees (as in Matthew), Luke made it a universal rule. The unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit can

---

75 See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, 960–962; Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 680–682; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1114–1116.

be committed by any person who denies that Jesus is the Son of God, acting by the power of the Holy Spirit. This category includes opponents of the historical Jesus who reject His divine mission and prerogatives. However, for the post-Paschal Church, Jesus' logion in Luke 12:10, by isolating it from the context of direct confrontation, becomes a universal rule: anyone who denies that Jesus is the Revelator of God and acts by the power of the Holy Spirit, that is, of the triune God Himself, commits an act of unbelief and excludes themselves from those whose sins have been forgiven and who have become beneficiaries of the gift of salvation.

4. A Broader Perspective on the Topic

In seeking an answer to the question posed in the title of this article, it is necessary to broaden the scope of the sources analysed to include texts that are not usually taken into account by exegetes and theologians who focus primarily on the search for an unambiguous dogmatic solution. First, we want to compare the synoptic pericopes analysed above on the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit with a hypothetical reconstruction of the relevant logion in the Q source. If this source existed, then the logion in Q 12:10 influenced the way this theme, taken from Mark, was understood by Matthew and Luke. In addition, the New Testament canon contains two other texts that at least indirectly refer to the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit: Heb 6:4–6 and 1 John 5:16. We also believe that logion 44 from the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas*, which addresses this issue, should be given consideration. In our analysis of these texts, we will employ the same research method as in the previous paragraph, albeit with less detail. First, we will present the context of a given statement in the analysed source. Then, we will explain its exegetical details from the perspective of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

4.1. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and Q 12:10

The theme of the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit also appears in Q 12:10. This hypothesised, reconstructed document is a collection of Jesus' sayings, dated to ca. AD 50–70, which predates the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.[76] It contains material common to these two Evangelists and absent from the Gospel of Mark. It consists mainly of Jesus' logia (e.g. blessings, the Lord's Prayer, ethical teachings, etc.); it is considered wisdom literature, with some apocalyptic elements.[77] Q probably originated in a Judeo-

76 For a good introduction to topics related to the Q source, see A.D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge 1992); B.L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (San Francisco, CA: Harper 1993); D.R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: Clark 1993); R.A. Horsley – J.A. Draper, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International 1999).

77 See J.S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2000) 39–34.

Christian environment in Galilee or Syria and was addressed to a community awaiting the imminent Parousia.[78]

Based on the consensus of exegetes who, referring to the two-source theory, accept the existence of the Q source, the reconstructed fragment of the text in question in the original Greek would have the following form (see table at the beginning of section 3 of this article): καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὃς δ' ἂν [εἴπ]ῃ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. We propose the following literal translation of this logion into English: 'And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him.'

This particular reconstruction of the logion is argued as follows: in Matt 12:32, Jesus' statement was expanded with the addition of 'neither in this age nor in the one to come', which is an editorial development typical of eschatology.[79] Luke, on the other hand, retains a simpler form, closer to the presumed Q, placing this logion in the context of teaching about confessing Jesus before people (Luke 12:8–12). The key terms in the reconstructed Q 12:10 are 'speak a word against', which corresponds to 'blaspheme' and 'Holy Spirit' (τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα). These indicate the seriousness of sin. On the other hand, the phrase 'Son of Man' in Q is typical of logia about Jesus as an eschatological mediator, which differentiates Q 12:10 from Mark 3:28–30, which refers to 'sons of men'.[80]

Since the Q source is not a narrative, but a collection of Jesus' sayings without a strictly defined internal structure, we present here only the location of logion 12:10 within what appears to be a thematically coherent block of Jesus' teaching contained in 12:2–12, in which the following elements stand out: a warning against hypocrisy (12:2–3); an encouragement to profess one's faith fearlessly (12:4–7); a teaching about the Son of Man as judge (12:8–9); the logion about blasphemy against the Spirit (12:10); the promise of the Spirit's help at times of persecution (12:11–12). As a coherent thematic unit, it highlights the importance of staying true to Jesus when faced with persecution and the role of the Holy Spirit.[81] This may reflect the situation of a community experiencing persecution or rejection by its Jewish neighbours (cf. the previous context in Q 11:47–51). In this historical context, logion 12:10 could have been a warning against rejecting Jesus' teaching and the Holy Spirit, especially amid the heated debates between Judeo-Christians and other Jewish groups.[82]

Jesus' logion in Q 12:10 consists of two opposing statements. The first is about forgiving those who speak against the Son of Man (ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ) (12:10a). The second is about not forgiving those who speak against the

78 D.C. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International 1997) 3–7.

79 See Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 134–135.

80 This is argued, for example, by C.M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: Clark 1996) 194–195.

81 J.M. Robinson – P. Hoffmann – J.S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas* (Minneapolis, MN – Leuven: Fortress – Peeters 2000) 286–296.

82 See Tuckett, *Q and Early Christianity*, 197–198.

Holy Spirit (ὃς δ’ ἂν [εἴπ]η εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ) (12:10b).[83] Both statements contain the syntactic construction of *modus eventualis*, which takes on the meaning of *modus realis* to refer to the future. This is identical to the syntactic structure in the parallel passage in Matt 12:32 (see the detailed explanation above). As in Matt 12:32, but unlike Luke 12:10, the verb βλασφημέω is not used, but the twice-used phrase εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς should be attributed the same meaning of blasphemy as εἴπῃ λόγον κατά in Matt 12:32 (see above). As one might expect, given the reconstruction of the Q source, logion 12:10 is a theological synthesis of Matt 12:31–32 and Luke 12:10. This logion is closer to Luke's version. It does not introduce any theological concepts concerning the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit that would go beyond the material common to Matthew and Luke.

As for the reference to Mark 3:28–30, where blasphemy against the Spirit is a specific act of attributing to Satan the power behind Jesus' exorcisms, logion Q 12:10 lacks such a narrative context. It is more general and timeless, forming a binding rule, which suggests that it served as a universal warning to the community that was the depositary of the Q source in its struggle to bear witness to the Holy Spirit working in the Church.[84] Compared to Mark 3:28–30, Q 12:10 also emphasises the contrast between the Son of Man (forgivable sin) and the Holy Spirit (unforgivable sin), which may reflect the development of theology after the resurrection, when the latter became central to the experience of the Church,[85] as evidenced by the Acts of the Apostles. The logion in Q 12:10 thus has a paraenetic function – it warns against falling away from faith in difficult times, thereby strengthening the identity of the community.[86]

Scholars of logion Q 12:10, considering the theme of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, put forward three proposals regarding its function and theological significance. Some emphasise the continuation and universality of synoptic traditions in this regard, arguing that Q 12:10 originates from early Christian tradition, close to Mark, but acquires a broader context in Q. Blasphemy against the Spirit would then consist in rejecting the Spirit as the source of Jesus' revelation, especially in the face of persecution, when the Q community relied on the Holy Spirit as the One who would strengthen them in their profession of faith (as indicated by the context of Q 12:11–12).[87] In this context, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit would refer to the deliberate rejection of Jesus' teaching after His resurrection, when the Spirit is active in the Church.[88] Other scholars maintain that Q 12:10 was a warning to the Q community, which had been rejected by other

83 See Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 135–136.

84 This view is held, for example, by J.D.G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM 1975) 45–47; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 137–138.

85 See Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 48–49.

86 Tuckett, *Q and Early Christianity*, 198–199.

87 This is argued, for example, by Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 136–137.

88 See Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 46–48.

Jews. Blasphemy against the Spirit could refer to rejecting the Holy Spirit's work in Jesus' teachings, which was equivalent to rejecting God's work.[89] They argue that the logion reflects tensions between Judeo-Christians and the synagogue. Sin against the Son of Man (e.g. misunderstanding Jesus' earthly mission) is forgivable, but rejecting the Holy Spirit working in the Church after the resurrection is unforgivable because it closes the door to faith.[90] Other exegetes draw attention to the eschatological seriousness of the sin of blasphemy mentioned in Q 12.10. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unforgivable because it signifies hardness of heart towards the One who leads to salvation in the face of the coming judgement (see the previous context in Q 12:8–9). This logion would thus reinforce the call to faithfulness.[91] In Q 12:10, the Holy Spirit represents God's presence in the here and now, and blasphemy against Him would be to reject this presence, which consequently excludes participation in eternal life.[92]

To sum up, the following conclusions can be drawn regarding the theme of the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit in the hypothesised reconstruction of the Q source. Unlike in the Synoptic Gospels, where this sin is associated with a specific act against Jesus, this logion is universal, warning against rejecting the Holy Spirit as the source of revelation and inspiration in faith and in the apostolic work of the Church. In the context of Q, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit means hardness of heart towards the message of the Gospel, especially in the face of persecution, during which the Holy Spirit supports the witness of faith (12:11–12). The logion has a paraenetic function in Q, calling for faithfulness and warning of the eschatological consequences of unbelief. Its open formula allows for a variety of interpretations, from ethical to apocalyptic, making it important for understanding the theology of Q. The inclusion of this hypothetical source in the discussion seeking an answer to the question 'What is the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit?' appears productive, as it opens up the possibility to recontextualise parallel synoptic statements at the level of a universal rule binding on the Church of all times.

4.2. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and Heb 6:4–6

The Epistle to the Hebrews is an anonymous work traditionally attributed to Saint Paul. However, most modern scholars believe that it was written by someone else, possibly from the circle of Hellenistic Christians (e.g. Apollos or Barnabas). This letter was written before or shortly after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in AD 70. It was addressed to Christian communities, probably of Jewish origin, experiencing persecution (10:32–34) and repression from their former co-religionists. Its addressees faced the threat of abandoning their faith in Christ.[93] In light of these problems, Hebrews emphasises the superiority

89 This view is held, for example, by Tuckett, *Q and Early Christianity*, 195–196.
90 This is the conclusion of, for example, Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 106–107.
91 A.J. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1994) 54–55.
92 See R. Cameron, *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1984) 89–90.
93 See H.W. Attridge – H. Koester, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1989) 8–10.

of Christ as the High Priest of the New Covenant, whose sacrifice once and for all forgives all sins (9:11–14).

In the broader context of the epistle, the pericope in 6:4–6 is part of a series of warnings (2:1–4; 3:7–4:13; 10:26–31; 12:25–29) that call for perseverance in faith and caution against rejecting grace.[94] This passage resolves the addressees' doubts about salvation: whether it can be lost, and whether apostasy is irreversible.

The analysed passage from Hebrews is found in the middle of the paraenetic section (5:11–6:20), which is part of a discussion on the superiority of the Melchizedek priesthood (Heb 5:1–10; 7:1–28). In the immediate context of Heb 5:11–14, the author criticises the spiritual immaturity of his audience and calls on them to place greater emphasis on progress in faith than on rituals (6:1–3) (e.g. penance, baptism), which are to be secondary to a more profound knowledge and understanding of Christ.[95] In this context, the passage of interest in 6:4–6 is a warning. This is followed by an example of the earth 'drinking in the rain' and 'producing plants that are useful', thus receiving blessings for those who cultivate it (6:7). It is contrasted with the earth, which 'produces thorns and thistles' and will ultimately be burned (6:8). Following this warning, the author encourages his audience to diligently improve themselves in Christian hope (6:9–12). The final element of this *paraenesis* is the promise of God's faithfulness (6:13–20).

In passage 6:4–6, the author states emphatically:

> For it is impossible, those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and became partakers of the Holy Spirit [μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου], and have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the coming age, and having fallen away, to renew them again to repentance, crucifying again for themselves the Son of God and putting him to open shame.[96]

This statement begins with the emphatic assertion ἀδύνατον γάρ 'for it is impossible' (6:4a) with strong rhetorical overtones. The scholars believe this phrase does not mean absolute ontological impossibility, but rather a very high degree of difficulty.[97] Those who have not received the gift of salvation are referred to as παραπεσόντας, those who 'have fallen away' (6:6a). This is the active participle form in the aorist tense of the verb παραπίπτω, which indicates a state of rejection resulting from a single action (the basic aspect in the aorist tense). This signifies a deliberate rejection of faith, not an accidental sin. In the context of the epistle as a whole, this may indicate a return to Judaism or an abandonment of faith in Jesus due to pressure from those around them.[98] Based on the letter, five attributes of

94 T.R. Schreiner, *Commentary on Hebrews* (BTCPC; Nashville, TN: B&H 2015) 186–187.

95 See Attridge – Koester, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 171–172; W.L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8* (WBC 47A; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1991) 139–140.

96 Full text in the original version published by Nestle-Aland 28: Αδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

97 See, for example, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 141.

98 Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 142.

those who have fallen away from the faith can be identified in keeping with 6:4–5: (a) they have been 'enlightened' (φωτισθέντας) once, yet they 'have fallen away' from the faith. In the context of 10:32, the term 'enlightened' refers to conversion or baptism, signifying the acceptance of faith and spiritual enlightenment;[99] (b) they 'have tasted the heavenly gift' (γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου). This suggests the experience of the grace of salvation, perhaps in the context of the Eucharist or baptism;[100] (c) they 'have shared in the Holy Spirit' (μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου). This indicates a profound experience of the Spirit, e.g. through charismatic gifts;[101] (d) they 'have tasted the goodness of the word of God' (καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα). This refers to the acceptance of the gospel and Christian teaching; (e) they have experienced 'the powers of the age to come' (δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος). This may indicate their experience of eschatological signs, e.g. miracles, which foretell the kingdom of God.[102]

Despite receiving such wonderful gifts, these people scorned them and 'then have fallen away' from faith (6:6a). This resulted in it being impossible (ἀδύνατον γάρ in 6:4a) 'to restore them again to repentance' (πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν), since they are apostates 'crucifying again' (ἀνασταυροῦντας) the Son of God and 'holding him up to contempt' (παραδειγματίζοντας). These terms imply a deliberate, public rejection of Christ's sacrifice, rendering it impossible to return to conversion.[103]

As can be inferred from the above contextual analysis and the message of Heb 6:4–6, the central theme of this passage is apostasy from the faith and having 'shared in the Holy Spirit' (μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου) is given as one of the attributes of the members of the community before falling away from faith. Despite the seemingly obvious conclusion arising from this text, some exegetes read it as a voice in the discussion on the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Scholars' opinions on this matter can be broadly classified into three groups.

Some exegetes maintain that Heb 6:4–6 explicitly expresses the teaching on the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The following three main arguments are presented to support this view. The first results from the very fact of the addressees' participation in the Holy Spirit (6:4) and then their deliberate rejection of Him, which can be compared to the situation in Mark 3:28–30 and par.[104] The second argument pointing to the similarity with the previously analysed texts from the Synoptic Gospels is the irreversibility of this process. The author of Heb 6:6 writes about it being impossible 'to

99 See C.R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 36; New York: Doubleday 2001) 321.

100 This is the view of P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1993) 320–321.

101 See Attridge – Koester, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 173.

102 See Schreiner, *Commentary on Hebrews*, 190.

103 See Koester, *Hebrews*, 323–324.

104 This is the view presented by W. Grudem, "Perseverance of the Saints: A Case Study from Hebrews 6:4–6 and the Other Warning Passages in Hebrews," *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will: Historical and Theological Perspectives on Calvinism* (eds. T.R. Schreiner – B.A. Ware) (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1995) 155–158.

restore them again to repentance', which resembles the unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit due to the hardness of heart.[105] The third argument supporting the theme of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in Heb 6:4–6 is the phraseology in v. 6 of crucifying Christ again and exposing Him to ridicule, which is seen as an act of public blasphemy, analogous to attributing to Satan the deeds that Jesus performs by the power of the Holy Spirit (see Matt 12:31–32).[106]

The second group is exegetes who claim that Heb 6:4–6 refers to the sin of apostasy, which should not be confused with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The argumentation in this case can also be broken down into three main points. The first argument refers to the historical context, where 6:4–6 supposedly refers to those Christians of Jewish origin who, under pressure of persecution, returned to their original faith, thus rejecting their belief in Jesus as the Messiah. Therefore, it would not be a sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, but apostasy – the rejection of the only way of salvation offered in Jesus Christ.[107] The second argument presented by supporters of this thesis highlights the distinction between the two sins. This blasphemy, as mentioned in the Gospels, involves attributing the works of the Holy Spirit to Satan, which is a specific act of hostility towards God. On the other hand, Heb 6:4–6 speaks of falling away (παραπεσόντας), understood as a rejection of faith, without necessarily being connected to blasphemy.[108] The third argument put forward by exegetes is the absence of terminology relating to blasphemy in Heb 6:4 6, which is key to the Synoptic Gospels analysed above.[109] Furthermore, Heb 6:4–6 is considered a warning against the virtual impossibility of returning to repentance once apostasy has occurred, rather than a definition of unforgivable sin in the evangelical sense.[110]

The third group of exegetes draws parallels between Heb 6:4–6 and blasphemy against the Spirit, but avoids equating these sins, pointing to their different contexts and purposes. These authors note that both Heb 6:4–6 and Mark 3:28–30 and par. refer to a deliberate and irreversible rejection of God's work: in Hebrews through apostasy after experiencing the Spirit, and in the Gospels through blasphemously attributing the works of the Spirit to Satan.[111] Furthermore, it should be noted that Heb 6:4–6 is a paraenetic text addressed to the community in order to prevent apostasy, whereas blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the Gospels is more of an individual act of hostility towards Jesus, committed

105 Grudem, "Perseverance of the Saints," 156.

106 See Attridge – Koester, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 175. Wayne Grudem, on the other hand, in his analysis of the warnings in Hebrews, suggests that this passage may refer to the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, particularly in the context of consciously rejecting grace after having experienced Christianity fully. However, he emphasizes that the text is paraenetic rather than doctrinal and does not necessarily refer to the situation described in Matt 12:31–32. See Grudem, "Perseverance of the Saints," 157–158.

107 See Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 142–145.

108 This is rightly noted by Attridge – Koester, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 173–174.

109 See Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 320–322.

110 Such a conclusion is drawn, for example, by Koester, *Hebrews*, 324–326.

111 See Schreiner, *Commentary on Hebrews*, 191–193.

in the specific context of His ministry.[112] The analysed passage from Hebrews refers to the rejection of Jesus Christ's salvific sacrifice without any connection to blasphemy, which is crucial in the passages presented in the Synoptic Gospels.[113]

In conclusion of the exegetical analysis of Heb 6:4–6 and the opinions of commentators presented, it should be noted that this pericope does not directly mention the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. There are similarities between this text and the passages from the Gospel analysed above, such as the conscious rejection of God's action and the apparent irreversibility of its consequences. However, it should be assumed that Heb 6:4–6 refers to apostasy in the context of persecuted Christians of Jewish origin, and not to blasphemy in the evangelical sense. Key differences include the absence of blasphemy terminology in Hebrews and a different historical context (the Christian community in Hebrews vs Jesus' opponents in the Gospels). It is also important to note the paraenetic purpose of Hebrews, which is to prevent apostasy, not to define the doctrine of unforgivable sin.

4.3. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and 1 John 5:16

In-depth studies on the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit sometimes also refer to 1 John 5:16 as a source text. Although this verse does not contain any terminology suggesting this interpretation, it does introduce a distinction between a 'sin leading to death' and 'sin not leading to death'. Hence, this verse evokes associations with the unforgivable sin mentioned in the Gospels (Matt 12:31–32 and par.).

In the English translation, 1 John 5:16 reads as follows:

> If anyone sees his brother committing a sin not leading to death [ἁμαρτία μὴ πρὸς θάνατον], he shall ask, and life will be given to him, to those sinning not leading to death. There is a sin leading to death [ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον]; I do not say that he should pray concerning that.[114]

This statement likely emerged during the heated debate between the Johannine communities at the end of the 1st century AD, marked by internal divisions, possibly due to Gnostic or Docetic heresies (for example, see 2:18–19; 4:1–3).[115] Its immediate context is chapter 5, in which the author focuses on the certainty of faith, victory in Christ and the power of intercessory prayer (5:14–15). While 5:16, which is of interest to us, is part of the teaching on the community's responsibility for sinners. It introduces an enigmatic distinction between

---

112 Schreiner, *Commentary on Hebrews*, 192; D.A. deSilva, "Hebrews 6:4–8: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation," *TynBul* 50/1 (1999) 44–47.

113 See F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, revised ed. (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1990) 149–151.

114 Original version from the Nestle-Aland critical edition 28: Εάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, αἰτήσει, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωήν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. ἔστιν ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον· οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ (E.E. Nestle – B.K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28 ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2012]).

115 See R.E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB 30; Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1982) 30–35.

a 'sin leading to death' (ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον) and 'sin not leading to death' (ἁμαρτία μὴ πρὸς θάνατον).[116]

The analysis presented in this article demonstrates that, in the Gospels, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit involves deliberately attributing the action of the Holy Spirit (e.g. exorcism) to Satan (Mark 3:28–30 and par.), which is considered an unforgivable sin. Thus, we want to seek an answer to the question: Does the 'sin leading to death' mentioned in 1 John 5:16 correspond to this blasphemy, or does it refer to a different kind of transgression? First, we will outline the arguments of commentators who answer this question in the affirmative, and then we will present the arguments of those who oppose this view.

Authors who endorse identifying the 'sin leading to death' in 1 John 5:16 with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit give three reasons to support this view. The first perceived parallel is the irreversibility of sin in both cases. For the author instructs in 1 John 5:16 that one should not pray for those who commit 'sin leading to death', which is somewhat reminiscent of the unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the Gospels (Matt 12:31–32). The absence of the call to prayer may indicate a sin that excludes the possibility of forgiveness, as does the deliberate rejection of the work of the Holy Spirit.[117] The second argument in support of identifying the two sins, as stated by the proponents of this thesis, is the broader context of 1 John, which strongly underlines the Holy Spirit as the witness to the truth about Christ (for example, see 4:2–6; 5:6–8). Thus, the 'sin leading to death' could be related to the rejection of this truth. Such a 'sin leading to death' tantamount to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit would be, for example, the deliberate rejection of Jesus' incarnation and divinity (4:3).[118] The third argument is that 'sin leading to death' implies an attitude of hardness of heart, similar to that presented in Mark 3:29. If the sinner in 1 John 5:16 rejects faith in Jesus as the Messiah despite clear evidence from the Holy Spirit, then this sin can be compared to the evangelical blasphemy.[119]

The opposite hypothesis, which does not identify the sin referred to in 1 John 5:16 with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, has more supporters and arguments. First of all, it is noted that 1 John 5:16 does not contain the blasphemy terminology, which is crucial in the relevant texts of Mark 3:29–30 and par. In 1 John 5:16, there is mention of 'sin leading to death', which is a broader concept and can refer to various ways of 'falling away', not necessarily related to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.[120] The second argument is derived from reading 1 John 5:16 in the context of the Johannine community dynamics. Some of its members had left (2:19) and actively refuted the faith (e.g. by denying the incarnation, see 4:2–3). In this context, the 'sin leading to death' is more likely to denote a permanent apostasy or heresy that excludes the sinner from the community than a specific blasphemy

116 S.S. Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John* (WBC 51; Waco, TX: Word Books 1984) 295–297.

117 See Brown, *Epistles of John*, 612–614.

118 Brown, *Epistles of John*, 613.

119 This is argued, for example, by I.H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1978) 248–250.

120 See Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, 298–299.

against the Holy Spirit.[121] It should be noted that the author does not forbid praying for such a person, but merely does not recommend it, which differs from the absolute unforgiveness of the sin of blasphemy in the Gospels. Other supporters of this position point to differences in the nature of sin. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the Gospels is a concrete act of hostility by opponents to Jesus performing miracles. On the other hand, 'sin leading to death' in 1 John is associated with a permanent rejection of faith in Christ or with moral decline (e.g. hatred of brothers and sisters in 3:14–15),[122] but it is likely to have nothing to do with blasphemy. The final argument against linking 'sin leading to death' in 1 John 5:16 with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit stems from the practical purpose of this statement, which is part of the instructions for intercessory prayer in the community.[123] 'Sin leading to death' can be understood here as conduct that leads to spiritual or physical death[124] (e.g. through a permanent rejection of faith).

We favour the middle ground taken by some scholars who see similarities but avoid equating the sin referred to in 1 John 5:16 with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.[125] The similarity lies in the fact that both sins involve a deliberate rejection of God's action: in the Gospels, through the denial of Jesus' miracles performed by the power of the Holy Spirit, and in 1 John, through apostasy, which involves rejecting the truth about Christ or distorting this truth through heresy. However, differences in the context in which these statements were made (Jesus' polemic with His opponents vs a doctrinal and/or ethical crisis within the community) and the lack of common terminology make it impossible to equate these sins. We believe that 'sin leading to death' is a broader concept that can include various types of persistent rebellion, but not necessarily blasphemy in the strict sense.

4.4. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and the *Gospel of Thomas* 44

Jesus' statements on the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 3:28–30; Matt 12:31–32; Luke 12:10) find their counterpart in logion 44 of the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas*, written between AD 100 and 150 (manuscript discovered in Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2 in 1945),[126] which has survived in the Sahidic dialect of Coptic.[127] It is not a narrative but a collection of 114 sayings of Jesus, which,

121 This is stressed, for example, by K.H. Jobes, *1, 2, and 3 John* (Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2014) 239–241.

122 See C.G. Kruse, *The Letters of John* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2000) 190–193.

123 See R.W. Yarbrough, *1–3 John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2008) 308–311.

124 Cf. Acts 5:1–11; 1 Cor 11:30.

125 For example, see D.L. Akin, *1, 2, 3 John: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC 38; Nashville, TN: B&H 2001) 206–208.

126 Some scholars claim that this text may contain a significant amount of material recorded in the 1st century AD, when the canonical Gospels were being compiled. For more, see A.D. DeConick, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel* (LNTS 287; London: Clark 2007) 2–5.

127 A few passages in Greek have also survived (P. Oxy. 1; 654 and 655), but it is presumed that the original language of the Gospel of Thomas is Syriac. The Greek versions on the papyri are consistent with the Coptic

according to tradition, were written down by the apostle Thomas.[128] Many of these logia, often using slightly different wording, can be found in the canonical Gospels. The *Gospel of Thomas* (*Gos. Thom.*) exhibits Gnostic influences, yet it is not an entirely Gnostic work, as it combines elements of wisdom, apocalyptic, and proto-Gnostic thought.[129] This text was probably addressed to an early Christian community seeking esoteric knowledge (*gnosis*) that leads to salvation through understanding oneself and divine reality.[130] This work was probably composed in Syria or Egypt, where Jewish, Christian and Hellenistic influences overlapped. This text may have originated in interaction with early Christian communities that fought to preserve orthodoxy and strengthen the institutional Church.[131]

The context of logion 44 is a sequence of statements concerning the ethics of Christian life and doctrinal assertions (logia 42–46). It is preceded by logion 43, which speaks of recognising the source of Jesus' words, and followed by logion 45 on the fruit of the heart. However, the lack of narrative continuity means that logion 44 functions as an independent statement, which resonates with synoptic parallels.[132] Although in the context of the *Gospel of Thomas* as a whole, logion 44 fits into a broader reflection on the role of the Holy Spirit in revelation and salvation.

After this general introduction, we proceed to analyse logion 44 in the context of the subject matter of this article. In our exegesis, we will rely on our original translation of this text, without referring to Coptic terminology:

> It is said: He who speaks something against the Father, they will forgive him, and he who speaks against the Son, they will forgive him. But he who speaks something against the Spirit, which is Pure/Holy, they will not forgive him, neither on earth nor in heaven.

This logion can be divided into three parts: blasphemy against the Father, against the Son and against the Holy Spirit. The text suggests that both the insult to the Father and to the Son do not have irreversible consequences and can be forgiven. In contrast, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven ('neither on earth nor in heaven'). This highlights the exceptional gravity of this sin, with the absolute exclusion of forgiveness.[133]

---

original, confirming the stability of the text transmission. See T.O. Lambdin, "Introduction to the Gospel of Thomas," *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7 together with XIII, 2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P. OXY. 1, 654, 655*. I. *Gospel according to Thomas, Gospel according to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, Indexes* (ed. B. Layton) (NHS 20; Leiden: Brill 1989) 53–94.

128 The following introductions to the Gospel of Thomas are recommended: H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International 1990); R. Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas* (New Testament Readings; London: Routledge 1997); A.D. DeConick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth* (LNTS 286; London: Clark 2006).

129 See M.W. Meyer, *The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus* (San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco 1992) 11–15.

130 E. Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Random House 1979) 128–130.

131 Such a view is given in S.J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press 1993) 17–20.

132 See DeConick, *Original Gospel*, 167–168.

133 This is noted, for example, by Meyer, *Gospel of Thomas*, 85–86.

The phrase 'neither on earth nor in heaven' reinforces the rhetoric of irreversibility. This may reflect the Gnostic dichotomy between the material and spiritual worlds.[134]

Comparing logion 44 with parallel statements in Mark 3:28–30, Matt 12:31–32 and Luke 12:10, a clear difference emerges: in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus' statement is linked to specific situations related to His thaumaturgic activity (see above). In logion 44, however, there is no narrative context, which gives Jesus' statement a universal character.[135] The lack of narrative context makes this logion more abstract, directed at anyone who rejects spiritual revelation, rather than at a specific group (such as the scribes or Pharisees in the Synoptic Gospels). As in Luke 12:10, blasphemy against the Son of Man is forgivable. However, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, unlike in Luke, the forgiveness of this sin is extended to God the Father. This is a unique approach.[136]

How should this blasphemy (literally, 'saying something') against the Holy Spirit be understood in the context of the Gnostic character of the *Gospel of Thomas*? Indeed, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, the Holy Spirit is not often mentioned directly. Apart from logion 44, He appears only twice, and indirectly (in logion 3 in the phrase 'know yourselves'[137] and in logion 53 in the phrase 'circumcision in spirit'). Logion 44, on the other hand, suggests the central role of the Holy Spirit in revelation. Therefore, blasphemy against Him may imply a rejection of divine *gnosis*, which in Gnostic thought is the key to salvation.[138]

It should be noted that logion 44 unmistakably refers to the synoptic tradition of the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit. However, in a Gnostic or proto-Gnostic context, this changes the focus of the message. This logion retains an early Christian tradition, closely related to the Gospel of Mark, but adapted for the Gnostic audience of the *Gospel of Thomas*. Blasphemy against the Spirit is unforgivable because it implies a rejection of the divine revelation that the Spirit communicates through Jesus.[139] In the Synoptic Gospels, this sin involves deliberately denying Jesus' miracles as works of the Holy Spirit (Mark 3:30). However, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, there is no such context of miracles, and thus blasphemy may refer to the rejection of Jesus' words as a source of *gnosis*.[140] In the Gnostic context, the Holy Spirit represents the inner divine spark or knowledge that believers discover within themselves. Blasphemy against the Spirit is the rejection of this knowledge, which is equivalent to spiritual death, because it prevents a return to the divine *pleroma* (fullness).[141] Therefore, logion 44 may be a warning against the hardness of heart towards revelation,

134 See Pagels, *Gnostic Gospels*, 132–133.

135 This was rightly pointed out by R. McL. Wilson, *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* (London: Mowbray 1960) 96–98.

136 See Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures*, 389.

137 In the Gnostic understanding, to 'know yourselves' is the work of the divine spark or Spirit that dwells within man. Although the phrase 'Holy Spirit' is not found here, experts on the subject suggest that logion 3 reflects the Gnostic vision of the Spirit as a force of revelation, similar to that in logion 44. See Pagels, *Gnostic Gospels*, 128–130.

138 See DeConick, *Original Gospel*, 169.

139 DeConick, *Original Gospel*, 168–170.

140 See Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas*, 45–46.

141 Pagels, *Gnostic Gospels*, 134–135.

which in the *Gospel of Thomas* is perceived as more individual and esoteric than in the canonical Gospels.[142] Hence, Jesus' statement in logion 44, although embedded in the synoptic tradition, serves a more ethical function in the *Gospel of Thomas* – the emphasis is placed on calling for respect for divine revelation. Unlike the Synoptic Gospels, where sin is a specific act, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, it can refer to an attitude towards the truth of the Christian faith.[143] In the Gnostic context, blasphemy against the Spirit, parallel to the statements of Jesus analysed above from the Synoptic Gospels, can be seen as a rejection of inner enlightenment, which is a prerequisite for salvation.[144]

In summary, it can be concluded that Logion 44 of the *Gospel of Thomas* is a clear reference to the synoptic tradition of the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit, but it takes on a new meaning within the context of this work. Unlike in the canonical Gospels, where this sin is associated with a specific act of hostility towards Jesus as a miracle worker, in the *Gospel of Thomas*, it has a more universal and esoteric character, referring to the rejection of divine revelation or *gnosis*. The Gnostic or proto-Gnostic context suggests that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the hardness of heart towards the inner truth, leading to spiritual death. Although the logion retains the rhetoric of irreversibility present in the Synoptic Gospels, the lack of a narrative framework makes it open to various interpretations, ranging from an ethical warning to a metaphysical reflection on salvation.[145]

Conclusions

In this article, we have set ourselves the task of answering the *crux interpretum*, which is the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. After outlining a broader background to this issue, we presented the Old Testament context for understanding blasphemy against God. We demonstrated that such a concept existed in pre-Christian Judaism and had a well-established Hebrew terminology (see Lev 24:10–23; Exod 22:27; 1 Kgs 21:1–16; Isa 8:21). Blasphemy against God is not clearly defined in these texts, and therefore could involve uttering God's name without due reverence or even the sole fact of uttering His name. However, in the Old Testament, we do not find any phrase that would specify blasphemy against God as a transgression against the Spirit (of God).

The presented *status quaestionis* concerning the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit has proved that from the earliest statements of the Apostolic Fathers on this subject to the present day, there is no consensus on the nature of this sin. The solutions proposed throughout Christian history and in modern times can be logically arranged into four categories. The first includes a small number of theologians who deny the existence of

142 See Meyer, *Gospel of Thomas*, 86–87.

143 Meyer, *Gospel of Thomas*, 87. This idea also appears, for example, in the aforementioned logion 3, where the Spirit is also mentioned.

144 See Pagels, *Gnostic Gospels*, 136.

145 Pagels, *Gnostic Gospels*, 136.

the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The second comprises the followers of Augustine of Hippo, whose proposal was advocated in the Middle Ages, according to which unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit consists in denying the salvation offered by God and rejecting reconciliation with Him at the moment of death. The third group encompasses authors who claim that this sin was a concrete, one-time transgression committed by the opponents of the historical Jesus, who accused Him of casting out evil spirits by the power of Satan. The fourth category is represented by the largest number of contemporary theologians who argue that the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit can be committed by people at all stages of salvation history, initiated by the incarnation of the Son of God. However, these authors disagree so strongly on the specific answers they propose that there is no prospect of any consensus.

In the search for an answer to the question posed in the title of this article, we proposed to analyse each of the three pericopes from the canonical Gospels dealing with this issue independently in the context of each of these works. The second novelty was the expansion of the research field to include logion 12:10 from the hypothesised Q source, passages from Heb 6:4–6 and 1 John 5:16, and logion 44 from the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas*.

These analyses led to several important conclusions. First of all, the differences in content and context between parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels dealing with this topic allow the commentator to take a broader view of the issue. Our analyses show that individual Evangelists and the early Christian communities they represented may have had slightly different views on this topic. In Mark 3:28–30, this sin consists in the audacious self-exclusion of a person from those to whom God offers forgiveness and salvation. This self-exclusion involves denying the truth that Jesus acts by the power of the Holy Spirit and thus rejecting the salvation that the triune God offers in Christ. In the Gospel of Matthew (12:31–32), with reference to Mark, the emphasis is shifted from contrasting unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit with any other sin that can be forgiven to juxtaposing blasphemy against the Son of Man with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The first of these, although grave, can be forgiven, since it involves a verbal denial and persistent rejection of the truth that Jesus is the promised Messiah. It is therefore a sin of unbelief in His divine mission, declared before others. However, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit cannot be forgiven, as it essentially denies that God Himself is revealed in Jesus by the power of the Holy Spirit. Rejecting this truth is tantamount to rejecting God and His salvific action in the world, i.e. apostasy. Luke the Evangelist presents us with logion 12:10 in a form similar to Matthew's. However, he isolates it from the context of Jesus' confrontation with His opponents, thereby rendering it as a universal rule, according to which the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit entails denying that God Himself is at work in Jesus' words and deeds. Refusing Jesus as the unique Teacher and Miracle Worker is a forgivable sin, but refusing His messianic mission and that God Himself works in Him by the power of the Holy Spirit is an act of unbelief and self-exclusion from the community of the saved. Therefore, it can be concluded that each of the three Evangelists placed a slightly different emphasis on understanding the sin of blasphemy against

the Holy Spirit; however, in essence, it is a sin of apostasy – the rejection of God revealed in Christ. Inclusion of the anthropological and cultural perspective (the mechanism of the game for honour) in the analyses allows us to see in Mark and Matthew the nuance of the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit as a refusal to give God the glory that is due to Him. It involves an attempt to diminish His reputation and power in favour of the forces of evil represented by Beelzebub. Therefore, this sin does not entail solely denying God's agency, but its consequence is to take the side of the forces of evil (it is an either-or situation).

We broadened our understanding of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit by analysing four other texts in which this topic also appears (albeit indirectly in Heb 6:4–6 and 1 John 5:16). The first of these is logion 12:10 in the hypothesised Q source. This logion has a paraenetic function in Q, calling for faithfulness to God and warning against the eschatological consequences of unbelief in God revealed in Christ. The inclusion of this non-narrative source has made it possible to draw attention to the recontextualisation of the synoptic understanding of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit as a more universal principle applicable to the Church of all times. An exegetical analysis of Heb 4:4–6 has led us to conclude that this text does not directly address the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. However, it should be assumed that Heb 6:4–6 refers to apostasy in the context of persecuted Christians of Jewish origin, and not to blasphemy in the sense presented in the Synoptic Gospels. Key differences include the absence of blasphemy terminology in this passage and a different historical context (the Christian community in Hebrews vs Jesus' opponents in the Gospels). When examining the relationship between the parallel passages from the Synoptic Gospels and 1 John 5:16, as analysed in this article, both similarities and differences are apparent. The similarity lies in the fact that both the sin against the Holy Spirit (Synoptics Gospels) and the 'sin leading to death' (1 John) presuppose a deliberate rejection of God's action: in the Gospels, through the denial of Jesus' miracles performed by the power of the Holy Spirit, and in 1 John, through apostasy denying the truth about Christ or heresy distorting this truth. As we demonstrated, differences in the context in which these statements were made (Jesus' polemic with His opponents vs a doctrinal and/or ethical crisis within the community) and the lack of common terminology make it impossible to equate these sins. The last text analysed in this article with regard to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was logion 44 from the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas*. This passage clearly refers to the synoptic tradition of the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit, but this theme is more universal and esoteric in the *Gospel of Thomas*. Its universal character derives from the non-narrative structure of the *Gospel of Thomas* and the significant role assigned to the Holy Spirit in this work for the transmission of divine revelation. Its esoteric nature, in turn, derives from the Gnostic origins of this text. This context suggests that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the hardness of heart towards the inner truth, leading to spiritual death. Therefore, it offers a slightly different perspective on the reality of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit: it does not entail, as in the Synoptic Gospels, rejecting God revealed in Jesus Christ, but in closing oneself off to the truth that God reveals to

us in our hearts, the ultimate consequence of which is closing oneself off to salvation and spiritual self-destruction.

To sum up the entire analysis, it can be concluded that a tendency to recontextualise the teaching on the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is evident in the Synoptic Gospels. The Evangelists Mark and Matthew place Jesus' logion in two slightly different narrative contexts, but with a shared conviction that this sin ultimately arises from rejecting the fact of God's revelation in Jesus Christ in favour of attributing His works to Satan. By placing this logion in a context that indicates that it is a truth that the disciples are to pass on in their (post-Paschal) teaching, Luke the Evangelist guides the reader to interpret Jesus' teaching on the sin of blasphemy as a universal tenet. If we accept the existence of the hypothesised Q source, we can surmise that Luke drew inspiration for his universal view of this issue from Q 12:10. The other three texts analysed in this article (Heb 6:4–6; 1 John 5:16, and *Gos. Thom.* 44) do not offer significant contribution to answering the question posed in the title of this paper, but they do provide background knowledge that allows us to look at the issue under consideration from a broader theological and cultural perspective.

Bibliography

Akin, D.L., *1, 2, 3 John: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (New American Commentary 38; Nashville, TN: B&H 2001).

Allison, D.C., *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International 1997).

Atanazy Wielki, *Listy do Serapiona* (trans. S. Kalinkowski) (Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 2; Kraków: WAM 1996).

Athanasius Alexandrinus, "Epistula ad Serapionem" 4,17, *Athanasius Werke* I/1,4 (ed. K. Savvidis) (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte Neue Folge 19; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2010) 583–584.

Attridge, H.W. –Koester, H., *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1989)

Augustinus Hipponensis, *Sermo 71* (De blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum) (ed. Cyrille Lambot) (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 41Aa; Turnhout: Brepols 2008).

Barclay, W., *The Gospel of Matthew*, revised ed. (The Daily Study Bible; Philadelphia, KY: Westminster John Knox 1975).

Barnes, A., *Barnes' Notes on the New Testament*, 8 ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel 1962).

Barrett, C.K., *Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* London: SPCK 1947).

Bauer, D.R., *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 31; Sheffield: Almond Press 1988).

Bauer, W., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3 ed. (ed. F.W. Danker) (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press 2000).

Beaton, R., "Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew's Use of Isaiah 42:1–4?," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22/75 (2000) 5–23.

Berkouwer, G.C., *Sin* (Studies in Dogmatics; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1971).

Blass, F. – Debrunner, A., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and revision R.W. Funk) (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press 1961).

Blenkinsopp, J., *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 19; New York: Doubleday 2000).

Bock, D.L., *Luke 9:51–24:53* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 1996).

Broadus, J.A., *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (An American Commentary on the New Testament; Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society 1886).

Brown, R.E., *The Epistles of John* (Anchor Bible 30; Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1982).

Bruce, F.F., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, revised ed. (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1990).

Callaham, S.N., "Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit: Rejecting the Sign of the Covenant," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 45/1 (2023) 37–58.

Cameron, R., *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1984).

Catchpole, D.R., *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: Clark 1993).

Childs, B.S., *Isaiah: A Commentary* (Old Testament Library; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2001).

Cogan, M., *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 10; New York: Doubleday 2001) 482–494.

Collins, A. Yarbro, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2007).

Combs, W.W., "The Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9/1 (2004) 57–96.

Davies, W.D. – Allison, D.C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (International Critical Commentary; London – New York: Clark 2004) II.

DeConick, A.D., *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth* (The Library of New Testament Studies 286; London: Clark 2006).

DeConick, A.D., *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel* (The Library of New Testament Studies 287; London: Clark 2007).

deSilva, D.A., "Hebrews 6:4–8: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation," *Tyndale Bulletin* 50/1 (1999) 44–47.

Dozeman, T.B., *Exodus* (Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2017).

Dunn, J.D.G., *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM 1975).

Ellingworth, P., *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1993).

Fitzmyer, J.A., *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Anchor Bible 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1985).

France, R.T., *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2002).

France, R.T., *The Gospel of Matthew* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2007).

Funk, R.W. – Hoover, R.W. – Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York: Scribner 1993).

Godet, F., *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, 3 ed. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1890).

Green, J.B., *The Gospel of Luke* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1997).

Grudem, W., "Perseverance of the Saints: A Case Study from Hebrews 6:4–6 and the Other Warning Passages in Hebrews," *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will: Historical and Theological Perspectives on Calvinism* (eds. T.R. Schreiner – B.A. Ware) (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1995) 133–182.

Guelich, R.A., *Mark 1–8:26* (Word Biblical Commentary 34A; Waco, TX: Word Books 1989).

Habets, M., "Jesus, the Spirit, and the Unforgivable Sin: A Contribution from Spirit Christology," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 12/1 (2018) 39–57.

Hägerland, T., *Jesus and the Forgiveness of Sins: An Aspect of His Prophetic Mission* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series; New York: Cambridge University Press 2011).

Hagner, D.A., *Matthew 1–13* (Word Biblical Commentary 33A; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1993).

Hendriksen, W., *Exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew* (New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1973).

Higgins, A.J.B., *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 39; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1980).

Hobbs, H.H., *An Exposition of the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1965).

Hogue, W.T., *The Holy Spirit: A Study* (Chicago, IL: Rose 1916).

Horsley, R.A. –Draper, J.A., *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International 1999).

Hultgren, A.J., *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1994).

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, https://www.internationalstandardbible.com/B/blasphemy.html [access: 28.04.2025].

Ioannes Chrysostomus, *In Matthaeum homiliae* I–XC (ed. F. Field) (Patrologia Graeca 57–58; Paris: Migne 1862).

Irénée de Lyon, *Contre les hérésies*, Livre III, Édition critique. Texte et traduction par F. Sagnard (Sources Chrétiennes 34) (Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1974).

Jacobson, A.D., *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge 1992).

Jan Chryzostom, *Homilie na Ewangelię według św. Mateusza. Część II: Homilie 41–90* (trans. A. Baron) (Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 23; Kraków: WAM 2001).

Jobes, K.H., *1, 2, and 3 John* (Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2014).

Johansson, D., "'Who Can Forgive Sins but God Alone?' Human and Angelic Agents, and Divine Forgiveness in Early Judaism," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33/4 (2011) 351–374.

Jordan, R., "The Significance of Mark 3:20–End for Understanding the Message of Mark's Gospel," *The Expository Times* 124/5 (2013) 225–230.

Katechizm Kościoła Katolickiego, 2 ed. (Poznań: Pallotinum 2002).

Keener, C.S., *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1999).

Kingsbury, J.D., *Matthew as Story*, 2 ed. (Philadelphia, MA: Fortress 1988).

Kloppenborg, J.S., *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2000).

Koester, C.R., *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 36; New York: Doubleday 2001).

Koester, H., *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International 1990)

Kohler, K. – Amram, D.W., "Blasphemy," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/3354-blasphemy [access: 21.02.2025].

Kręcidło, J., *Honor i wstyd w interpretacji Ewangelii. Szkice z egzegezy antropologicznokulturowej* (Lingua Sacra. Monografie 1; Warszawa: Verbinum 2013).

Kręcidło, J., "Jezus Syn Człowieczy w ogniu współczesnej debaty egzegetycznej," *Jezus Chrystus Syn Boży i Syn Człowieczy* (ed. J. Kręcidło) (Studia Salettensia 6; Kraków: Wydawnictwo La Salette Księży Misjonarzy Saletynów 2015) 45–60.

Kręcidło, J., "Koncepcja honoru rodziny w Ewangelii wg św. Marka," *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 166/1 (2016) 12–26.

Kruse, C.G., *The Letters of John* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2000).

Lambdin, T.O., "Introduction to the Gospel of Thomas," *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7 together with XIII, 2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P. OXY. 1, 654, 655*. I. *Gospel according to Thomas, Gospel according to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, Indexes* (ed. B. Layton) (Nag Hammadi Studies 20; Leiden: Brill 1989) 53–94.

Lane, W.L., *Hebrews 1–8* (Word Biblical Commentary 47A; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1991).

Layton, B., *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1987).

Levy, L.W., *Treason against God: A History of the Offense of Blasphemy* (New York: Schocken Books 1981).

Linssen, M., *The True Words of Thomas (Interactive Coptic-English Translation)* (Version 1.9.5), https://www.academia.edu/42110001/The_true_words_of_Thomas_Interactive_Coptic_English_gospel_of_Thomas_ [access: 12.02.2025].

Luz, U., *Matthew 8–20* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2001).

Luz, U., "The Unforgivable Sin: Matthew 12:31–32 and Its Theological Implications," *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005) 141–158.

Mack, B.L., *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (San Francisco, CA: Harper 1993).

Malina, A., *Ewangelia według Świętego Marka, rozdziały 1,1 – 8,26* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Nowy Testament 2.1; Częstochowa: Edycja św. Pawła 2013).

Malina, B.J., *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3 ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2001).

Marcus, J., *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Yale Bible 27; New Haven, CT – London: Yale University Press 2002.

Marshall, I.H., *The Epistles of John* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1978).

Marshall, I.H., *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1978).

McNeile, A.H., *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices* (London: Macmillan 1915; reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1980).

Meier, J.P., *Matthew* (New Testament Message 3; Wilmington, DE: Glazier 1980).

Meyer, M.W., *The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus* (San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco 1992).

Moulton, J.H. – Turner, N., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. III. *Syntax* (Edinburgh: Clark 1963).

Müller, J., *Christian Doctrine of Sin* (trans. W. Urwick) (Edinburgh: Clark 1885).

Nestle, E.E. – Aland, B.K., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28 ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2012).

Neyrey, J.H., "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42,1–4 in Matthew 12," *Biblica* 63/4 (1982) 457–473.

Nolland, J., *Luke 9:21–18:34* (Word Biblical Commentary 35B; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1993).

Nolland, J., *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005).

Olyan, S.M., "The Sin of Blasphemy in Ancient Israel: Boundaries of the Sacred," *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2000) 85–102.

Origène, *Commentaire sur l'Évangile selon Jean* 2.6 (45–50) (ed. Cécile Blanc) (Sources Chrétiennes 120; Paris: Cerf 1966) I.

Paciorek, A., *Ewangelia według św. Mateusza, rozdziały 1–13* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Nowy Testament 1.1; Częstochowa: Edycja św. Pawła 2005).

Pagels, E., *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Random House 1979).

Palmer, E.H., *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit: The Traditional Calvinistic Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1974).

Patterson, S.J., *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press 1993).

Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 3 ed. (Grottaferrata: Collegium S. Bonaventurae 1971–1981) I–II.Pieper, F., *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia 1950).

Powell, M.A., *What Are They Saying about Luke?* (New York: Paulist Press 1989).

Ress, T., "Blasphemy," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (ed. J. Orr) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1939) I, 486.

Rhoads, D. – Dewey, J. – Michie, D., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, 3 ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2012).

Robinson, J.M. –Hoffmann, P. –Kloppenborg, J.S., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas* (Minneapolis, MN – Leuven: Fortress – Peeters 2000).

Sanders, J.O., *The Holy Spirit of Promise: The Mission and Ministry of the Comforter* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott 1940).

Schreiner, T.R., *Commentary on Hebrews* (Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation; Nashville, TN: B&H 2015).

Scroggs, R., "The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84/4 (1965) 359–373.

Shively, E.E., *Apocalyptic Imagination in the Gospel of Mark: The Literary and Theological Role of Mark 3:22–30* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 189; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2012).

Sklar, J., "Exodus," https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/commentary/exodus/ [access: 30.04.2025].

Smalley, S.S., *1, 2, 3 John* (Word Biblical Commentary 51; Waco, TX: Word Books 1984).

Smeaton, G., *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Edinburgh: Clark 1882; reprint Edinburgh: Bunner of Truth Trust 2016).

Strugnell, J., "'Amen, I Say Unto You' in the Sayings of Jesus and in Early Christian Literature," *Harvard Theological Review* 67/2 (1974) 177–182.

Sweeney, M.A., *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (Old Testament Library; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2007).

Sweetnam, M., *The Dispensations: God's Plan for the Ages* (Lisburn: Scripture Teaching Library 2013).

Swete, H.B., *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan 1910; reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1964).

Tannehill, R.C., *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. I. *The Gospel according to Luke* (Foundations and Facets: New Testament; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1986).

Tasker, R.V.G., *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1962).

Thayer, J.H., *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2023), https://biblehub.com/greek/988.htm [access: 29.04.2025].

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* (Editio Leonina. Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita) (Romae 1888–1906) VI–XII.

Thompson, E.T., *The Gospel according to Mark and Its Meaning for Today* (Richmond, VA: John Knox 1954).

Tomasz z Akwinu, *Suma teologiczna*. XV. *Wiara i nadzieja, 2–2, qu. 1–22* (trans. and notes P. Bełch) (London: Katolicki Ośrodek Wydawniczy "Veritas" 1966).

Tronina, A., *Księga Kapłańska. Wstęp, przekład, miejsca paralelne i komentarz* (Biblia Lubelska; Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL 2021).

Tuckett, C.M., *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: Clark 1996).

Turek, W., "Grzech przeciw Duchowi Świętemu: Mt 12,31–32 w Listach do Serapiona św. Atanazego Wielkiego," *Studia Płockie* 26 (1998) 67–74.

Valantasis, R., *The Gospel of Thomas* (New Testament Readings; London: Routledge 1997).

Wallace, D.B., *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 1996).

Walvoord, J.F., *Matthew: Thy Kingdom Come* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press 1974).

Wesley, J., *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, 12 ed. (New York: Carlton and Porter 1856).

Wilson, R. McL., *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* (London: Mowbray 1960).

Yarbrough, R.W., *1–3 John* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2008).

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 115–140

John's Farewell Discourse under the Shadow of Mark

William Bowes
Northpoint Bible College, Haverhill, MA
wbowes@northpoint.edu
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7676-8978

ABSTRACT: The lengthy discourses of John's Gospel are a feature of the Evangelist's writing which has contributed to the idea that he wrote independently of other Gospels. The absence of such discourses in the Synoptics might suggest that John's discourses are idiosyncratic vehicles for theologizing, wherein Jesus' speech mirrors Johannine idiom. In this article, I re-examine Jesus' farewell discourse in John 13–17 in light of the view that John is dependent on Mark's Gospel. Although John 13–17 is not often considered a connection between these Gospels, I argue that John built this material from Mark 12–14, seeking to improve and expand Mark in a competitive literary marketplace and to persuade his readers to view Jesus and themselves in a particularly Johannine way. John's compositional practices in his farewell discourse material will be compared with two Jewish texts (Chronicles and *Jubilees*) which reinterpret earlier source material to create farewell discourses.

KEYWORDS: John's Gospel, compositional practices, rewriting, *Jubilees*, Chronicles, Mark's Gospel, Second Temple Judaism

For decades now, John's Gospel has been categorised as a 'genre-bending' text.[1] That is, John[2] borrows from varying but recognisable literary conventions, combining and tweaking them in order to create his kaleidoscopic portrayal of Jesus – a portrayal often recognised for its peculiarity and difference when compared with earlier Gospel texts like Mark.[3] John 13–17 is an example of Johannine difference, since this portion of his Gospel provides readers with lengthy speeches from Jesus not found elsewhere. While peculiar, John 13–17 also represents an example of John's manipulation of recognisable generic

1 H.W. Attridge, "Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 121/1 (2002) 3–21; K.B. Larsen (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic* (SANt 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2015).

2 I refer to the Fourth Evangelist as 'John' without further assumptions about the precise identity of the author, except that he was a Jewish Christian writing at the end of the first century. There are ambiguities that arise when considering whether multiple authors are involved or what to make of the designation 'beloved disciple', and these issues need not be rehashed here. See A. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John* (BNTC 4; London – New York: Continuum 2006) 17–26.

3 Here I follow the widely supported date ranges for Mark and John. John is usually dated 90–110 (see S. Porter, "The Date of John's Gospel and Its Origins," *The Origins of John's Gospel* [eds. S.E. Porter – H.T. Ong] [JS 2; Leiden: Brill, 2015] 11–29). Mark is usually dated 66–75 (see E.-M. Becker, "Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature," *Mark and Matthew*. I. *Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings* [eds. E.-M. Becker – A. Runesson] [WUNT 271; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011] 123–143).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.18813 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

forms, since he couches these sayings of Jesus in the form of a 'farewell discourse'. Much has been written about this literary convention,[4] but it suffices to say that, by John's time, this was a common vehicle for writers to communicate important teaching from a notable person.[5] In Jewish texts, this often takes the form of a major figure's final exhortations to his children or to the nation of Israel just before his death (e.g., Jacob in Gen 49). Though the form and content of such discourses vary, they typically feature the speaker reflecting on his life and discussing how he accomplished his purpose, calling listeners to remembrance of God's commands or the speaker's teachings (and sometimes giving new commands), naming some sort of successor(s), and calling his listeners to faithfulness.[6] Since readers would consider a major figure's final words to have utmost importance, the authors of these discourses could use this literary form as a way to shape reader interpretation and to speak to a later context. For John, Jesus' farewell discourse represents his disciples' final encounter with him prior to his death, and therefore, it represents an opportunity to convey essential information to readers.

Jesus' final speeches are in the context of Passover, in the context of his last evening with his disciples. Initially, Jesus is at a meal with his disciples, and in keeping with the Johannine emphasis on Jesus being in total control of himself and having all knowledge, the narrator indicates that Jesus was aware of his imminent death (13:1). After washing his disciples' feet as an example of how they should serve each other, Jesus predicts his betrayal (13:21, 26). After Judas departs, Jesus gives a 'new' command to his disciples to love one another (13:34), just before predicting Peter's threefold denial (13:38). Jesus then speaks of the nature of his departure (14:1–4), corrects his disciples' misunderstandings of his death and his identity (14:5–14), and then describes his 'successor', who is the Spirit (14:15–31). This is followed by exhortations for his disciples to remain 'in' Jesus and faithful to his teaching (15:1–17), with predictions of opposition (15:18–25) and another promise of a successor (15:26–27). Jesus then gives a rationale for heeding his words: that the disciples

4 F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1991); E. Bammel, "The Farewell Discourse of the Evangelist John and its Jewish Heritage," *TynBul* 44/1 (1993) 103–116; M. Winter, *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Väter: Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Vermächtnisrede im Blick auf Joh. 13–17* (FRLANT 161; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1994); C. Dietzfelbinger, *Der Abschied des Kommenden: Eine Auslegung der johanneischen Abschiedsreden* (WUNT 1/95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1996) 1–14; J.C. Stube, *A Graeco-Roman Reading of the Farewell Discourse* (LNTS 309; London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2006); R. Sheridan, "John's Gospel and Modern Genre Theory: The Farewell Discourse (John 13–17) as a Test Case," *ITQ* 75/3 (2010) 287–299.

5 As A. Kolenkow puts it, 'Death was believed to be a time when God granted prophetic knowledge and visions of the other world to the righteous. Testaments were viewed as authoritative because no person would be expected to tell an untruth at the hour of death/judgment' (from "Testaments," *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* [eds. R.E. Kraft – G.W.E. Nickelsburg] [Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1986] 259).

6 Interpreters agree that the presence of these elements is a fundamental feature of the generic form; cf. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 384; D.M. Reis, "Jesus' Farewell Discourse, 'Otherness,' and the Construction of a Johannine Identity," *SR* 32/1–2 (2003) 39–58; C.S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2005) II, 896–897.

would not fall away when they are opposed (16:1–6).[7] After once more promising his successor (16:7–15), he speaks about his disciples' imminent difficulties, clarifies their misunderstandings, and provides encouragement (16:16–33). Finally, a lengthy prayer is included where Jesus states his accomplishments (17:1–14), asks for the disciples' protection (17:15–19), and for the blessing of future believers (17:20–24). Jesus concludes by praying about accomplishing his revelatory mission (17:25–26). Although debate continues about the development or redaction of individual sections within John 13–17, these chapters are unified around (1) Jesus' departure, (2) his command to love (of which he provides the example), (3) the provision of the Spirit, and (4) exhortations to his disciples to continue his work.[8]

Despite the many ways that John 13–17 does conform to the generic framework of ancient farewell discourses, it is also different in important respects. For example, Jesus is presented differently than other figures in the way that he returns to where he once was, and Jesus' experiences before death are not suffering but glorification, and finally, unlike other similar ancient examples, Jesus does not use the 'blessing' formula of a figure like Moses in Deut 33, but commissions his disciples to be sent as he was sent (John 17:18).[9] Beyond this, Jesus does not join his ancestors, but returns to his Father. In such ways, John stretches expectations for the use or performance of genres, even while he appeals to recognisable forms, and thus proves that his 'genre bending' classification is apt. Of course, the biggest difference of all between John's farewell discourse and other similar examples is that Jesus rises after dying, which is perhaps the ultimate form of genre-bending.[10] Jesus' death is reinterpreted as his true glorification; what was shameful becomes the culmination of Jesus' loving obedience of the Father and the means by which God displays and secures Jesus' identity as his Son.[11]

John does more than bend genres, however. In what follows, I suggest that John also 'bends' his source material by his reuse, reinterpretation, and reimagining of it. Subsequently, I propose a different way to read John's farewell discourse material, based on the view that John knows Mark's Gospel and uses it as his primary source. The idea that John is dependent on (at least) Mark has had a resurgence in recent years, which is remarkable

7 John 16:2 is a clear point of evidence that the narrator was structuring this discourse to speak to the needs of his context, given the mention of the disciples being put out of the synagogue. As with other farewell discourses, these statements serve as the narrator's opportunity to shape the tradition to serve his readers. I will return to this point below.

8 See T. Engberg-Pedersen, *John and Philosophy: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2017) 255–284. Here I will not analyse redactional layers within John 13–17, though I recognise that unusual characteristics in the text may suggest that John 15–17 is secondary to John 13–14. Even so, theories about how Markan/synoptic material may have been incorporated into later Johannine redactions strike me as excessively complicated, and, as Engberg-Pedersen argues in the work cited above, John 13–17 is sufficiently unified as it stands. If John 15–17 was secondary, it would have been added only a very short time after John 13–14, and thus my arguments throughout this paper are generally unaffected by this possibility.

9 See M. Coloe, "John 17:1–26: The Missionary Prayer of Jesus," *ABR* 66 (2018) 3.

10 Sheridan, "John's Gospel and Modern Genre Theory," 287–299.

11 Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 399.

given the dominance of independence-oriented readings of John throughout much of the twentieth century.[12] While John's dependence on Mark does not currently represent a consensus position, I follow the growing dependence-oriented view here and seek to contribute to its advancement by highlighting how John may have engaged with Mark in a part of his Gospel which is not often considered in dependence-oriented arguments – the lengthy discourse(s) of John 13–17. After providing an overview of John's relation to Mark and why dependence is plausible, I will rationalise my reading of John's farewell discourse as a rewritten text by examining two examples of Second Temple-era Jewish texts (Chronicles and *Jubilees*) which rewrite source material in a creative way, demonstrating a broad spectrum of similarity and difference from their sources. Specifically, I will examine how these texts rewrite the last words of major figures, noting how each creates expansive farewell discourses out of sparse source material to show how such examples could be analogues to John's source use. Finally, I will analyse the transformation of Mark 12–14 in John 13–17 and will suggest several possible motivations for John's compositional practices.

1. The Relationship Between John's Gospel and Mark's Gospel

Given that there is a consensus that Mark was the first written Gospel text,[13] it is at least possible that John's Gospel is dependent on Mark. But the fact that this is possible does not necessarily mean that it is plausible or likely. Other factors must be taken into consideration to build such a case. Whether a later text uses an earlier text as a source should be assessed as a function of various internal and external criteria. Internal criteria are textual elements, such as alignments in order, structure, wording, and narrative features, all of which can exist in degrees from minor connections to major agreements. A major agreement between two texts might be the presence of distinctive details which are difficult to explain otherwise. External factors are contextual elements, such as the date for each text, the accessibility of the earlier text, and the literary environment or culture (i.e., the extent to which similar source use was observable in other texts around the same time).

---

12 See H.W. Attridge, "John and other Gospels," *The Oxford Handbook of Johannine Studies* (eds. J. Lieu – M.C. de Boer) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2018) 44–62; E.-M. Becker – H.K. Bond – C.H. Williams (eds.), *John's Transformation of Mark* (London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2021); W. Bowes, "The Relationship between John and the Synoptic Gospels Revisited," *JETS* 66/1 (2024) 113–132; J. Barker, *Writing and Rewriting the Gospels: John and the Synoptics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2025); M. Goodacre, *The Fourth Synoptic Gospel: John's Knowledge of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2025). Classic examples of the independence perspective include C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1968); D. Moody Smith, *John among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth-Century Research* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1992).

13 See P. Foster, "The Rise of the Markan Priority Hypothesis and Early Responses and Challenges to It," *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem* (eds. J.S. Kloppenborg – J. Verheyden) (LNTS 618; London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2020) 89–113.

In terms of internal criteria, John has general sense of alignment in structure and order with Mark (e.g., both begin with John the Baptist, both have similarly placed feeding-crossing narratives). An example of a major agreement is the parallel Bethany anointing narratives, which have unusual verbatim connections unlikely to have emerged by coincidence (e.g., John 12:3 and Mark 14:3). In terms of external criteria, typical dates given for these texts would allow for a distance of a few decades, and the reception and transformation of Mark by both Matthew and Luke means that Mark was widely circulated in a short amount of time, which implies its accessibility. Additionally, the many other texts from the Second Temple era which reuse and rewrite earlier texts, interpreting them and extending their voice into more developed, autonomous narratives (e.g., the 'Rewritten Scripture' texts) provide points of comparison from John's wider Jewish literary milieu which suggest that his reuse of Mark's Gospel would not be considered unusual.[14]

Often, independence-oriented interpreters have alleged that John's similarities with Mark could be explained through divergent streams of oral tradition.[15] The ancient world of the first century was certainly a mixed-media environment, where oral tradition played an important role alongside written texts, but the problem with an appeal to oral tradition is that oral tradition is so malleable that such appeals are ultimately unfalsifiable, since we have no access to it. It must be acknowledged that a text exhibiting wide-ranging similarity and difference with theorised source material cannot be presumed independent from that source material purely on the basis of inconsistent degrees of similarity, since there are many examples of texts with major differences from undisputed sources (e.g., Philo's *De Vita Mosis* in its reuse of Exodus–Numbers, or *4 Macc* in its reuse of 2 Macc). Moreover, it is precarious to compare John's possible reuse of Mark with the reuse of Mark found in Matthew and Luke, since the frequent copying utilised by these texts has actually been shown to be quite anomalous in their literary context.[16] Given how other ancient Jewish texts use earlier source material, it seems more likely that John knew and used Mark, transforming its content for a later audience with different concerns.

At this point, it must also be acknowledged that whether John reuses Mark's Gospel is a different question than whether he reuses all three Synoptics, and here I focus only on Mark. His knowledge of both Matthew and Luke is possible, but the difficulties that arise with this possibility are sometimes understated by those who hold that view. Connections between John and Matthew are sometimes intriguing, but the texts have so little alignment (in structure/order, linguistic parallels, and theological emphases) that a proposed relationship between them seems to create more questions than answers. In Luke's case, there are a few plausible examples of connection, but there is also the problem of how Luke should

14 See C. Williams, "John's 'Rewriting' of Mark: Insights from Ancient Jewish Analogues," *John's Transformation of Mark* (eds. E.-M. Becker – H.K. Bond – C.H. Williams) (London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2021) 51–66.

15 E.g., J. Dunn, "John and the Oral Gospel Tradition," *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. Wansborough) (JSNTSup 64; London: Clark 1991) 351–379.

16 See S. Mattila, "A Question Too Often Neglected," *NTS* 41/2 (1995) 199–217.

be dated; it is at least possible that Luke's Gospel is a second century text, contemporaneous with or even later than John's Gospel. Thus, there is less plausibility to the idea that John does meaningfully engage with Luke, even if we allow for the possibility that there were multiple 'editions' of John's Gospel.[17] Such concerns cannot rule out John's familiarity with these Gospels, but if John knows any other Gospels at all, it is just more likely that he knows Mark.

With these considerations in mind, the case for a direct literary relationship between John and Mark is plausible. However, it is not enough to assume that John's farewell discourse material must derive from Mark solely on this basis, since John's access to Mark need not mean that he had access only to Mark. That is, John's differences from Mark with respect to John 13–17 are significant, and such difference merits further explanation; if John 13–17 is indebted to Mark, why did John rewrite Mark in the way that he did? One way to approach this question is to highlight other ancient literary examples of texts which rewrite earlier source material in a similar way, with a comparable spectrum of similarity and difference. Consequently, in what follows I want to focus on how John's farewell discourse can be compared to other examples of farewell discourses in rewritten Jewish literature, namely the discourse of David in 1 Chr 28–29 (which rewrites 1 Kgs 2:1–12) and the discourse of Abraham in *Jub.* 20:1–23:8 (which rewrites Gen 25:1–11).[18] Afterwards, I will discuss how these findings can inform our understanding of the purpose and function of John's Gospel *vis-à-vis* Mark's Gospel.

2. David's Farewell Discourse from 1 Kgs 2:1–12 to 1 Chr 28–29

1 Kgs begins with an aged David needing to negotiate Adonijah's claim to the throne, followed by his own proclamation of his son Solomon as king.[19] In 1 Kgs 2:1–12, David gives a final speech to Solomon, acknowledging his imminent death and calling Solomon to courage and faithfulness. David then asks Solomon to deal harshly with his enemies and kindly with his friends and finally provides instructions about one particular enemy (Shimei) before he dies and is buried. Despite David's importance in Israel's history, this episode is an example of David's mixed portrayal throughout Samuel–Kings. While the text exhibits a concern for the establishment of a clear succession and a sense that David's accomplishments continued, David is also portrayed as a feeble man who is concerned as much with vengeance as he is about Solomon's preparation (2 Kgs 1:5–6, 8–9).

17 See the discussion in M.C. de Boer, *John 1–6* (ICC; London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2024) 99–153.

18 There are other Jewish texts which include farewell discourses (and discourses which sometimes end in final prayers), such as Josephus' *Antiquities* or the *Testament of Naphtali*. I highlight these examples for the sake of space, and because they represent particularly expansive farewell discourses crafted by Jewish writers whose texts have an undisputed relationship of dependence with earlier sources.

19 For background information on 1 Kgs, see L.M. Wray Beal, *1 & 2 Kings* (ApOTC; Downers Grove, IL: IVP – Apollos 2014) 21–60.

Writing at some point in the Persian era, the Chronicler augmented and transformed this earlier account.[20] The secondary transformations in 1–2 Chr are clear enough that it has long been categorised as one of the earliest members of the corpus of texts called 'Rewritten Scripture'. These Second Temple-era texts were written in a period of textual fluidity, after some authoritative texts existed but before any concept of a fixed canon.[21] Texts within this group (such as Temple Scroll and *Genesis Apocryphon*) display similar features of broad textual reuse and transformation of at least one antecedent source, utilising techniques like addition, omission, rearrangement, and paraphrase in order to produce an entirely new, independent composition.[22] Within such writings, an author's purpose for reusing earlier texts is not always clear, but most assume exegetical motivations.[23] That is, one or more source texts are rewritten to interpret them in light of the needs of readers in a different context.[24] In the 'Rewritten Scripture' texts, exegetical changes can range from relatively minor to highly creative, with the writer intending to extend the authoritative message of an earlier text, to participate in its discourse, and to limit misinterpretation. These texts are worth highlighting here, not in order to argue that John's Gospel belongs to this corpus, but to show that such texts existed in the Second Temple era and their existence attests to certain practices and techniques of transforming earlier written tradition which were not unprecedented by John's time.

In his exegetical changes, the Chronicler improved the portrait of David that he inherited and re-interpreted it for his later context. In this case, the Chronicler begins by narrating the end of David's life in 1 Chr 28 by describing David summoning the heads of Israel to assemble at Jerusalem. He discusses his desire to build a temple, but relays that YHWH did not allow him to do so, saying that YHWH chose David's family to lead the nation and had specifically chosen his son Solomon. In a speech likely influenced by Deuteronomic

---

20 For background information on Chronicles, see R. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2006) 1–50.

21 The literature on Rewritten Scripture is immense, but see principally S.W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2008); J. Zsengellér (ed.), *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (JSJSup 166; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2014); M. Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2020). For discussions of textual fluidity in a pre-canonical era, see T.H. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (AYBRL; London – New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2013); E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VTSup 169; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2015); E. Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2016).

22 See A.K. Petersen, "The Riverrun of Rewriting Scripture: From Textual Cannibalism to Scriptural Completion," *JSJ* 43/4–5 (2012) 475–496, esp. 486 (reprint *CBÅ* 16 [2012] 7–19).

23 In Crawford's words, these texts rewrite 'for the purpose of exegesis' (*Rewriting Scripture*, 13).

24 In M. Zahn's words, these texts function 'interpretively to renew (update, correct) specific earlier traditions by recasting a substantial portion of those traditions in the context of a new work that locates itself in the same discourse as the scriptural work it rewrites … (they) provide a version of past tradition that better reflects the concerns and ideology of their community' (*Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* [STDJ 95; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2011] 286).

language,[25] David urges obedience to YHWH's commands and then specifically addresses Solomon. David urges Solomon to be faithful to YHWH, charges him to build the sanctuary, and gives Solomon the plans that the Spirit had put into David's mind. Solomon is enabled to understand this plan, and David assures Solomon that Israel will listen to him. In 1 Chr 29, David speaks again to the whole assembly, addressing Solomon's age and giving of his own wealth to the temple. The people then give of their own resources and David rejoices with the people. Then, the Chronicler includes a final prayer (1 Chr 29:10–19) and calls the assembly to praise God. The next day, sacrifices are made, Solomon is installed and exalted, and David's life is summarised and he dies (1 Chr 29:26–28). Similarities and differences between the two episodes are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. A comparison of David's final sayings in 1 Kgs and 1 Chr

1 Kgs 2:1–12	1 Chr 28–29
2:1: Introductory statements by narrator (David about to die, gives charge to Solomon)	28:1: Introductory statements by narrator (David summoned a large assembly)
	28:2–8: David's first speech to the assembly
	28:2–3: David explains his plans for the temple
	28:4–5: Solomon is chosen to rule
	28:6–7: Solomon must build the temple
	28:8: David charges the assembly to obey YHWH
2:2–9: David's speech to Solomon	28:9–21: David's speech to Solomon
2:2–4: Exhortations to strength, faithfulness	28:9: Exhortations to acknowledge, seek YHWH
	28:10: Exhortation to build the temple, strength
2:5–9: Instructions about certain parties	
2:5–6: Deal with Joab son of Zeruiah	
2:7: Show kindness to the sons of Barzillai	
2:8–9: Deal with Shimei son of Gera	
	28:11–19: David gives Solomon building plans
	28:20–21: Exhortation to strength, reminders
	29:1–9: David's second speech to the assembly
	29:1–5: David calls for communal consecration
	29:6–9: The people respond, all rejoiced
	29:10–20: David's final prayer
	29:10–13: Praises, affirmations of YHWH
	29:14–17: Statements about the people
	29:18–19: Statements about remaining faithful
	29:20: Collective call to praise
	29:21–25: People, YHWH acknowledge Solomon
2:10–12: Concluding statements by narrator	29:26–30: Concluding statements by narrator
2:10: David rested with his ancestors	
2:11: He reigned forty years	29:26–27: David was king, ruled forty years
2:13: Solomon sat on David's throne	29:28: Solomon succeeded him
	29:29–30: Reference to source materials

25 S. Ahn, *The Persuasive Portrayal of David and Solomon in Chronicles: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Speeches and Prayers in the David-Solomon Narrative* (MBS 3; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock 2018) 195.

I want to emphasise the various forms of rewriting utilised by the Chronicler. He retains the basic framework from 1 Kgs, but engages in extensive expansion and elaboration, incorporating additions, omissions, rearrangements, and paraphrase to create a more seamless narrative and an improved portrayal of David. As Ahn observes, although the relationship between 1–2 Chr and Sam–Kgs is not in doubt, David's final speeches in 1 Chr 28–29 'have no parallels in Samuel–Kings'.[26] These speeches are better understood as intentional rhetoric, directed toward the readers to address issues pertinent to their later context.

The Chronicler goes to great efforts to portray David as a priestly figure. David directs and organises the community's worship, and thereby, readers come to a different understanding of David's role and legacy.[27] This was certainly important for the Chronicler's audience, possibly dealing with a crisis in the Persian period, after their collective identity was challenged following the exile (and the disappearing of cultural identity markers like the monarchy and the temple).[28] The anchoring memory of David as a faithful, unifying figure–one who gave clear instructions for the future–becomes increasingly important. Minor alterations improve the perception of David's piety (e.g., an exhortation to strength in 1 Kgs 2:2 becomes a call to seek YHWH in 1 Chr 28:9). 1 Chr 29 also includes a lengthy final prayer from David, not included in the source material. In this prayer, David puts his donations towards the temple in theological perspective and prays for the realisation of the temple's construction. The commands to Solomon about executing vengeance are absent, and the transition to Solomon's enthronement is peaceful, seamless, and divinely guided.[29] That is, the prayer serves to emphasise that the temple plans were given by YHWH, and that YHWH elected Solomon for this task.[30] David's moral character is moved to the background, and his liturgical role is brought to the forefront. These changes were part of the Chronicler's narrative and rhetorical goals, as he was keenly interested in legitimising a certain understanding of both the temple and of David's role.[31] David is here a man who is given special, private revelation from God about his role in the establishment of the temple, and his final prayer is highly poetic, giving readers an image of the king as a psalmic figure.[32]

For the Chronicler, David's legacy was of utmost importance; his last days were not characterised by weakness and conflict, but by the effective establishment of his legacy as an effective governor and military leader, and as the founder of the temple. In these final days of his life, 'David visibly enters into competition with Moses: Like the latter in the Priestly tabernacle account, David receives from YHWH a blueprint [...] of the sanctuary to be

26 Ahn, *The Persuasive Portrayal*, 188.
27 K. Hoglund, "The Priest of Praise: The Chronicler's David," *RevExp* 99/2 (2002) 189–190.
28 Ahn, *The Persuasive Portrayal*, 2–3, 15.
29 J. Hutzli, "David in the Role of a Second Moses – The Revelation of the Temple-Model (tabnît) in 1 Chronicles 28," *Chronicles and the Priestly Literature of the Hebrew Bible* (eds. J. Jeon – L.C. Jonker) (BZAW 528; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2021) 322–336, esp. 330.
30 Ahn, *The Persuasive Portrayal*, 188.
31 S. Joo, "Past No Longer Present: Revision of David's Legacy in Chronicles," *SJOT* 26/2 (2012) 235–258.
32 Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 532.

built. Furthermore [...] David took the lead in donating to the temple.'[33] Here, the Chronicler was likely concerned with the reconstruction of his reading community; his rhetoric 'serves to reconstruct the community identity through the Jerusalem temple, revealing the continuity of the covenant relationship between YHWH and Israel.'[34] The Chronicler is also concerned with communicating to the audience that obedience to YHWH will assure possession of the land, the exile resulted from forsaking YHWH, and that readers prospering in their current situation will depend on seeking YHWH.[35]

The Chronicler's shaping of this discourse (with its broad spectrum of similarity and dissimilarity with his source) would have had import for his audience in a precarious and uncertain context, especially if they applied David's exhortations to faithfulness (that David prayed for them, that YHWH would keep their hearts faithful to him forever; 1 Chr 29:18) to their own situation. As I will show, in terms of correspondence, degree of change, and rhetorical aims, the Chronicler's rewriting practices are similar to what we find in John's farewell discourse material, from his reshaping of material for a later audience to his inclusion of a final prayer for a central figure who is being spotlighted. Thus, 1 Chr 28–29 could provide a helpful example of a similar type of rewriting, or the utilisation of similar types of literary strategies that may be at work in John's reworking of Mark.

3. The Last Words of Abraham from Gen 25:1–11 to *Jub.* 20:1–23:8

For the second text comparison we turn to the end of Abraham's life in Genesis, and its corresponding elaboration in Jubilees. In Gen 25, the narration of the end of Abraham's life is sparse. Readers are told that the patriarch gave gifts to his sons and left much of his wealth to Isaac, and that he lived 175 years, died, and was buried with Sarah. Abraham's last words are recorded in Gen 24, involving an oath he asks of his household servant to get a wife for Isaac, but no other information is provided before the narrative shifts toward Isaac and Jacob. Like David in Samuel–Kings, Genesis provides readers with a 'mixed' portrait of Abraham; the text illustrates a concern for continuity and succession with respect to the covenant promises made to Abraham about his future, but he fades from the literary scene in a rather abrupt fashion.

Likely written in the mid-second-century BCE, *Jubilees* creatively rewrites Gen 1–Exod 12 and, in its features and function, it similarly belongs to the corpus of texts called 'Rewritten Scripture'.[36] Like the Chronicler, the author of *Jubilees* augmented and transformed the rather undetailed account of Abraham's end and provides Abraham with a lengthy and

33 Hutzli, "David in the Role," 322.

34 Ahn, *The Persuasive Portrayal*, 2–3.

35 J. Wright, "The Founding Father: The Structure of the Chronicler's David Narrative," *JBL* 117/1 (1998) 55–57; Ahn, *The Persuasive Portrayal*, 193–5.

36 For the background of *Jubilees*, see J. VanderKam, *Jubilees: A Commentary in Two Volumes* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2018) 1–121.

detailed farewell discourse in *Jub.* 20:1–23:8 (which, like John 13–17, is actually a series of discourses).[37] In *Jub.* 20, Abraham calls his sons to righteousness, imploring them to observe circumcision and to avoid idolatry, and proceeds to give them gifts. In *Jub.* 21, Abraham speaks directly to Isaac, instructing him concerning idolatry, the manipulation of blood, and the proper way to offer sacrifices. In *Jub.* 22, Isaac and Ishmael visit Abraham in his final days. Isaac gives a sacrifice, and the sons and their father have a meal together. Finally, as with the Chronicler's David, Abraham is provided with a final prayer in *Jub.* 22:6–9. This is a prayer of thanksgiving, a prayer about the identity of YHWH, and a prayer for mercy and peace on Abraham's sons. In *Jub.* 22:10, Abraham calls Jacob and asks for God's blessing on him, and there is a series of sayings about Jacob's blessing (22:11–24). Jacob sleeps in Abraham's arms (22:25–26), and Abraham blesses him once more (22:27–30) on the last night before Jacob wakes to find that Abraham has died (*Jub.* 23:1–3). Similarities and differences are detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. A comparison of Abraham's final sayings in Genesis and in *Jubilees*

Gen 25:1–11	***Jub.* 20:1–23:8**
25:1–4: Abraham's descendants by Keturah listed	20:1: Abraham calls his sons, and sons by Keturah
	20:2–10: Abraham's first speech to his sons
	20:2–3: righteousness, circumcision commanded
	20:4: Punishments for sexual immorality
	20:5: Abraham recalls judgment of giants, Sodom
	20:6: Exhortations against uncleanness
	20:7–8: Prohibition of idolatry
	20:9–10: Call to worship God, blessing promised
25:5: Abraham leaves everything to Isaac	20:11b: He gives everything to Isaac
25:6: Abraham gives gifts to his other sons	20:11a: He gives gifts to other sons, sends them out
	20:12–13: Other sons go to the East, called Arabs
	21:1–26: Abraham's second speech to Isaac
	21:1–4: Abraham speaks of his own faithfulness
25:7: Abraham lived 175 years	21:2: 'I am 175 years old…'
	21:5–20: Exhortations about various laws
	21:21–25: Call to turn away from wickedness
	21:26: Isaac goes out rejoicing
	22:1–5: Isaac, Ishamel celebrate the Feast of Weeks
	22:6–9: Abraham blesses, thanks God
	22:10–15: Abraham prays for Jacob
	22:16–25: Abraham exhorts Jacob to faithfulness
	22:26: Jacob and Abraham sleep, rejoice
	22:27–30: Abraham prays for Jacob again
	23:1: Abraham blesses Jacob and died
25:8: Abraham died	23:2–6: His sons, Rebecca, find him and mourn
	23:7: Isaac and Ishmael buried him with Sarah
25:9–10: Isaac and Ishmael buried him with Sarah	
25:11: God blesses Isaac	

37 This is one of many striking similarities between John and Jubilees; see further B.E. Reynolds, "The Necessity of Form and Spatial Content for Defining 'Apocalypse' and 'Apocalyptic'," *JSP* 33/3 (2024) 187–197.

This portion of *Jubilees* represents what van Ruiten calls 'an enormous expansion in details that are not present in the story of Genesis.'[38] Compared with Gen 25:1–10, the version in *Jubilees* does have some similarities, but it is characterised mostly by extensive expansions. Some of these expansions improve Abraham's character, but also retroject features of Torah-obedience to Abraham and his sons, thus improving their portrayal and making them Law-observant prior to the giving of the Law. An interesting feature along these lines is the weight that the author gives to the command from Lev 19:18 to love one's neighbour, a command also found in Noah's farewell discourse earlier (*Jub.* 7:20–39).[39] Abraham begins first with an acknowledgement and awareness of his death, describes the present situation in which he gives his final speech(es), summarises the past, and points ahead to the future in order to instruct his sons in what they should do. Here, the author of *Jubilees* has his readers in mind; the point is not Abraham's death but the future life of his descendants. Abraham's final speeches are an opportunity to extend the authoritative voice of the patriarch and provide instruction to a later audience in a different context – probably a situation after Antiochus Epiphanes, where readers may have needed to reorient their collective identity.[40]

In the author's reworking of Abraham's last days, we see an example of both his later perspective and his rhetorical intention for his audience. For example, on his last day, Abraham celebrates the Festival of Weeks with Isaac and Ishmael (*Jub.* 22:1–9), although, as I just noted, from a literary perspective this festival was unknown prior to Moses. The notion of law-observant patriarchs is a window into the author's exegetical perspective, in that these additions fill gaps in his source material but also advance the view that the Torah did not begin with Moses but began with God, and thus it always existed and was always authoritative. Such additions make sense when they are viewed with their audience in mind. *Jubilees* extends the voice of the earlier material, building a fuller picture of Abraham where the source material was sparse. For the audience to view Abraham as continuing in righteousness to the end, teaching his sons to be righteous, and insisting that they refrain from idolatry (*Jub.* 20:2–10), the audience (viewing themselves as Abraham's descendants) can further understand the importance of these exhortations for their own sense of identity. As with the Chronicler, we see an authorial effort to impart a sense of secure identity in a different (possible precarious) context.

Finally, as with David in Chronicles (and Jesus in John 17), in *Jubilees*, Abraham is given a lengthy final prayer. The prayer calls for blessing on Abraham's children and emphasises the author's view about Israel as a chosen people, different than other nations (*Jub.* 22:10). Here, we see a similar series of rewriting practices as we find in Chronicles; *Jubilees* utilises additions, omissions, rearrangement, and paraphrase to create a more seamless narrative

38 J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8* (JSJSup 161; Leiden: Brill 2012) 253.

39 Aside from being an example of Abraham's proleptic Torah obedience, it also is yet another similarity with John's Gospel, since this command is found in John 13:34.

40 On *Jubilees*' situation, see J.C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington, DC: CBA 1987) 18–50.

with different aims, extending the voice of an authoritative figure to a later time, while exhibiting a wide range of similarity and dissimilarity with the source. As we return to John's Gospel, such examples provide a basis for understanding how other Jewish texts rewrote and transformed antecedent source material with a broad spectrum of similarity and difference, and why they may have done so. I suggest that, while John is not precisely the same type of text as 1 Chronicles or *Jubilees*, he is doing something similar to these texts in terms of his engagement with Mark's Gospel as his source material. This suggestion prepares us for a more detailed analysis of his farewell discourse material.

4. The Last Words of Jesus from Mark 12–14 to John 13–17

Mark 12–14 has Jesus in Jerusalem as conflicts with the religious authorities continue toward the crucifixion. This section of Mark's Gospel begins after the climactic temple disturbance (which John has rearranged to an earlier place as a framing device; John 2:13–22), where Jesus speaks against the religious authorities and subsequently is caught in several controversies. Mark 13 records a final discourse from Jesus about the future, a discourse which likely reflects Mark's close proximity to the events of the Jewish-Roman War. In Mark 14, Jesus is anointed, prior to the Last Supper with his disciples (Mark 14:1–26). After going to the Mount of Olives, Jesus predicts Peter's denial and prays in Gethsemane prior to his arrest (Mark 14:27–42). John 13–17 (summarised in the introductory section) has Jesus' final discourse set entirely in the context of his final meal with his disciples, just before his arrest. In keeping with the two prior examples, similarities and differences are illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3. A comparison of Jesus' final sayings in Mark and in John

Mark 12:1–14:42	John 13–17
12:1–12: Parable of the vineyard tenants	(15:1–8: Saying about vines and branches)
12:13–27: Controversies over taxes and marriage	
12:28–37: Controversies over law and Messiah	
12:31: Command: Love your neighbour as yourself	(13:34: 'New' commandment: love one another)
12:38–44: Sayings about teachers, offering	
13:1: Jesus' disciples comment on the temple	
13:2: Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple	
13:3–4: Four disciples ask Jesus about the end, signs	
13:5–37: Eschatological speech	
13:5–8: Deception, false Christs, wars, disasters	(16:21–22: Saying about anguish of birth pains)
13:8b: '[...] beginning of birth pains'	
13:9–11: You will be witnesses, flogged, arrested	
13:12: There will be betrayal, rebellion	(15:18–21: Sayings about the world hating disciples)
13:13: All will hate you, stand firm	
13:14–17: Sayings about fleeing, abomination	
13:18–20: Sayings about distress, time	
13:21–25: Warnings about false Christs, distress	

Mark 12:1–14:42	John 13–17
13:26–27: The return of the Son of Man	
13:28–31: Sayings about fig tree, imminence	
13:32–37: Exhortations to be on guard, watch	(16:1: 'so that you will not fall away')
14:1–9: Jesus anointed at Bethany	(12:1–8: Jesus anointed at Bethany)
14:10–11: Judas goes to priests to betray Jesus	
14:12–16: Jesus sends disciples to prepare Passover	13:1: Just before the Passover Festival
	13:2–17: Jesus washes disciples' feet
14:17–21: At table, Jesus warns about betrayal	13:18–26: At table, Jesus warns about betrayal
	13:27–30: Satan enters Judas, he goes out
	13:31–35: Sayings about departure, love
14:22–26: Saying about bread, cup, covenant	
14:27–28: Jesus predicts disciples' abandonment	(16:32: Jesus predicts disciples' abandonment)
14:29–31: Jesus predicts Peter's denial	13:36–38: Jesus predicts Peter's denial
	14:1–4: Jesus comforts, exhorts disciples
	14:5–14: Responses to Thomas, Philip, about identity
	14:15–21: Exhortations to obedience, Spirit promised
	14:22–31: Sayings about Jesus' words, Spirit, peace
	15:1–17: Sayings about vines, branches, remaining
	15:18–16:11: Sayings about opposition, Advocate
	16:12–15: Sayings about the coming Spirit of truth
	16:16–24: Sayings about leaving and returning
	16:25–33: Sayings of clarity of speech, belief
14.32–40: Prayer in Gethsemane	17:1–26: Jesus prays (18:1: in a garden)
	17:1–5: Prayer to be glorified
	17:6–19: Prayer for the disciples, protection
	17:20–23: Prayer for believers, unity
	17:24–26: Prayer about glory, sending, revelation
14.33–39: Jesus prays that he would be delivered	(12:27: Jesus speaks against praying for deliverance)
14.41: 'hour has come … Son of Man is delivered'	(13:1: Hour had come) (13:31: Son of Man glorified)
14.42 'Let us go' betrayer comes	(18:2–3: Judas comes)

Rather than assuming that John's differences from Mark in Jesus' discourse provide evidence for his literary independence, these texts and their practices can provide helpful reference points for understanding John as dependent on Mark, even while different from Mark. The fact that other Jewish writers rewrote earlier sources and created expansive farewell discourses for key characters does not, in itself, establish that John did the same with Mark, but I am suggesting that the existence of established literary precedents in texts like Chronicles and *Jubilees* can increase the plausibility that John did this.[41]

41 For examples of interpreters who consider John to be relying on (at least) Mark's Gospel in John 13–17, see K. Kleinknecht, "Johannes 13, die Synoptiker und die >>Methode<< der johanneischen Evangelienüberlieferung," *ZTK* 82/3 (1985) 361–388; H. Thyen, "Johannes und die Synoptiker: Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Paradigma zur Bieschreibung ihrer Beziehungen anhand von Beobachtungen an Passions- und Ostererzählungen," *John and the Synoptics* (ed. A. Denaux) (BETL 101; Leuven: Peeters – Leuven University Press 1992) 81–107; J. Beutler, "Synoptic Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Farewell Discourse," *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (eds. R.T. Fortna – T. Thatcher) (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2001) 165–174; M. Jennings, "The Fourth Gospel's Reversal of Mark in John 13,31–14,3," *Bib* 94/2 (2013) 210–236; Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 362–441; E.-M. Becker, "John 13 as Counter-Memory: How the Fourth

If we could consider John as doing something similar to Chronicles and *Jubilees* in his effort to communicate an authoritative message to an audience in a different situation, this prepares us to consider the possibility that John's Gospel can be understood as a rewritten text, one which transposes Markan content in a different key. That is, John can be understood as an 'inspired interpreter',[42] reimagining earlier written traditions about Jesus and reinterpreting them for his audience in a distinct, autonomous narrative (i.e., not simply a 'second edition' of Mark). As with Chronicles and *Jubilees*, John's situation was likely a precarious one, with his audience being familiar with war, opposition, and schism, especially if, as most interpreters assume, the situation underlying John's Gospel reflects a situation of recent division and conflict with other Jewish groups and growing resistance to a Johannine understanding of Jesus, which had threatened the social identity of the audience.[43] John may have considered their identity formation as a motivating factor in his composition and arrangement of this material, and guided him in his reshaping of what he had received.

Even if the above comparisons are considered important, independence-oriented interpreters could allege that the differences between the material in John 13–17 and the material in Mark 12–14 are simply too vast. Admittedly, at first glance, a relationship between these particular sections could appear far-fetched (when compared with clearer points of overlap, like John 6:1–15 and Mark 6:30–44). But I purposefully discuss this comparison between John and Mark after examining Chronicles and *Jubilees*, because both earlier examples have very few contacts with their primary source material. While these two certainly appealed to a wide array of traditions, their primary source material is not in question. And yet, their transformational techniques, while more conservative in some places, are quite extensive in the instances I have explored here.[44] If John's Gospel is similar to other Jewish texts like these, and if his situation provided a reason for engaging in this type of exegesis, it

---

Gospel Revises Early Christian Memory," *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic* (ed. K.B. Larsen) (SANt 3; Göttingen – Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2015) 269–281; K.L. Yoder, "Mimesis: Foot Washing from Luke to John," *ETL* 92/4 (2016) 655–670; K.O. Sandnes, *Early Christian Discourses on Jesus' Prayer at Gethsemane: Courageous, Committed, Cowardly?* (NovTSup 166; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 187–189; B. Mathew, *The Johannine Footwashing as the Sign of Perfect Love* (WUNT 2/464; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2018) 129–165; K.B. Larsen, "The Lord's Prayer in the Fourth Gospel: Jesus' Testamentary Prayer (John 17) as Rewritten Prayer," *The Lord's Prayer* (eds. B. Langstaff – L. Stuckenbruck – M. Tilly) (WUNT 1/490; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2022) 173–188; A. Hentschel, *Die Fußwaschungserzählung im Johannesevangelium: Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Ekklesiologie* (WUNT 1/493; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2022): 216–218; E. Corsar, "The Imitable Ethic of Self-Sacrificial Love: Johannine Ethics as a Reworking of Markan Ethics," *The Ethics of John: Retrospect and Prospects* (eds. J. van der Watt – M. den Dulk) (BibInt 227; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2025) 125–141, esp. 135–138.

42 For the language of 'inspired interpretation', see D. Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1992) 196–198.

43 De Boer, *John 1–6*, 98–99.

44 In some cases, Jewish rewriters may follow their source material very closely (e.g., *Jubilees'* rather close reproduction of the Aqedah from Gen 22:1–19 in *Jub.* 17:15–18:19), but in other cases there may be extensive departures (11QT 56–59 completely departs from Deuteronomy, although its reuse is conservative elsewhere). Whether there are minimal or extensive departures may depend on the author's intention for his audience.

is possible that this is precisely what John did for his own readers. John could have been the sort of Jewish writer who served as an 'inspired interpreter' of earlier tradition, reshaping it in order to address the needs of his audience and their situation. Specifically, I suggest that John incorporated Markan material from throughout Mark 12:1–14:42 into John 13–17, adding, omitting, rearranging, and paraphrasing as he saw fit, refashioning this material into the form of a farewell discourse in order to address the needs of his readers and guide their understanding of Jesus.[45]

Beginning in John 13, Jesus has a final meal with his disciples, just as in Mark, but John focuses on Jesus' exemplification of ethical practice rather than on the institutionalisation of a ritual meal.[46] This is not to suggest a Johannine antipathy toward this ritual, but it can be understood as a way to tie together Mary's earlier paradigmatic action of anointing Jesus' feet and the later exhortation of Jesus to his disciples that they love one another on the basis of Jesus' paradigmatic action. In some sense, Jesus' 'transformation' from incarnate Word to one who washes feet is highly ironic, and could be an intentional reversal of some key Markan ideas. Feník and Lapko have argued that John means for Jesus to engage in a type of 'inverse transfiguration' here, in that Jesus manifests the attributes of an enslaved person tending to his disciples, rather than manifesting divine attributes to his disciples on a mountain.[47] Moreover, John's presentation of Jesus' glorification in John 13–14 already reverses Mark's future-oriented understanding of Jesus' glorification, since for John, Jesus is glorified 'now' (John 13:31), not necessarily only at his future return, as is the emphasis in Mark's discourse material (cf. Mark 13:26).[48] As Corsar has recently noted, the 'new' commandment that Jesus gives his disciples (to love one another; John 13:34) could be understood as 'a reworking of the love commandment in Mark' (Mark 12:31).[49] The command to love one's neighbour as oneself is modified to love others as Jesus has loved them, thus adjusting the point of reference. Finally, John follows Mark quite closely in his inclusion of Jesus' prediction of Peter's three denials (John 13:36–38; Mark 14:29–31).

In John 14, Jesus comforts his disciples (and John comforts his audience) through the promise of Jesus' future return (John 14:3, 18, 28), which is an especially important element of Mark's final discourse (Mark 13:28, 35–36). Additionally, John addresses his audience through Jesus (John 14:12–14) and assures them of their reception of the Spirit (John 14:15–17) before he prepares to be confronted by Satan (John 14:30) in a similar way (and with similar language) as he is confronted by Judas in Mark (Mark 14:42). Jesus goes willingly to his fate because it was commanded beforehand (John 14:31), just as in Mark

45 To rearrange and distribute source material from other contexts (within the same text) in this way has precedent in other Jewish interpretive texts (e.g., the rewriting of Korah's Rebellion in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 16:1–8, where the author borrows elements from Num 16 as well as the surrounding context of Num 15–17).

46 Becker, "John 13 as Counter-Memory," 280.

47 J. Feník – R. Lapko, "Jesus' Inverse Transfiguration in John 13," *Neot* 55/2 (2021) 347–364.

48 Jennings, "The Fourth Gospel's Reversal of Mark in John 13,31–14,3," 217.

49 Corsar, "The Imitable Ethic," 136.

he actively confronts 'the hour' (Mark 14:41), telling his disciples, 'let us go' (Mark 14:42) as his betrayer approaches.

In John 15, Jesus' sayings about the vine and branches (John 15:1–8) could be inspired by and connected to Mark's parable of the tenants (Mark 12:1–12), as Cespedes has recently suggested.[50] Both Evangelists draw on imagery from Isa 5 and Ps 80 in each case. Mark's parable is clearly an indictment of the religious authorities opposing Jesus, to cast them as unfruitful and illegitimate workers in the 'vineyard' of Israel, deserving of God's judgment, who will be supplanted in their role by 'others' (Mark 12:9). Following Cespedes, I suggest that John draws from Mark here to present Jesus' disciples as those 'others', who are the legitimate, fruitful workers in the 'vineyard' of Israel, which is represented by Jesus himself as the 'vine'. Both Mark's parable and John's vine metaphor involve the divine mission, as in Mark, the vineyard must continue to be tended even without the former tenants (Mark 12:9), and in John, the branches which are not burned must remain on the vine and bear fruit (John 15:6–8).[51] Beyond this, John's language of the world hating the disciples (John 15:18–16:4) finds a parallel in the similar language of Mark's discourse (Mark 13:9–13).[52]

While there may be comparatively few parallels with Mark in John 16–17, some minor overlaps are still present (e.g., Jesus using 'birth pain' language to refer to the difficult future experience of the disciples; John 16:21–22 and Mark 13:8). Of course, the idea that Jesus prayed in the presence of his disciples before his betrayal finds its earliest expression in Mark's Gethsemane, but other connections between Jesus' prayer in John 17 and Jesus' prayer in Mark 14 are sparse. As a result, the seeming idiosyncrasy of this prayer (compared to Jesus' prayer in Mark 14:32–40) has long contributed to independence-oriented arguments.[53] Even so, I suggest that John knew Mark's Gethsemane prayer material, placing his prayer in the same location but expanding it in order to communicate important information to his audience.[54] Through Jesus' prayer, part of what John communicates is that the disciples (who, thus far in the narrative, have frequently failed to understand) begin to come to a fuller understanding of Jesus' identity and message (e.g., John 16:29–30), and also that the audience still needs to understand Jesus' identity and message (e.g., John 17:20).

---

50 J. Cespedes, *John's Complementing of Mark's Wicked Tenants Parable in his Metaphor of the True Vine* (PhD Diss. Liberty University; Lynchburg, VA 2023).

51 Cespedes, "John's Complementing," 182–185.

52 Beutler, "Synoptic Jesus Tradition," 171.

53 For examples of this argument, see B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1982) 441–444; M. Coloe, "Sources in the Shadows: John 13 and the Johannine Community," *New Currents through John: A Global Perspective* (eds. F. Lozado – T. Thatcher) (RBS 54; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2006) 69–82.

54 As I noted above, here I focus only on the relationship between John and Mark. While some have argued that John knows Matthew and Luke as well, I do not hold to this view. For an example of a scholar who sees the prayer in John 17 as a reworking of not only Mark but Matthew as well (esp. Matt 6:9–13), see R. Green, "John's Use of the Synoptic Gospels and Jesus' Farewell Prayer (Jn 17)," *Stella Maris* 5/1 (2024) 13–21.

That is, the purpose of this prayer is paraenetic; John intends to shape his audience's view of Jesus and themselves.[55] Within the text-world, the disciples were given an example to follow when Jesus asked them to wash feet as he did (13:15), to do mighty works as he did (14:12–14), to be opposed as he was (15:18), and to be unified as Jesus is with the Father (17:11). Through the rhetorical vehicle of these speeches John calls his audience to unity, to deeper knowledge of God, and to a relationship of abiding (17:20–26). John seeks not merely to theologise but to persuade his readers to take a particular view of Jesus' mission and of themselves in relation to his mission.[56] Jesus' prayer

> reflects the belief that even after his departure Christ's advocacy in prayer supports the mission of his followers. The knowledge that the risen and exalted Christ prays for his followers should be a major factor in shaping their identity and providing reassurance.[57]

Additionally, in a competitive literary marketplace, where other narratives of Jesus' life were being composed, John's portrayal here presents a different perspective than what readers find in Mark.[58] Here, in the final moments before his betrayal, Jesus is more sure of himself and concerned for the welfare of his disciples. This is distinct from the rather mixed portrayal found in Mark's Gethsemane scene (cf. Mark 14:36, John 12:27). In such instances, John could have understood Mark's material as authoritative and useful, but needing improvement, expansion, and reworking, particularly in a context where multiple Gospel writers may have been vying for prominence in a literary marketplace.

John could have many reasons for building a farewell discourse from Mark 12–14, but I suggest that his compositional practices had at least five aims. First, John needed to address the immediate divisions within his own community due to the issue of their removal from certain Jewish assemblies, and this plays a role in the way that Jesus speaks to his disciples about the future.[59] Just as Mark's readers would have found Jesus' predic-

---

55 M.P. Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17* (WUNT 2/342; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013) 96.

56 Recently, A. Grottoli has noted that John's Gospel, as an ancient *bios*, seeks to persuade its audience. This is purpose of the text. Grottoli argues that John rewrites Mark and selectively chooses and shapes certain material in order that readers would see Jesus as John presents him (of course, this is explicitly stated in John 20:30–31). See A. Grottoli, *'But These Things Are Written': Lives, Rewriting, and the Gospel of John* (PhD Diss. University of Edinburgh; Edinburgh 2024) 241–242.

57 Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 440.

58 For the 'competitive textualisation' paradigm, see B. Wassell, "John's Competition with the Synoptics," *From Difference to Deviance: Rivalry and Enmity in Earliest Christianity* (eds. D.A. Smith – J. Verheyden) (BETL 339; Leuven: Peeters 2024) 139–172. On the question of history relative to John's discourse material, see P.F. Bartholomä, *The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics: A Contribution to the Discussion Concerning the Authenticity of Jesus' Words in the Fourth Gospel* (TANZ 57; Tübingen: Francke 2012) 251–306.

59 See M.C. de Boer, "Expulsion from the Synagogue: J.L. Martyn's *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* Revisited," *NTS* 66/3 (2020) 367–391; W.V. Cirafesi, "Rethinking John and 'the Synagogue' in Light of Expulsion from Public Assemblies in Antiquity," *JBL* 142/4 (2023) 677–697. Jesus predicts his people's opposition, describing this as something that affirms their belonging to him (John 15:18–25; 16:1–4).

tions of their persecutions comforting (Mark 13:9–13), this provides meaning for the difficulties that John's readers faced and encouragement to continue. Second, John wanted to present a portrait of Jesus informed by more developed tradition; he writes this section from a later eschatological perspective (that is, through the lens of a realised rather than a future eschatology)[60] as well as a later Christological perspective (that is, through the lens of a clearer, less ambiguous view of the relationship between Jesus and God).[61] Third, John felt the need to more clearly elucidate the role of the Holy Spirit, which is left unclear in Mark.[62] Fourth, John wanted to explain the reason for and necessity of Jesus' departure, and the nature of his present activity.[63] Finally, in the case of the last prayer of Jesus, John wanted to emphasise the importance of the mission of the disciples, which continues in the community of the early church. While the whole discourse is generally participatory, the final prayer is especially participatory; in it, John emphasises the involvement of his audience by portraying the community of Jesus as God's dwelling place.[64] This could clarify some unanswered questions for readers of Mark about what following Jesus looks like in time between his resurrection and his return. Such participatory emphases provide meaning to additional revelation that follows and goes beyond the written text, showing that John means for his text to be considered a product of the Spirit (16:12–15).

One feature of exegetical rewriting in the Second Temple era is in the inclusion of a later eschatological perspective which is imposed onto the earlier material. Texts like Chronicles and *Jubilees* do this in certain places. For example, Chronicles writes with a view to restoration; his emphases on retribution and on God's direct involvement in history suggests that he wanted his readers to look to the future for deliverance and the hope of covenant renewal.[65] *Jubilees* also recasts its Pentateuchal material from the perspective of eschatological expectation, with the author seeking Israel's restoration and shaping the text's angelic discourse to fit that framing.[66] In these sorts of features we see the pilgrimage of tradition in the way that episodes are retold from a later context with a more developed perspective

60 As E. Haenchen puts it, '[t]he expectation of the end, which still lay, for Mark, in an indeterminate future as a cosmic event, was radicalized by John in such a way that chronological time was eliminated and with it the transformation of the world expected by Mark and the first Christians' (*John 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of John, Chapters 7–21* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1988] 144).

61 Jesus' true identity *vis-à-vis* the Father is clarified in this section (John 14:9–14), as is the extent of his authority (John 17:2) both of which are ambiguous in Mark (2:10; 6:5a; 9:2–7; 10:18).

62 In Mark 1.8, for example, Jesus is identified as one who will 'baptize with the Holy Spirit', but the significance of this is left unclear.

63 This is also ambiguous in Mark. Mark teaches that Jesus will return (Mark 13:26–37; 14:62), but little detail is given about what happens prior to that return.

64 W.H. Oliver – A.G. van Aarde, "The Community of Faith as Dwelling-Place of the Father: 'βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ' as 'Household of God' in the Johannine Farewell Discourse(s)," *Neot* 25/2 (1991) 379–399. The rehearsal of Jesus' commands (i.e., to love) provides a template for John's readers for what faithfulness (and/or 'abiding') looks like in their fraught context (John 14:15–21; 15:1–17).

65 B.E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSup 211; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1996) 135–185.

66 See T.R. Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees* (EJL 34; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2012).

that the author can present to his audience to guide interpretation. John, I suggest, did something similar in reworking the material about Jesus' last words with his later eschatology, different and developed from Mark's earlier eschatology. We see this most clearly in John's concept of 'the hour'.

In Johannine perspective, it is not so much that the eschaton is realised already during Jesus' earthly ministry, but more so that the things associated with the eschaton (eternal life, judgment, etc.), while future events, are present in Jesus in his earthly ministry, bound up with his destiny, and initiated by his predetermined 'hour' of suffering and glorification.[67]

For Mark, the 'hour' is the eschatologically pregnant time of Jesus' death and resurrection – the end to which Jesus' earthly ministry had pointed (Mark 14:35). For John, the initiation of this 'hour' in Jesus is nothing less than the inauguration of a new age, one with high eschatological expectation that he wants to encourage his readers to live in now, not await in expectation.[68] The farewell discourse is intended to have an effect on its readers within their situation, and part of the intended effect is that readers would live from this eschatological fulfillment-oriented perspective in the present. In Grottoli's words, John 'picks out the idea (of the 'hour') and not only does he expand and correct it, but more importantly, he repurposes it as the focal point of Jesus' life, to portray him as unequivocally determined to carry out his mission.'[69] That is, for Mark, the 'hour' is the moment when Jesus is handed over – a moment of crisis which shifts the narrative. For John, though, the 'hour' guides the entire narrative; an element of Jesus' purpose is to experience this 'hour', to move toward it and not to resist it, to display total control over it.[70] In such instances, John's differences from Mark can be understood as developments of Mark, contributing to the conviction that John is actually much more 'Markan' than he appears.

Conclusion

Thirty years ago, Hoegen-Rohls convincingly argued that John's farewell discourse should be understood as the hermeneutical key for the way that the whole Gospel functions.[71] John's Gospel should not be viewed simply as a patchwork of oral traditions or as a series of idiosyncratic reflections pieced together in a disorganised way. Rather, its various pieces work together, designed by the author to present the message of Jesus from a self-consciously

67 C. Caragounis, "The Kingdom of God in John and the Synoptics," *John and the Synoptics*, 473–480.

68 J. Frey, "From the Expectation of the Imminent Kingdom to the Presence of Eternal Life: Eschatology in Mark and John," *John's Transformation of Mark* (eds. H.K. Bond – E.-M. Becker – C.H. Williams) (London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2021) 169–186.

69 Grottoli, "'But These Things Are Written,'" 234.

70 To borrow a rather minor element from source material and expand it into a major element of a later narrative is also not unprecedented in other Jewish texts. For example, Jubilees borrows the context of Moses' time of Sinai in order to create a narrative frame for the way that the entire narrative of Genesis is retold (*Jub.* 1).

71 C. Hoegen-Rohls, *Der nachösterliche Johannes: Die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium* (WUNT 2/84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1996).

later, post-Easter perspective. Through the lens of the farewell discourse, we see how the text functions retrospectively and the concerns of the author's time are weaved into the constructed past of the text-world to shape reader interpretation, which, as I have shown here, is how some other Jewish texts like Chronicles and *Jubilees* function. This is important for reconciling differences between John and Mark, because differences in the presentation of certain episodes become clearer if one considers the text as taking shape in an exegetical and literary milieu similar to (or influenced by) Chronicles and *Jubilees*.

In his influential work on these chapters of John, Käsemann once remarked that 'if the Fourth Gospel took up this Synoptic tradition, then John transformed it to an unusual extent.'[72] I am arguing that in fact, John did transform antecedent written Gospel sources, but that, when compared with Jewish texts like Chronicles and *Jubilees*, John's transformations of his source material become far less 'unusual'.[73] On closer examination, these texts were not outliers in terms of their exegetical practices and rewriting techniques, but such practices have precedent. The commonality of such features can help us to see that John may not be the 'outlier' at all. Rather, as I noted earlier, Matthew and Luke, with their frequent copying and retention of verbatim Markan material, may be the true 'outliers'.[74] If this is correct, it provides a way to understand how John appeals to a recognisable generic form (i.e., the farewell discourse), but not simply as a vehicle for idiosyncratic theologising. Rather, he appeals to this form as a vehicle for transforming and expanding on what he received from Mark. In the process, he 'bends' both genres and sources to his ends, but not in an unprecedented way when compared with other Jewish literature.

John's 'bending' of Mark by his creative reuse, reinterpretation, and reimagining of it may have been motivated by deficiencies that he perceived in Mark's presentation, as well as by the desire to write an improved and expanded life of Jesus in the context of a competitive literary marketplace, where traditions were fluid, the canon was not closed, and Gospels were continuing to be produced. When it comes to his writing techniques, though, I suggest that John, like Chronicles and *Jubilees*, began with rather sparse material found in the source, sought to extend its authoritative voice, and aimed to transform it in a way that spoke to a different situation. It is not so much that John's Gospel is the same type of text as Chronicles or *Jubilees* (i.e., a 'Rewritten Scripture' text), but that in rewriting his source material, John is doing something similar to what these texts do, thereby participating in recognisable streams of Jewish literary culture. When viewed alongside these examples, John's spectrum of similarity with and difference from Mark need not indicate independence from Mark, but a creative, sustained engagement with it – one which provides insight into the diverse and complex world of early Christian literary production.

John's purpose was also related to his context and the situation of his audience. As was the case for other ancient biographers, John sought to persuade his readers to trust his

72 E. Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (London: SCM 1968) 4.

73 See Williams, "John's 'Rewriting' of Mark," 51–66.

74 Mattila, "A Question Too Often Neglected," 199–217.

account precisely because of his choice of material – what he included and what he excluded. This is explicit in the narrator's comment in John 20:30–31, where the validity of the account is associated with the narrator's editorial decision-making.[75] John not only seeks to affect his present readers, but to reach future generations as well, as is clear from John 20:29 ('blessed are those who have not seen, and yet have believed'). The Evangelist expects that, because of his presentation of events, future readers can have continuous access to what Jesus offers. In light of this, it is especially important for John to write with a persuasive purpose; he must convince readers of the authority and truthfulness of his writing, especially in light of their present situation.

While we cannot know the details of the underlying situation of John's audience with certainty, in light of texts like John 16:2, it seems that this was a context fraught with division and uncertainty. The context for John's readers was likely the precarious, post-war years of the late first century, where division with other Jewish groups and the proliferation of different understandings of Jesus motivated the Evangelist to produce his own reading of the life of Jesus – one which built on a prior model, even while departing from it. In some sense, this was an effort to shape the collective memory of his audience, so that they would remember Jesus in a more clearly Johannine way. This was necessary because John's readers needed assurance about Jesus' future and about their own future.[76] I argue that John designed his farewell discourse with his audience in mind, incorporating Mark's Gospel into his own because of his awareness of an emerging, competitive literary marketplace of Gospel texts.

Throughout his Gospel (but especially in the farewell discourse), this new kind of Johannine 'remembering' is presented as a product of the Spirit. As an 'inspired interpreter', one who was considered (or considered himself) to be an authority on Jesus, reinterprets earlier tradition as an act of remembering.[77] Through his writing, John's readers thus acquire a 'new' memory of Jesus, one shaped by their experience and context.[78] Part of the function of this 'remembering' is to ensure that John can limit possible misinterpretation of Jesus' last days, so that readers rightly understand Jesus and themselves, even while the disciples in the narrative context rarely understand.

John's purpose is probably not to create a replacement of Mark, or a newer 'version' of it. Rather, John uses and transforms much of Mark's content, and writes his own Jesus book to shape belief and practice. He does this by providing a new version of Jesus' last days, a new memory that reinterprets Christology and Christian identity for his readers.[79] Even while he may seek to improve what he inherited, John means not to denigrate his

75 Grottoli, "'But These Things Are Written,'" 245–247.

76 Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 399.

77 See J.D. Lindenlaub, *The Beloved Disciple as Interpreter and Author of Scripture in the Gospel of John* (WUNT 2/611; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2024).

78 As noted by D.B. Woll, *Johannine Christianity in Conflict: Authority, Rank and Succession in the First Farewell Discourse* (SBLDS 60; Atlanta, GA: SBL 1981) 101–105.

79 Becker, "John 13 as Counter-Memory," 273–275.

source material, but aims to create an account which would be considered authoritative and trustworthy. John did not consider that Mark's Gospel had to be the last word on Jesus' life. Like Chronicles and *Jubilees*, he extended earlier voices, participated in authoritative discourse, and thereby sought to persuade this audience to adopt his view of Jesus and trust the truthfulness of his own presentation. His farewell discourse represents a clear and creative example of this complex process at work.

Bibliography

Ahn, S., *The Persuasive Portrayal of David and Solomon in Chronicles: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Speeches and Prayers in the David-Solomon Narrative* (McMaster Biblical Studies 3; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock 2018).

Attridge, H.W., "John and other Gospels," *The Oxford Handbook of Johannine Studies* (eds. J. Lieu – M.C. de Boer) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2018) 44–62.

Attridge, H.W., "Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121/1 (2002) 3–21.

Bammel, E., "The Farewell Discourse of the Evangelist John and its Jewish Heritage," *Tyndale Bulletin* 44/1 (1993) 103–116.

Barker, J., *Writing and Rewriting the Gospels: John and the Synoptics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2025).

Bartholomä, P.F., *The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics: A Contribution to the Discussion Concerning the Authenticity of Jesus' Words in the Fourth Gospel* (Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 57; Tübingen: Francke 2012).

Becker, E.-M., "Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature," *Mark and Matthew*. I. *Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings* (eds. E.-M. Becker – A. Runesson) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 271; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011).

Becker, E.-M., "John 13 as Counter-Memory: How the Fourth Gospel Revises Early Christian Memory," *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic* (ed. K.B. Larsen) (Studia Aarhusiana Neotestamentica 3; Göttingen – Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2015) 269–281.

Beutler, J., "Synoptic Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Farewell Discourse," *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (eds. R.T. Fortna – T. Thatcher) (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 2001) 165–174.

Bond, H.K. – Becker, E.-M. – Williams, C.H. (eds.), *John's Transformation of Mark* (London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2021).

Bowes, W., "The Relationship between John and the Synoptic Gospels Revisited," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 66/1 (2024) 113–132.

Caragounis, C., "The Kingdom of God in John and the Synoptics," *John and the Synoptics* (ed. A. Denaux) (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 101; Leuven: Peeters 1992) 473–480.

Cespedes, J., *John's Complementing of Mark's Wicked Tenants Parable in his Metaphor of the True Vine* (PhD Diss. Liberty University; Lynchburg, VA 2023).

Cirafesi, W.V., "Rethinking John and 'the Synagogue' in Light of Expulsion from Public Assemblies in Antiquity," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 142/4 (2023) 677–697.

Coloe, M., "Sources in the Shadows: John 13 and the Johannine Community," *New Currents through John: A Global Perspective* (eds. F. Lozado – T. Thatcher) (Resources for Biblical Study 54; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2006) 69–82.

Coloe, M., "John 17:1–26: The Missionary Prayer of Jesus," *Australian Biblical Review* 66 (2018) 1–12.

Corsar, E., "The Imitable Ethic of Self-Sacrificial Love: Johannine Ethics as a Reworking of Markan Ethics," *The Ethics of John: Retrospect and Prospects* (eds. J. van der Watt – M. den Dulk) (Biblical Interpretation Series 227; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2025) 125–141.

Crawford, S.W., *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2008).

De Boer, M.C., "Expulsion from the Synagogue: J.L. Martyn's *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* Revisited," *New Testament Studies* 66/3 (2020) 367–391.

De Boer, M.C., *John 1–6* (International Critical Commentary; London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2024).

Dietzfelbinger, C., *Der Abschied des Kommenden: Eine Auslegung der johanneischen Abschiedsreden* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1996).

Dodd, C.H., *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1968).

Dunn, J., "John and the Oral Gospel Tradition," *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. Wansborough) (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1991) 351–379.

Endres, JC., *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 18; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association 1987).

Engberg-Pedersen, T., *John and Philosophy: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2017).

Feník, J. – Lapko, R., "Jesus' Inverse Transfiguration in John 13," *Neotestamentica* 55/2 (2021) 347–364.

Foster, P., "The Rise of the Markan Priority Hypothesis and Early Responses and Challenges to It," *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem* (eds. J.S. Kloppenborg – J. Verheyden) (The Library of New Testament Studies 618; London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2020) 89–113.

Frey, J., "From the Expectation of the Imminent Kingdom to the Presence of Eternal Life: Eschatology in Mark and John," *John's Transformation of Mark* (eds. H.K. Bond – E.-M. Becker – C.H. Williams) (London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2021) 169–186.

Goodacre, M., *The Fourth Synoptic Gospel: John's Knowledge of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2025).

Green, R., "John's Use of the Synoptic Gospels and Jesus' Farewell Prayer (Jn 17)," *Stella Maris* 5/1 (2024) 13–21.

Grottoli, A., *'But These Things Are Written': Lives, Rewriting, and the Gospel of John* (PhD Diss. University of Edinburgh; Edinburgh 2024).

Haenchen, E., *John 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of John, Chapters 7–21* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1988).

Hanneken, T.R., *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees* (Early Judaism and Its Literature; Atlanta, GA: SBL 2012).

Hentschel, A., *Die Fußwaschungserzählung im Johannesevangelium: Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Ekklesiologie* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 1/493; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2022).

Hera, M.P., *Christology and Discipleship in John 17* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/342; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013).

Hoegen-Rohls, C., *Der nachösterliche Johannes: Die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1996).

Hoglund, K., "The Priest of Praise: The Chronicler's David," *Review & Expositor* 99/2 (2002) 189–190.

Hutzli, J., "David in the Role of a Second Moses – The Revelation of the Temple-Model (tabnît) in 1 Chronicles 28," *Chronicles and the Priestly Literature of the Hebrew Bible* (eds. J. Jeon – L.C. Jonker) (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 528; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2021) 322–336.

Instone Brewer, D., *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1992).

Jennings, M., "The Fourth Gospel's Reversal of Mark in John 13,31–14,3," *Biblica* 94/2 (2013) 210–236.

Joo, S., "Past No Longer Present: Revision of David's Legacy in Chronicles," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 26/2 (2012) 235–258.

Käsemann, E., *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (London: SCM 1968).

Keener, C.S., *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2005) II.

Kelly, B.E., *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 211; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1996).

Klein, R., *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2006).

Kleinknecht, K., "Johannes 13, die Synoptiker und die »Methode« der johanneischen Evangelienüberlieferung," *Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche* 82/3 (1985) 361–388.

Kolenkow, A., "Testaments," *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (eds. R.E. Kraft – G.W.E. Nickelsburg) (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1986) 259–267.

Larsen, K.B. (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic* (Studia Aarhusiana Neotestamentica 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2015).

Larsen, K.B., *The Lord's Prayer in the Fourth Gospel: Jesus' Testamentary Prayer (John 17) as Rewritten Prayer*. *The Lord's Prayer* (eds. B. Langstaff – L. Stuckenbruck – M. Tilly) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 1/490; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2022) 173–188.

Lim, T.H., *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; London – New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2013).

Lincoln, A., *The Gospel according to St. John* (Black's New Testament Commentaries 4; London – New York: Continuum 2006).

Lindars, B., *The Gospel of John* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1982).

Lindenlaub, J.D., *The Beloved Disciple as Interpreter and Author of Scripture in the Gospel of John* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/611; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2024).

Mathew, B., *The Johannine Footwashing as the Sign of Perfect Love* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/464; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2018).

Mattila, S., "A Question Too Often Neglected," *New Testament Studies* 41/2 (1995) 199–217.

Mroczek, E., *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2016).

Oliver, W.H. – van Aarde, A.G., "The Community of Faith as Dwelling-Place of the Father: 'Basileia tou Theou' as 'Household of God' in the Johannine Farewell Discourse(s)," *Neotestamentica* 25/2 (1991) 379–399.

Petersen, A.K., "The Riverrun of Rewriting Scripture: From Textual Cannibalism to Scriptural Completion," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 43/4–5 (2012) 475–496.

Porter, S., "The Date of John's Gospel and Its Origins," *The Origins of John's Gospel* (eds. S.E. Porter – H.T. Ong) (Johannine Studies 2; Leiden: Brill 2015) 11–29.

Reis, D., "Jesus' Farewell Discourse, 'Otherness,' and the Construction of a Johannine Identity," *Studies in Religion* 32/1 (2003) 39–58.

Reynolds, B.E., "The Necessity of Form and Spatial Content for Defining 'Apocalypse' and 'Apocalyptic,'" *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 33/3 (2024) 187–197.

van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M., *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 161; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2012).

Sandnes, K.O., *Early Christian Discourses on Jesus' Prayer at Gethsemane: Courageous, Committed, Cowardly?* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 166; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016).

Segovia, F., *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1991).

Sheridan, R., "John's Gospel and Modern Genre Theory: The Farewell Discourse (John 13–17) as a Test Case," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 75/3 (2010) 287–299.

Smith, D. Moody, *John among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth-Century Research* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1992).

Stube, J.C., *A Graeco-Roman Reading of the Farewell Discourse* (The Library of New Testament Studies 309; London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2006).

Thyen, H., "Johannes und die Synoptiker: Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Paradigma zur Bieschreibung ihrer Beziehungen anhand von Beobachtungen an Passions- und Ostererzählungen," *John and the Synoptics* (ed. A. Denaux) (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 101; Leuven: Peeters – Leuven University Press 1992) 81–107.

Ulrich, E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 169; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2015).

VanderKam, J., *Jubilees: A Commentary in Two Volumes* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2018).

Wassell, B., "John's Competition with the Synoptics," *From Difference to Deviance: Rivalry and Enmity in Earliest Christianity* (eds. D.A. Smith – J. Verheyden) (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 339; Leuven: Peeters 2024) 139–172.

Williams, C., "John's 'Rewriting' of Mark: Some Insights from Ancient Jewish Analogues," *John's Transformation of Mark* (eds. E.-M. Becker – H.K. Bond – C.H. Williams) (London – New York: Clark – Bloomsbury 2021) 51–66.

Winter, M., *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Väter: Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Vermächtnisrede im Blick auf Joh. 13–17* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 161; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1994).

Woll, D.B., *Johannine Christianity in Conflict: Authority, Rank and Succession in the First Farewell Discourse* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 60; Chico, CA: Scholars Press 1981).

Wray Beal, L.M., *1 & 2 Kings* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary; Downers Grove, IL: IVP – Apollos 2014).

Wright, J., "The Founding Father: The Structure of the Chronicler's David Narrative," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117/1 (1998) 55–57.

Yoder, K.L., "Mimesis: Foot Washing from Luke to John," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 92/4 (2016) 655–670.

Zahn, M., *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 95; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2011).

Zahn, M., *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission* (Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press 2020).

Zsengellér, J. (ed.), *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 166; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2014).

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 141–158

Verifying Biblical Allusions in John 1:51: A Methodological Framework for Genesis Reception Studies

Tomasz Tułodziecki
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń
thomast@umk.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7650-8543

ABSTRACT: Current methodologies for identifying biblical allusions in the Fourth Gospel, while extensive, often struggle with texts that operate through imagery and metaphor. This study applies a tripartite framework – textual flow analysis, image analysis, and intertextual verification – to demonstrate that John 1:51 constitutes a deliberate allusion to Jacob's dream (Gen 28:12). The methodology reveals that the allusion operates through recontextualization: the Son of Man replaces both Jacob's ladder and the divine figure, creating a new christological revelation theology. While multiple intertextual connections may be present (including Dan 7), the Genesis reception proves central to the text's mystagogical function. The applied verification shows semantic, structural, and functional correspondences between the texts, confirming systematic Genesis reception in the Johannine narrative. This synchronic approach, though it yields specific insights into the text's faith-formational purpose, represents one methodological option among others. The framework contributes to ongoing discussions about allusion verification in biblical texts, particularly for passages where imagery carries the primary allusive weight. The results demonstrate that authentic allusions function not through simple borrowing, but through deliberate theological recontextualisation that preserves original narrative function while establishing new meaning paradigms.

KEYWORDS: Biblical allusions, intertextuality, Johannine Christology, Genesis reception, verification methodology

What constitutes an allusion remains a contested question in biblical scholarship. When we encounter a potential allusion, how do we verify its presence? And, if present, can we truly call it self-evident? Recent decades of exegetical work have begun to provide answers, developing methodologies to define and identify allusions in New Testament reception of the Old Testament.[1]

Richard Hays' influential work on Pauline echoes has proposed various criteria for identifying scriptural allusions – though applying these to Johannine imagery presents

1 D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHTh 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1986) 17; G. Häfner, *„Nützlich zur Belehrung (2 Tim 3,16)". Die Rolle der Schrift in den Pastoralbriefen im Rahmen der Paulusrezeption* (HBS 25; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 2000) 50–51; R. Zimmermann, "Jesus im Bild Gottes. Anspielung auf das Alte Testament im Johannesevangelium am Beispiel der Hirtenbildfelder in Joh 10," *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (eds. J. Frey – U. Schnelle) (WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004) 81–116 (particularly 87–89).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.18930 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

particular challenges. The Fourth Gospel's distinctive use of visual and metaphorical language requires us to ask not merely whether an allusion exists, but how it functions within John's narrative strategy.[2]

John 1:51 holds a unique place among the Gospel passages linked to Genesis. Nearly all exegetes recognise Jesus' words – 'Amen, amen, I say to you: You will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man' – as what appears to be a clear allusion to Jacob's dream in Gen 28:12.[3] While this connection has been widely recognised in scholarship, the precise mechanisms by which this allusion operates and generates meaning merit closer examination. To be clear, this study does not seek to prove an allusion that scholarship has already established. Rather, it aims to demonstrate systematically how this acknowledged allusion functions within John's narrative strategy to generate theological meaning. Many scholars interpret this passage through the lens of Jewish traditions,[4] making it an ideal case for re-examination. This invites us to examine John 1:51 once more from this perspective.

Scholarship has also begun to recognise the rich imagery of Johannine language,[5] a perspective that merits attention here. Like the previous approaches, narrative exegesis emerged from literary and linguistic studies. This method investigates both the author's narrative techniques to uncover his intentions and the text's pragmatic dimensions.[6] Together with John's recently recognised mystagogical character, this approach has shifted scholarly focus from diachronic to synchronic reading[7] – the method adopted in this study.

---

2 See R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1989), whose criteria have been widely discussed, though their application to Johannine texts remains debated. For further methodological discussions, see also R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press 2016); G.K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1998); S. Moyise, *Evoking Scripture: Seeing the Old Testament in the New* (London: Clark 2008); M.A. Daise, *Feasts in John* (WUNT 2/229; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2007). The present study seeks to adapt and refine these approaches specifically for the imagery-rich discourse of the Fourth Gospel.

3 G. Reim employs the concept of evident allusion (*Jochanan. Erweiterte Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* [Erlangen: Evangelisch-Lutherischen Mission 1995] 97–98). Only W. Michaelis denies any reference to Gen 28:12 ("Joh 1,51, Gen 28,12 und das Menschensohn-Problem," *TLZ* 85/8 [1960] 561–578 [particularly 576]). Unfortunately, it is not possible to engage with this argumentation in detail within the scope of this study.

4 Thus, inter alia, Reim, *Jochanan*, 101–104; F.J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press 1998) 57; J.E. Fossum, "The Son of Man's Alter Ego. John 1:51, Targumic Tradition and Jewish Mysticism," *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA 30; Göttingen – Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht – Universitätverlag 1995) 135–151; K. Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium*. I. *Kapitel 1–10* (ThKNT 4/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 2000) 95–96.

5 On the development, see R. Zimmermann, "Imagery in John: Opening up Paths Into the Tangled Thicket of John's Figurative World," *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language* (eds. J. Frey – J.G. van der Watt – R. Zimmermann) (WUNT 200; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006) 1–43 (particularly 2–9).

6 A highly significant contribution to the rediscovery of the Gospel of John as a narrative text was made by R.A. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1983).

7 A. Meyer, *Kommt und seht: Mystagogie im Johannesevangelium ausgehend von Joh 1,35–51* (FB 103; Würzburg: Echter 2005) 15. A much stronger position in favour of synchronic reading of the Gospel of John from a hermeneutical perspective is advocated by: D.F. Gniesmer, "Kommt und Seht. Hermeneutische Erwägungen

This synchronic approach particularly illuminates the text's faith-formational function. It represents one methodological option, among several. A diachronic analysis might yield different insights regarding sources and redaction history. Our chosen approach specifically highlights how the final form guides readers toward faith formation.

This leads to the following methodology: first, we examine the verse, particularly its textual flow. Next, we verify the intertextuality to determine whether a Genesis allusion exists and how it functions, with Johannine imagery playing a crucial role. Finally, we explore the interpretative consequences if Genesis reception is confirmed. This approach naturally emphasises the text's effect on readers and its faith-formational purpose.

We acknowledge that different methodological approaches would yield different insights. A historical-critical investigation of the Son of Man tradition or a redaction-critical analysis of the text's compositional layers would emphasise other aspects of the text. Our conclusions about mystagogical function are, in part, a product of our synchronic lens. Most importantly, we shall demonstrate how Genesis reception operates in John 1:51, thereby enabling its verification.

1. Textual Flow

John 1:19–51 displays a clear four-part structure: (a) 1:19–28; (b) 1:29–34; (c) 1:35–42; (d) 1:43–51. The first scene opens with John's μαρτυρία, announced in the prologue (καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ιωάννου), whilst the temporal marker τῇ ἐπαύριον introduces each subsequent scene.[8]

1.1. First Scene

In the first scene (1:19–28), John the Baptist testifies before the Jerusalem delegation. He speaks first about himself (designated in 1:20 as ὡμολόγησεν), then, after considerable hesitation, about another in 1:26 (μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν). The scene gradually reveals John's identity and role, along with his relationship to the coming one – to Jesus. Though the prologue has already named Jesus (1:17), his name goes unmentioned here. The Messiah's identity remains veiled. Instead, John announces a mysterious figure, whose name stays hidden. A metaphor establishes John's relationship to this figure (οὗ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος – 1:27), sparking the hearers' interest. The narrative thus redirects the readers' attention toward this new figure. A precise geographical reference closes the scene, leaving one question: who is this mysterious figure?

---

zur johanneischen Sehweise," *Der bezwingende Vorsprung des Guten. Exegetische und theologische Werkstattberichte. Festschrift für Wolfgang Harnisch* (eds. U. Schoenborn – S.H. Pfürtner) (Münster – Hamburg: Lit 1994) 139.

8 A hidden background is often sought in Johannine day-counting. A highly interesting example of this is offered by the interpretation in Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 50–51.

1.2. Second Scene

The second scene (1:29–34) marks Jesus' first personal appearance, as he gradually merges with the mysterious figure. The identification begins through the metaphorical designation ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (1:29). To confirm we are still discussing the same mysterious figure, John explicitly recalls his earlier words: οὗτός ἐστιν ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον (1:30a). This figure – whom John the Baptist calls the Lamb of God and the narrator identifies as Jesus – gains increasingly distinct, yet still enigmatic, characteristics: ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν (1:30b,c).

The narrative now clarifies John's relationship to Jesus: κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν (1:31a), along with his own mission: ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ισραήλ, διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βαπτίζων (1:31b). The theme of knowing Jesus emerges here. This description of the mysterious figure – now identified with Jesus – likely aims to create uncertainty in the hearers about Jesus' true identity.

The Baptist's repeated declaration, κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν (1:31, 33a), reinforces this uncertainty, yet also offers its resolution through a new image. This image appears twice: first as prophecy, then as witnessed reality. It depicts the Spirit descending like a dove, serving as the key to identification: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (1:33). This visual identification leads to confession: κἀγὼ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (1:34) – a declaration that surprisingly transcends the image itself. Thus, John 1:29–34 establishes a crucial sequence for understanding the text's flow: prediction–seeing–confessing.[9]

These opening scenes create dual effects in the hearers. They generate uncertainty about Jesus' true identity – this enigmatic figure who takes away the world's sin, baptises with the Holy Spirit, and is proclaimed Son of God. Yet, they simultaneously kindle desire for personal acquaintance with him. Such knowledge can come only through direct encounter.

1.3. Third Scene

The third scene (1:35–42) delivers this encounter. Jesus again appears under the Lamb of God metaphor. Now the Baptist's disciples enter the narrative, though not through direct address – they simply stand beside their teacher. Hearing his words, they follow Jesus, the one presented as God's Lamb. Direct encounter comes only when Jesus asks them: τί ζητεῖτε. The hospitality metaphor that follows creates a space where genuine acquaintance can develop.[10]

The text leaves Jesus' dwelling undescribed, though the disciples accept his invitation and see it. This narrative vacuum invites the hearers' imagination. The process of knowing the Messiah now extends outward – no longer through John the Baptist, but through his

---

9 That what is seen in the context of faith culminates in confession has already been demonstrated by C. Hergenröder (*Wir schauten seine Herrlichkeit: Das johanneische Sprechen vom Sehen im Horizont von Selbsterschließung Jesu und Antwort des Menschen* [FB 80; Würzburg: Echter 1996] 3).

10 The metaphor of hospitality can already be discerned in the prologue from the words: εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον (John 1:11). At the corresponding passage (1:39), we are dealing with a possible inversion: it is the Logos who first grants hospitality.

former disciples, who introduce others to Jesus. The pattern of prediction–seeing–confessing continues implicitly.

The two disciples receive an invitation-prediction: ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε. They come and see. The expected confession emerges only in the next encounter, when Andrew declares to his brother (perhaps speaking also for his companion): εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν (1:41). When Jesus meets Simon, Andrew's brother, the text's mystagogical features recede. No image or metaphor appears.

The prediction–seeing–confessing pattern barely surfaces here. Attention shifts briefly from Jesus to Simon, who receives the new name Cephas, yet speaks not a word. Jesus now commands the narrative of these opening events, whilst John the Baptist – last mentioned in 1:40 – exits the stage. The chain of calling that began with the Baptist seems to reach its end.

1.4. Fourth Scene

The fourth scene (1:43–51) bridges to the next narrative unit (2:1–12) by indicating Jesus' intended destination.[11] Only then does the encounter-calling theme resurface through Philip's calling, which now comes directly from Jesus. This introduces the scene's true focus: the encounter with Nathanael, whom Jesus calls 'a true Israelite'. Jesus' identity returns to centre stage, as this scene contains more titles for him than any other: 'the one [...] about whom Moses in the Law and also the Prophets wrote,' 'Jesus from Nazareth, the son of Joseph,'[12] 'Rabbi', 'the Son of God', 'King of Israel', and finally, 'the Son of Man'.[13]

Yet, Nathanael's confessional titles seem insufficient to capture Jesus' identity. Jesus therefore introduces a new designation, a new title embedded within an image. The image of the Son of Man with angels ascending and descending upon him appears to offer the definitive designation, revealing Jesus' true identity. However, the future tense of ὁράω defers this discovery.

The subsequent Cana narrative, set in the location announced in John 1:43, does reveal Jesus' δόξα and reports the disciples' belief. Yet, this revelation lacks its proper culmination – confession. We may conclude that John 1:51's image awaits future unveiling, when

11 Verse 43 is classified by Kuhn, similarly to v. 51, as a later redactional addition. See H.-J. Kuhn, *Christologie und Wunder: Johannesuntersuchungen zu Joh 1, 35–51* (BU 18; Regensburg: Pustet 1988) 130.

12 Here the name Jesus is, interestingly, spoken for the first time by one of the actors and not by the narrator.

13 An exact list of the titles, names and images that designate Jesus has been compiled by R. Zimmermann, *Christologie der Bilder im Johannesevangelium. Die Christopoetik des vierten Evangeliums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Joh 10* (WUNT 171; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004) 97–98. It should be noted that in John 1:19–51 two designations are missing which play an important role in the Gospel of John: *Lord* (in John 1:23 only as an Old Testament quotation) and *God* (in John 1 only in the prologue: John 1:1, 18). One would have to ask whether the distribution of Jesus' designations is merely coincidental or represents a development that culminates in the confession of Jesus' divinity.

it will bear fruit in confession. This accords with the pericope's mystagogical character, evident in the shift from singular 'you' to plural 'you will see.'[14]

This final scene contains a peculiar feature: two or three allusions proper. Philip provides the first, describing a figure: 'we have found the one about whom Moses [...] wrote.' Though this figure is identified as Jesus from Nazareth, the text never specifies whom Moses and the Prophets described.[15] The conversation's flow suggests Nathanael grasps the allusion – his dismissive, doubting response presupposes understanding. For readers, this allusion becomes clear only through the encounter scenes' context and the passage's theme in John 1:19–42: the Messiah's identity.

Jesus provides the second allusion, addressing Nathanael: 'Before Philip called you, I saw you under the fig tree' (John 1:48). This image-allusion evokes a memory of a situation known only to Nathanael. The revelation that another – Jesus – knows this private moment provokes Nathanael's amazement and confession of faith. Readers can deduce that Nathanael understood the allusion, though its actual content remains impenetrable to them. This opacity may trigger readers' own associations, leading them to recall private situations and realise that Jesus knows these, too.

The angels and Son of Man image forms a potential third allusion. Whether this image truly functions as an allusion requires further investigation.

1.5. Conclusion on Textual Flow

Jesus' identity, announced in the prologue, develops throughout John 1:19–51. Each scene treats this theme distinctively. From John's testimony that he is not the Messiah, through hints at someone already present, readers journey to the Lamb of God and encounter him directly. The sequence of encounters and callings culminates in the Son of Man image, opening fresh perspectives on Jesus' identity.

Each scene employs images, metaphors, or titles to present Jesus' figure from different angles. Every image or encounter produces a confession – a sign of faith – yet each confession transcends its originating image. Only the final image lacks a confession. As this image constitutes a promise, its corresponding confession awaits fulfilment in the narrative's future.

Despite unresolved questions in this pericope, John 1:51's present form serves a specific function: illustrating something for readers, whilst propelling them into the narrative's future.[16] From a mystagogical perspective, the verse must guide readers toward faith and its confession. The entire pericope displays a strong link between perception and faith's

---

14 See note 8. The mystagogical character of this passage can also be seen as confirmed from the perspective of the implied reader, who is here unobtrusively made present. Cf. R. Kieffer, "The Implied Reader in John's Gospel," *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997* (eds. J. Nissen – S. Pedersen) (JSNTSup 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1999) 52.

15 The mention of Scripture may be of significance for a further exploration of the pericope.

16 A. Meyer, *Kommt und seht*, 99.

confession. This verse completes the Gospel's introduction proper. We must now verify whether Genesis reception occurs here, how it operates, and whether it serves these identified functions.

2. Image Analysis

Verse 1:51 clearly functions as an image in two senses. First, it is a visual image: the verb ὁράω signals that readers should see what is described, and the verse depicts a concrete scene. Second, it operates as a linguistic image through its metaphorical features. The verbs ἀναβαίνω and καταβαίνω lack their normal semantic force when used with ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Similarly, τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα carries metaphorical weight. This metaphorical dimension points beyond the individual elements toward a higher meaning. Any linguistic image possesses three aspects: function, content, and meaning.

Function operates at multiple levels. Linguistically, an image illustrates its object. When metaphorical, it conveys something new – something that resists conceptual expression or deliberately avoids it. As we have discerned from context and textual flow, this image performs several narrative functions. It illustrates the 'greater things', awakens faith, elevates it to new levels, and ultimately produces confession.[17] The image serves as faith's springboard.

The image's content comprises four elements: (a) τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα; (b) τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ; (c) υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; (d) the movement expressed through the participles ἀναβαίνοντας and καταβαίνοντας. The first element provides the background. The remaining elements occupy the foreground, with the Son of Man – mentioned last – at centre. The hearer's imagination moves upward to heaven, where God's angels appear alongside the Son of Man. The participles ἀναβαίνοντας and καταβαίνοντας draw final attention to this central figure.

The image's meaning resists direct deduction. The text explains neither the individual elements, nor their combination, and a linguistic image's meaning transcends the sum of its parts. The complete image conveys the message.[18] Yet individual elements do evoke associations – associations that require an interpretive framework. The text provides only one such framework: Scripture (John 1:45). Since the image's meaning remains opaque, it fulfils the primary condition for allusion.[19]

---

17 A. Kubiś, *Jezus Oblubieniec. Metafora małżeńska w Ewangelii Janowej* (DABAR 6; Rzeszów: Bonus Liber 2023) 21.

18 R. Zimmermann has pointed to the necessity of considering linguistic images in their totality ("Du wirst noch Größeres sehen ... (Joh 1,50). Zur Ästhetik der Christusbilder im Johannesevangelium – Eine Skizze," *Metaphorik und Christologie* (eds. J. Frey – J. Rohls – R. Zimmermann) (TBT 120; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2003) 98.

19 R. Zimmermann has already noted the occurrence of images in the context of allusions ("Imagery in John," 200).

3. Intratextuality

3.1. John 1:51 and Its Position in the Gospel of John

John 1:51 concludes Jesus' encounter with Nathanael – the final calling scene in the four-part sequence (1:35–51). In its present form, the verse illustrates the 'greater things' Nathanael was promised he would see.[20] The connection between 1:50 and 1:51 appears through the repeated future tense of ὁράω. The shift from singular ὄψῃ (1:50) to plural ὄψεσθε (1:51) signals the author's mystagogical intentions toward readers rather than indicating later addition.[21] John 1:51 marks both the first 'Amen, amen' saying in the Gospel and the inaugural use of the Son of Man title, doubly reinforcing the statement's significance for the entire Gospel.

The calling scenes form part of the larger unit, John 1:19–51, marked by day-counting (τῇ ἐπαύριον) and the location reference ('[...] where John was baptising'). A change of location separates this unit from the following text (John 2:1–11), though another temporal marker appears (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ) and Galilee, the new location, was already announced in 1:43.[22]

The narrative of first events (1:19–51) displays clear structure through temporal markers and changing actors. Individual scenes link together through recurring persons and phrases. To understand verse 1:51 properly – whether as conclusion to Nathanael's encounter, as ending to the calling sequence, or as part of the larger unit including John the Baptist's testimonies (evident in the day-counting) – we must examine the entire unit, John 1:19–51, analysing both context and textual flow. This prepares our investigation of Genesis reception.

3.2. Context of John 1:19–51

John 1:19–51 sits between the prologue and the Cana wedding pericope. The prologue announces the Gospel's major themes:[23] Jesus' identity (as Logos, light, and life), John

---

20 Some authors suspect that the entire 1:51 was added to the text corpus later. Thus, for example, R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 10 ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1964) 68, 74; C. Dietzfelbinger, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (ZBK.NT 4/1-2; Zürich: TVZ 2001) 63–64. For discussion, see also F.J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man*, 2 ed. (BScR 14; Roma: LAS 1978) 23–41. This position is even supported by detailed linguistic analyses, but without considering the textual flow. On this, see Kuhn, *Christologie und Wunder*, 153–159. However, this is not a text-critical problem, but possibly a literary-critical one: there are also decisive voices that argue for original belonging; S.S. Smalley, "Johannes 1,51 und die Einleitung zum vierten Evangelium," *Jesus und derMenschensohn. Festschrift für Anton Vögtle zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. R. Pesch – R. Schnackenburg) (Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder 1975) 308.

21 Meyer, *Kommt und seht*, 134–135.

22 The determination of the direct context in which verse 1:51 should be examined and the text delimitation are in this case not self-evident – they depend on the perspective from which the text is viewed or read. S ome speak of John 1:19 – 2:12 as the relevant textual unit, such as L. Schenke, *Johannes. Kommentar* (Düsseldorf: Patmos 1998) 37.

23 On the introductory role of the prologue, see, *inter alia*, U. Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (THKNT 4; Leipzig: Evangelische 2004) 36–37.

the Baptist's role (as witness), faith (accepting the Logos leading to divine sonship), and the Moses-Jesus relationship. John 1:19–51 develops these themes further, especially Jesus' identity, as we shall demonstrate.

The Cana wedding narrative (2:1–11), following the encounter scenes, culminates in Jesus' δόξα, revelation, reprising the prologue's theme (1:14). This glory reveals Jesus' identity in a way that generates faith. These twin themes – identity disclosure and resulting faith – continue from new angles in the temple cleansing pericope[24] and surface again in the Nicodemus dialogue.

4. Intertextuality

Few exegetes question that John 1:51 refers to Genesis 28:12.[25] The image's association with Jacob's dream and the precise adoption of its formulation make the connection undeniable. Yet, the passage raises questions about how we verify such references. Recent exegesis increasingly recognises John's use of linguistic images[26] and their allusive functions.

John 1:51 presents us with an image that, given its role in illustrating the 'greater things', defies self-explanation. This opacity suggests we have an allusion working through imagery. To demonstrate this, we must examine both the image itself and its allusive function. The Old Testament formulation's adoption indicates the reference point, while Nathanael's presumed scriptural knowledge enables it. Comparing with the proposed reference passage will reveal whether this image-allusion successfully unveils Jesus' true identity within John's Gospel.

4.1. Disclosing the Allusion

The essential condition for allusion – ambiguity – is clearly present. Several indicators sharpen our perception of it: the repeated introduction καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, the solemn formula ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, the shift from singular ὄψῃ to plural ὄψεσθε, and the new designation υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Among the image's various elements, the formulation τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ [...] creates the strongest association, if only through its distinctive length.

Since Scripture provides the only associative framework for this formulation (John 1:45), we must seek the allusion's resolution there. The formulation not only links to, but clearly

24 B. Kowalski, "Die Tempelreinigung Jesu nach Joh 2,13–25," *MTZ* 57/3 (2006) 201.

25 See note 1.

26 Cf. Zimmermann, "Jesus im Bild Gottes," 97. For a historical overview of research see: Zimmermann, "Imagery in John," 2–9.

derives from, Genesis 28:12.[27] The image's other elements lack such unambiguous Old Testament references.

The opened heavens motif appears throughout the Old Testament (Gen 7:11; Deut 28:12; Ps 77:12; Mal 3:10; Isa 24:18; 63:19; Ezek 1:1).[28] Only some passages suggest divine appearance (Isa 24:18; 63:19), with Ezek 1:1 being unambiguous – there a human form appears in the divine vision (Ezek 1:26). However, the designation υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου – Son of Man (Ezek 2:1) – refers to the prophet, not the human figure. The same designation, υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, appears in the Book of Daniel (7:13).

The heavenly settings differ – open heaven in John 1:51, clouds of heaven in Daniel – while Ezekiel and Daniel interpret the Son of Man figure differently. These factors initially seem to favour the Daniel connection.[29] Yet, the ascending and descending angels of God create such a powerful association that the balance tips strongly toward Gen 28:12.

It should be noted, however, that the 'Son of Man' title likely evokes multiple intertextual associations simultaneously. Rather than viewing Genesis and Daniel as competing references, the Johannine text may deliberately merge these scriptural traditions to create a richer theological tapestry. The Genesis connection remains primary for our analysis, particularly given the precise verbal correspondence, but this does not preclude other allusive layers operating within the same image.

We therefore have an allusion to Jacob's dream in Gen 28:12.[30] The allusion operates through adopting a specific formulation – an element from Jacob's dream: the ascending and descending angels of God. Two questions remain: which elements from Jacob's dream narrative are evoked, and why? The allusion's purpose must align with John 1:51's immediate context and the textual flow of John 1:19–51.

We have established that John 1:51's image interprets and illustrates the 'greater things' from 1:50. Decoding the allusion must, therefore, clarify these 'greater things'. The textual flow reveals that this intensification encompasses not only vision, but also faith and confession. The allusion must generate deeper faith content and corresponding confession. Since John 1:19–51 focuses on the identity of Jesus and the Son of Man, the allusion to Jacob's dream must serve this purpose. Comparing with Genesis will show whether and how the allusion achieves its goal.

---

27 Even an adoption of the Old Testament formulation that is clearly identifiable would, according to Häfner's definition of allusion, suffice to plausibly demonstrate in this case a reference to Genesis, i.e., a reception of the Book of Genesis. For the definition of allusion, see Häfner, *"Nützlich zur Belehrung" (2Tim 3,16)*, 51. The additional details discussed here should enable the interpretation of this allusion.

28 Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 57.

29 It is possible that John adopted the motifs from both Ezekiel and Daniel.

30 Research into allusion using metaphor as a form of linguistic image has already yielded good results in exegesis. On this, see Zimmermann, "Jesus im Bild Gottes," 81–116. See also S. Mędala, *Ewangelia według Świętego Jana. Rozdziały 1–12* (NKB.NT 4/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2009) 338–339.

4.2. Comparison with the Reference Passage

The Book of Genesis describes Jacob's dream during his flight: a nocturnal vision of a ladder with God's angels ascending and descending. Most exegetes focus on this image when interpreting John 1:51. Yet, comparing the images yields little clarity about the 'greater things'. John 1:51 lacks the ladder; Genesis lacks the Son of Man. Since angels ascend and descend upon (ἐπὶ) both – the ladder and the Son of Man – interpreters link them, making the Son of Man the ladder, the heaven-earth connection.[31]

Does this interpretation truly illustrate the 'greater things' from John 1:50? One might question whether this new element – the heaven-earth connection – surpasses the titles in John 1:19–51. The Old Testament already presents such mediatorial functions: Moses mediates law and brings Israel's concerns before God; prophets proclaim God's word and intercede for the people; priests primarily offer the people's sacrifices to God.

We must consider Jacob's dream in its entirety. John 1:51 adopts not the dream's centre, but merely its kinetic background. Jacob's dream focuses on God's appearance – God whom Jacob sees and who speaks to him. God reveals his identity, then promises Jacob land, descendants, and divine assistance.

Identity thus forms the true theme of John 1:43–51. Comparing both images reveals a central figure in each: the Son of Man in John, God in Genesis. John treats identity implicitly; Genesis reveals it explicitly: ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς Αβρααμ τοῦ πατρός σου καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ισαακ (Gen 28:13). Does John 1:51 therefore suggest the Son of Man's identity as God? The allusion points in this direction. Yet, allusions by nature avoid unambiguous assertions – they neither impose meaning on recipients nor commit their authors to specific claims.

Jacob's dream narrative contains more. Upon waking, Jacob offers a twofold confession. First: 'Surely the Lord is in this place, and I did not know it.' Then, after a note about Jacob's fear: 'How awe-inspiring is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.'

Through sacrifice, Jacob accepts this God as his own, vowing to build a sanctuary and give tithes – entering a cultic relationship. He commits himself to the God who appeared to him. We must ask: does Jacob's confession parallel what John 1:43–51 expects, what the allusion targets?

Yet, the allusion cannot target this exact confession, since the images in John 1:51 and Gen 28 differ. John does not simply repeat the Old Testament scene, but presents something that appears greater. This 'greater thing' emerges through comparing Jesus' titles and the disciples' confessions, not from Jacob's dream narrative alone. What matters is the associative space Genesis 28:10–22 creates for understanding Jesus' figure.

We must finally verify whether this decoded allusion – with all its elements, tendencies, and possibilities – finds confirmation throughout John's Gospel. Since Johannine images

31 Thus, e.g., U. Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 66–67. S. Mędala, *Ewangelia według Świętego Jana*, 338.

form an interconnected network, we must examine whether our decoded allusion fits this larger pattern.[32]

First, we note that Jacob's name – the patriarch who dreams in Genesis – appears in John's Gospel at 4:1–42. Whether this passage also references Jacob's dream requires separate investigation. Nevertheless, the name's presence in John strengthens the probability that 1:51 alludes to Jacob's dream.

The angel theme presents difficulties, appearing only in John 1:51 and 12:29. In the latter, some crowd members think an angel spoke to Jesus; others hear thunder. The narrator clarifies: God himself spoke. This minimal treatment reveals the author's limited interest in angels.[33]

This scarcity might suggest John 1:51 is secondary, disconnected from the Gospel's image network. Alternatively, it could confirm that the ascending and descending angels serve purely allusive purposes, not as content-bearers. John 12:28's 'voice from heaven' echoes Jacob's dream's associative space: heaven and God's voice. This creates another image connection, though we cannot demonstrate direct literary dependence on Jacob's dream. Image networks need not trace every connection to identical intertextual sources.

'Heaven' appears throughout John's Gospel: 1:32; 1:51; 3:13; 3:27; 3:31; 6:31, 32, 38, 41, 42, 50, 58; 12:28; 17:1. The search yields surprising results. John 6 uses οὐρανός nine times, linking it ἄρτος (bread) and καταβαίνω (descend). Significantly, ἄρτος also appears in Jacob's dream narrative. While John 6 bears no direct relationship to Genesis, the bread-heaven connection creates a shared associative space, though functioning differently.

Jacob's dream also features the ladder, upon which God's angels move. The allusion enables associating this ladder with a person. Does John's Gospel develop this? The answer appears when Jesus declares: 'I am the way, the truth and the life' and 'no one comes to the Father except through me.' Though κλίμαξ (ladder) is absent, the semantic field remains. Gen 28:12's conceptual field – temple, holy place, house of God – reappears in John connected to Jesus, notably as ὁ ναός τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ (John 2:21).

More complex is the possibility of identifying the Son of Man – or Jesus himself – with God, through imagery. Exegesis has demonstrated this possibility exists in John.[34] The identification culminates in Thomas's confession: ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (John 20:28), echoing the revelatory formula from Gen 28:13: ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς Αβρααμ τοῦ πατρός σου καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ισαακ.

These observations yield clear results: the Gen 28:12 allusion opens an associative space realised throughout John's Gospel in various forms. Even the most challenging element – identifying the Son of Man with God – finds expression. This strengthens our conclusion that John 1:51 alludes to Jacob's dream narrative (Gen 28:12–22), specifically to reveal and confess the Son of Man's true identity.

---

32 On the interconnection of linguistic images in the Gospel of John, see Zimmermann, *Imagery in the Gospel of John*, 33–36.

33 Cf. R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*. I. *Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1–4* (HThKNT 4/1; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 1979) 318.

34 On this see Zimmermann, "Jesus im Bild Gottes," 111–113.

4.3. Genesis Reception in John 1:19–51 – History of Religions Comparison

From a tradition-historical and history-of-religions perspective, the Genesis reception in John 1:51 carries far-reaching implications. It confirms and reinforces John's use of Scripture and Old Testament narrative demonstrated elsewhere. For the Fourth Gospel's author, Scripture provides the encounter-space with the incarnate Logos.

The biblical text functions as a treasure chamber with its entire conceptual world, yielding examples that illustrate the new reality. Yet, Scripture is also transformed by this new reality – its words and images gain fresh interpretation through the story of Jesus of Nazareth. We can assert with increasing certainty that the Gospel's author knew Scripture, including Genesis, and deliberately engaged with it.

Scripture's vocabulary and imagery formed integral parts of the author's conceptual world. The addressees likewise needed scriptural knowledge, at least as narrative. They are explicitly invited to search the Scriptures (cf. John 5:39) – a necessity for decoding John's enigmatic allusions.[35] Scripture thus both shaped and addressed the addressees' conceptual world. Old Testament concepts and narratives guided believers toward deeper understanding. Scripture thus served mystagogy excellently. When hearers lacked scriptural knowledge, this provided opportunity for instruction.[36]

The author's and addressees' conceptual world extended beyond the Old Testament. They inhabited the same contemporary world as those who neither knew Jesus of Nazareth, nor belonged to Israel. They emerged from diverse cultural, religious, and educational backgrounds. This broader world also flows into John's Gospel.

John's numerous associations with rabbinic and early Jewish traditions therefore come as no surprise – Philo of Alexandria represents their most prominent example. The concept 'Logos' exemplifies this cultural influence most clearly, becoming a *terminus technicus* in John and throughout later Christianity. Yet, John's increasingly evident Old Testament background proves the author never intended to abandon Scripture. Rather, he sought to invest ancient Scripture with new meaning. By recontextualising the old divine images, he transformed Scripture into distinctly Christian Scripture. This sophisticated scriptural engagement established the Old Testament, including Genesis, as a permanent element of Christian instruction.

---

35 It is possible that Scripture research in the strict sense was reserved only for the Scripture-learned in the Johannine community. All others, however, were certainly introduced over time to the narrative material of the Old Testament through instruction and through liturgies in which Scripture was read aloud. On the theme of familiarity with textual sources in early Christianity, see K. Backhaus, "Gott als Psalmist. Psalm 2 im Hebräerbrief," *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. D. Sänger) (BThSt 67; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2004) 198.

36 This applies even if the image of the exalted Son of Man that is seen in John 1:51 is possibly to be traced back to community traditions. This is the view of J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. III. *Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (WUNT 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2000) 34. H. Thyen sees therein 'a double play' between Mark 14:62 and Genesis 28 (*Das Johannesevangelium* [HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck] 174).

5. Result

5.1. Assessment

Our analysis of John 1:51's image strongly suggests the presence of an allusion, meeting the essential criterion of ambiguity. Additional indicators strengthen this conclusion. We demonstrated that Scripture provides the primary key to resolving this allusion. Among various associations triggered by the image's elements, the ascending and descending angels motif proves strongest, clearly deriving from an Old Testament formulation.

Comparing with Gen 28:12 reveals that John 1:51's allusion targets not merely Jacob's dream image but the entire vision narrative. This conclusion emerges from the image's function within its microcontext and textual flow: illustrating the 'greater things' from 1:50 and consequently generating deeper faith content and stronger confession regarding Jesus' true identity.[37]

Jacob's dream narrative includes both confession and the revelation of the central figure's identity in Gen 28:13, confirming that John 1:51 receives Genesis.[38] The precise adoption of the Old Testament formulation with its distinctive sequence does more than evoke association – it strongly indicates Genesis reception.[39]

Our analysis has proceeded through three integrated dimensions – textual flow, image analysis, and intertextual verification. While the individual components draw on established exegetical practices, their systematic integration offers a way forward for addressing the particular challenges posed by John's imagery.

Testing whether this decoded allusion fits John's image network yields positive results, further confirming the demonstrated reception. The Genesis reception through John 1:51's allusion to Gen 28:10–22 operates not through simple adoption but through recontextualisation. The new figure – the Son of Man, namely, Jesus – enters the old image's framework, thereby investing that image with new content.

This allusion opens a full spectrum of associations confirmed throughout the Gospel.[40] Jesus becomes identifiable both as the ladder – the locus of God's sovereignty (temple motif)[41] – and as God who promises assistance and land.[42] The image's alterations (Son of

37 W. Loader, "John 1,50–51 and the 'Greater Things' of Johannine Christology," *Anfänge der Christologie: Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. C. Breytenbach – H. Paulsen) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1991) 270.

38 Fossum moves in a similar direction, proceeding from comparison with Targums ("The Son of Man's alter ego," 135–151).

39 Many exegetes draw attention to the sequence. That it is, however, decisive for the reference to Genesis was shown by Dietzfelbinger, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 63–64.

40 Although it would be impossible to prove that such associations have the quality of an allusion, they gain plausibility when considering the mystagogical character of the Gospel.

41 The connection between John 1:51 and the temple motif is seen by J. Rahner, *"Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes". Jesus von Nazareth als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im vierten Evangelium* (BBB 117; Bodenheim: Philo 1998) 309.

42 It would be interesting to investigate whether heaven and pasture and stable are metaphors of paradise, of the promised land.

Man replacing God and/or ladder) recontextualise Genesis's presentation of divine revelation. Now the Son of Man stands atop the ladder that he himself embodies, revealing himself to his disciples. The allusion's future orientation, marked by ὄψῃ and ὄψεσθε, finds fulfilment as the Gospel's greater confession unfolds gradually (John 4:42; 6:14,69; 7:40–41; 8:58; 11:27), culminating in Thomas's declaration: ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (John 20:28).

It should be noted that this methodological choice carries certain limitations. By focusing on the final form of the text and its narrative function, we necessarily set aside questions about the historical development of the Son of Man tradition, the potential layers of redaction in John 1:51, and the socio-historical context of the Johannine community. These aspects, while important, lie beyond the scope of our current investigation.

5.2. Function

John's Gospel introduces a new form of Christian instruction. The Old Testament image employed here reveals a remarkably sophisticated methodology for faith formation, properly termed mystagogy. Unlike the Synoptics, which narrate faith's contents for belief, or Paul, who expounds and argues, John's approach resembles that of the later Church Fathers.[43] Instead, John creates an encounter space, where readers, through personal participation, gradually come to know Jesus of Nazareth and discover him as God's Son. The enigmatic image in John 1:51 invites investigation without compulsion. This search rewards readers with independent discovery, inviting acceptance of self-discovered truth rather than predetermined content.

Readers can affirm: what was predicted, they have seen for themselves, enabling authentic belief and confession.[44] Genesis, with its narrative world, becomes integral to this mystagogical process. Scripture's existing authority undergoes acceptance and transformation, conferring a comprehensive faith vision – certainty spanning past, present, and future. Scripture serves not merely as a pre-existing conceptual world requiring address, but as material for constructing the reader's new conceptual world.

5.3. Theological Relevance

Genesis reception in John's Gospel carries significant theological and christological implications. Using and recontextualising ancient divine images to represent Jesus' identity produces dual consequences. First, the Old Testament God gains concrete connection with the visible world whilst maintaining absolute transcendence – remaining unchanged. John presents no different God, only new revelation of the same God.

God receives more distinct human features than in Old Testament anthropomorphisms – he gains a concrete face: the Son of Man's. Second, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Man, receives God's fullness (cf. John 1:16) without sacrificing humanity. Theology and

43 Meyer, *Kommt und seht*, 2–3.

44 Mussner has already presented this approach in early Christianity; F. Mussner, *Die johanneische Sehweise und Frage nach dem historischen Jesus* (QD 28; Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien: Herder 1965) 20.

Christology converge, as Jesus the Son of Man mediates between God and humanity whilst transcending the role of mere divine envoy.[45]

John 1:51's image, like all Johannine images, serves a christological function.[46] Exegetes debate whether this Christology carries eschatological implications.[47] Yet, these images require holistic consideration within their interconnected network. Extracting individual details from context risks one-sided conclusions.[48] Throughout, we must remember these images' mystagogical function: they guide readers toward faith in Jesus Christ as Son of God and recognition of his divinity.

Translated by Rev. Dariusz Iwański

Bibliography

Backhaus, K., "Gott als Psalmist. Psalm 2 im Hebräerbrief," *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. D. Sänger) (Biblisch-theologische Studien 67; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2004) 198–230.

Beale, G.K., *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1998).

Bultmann, R., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 10 ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1964).

Culpepper, R.A., *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1983).

Daise, M.A., *Feasts in John* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/229; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2007).

Dietzfelbinger, C., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare. Neues Testament 4/1-2; Zürich: TVZ 2001).

Fossum, J.E., "The Son of Man's Alter Ego. John 1:51, Targumic Tradition and Jewish Mysticism," *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 30; Göttingen – Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht – Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz 1995) 135–151.

Frey, J., *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. III. *Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2000).

45 This 'more', which could be expressed with the divinity of Jesus, has often become a challenge for exegesis. See, e.g., D.R. Sadananda, *The Johannine Exegesis of God: An Exploration into Johannine Understanding of God* (BZNW 121; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2004) 282–284.

46 See Zimmermann, "Du wirst noch Größeres sehen," 93–110.

47 U. Wilckens argues against an eschatological interpretation of John 1:51 (*Das Evangelium nach Johannes* [NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1998] 54). An eschatological statement in the sense of the parousia is seen therein by, e.g., G. Richter, *Studien zum Johannesevangelium* (BU 13; Regensburg: Pustet 1977) 361–362.

48 From the perspective of eschatology and in comparison with the Synoptics, some see in the individual elements a still Jewish-Christian conception of the parousia. Thus, e.g., Richter, *Studien zum Johannesevangelium*, 361–362. Richter, however, leaves open the question of whether the ascending and descending of the angels points to John's own conception of the parousia.

Gniesmer, D.F., "Kommt und Seht. Hermeneutische Erwägungen zur johanneischen Sehweise," *Der bezwingende Vorsprung des Guten. Exegetische und theologische Werkstattberichte. Festschrift für Wolfgang Harnisch* (eds. U. Schoenborn – S.H. Pfürtner) (Münster – Hamburg: Lit 1994) 126–153.

Häfner, G., *„Nützlich zur Belehrung" (2 Tim 3,16). Die Rolle der Schrift in den Pastoralbriefen im Rahmen der Paulusrezeption* (Herders biblische Studien 25; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 2000).

Hays, R.B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1989).

Hays, R.B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press 2016).

Hergenröder, C., *Wir schauten seine Herrlichkeit: Das johanneische Sprechen vom Sehen im Horizont von Selbsterschließung Jesu und Antwort des Menschen* (Forschung zur Bibel 80; Würzburg: Echter 1996).

Kieffer, R., "The Implied Reader in John's Gospel," *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997* (eds. J. Nissen – S. Pedersen) (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1999).

Koch, D.-A., *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1986).

Kowalski, B., "Die Tempelreinigung Jesu nach Joh 2,13–25," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 57/3 (2006) 194–208.

Kubiś, A., *Jezus Oblubieniec. Metafora małżeńska w Ewangelii Janowej* (Biblioteka Szkoły DABAR 6; Rzeszów: Bonus Liber 2023).

Kuhn, H.-J., *Christologie und Wunder: Johannesuntersuchungen zu Joh 1, 35–51* (Biblische Untersuchungen 18; Regensburg: Pustet 1988).

Loader, W., "John 1,50–51 and the 'Greater Things' of Johannine Christology," *Anfänge der Christologie: Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. C. Breytenbach – H. Paulsen) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1991) 255–274.

Mędala, S., *Ewangelia według Świętego Jana. Rozdziały 1–12* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Nowy Testament 4/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2009).

Meyer, A., *Kommt und seht: Mystagogie im Johannesevangelium ausgehend von Joh 1,35–51* (Forschung zur Bibel 103; Würzburg: Echter 2005).

Michaelis, W., "Joh 1,51, Gen 28,12 und das Menschensohn-Problem," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 85/8 (1960) 561–578.

Moloney, F.J., *The Johannine Son of Man*, 2 ed. (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 14; Roma: LAS 1978).

Moloney, F.J., *The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina 4; Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press 1998).

Moyise, S., *Evoking Scripture: Seeing the Old Testament in the New* (London: Clark 2008).

Mussner, F., *Die johanneische Sehweise und Frage nach dem historischen Jesus* (Quaestiones Disputatae 28; Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien: Herder 1965).

Rahner, J., *"Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes". Jesus von Nazareth als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im vierten Evangelium* (Bonner biblische Beiträge 117; Bodenheim: Philo 1998).

Reim, G., *Jochanan. Erweiterte Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (Erlangen: Evangelisch-Lutherischen Mission 1995).

Richter, G., *Studien zum Johannesevangelium* (Biblische Untersuchungen 13; Regensburg: Pustet 1977).

Sadananda, D.R., *The Johannine Exegesis of God: An Exploration into Johannine Understanding of God* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 121; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2004).

Schenke, L., *Johannes. Kommentar* (Düsseldorf: Patmos 1998).

Schnackenburg, R., *Das Johannesevangelium*. I. *Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1–4* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4/1; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 1979).

Schnelle, U., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 4; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2004).

Smalley, S.S., "Johannes 1,51 und die Einleitung zum vierten Evangelium," *Jesus und der Menschensohn. Festschrift für Anton Vögtle zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. R. Pesch – R. Schnackenburg) (Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder 1975).

Thyen, H., *Das Johannesevangelium* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Wengst, K., *Das Johannesevangelium*. I. *Kapitel 1–10* (Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 2000).

Wilckens, U., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1998).

Zimmermann, R., "Du wirst noch Größeres sehen ... (Joh 1,50). Zur Ästhetik der Christusbilder im Johannesevangelium – Eine Skizze," *Metaphorik und Christologie* (eds. J. Frey – J. Rohls – R. Zimmermann) (Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 120; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2003) 93–110.

Zimmermann, R., *Christologie der Bilder im Johannesevangelium. Die Christopoetik des vierten Evangeliums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Joh 10* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 171; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004).

Zimmermann, R., "Jesus im Bild Gottes. Anspielung auf das Alte Testament im Johannesevangelium am Beispiel der Hirtenbildfelder in Joh 10," *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (eds. J. Frey – U. Schnelle) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004) 81–116.

Zimmermann, R., "Imagery in John: Opening up Paths Into the Tangled Thicket of John's Figurative World," *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language* (eds. J. Frey – J.G. van der Watt – R. Zimmermann) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 200; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006) 1–43.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 159–188

Polskie Biblie XVI-wieczne – przegląd egzemplarzy, cechy charakterystyczne oraz czynniki wpływające na kształtowanie się cen na polskim rynku aukcji antykwarycznych

Polish Bibles from the 16th Century: A Review of Copies, Characteristics and Factors Affecting Prices on the Polish Antiquaria Auction Market

Łukasz Zakonnik
Uniwersytet Łódzki
lukasz.zakonnik@uni.lodz.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1842-7558

STRESZCZENIE: W artykule poruszono kwestię dostępności egzemplarzy XVI-wiecznych polskich Biblii na antykwarycznym rynku aukcyjnym w Polsce. Celem tego badania było poszerzenie wiedzy o zachowanych egzemplarzach starych polskich Biblii, które ze względu na obecność w rękach prywatnych często nie były opisywane ani katalogowane. W pracy udało się zidentyfikować 59 ofert egzemplarzy, wśród których najliczniejszą grupę stanowiła Biblia Wujka. Najrzadziej natomiast spotykano Biblię Leopolity w jej pierwszym wydaniu oraz Biblię brzeską. Listę opisywanych edycji uzupełniała Biblia Leopolity drugiego wydania oraz krótka informacja o Biblii Budnego. Celem artykułu było także wskazanie czynników wpływających na kształtowanie się cen omawianych egzemplarzy. Wśród tych czynników za najważniejszy uznano szeroko rozumiany stan zachowania, a najmniej istotne okazało się uwzględnianie warstwy ilustracyjnej omawianych edycji Biblii.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Biblia, XVI wiek, cena, inwestycje, alternatywne rynki, rynek sztuki, aukcje, Biblia Wujka, Biblia brzeska, Biblia Leopolity, Biblia Budnego

ABSTRACT: This article discusses the copies of 16th-century Polish Bibles on the antiquarian auction market in Poland. It aims to expand the knowledge of surviving copies of old Polish Bibles, which, often, due to being held in private collections, have not been described and catalogued. This study identified 59 offers for Bible copies, with the largest number concerning the Wujek Bible. In turn, the rarest were the 1st edition of the Leopolita Bible and the Brest Bible. The descriptions were supplemented for the 2nd edition of the Leopolita Bible and a brief mention of the Budny Bible. This article also seeks to identify the factors that influenced the prices of the copies discussed earlier. The most important of these included the broadly understood condition of the copy, while the least important was the inclusion of illustrations in the editions of the Bible under discussion.

KEYWORDS: Bible, 16th century, price, investment, alternative markets, art market, auctions, Wujek Bible, Brest Bible, Leopolita Bible, Budny Bible

Początek XVI w. otworzył w historii Polski okres druku polskojęzycznych książek. Pierwsze znane publikacje dotyczyły tematyki religijnej i, choć nie były drukami tekstów wprost biblijnych, wskazywały, jak wielkie znaczenie miała ta tematyka dla potencjalnych

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.18593 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

czytelników[1]. Początek reformacji jeszcze bardziej wzmocnił tę tendencję. Musiało jednak minąć blisko 50 lat, zanim polskojęzyczny czytelnik doczekał się druku pełnego tekstu Nowego Testamentu[2]. Nowy Testament (tzw. królewiecki z 1553 r.) Stanisława Murzynowskiego – zwolennika luteranizmu – wpłynął zapewne na mobilizację strony katolickiej, czego efektem było wydanie Nowego Testamentu tzw. krakowskiego[3] (opracowanego przez Marcina Bielskiego w 1556 r.)[4]. Te dwie bardzo ważne pozycje w historii polskiej literatury – nie tylko religijnej – stanowiły jedynie wstęp do realizacji olbrzymiego przedsięwzięcia, jakim było wydanie całości Pisma Świętego. Tym razem minimalnie szybszy okazał się obóz katolicki – to on szczyci się pierwszą w historii Polski drukowaną edycją całości Pisma Świętego (tzw. Biblia Leopolity[5], opublikowana w Krakowie w 1561 r.[6]). Zwolennicy nurtu reformacji dwa lata później wydali tzw. Biblię brzeską[7] (1563 r.). Obydwie edycje Pisma Świętego spotkały się z krytyką. Biblia Leopolity była oceniana jako dzieło z archaicznym językiem, w widoczny sposób trzymającym się

1 Choć pierwsze drukarnie działały w Polsce już w XV w., to zapewne nie wydrukowano wtedy żadnej książki w języku polskim (choć zdarzały się polskojęzyczne druki drobnych tekstów zawierające np. treść codziennych modlitw – zob. *Statuta synodalia episcoporum Wratislaviensium* [Wrocław 1475], https://www.biblioteka-cyfrowa.pl/dlibra/publication/35364/edition/89440 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). Pierwszymi polskojęzycznymi książkami miały być: *Historyja umęczenia Pana naszego Jezusa Chrystusa* (Kraków: Haller 1508) (niezachowany) i Biernata z Lublina, *Raj duszny* (Kraków: Unglera 1513) (zachowane kilka kartek – https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=329584 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]) – zob. T. Michałowska, *Literatura polskiego średniowiecza* (Warszawa: PWN 2011) 339, 738.

2 Znane są częściowe, rękopiśmienne przekłady Pisma Świętego na język polski – poczynając od pojedynczej księgi – psałterzy (np. tzw. Psałterz Floriański z przełomu XIV i XV w. – https://polona.pl/preview/43713d40-72bd-439c-b7ce-300541ade137 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]), a skończywszy na całym Starym Testamencie – tzw. Biblia Królowej Zofii z połowy XV w. (faksymile z 1930 r. – https://pbc.gda.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=50169 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). Pierwszymi drukami były także pojedyncze księgi (ponownie psałterze – np. *Psałterz albo koscielne spiewanie* [Kraków: Wietor 1532] – https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/90044/edition/83472/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025], choć wcześniejsze było wydanie Hieronima z Wielunia, *Ecclesiastes* [Kraków: Wietor 1522] – https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=4219 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). Cała treść Nowego Testamentu (nazywana też Biblią lub Nowym Testamentem królewieckim) została wydana dopiero w 1553 r. – S. Murzynowski, *Testament Nowvy zvpełny z greckiego ięzyka na polski przełożony i wykładem krotkiem objaśniony* (Królewiec: Augezdecki 1553) – https://polona.pl/item-view/fa0907d2-fa82-4aaf-8b9c-996c73ded5f1 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]. Porównaj np. M. Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim* (Poznań: Księgarnia Św. Wojciecha 1968) I, 13–198 czy R. Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum* (Poznań: Pallottinum 2016) I, 149–349.

3 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://polona.pl/item-view/b784e760-2f30-4cdd-ae80-b208fa10a18d [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

4 Przeglądu poszczególnych edycji Biblii dokonano na podstawie Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim*; Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*; W. Smereka, „Zarys bibliograficzny ważniejszych wydań Biblii ks. Wujka (15931950)", *RBL* 3/1–2 (1950) 74, 64–91; R. Gustaw, „Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego", *Podręczna encyklopedia biblijna* (red. E. Dąbrowski) (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha 1959) II, 299–330; M. Ptaszyk, „Okoliczności wydania Biblii Wujka z 1821 roku", *Pamiętnik Literacki* 87/3 (1996) 133–154.

5 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://polona.pl/item/11633395/2/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

6 Najważniejsze informacje związane z historią powstania poszczególnych, całościowych edycji polskojęzycznych Biblii XVI-wiecznych zostały przedstawione w innych podpunktach tego artykułu.

7 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/publication/1687/edition/2752/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

tłumaczeń wtórnych[8]. Z kolei Biblia brzeska wzbudziła wątpliwości doktrynalne w coraz mocniej różniących się w poglądach teologicznych odłamach zwolenników reformacji w Polsce[9]. Rezultatem tych problemów było dążenie do utworzenia nowego przekładu. W ten sposób w obozie niekatolickim pojawiła się kontrowersyjna tzw. Biblia Budnego[10] z 1572 r. oraz – jednakże dopiero w kilkadziesiąt lat później – tzw. Biblia gdańska[11] z 1632 r.[12]. Obóz katolicki początkowo wydał jedynie zmodyfikowaną językowo wersję Biblii Leopolity[13] (wydanie z 1575 r. i wariant tytułowy z 1577 r.), lecz następnie udało mu się doprowadzić do powstania wiekopomnego tłumaczenia ks. Jakuba Wujka[14] (1599 r.). Po wspomnianym już XVII-wiecznym wydaniu Biblii gdańskiej, dla polskiej translatoryki biblijnej nastał czas zastoju. Sam XVII w. zaowocował dwoma wydaniami[15] polskojęzycznej Biblii gdańskiej (wspomniany pierwodruk z 1632 r. i wznowienie w Amsterdamie[16] w 1660 r.). Wiek XVIII przyniósł sześć edycji (dwukrotnie pojawiła się Biblia Wujka[17] – wydana w 1740 r. i 1771 r. we Wrocławiu; czterokrotnie Biblia gdańska[18] – wydana w 1726 r. w Hali Magdeburskiej, w 1738 r. w Królewcu, w 1768 r. w Brzegu oraz w 1779 r. ponownie w Królewcu). Dopiero w XIX w. czytelnicy doczekali się znacznie

8 Wskazywano na wpływ wcześniejszych tłumaczeń w języku czeskim, ale i podobieństwa do wspomnianego NT królewieckiego czy posiłkowanie się tekstami greckimi – porównaj np. E. Belcarzowa, *Polskie i czeskie źródła przekładu Biblii Leopolity* (Kraków: Lexis 2006).

9 Spory, m.in. odnośnie do zasad tłumaczenia, powodowały zmiany w składzie osób zaangażowanych w wydanie Biblii – porównaj np. Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim*, 225–228.

10 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/publication/4425/edition/4263/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

11 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://polona.pl/preview/e48bfa40-8fa9-49f6-b270-6f5b04a8a0a2 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

12 Biblia ta zdobyła dominującą pozycje wśród polskich protestantów aż do drugiej połowy XX w. (do chwili pojawienia się tzw. Biblii warszawskiej w 1975 r.). Niemniej, ze względu na ustalone w artykule ramy czasowe, zagadnienia związane z tą Biblią nie są tu szerzej poruszane.

13 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza z 1575 r.: https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=9267 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]; skan egzemplarza z 1577 r.: https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=9267 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

14 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/show-content/publication/edition/9662?id=9662 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

15 Autor wymienia tu tylko wydania całej Biblii.

16 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://polona.pl/item-view/d30d83fe-dcc4-4e80-84af-0f38b1162b95 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

17 Skan przykładowych egzemplarzy – z 1740 r. – w dwóch częściach: https://dlibra.bibliotekaelblaska.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=6824 [dostęp: 12.05.2025], https://digital.fides.org.pl/dlibra/publication/3082/edition/2884/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025]; z 1771 r.: https://polona.pl/item/biblia-sacra-latino-polonica-vulgatae-editionis-auctoritate-sixti-v-et-clementis-viii,MTI2MTI4NDcz/1/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

18 Skan przykładowych egzemplarzy – z 1726 r.: http://bibliotekacyfrowa.eu/dlibra/show-content/publication/edition/26073?id=26073 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]; z 1738 r.: https://books.google.pl/books?id=eVRJAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=pl#v=onepage&q&f=false [dostęp: 12.05.2025]; z 1768 r.: https://books.google.pl/books?id=qoJdAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=pl#v=onepage&q&f=false [dostęp: 12.05.2025]; z 1779 r.: https://polona.pl/item-view/a64772d8-7e48-46ca-809d-d750ceea97cd?page=1 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

większej liczby wydań[19]. Tak więc XVI w. – ze swoimi aż pięcioma edycjami, w tym czterema zupełnie nowymi – zasługuje na specjalną uwagę, a konkretne egzemplarze omawianych wydań są nie tylko świadkami historii, ale także obiektem pożądania zarówno muzeów, bibliotek, jak i zwykłych kolekcjonerów.

To ostatnie stwierdzenie może stanowić pewne zaskoczenie dla osób niezaznajomionych z tematem. Okazuje się, że na rynku aukcyjnym w Polsce wcale nie tak rzadko spotyka się w ofercie sprzedażowej oryginalne wydania z XVI w. Ich cena – choć oczywiście wysoka – nie stanowi bariery nie do pokonania nawet dla średnio zamożnego Polaka. Dzięki obrotowi antykwarycznemu te stare wydania „żyją" nie tylko w środowiskach specjalistów (albo stanowią nierzadko jedynie ciekawostkę w oczach zwiedzających np. muzeum), lecz są realnym obiektem zainteresowania (czasem motywowanym aspektem czysto inwestycyjnym) szerokiego kręgu kolekcjonerów[20]. Warto zwrócić uwagę na to, że analiza rynku daje unikalne możliwości poszerzenia wiedzy o liczbie zachowanych egzemplarzy[21], ich stanie zachowania, a czasami pozwala zidentyfikować cechy unikalne czy nawet nowe warianty edycyjne[22].

1. Problematyka badawcza, metoda i procedury badawcze

W związku ze stwierdzeniami zawartymi we wcześniejszym akapicie cele tego artykułu można podzielić na dwie grupy. W ramach realizacji celów pierwszej z tych grup autor postarał się opisać egzemplarze XVI-wiecznych polskojęzycznych Biblii[23], które były dostępne w ogólnopolskim aukcyjnym obrocie antykwarycznym od początku przemian ustrojowych w 1989 r., aż do chwili obecnej (koniec kwietnia 2025 r.). Autor prześledził dostępne mu

19 Próbę skatalogowania wydań XIX-wiecznych (a także późniejszych, do 1945 r. włącznie) można znaleźć w Ł. Zakonnik, „Biblie w języku polskim wydane w latach 1801–1945", *ABMK* 116 (2021) 483–532, https://doi.org/10.31743/abmk.9592 oraz Ł. Zakonnik, „List of Bibles in Polish Published over the Years 1801–1945 – Supplement" (preprint), https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14285.45287.

20 Porównaj np. Ł. Zakonnik *et al.*, „Art Market Investment Bubble during COVID-19—Case Study of the Rare Books Market in Poland", *Sustainability* 14/18 (2022) 11648, https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811648; G. Nieć, „COVID-19 i rynek książki. Ulotne zjawiska i trwałe zmiany", *Perspektywy Kultury* 4.2/43 (2023) 639–650, https://doi.org/10.35765/pk.2023.430402.36.

21 Postulat skatalogowania istniejących, polskojęzycznych egzemplarzy poszczególnych edycji XVI-wiecznych Biblii (dostępnych nie tylko w instytucjach, lecz także w zbiorach prywatnych – podobnie jak ma to miejsce np. w przypadku Biblii Gutenberga) podnoszony jest od dawna, czego przykładem są np. apele o opracowanie katalogu egzemplarzy Biblii brzeskiej – porównaj np. R. Leszczyński, „Biblia brzeska – pierwszy ewangelicki przekład Pisma Świętego na język polski", *Kalendarz ewangelicki* (red. D. Nowak *et al.*) (Bielsko-Biała: Augustana 2014) 158.

22 Przykładowo, podczas aukcji w Antykwariacie Logos w 2020 r. oferowany był egzemplarz o wcześniej nieznanym układzie typograficznym księgi Genesis. Wybrane aspekty tego zagadnienia są poruszane przy okazji omawiania konkretnych edycji w dalszej części artykułu.

23 Autor ma na myśli wydania obejmujące zarówno tekst Starego, jak i Nowego Testamentu. Zrezygnował z analizy wydań samego Nowego Testamentu, ponieważ w obrocie antykwarycznym takich egzemplarzy jest znacznie mniej (jeśli w ogóle się pojawiają – wyjątek stanowią tłumaczenia ks. Wujka).

katalogi aukcyjne ze wspomnianego okresu[24]. Do czasu pandemii COVID-19 trzy antykwariaty odpowiadały za ok. 85% obrotów na tego typu aukcjach[25]. W związku z tym przeanalizowano wszystkie znane autorowi katalogi aukcyjne tych właśnie antykwariatów. Starano się także uwzględnić katalogi antykwariatów mniejszych, choć nie zawsze było to możliwe ze względu na ograniczoną dostępność źródeł. Od czasów pandemii COVID-19 praktycznie wszystkie aukcje zaczęły odbywać się w formie zdalnej. Było to możliwe m.in. dzięki pojawieniu się (formalnie miało to miejsce jeszcze przed pandemią) dodatkowego, bardzo ważnego podmiotu, zapewniającego platformę aukcyjną dla każdego antykwariatu, który chciałby z takiej opcji skorzystać[26]. W artykule wykorzystano więc dane dostępne na wspomnianej platformie od 2020 r. W efekcie końcowym zgromadzono informacje o 59 egzemplarzach różnych edycji Biblii[27]. Należy wyjaśnić, że wiele sformułowań używanych w dalszej części artykułu zostało zaczerpniętych z istniejących opisów aukcyjnych. Sformułowania te mogły być niespójne z formalną terminologią. Niestety, ze względu na zwięzłość opisów, nie zawsze możliwa była ich korekta. Często też w analizowanych katalogach nie było wystarczającej ilustracji graficznej, co ograniczało możliwości wyciągania pewnych wniosków. Niemniej jednak, nawet uwzględniając wspomniane ograniczenia, zebrany materiał stanowi ciekawe i z pewnością unikalne źródło wiedzy[28].

Drugą grupę celów stanowiły te związane z próbą określenia wpływu wybranych czynników na kształtowanie cen – zarówno wywoławczych, jak i osiąganych. Czynniki identyfikowane były na podstawie wspomnianych opisów umieszczanych w ofertach aukcyjnych. Analizowane w artykule ceny XVI-wiecznych Biblii z pewnością nie podlegają takim samym wahaniom jak np. ceny dóbr pierwszej potrzeby[29]. Tak więc, gdy ceny np. chleba

---

24 Przedstawiony sposób zbierania i opracowywania danych jest analogiczny do tego, który umożliwił autorowi podobną analizę odnośnie polskojęzycznych kronik ogólnohistorycznych – patrz Ł. Zakonnik, „Kronika Gwagnina na tle polskojęzycznych kronik końca XVI i początku XVII wieku – dostępność i czynniki wpływające na kształtowanie się ceny na polskim rynku antykwarycznym", *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria Polonica* 70/1 (2025) 305–335, https://doi.org/10.18778/1505-9057.70.13.

25 Zob. Ł. Zakonnik – P. Czerwonka, „Return on Investment in Alternative Markets: The Case of The Polish Rare Book Market", *Proceedings of the 40th International Business Information Management Association* (red. K.S. Soliman) (Seville: IBIMA 2022) 281–288.

26 Platforma OneBid, https://onebid.pl [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

27 Niekiedy – a bierzemy tu pod uwagę okres przeszło 35 lat – zdarzało się, że na aukcje wracały te same egzemplarze. Liczba opisywanych w opracowaniu egzemplarzy generalnie pokrywa się (dla odpowiedniego okresu) z liczbą wspominaną przez innych specjalistów (np. w przypadku pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity czy Biblii Wujka – por. J. Miliszkiewicz, „Rynek bibliofilski. Wiekowy klejnot w zbiorach", *Rzeczpospolita* 5 lutego [2015]).

28 Stwierdzenie to odnaleźć można w wielu innych opracowaniach – por. P. Podniesiński, „Inicjatywy na rynku antykwarycznym jako nowe narzędzie wspomagające badania księgoznawcze", *Biblioteki, informacja, książka: interdyscyplinarne badania i praktyka w 21. wieku* (red. M. Kocójowa) (Kraków: Instytut Informacji Naukowej i Bibliotekoznawstwa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 2010); A. Jachimczyk, „Informacja o książce w księgarniach internetowych", *Przestrzeń informacyjna książki* (red. J. Konieczna – S. Kurek-Kokocińska – H. Tadeusiewicz) (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Biblioteka 2009) 161–170; G. Nieć, *Wtórny rynek książki w Polsce – instytucje, asortyment, uczestnicy* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Księgarnia Akademicka 2016) 105–115.

29 Zob. Zakonnik, „Kronika Gwagnina na tle polskojęzycznych kronik końca XVI w. i początku XVII w. – dostępność i czynniki wpływające na kształtowanie się ceny na polskim rynku antykwarycznym".

czy paliwa rosną, ceny starych książek mogą pozostawać na tym samym poziomie, a nawet spadać. Wskazuje to na problem korekty cen w czasie, opartej na jakimś współczynniku inflacji. Ze względu na fakt, że książki są często nabywane przez konsumentów, a nie wyłącznie przez placówki typu muzealnego, w prezentowanym artykule skorzystano ze wskaźnika cen towarów i usług konsumpcyjnych (ang. *Consumer Price Index*)[30].

2. Polskie Biblie XVI-wieczne – przegląd poszczególnych edycji

2.1. Biblia Leopolity z 1561 r. – opis egzemplarzy

Pierwsze wydanie Biblii Leopolity (nazywanej też krakowską czy Szarfenbergowską) ukazało się w Krakowie w 1561 r. w oficynie „Dziedziców Marka Szarfenberga". Pozycja była bogato ilustrowana (wykorzystano ok. 284 różne drzeworyty, odbite 293 razy)[31]. Zaliczana jest do tłumaczeń katolickich opartych na tekście Wulgaty[32], choć do tej pory nie jesteśmy pewni, kto tak naprawdę był tłumaczem tekstu (pomimo oczywistego odwołania się do nazwiska Jana Leopolity[33]). Biblię tę udało się odnaleźć sześć razy w ofercie aukcyjnej, na przestrzeni lat 1994–2014. Ta niewielka liczba egzemplarzy, jak i odległy czas ostatniej oferty, czynią ją jedną z najbardziej unikalnych na polskim rynku. Choć Biblia posiada pewną wariantowość[34] (zresztą jak każda z omawianych Biblii), to niestety opisy antykwaryczne najczęściej nie odnoszą się do tej kwestii, przez co nie mogła ona być badana w artykule. W tabeli 1 opisano wszystkie zidentyfikowane oferty.

30 Wartość wskaźnika jest publikowana regularnie na stronie Głównego Urzędu Statystycznego (https://stat.gov.pl/obszary-tematyczne/ceny-handel/wskazniki-cen/wskazniki-cen-towarow-i-uslug-konsumpcyjnych-pot-inflacja-/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). W artykule używano pojęcia „poziom inflacji" właśnie w powyższym rozumieniu. Obliczając inflację, za rok bazowy przyjęto rok powstawania artykułu (2025), natomiast do wyliczeń cen z lat wcześniejszych stosowano standardowy wzór (iteracyjnie liczony iloczyn ceny i wskaźnika inflacji).

31 Informacje za Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim*, 199–224; Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, I, 360–381; Gustaw, „Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego", 309–311.

32 We wprowadzeniu wspominano o zależnościach niektórych polskich tłumaczeń, np. od przekładów czeskich (por. przypis 8). Co więcej, to właśnie odstępstwa od Wulgaty miały być powodem powstania nowego przekładu – por. T. Rubik, „Jan ze Lwowa i Erazm z Rotterdamu. Grecki tekst Nowego Testamentu a pierwodruk (1561) oraz zrewidowana edycja (1575) «Biblii Leopolity»", *BA* 13/2 (2023) 363–378, https://doi.org/10.31743/biban.14933.

33 Nowe rozważania dotyczące tego tematu możemy należć np. w B. Matuszczyk-Podgórska, „Co dziś wiemy o Biblii Leopolity (1561)?", *Portret Wielkiej Damy: Profesor Janina Gardzińska (1944–2022)* (red. V. Machnicka *et al.*) (Bukowiec: Igitur Violetta Machnicka 2023) 131–134.

34 Patrz K. Krzak-Weiss, „Inne spojrzenie na wariantywność pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity", *Jak wydawać teksty dawne* (red. K. Borowiec *et al.*) (Poznań: Rys 2017) 297–312.

Tabela 1. Opis zidentyfikowanych pozycji Biblii Leopolity (1561 r.) oferowanych na polskim rynku aukcyjnym

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Opis kart	Opis oprawy	Proweniencja
W 3/1994	kompletna, stan bardzo dobry, obcięcia barwione	skóra na desce, tłoczenie z przedstawieniem ukrzyżowania, zachowane klamry, ślady kornika, zapewne z epoki	brak
W 6/1998	karta tytułowa i dedykacji w kopii, 25 kart na końcu z podklejeniem	półpergaminowa, XIX w.	brak
W 15/2003	brak 107 kart	?	brak
W 19/2005	braki: pięć kart z przodu, sześć losowo w tekście i 36 ostatnich; podklejenie ze stratą dla tekstu na 23 kartach, przycięcie marginesów	współczesna, wykonana ze starego pergaminu	Teofil Krawczyński, organista z klasztoru oo. Dominikanów sieradzkich (powinowaty z babką Chopina)
W 37/2013	braki: trzy karty początkowe (obie tytułowe i dedykacja – zastąpione kopiami); pięć kart w środku i 27 na końcu ze stratą dla tekstu, przycięcie marginesów	wtórna, grzbiet w starym pergaminie z napisami, narożniki w pergaminie	brak
L 38/2014	karta tytułowa w XIX-wiecznej kopii; trzy karty na początku i 13 kart rejestru w kopii	późniejsza, skórzana	Marian Swinarski oraz Andrzej Łuczak

L – antykwariat Lamus, W – antykwariat Wójtowicz, ? – brak danych

Źródło: opracowanie własne na podstawie opisów z folderów aukcyjnych, których numery podano w tabeli.

Pierwsze wydanie Biblii Leopolity, pomimo istniejących przekonań dotyczących rzadkości Biblii brzeskiej (o czym szerzej napisano przy okazji opisu tej Biblii), pojawiało się najrzadziej w aukcyjnym obrocie antykwarycznym w Polsce[35]. Jak wspomniano, udało się uzyskać informacje jedynie o sześciu kopiach – co więcej, ostatni egzemplarz został zaoferowany przeszło 10 lat temu (w 2014 r.)[36]. Poszczególne opisywane egzemplarze różniły

35 Dotyczy to wskazywanego w artykule okresu po 1989 r. oraz polskiego rynku aukcji antykwarycznych. Należy wziąć pod uwagę, że poszczególne egzemplarze omawianych Biblii były sprzedawane także poza obiegiem aukcyjnym poszczególnych antykwariatów, o czym autor wspomina krótko przy okazji omawiania poszczególnych edycji.

36 Prowadząc kwerendę dotyczącą tego wydania Biblii Leopolity, można było znaleźć mocno niekompletne egzemplarze, np. w londyńskim domu aukcyjnym Bonhams (https://www.bonhams.com/auction/25355/lot/119/bible-in-polish-biblia-to-iest-kxiegi-stharego-y-nowego-zakonu-cracow-n-and-s-scharffenberger--1561-sold-not-subject-to-return/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025], oferta dotyczyła tylko ST), polskim Welin (https://starodruki.com/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025], egzemplarz niekompletny sprzedawany w częściach m.in. na platformie https://onebid.pl [dostęp: 12.05.2025]), a nawet większe fragmenty w ofercie prywatnej na portalu aukcyjnym Allegro (https://archiwum.allegro.pl/oferta/biblia-leopolity-wyd-i-1561-st-testament-9-ksiag--i9364146751.html [dostęp: 12.05.2025]).

się stanem zachowania – od pozycji kompletnej, z zachowaną oprawą z epoki (jedyna taka oferta sprzed 31 lat), po egzemplarz bardzo mocno zdefektowany, z ponad 100 brakującymi kartami (w ofercie z 2003 r.). Dwa egzemplarze można było uznać za mocno podniszczone. Uśredniając stan zachowania, egzemplarze miały od kilkunastu do kilkudziesięciu brakujących kart (średnia ok. 30, a mediana ok. 10 brakujących kart)[37] i przynajmniej późniejszą (jeśli nawet nie współczesną) oprawę. Wśród omawianych egzemplarzy brak było tych o znaczącej proweniencji (choć zdarzył się zapisek np. o właścicielu pochodzącym z rodziny Chopina – egzemplarz z 2005 r. – czy nota własnościowa znanego antykwariusza i bibliofila M. Swinarskiego – egzemplarz z 2014 r.).

2.2. Biblia brzeska z 1563 r. – opis egzemplarzy

Biblia wydana w 1563 r. doczekała się przynajmniej trzech nazw – brzeska (od miejsca wydania), Radziwiłłowska (od nazwiska księcia Michała Radziwiłła „Czarnego", magnata zapewniającego finansowanie wydania) czy w końcu pińczowska (od miejsca, w którym dokonywano tłumaczenia). Zachowała się informacja o łącznych kosztach wydania, mających wynosić 3000 dukatów[38]. Grupa osób odpowiadających za tłumaczenie zmieniała się w czasie. Samo tłumaczenie miało być oparte na tekstach w językach oryginalnych, choć obecnie spotyka się zastrzeżenia co do tego twierdzenia[39]. W efekcie otrzymano pięknie wydane dzieło, w wielkim formacie, cechujące się starannym językiem i wysokim warsztatem edytorskim, przyozdobione drzeworytami (jednak tylko w Pięcioksięgu – w łącznej liczbie 12, nie wliczając kart z tytulaturą) oraz wieloma zdobnymi inicjałami. Tak jak w przypadku poprzedniej Biblii, wiemy, że istniały różne jej warianty[40], o czym jednak zazwyczaj nie informowały opisy pozycji aukcyjnych.

---

37 Średnia – w tym przypadku arytmetyczna – informuje o średniej wartości cechy w populacji, natomiast mediana dzieli zbiór na połowę (w analizowanych przypadkach połowa egzemplarzy ma wartość cechy poniżej mediany, a połowa powyżej). Użycie średniej jest bardziej wrażliwe na występowanie obserwacji skrajnych (np. pozycji z bardzo dużą ilością strat). Gdy różnica między średnią a medianą jest duża, populację lepiej opisuje mediana – zob. S. Ostasiewicz – Z. Rusnak – U. Siedlecka, *Statystyka*, wyd. 2 (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej 1997) 46–60.

38 Trudno określić siłę nabywczą wyrażoną w tamtym czasie dukatami. Niemniej, dokonując prostego przeliczenia opartego na kursie złota, otrzymujemy – dość orientacyjną i chyba stanowiącą bardziej ciekawostkę – cenę dzisiejszą: 3000 dukatów (dukat ważył około 3,5 g złota) daje 10,5 kg złota (choć formalnie niższej próby). Licząc po aktualnym kursie (z 9 maja 2025 r.), mamy 10500 g × 463 zł/g, co daje około 4,9 mln zł.

39 Na problem opierania się tłumaczy Biblii brzeskiej na wtórnych łacińskich tłumaczeniach Biblii hebrajskiej (Biblia łacińska Stephanusa, Biblii Pagniniego) zwrócono uwagę m.in. w R. Pietkiewicz, „*Hebraica veritas* in the Brest Bible", *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 17/1 (2015) 44–62, https://doi.org/10.1179/1462245915Z.00000000068.

40 Zob. np. S. Siess-Krzyszkowski, „Warianty typograficzne *Biblii brzeskiej*", *Tematy i Konteksty* 11/6 (2016) 36–59.

Tabela 2. Opis zidentyfikowanych pozycji Biblii brzeskiej (1563 r.) oferowanych na polskim rynku aukcyjnym

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	**Opis kart**	**Opis oprawy**	**Proweniencja**
L 1/1994	brak dwóch kart indeksu	współczesna	brak
L 7/1999	braki: pierwsze nieliczbowane 13 kart, 14 kart liczbowanych (karty zastąpione kopiami); pewna część kart z uszkodzeniem ze stratą dla tekstu	skóra, tłoczenia, okucia, zapewne z epoki	brak
W 9/2000	brak siedmiu kart	?	brak
L 12/2001	kompletna (ST i NT), karty nr 92 i 143 w NT z podklejonymi rozerwaniami	z epoki, skóra na desce, tłoczenia, mosiężne okucia, guzy, ślady zapinek	exlibris dr Szwed
R 65/2006	brak 14 kart: czterech ostatnich NT i sześć rejestru; trzy karty wstępu i jedna rejestru w kopii	późniejsza, półskórek (XIX w.), pęknięcia, szyldzik – Biblia Święta	brak
R 67/2006	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji R 67/2006		
RE 116/2006	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji R 67/2006		
R 75/2007	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji R 67/2006		
W 34/2012	siedem kart początkowych w kopii, 16 kart podniszczonych, sześć kart ze stratą dla tekstu, zabrudzenia, zawilgocenia, nieco przycięte marginesy	XX-wieczna wykonana ze starych materiałów, deska, skóra z tłoczeniami, klamry i okucia metalowe, osiem guzów narożnych	brak
L 45/2017	brak 46 kart (27 kart z przodu, sześć losowo w tekście oraz 13 kart w Listach Apostolskich oraz Apokalipsie) – wszystkie braki uzupełnione na starym papierze	z epoki, skóra brązowa	Marian Swinarski

L – antykwariat Lamus, R – antykwariat RaraAvis, RE – Dom Aukcyjny Rempex, W – antykwariat Wójtowicz, ? – brak danych, ST – Stary Testament, NT – Nowy Testament

Źródło: opracowanie własne na podstawie opisów z folderów aukcyjnych, których numery podano w tabeli.

W przypadku tej Biblii istnieje przekaz o spaleniu na rynku wileńskim większości kopii na polecenie syna magnata łożącego na wydanie dzieła (Mikołaja Krzysztofa Radziwiłła „Sierotki"). Sam wydatek na zebranie ksiąg do spalenia szacowano na 5000 dukatów[41].

41 Bazując na wcześniej określonej metodzie (zob. przypis 38), otrzymujemy dzisiejszą wartość równą: 5000 × 3,5 g × 436 zł/g ≈ 7,63 mln zł.

Z łącznej – zapewne wyolbrzymionej – liczby 1000 pierwotnych egzemplarzy[42] miało ocaleć tylko ok. 20–40 kopii. Przeglądając liczbę ofert aukcyjnych, a także opierając się na informacjach o egzemplarzach zachowanych w publicznych zbiorach, należy dojść do wniosku, że powyższy przekaz nie jest zgodny z prawdą. W wyniku kwerendy autora udało się w polskim obiegu aukcyjnym zidentyfikować 10 ofert – niemniej cztery z nich dotyczyły zapewne tego samego egzemplarza (dawałoby to siedem różnych kopii)[43]. Podobnie jak w przypadku Biblii Leopolity z 1561 r., raz pojawił się egzemplarz kompletny (w 2001 r.); nie było natomiast egzemplarzy bardzo mocno zdefektowanych (tylko raz, w ofercie z 2017 r., stwierdzono 46 brakujących kart). Za wyraźnie podniszczone można było uznać dwa egzemplarze. W przypadku trzech ofert można zakładać zachowanie oprawy z epoki. Opisując uśredniony stan zachowania – co daje praktycznie idealną zgodność z tym, o czym wspomniano przy Biblii Leopolity z 1561 r. – egzemplarze miały od kilkunastu do kilkudziesięciu brakujących kart (średnia ok. 32, mediana ok. 10 brakujących kart). W odróżnieniu jednak od wcześniej opisywanej Biblii około połowa kopii miała oprawę z epoki. Ponownie w notach proweniencyjnych pojawiło się nazwisko M. Swinarskiego.

2.3. Biblia Budnego z 1572 r.

Biblia Budnego wydrukowana została w 1572 r. w Zasławiu przez Macieja Kawęczyńskiego. Biblia ta nosiła też nazwę nieświeskiej, ze względu na miejsce, w którym odbywało się tłumaczenie. Autor – Szymon Budny – głosił poglądy negujące przedwieczność Jezusa i polemizował w kwestiach interpretacji Jego poczęcia. Poglądy te były tak radykalne, że sam tekst Biblii był w niektórych miejscach korygowany przez wydawcę bez konsultacji z autorem. Doprowadziło to później do odrzucenia tłumaczenia przez samego autora, który

42 O liczbie pozostałych egzemplarzy wspomina np. Gustaw, „Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego", 325. Obecnie szacuje się, że ocalałych kopii może być około 120 (por. np. Leszczyński, „Biblia brzeska – pierwszy ewangelicki przekład Pisma Świętego na język polski", 159). Sto egzemplarzy uległo spaleniu na rynku wileńskim, kolejnych 80 zaginęło. Daje to około 300 egzemplarzy nakładu – za I. Kwilecka, „Die Brester Bibel: Kulturgeschichtliche und sprachliche Fragen der Übersetzung", *Biblia święta to jest Księgi Starego i Nowego Zakonu*. II. *Księgi Nowego Testamentu* (red. H. Rothe – F. Scholz) (Paderborn: Schöningh 2001) 1513–1514. Ciekawostką – potwierdzającą, że przetrwało więcej kopii Biblii niż tylko 20–40 sztuk – jest informacja z listopada 2024 r. o odnalezieniu na poddaszu polskiego domu pod Opolem dwóch dość kompletnych egzemplarzy. Wydarzenie to odbiło się echem nie tylko w Polsce, lecz także na całym świecie, i to nie wyłącznie w publikacjach fachowych (por. A. Pflughoeft, *Family Stumbles on Two Valuable 400-Year-Old Bibles Hidden in Poland Home*, https://www.miamiherald.com/news/nation-world/world/article296864019.html [dostęp: 12.05.2025]).

43 Egzemplarze Biblii brzeskiej były oferowane np. w krajach za wschodnią granicą Polski – w 2023 r. dwukrotnie pojawiła się oferta sprzedaży Biblii z 1563 r. na portalach rosyjskich (w cenie około 400 tys. zł). W tym samym roku dwukrotnie oferta ukazała się również na polskim serwisie OLX (w cenie 600 tys. zł). W każdym przypadku linki do oferty były tymczasowe i znikały po niedługim czasie (np. nieaktualny już link: https://www.olx.pl/d/oferta/zabytkowa-biblia-brzeska-z-1563-roku-CID4042-IDUf4Lk.html [dostęp: 10.10.2023]). Ta efemeryczność omawianych ofert może sugerować nie do końca legalne pochodzenie kopii. Zagadnienie potencjalnej „czarnorynkowej" sprzedaży dzieł sztuki wykracza jednak poza ramy tego artykułu.

wydał jeszcze bardziej radykalny Nowy Testament w Łosku[44] w 1574 r. (przed śmiercią autor stonował jednak swoje poglądy)[45]. Według dostępnych materiałów źródłowych Biblia ta nigdy nie pojawiła się w antykwarycznym obrocie aukcyjnym po 1989 r. Według przekazów starszych antykwariuszy egzemplarze tego wydania ostatni raz były oferowane przed II wojną światową[46].

2.4. Biblia Leopolity (drugie wydanie z lat 1575/1577 r.) – opis egzemplarzy

Decyzja o druku drugiego wydania Biblii Leopolity miała być podyktowana kilkoma czynnikami. Zaliczyć można do nich: potrzebę korekty tekstu Biblii jako nie do końca zgodnego z Wulgatą[47], usuwanie dostrzegalnych archaizmów[48], wyczerpanie się katolickich nakładów Pisma Świętego, a w końcu prostą chęć zarobku i przypodobania się nowemu królowi Henrykowi Walezemu (nowa dedykacja dzieła). W drugim wydaniu dopracowano warstwę graficzną, wykorzystując 296 drzeworytów – często większych niż w pierwszym wydaniu[49]. Ta piękna edycja, drukowana ponownie u Szarfenbergów w Krakowie, doświadczyła nieszczęśliwego zbiegu okoliczności – była nim ucieczka króla, któremu dedykowano dzieło. W związku z tym wydarzeniem we wznawianym wydaniu z 1575 r. szybko zastąpiono kartę tytułową oraz wstęp – tak powstał wariant z datą 1577 r.[50]. Rozróżnienie między tymi wydaniami generalnie nie jest dostrzegane na rynku antykwarycznym.

---

44 Skan przykładowego egzemplarza: https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=30338 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

45 Zob. Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim*, 59–264; Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, I, 412–451; Gustaw, „Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego", 325–327.

46 O zakupie egzemplarza Nowego Testamentu Szymona Budnego w 1913 r. wspomniał w swojej pracy R. Pietkiewicz, „Nowe «pilne weźrzenie» w biblijne przekłady Szymona Budnego", *Abychmy w ten przekład pilnie weźrzeli: wobec tłumaczenia tekstów dawnych* (red. A. Bielak) (Warszawa: Zakład Graficzny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 2014) 131.

47 Zarzut niezgodności z Wulgatą i odwoływanie się np. do greckiego tłumaczenia Erazma z Rotterdamu były podnoszone dość często. Przykładowo – jak podaje T. Rubik – „Jan Wielewicki, kronikarz domu zakonnego oo. Jezuitów przy kościele św. Barbary w Krakowie, stwierdzał nawet w 30. latach XVII w., że wydanie to zostało «opublikowane albo przez samych heretyków, nie bez największych wypaczeń, albo przez pewnych katolików, którzy nie mieli żadnej dbałości o wydanie Wulgaty»." („Jan ze Lwowa i Erazm z Rotterdamu", 364).

48 Dziś pewną formę anegdoty stanowi fragment Jr 13,4: „weźmi ten pas (...) y schowayże go tam w dupiu skalnym". Wyraz „dupiu" został zmieniony w drugim wydaniu – por. T. Lewaszkiewicz, „Samuel Bogumił Linde jako badacz polskich i innojęzycznych przekładów Biblii", *Na szlakach dawnej i współczesnej polszczyzny. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesor Danucie Bieńkowskiej* (red. D. Kowalska *et al.*) (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego 2023) 98.

49 Szerszy opis tej Biblii można znaleźć w Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, I, 367–382.

50 Warto zauważyć, że przez długi czas nie dostrzeżono tej zależności i wydanie z 1575 r. traktowano jako odrębne względem wydania z 1577 r. Na jedynie wariantowość tych wydań pierwszy miał zwrócić uwagę J. Muczkowski („O bibliach Szarfenbergerowskich", *Dwutygodnik Literacki* 2/24 [1845] 388–392, https://polona2.pl/item/o-janach-leopolitach-w-szesnastym-wieku-zyjacych,NTQ0MzI2NDQ/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025]).

Tabela 3. Opis zidentyfikowanych pozycji Biblii Leopolity drugiego wydania (1575/1577 r.) oferowanych na polskim rynku aukcyjnym

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	**Opis kart**	**Opis oprawy**	**Proweniencja**
L 4/1997	braki: karta tytułowa, dedykacji i ostatnia rejestru; wszyto 12 z przodu i sześć na końcu kart czystych; karta 612 częściowo urwana, pierwsze kilkanaście kart z przodu z podklejeniem ze szkodą dla tekstu; blok poluzowany, przebarwienia	skóra na desce z epoki, okucia narożne, klamry	brak
W 6/1998	40 kart ze szkodą dla tekstu po renowacji, marginesy obcięte i barwione	po renowacji, deska, skóra brązowa, tłoczenie ślepe na licu, klamry	brak
W 7/1999	kompletna, czasem pojawiające się podklejenia marginesów, pierwsze karty z niewielką stratą dla tekstu, przebarwienia	skóra reperowana z szyldzikiem, tłoczenia, klamry	brak
L 8/1999	brak 35 kart w tym 28 początkowych; kilkadziesiąt kart reperowanych, marginesy przycięte	skóra z epoki z tłoczeniami, deska, zapinki mosiężne	brak
L 7/1999	kompletna, pierwsza i ostatnia karta z ubytkami marginesu, czasem podklejenia	skóra reperowana z szyldzikiem, tłoczenia	brak
W 17/2004	brak pierwszych 14 kart ST (uzupełnione kopiami), egzemplarz składany z dwóch innych, brak całego NT, łącznie blisko 200 kart strat	po obu stronach oryginalna skóra z tłoczeniami, grzbiet czarna skóra współczesna	brak
L 28/2009	karta tytułowa oraz 36 kart w kopiach, inne karty reperowane i uzupełniane, brzegi przycięte i barwione	skóra na nowej desce, naklejone pozostałości po starej skórze	brak
W 33/2011	brak 54 kart: tytułowa, 10 wstępu, dalej losowo w tekście, końcówki NT i rejestru; parę naście kart ze szkodą dla tekstu; ślady zawilgoceń i zabrudzeń	grzbiet w starym pergaminie, okładki w płótnie szarym	niezidentyfikowany exlibris, na przedniej wyklejce całostronicowy zapis współczesny
L 32/2011	dwie pierwsze karty w kopii	?	brak
L 33/2011	28 kart w kopii (w większości na początku), część małych drzeworytów wycięta i wstawiona ponownie – czasem ręcznie uzupełniana	późniejsza, skóra marmurkowa	brak
RS 2012	blok barwiony czerwienią, ślady po zalaniu i działaniu wilgoci, część składek luźno związana z blokiem, brak karty tytułowej, widoczne naprawy introligatorskie, ubytki kart drukowanych uzupełnione interfoliowanymi kartami rękopiśmiennymi	nowa skóra cielęca nakładana na starą – nakrapiana; szyldzik	brak
L 35/2012	drobne naderwania, zalania, dwie ostatnie karty indeksu w kopii, ubytki tekstu na dwóch innych kartach indeksu	późniejsza, skóra	rajca krakowski w 1586 r.

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Opis kart	Opis oprawy	Proweniencja
L 40/2015	kompletna z dużymi marginesami, brzegi kart barwione, część kart ze wzmocnionymi krawędziami, charakterystyczne przebarwienia	XVIII-wieczna, skóra ciemnobrązowa, grzbiet pięciopolowy, w polu dwa tłoczenia, złocona tytulatura	brak
R 116/2016	siedem kart w starannych kopiach drukowanych na starym papierze: nieliczbowane (1–2, 5, 7–8, 10), liczbowane (1)	późniejsza, skóra, tłoczenia na desce, imitująca oprawę renesansową, zapinki, obcięcie barwione	brak
L 9/2017	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji L 8/1999		
D 1/2018	karta tytułowa i druga z ubytkami, stan dobry ze starymi plamami	XVIII-wieczna, pełna brązowa skóra w średnim stanie z drobnymi przetarciami i ubytkami na rogach, grzbiet tłoczony z pozłacanym tytułem	Joachim i Anna (Podzilińscy? Lodzilińscy?)
L 48/2019	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji L 35/2012		
L 13/2019	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji L 35/2012		
L 51/2020	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji L 35/2012		
G 49/2020	brak 136 kart, naprawiane 75	półskórek, XIX w.	brak
O 239/2025	brak 145 kart: dziewięć nieliczbowanych, 54 w ST, 70 w NT, 12 rejestru; zaczyna się od kart rozdziału 32 Wtórych Ksiąg Mojżeszowych i dochodzi do rozdziału 27 Dziejów Apostolskich, postrzępienia krawędzi	brak oprawy	brak
O 240/2025	zapewne ponownie wystawiony egzemplarz z aukcji O 239/2025[51]		

G – antykwariat Logos, L – antykwariat Lamus, O – Dom Aukcyjny Ostoya, R – antykwariat RaraAvis, RS – Dom Aukcyjny Rynek Sztuki, W – antykwariat Wójtowicz, ? – brak danych, ST – Stary Testament, NT – Nowy Testament

Źródło: opracowanie własne na podstawie opisów z folderów aukcyjnych, których numery podano w tabeli.

Drugie wydanie Biblii Leopolity z 1575 r. (wliczając omawiany wariant tytułowy z 1577 r.) pojawiało się zdecydowanie częściej w ofercie aukcyjnej niż dwie poprzednie edycje Biblii (lub trzy, jeśli uwzględnić Biblię Budnego). Autor łącznie odnotował aż 21 takich ofert – dokładnie tyle samo co kolejnej edycji Biblii, tym razem w tłumaczeniu ks. J. Wujka. Niemniej, w przypadku tych 21 ofert przynajmniej pięciokrotnie wystawiano ponownie wcześniej sprzedawany egzemplarz. W sumie daje to 17 unikalnych kopii analizowanego wydania[52]. Pięć egzemplarzy było formalnie w pełni kompletnych (szczególnie

51 Egzemplarz ten został zapewne sprzedany w ofercie poaukcyjnej – niestety autor nie posiada na ten temat bliższych informacji.

52 Wielokrotnie, większe lub mniejsze fragmenty (liczące od kilku ksiąg do nawet pojedynczych kart), odnotowywano na portalu aukcyjnym Allegro (por. https://archiwum.allegro.pl/oferta/1577-biblia-leopolity-

oferty z lat 90. XX w.), ale zaobserwowano też kilka egzemplarzy z bardzo poważnymi brakami, sięgającymi czasem ponad 100 kart (zwłaszcza ostatnio oferowane na rynku). Sześć egzemplarzy posiadało oprawę z epoki (zachowaną przynajmniej w dużej części). Osiem oferowanych kopii można było uznać za wyraźnie podniszczone lub zdefektowane. Uśredniając stan zachowania, egzemplarze miały ponownie ponad 20 brakujących kart (średnia wyniosła 25), ale mediana była bardzo niska – tylko dwie karty. Tę zastanawiającą sytuację można tłumaczyć faktem, że na rynku pojawiały się egzemplarze o skrajnie różnym stanie zachowania – albo prawie idealne (w oryginalnych oprawach z epoki), albo stosunkowo mocno zdekompletowane (czasem nawet bez oprawy). W przypadku not proweniencyjnych nie stwierdzono kopii pochodzących od szerzej znanych osób.

2.5. Biblia Wujka z 1599 r. – opis egzemplarzy

Biblia Wujka, nazwana tak od nazwiska autora tłumaczenia – ks. Jakuba Wujka, jest z punktu widzenia historycznego najważniejszym polskim tłumaczeniem katolickim (opartym na Wulgacie, ale z uwzględnieniem języków oryginalnych, gdy tłumacz napotykał wątpliwości translacyjne[53]). Towarzyszyła polskim katolikom przez ponad 350 lat[54] i była tekstem nie tylko religijnym, ale często kulturotwórczym[55]. Nawet dziś tekst Wujka znajduje swoich odbiorców[56], zwłaszcza w wersjach sprzed modyfikacji językowych czynionych w XIX i XX w.[57]. Co warte uwagi, sama Biblia Wujka, wydana w Krakowie w 1599 r. w Drukarni Łazarzowey (kierowanej przez Jana Januszowskiego)[58], przeszła dość istotną korektę językową poczynioną przez komisję jezuicką (ks. Wujek zmarł w 1597 r. i zdążył nadzorować

---

piekna-oprawa-i5130784938.html [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). Na wspomnianym portalu odnotowywano też oferty całej Biblii, ale były to zazwyczaj formy rozreklamowania poszczególnych antykwariatów przed prowadzonymi aukcjami (por. https://archiwum.allegro.pl/oferta/lamus-biblia-leopolity-krako-1577-i8104959847.html [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). Także na portalu OLX odnaleziono pojedynczy przypadek oferty zdekompletowanego wydania zawierającego np. środkową część ST.

53 Por. R. Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, I, 459.

54 Istotne było przekonanie o zaakceptowaniu Biblii przez papieża i uznaniu przekładu (podczas synodu piotrkowskiego w 1607 r.) za powszechnie obowiązujący. Założenia te zostały podważone dopiero w 1894 r. (przez ks. S. Chodyńskiego), choć jeszcze przez kilkadziesiąt lat kwestia ta budziła wątpliwości – por. R. Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum* (Poznań: Pallottinum 2016) V, 77; J. Archutowski, „I Zjazd Biblistów Polskich", *Przegląd Biblijny* 1 (1937) 101–102, https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/713622/edition/676034/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

55 Por. S. Koziara, „Biblia Wujka w języku i kulturze polskiej", *Konspekt* 14/15 (2003) 131–133.

56 Można to dostrzec, obserwując szybko znikające oferty na portalu Allegro, dotyczące Biblii w tłumaczeniu Wujka wydanych w XIX w. (szczególnie stosunkowo tanie wydanie lipskie z 1898 r.). Zagadnienie to wykracza jednak poza ramy tego artykułu.

57 O modernizacji języka tłumaczeń można przeczytać np. w H. Duda, *„... każdą razą Biblię odmieniać" Modernizacja języka przedruków Nowego Testamentu ks. Jakuba Wujka w XVII i XVIII wieku* (Lublin: TN KUL 1998).

58 Nakład tej edycji obejmował zapewne paręset sztuk. Na początku XIX w. władze carskie zakładały łączny nakład Biblii w tłumaczeniu J. Wujka (trzy wydania z lat 1599, 1740 i 1771) na około 3000 egzemplarzy – zob. M. Godlewski, „O mistycyzmie cesarza Aleksandra I. Szkic historyczny", *Przegląd Powszechny* 162/484 (1924) 51, https://academica.edu.pl/reading/readSingle?page=53&uid=53054183 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

wydanie jedynie Nowego Testamentu w 1593 r. i 1594 r.)[59]. Biblia imponuje rozmachem i sprawnością stosowanej sztuki edytorskiej. Co jednak ciekawe, nie zawiera – jako jedyna spośród dostępnych na rynku polskich Biblii XVI-wiecznych – ilustracji (poza bardzo ciekawym frontyspisem, kartami tytułowymi Starego i Nowego Testamentu oraz rozbudowaną bordiurą początku Ewangelii wg św. Mateusza)[60]. W obiegu spotyka się dwa podstawowe warianty tekstowe[61], jednak nie są one rozróżnialne na rynku antykwarycznym.

Tabela 4. Opis zidentyfikowanych pozycji Biblii Wujka (1599 r.) oferowanych na polskim rynku aukcyjnym

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	**Opis kart**	**Opis oprawy**	**Proweniencja**
W 6/1998	brak frontyspisu, karty 70–73 ze stratą dla tekstu	deska, brązowa skóra, tłoczenia, klamry	brak
L 9/2000	drobne ubytki i podklejenia	skóra XVIII w., barwienia i złocenia	Marian Swinarski
L 13/2002	braki: frontyspis, karta tytułowa, cztery karty losowo w tekście, 20 stron końcowych; kilka kart ze stratą dla tekstu	współczesna, skóra z tłoczeniami	brak
W 19/2005	brak 53 kart: 39 z przodu, pięć z tyłu i dziewięć losowo – w ich miejsce wmontowano dokładne rękopiśmienne kopie (XIX w.)	skóra – wykonana w XIX w. (?), 5-polowy grzbiet, złocony napis, przednie lico z tłoczeniem i złoconym krzyżem, tylna cześć z Matką Boską i Dzieciątkiem	brak
W 20/2005	brak 60 kart (w ich miejsce umieszczono reprodukcje na starym papierze): 12 z przodu i 48 z tyłu; zachowany fragment karty tytułowej luzem; uzupełnienia marginesów; ubytki	pełna skóra, XVIII w.	brak
L 24/2007	brak karty tytułowej i końcowej, karta tytułowa w XIX-wiecznej kopii	z epoki, skóra na desce, ślepe tłoczenia, motywy kwiatowe, mosiężne zapinki, narożniki mosiężne, złocenia	brak

59 Pierwszy miał to wykazać J. Gołąb (*O tłómaczeniu Nowego Testamentu przez ks. Jakuba Wujka* [Warszawa: Przegląd Katolicki 1906] 23, https://zbc.uz.zgora.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=20182 [dostęp: 12.05.2025]). Warto w tym miejscu wskazać także na pracę doktorską T. Rubika (oraz jej późniejsze wydanie książkowe z kolejnego roku), w której szeroki rozdział poświęcono jezuickiej cenzurze tłumaczenia Wujka – zob. T. Rubik, *Biblia Wujka, Rabba i Grodzickiego. Historia jezuickiego przekładu (ok. 1579–1599) w kontekście kulturowym epoki* (praca doktorska, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Wydział „Artes Liberales", Międzydziedzinowa Szkoła Doktorska; Warszawa 2023) 521–566.

60 Zob. Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim*, 313–360; Pietkiewicz, *Biblia Polonorum*, I, 452–479; Gustaw, „Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego", 311–318.

61 Zob. T. Komender – H. Mieczkowska, *Katalog druków XVI wieku w zbiorach BU w Warszawie* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 1998) II:B, Cz. I, 319, https://crispa.uw.edu.pl/object/files/619958/display/Default [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Opis kart	Opis oprawy	Proweniencja
W 24/2007	brak 47 kart: 24 z przodu, 16 z tyłu, siedem losowo; siedem kart ze stratą dla tekstu	naprawiana, pełna skóra, niewielki ubytek grzbietu	brak
W 25/2007	brak 29 kart: karta tytułowa (w odpisie z XVIII w.), ostatnia karta nieliczbowana z przodu, karty 1475 i 1477 oraz 25 kart końcowych	napis na grzbiecie – „Biblia Starego i Nowego Testamentu", skóra XVIII w.	Józef Kociesza Żaba, Marian Swiniarski
R 75/2007	brak karty tytułowej oraz ostatniej	?	brak
R 77/2008	brak czterech kart (w tym tytułowej), część kart luzem	?	brak
R 98/2012	tylko NT, ubytki papieru okleinowego, podklejenia marginesów jednej karty, podklejone przedarcie przedostatniej karty, niewielkie zaplamienia kart w grzbiecie na końcu	późniejsza, półskórek	brak
L 34/2012	braki: karta tytułowa, pięć kart początkowych, dwie w środku i 19 końcowych (braki uzupełnione w kopii)	XVIII w., skóra marmurkowa, grzbiet 6-polowy, ramka z motywami kwiatowymi	brak
W 37/2013	braki: 14 kart (siedem na początku i siedem na końcu – zastąpione fachowo wykonanymi kopiami) oraz frontyspis; niewielkie przycięcie marginesów	wtórna, brązowa skóra z tłoczeniami, deska, zachowane dwie zapinki, brzegi barwione	brak
OS 182/2014	braki: 13 kart nieliczbowanych na początku, strony 1–240 oraz końcowe osiem kart regestru	brak oprawy	Vincentii Kubicki Anno Domini 1800
W 40/2015	brak 24 kart: frontyspis, 11 kart początku, 12 na końcu (uzupełnienia w kopiach); przycięcie marginesów; krawędź barwiona	deska, brązowa skóra z tłoczeniami, osiem guzów metalowych, dwie zapinki	brak
G 49/2020	brak całego wstępu, tekst Pisma Świętego w całości, ale kilka kart ręcznie uzupełniona (około XVIII w.), Księga Genesis w innym, unikalnym układzie typograficznym	tylna część oprawy i część grzbietu z epoki, przód dołożony z dzieła XV-wiecznego	brak
L 55/2021	kompletna	skóra ze złoceniami i tłoczeniami, szyldzik, wyklejka – papier marmurkowy	brak
W 53/2021	brak 14 kart: frontyspis, karta tytułowa, karta dedykacji, karta Porządku Ksiąg ST, karty liczbowane: 1–4, 9–10, 13–14, sześć końcowych kart nieliczbowanych w rejestrze; brakujące karty zastąpione fachowo wykonanymi kopiami na papierze z epoki	deska, żółty pergamin z epoki	Konstanty Podhorski Mikołajówka (Konstanty Maciej książę Podhorski 1859–1907); Kalwaria Pacławska k. Przemyśla

Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Opis kart	Opis oprawy	Proweniencja
R 131/2021	brak frontyspisu, obcięcia barwione	pergamin z epoki, metalowe okucia i zapinki, na 5-polowym grzbiecie ze zwięzami odręczny tytuł umieszczony w epoce: „Biblia", na obu kartach okładki złocony owalny zdobnik z postacią króla Dawida z cytrą	brak
A 11/2023	brak frontyspisu, karta ze stroną tytułową i druga karta uzupełniona w 1/4 powierzchni; wśród kolejnych 30 stronnic ok. 10 podklejonych (w epoce) na marginesach	grzbiet obleczony brązową skórą, okładki czarne, zauważalny nieznaczny ubytek górnej krawędzi tylnej oprawy, naprawiane w 1920 r. (opisy introligatorskie)	dedykacja – księdzu Zygmuntowi Migdałowi, proboszczowi Parafii Brzezie (1892–1915) oraz Parafii Niepołomice
L 69/2025	brak karty tytułowej, podklejenia frontyspisu oraz karty końcowej	z epoki, zwięzy, skóra	dr Antoni Przyborowski; wklejone autografy Jana Pawła II, prymasa Wyszyńskiego oraz kardynała Dziwisza

A – antykwariat Abecadło, D – antykwariat Derubeis, G – antykwariat Logos, L – antykwariat Lamus, OS – Dom Aukcyjny Okna Sztuki, R – antykwariat RaraAvis, W – antykwariat Wójtowicz, ? – brak danych, ST – Stary Testament, NT – Nowy Testament

Źródło: opracowanie własne na podstawie opisów z folderów aukcyjnych, których numery podano w tabeli.

Biblia Wujka z 1599 r. – ze względu na znaczenie dla katolików w Polsce – była książką pożądaną i bardzo szanowaną. Zapewne uniknęła wielu niebezpieczeństw, na które były narażone poprzednie wydania – niszczona, niekatolicka Biblia brzeska oraz formalnie już nieużywana w Kościele, a przez to narażona na zapomnienie, Biblia Leopolity. Nie powinien więc dziwić fakt, że omawiana edycja mogła się zachować – i zapewne zachowała – do naszych czasów w największej liczbie egzemplarzy. Świadczyć może o tym również fakt, że Biblię Wujka najczęściej oferowano na aukcjach antykwarycznych w Polsce – co prawda formalnie tyle samo razy co drugie wydanie Biblii Leopolity, ale prawdopodobnie wszystkie oferty dotyczyły różnych kopii. Pomijając często brakujący, efektowny i sugestywny frontyspis, Biblia Wujka pięciokrotnie była oferowana jako dzieło kompletne (odmiennie niż w przypadku Biblii Leopolity – dotyczyło to egzemplarzy ostatnio wystawianych na aukcjach). Osiem oferowanych kopii posiadało oprawę z epoki. Sześć egzemplarzy było dość mocno uszkodzonych, w tym dwa bardzo mocno zdefektowane (kilkaset brakujących stron). Fakt ten znacząco wpłynął na opis egzemplarza uśrednionego, w przypadku którego można stwierdzić, że charakteryzował się aż 50 brakami w liczbie kart (tyle wyniosła średnia). Mediana jednak jest podobna do dwóch pierwszych opisywanych edycji i wynosiła 14 brakujących kart. W mniej niż połowie egzemplarzy zachowała się oprawa z epoki (dziewięć kopii). W zapisach proweniencyjnych kilkukrotnie

odnotowano ciekawe wpisy, choć podobnie jak w przypadku pozostałych edycji nie były to osoby bardzo znane. Ciekawostką jest fakt dwukrotnego wpisu M. Swinarskiego. W przypadku ostatniego z oferowanych egzemplarzy wklejono w nim autografy papieża Jana Pawła II oraz prymasa Stefana Wyszyńskiego. Fakt ten mógł przyczynić się do uzyskania wyższej ceny końcowej, co prawdopodobnie nie miało miejsca w przypadku innych kopii jakiegokolwiek wydania.

2.6. Podsumowanie przedstawionych egzemplarzy

Próbując podsumować powyższe rozważania, można wskazać na następujące fakty. Na podstawie zebranych danych opisano 59 ofert polskojęzycznych Biblii z XVI w. Oferty te dotyczyły łącznie 51 unikalnych kopii. W badanym okresie nie udało się zidentyfikować egzemplarza Biblii Budnego z 1572 r. Wśród unikalnych kopii 12 (24% całości) było kompletnych lub prawie kompletnych (brak frontyspisu w przypadku Biblii Wujka), ta sama liczba (12) egzemplarzy miała stratę ponad lub blisko 50 kart (100 stron). Średnio w analizowanych egzemplarzach brakowało około 30 kart, ale mediana była znacząco niższa (około 10 kart). Tylko 18 analizowanych kopii (35%) Biblii wciąż posiadało oprawę wykonaną w epoce. Stan 22 egzemplarzy (43%) autor – choć należy zaznaczyć, że była to subiektywna ocena, podyktowana analizą wszystkich dostępnych opisów i ewentualnych zdjęć zawartych w katalogach aukcyjnych – ocenił na bardzo dobry lub dobry. Za mocno zniszczone (w tym zdefektowane) uznano 18 kopii (35%). Powyższy opis potwierdza w dużej części fakt, że na aukcjach często pojawiały się egzemplarze w tzw. polskim stanie zachowania[62], a sytuacja ta była – i wciąż jest – akceptowana przez kupców polskojęzycznych starodruków (nie tylko biblijnych).

Patrząc na ocenę stanu zachowania poszczególnych edycji, można zauważyć, że w przypadku dwóch najwcześniejszych – Biblii Leopolity z 1561 r. oraz Biblii brzeskiej z 1563 r. – mamy znacząco mniejszy udział egzemplarzy dostępnych w handlu (odpowiednio sześć i siedem egzemplarzy), jak i tych zachowanych w dobrym stanie (odpowiednio 17% i 14% egzemplarzy). W przypadku edycji późniejszych (Biblia Leopolity z 1575/1577 r. oraz Biblia Wujka z 1599 r.) dostępnych było więcej egzemplarzy (odpowiednio 17 i 21 egzemplarzy), a dobry stan zachowania był częściej spotykany (odpowiednio 29% i 24% egzemplarzy). Ciekawie kształtuje się odsetek egzemplarzy dostępnych w gorszych stanach – oscyluje on generalnie na poziomie około 30% (jedynie dla drugiego wydania Biblii Leopolity osiąga on niemal 50%). Widać tu wyraźną różnicę między pierwszymi edycjami polskojęzycznych Biblii z początku lat 60. XVI w. a wydaniami późniejszymi. Skąd wynika ta różnica? W przypadku Biblii Wujka (o czym już wspominano) można ją tłumaczyć tym, że jako zatwierdzone wydanie katolickie była ceniona i dobrze przechowywana. Trudno natomiast wskazać

62 Termin ten odzwierciedla fakt doświadczania, szczególnie przez Polskę, okresu wielu wojen i innych form niepokojów. Powodowało to, że zasoby biblioteczne były narażone na znacznie większe uszkodzenia i zdekompletowanie – zob. W. Jurasz, *Polski inkunabuł w europejskim stanie*, https://dziennikpolski24.pl/polski-inkunabul-w-europejskim-stanie/ar/3236592 [dostęp: 10.10.2024].

przyczynę różnicy między pierwszym i drugim wydaniem Biblii Leopolity – być może znaczenie miał nakład, niestety autor nie był w stanie tych liczb porównać. Warte podkreślenia jest natomiast, że pomimo dużego sentymentu, jaką darzona jest Biblia brzeska, pierwsze wydanie Biblii Leopolity – zarówno pod względem dostępności, jak i stanu zachowania – w niczym jej nie ustępuje.

3. Ceny poszczególnych egzemplarzy

Kluczowe informacje potrzebne do prowadzonych w tym punkcie analiz zawarto w tabeli 5. Wszystkie ceny w artykule są podawane w polskich złotych, chyba, że wyraźnie wskazano, że jest inaczej.

Tabela 5. Zestaw cen wywoławczych i osiągniętych za egzemplarze Biblii na polskich aukcjach antykwarycznych w latach 1994–2025

Biblia – rok wydania	Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Cena wywoławcza	Cena osiągnięta	Cena wywoławcza/ inflacja	Cena osiągnięta/ inflacja
1561	W 3/1994	4000	?	26 376,81	?
1561	W 6/1997	5500	?	17 903,73	?
1561	W 15/2003	3000	?	5985,86	?
1561	W 19/2005	8000	13 200	15 300,10	25 245,17
1561	W 37/2013	20 000	?	30 237,43	?
1561	L 38/2014	50 000	55 000	74 919,31	82 411,24
Podsumowanie dla 1561:	**sześć ofert**	**średnia cena wywoławcza/inflacja: 28 453,88**		**średnia cena osiągnięta/inflacja: 53 828,21**	
1563	L 1/1994	?	9900	?	65 282,61
1563	L 7/1999	8000	?	20 272,58	?
1563	W 9/2000	10 000	33 000	23 616,70	77 935,12
1563	L 12/2001	45 000	?	96 526,03	?
1563	R 65/2006	42 000	0	78 673,41	0
1563	R 67/2006	42 000	0	78 673,41	0
1563	RE 116/2006	?	63 800	?	119 508,70
1563	R 75/2007	42 000	85 800	77 894,46	159 127,30
1563	W 34/2012	60 000	101 200	94 068,66	158 662,50
1563	L 45/2017	45 000	165 000	68 450,44	250 985,00
Podsumowanie dla 1563:	**10 ofert**	**średnia cena wywoławcza/inflacja: 67 271,96**		**średnia cena osiągnięta/inflacja: 138 583,50**	

Biblia – rok wydania	Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Cena wywoławcza	Cena osiągnięta	Cena wywoławcza/ inflacja	Cena osiągnięta/ inflacja
1575/1577	L 4/1997	1800	?	5859,402	?
1575/1577	W 6/1997	6000	?	19531,34	?
1575/1577	W 7/1998	7000	7700	19 831,65	21 814,81
1575/1577	L 8/1999	1800	?	4561,33	?
1575/1577	L 7/1999	7000	?	17 738,51	?
1575/1577	W 17/2004	5000	?	9897,26	?
1575/1577	L 28/2009	24 000	?	41 675,13	?
1575/1577	W 33/2011	20 000	24 750	32 704,54	40 471,86
1575/1577	L 33/2011	35 000	?	57 232,94	?
1575/1577	L 32/2011	40 000	?	65 409,07	?
1575/1577	RS 2012	5500	5500	8622,96	8622,96
1575/1577	L 35/2012	40 000	?	62 712,44	?
1575/1577	L 40/2015	50 000	?	74 919,31	?
1575/1577	R 116/2016	36 000	0	54431,79	0
1575/1577	L 9/2017	14 000	22 000	21 295,69	33 464,66
1575/1577	D 1/2018	50 000	0	74 564,75	0
1575/1577	L 48/2019	56 000	0	82 197,36	0
1575/1577	L 13/2019	45 000	0	66 051,45	0
1575/1577	L 51/2020	44 000	55 000	63 131,62	78 914,52
1575/1577	G 49/2020	8000	15 400	11 478,48	22 096,07
1575/1577	O 239/2025	50 000	0	50 000,00	0
1575/1577	O 240/2025	40 000	0	40 000,00	0
Podsumowanie dla 1575/1577:	**21 ofert**	**średnia cena wywoławcza/inflacja: 40 174,86**		**średnia cena osiągnięta/inflacja: 34 230,81**	
1599	W 6/1997	6500	?	21 158,95	?
1599	L 9/2000	18 000	66 000	42 510,07	155 870,20
1599	L 13/2002	9000	?	18 298,77	?
1599	W 19/2005	15 000	16 500	28 687,70	31 556,47
1599	W 20/2005	12 000	?	22 950,16	?
1599	L 24/2007	48 000	66 000	89 022,24	122 405,60
1599	W 25/2007	24 000	?	44 511,12	?
1599	W 24/2007	12 000	13 200	22 255,56	24 481,12
1599	R 75/2007	15 000	19 910	27 819,45	36 925,69
1599	R 77/2008	12 000	?	21 712,74	?
1599	R 98/2012	8000	10 120	12 542,49	15 866,25

Biblia – rok wydania	Antykwariat (kod), nr aukcji, rok	Cena wywoławcza	Cena osiągnięta	Cena wywoławcza/ inflacja	Cena osiągnięta/ inflacja
1599	L 34/2012	30 000	?	47 034,33	?
1599	W 37/2013	20 000	?	30 237,43	?
1599	OS 182/2014	10 000	?	14 983,86	?
1599	W 40/2015	29 000	?	43 453,20	?
1599	G 49/2020	10 000	28 050	14 348,09	40 246,40
1599	L 55/2021	75 000	93 500	104 072,30	129 743,40
1599	W 53/2021	36 000	42 900	49 954,68	59 529,33
1599	R 131/2021	42 000	88 000	58 280,46	122 111,40
1599	A 11/2023	39 000	59 400	45 010,06	68 553,78
1599	L 69/2025	60 000	99 000	60 000	99 000,00
Podsumowanie dla 1599:	**21 ofert**	**średnia cena wywoławcza/inflacja: 38 992,55**		**średnia cena osiągnięta/inflacja: 75 524,14**	

A – antykwariat Abecadło, D – antykwariat Derubeis, G – antykwariat Logos, L – antykwariat Lamus, OS – Dom Aukcyjny Okna Sztuki, R – antykwariat RaraAvis, RE – Dom Aukcyjny Rempex, RS – Dom Aukcyjny Rynek Sztuki, W – antykwariat Wójtowicz, ? – brak danych, ST – Stary Testament, NT – Nowy Testament

Źródło: opracowanie własne na podstawie opisów z folderów aukcyjnych (numery podano w tabeli), informacji poaukcyjnych o cenach osiągniętych oraz własnych przeliczeń uwzględniających poziom inflacji.

Omawiane wyniki bazują na cenach skorygowanych o inflację. Analizując powyższą tabelę można stwierdzić, że w ujęciu średnim najwyższe ceny osiągała Biblia brzeska (blisko 139 tys. zł), a druga w kolejności była Biblia Wujka (ponad 75,5 tys. zł). Najniższe średnie ceny osiągały obydwa wydania Biblii Leopolity – pierwsze wydanie blisko 54 tys. zł, drugie wydanie nieco ponad 34 tys. zł. Należy jednak zauważyć, że w przypadku pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity tylko dwa razy udało się zidentyfikować sprzedany egzemplarz. Biblia brzeska i drugie wydanie Biblii Leopolity pojawiły się na aukcjach sześć razy, natomiast Biblia Wujka aż 12 razy[63]. Nieco inaczej kształtowały się ceny wywoławcze. Za najcenniejszą ponownie można było uznać Biblię brzeską (ponad 67 tys. zł). Drugie miejsce zajęło drugie wydanie Biblii Leopolity (nieco ponad 40 tys. zł), niewiele ustępujące Biblii Wujka (niecałe 40 tys. zł). Zaskakująco niska była średnia cena wywoławcza pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity – jedynie około 28,5 tys. zł. Wśród 10 najdrożej sprzedanych egzemplarzy pierwszą trójkę stanowiły druki Biblii brzeskiej (najdroższa została wyceniona przez kupujących na ponad 250 tys. zł). Kolejne cztery miejsca zajęła Biblia Wujka (z najdroższym drukiem wartym ponad 155 tys. zł). W dziesiątce znalazł się również egzemplarz pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity (blisko 82,5 tys. zł), a zaraz po analizowanych

63 Poza wspomnianą kwestią pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity, także w przypadku innych Biblii kilkukrotnie odnotowywano fakt wystawienia oferty bez finalnej sprzedaży.

egzemplarzach pierwszy raz pojawił się druk drugiego wydania Biblii Leopolity (sprzedany za blisko 79 tys. zł). Warto podkreślić, że blisko połowa najdroższych egzemplarzy sprzedała się w ostatnich 10 latach. Dość odmiennie wyglądała sytuacja w przypadku 10 najwyższych cen wywoławczych. Najdrożej wyceniono egzemplarz Biblii Wujka (ok. 104 tys. zł), natomiast dwa kolejne miejsca przypadły Biblii brzeskiej (droższa z wycen – nieco ponad 96,5 tys. zł). Co może zaskakiwać, dwa razy wśród analizowanych egzemplarzy odnotowano drugie wydanie Biblii Leopolity (droższa z nich wyceniona na trochę ponad 82 tys. zł). Ostatnie miejsce w analizowanej dziesiątce zajęło pierwsze wydanie Biblii Leopolity (blisko 75 tys. zł). Tylko trzy egzemplarze na tej liście były oferowane w ciągu ostatnich 10 lat. Warto też dodać, że średnia cena sprzedaży wszystkich edycji łącznie wyniosła blisko 78,9 tys. zł, natomiast średnia cena wywoławcza – około 42,5 tys. zł.

Podsumowując powyższe informacje, po raz kolejny w artykule uwidacznia się wyjątkowa pozycja Biblii brzeskiej. Była ona najbardziej pożądaną pozycją na rynku – odnotowywała jedne z najwyższych cen zarówno wywoławczych, jak i końcowych. Potwierdziła się też wartość rynkowa Biblii Wujka, natomiast drugie wydanie Biblii Leopolity cechowało się zauważalnie niższą wyceną. Dość zaskakująca jest natomiast niska obecność pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity – zarówno pod względem analizowanych cen, jak i liczby omawianych egzemplarzy. Prawdopodobnym wytłumaczeniem tego stanu rzeczy jest rzadka dostępność tego wydania na rynku, a także fakt, że ostatni egzemplarz pojawił się ponad 10 lat temu. W konsekwencji, mimo że analizy cen nie wskazują wyraźnie na atrakcyjność tego wydania dla kolekcjonerów, jego rzadkość może znacząco wpływać na wartość rynkową tego druku[64].

W kontekście podsumowania analiz dotyczących szacowanej wartości egzemplarzy polskojęzycznych Biblii z XVI w. warto przypomnieć, że rozważania tego typu pojawiały się w dyskusjach bibliofilskich przynajmniej już od przełomu XVIII i XIX w. Już chociażby J. Lelewel w swoim dziele *Bibljograficznych ksiąg dwoje* (1823 r.) wspominał, że za najdroższą edycję uchodziła Biblia Budnego (o szacowanej wartości 20 dukatów), za nią wskazywano na Biblię Brzeską (12 dukatów), a następnie „wydania Leopolity co do wartości na równi z Wuykiem iść mogą (...) Biblja Brzeska wyżej od nich stoji”[65] – choć tu niestety nie podano ceny[66]. Można więc stwierdzić, że przez ponad 200 lat kolejność wartościowania

64 W tym miejscu należy dodać, że inne analizy rynku sugerują regularny, kilkuprocentowy wzrost cen rzadkich druków i rękopisów, przewyższający inflację (por. Zakonnik – Czerwonka, „Return on Investment in Alternative Markets: The Case of The Polish Rare Book Market”, 286). Zapewne spostrzeżenie to może tłumaczyć sytuację, że egzemplarze dawniej oferowane na rynku mogą mieć w rzeczywistości większą wartość niż wynika to tylko z dzisiejszego uwzględniania inflacji. Ze względu jednak na brak jednoznacznej pewności, co do faktycznego poziomu tego wzrostu, zagadnienie to nie zostało uwzględnione w tym opracowaniu.

65 Zob. J. Lelewel, *Bibljograficznych ksiąg dwoje* (Wilno: J. Zawadzki 1823) I, 196, https://cybra.lodz.pl/dlibra/publication/711/edition/1093/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

66 Bazując na metodzie opisanej w przypisie 38, możemy oszacować cenę dzisiejszą: 20 dukatów (po 3,5 g złota) daje 70 g złota. Licząc po aktualnym kursie (z 9 maja 2025 r.), mamy 70 g × 463 zł/g, co daje około 32 000 zł. Dla 12 dukatów mamy 42 g × 463 zł/g ≈ 19 500 zł. Można więc bardzo ostrożnie stwierdzić, że dostrzec można ponad siedmiokrotny wzrost ceny na przestrzeni dwóch stuleci.

poszczególnych edycji nie uległa większym zmianom, z tą uwagą, że Biblia Budnego zniknęła z rynku, a sam Lelewel nie rozróżniał edycji Biblii Leopolity.

4. Czynniki wpływające na cenę

4.1. Metoda badawcza

Patrząc na poprzedni podpunkt, z pewnością można zastanawiać się, czy istnieją jakieś obiektywne czynniki wpływające na kształtowanie się cen[67] analizowanych druków biblijnych[68]. Myśląc o takich czynnikach, należy pamiętać również o wielu trudno mierzalnych czynnikach – m.in. indywidualnych upodobaniach kupujących, aktualnych trendach na rynku antykwarycznym czy skłonności do podejmowania ryzyka. Literatura poświęcona mechanizmom aukcyjnym szeroko omawia wybrane aspekty tych zagadnień[69]. Autor w tym miejscu podjął próbę wskazania czynników względnie mierzalnych. Do takich zaliczono: rok wydania Biblii (oraz jego pochodne, np. czy mamy do czynienia z pierwodrukami, jak pierwsze wydanie Biblii Leopolity i Biblia brzeska), denominację chrześcijańską (uproszczając – czy wydanie było katolickie, czy nie), obecność ilustracji (ze wskazaniem głównie na Biblię Leopolity), szeroko rozumiany stan zachowania (kompletność, stan kart, czas i zachowanie oprawy), proweniencję, wpływ pandemii COVID-19. Wskazany zbiór czynników nie jest kompletny – bezpośrednia możliwość przejrzenia egzemplarza dawałaby zapewne szansę wyróżnienia większej grupy cech. Na podstawie posiadanych danych zbiór ten stanowił jednak praktycznie jedyne możliwe źródło do oceny zależności.

Starając się znaleźć potencjalne zależności między czynnikami, wykorzystano oprogramowanie IBM SPSS Statistics (w wersji 29). Zbadano występowanie korelacji parami, stosując współczynnik rho-Spearmana[70]. O stwierdzeniu zależności decydował poziom istotności (ang. *significance* – *sig.*) poniżej 0,05, choć wskazywano także na potencjalne tendencje statystyczne (sig. < 0,1)[71]. Za silny związek uznawano ten, gdzie współczynnik rho był powyżej 0,7, średni – jeśli był poniżej 0,7, ale powyżej 0,4, w końcu za słaby – gdy był

67 W literaturze tematu można znaleźć zakres takich czynników – por. K. Borowski, *Rynek inwestycji kolekcjonerskich i alternatywnych*, wyd. 2 (Warszawa: CeDeWu 2024) 32–33.

68 Według analogicznej metody autor przeprowadził wcześniej analizę czynników wpływających na kształtowanie się cen polskojęzycznych kronik ogólnohistorycznych przełomu XVI i XVII w. – Zakonnik, „Kronika Gwagnina na tle polskojęzycznych kronik końca XVI i początku XVII wieku – dostępność i czynniki wpływające na kształtowanie się ceny na polskim rynku antykwarycznym".

69 Zakres czynników wpływających na cenę może być bardzo szeroki – od subiektywnej postrzeganej wartości po takie elementy, jak pora dnia zakończenia aukcji – zob. Ł. Zakonnik – P. Czerwonka – R. Zajdel, „Online Auctions End Time and Its Impact on Sales Success – Analysis of the Odds Ratio on a Selected Central European Market", *Folia Oeconomica Stetinensia* 22/2 (2022) 246–264, https://doi.org/10.2478/foli-2022-0029.

70 Zob. M. Roszkiewicz, *Analiza Klienta* (Kraków: SPSS Polska 2011) 236–237.

71 Zob. L. Pritschet – D. Powell – Z. Horne, „Marginally Significant Effects as Evidence for Hypotheses: Changing Attitudes over Four Decades", *Psychol Sci.* 27/7 (2016) 1036–1042, https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616645672.

poniżej 0,4[72]. Otrzymane wyniki opisano poniżej. W analizach uwzględniono wszystkie odnalezione egzemplarze, przy czym ceny skorygowano o poziom inflacji.

4.2. Czynniki wpływające na cenę osiągniętą (cenę sprzedaży)

W przypadku analizy czynników wpływających na cenę osiągniętą stwierdzono następujące zależności:

a) cena końcowa/inflacja a wydania z lat 60-tych XVI w. (rho = ,411, sig. = 0,037) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile[73];
b) cena końcowa/inflacja a wydania katolickie (rho = -,499, sig. = 0,009) – stwierdzona zależność ujemna o średniej sile[74];
c) cena końcowa/inflacja a kompletność pozycji[75] (rho = ,458, sig. = 0,019) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile;
d) cena końcowa/inflacja a widoczne podniszczenia[76] (rho = -,330, sig. = 0,1) – stwierdzono ujemną tendencję statystyczną o słabej sile;
e) cena końcowa/inflacja a proweniencja (rho = ,423, sig. = 0,031) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile;
f) cena końcowa/inflacja a przebicia ofert[77] (rho = ,452, sig. = 0,027) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile.

Analizując otrzymane wyniki, można po raz kolejny potwierdzić bardzo silną pozycję rynkową Biblii brzeskiej. Wskazują na to korelacje o średniej sile pomiędzy ceną a takimi czynnikami, jak wydania z lat 60. XVI w. (pkt a) oraz wydania katolickie (pkt b). Należy jednak dodać, że wyłączenie z analizowanego zbioru pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity nie zmieniło znacząco uzyskanych wyników (w przypadku tych dwóch czynników). Zapewne więc zmienna wydania katolickie (zależność ujemna) nie wskazuje na wyższą wycenę wydań innych denominacji chrześcijańskich, lecz jedynie potwierdza silną pozycję rynkową Biblii brzeskiej. Osiągana cena powiązana jest także – zgodnie z intuicją – z kompletnością

72 Zob. Ostasiewicz – Rusnak – Siedlecka, *Statystyka*, 276.

73 Zależność dodatnia oznacza, że wraz ze wzrostem wartości jednego czynnika wzrasta także wartość drugiego. W tym przypadku fakt wydania wcześniejszego (lata 60. XVI w.) powiązany jest z wyższą osiąganą ceną.

74 Analogicznie jak wyżej, ale ze wzrostem wartości jednego czynnika drugi maleje. W tym przypadku wydanie katolickie powiązane było z niższą osiąganą ceną. Oczywiście można tu zakładać pewną zależność wtórną – wnioski na ten temat zostały opisane w dalszej części pracy.

75 Kompletność pozycji była zmienną zero-jedynkową (gdzie 0 oznaczało pozycje „mniej więcej kompletne", a 1 – dzieło mocno niekompletne). Za dzieło „mniej więcej kompletne" uważano takie, które miało co najwyżej kilkanaście procent braków. W przypadku tworzenia zmiennych określających kompletność na poziomie odpowiednio 1–2 kart braków czy kilku procent braków, zależności były również dostrzegalne, ale poziom istotności przekraczał założony (0,05–0,1).

76 Była to zmienna porządkowa – na początku skali uwzględniano dzieła zachowane w bardzo dobrym stanie, a na końcu – te zachowane w złym stanie.

77 Poprzez pojęcie „przebicia oferty" rozumiano sytuację, w której osiągana cena końcowa była wynikiem złożenia więcej niż jednej propozycji kupna. Obserwowano więc rywalizację oferentów, co mogło (choć nie musiało) wywoływać swoistą „gorączkę aukcyjną" i w efekcie końcowym prowadziło do wyższej ceny.

dzieła (pkt c) i stanem jego zachowania, wyłączając jednak ocenę oprawy (pkt d). Potwierdzono natomiast znaczenie proweniencji egzemplarza (pkt e). Zaobserwowano również, że wraz ze wzrostem liczby licytujących rosła cena końcowa (pkt f). Z jednej strony wydaje się to oczywiste (oferty muszą być przecież coraz wyższe), z drugiej może wskazywać na powstawanie pewnej „gorączki" aukcyjnej. Zaskakujący jest brak możliwości wykazania wpływu stanu i czasu pochodzenia oprawy na cenę. Być może wynika to z faktu, że opisy aukcyjne w tym zakresie bywają czasem nazbyt ogólne i nie wpływają jednoznacznie na decyzję kupującego. Nie wykazano także zależności między atrakcyjną szatą graficzną a ceną końcową (przyjmując Biblię Leopolity jako najbardziej rozbudowaną ilustracyjnie, Biblię Wujka jako jej przeciwieństwo, a Biblię brzeską jako pozycję pośrednią). Można przypuszczać, że atrakcyjność Biblii brzeskiej oraz historyczne znaczenie Biblii Wujka niwelowały wpływ efektownej oprawy graficznej Biblii Leopolity. Warto też zwrócić uwagę, że zawirowania rynkowe wywołane pandemią COVID-19 nie znalazły odzwierciedlenia w ocenie czynników kształtujących cenę końcową.

4.3. Czynniki wpływające na cenę wywoławczą

Przechodząc do analizy cech wpływających na cenę wywoławczą, stwierdzono następujące zależności:

a) cena wywoławcza/inflacja a wydania katolickie (rho = -,356, sig. = 0,007) – stwierdzona zależność ujemna o słabej sile;
b) cena wywoławcza/inflacja a data aukcji[78] (rho = ,429, sig. = 0,001) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile;
c) cena wywoławcza/inflacja a udana sprzedaż[79] (rho = -,383, sig. = 0,030) – stwierdzona zależność ujemna o słabej sile;
d) cena wywoławcza/inflacja a kompletność pozycji (rho = ,420, sig. = 0,001) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile;
e) cena wywoławcza/inflacja a widoczne podniszczenia (rho = -,411, sig. = 0,02) – stwierdzona zależność ujemna o średniej sile;
f) cena wywoławcza/inflacja a proweniencja (rho = ,349, sig. = 0,008) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o słabej sile.

Jak można zauważyć, cena wywoławcza w kilku przypadkach korelowała bardzo podobnie jak miało to miejsce w przypadku ceny osiąganej. Dotyczyło to następujących kwestii: charakteru wydania jako katolickiego (pkt a), kompletności pozycji (pkt d), ogólnej oceny stanu zachowania egzemplarza, ponownie z wyłączeniem oceny stanu oprawy (pkt e), proweniencji (pkt f). Ponownie nie wykazano statystycznych zależności między ceną a bogatą warstwą ilustracyjną ani szeroko rozumianą oceną stanu oprawy. Przechodząc do różnic, można sformułować kilka ciekawych wniosków. Przy ustalaniu ceny wywoławczej

78 Data aukcji to faktyczna data przeprowadzonej aukcji – dzień, miesiąc i rok.
79 Termin „udana sprzedaż" oznaczał, że pozycja została sprzedana w ramach aukcji.

antykwariaty w dostrzegalny sposób nie kierowały się wczesnym pochodzeniem Biblii (czyli wydaniami z lat 60. XVI w.). Widoczne jest natomiast, że wraz z upływem lat ceny wywoławcze stopniowo rosły (pkt b). Warto przy tym przypomnieć, że ceny osiągane nie zachowywały się w analogiczny sposób – przynajmniej nie można było tego stwierdzić na podstawie analizy korelacji czynników. Dość interesująca wydaje się także sugestia, że przeszacowanie ceny wywoławczej wpływało na brak zainteresowania zakupem tak wycenionej pozycji (pkt c). Może to być ostrzeżeniem dla sprzedających.

4.4. Inne czynniki i ich związki

Kończąc część artykułu poświęconą analizom potencjalnych związków między wybranymi czynnikami a ceną, warto zastanowić się, czy inne czynniki korelują ze sobą. Podstawę do odpowiedzi na to pytanie stanowią wyniki zaprezentowane poniżej:

a) data aukcji a wydania lat 60-tych XVI w. (rho = -,355, sig. = 0,006) – stwierdzona zależność ujemna o słabej sile;
b) bogata warstwa ilustracyjna a widoczne podniszczenia (rho = ,223, sig. = 0,090) – stwierdzono dodatnią tendencję statystyczną o słabej sile;
c) data aukcji a czas powstania oprawy[80] (rho = ,271, sig. = 0,047) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o słabej sile;
d) czy był wzrost ceny wywoławczej a czas powstania oprawy (rho = -,419, sig. = 0,024) – stwierdzona zależność ujemna o średniej sile;
e) widoczne podniszczenia a kompletność pozycji (rho = ,491, sig. = 0,000) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o średniej sile;
f) czas powstania oprawy a kompletność pozycji (rho = ,314, sig. = 0,021) – stwierdzona zależność dodatnia o słabej sile;
g) widoczne podniszczenia a czas powstania oprawy (rho = ,235, sig. = 0,087) – stwierdzono dodatnią tendencję statystyczną o słabej sile.

Pomimo braku wcześniej zauważalnych związków z ceną (zarówno wywoławczą, jak i osiągniętą), stwierdzono kilka istotnych zależności między czasem powstania oprawy a innymi czynnikami. Zależności te są intuicyjnie zrozumiałe – im bardziej analizowany egzemplarz cechował się gorszym stanem zachowania lub mniejszą kompletnością (warto zwrócić uwagę, że także między tymi czynnikami wskazano na związek dodatni – pkt e), tym częściej spotykano dzieła bez oryginalnej oprawy (a czasem nawet pozycje całkowicie jej pozbawione – odpowiednio pkt g i pkt f). Nieoczywiste są natomiast inne zależności związane z oprawą. W ostatnich latach zaobserwowano częstsze pojawianie się pozycji z oprawami wtórnymi (pkt c), a egzemplarze te cieszyły się mniejszą liczbą ofert składanych w trakcie licytacji (pkt d). Wreszcie odnotowano jedyną zależność związaną z warstwą ilustracyjną – pozycje bogatsze w ilustracje częściej cechowały się większymi uszkodzeniami (pkt b).

80 Zmienna porządkowa, której wartość wzrastała wraz z wiekiem powstania oprawy dzieła (0 – XVI w., 1 –XVII i XVIII w., 2 – XIX w., 3 – oprawa uważana za nową).

Ta ostatnia zależność być może wynikała z szybkiego „kartkowania" konkretnych egzemplarzy w celu poszukiwania sugestywnych obrazów, co mogło prowadzić do ich uszkodzeń, lub też z faktu „wykradania" kart z ilustracjami ze względu na ich atrakcyjność. Kończąc analizy statystyczne, warto zwrócić uwagę także na to, że z upływem czasu coraz rzadziej spotykane są na rynku najstarsze wydania (z lat 60. XVI w. – pkt a).

Zakończenie

Pomimo wielu dostępnych opracowań dotyczących polskich Biblii z XVI w. autor ma nadzieję, że zaprezentowane informacje w sposób oryginalny poszerzyły zakres wiedzy na temat omawianego zagadnienia. W artykule wskazano, że obok szeroko znanej Biblii brzeskiej na szczególną uwagę zasługuje dziś mniej rozpoznawalna (oczywiście poza kręgami specjalistów) Biblia Leopolity w jej pierwszym wydaniu. Obydwie te Biblie są w szerokim zakresie podobnie unikalne (choć Biblia brzeska wydaje się pod tym względem przeceniana, a Biblia Leopolity – niedoceniana) oraz cenne – i to nie tylko w kontekście historycznym, lecz także inwestycyjnym.

Pomimo tego stwierdzenia prawdziwym unikatem, obecnie nieosiągalnym na rynku, jest Biblia Budnego, która zapewne z powodu swych kontrowersyjnych fragmentów nigdy nie zdobyła wiernych odbiorców i z czasem niemal całkowicie zniknęła z obrotu prywatnego. Opracowanie wykazało również, że najczęściej spotykaną polską Biblią jest ta, która dla kultury polskiej miała – i w pewnym sensie wciąż ma – ogromne znaczenie, czyli Biblia Wujka. Jej stosunkowo większa dostępność nie skutkuje jednak niższą ceną, która w ostatnich latach wyraźnie wzrasta (choć zapewne jest to także spowodowane mniejszą częstotliwością ukazywania się na rynku innych edycji).

W pewien sposób zagadkowa pozostaje pozycja Biblii Leopolity w jej drugim wydaniu – jest ona stosunkowo często spotykana na rynku, lecz pomimo imponującej liczby efektownych drzeworytów cenowo ustępuje omawianym wcześniej edycjom. Winnym tego jest prawdopodobnie mniejsza rozpoznawalność tej wersji, co jednak nie powinno dziwić, gdyż ta katolicka Biblia została niespełna 40 lat po swoim wydaniu zastąpiona bardzo udanym językowo przekładem Biblii Wujka.

Niezależnie od powyższych rozważań autor podjął próbę wskazania czynników wpływających na kształtowanie się cen. Do czynników takich – często zgodnie z intuicją – zaliczono przede wszystkim kompletność egzemplarza oraz brak uszkodzeń. Do ważnych czynników zaliczono także atrakcyjną proweniencję. Co zaskakujące, o wiele mniejsze znaczenie miały natomiast takie czynniki, jak stan i czas powstania oprawy czy np. bogata warstwa graficzna. Kończąc artykuł, autor stawia pytanie, czy sformułowane tu wnioski byłyby prawdziwe dla np. egzemplarzy Biblii XVII- czy XVIII-wiecznych. Kwestia ta może stanowić punkt wyjścia do dalszych badań i kolejnych opracowań.

Bibliografia

Archutowski, J., „I Zjazd Biblistów Polskich", *Przegląd Biblijny* 1 (1937) 97–108, https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/713622/edition/676034/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Belcarzowa, E., *Polskie i czeskie źródła przekładu Biblii Leopolity* (Kraków: Lexis 2006).

Borowski, K., *Rynek inwestycji kolekcjonerskich i alternatywnych*, wyd. 2 (Warszawa: CeDeWu 2024).

Duda, H., *„... każdą razą Biblię odmieniać" Modernizacja języka przedruków Nowego Testamentu ks. Jakuba Wujka w XVII i XVIII wieku* (Lublin: TN KUL 1998).

Godlewski, M., „O mistycyzmie cesarza Aleksandra I. Szkic historyczny", *Przegląd Powszechny* 162/484 (1924) 47–61, https://academica.e Biblia Wujka w języku i kulturze polskiej du.pl/reading/readSingle?page=53&uid=53054183 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Gołąb, J., *O tłómaczeniu Nowego Testamentu przez ks. Jakuba Wujka* (Warszawa: Przegląd Katolicki 1906), https://zbc.uz.zgora.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=20182 [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Gustaw, R., „Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego", *Podręczna encyklopedia biblijna* (red. E. Dąbrowski) (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha 1959) II.

Jachimczyk, A., „Informacja o książce w księgarniach internetowych", *Przestrzeń informacyjna książki* (red. J. Konieczna – S. Kurek-Kokocińska – H. Tadeusiewicz) (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Biblioteka 2009) 161–170.

Jurasz, W., *Polski inkunabuł w europejskim stanie*, https://dziennikpolski24.pl/polski-inkunabul-w-europejskim-stanie/ar/3236592 [dostęp: 10.10.2024].

Komender, T. – Mieczkowska, H., *Katalog druków XVI wieku w zbiorach BU w Warszawie* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 1998) II: B, Cz. I, https://crispa.uw.edu.pl/object/files/619958/display/Default [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Kossowska, M., *Biblia w języku polskim* (Poznań: Księgarnia Św. Wojciecha 1968) I.

Koziara, S., „Biblia Wujka w języku i kulturze polskiej", *Konspekt* 14/15 (2003) 129–133.

Krzak-Weiss, K., „Inne spojrzenie na wariantywność pierwszego wydania Biblii Leopolity", *Jak wydawać teksty dawne* (red. K. Borowiec *et al.*) (Poznań: Rys 2017) 297–312.

Kwilecka, I., „Die Brester Bibel: Kulturgeschichtliche und sprachliche Fragen der Übersetzung", *Biblia święta to jest Księgi Starego i Nowego Zakonu*. II. *Księgi Nowego Testamentu* (red. H. Rothe – F. Scholz) (Paderborn: Schöningh 2001) 1485–1660.

Lelewel, J., *Bibljograficznych ksiąg dwoje* (Wilno: J. Zawadzki 1823) I, https://cybra.lodz.pl/dlibra/publication/711/edition/1093/content [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Leszczyński, R., „Biblia brzeska – pierwszy ewangelicki przekład Pisma Świętego na język polski", *Kalendarz ewangelicki* (red. D. Nowak *et al.*) (Bielsko-Biała: Augustana 2014) 152–160.

Lewaszkiewicz, T., „Samuel Bogumił Linde jako badacz polskich i innojęzycznych przekładów Biblii", *Na szlakach dawnej i współczesnej polszczyzny. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesor Danucie Bieńkowskiej* (red. D. Kowalska *et al.*) (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego 2023) 89–112.

Matuszczyk-Podgórska, B., „Co dziś wiemy o Biblii Leopolity (1561)?", *Portret Wielkiej Damy: Profesor Janina Gardzińska (1944–2022)* (red. V. Machnicka *et al.*) (Bukowiec: Igitur Violetta Machnicka 2023) 131–134.

Michałowska, T., *Literatura polskiego średniowiecza* (Warszawa: PWN 2011).

Miliszkiewicz, J., „Rynek bibliofilski. Wiekowy klejnot w zbiorach", *Rzeczpospolita* 5 lutego (2015).

Muczkowski, J., „O bibliach Szarfenbergerowskich", *Dwutygodnik Literacki* 24 (1845) 388–392, https://polona2.pl/item/o-janach-leopolitach-w-szesnastym-wieku-zyjacych,NTQ0MzI2NDQ/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Nieć, G., „COVID-19 i rynek książki. Ulotne zjawiska i trwałe zmiany", *Perspektywy Kultury* 4.2/43 (2023) 639–650, https://doi.org/10.35765/pk.2023.430402.36.

Nieć, G., *Wtórny rynek książki w Polsce – instytucje, asortyment, uczestnicy* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Księgarnia Akademicka 2016).

Ostasiewicz, S. – Rusnak, Z. – Siedlecka, U., *Statystyka*, wyd. 2 (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej 1997).

Pflughoeft, A., *Family Stumbles on Two Valuable 400-Year-Old Bibles Hidden in Poland Home*, https://www.miamiherald.com/news/nation-world/world/article296864019.html [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Pietkiewicz, R., *Biblia Polonorum* (Poznań: Pallottinum 2016) I.

Pietkiewicz, R., *Biblia Polonorum* (Poznań: Pallottinum 2015) V.

Pietkiewicz, R., „*Hebraica veritas* in the Brest Bible", *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 17/1 (2015) 44–62, https://doi.org/10.1179/1462245915Z.00000000068.

Pietkiewicz, R., „Nowe «pilne weźrzenie» w biblijne przekłady Szymona Budnego", *Abychmy w ten przekład pilnie weźrzeli: wobec tłumaczenia tekstów dawnych* (red. A. Bielak) (Warszawa: Zakład Graficzny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 2014) 129–146.

Podniesiński, P., „Inicjatywy na rynku antykwarycznym jako nowe narzędzie wspomagające badania księgoznawcze", *Biblioteki, informacja, książka: interdyscyplinarne badania i praktyka w XXI wieku* (red. M. Kocójowa) (Kraków: Instytut Informacji Naukowej i Bibliotekoznawstwa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 2010).

Pritschet, L. – Powell, D. – Horne, Z., "Marginally Significant Effects as Evidence for Hypotheses: Changing Attitudes over Four Decades", *Psychological Science* 27/7 (2016) 1036–1042, https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616645672.

Ptaszyk, M., „Okoliczności wydania Biblii Wujka z 1821 roku", *Pamiętnik Literacki* 87/3 (1996) 133–154.

Roszkiewicz, M., *Analiza Klienta* (Kraków: SPSS Polska 2011).

Rubik, T., *Biblia Wujka, Rabba i Grodzickiego. Historia jezuickiego przekładu (ok. 1579–1599) w kontekście kulturowym epoki* (praca doktorska, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Wydział „Artes Liberales", Międzydziedzinowa Szkoła Doktorska; Warszawa 2023).

Rubik, T., „Jan ze Lwowa i Erazm z Rotterdamu. Grecki tekst Nowego Testamentu a pierwodruk (1561) oraz zrewidowana edycja (1575) «Biblii Leopolity»", *The Biblical Annals* 13/2 (2023) 363–378, https://doi.org/10.31743/biban.14933.

Siess-Krzyszkowski, S., „Warianty typograficzne *Biblii brzeskiej*", *Tematy i Konteksty* 11/6 (2016) 36–59.

Smereka, W., „Zarys bibliograficzny ważniejszych wydań Biblii ks. Wujka (1593–1950)", *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 3 (1950) 74, 64–91.

Zakonnik, Ł. – Czerwonka, P., „Return on Investment in Alternative Markets: The Case of The Polish Rare Book Market", *Proceedings of the 40th International Business Information Management Association* (red. K.S. Soliman) (Seville: IBIMA 2022) 281–288.

Zakonnik, Ł., „Biblie w języku polskim wydane w latach 1801–1945", *Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne* 116 (2021) 483–532, https://doi.org/10.31743/abmk.9592.

Zakonnik, Ł., „Kronika Gwagnina na tle polskojęzycznych kronik końca XVI i początku XVII wieku – dostępność i czynniki wpływające na kształtowanie się ceny na polskim rynku antykwarycznym", *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria Polonica* 70/1 (2025) 305–335, https://doi.org/10.18778/1505-9057.70.13.

Zakonnik, Ł., „List of Bibles in Polish Published over the Years 1801–1945 – Supplement" (preprint), https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14285.45287.

Zakonnik, Ł. *et al.*, „Art Market Investment Bubble during COVID-19—Case Study of the Rare Books Market in Poland", *Sustainability* 14/18 (2022) 11648, https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811648.

Zakonnik, Ł. – Czerwonka, P. – Zajdel, R., „Online Auctions End Time and Its Impact on Sales Success – Analysis of the Odds Ratio on a Selected Central European Market", *Folia Oeconomica Stetinensia* 22/2 (2022) 246–264, https://doi.org/10.2478/foli-2022-0029.

Lista antykwariatów i domów aukcyjnych
Abecadło Antykwariat, https://www.abecadlo.org/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Derubeis Antykwariat, http://www.derubeis.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Lamus. Antykwariaty Warszawskie, https://www.lamus.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Logos Antykwariat, https://www.facebook.com/AntykwariatLOGOS (zamknięty) [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Okna Sztuki. Dom Aukcyjny, http://www.oknasztuki.pl/ (zamknięty) [dostęp: 4.11.2017].
OneBid platforma aukcyjna online, https://onebid.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Ostoya Dom aukcyjny, https://aukcjeostoya.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Rara Avis Antykwariat, https://raraavis.krakow.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Rempex Dom Aukcyjny, https://rempex.com.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Rynek Sztuki. Galeria. Dom Aukcyjny, https://rynekssztuki.eu/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].
Wójtowicz Antykwariat, https://www.antykwariat.wojtowicz.krakow.pl/ [dostęp: 12.05.2025].

Reviews

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 189–191

Samuel Hildebrandt – Ekaterina E. Kozlova (eds.), *Loneliness in the Hebrew Bible* (The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 718; London: Clark 2025) Pp. 248. £ 64.60 (E-Book); £ 108 (Hardback). ISBN: 978-05-67-71445-9 (E-Book); 978-05-67071444-2 (Hardback)

Marcin Zieliński
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
marcin.zielinski@kul.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9965-2196

The book *Loneliness in the Hebrew Bible* is an interesting reflection on the phenomenon of loneliness, which has become even more pronounced during the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic has been associated with isolation and experiences of loneliness, raising questions about the nature and meaning of this phenomenon. This analysis was undertaken by ten authors, who are briefly introduced at the beginning of the publication (viii-ix). The editors of the book are Samuel Hildebrandt (Lecturer in Biblical Studies at Nazarene Theological College, UK) and Ekaterina E. Kozlova (Old Testament Lecturer at London School of Theology, UK).

In the introduction to the book, the editors, starting from Hesse's poem about loneliness, show the timelessness of this problem, which has been strongly emphasised by the pandemic and the resulting restrictions on movement and opportunities to meet. The issue of loneliness has been the subject of numerous studies in psychological and sociological research. Attempts have also been made to define this phenomenon, described as an emotional state, and to distinguish it from social exclusion. The phenomenon itself seems to be related to the development of civilisation, which creates useful structures, but at the same time, makes people very autonomous and, as a consequence, lonely. It is also present in the ancient world, although it is not always explicitly defined, and the monograph aims to examine the vocabulary and texts that can shed light on the understanding of the problem of loneliness.

The book has 10 chapters, which are contributions from researchers invited to create this book. Each chapter contains a bibliography that includes both biblical sources and numerous philosophical, psychological, and sociological studies. This suggests an interdisciplinary approach to researching this topic in the Hebrew Bible. The book also includes an index of modern authors (pp. 221–228) and an index of references (pp. 229–231), which makes it easier for the reader to find authors or biblical texts of interest.

In the first chapter (pp. 9–33), Sonia Noll analyses biblical vocabulary related to the theme of loneliness. She first presents various definitions of loneliness, understood as a lack of satisfying personal relationships, perceived social isolation, or sadness caused by

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.19446 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

the absence of friends or companionship, and discusses their understanding in the context of contemporary culture. She then examines vocabulary related to loneliness and its translation into English and ancient biblical versions. She also gives examples of biblical characters to whom her linguistic analyses can be applied.

Karolien Vermeulen, in her article on loneliness in the story of Hagar (pp. 35–54), takes up the theme of loneliness as a spatial category, in which the image of the desert emphasises her loneliness and the loss of her original position and relationships. She shows how this situation changes for the better through the visit of an angel, as well as Hagar's second departure from Abraham's house in Gen 21.

In the third chapter (pp. 55–72), Christie Gilfeather describes the loneliness of widows and orphans in the Hebrew Bible. She briefly presents the situation of the family and the etymological meaning of the Hebrew word for 'widow'. She then analyses the situation of orphans in selected biblical texts and ways of overcoming this loneliness.

The fourth chapter (pp. 73–93) by Holly Morse, deals with the loneliness of women in the context of abuse, isolation, and social stigmatisation. She notes the close association between shame and loneliness, and then analyses the theme of loneliness in Lam 1 and 2 Sam 13 in relation to the experience of sexual abuse.

Next, Ekaterina E. Kozlova, in chapter five (pp. 95–121), analyses Qoh 4:9 and the theme of loneliness as a context that can make work a difficult and boring experience, especially when satisfaction from work and a sense of professional fulfilment are expected. She then explores the theme of work and social isolation in ANE Sources and ancient Israel. She briefly analyses the theme of loneliness in Qoh 4:9, but also devotes a surprising amount of space to the case of Elijah. Elijah seems to become the dominant theme of the biblical analysis, due to the amount of attention devoted to him and the fact that Qohelet does not appear in the summary of the article.

In chapter six (pp. 123–140), Heather A. McKay writes about the loneliness of Mephibosheth in the David cycle. She briefly describes the situation of Saul's descendant and the impact of his lameness on his life, and then analyses three words – silent, silenced, and mute – in the context of his story. Although the biblical text does not explicitly mention loneliness, the author accurately brings out all aspects of his isolation and helplessness in the face of historical necessities.

Chapter seven (pp. 141–162) is a reflection on the role of animals in human life and in overcoming loneliness, written by Suzanna Millar. Starting from the definition of loneliness as the negative experience of living with unmet social needs, she shows how the company of animals might be considered to mitigate human loneliness. She notes the evolution of this relationship, which was once associated with specific human needs (protection, transportation, food, wool, etc.), and now makes domestic animals companions in human loneliness. She then analyses selected biblical images from Gen 2–3, the Book of Job, and 2 Sam 12. In conclusion, she emphasises once again that the companionship of animals can fulfil human social needs, although these biblical images also reveal significant limitations and shortcomings.

The theme of loneliness in the Psalms is taken up by Philip S. Johnston in chapter eight (pp. 163–175). The Book of Psalms, which contains many joyful hymns and encourages the praise of God, contains a surprising number of moments of sadness and loneliness. Approaching aloneness in the Psalms, the author aptly notes that one cannot begin only with vocabulary, but must focus on specific images that he seeks in the first book (Psalms 1–41). He divides the psalms into four groups, depending on the degree to which this theme appears in the text, and identifies seven psalms where the theme is clearly marked and two psalms (22 and 38) where the issue of loneliness is evident. The author limits himself to a brief analysis of the texts and, in the final sentence of the summary, emphasises the aspect of God's presence in this loneliness, stating that 'the divine companionship, for all its complexity, can and does mitigate this.'

In chapter nine (pp. 177–195), Samuel Hildebrandt emphasises the positive aspects of loneliness in Lam 3 and the Hebrew Bible. He draws inspiration from Petrarch's *Life of Solitude* and from the context of contemporary culture, where loneliness can be experienced as something good and positive, provided one is able to experience loneliness, even though it is also a difficult experience. The author then analyses the longest and central chapter of the Book of Lamentations (chapter 3). He emphasises the existence of positive aspects related to the loneliness of the individual and its impact on the wider community. At the same time, he points out that loneliness in the Bible, especially in the Psalms, is not considered a desirable experience.

Finally, the tenth chapter, written by David J. Reimer, addresses the theme of God's loneliness (pp. 197–219). The author, frequently referring to G.K. Chesterton, writes about the nature of God and his superiority over the whole world, which may give the impression that God lives in loneliness. He then presents interpretations of this topic among Jewish authors. He also analyses the problem of defining loneliness and briefly discusses texts in which the issue of God's loneliness may appear (Gen 3; Deut 6; Isa 63; Psalm 86; 1 Kgs 19; Job 1–2). However, the author clearly states that there are no texts in the Hebrew Bible that explicitly depict God's loneliness.

The study addresses an interesting and very topical issue imposed by the social situation. This is a valid approach because, although the Bible is primarily a book that reveals God, it also deals with human history, with all aspects of human existence – both positive and negative. This perspective can help to interpret the problem of loneliness in the context of the current situation and to build bridges between the biblical text and the present day, since the authors often approach the topic in an interdisciplinary manner, referring not only to biblical research, but also to achievements in the human sciences.

In my opinion, the study lacks an attempt to describe this topic in general terms throughout the Bible, showing both the negative and the possible positive aspects of loneliness. Such a synthesis would allow the reader to better understand the topic. It would also be valuable to show ways of overcoming loneliness and to emphasise more strongly the role of God as a reality that accompanies humans in moments of the deepest loneliness.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 16/1 (2026) 193–198

Tadeusz Rubik, *Biblia Wujka, Rabba i Grodzickiego. Historia powstania jezuickiego przekładu (ok. 1579–1599) w kontekście kulturowo-konfesyjnym epoki* (Reformacja w Polsce i Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej 8; Warszawa – Truskaw: Uniwersytet Warszawski Wydział „Artes Liberales" – Wydawnictwo Naukowe Sub Lupa 2024). Ss. 763. PLN 90. ISBN: 978-83-68194-03-6.

Piotr Łabuda
Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie
piotr.labuda@upjp2.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9044-817X

Biblia ks. Jakuba Wujka to pierwszy katolicki przekład całej Biblii na język polski. Opatrzony rzeczowymi komentarzami, odznaczał się prostotą języka i przejrzystością, odzwierciedlając chrześcijańskie rozumienie Starego i Nowego Testamentu. To prawdziwe arcydzieło języka polskiego przez ponad trzy stulecia było nieocenioną Biblią polską. Przekład ten znacząco wpłynął na rozwój polskiego języka teologicznego oraz polszczyzny w ogóle, a także na rozwój myśli i kultury. Przyczyniał się nie tylko do rozwoju polskiego języka teologicznego, lecz także do rozwoju polszczyzny i kultury polskiej we wszystkich jej wymiarach. Wymownym dowodem trwałości i żywotności pracy wykonanej przez ks. Jakuba Wujka są wznowienia jego dzieła (np. w ramach Prymasowskiej Serii Biblijnej), jak również publikacje i opracowania.

Opracowanie, które ukazało się w ramach serii Reformacja w Polsce i Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej (tom 8), kreśli historię dzieła ks. Jakuba Wujka. Książka ta jest poprawioną i skróconą wersją rozprawy doktorskiej Tadeusza Rubika. To obszerne studium zostało oparte na licznych tekstach źródłowych oraz bogatej bibliografii. Niewątpliwie jest to cenne opracowanie, pozwalające poznać kontekst kulturowy, religijny i społeczny pierwszego pełnego tłumaczenia Biblii na język polski. Całość studium, które zostało wydane z niezwykłą dbałością od strony edytorskiej i graficznej, rozpoczynają podziękowania, które ukazują, jak wiele osób współuczestniczyło w powstaniu tego wartościowego dzieła.

Już na początku wstępu autor przywołuje książkę Juliana Gołąba z 1906 r., w której porównano dwa wydania Nowego Testamentu z 1593 r. i 1594 r. z tekstem Biblii z 1599 r. Przytoczone stwierdzenie, iż „Duch tłómaczenia w nim inny. Przekład pierwszy (1593–1594) więcej wolny, drugi najdosłowniejszy; znać, że poprawy dokonali inni ludzie, mniejszej wprawy od ks. Wujka, który trzecią część swego życia tej pracy poświęcił" (s. 21), stanowi jasne wyjaśnienie tytułu dysertacji: *Biblia Wujka, Rabba i Grodzickiego. Historia powstania jezuickiego przekładu (ok. 1579–1599) w kontekście kulturowo-konfesyjnym epoki*. Owymi „innymi ludźmi", o których wspomina przywołany J. Gołąb,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.19453 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

byli członkowie jezuickiej komisji cenzorów, którzy po śmierci Wujka (27.07.1597 r.) zrewidowali całość tłumaczenia – w sposób szczególny ojcowie Justus Rabb i Stanisław Grodzicki.

Monografia Tadeusza Rubika opisuje proces powstawania Biblii Wujka oraz towarzyszące mu uwarunkowania. Jest to rekonstrukcja historii tworzenia i rewidowania przekładu, oparta na dokumentach epoki. Autor przedstawia, w jaki sposób przekład ks. Jakuba Wujka zmieniał się na skutek zaangażowania kolejnych cenzorów. Stara się on także przeprowadzić rekonstrukcje strategii translatorskich przyjmowanych na kolejnych etapach pracy i ukazać je w kontekście kulturowo-konfesyjnym XVI w.

Na początku zostają nakreślone cel pracy, metodyka oraz stan badań. Dalej następują trzy zasadnicze części, podzielone na mniejsze jednostki. Układ książki jest jasny i pozwala dobrze poznać kontekst oraz okoliczności powstania samego dzieła ks. Jakuba Wujka, jak i kolejne dzieje – wersje przekładu. Całości dopełniają aneksy, obszerna bibliografia oraz indeksy. Pozwala to – podobnie jak wzmianka o dalszych pracach badawczych prowadzonych przez autora (w nocie redakcyjnej zaznaczono, iż badania nad recepcją Biblii Wujka, Rabba i Grodzickiego w XVII–XIX w. oraz nad tradycją wydawniczą i tekstową popularnych Ewangelii i Epistoł, które były prowadzone po złożeniu książki do druku, znajdują się w innym opracowaniu, którego dane bibliograficzne podano) – na dalsze zgłębianie kwestii poruszanych w monografii.

Pierwsza część studium, zatytułowana „Humanizm biblijny w XVI-wiecznym katolicyzmie", przybliża historyczno-kulturowy kontekst prac translatorskich polskich ojców jezuitów. Otwiera ją rozdział, w którym na przykładzie dzieła Erazma z Rotterdamu, wykorzystywanego przez autorów Biblii Wujka, przedstawiono humanizm biblijny – nurt intelektualny przejawiający się w przyjęciu zasady *ad fontes* („do źródeł") w odniesieniu do dociekań biblistycznych oraz w przekonaniu o wartości przekładów Pisma Świętego na języki rodzime.. Wspomniany nurt niewątpliwie wywarł istotny wpływ na autorów zarówno protestanckich, jak i katolickich – teologów oraz hierarchów.

Kolejny rozdział poświęcony jest zagadnieniom związanym z obradami i dekretami Soboru Trydenckiego dotyczącymi Biblii. Autor omawia okoliczności przyjęcia wydania Wulgaty jako tekstu „autentycznego", a także problemy i kontrowersje związane z przekładami Biblii na języki narodowe (określane przez niego mianem wernakulacji[1]) oraz postulaty ojców soborowych dotyczące opracowania ujednoliconej edycji Wulgaty, oczyszczonej z narastających przez wieki skażeń tekstu. Pisząc o dekrecie uznającym Wulgatę, autor zauważa, iż nie ma w nim właściwie żadnych wzmianek o innych przekładach na języki narodowe. Wskazuje, iż było to spowodowane sporami, które spolaryzowały gremium trydenckie. Przywołuje jednak jedno z przemówień, w którym wspomniana zostaje Polska jako kraj, w którym istnieją przekłady na język wernakularny. Przekłady te, jak zaznacza,

1 W kwestii samego używania i rozumienia terminu wernakularyzacji zob. D. Masłej, „O potrzebie zastosowania terminu wernakularyzacja w Polskich badaniach historio językowych", *LingVaria* 13/25 (2018) 113–122.

przynoszą zbudowanie i naukę. Co więcej, autor wskazuje Polskę jako kraj, w którym istniała tradycja lektury Biblii w języku narodowym.

Kolejny rozdział rozpoczyna przywołanie wiersza o młodym filologu, który bada Biblię, a którego autorem jest Chat GPT (Feb 13 Version; 17.02.2023 r.) – trudno jednak odpowiedzieć na pytanie, dlaczego w tym miejscu i takiego „autorstwa" wiersz jest przywołany. Sam jednak czwarty rozdział jest ważny i ciekawy. Kreśli historię Wulgaty – od tzw. Wulgaty lowańskiej z 1547 r. do Wulgaty autorytatywnej, tzw. Wulgaty syksto-klementyńskiej. Autor przybliża prace filologiczno-edytorskie poprzedzające wydanie Wulgaty syksto-klementyńskiej. Opisane opracowania – Poliglota antwerpska, Wulgata lowańska z 1574 r., *Notationes in Sacra Biblia* Franciszka Łukasza z Brugii oraz Wulgata sykstyńska – stanowią ważny punkt odniesienia dla prac polskich ojców jezuitów. Jak podkreśla autor, kontrowersje, jakie wywoływały Poliglota antwerpska oraz Wulgata sykstyńska, odzwierciedlają zmieniający się stosunek XVI-wiecznych katolików do humanizmu biblijnego. Niewątpliwie zarysowana w czwartym rozdziale historia edycji Wulgaty syksto-klementyńskiej pokazuje, jak na przestrzeni dekad ewoluował projekt korekty łacińskiego tekstu Biblii. Ostatecznym owocem był tekst „autentyczny" nie tylko w zakresie wiary i obyczajów, ale – jak wskazywano – przywrócony do pierwotnej i prawdziwej postaci, mający uchodzić za „autentyczny" co do litery.

Dalej autor przechodzi do zagadnień, które pojawiły się po Soborze Trydenckim. Wskazuje, iż między uczestnikami Soboru Trydenckiego nie było zgody co do tego, czy tłumaczenie Biblii na języki narodowe powinno być dozwolone czy też zakazane. Stąd też kwestie te zostały pominięte w dekretach. Oficjalne stanowisko Kościoła katolickiego formowała w drugiej połowie XVI w. kuria rzymska. Do kwestii tych odnosili się kolejni papieże i Kongregacje ds. Inkwizycji oraz *Indeksu ksiąg zakazanych*. Zasadniczo przekłady Biblii na języki rodzime nie były dozwolone. Na początku rozdziału zostaje przywołany taki zakaz zapisany w *Indeksie ksiąg zakazanych* z 1557 r.: „Pod żadnym pozorem nie można i drukować, i czytać i przechowywać całej Biblii spisanej w języku wernakularnym (...) bez pozwolenia Świętego Oficjum świętej rzymskiej Inkwizycji". Przekłady Biblii – za zgodą papieża – były dopuszczane jedynie w krajach objętych reformacją jako środek zaradczy. Kraje, które ze względu na reformację taką zgodę otrzymały, to Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów oraz Anglia. Rozdział piąty przedstawia charakterystykę wydania Douai-Rheims New Testament opracowanego przez brytyjskich katolików – przedsięwzięcie bardzo podobne do tłumaczenia polskich jezuitów, którzy wykorzystali zawarte w nim komentarze w swoich pracach nad przekładem Biblii na język polski.

Rozdział szósty pokazuje znaczenie Biblii dla Towarzystwa Jezusowego. Po krótkim nakreśleniu historii początków zakonu autor wskazuje, iż jezuici starali się kroczyć trudną drogą między niekwestionowanym autorytetem Wulgaty a metodą humanizmu biblijnego – dla wielu niezwykle atrakcyjną i właściwą. Działaniom tym towarzyszyły prace nad *Ratio studiorum*, jezuicką ordynacją szkolną i podstawą programową. Poszczególne wersje *Ratio* przynosiły wytyczne obowiązujące jezuickich biblistów.

Druga część opracowania, „Jakub Wujek z Wągrowca i powstawanie przekładu Biblii", przybliża działalność jezuitów w Rzeczypospolitej oraz samą historię powstania

tłumaczenia Biblii na język polski. Autor, kreśląc początki dziejów jezuitów na ziemiach Polskich, zaznacza, iż niezwykle ważnym dla powstałego nowego państwa – Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów (formalne zjednoczenie Korony Królestwa Polskiego i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w jeden organizm polityczny) – było przybycie w 1565 r. nowego zakonu. Wierzono, iż polski katolicyzm znajdzie w Towarzystwie Jezusowym istotne wsparcie. Nowopowstałe państwo, zawiłości dziejów nowych władców oraz trudności związane z reformacją – to okoliczności, w których miała zrodzić się inicjatywa katolickiego przekładu Pisma Świętego na język polski, który przeszedł do historii jako Biblia Wujka. W części poświęconej osobie Jakuba Wujka zostaje przywołane pismo Stanisława Rozdrażewskiego do generała Towarzystwa Jezusowego, odnoszące się do zagrożeń wiary, jakie płyną ze strony protestantów.

Bardzo dokładnie i szeroko zostaje ukazana w dysertacji formacja i edukacja pochodzącego z Wągrowca Jakuba Wujka, co miało niewątpliwie duży wpływ na jego *Postylle* – przykład zastosowania piśmiennictwa potocznego w kontrowersjach konfesyjno-kulturowych, swoiste laboratorium dla powstającego przekładu Biblii – a także na samą Biblię Wujka. Kreśląc dzieje duchowe i naukowe Jakuba Wujka, autor bardzo starannie dobiera materiały źródłowe i opracowania. Pozwala to na rzetelne przedstawienie zarówno sylwetki ks. Wujka, jak i jego dzieł. Całość tej części kończy przybliżenie okoliczności powstania i ukazanie znaczenia *Postylli* Wujka – zbiorów homilii do czytań biblijnych, które zawierały przetłumaczone przez niego perykopy ewangeliczne. Były one obecne w biblioteczkach bez mała wszystkich proboszczów lub kaznodziejów. Nakaz posiadania *Postylli* ks. Jakuba Wujka, wydanych w języku polskim, został zapisany w piśmie dołączonym do postanowień synodalnych diecezji krakowskiej. Powstawanie *Postylli*, w uznaniu autora, wyznacza początek prac translatorskich Wągrowczyka nad Biblią. Przetłumaczone fragmenty biblijne zostają nazwane praprzekładem.

Kolejny rozdział, „Powstanie przekładu Biblii i jego cenzura", rozpoczyna krótkie przedstawienie historii powierzenia tłumaczenia tekstu Biblii na język polski ks. Jakubowi Wujkowi. Przyczynić się do tego miał znacząco m.in. królewski kaznodzieja Marcin Laterna, który w liście do generała jezuitów Claudia Aquavivy przedstawił ks. Wujka jako najlepszego kandydata na tłumacza Biblii. Grzegorz XIII bowiem, wyrażając zgodę na dokonanie tłumaczenia na język ojczysty, postawił dwa warunki: wyznaczenie do takich prac odpowiednich osób oraz wymóg cenzury – odpowiedniego przebadania dzieła. Za taką odpowiednią osobę został uznany właśnie ks. Jakub Wujek.

Rozdział ósmy pracy zawiera omówienie dotyczące cenzur zakonnych obowiązujących w trakcie prac nad tłumaczeniem, a także rekonstrukcję historii cenzury, która zostaje oparta na źródłach o proweniencji jezuickiej. Autor przedstawia prace ks. Wujka nad Nowym Testamentem. Wskazuje, iż w sposób systematyczny rozpoczęły się one w 1589 r. Przywołuje osoby związane z pierwszą cenzurą i drukiem *editio princeps* (lata 1591–1593), pracę nad *Psałterzem Dawidów* oraz drugie wydanie Nowego Testamentu (1593–1594), dzieje przekładu Starego Testamentu (1594–1597) i śmierć ks. Wujka (1597 r.), a także historię drugiej cenzury i druk Biblii (1597–1599). Ostateczne tłumaczenie Biblii ukazało

się 25 sierpnia 1599 r. W rozdziale ósmym autor przybliża także „rzymskie dzieje" polskiej Biblii – aprobatę tłumaczenia przez Klemensa VIII, niezbędną ze względu na obostrzenia zawarte w *Indeksie ksiąg zakazanych*, oraz dążenia polskich hierarchów do propagowania Biblii polskojęzycznej wśród duchowieństwa i osób świeckich.

Trzecia część książki – „Kolejne wersje przekładu" – poświęcona jest edycjom tekstów Biblii Wujka, Rabba i Grodzickiego oraz przyjętym przez autorów strategiom translatorskim w aspekcie recepcji treści humanizmu biblijnego (wykorzystanie tekstu greckiego do korygowania Wulgaty reprezentowanej w polskim tłumaczeniu lub jako pomocy egzegetycznej), a także sposobom interpretacji i praktycznej realizacji obowiązujących reguł. Na początku autor niejako wraca do wcześniejszych prac ks. Jakuba Wujka – tłumaczenia perykop ewangelicznych zapisane w *Postyllach* z lat 1579–1580 po edycję z 1590 r. – które, według niego, poświadczają ukończony przekład Ewangelii sprzed pierwszej cenzury. Zestawiając wybrane fragmenty *Postylli* z tekstami Biblii Leopolity, Wulgaty czy tekstem greckim, studium pokazuje, iż tłumaczenie Wujka było skrajnie literalne. Reprodukowanie formalnej warstwy tekstów źródłowych, w opinii autora, było niezbędne, by czytelnicy mogli dostrzec „odstępstwa" od Wulgaty i detale zaczerpnięte z tekstu greckiego. Umożliwiały to rozpoznanie filologicznej pracy tłumacza.

W wyniku zaangażowania w prace innego jezuity – Justa Rabba – na znaczeniu zyskała „elegancja" polskiego tekstu i jego komunikatywność, możliwa do osiągnięcia dzięki niedosłownemu tłumaczeniu. Autor wskazuje, iż Jakub Wujek i Justus Rabb, pracując nad Nowym Testamentem z 1593 r., intensywnie wykorzystywali tekst grecki. Ich prace jednak spotkały się ze sprzeciwem części jezuitów. Autor studium omawia „Przedmowę do czytelnika" i koncepcję wydania Nowego Testamentu z 1593 r., a także zmiany tłumaczenia, do jakich doszło podczas pierwszej cenzury. W kolejnym rozdziale zostają przybliżone zarzuty wobec takiej koncepcji tłumaczenia. Autor zastanawia się, czy i jaki wpływ miały pojawiająca się krytyka oraz publikacja autorytatywnej Wulgaty syksto-klementyńskiej na strategię translatorską realizowaną w Nowym Testamencie i *Psałterzu* z 1594 r.

Rozdział dwunasty pracy poświęcony jest Biblii z 1599 r. Na podstawie *Apparatus sacer* autor dokonuje próby rekonstrukcji koncepcji strategii translatorskiej drugiej komisji cenzorów pod przewodnictwem Stanisława Grodzickiego. Wskazuje, iż miało to być skrajnie dosłowne reprodukowanie Wulgaty syksto-klementyńskiej. Inne podejście, według cenzorów, jawiło się jako „fałszerstwo" tekstu natchnionego. Na bazie analizy zmian wprowadzonych względem wcześniejszych edycji wykazano, iż z powodu pośpiechu, pobieżności i niekonsekwencji rewizji nie udało się zrealizować tego celu.

Całość studium wieńczy zakończenie – streszczenie, zebranie i ukazanie najważniejszych etapów badawczych i wniosków z przeprowadzonego obszernego studium. Wnioski kończą się kilkoma pytaniami, które otwierają pole do dalszych badań i dyskusji.

Opracowanie Tadeusza Rubika jest niewątpliwie bardzo bogatym, całościowym ukazaniem procesu powstania i cenzurowania Biblii Wujka w kontekście kulturowym epoki. Autor poddał studium teksty źródłowe, dokonał porównania tekstów kolejnych edycji tłumaczenia – od *editio princeps Postylli mniejszej* po Biblię z 1599 r. – a także fragmenty

wydań *Postylli większej*, starając się wskazać miejsca podlegające przekształceniom, które poddał analizie translatorycznej. Badania i teksty posłużyły do próby rekonstrukcji kontekstu historyczno-kulturowego epoki, który był niezwykle pomocny przy interpretacji działalności księży jezuitów – polskich tłumaczy Biblii.

Praca zasługuje na uwagę i uznanie, choć jej język jest dość trudny. Autor dość często używa określeń zawiłych; czasami można odnieść wrażenie nadmiernej terminologizacji wypowiedzi, co obniża komunikatywność dyskursu naukowego. Pewnym zdziwieniem jest także prawie całkowite opuszczanie tytułów kościelnych „ksiądz" i „ojciec" w odniesieniu do przywoływanych jezuitów. Jakub Wujek (podobnie Justus Rabb, Stanisław Grodzicki, Piotr Skarga i inni) określany jest jako ksiądz czy ojciec (osoba duchowna) tylko w przywoływanych dokumentach źródłowych. Nigdy jednak nie jest tak określany przez autora dysertacji – a wydaje się, iż warto czasami zaznaczyć i przypomnieć czytelnikom, że we wszystkich tych doniosłych pracach uczestniczył Jakub Wujek – Wujek-Wągrowczyk (i inni), który był księdzem, ojcem jezuitą, osobą duchowną. Tytuł kościelny jest istotny nie tylko w kontekście danego wyznania, ale także w wymiarze kulturowo-historycznym; wskazuje na autorytet i rolę duchową oraz zobowiązania, jakie osoba duchowna na siebie przyjmuje, co w temacie tłumaczenia Biblii ma kluczowe znaczenie.

Wartość Biblii Wujka, tak samo jak wartość Wulgaty, wynika z niezwykłej mocy słowa Bożego, wiernie wyrażanej w tych przekładach. Wyrosły one z chrześcijańskiego czytania i zrozumienia ksiąg Starego i Nowego Testamentu, co pozwala lepiej rozumieć wiarę wspólnoty Kościoła. Niezwykle obszerne i rzetelne studium Tadeusza Rubika poświęcone historii przekładu Biblii Wujka, bogate w teksty źródłowe i opracowania oraz zawierające obszerną bibliografię, jest bardzo cenne poznawczo. Może stanowić ważne źródło informacji dla badaczy pragnących zgłębić proces powstawania tłumaczeń, stosowane strategie translatorskie oraz wzbogacić tę wiedzę o kontekst historyczno-kulturowy polskiego przekładu Biblii – Biblii ks. Jakuba Wujka.