

*Sonderdruck aus:*

# Einheit der Kirche im Neuen Testament

Dritte europäische orthodox-westliche  
Exegetenkonferenz in Sankt Petersburg  
24.–31. August 2005

Herausgegeben von

Anatoly A. Alexeev, Christos Karakolis  
und Ulrich Luz

unter Mitarbeit von

Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr



Mohr Siebeck 2008

*Dieser Sonderdruck ist im Buchhandel nicht erhältlich.*

## Inhalt

Vorwort ..... VII

### *Einheit der Kirche in der neutestamentlichen Ekklesiologie*

JAMES D. G. DUNN  
One Church – Many Churches ..... 3

ANNUARI IVLIEV  
Die Kirche Gottes als die eschatologische Realität  
in der Welt in der paulinischen Tradition ..... 23

STELIAN TOFANĂ  
Die Beziehung zwischen der lokalen und universalen Kirche  
im Licht der ekklesiologischen Terminologie des Neuen Testaments ..... 33

LOVEDAY ALEXANDER  
Community and Canon: Reflections on the Ecclesiology of Acts ..... 45

### *Geschichtliche Vielfalt der Kirche im Urchristentum*

GERD THEISSEN  
Kirche oder Sekte?  
Über Einheit und Konflikte im frühen Urchristentum ..... 81

ELENI KASSELOURI-HATZIVASSILIADI  
Women and Mission in the New Testament ..... 103

### *Eucharistie und Einheit der Kirche*

PETROS VASSILIADIS  
The Eucharist as an Inclusive and Unifying Element  
in the New Testament Ecclesiology ..... 121

## Some Ecclesiological Patterns of the Early Christian Period and Their Implications for the History of the Term ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ (Monk)

by

DMITRIJ F. BUMAZHNOV

In this paper I would like to discuss some examples of interdependence between several ecclesiological patterns and the dynamics of the ascetical movement in Christian communities of the early patristic period. The historical problem which the following presentation will try to make a contribution to solving is the evidence gap between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> century Christian sources which use the term μοναχός. My suggestion is that one of the ways to bridge or, at least, somehow to understand this gap, might be connected with a deeper consideration of different and, in some cases, also competitive ecclesiological models of this age which go back to the New Testament or its Jewish background.

The scholarly interest in the history of the non-biblical Christian term μοναχός is based on six new occurrences discovered in the twentieth century. Five of them we owe to the publication of the Nag Hammadi writings: the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Dialogue of the Saviour*.<sup>1</sup> The original versions of these Coptic texts found in Nag Hammadi were written in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. and are to be considered as produced in Gnostic circles. Because we do not know anything about institutionalized monasticism in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century either in the Gnostic or in the Orthodox environment, we have to assume that, at that time, the term μοναχός designated something other than what the classical monastic documents of the fourth century intended. These last sources describing the life of the first monks appear in the last part of the fourth century – the best known example may be the

<sup>1</sup> See MARGUERITE HARL, A propos des *logia* de Jésus: le sens du mot ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ, REG 73 (1960) 464–474; ALBERTUS KLIJN, The “single one” in the Gospel of Thomas, JBL 81 (1962) 271–278; FRANÇOISE MORARD, Monachos: une importation sémitique en Egypte? Quelques aperçus nouveaux, in: StPatr 12 (1974) 242–246; FRANÇOISE MORARD, Encore quelques réflexions sur monachos, VigChr 34 (1980) 394–401.

*Vita Antonii* by St. Athanasius – and they provide an impression that the phenomenon of classical monasticism as well as the term μοναχός itself were, by this time, already widely known and deeply rooted both in Christian life and literature.

The sixth piece of evidence for μοναχός which attracted the attention of scholars to the history of this word removed the boundary of the established usage of μοναχός in the sense “monk” up to the twenties of the fourth century. It is found in papyrus 77 from the collection of H.C. Youtie which is dated 6 (?) June 324 and provides “the earliest reference so far known to the ‘monk’ as a recognized figure in society”.<sup>2</sup>

The gap of evidence between the Gnostic 2<sup>nd</sup> century texts using μοναχός in a premonastic sense and the papyrus Youtie 77 from the year 324 as our earliest document presupposing the established circulation of the term as a name for monks raises at least two fundamental questions: what prevented the acceptance of the term μοναχός in the Orthodox communities in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and why did this process become possible later? In the following we will try to consider these problems in the context of contrasting ecclesiological concepts from the early Christian age.

In an earlier essay I argued for the relevance of the ecclesiological context by searching for the possible reasons for the Gnostic reception and the Orthodox non-reception of μοναχός in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.<sup>3</sup> This relevance can be demonstrated from a few texts in which the Orthodox writers of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and early 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries use the verb μονάζειν etymologically and in its meaning closely related to μοναχός. The striking fact is that, in three of four cases known to me, the quality of being alone or apart from the community described by μονάζειν is seen as unequivocally negative,<sup>4</sup> whereas the fourth bit of evidence is neutral.<sup>5</sup> The Epistle of Barnabas provides the most illustrative evidence:<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> E. A. JUDGE, The earliest Use of monachos for “Monk” (P. Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism, JAC 20 (1977) 72. See also MARTIN TETZ, Eine asketische Ermunterung zur Standhaftigkeit aus der Zeit der maximinischen Verfolgung (311/313), ZNW 81 (1990) 79–102. Tetz claims that the earliest evidence for μοναχός in the sense “monk” is to be found in the Pseudo-Athanasian writing *De patientia* 7 (= PG 26,1305 B) which he dates to 311–312, cf. op. cit. 94–98. Tetz’s thesis found much less response than the publication of Judge but even if his dating of *De patientia* is right, the gap between the second and the fourth century evidences for μοναχός would be only a few years shorter.

<sup>3</sup> DMITRIJ BUMAZHNOV, Einige Beobachtungen zur Geschichte des Begriffs MONACHOS (Mönch), StPatr 39 (2006) 293–299.

<sup>4</sup> Apart from the two pieces of evidence discussed below, the negative connotations of μονάζειν are obvious in Herm sim IX 26,3, cf. also Hebr 10,25 and IgnEph 13,1.

<sup>5</sup> See Hippolytus, Refutat 9,11,2 (PTS 25, 349,12 Marcovich).

<sup>6</sup> Barn 4,10 (SUC II, 146,19–21 Wengst). Translation of J. Kleist in: The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistle and The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments

μη καθ’ εαυτούς ἐνδύνοντες μονάζετε ὡς ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συννερχόμενοι συνζητεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος

Do not shut yourselves up and court solitude as though your justification were already assured. On the contrary, attend the common meetings and join in discussing what contributes to the common good.

The author of the Epistle opposes deliberate solitude (μονάζειν) on the one hand and the coming together of the Church community (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συννερχόμενοι) coupled with the management of the common business (συνζητεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος) on the other. The two last activities are explicitly recommended, the first one no less explicitly rejected (μη ... μονάζετε). Being alone is thus contrasted with the ideal of Christian community gathered ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, an expression which unmistakably points to the Acts of the Apostles 2 as the author’s ecclesiological pattern in this case. The concept of the primitive Church community, with its substantial feature of being *together*, is apparently an idea which would complicate the reception of the term μοναχός, as far as it stresses the solitary way of life, for the Christian who accepted the Epistle of Barnabas as authoritative.

A slightly more complicated case of interdependence between the preferred ecclesiological patterns and the attitude to the term μονάζειν is to be found in the Commentary on the Book of Daniel by St. Hippolytus of Rome.<sup>7</sup> While commenting on the angel’s words in the dream of King Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4,15–16<sup>8</sup> predicting the king’s animal-like existence apart from human society, Hippolytus says:<sup>9</sup>

οὐκέτι γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος <ὁ> μέγας βασιλεὺς καὶ δυνάστης ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις διαιτώμενος διήγεν, ἀλλὰ μονάζων ἐν ἐρημίαις “χόρτον” καὶ χλόην “ἔσθιεν”, ἕως <οὗ> ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἀλλοιωθεῖσα ἐγενήθη ὡς θηρίου ἐν ὕλαις καὶ σπηλαίοις νεμομένου ...

For the great king and ruler no longer dwelt as a man in <his> kingly palaces, but living alone in the wilderness (μονάζων ἐν ἐρημίαις), he “ate grass” and greens till his heart was changed and became like that of a wild animal which inhabits forests and caves.

The words “living alone in the wilderness” (μονάζων ἐν ἐρημίαις) paraphrase Theodotion’s translation of Dan 4,15 “his lot <will be> with the animals” (μετὰ τῶν θηρίων ἢ μερὶς αὐτοῦ). According to the meaning

of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus newly translated and annotated by JAMES KLEIST (ACW 6), Westminster/London 1961, 41–42.

<sup>7</sup> The commentary was written between 200 and 204 and is the first Christian Bible commentary transmitted in its entirety. See PETER BRUNS, Art. Hippolyt, in: S. DÖPP/W. GEERLINGS (Hrsgs.), Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur, Freiburg/Basel/Wien<sup>3</sup>2002, 337.

<sup>8</sup> St. Hippolytus comments on the Greek translation of Theodotion.

<sup>9</sup> Hippolytus, in Dan 3,9,4 (GCS Hippolyt I/1, 154,5–8 Bonwetsch/Richard).

of the Biblical passage the state of being alone in the wilderness is seen as absolutely incompatible with the dignity of a king and contrary to human nature. The separation from human society is one of the characteristics of Nebuchadnezzar's madness and a part of punishments imposed by God. The attitude of the king in the passage cited is not shown in contrast to any ecclesiological model, but, in the same commentary, St. Hippolytus outlines his vision of the Church which has some points of contact with the view expressed in the Epistle of Barnabas. St. Hippolytus writes:<sup>10</sup>

“Ὅτι δὲ ὁ παράδεισος ἐν Ἐδέμ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ φυτευθεὶς εἰς τύπον καὶ εἰκόνα ἐγένετο τῆς ἐκκλησίας, σαφέστατά ἐστιν ἐπιγνώσει τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς <...> Ἐδ<έ>μ οὖν <εἰ>ρηται τόπος τρυφῆς, τ<ουτ>ε<ι> <ν> παράδεισος· “κατὰ ἀνατολὰς” ἐφυτεύετο, ξύλοις ὠραίοις καὶ καρποῖς παντοδαποῖς κεκοσμημένος, ὥστε ἔστι νοῆσαι τὸ σύστημα τῶν δικαίων τόπον εἶναι ἅγιον ἐν ᾧ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐφυτεύετο. οὕτε γὰρ ψιλὸς τόπος δύναται καλεῖσθαι ἐκκλησία, <οὔτε> οἶκος διὰ λίθου καὶ πηλοῦ ὑκοδομημένος· οὔτε αὐτὸς καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἄνθρωπος δύναται καλεῖσθαι ἐκκλησία· οἶκος γὰρ καταλύεται καὶ ἄνθρωπος τελευτᾷ. τί οὖν ἐστιν ἐκκλησία; σύστημα ἁγίων ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πολιτευομένων. ἢ οὖν ὁμόνοια καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸς τοῦτο γίνεται ἐκκλησία ...

Those who love learning can clearly realize that the Paradise in Eden planted by God became a type and an image of the Church <...> So Eden means “a place of delight”, that is Paradise. It was planted “in the east” and adorned with frugiferous trees and fruits of every kind, so that one can understand that the congregation of the righteous ones is <that> holy place where the Church was planted. For neither bare land nor a house built of stones and clay can be called “the Church”, not even a man by himself can be called Church: since a house is exposed to destruction and a man is subject to death. What, then, is the Church? It is the community of the saints living according to the truth. Therefore it is the unanimity and the common way of the saints in the unity (ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸς) which makes up the Church.

The most essential point allowing St. Hippolytus to establish a typological link between the Old Testament Paradise and the Church is the presence of many trees in the Garden of Eden.<sup>11</sup> These trees in their multiplicity are an unmistakable indication that, in the Genesis story about Paradise, the community of the holy ones, i.e. the Church, is meant: “For neither bare land nor a house built of stones and clay can be called Church, not even a man can be by himself called Church.” The last phrase of the passage

<sup>10</sup> Hippolytus, in Dan 1,18 (GCS Hippolyt I/1, 40,19–21; 41,6–15 Bon./Rich.).

<sup>11</sup> The exegetical connection of Paradise with the Church must have been known to St. Hippolytus from the previous tradition, see n. 40 below. According to St. Anastasius Sinaita, Hex 7 (SUC 3, 66,1–68,3 Körtner) Paradise was allegorically explained as the Church by Papias of Hierapolis, Irenaeus of Lyon, Justin Martyr, Pantaeus, and Clement of Alexandria; however we only find a confirmation of the statement in Irenaeus, Adv haer V 20,1–2, see ULRICH KÖRTNER, Einleitung, in: Papiasfragmente, Hirt des Hermas. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übertragen und erläutert von U. H. J. Körtner und M. Leutzsch (SUC 3), Darmstadt 1998, 25.

allows us to assume that this view of the Church as a community possibly has to do with the Acts of the Apostles 2, the reference to “the common way of the saints in the unity” (ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸς) makes this suggestion at least probable.

The rather negative connotations connected with the verb μονάζειν, together with a view of the Church similar to that of the Epistle of Barnabas make us conclude that St. Hippolytus of the period of the Commentary on Daniel would probably not easily take up the term μοναχός to describe deliberately chosen singleness.

The Gnostic texts of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century containing the term μοναχός give us no clear idea about the notion of the Church accepted in the respective communities. An intertextual link can, however, be established between the concept of μοναχός in the *Gospel of Thomas*, on the one hand, and the people addressed by the author of another Nag Hammadi writing, *Testimonium Veritatis* (the *Testimony of Truth*), on the other,<sup>12</sup> so that some observation concerning the *Testimony of Truth* may be useful for understanding the place the μοναχοί had in the Gnostic groups.

It must be premised that, in the passages which we will examine now, the *Testimony of Truth* addresses itself to the Gnostic πνευματικοί living in the mixed communities with the Orthodox Christians<sup>13</sup> named by the

<sup>12</sup> The reconstructed version of TestVer 68,16–18 (NHS 15, 186 Giversen/Pearson) claims for the one who is able to renounce riches and sexual intercourse that “[he makes] the outer like the [inner. He resembles] an angel”. In EvThom 22 (NHS 20, 62,25–35 Layton) the canceling of the differences between the outer and the inner is one of the preconditions which allow entrance into the kingdom: “When you make the two one, and when you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside ... then will you enter [the kingdom]”, whereas Logion 49 (NHS 20, 72,24–27 Layt.) promises the kingdom to the “nmonakhos auo etsotp” (the solitary and elect, transliteration according to UWE-KARSTEN PLISCH, Einführung in die koptische Sprache. Sabidischer Dialekt [Sprachen und Kulturen des Christlichen Orients 5], Wiesbaden 1999, XIII). However, if the concept of μοναχός in the Gospel of Thomas has to do with the idea of the inner uniformity required in the Logia 22 and 106, the problem is far from being definitively solved. FRANÇOISE MORARD, Monachos, Moine. Histoire du terme grec jusqu’au 4<sup>e</sup> siècle. Influences bibliques et gnostiques, FZPhTh 20 (1973) 367–372 challenged the position of HARL, A propos des logia de Jésus (cf. above, n. 1), who answered the question positively. RISTO URO, Is *Thomas* an encratite Gospel?, in: IDEM. (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroads. Essays on the Gospel of Thomas, Studies of the New Testament and Its World*, Edinburgh 1998, 159, left the question rather open. Some new evidence for the advantage of the opinion of M. Harl is proposed in D. F. BUMAZHNOV, Beobachtungen (cf. above, n. 3).

<sup>13</sup> To the question of the mixed Orthodox-Gnostic communities cf. KLAUS KOSCHORKE, Einheit der Kirche als Problem der christlichen Gnosis, in: F. VON LILIENFELD/A. M. RITTER (eds.), *Einheit der Kirche in vorkonstantinischer Zeit. Vorträge, gehalten bei der Patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft, 2.-4. Januar 1985 in Bern* (Oikonomia 25), Erlangen 1989, 66–67: “die Einstellung der Valentinianer zu ihren

Gnostics ψυχικοί. Understanding themselves as a kind of *ecclesiola in ecclesia* and convinced that they are in possession of mysteries higher than the restricted knowledge of the ψυχικοί, the pneumatics are confronted with the situation of permanent polemics about questions of faith in their communities. The *Testimony of Truth* instructs them in the following way:

He (i.e. the pneumatic) rejects for himself loquacity and disputations, and he endures the whole place; and he bears up under them, and he endures all the evil things. And he is patient with every one; he makes himself equal to every one, and he also *separates* himself from them.<sup>14</sup> And having *withdrawn* (ἀναχωρεῖν) [ ] he became silent, having ceased from loquacity and disputations. But he [who has] found the [life-giving word and he who] has come to know [the Father of Truth has come to rest]; he has ceased [seeking], having [found.] And when he found he became [silent].<sup>15</sup>

The recommended attitude of keeping distance from the non-Gnostic, and probably from the Gnostic part of the community as well<sup>16</sup> is based on the feeling of superiority in the knowledge of God: “But he [who...] has come to know [the Father of Truth has come to rest]; he has ceased [seeking], having [found.] And when he found he became [silent].”

This individualistic and separative accent fits very well with the title μοναχός used in the *Gospel of Thomas* and in the *Dialogue of the Saviour* for designation of the Gnostic elect. Not speaking about the relation of the

kirchlichen Mitchristen ist durch das Bewußtsein bestimmt, demselben Leib Christi anzugehören wie jene. Dies zumindest ist die Auskunft, die uns ein Text wie Excerpta ex Theodoto 58,1 gibt ... Der Leib Christi wird also nicht als unforme Größe verstanden, sondern als eine *Größe in zwei Stufen*, dem pneumatischen Element – welches das gnostische Christentum repräsentiert – und dem psychischen, welches für die Psychiker, die Masse des Kirchenvolkes steht ... Dabei sind sich die valentinianischen Pneumatiker des Unterschiedes gegenüber ihren psychischen Mitchristen sehr wohl bewusst: Sie wissen ihren Ursprung bei der Achamoth ... und beanspruchen für sich selbst Teilhabe an jenem ‘pneumatischen Samen’, den sie jenen (i.e. the psychics) absprechen. Aber dieser ‘pneumatische Samen’ ist für sie zunächst nicht mehr als ein Vermögen, das der ... ‘Formung’ bedarf, und zwar der Formung im psychischen Element ...”. The Gnostic pneumatics need “den Mutterboden des psychischen Christentums ..., um ihre eigene gnostische Identität entwickeln ... zu können. Gerade auch um seiner selbst willen – und keineswegs nur aus taktischen Erwägungen – gilt dem Gnostiker also die Gemeinschaft mit den Kirchenchristen als unverzichtbar.” Further important insights into Valentinian ecclesiology with an explanation of exc. Thdot. 58,1, a text K. Koschorke refers to, are found by KARL MÜLLER, *Die Kirche bei den Valentinianern* (NGWG.PH 1920), Berlin 1920, 200–204.

<sup>14</sup> Translation according to TestVer 44,7–16 (NHS 15, 155,7–16 Pearson).

<sup>15</sup> Translation according to TestVer 68,27–69,4 (NHS 15, 187,27–189,4 Pear.).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. “he makes himself equal to every one, and he also separates himself from them”.

μοναχοί to the Church<sup>17</sup> the *Gospel of Thomas* shows them detached from the ties of the family and being absolutely alone:<sup>18</sup>

For there will be five in a house: three will be against two, and two against three, the father against the son, and the son against the father. And they will stand solitary.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> It is hardly surprising that the Church generally and especially the Church on earth occupies a comparatively modest place in Gnostic speculations. Rejecting the Old Testament and its God and believing in a personal predestination of a few pneumatics going back into the Pleroma of the hidden Father, the Gnostics could neither be interested in further developing the theology of God’s chosen nation as it did “the new Israel”, i.e. the Catholic Church, nor did they lay much stress on the importance of the local congregation. The Church appears characteristically in the context of the protological myth of the Valentinians in the pair Ἄνθρωπος – Ἐκκλησία being part of the first Ogdoad, see Irenaeus, Adv haer I 11,1 and Hippolytus, Refutat 4,51,9; 6,30,3. In the Valentinian eschatological conceptions the Ogdoad is “the place of rest to which the elect are destined before entering the pleroma” (SALVATORE LILLA, Art. Ogdoas - Ogdoad [ὀγδοάς], in: A. DI BERARDINO (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, Translated from the Italian by A. Walford, Vol. II, Cambridge 1992, 610 with references to Hippolytus, Refutat 6,32,9 (GCS Hippolytus III, 161,16–18 Wendland), Clemens Alexandrinus, Exc Theod 63,1 (GCS Clemens III, 128,9–12 Stählin) and Clemens Alexandrinus, Exc Theod 80,1 (GCS Clemens III, 131,25 St.)), or, a product of the love between Father and Son in the revision of the Valentinianism provided by the author of the *Tractatus Tripartitus* (TractTrip 58,22–33 [NHS 22, 202,22–204,33 Attridge/Pagels]). In both cases the relationship between the preexistent aeon called Church and the present church(es) on earth is beyond the authors’ scope. According to Irenaeus, Adv haer I 5,6 (SC 264, 89,580–582 Rousseau/Doutreleau) the church of the Gnostic elect called “seed” (τὸ σπέρμα) is an earthly reality corresponding to the celestial aeon (ἀντίτυπον τῆς ἕως Ἐκκλησίας). HANS-GEORG GAFFRON, *Studien zum koptischen Philippusevangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn, Bonn 1969, 92 observes about this evidence that “Sie (i.e. the Gnostic Ἐκκλησία) bedarf keiner Verwirklichung in einer Gemeinschaft, sondern ist in den Pneumatikern gegenwärtig.” A commentary to the Ἐκκλησία in Adv haer I 5,6 is to be found in EINAR THOMASSEN, *The Spiritual Seed. The Church of the “Valentinians”* (NHMS 60), Leiden/Boston 2006, 439–440. About the Gnostic understanding of the Church in general see WILLEM VAN UNNIK, *Les idées des gnostiques concernant l’église*, in: J. GIBLET (ed.), *Aux origines de l’Église*, FS A. G. Ryckmans (RechBib 7), Bruges 1965, 175–187 and KLAUS KOSCHORKE, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag-Hammadi-Traktate “Apokalypse des Petrus”* (NHC VII,3) und “*Testimonium Veritatis*” (NHC IX,3), NHS 12, Leiden 1978, 77–80.

<sup>18</sup> Translation according to EvThom 16 (NHS 20, 61,1–5 Layton). Cf. GAFFRON, *Studien* (cf. n. 17 above), 91: “Von unserer Grundbestimmung der gnostischen Existenz her gesehen ist der Gnostiker in der Welt immer einzelner und unabhängig von jeder weltlichen Gemeinschaftsbindung”

<sup>19</sup> In the last sentence (awo senaōhe eratu ewo mmonakhos) the Greek loanword “monakhos” < μοναχός is used.

A comparison of the Gnostic appreciation of being separated from the others, founded on the feeling of having special knowledge about the Father of Truth, with the Orthodox stress on the Church as the unity of the righteous<sup>20</sup> ones may help to understand that, in the eyes of some of the Orthodox Christians of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, the attempt to separate themselves from the community could appear as a typical Gnostic attitude.<sup>21</sup> One of the reasons for the Gnostic reception and the Orthodox non-reception of the term *μοναχός* in this early time could thus have been related to the different ecclesiastical patterns prevailing in respective groups.<sup>22</sup>

We shall now return to the problem of the gap of evidence between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> century Christian documents using the term *μοναχός*. As we have seen, we can more or less convincingly argue why some of the Orthodox Christians didn't take up this word in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century whereas the

<sup>20</sup> THOMASSEN, *The Spiritual Seed* (cf. n. 17 above), 396–397 argues that in some Valentinian groups “the complete elimination of physical (initiation, D.B.) ritual, to be replaced simply by knowledge itself” can be admitted. “It may also be surmised” – the author continues – “that the anointing and the invocation of the Name came to be seen by some of these groups more as a preparation of the initiate for the successful post-mortual journey of the spirit into the Pleroma, than as a rite of incorporation into the community of the elect”.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. PIER BEATRICE, *Une citation de l'évangile de Matthieu dans l'Épître de Barnabé*, in: J.-M. SEVRIN (ed.), *The New Testament in the Early Christianity* (BETL 86), Leuven 1989, 240: “la théologie enthousiaste critiquée par Barnabé est enracinée dans les milieux où l'Évangile des Hébreux et l'Évangile de Thomas ont vu la lumière.” Beatrice refers to Barn. 4,10b to corroborate his thesis, according to which the Epistle was a polemical answer to an enthusiastic movement challenging the community of Barnabas through an over-realized eschatology and an ascetical and isolationist form of behaviour (see *ibid.*). After the general criticism of this theory put forward by JAMES CARLETON PAGET, *The Epistle of Barnabas. Outlook and Background* (WUNT 64), Tübingen 1994, 63–64, and confirmed by REIDAR HVALVIK, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant. The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century* (WUNT 82), Tübingen 1996, 12–13, n. 43, the identity of the group addressed in Barn 4,10b remains an open question. Though a close connection between the opponents of Barnabas in Barn 4,10b and the *μοναχοί* of the Gospel of Thomas claimed by P. Beatrice (see *ibid.*) seems rather unprovable, he is certainly right to contrast the Orthodox and the Gnostic attitudes towards being alone. Barnabas makes clear that the reason for misleading some Christians to separate themselves from the community meetings is their belief in already being justified (*ὡς ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι*), which could possibly be understood as referring to the Gnostics in an Orthodox community.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. KOSCHORKE, *Die Polemik* (cf. n. 17), 77–78: “Die ‘Kirche’, der sich die Gnostiker zugehörig wissen, ist eine unweltliche Gemeinschaft, nämlich die Gemeinschaft der geistigen Wesen des Pleroma. ... Es ist diese *rein geistig zu definierende Ekklesia* ... der das ganze Interesse der Gnostiker gilt. ... Der Fehler der Katholiken in gnostischer Sicht ist nun der, daß sie ihre menschliche Versammlung für die ‘Kirche’ selbst halten.” The italics are the author's.

Gnostics did. But, what reasons could be given for the striking fact that, at the latest, in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century, it became a commonly understandable and apparently also acknowledged name for Orthodox monks? Moving along the ecclesiastical path we will try to provide one of many possible approaches to this problem.

As suggested above, Gnostic openness towards religiously motivated singleness and, consequently, towards a positive meaning for the term, could in one or another way be connected with the Gnostic view of the church stratified in two groups of the pneumatics and the psychics, the latter being the great masses of the Church Christians in the middle of which the Gnostics constituted a pneumatic core. According to Gnostic belief, both groups differed from each other with respect to their origin from different preexistent regions, with respect to the knowledge of God, and, as it seems, also regarding their chances for salvation.<sup>23</sup>

Until the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, we don't find any similar stratification in the writings of the Orthodox authors. A more or less close parallel to the Gnostic division of Church people into pneumatics and psychics is provided by Clement of Alexandria and Origen in the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. While Origen is aware of the differences between the simple believers and the advanced ones,<sup>24</sup> Clement put forward the image of the Christian Gnostic staying high above the rest of the Church.<sup>25</sup> In both cases, the differences lay in the field of unlike knowledge of God, the Logos or the Holy Scripture, whereas neither the simple believers of Origen nor the people who are not the Gnostics in the sense of Clement are excluded from salvation or supposed to be of a fundamentally different

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv haer* I 5,1–7,5, UW 98 (NHS 21, 70,29–1 Layton) and UW 116 (NHS 21, 78,6–9 Lay.). Further references are found in MARTIN HIRSCHBERG, *Studien zur Geschichte der simplices in der Alten Kirche. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Schichtungen in der menschlichen Erkenntnis*, Berlin 1944 (PhD, typewritten), 43–46; about the problem of the determinism of Gnostic anthropology see ELAINE PAGELS, *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon's Commentary on John* (SBL.MS 17), Nashville/New York 1973, 98ff.

<sup>24</sup> About the problem of the “simple people” in Origen's writings see WALTHER VÖLKER, *Das Bild vom nichtgnostischen Christentum bei Celsus*, Halle (Saale) 1928, HIRSCHBERG, *Studien* (cf. n. 23 above), 166–234; ADELE MONACI CASTANGO, *Origene ed “i molti”: due religiosità a contrasto*, Aug. 21 (1981) 99–117; GUNNAR AF HÄLLSTRÖM, *Fides simpliciorum* according to Origen of Alexandria (*Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 76), 1984; ADELE MONACI, *Art. Semplici*, in: *Origene. Dizionario: la cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, a c. di A. Monaci Castagno, Roma 2000, 440–443.

<sup>25</sup> About the place of Clement's Gnostic in the Church, see the classical work of WALTHER VÖLKER, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus* (TU 57), Berlin 1952, 153–160; 549–559 and the instructive article of FRITZ HOFMANN, *Die Kirche bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, in: *Vitae et Veritati*, FS K. Adam, Düsseldorf 1956, 11–27.

nature as is the case with the Gnostic psychics.<sup>26</sup> And although a certain individualistic feature of Clement's and Origen's stratifications cannot be denied,<sup>27</sup> the absence in their respective works of any developed terminology of ascetic solitude<sup>28</sup> makes the assumption about their possible role in the transmission of the term *μοναχός* into the Orthodox circles problematic. These doubts increase if one considers that – as the papyrus witnesses show – the term *μοναχός* appears first in the lower strata of Egyptian society and not in the learned tracts.

In searching for ecclesiological models which could have promoted the Orthodox reception of *μοναχός* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries, we came across a text which seems to be of interest in various respects. The text entitled “The discourse of the Saint Barsabas, archbishop of Jerusalem, about our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Churches [and about the chief priests]”<sup>29</sup> was published in 1982 by the Belgian Jesuit Michel van Esbroeck according to the Georgian manuscript of the tenth century *Athos Iviron* 11, which provides the only surviving version of this document.<sup>30</sup> van Esbroeck, whose introduction to the publication, to our knowledge, still remains one of the few pieces of scholarly work dedicated to the *Discourse*, convincingly connected it to 2<sup>nd</sup> century Orthodox Christian circles in Jerusalem.<sup>31</sup> The editor argues that the *Discourse*'s Christology was di-

<sup>26</sup> Cf. e.g. JACQUES ZEILLER, *La conception de l'Église aux quatre premiers siècles*, RHE 29 (1933) 579: “Pour Clément d'Alexandrie ... il semble que jusqu'à un certain point les 'gnostiques' soient des chrétiens supérieurs aux autres; mais tous les chrétiens sont capables, en principe, de s'élever à cette supériorité.”

<sup>27</sup> Cf. for example HOFMANN, *Die Kirche* (cf. n. 25 above), 12.

<sup>28</sup> A significant text provides Origen's commentary on Jeremiah 15,17 (LXX) “κατὰ μόνος ἐκαθήμην”, cf. Origenes, *Hom in Jer* 14,16 (GCS Origenes III, 122,3–21 Klostermann). Origen sees the solitary life, the deliberately chosen withdrawal from the community to be only possible as a result of avoiding contacts with the sinners persecuting a righteous one. It is in this context that the imitation of the prophet Elijah fleeing from Queen Jezebel's revenge and left entirely alone (1Reg 19,14) is recommended. Unlike later monastic tradition (cf. e.g. Athanasius, *Vita Anton* 7,12–13) Origen's Elijah is thus not considered as an archetype of ascetic practice in general and of ascetic solitude in particular. About Elijah's significance for early monastic tradition, see UTA RANKE-HEINEMANN, *Das frühe Mönchtum. Seine Motive nach den Selbstzeugnissen*, Essen 1964, 94. Cf. also a rather negativ look on the withdrawal in the wilderness in Origenes, *Hom in Jer* 20,8 (GCS Origenes III, 189,31–190,6 Klos.).

<sup>29</sup> The words “and about the chief priests” are a later addition to the title, see Barsabé de Jérusalem sur le Christ et les églises, introduction, édition du texte géorgien inédit et traduction française par MICHEL VAN ESBRÖECK, PO 41/2, Turnhout 1982, 29–31.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. VAN ESBRÖECK, Barsabé de Jérusalem (cf. n. 29 above).

<sup>31</sup> VAN ESBRÖECK, Barsabé de Jérusalem (cf. n. 29 above), 55–56, 59–60. About the *Discourse* see F. MANN, *Une nouvelle source littéraire pour l'étude du judéo-christianisme*, Heno 6 (1984) 165–180.

rected against the Ebionites according to whom Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and Jesus were the appearances of forms of Adam thought of as a prehistoric celestial being free from sin.<sup>32</sup> As van Esbroeck claims, the author of the *Discourse* contests this kind of identification of Christ with Adam and sets Jesus apart from all exegetical ties with the first man: different from St. Paul's typology of the first and second Adam,<sup>33</sup> the Adam of the *Discourse* is not a type of Christ, but of every Christian.<sup>34</sup>

Ukuet'u samot'xe igi eklesiy ars hmrt'isay, šen xar adami, piveli igi ĥorc'ieli. Šeimosā šen didebay, ik'men p'rt'xil da nu gardaxual mc'nebat'a, aramed ik'mode simart'lesa, da qav mšwdobay, rayt'a šexwde samot'xesa mas šina, romel ars eklesiy hmrt'say, da movidet' sasup'evelsa mas c'it'asa.

If Paradise is the Church of God, you are Adam, the first carnal <man><sup>35</sup>. Put on the glory, be vigilant and don't offend the commandments, but work <at> righteousness and make peace so that you will come into Paradise which is the Church of God and we shall reach the kingdom of heaven.

The typological links between Paradise and the Church and between Adam and every Christian once settled, the *Discourse* extends this connection incorporating some new details from the Biblical text of the Book of Genesis. The passage we are interested in reads as follows:<sup>36</sup>

“Daadgina adami samot'xesa sak'med da c'vad.” Vis t'ws sc'vida? Vin iqvnes mparav? Adam martoy iqo c'olit'urtl. Anu rasa ik'moda samot'xesa šina? Raymet'u sruliad sitqwt'a hmrt'isayt'a aššenebul iqvnes nergni igi, aramed saidumloy ceril ars, raymet'u daadgina igi samot'xesa šina, ese ars eklesiy, rayt'a ik'modis simart'lesa da daimarxnes mc'neban.

“He (i.e. God) put Adam in Paradise to work <it> and to guard <it>.”<sup>37</sup> What did he guard against? Who were the thieves? Adam was alone with <his> wife. Or, what did he work at in Paradise? For these plants were edified (made to grow?) by the word of God alone. But, what is written is a mystery. For He put him in Paradise, that is, the Church, for working <at> righteousness and for keeping the commandments.

<sup>32</sup> VAN ESBRÖECK, Barsabé de Jérusalem (cf. n. 29 above), 57–58 with the reference to HANS-JOACHIM SCHOEPS, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen 1949, 105.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Rom 5,12–21, 1Kor 15,21–22; 45–49.

<sup>34</sup> Barsabas, Christ 10 (PO 41, 70,16–21 Esbroeck). For Old Georgian we use the transliteration adopted by GABRIELE WINKLER in her study *Über die Entwicklungsgeschichte des armenischen Symbolums. Ein Vergleich mit dem syrischen und griechischen Formelgut unter Einbezug der relevanten georgischen und äthiopischen Quellen* (OCP 262), Roma 2000, XIX.

<sup>35</sup> VAN ESBRÖECK, Barsabé de Jérusalem (cf. n. 29 above), 71 n. 46 suggests that the Greek original text rendered at this place προτοπλάστης.

<sup>36</sup> Barsabas, Christ 4 (PO 41, 66,11–18 Esb.).

<sup>37</sup> Gen 2,15.

The first observation we would like to make concerns the understanding of the plants in Paradise. As we have seen above, St. Hippolytus of Rom interpreted them as the people of the Church. According to him, the trees of the garden of Eden are in their multiplicity a characteristic mark pointing to the Church as a society,<sup>38</sup> cf. Hippolytus, in Dan 1,18:

So Eden means “a place of delight”, that is Paradise. It was planted “in the east” and adorned with frugiferous trees and fruits of every kind, so that one can understand that the congregation of the righteous ones is <that> holy place where the Church was planted.

This imagery of the community as a group of plants cultivated by God has Biblical roots<sup>39</sup> and was explored in the Essene literature from Qumran, where it takes clear paradisiac traits: the members of the Qumran community are described as trees of life watered with the waters of holiness.<sup>40</sup> The Christian usage of this image belongs to the very center of the mystery of baptism, the person being baptized spoken of as a tree which will be planted by God in His Garden, i.e., the Church.<sup>41</sup> One of the earliest witnesses of this idea is found in the 11<sup>th</sup> Ode of Solomon with its unmistakable baptismal context,<sup>42</sup> cf. OdSal 11,16.18–19 (52,35–36; 53,9–13 Charlesworth):

<sup>38</sup> About this aspect of St. Hippolytus' ecclesiology, see ADOLF HAMEL, Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom (BFChTh 49), Gütersloh 1951, 42–46.

<sup>39</sup> Cf., e.g. Jes 60,21.

<sup>40</sup> 1QH 8,4–13. Pre-Christian is also PsSal 14,2 (324,2 Viteau): ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ κυρίου, τὰ ξύλα τῆς ζωῆς, ὅσοι αὐτοῦ.

<sup>41</sup> Concerning baptism as the entry into Paradise in the early Christian period, cf. JEAN DANIELÉLOU, Sacramentum futuri. Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique (ETH), Paris 1950, 16: « Que d'abord le baptême soit une entrée au Paradis, c'est un des thèmes de la catéchèse baptismale élémentaire »; for patristic evidence, see IBID., 16–17, IDEM, Liturgie und Bibel. Die Symbolik der Sakramente bei den Kirchenväter, München 1963, 42ff and PIERRE MIQUEL, Art. Paradis. Dans la tradition chrétienne (DSp 12,1), Paris 1984, 193. The baptismal context is evident also in Barn 11,10–11, where the trees planted by the river are associated with recently baptized Christians, though the Paradise motif is not explicit here. About the baptismal connotations in Barn 11,10–11, see FERDINAND-RUPERT PROSTMEIER, Der Barnabasbrief (KAV 8), Göttingen 1999, 430–432 and JAMES RHODES, The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition. Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident (WUNT 188), Tübingen 2004, 63–64; for further literature on the question, see IBID., 63 n. 96. Cf. also Origenes, Cant III 8,9 (SC 376, 572,4–10 Brésard/Crouzel): “In quo loco possumus nos catechumenos ecclesiae intelligere, super quos ex parte aliqua confirmatur ecclesia. Habet enim et in ipsis non parum fiducia et spei plurimum quod et ipsi fiant aliquando arbores fructiferae, ut plantentur in paradiso Dei ab ipso agricola Patre. Ipse enim est qui plantat huiusmodi arbores in ecclesia Christi, quae est paradisi deliciarum...”.

<sup>42</sup> See about it JEAN DANIELÉLOU, Art. Odes de Salomon (DBS 6), Paris 1960, 682–683.

And He took me to His Paradise,  
Wherein is the wealth of the Lord's pleasure ...  
And I said, Blessed, O Lord, are they  
Who are planted in Thy land,  
And who have a place in Thy Paradise;  
And who grow in the growth of Thy trees,  
And have passed from darkness to light.

Holding in the background this understanding of the paradisiac trees widely accepted in early Christian literature, we can state that the author of “The discourse about our Saviour Jesus Christ <and> the Churches” uses another tradition which interprets the task of keeping and tilling imposed upon Adam in Gen 2,15<sup>43</sup> as having in view not the plants of Paradise, but the commandments of the Lord. Michel van Esbroeck points to the Palestinian Targum on Gen 2,15 as a parallel to this exegesis:<sup>44</sup>

The Lord God took Adam ... and made him dwell in the garden of Eden to labour in the law and to keep its commandments.

The other point of contact between these two texts – and this is our second observation – is that both the *Discourse* and the Palestinian Targum see Adam as being alone,<sup>45</sup> whereas the Targum uses for his designation the

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Gen 2,15: “The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it.”

<sup>44</sup> VAN ES BROECK, Barsabé de Jérusalem (cf. n. 29 above) 209, n. 10. The English translation is quoted according to: The Aramaic Bible, Vol. 1B. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes by MICHAEL MAHER, Edinburgh 1992, 23. Similar ideas can furthermore be found in Philo Quest in Gen I,14 and sIHen 31,1. In the Christian milieu, apart from Barsabas, this Jewish tradition was adopted by the 2<sup>nd</sup> century apologetic St. Theophilus of Antioch, Autol 2,24 (SC 20, 158,22–25 Bardy). M. van Esbroeck's reference to “Ad Autolicum, 3 (SC 20), p. 118”, cf. VAN ES BROECK, Barsabé de Jérusalem (cf. n. 29 above), 209, n. 10 is not correct. Two more Christian parallels are Ephraem Syrus, Comm in Gen 2,7 (CSCO 152 Syr. 71, 29,16–28 Tonneau) and Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Dial Anth et Steph 25: “Anthemus: Of what kind had Adam been (literal: is) before he disobeyed (παραβαίω)? Cyrillus: He was (literal: is) like the trees <which were> there, being himself laden with fruits (καρπός), that is, the commandments (ἐντολή) of the Lord”, my translation from Coptic. The text is to be found in: Der Papyruscodex saec. VI–VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften, hrsg. und übersetzt von WALTER CRUM. Mit einem Beitrag von A. Ehrhard (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Straßburg 18), Straßburg 1915, 8,10–12. The authorship of the St. Cyrillus asserts ALBERT EHRHARD, Zur literarischen und theologischen Würdigung der Texte, in: CRUM, op. cit., 145–154, cf. also CPG № 5277.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Barsabas, Christ 4: “What did he guard against? Who were the thieves? Adam was alone with <his> wife.”



Aramaic term ܐܝܢܐܢܝܐ resp. ܐܝܢܐܢܝܐ<sup>46</sup> which means the religiously significant solitude and possibly could have influenced the Gnostic concept of μοναχός.<sup>47</sup>

Returning to the role the *Discourse* or some cognate texts could have played in the transmission of the term μοναχός, we can say that the choice of the less common tradition connecting the “keeping” of Gen 2,15 with the commandments of the Lord made impossible for the author of this text the understanding of the trees in the Garden of Eden as Church members. In combination with the given necessity to disconnect Adam and Jesus and to understand the first man as a type of every Christian, this choice sees Paradise – i.e., the Church – as inhabited by Adam,<sup>48</sup> and also by the addressed Christian reader only. Whereas the typological connection of Adam with every Christian is, according to the interpretation of Michel van Esbroeck, due to the polemical situation of the author, the Targumic exegesis of the keeping of the commandments seems to be a deliberate choice of the author pointing to his possible literary sources.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> century “Discourse about our Saviour Jesus Christ <and> the Churches” is thus an early Christian text in which, on the one hand, the Church as community plays no role, a Church member being confronted not with his fellow members but with the commandments of the Lord and this in the context where traditionally the opposite was the case. On the other hand, the *Discourse* being, as argued by his editor M. van Esbroeck, Palestinian in its origin has – apart from the idea of Adam keeping the Lord’s commandment in Paradise – at least one tradition in common with the Palestinian Targum where Adam is also seen as alone (ܐܝܢܐܢܝܐ), a term which most probably gave birth to the Greek Christian term μοναχός.

Summarizing this evidence, one is possibly not wrong to assume that the *Discourse* reflects the beliefs of a 2<sup>nd</sup> century Christian group whose ecclesiological conception and relations to the respective Jewish circles could probably make it, even in this early period, more open to the positive reception of the term μοναχός than was the case with the other parts of the Christian οἰκουμένη.

<sup>46</sup> I.e. “single, only one”, cf. TPJ Gen 3,22: “And the Lord God said ... ‘Behold, Adam was alone (ܐܝܢܐܢܝܐ) on the earth as I am alone (ܐܝܢܐܢܝܐ) in the heavens on high’”, translation according to MAHER, *The Aramaic Bible* (cf. n. 44 above), 29.

<sup>47</sup> See FRITZLEO LENTZEN-DEIS, *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern. Literar-kritische und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (FTS 4), Frankfurt a.M. 1979, 239–240 and DMITRIJ BUMAZHNOV, *Zur Bedeutung der Targume bei der Herausbildung des MONAXOΣ-Konzeptes in den Nag Hammadi-Texten*, ZAC 10 (2007) 252–259.

<sup>48</sup> And his wife as well, who plays no role, however, in the exegesis of the *Discourse*.

MARTIN EBNER

„Hütet euch vor dem Sauerteig der Pharisäer ...!“

Die Profilierung jesuanischer Tischgemeinschaft im narrativen und semantischen Konzept des Markusevangeliums ..... 147

OTFRIED HOFIUS

Gemeinschaft am Tisch des Herrn

Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments ..... 169

DAVID G. HORRELL

Pauline Churches or Early Christian Churches?

Unity, Disagreement, and the Eucharist ..... 185

### *Mission und Einheit der Kirche*

HANS KVALBEIN

Discipleship, Kingdom and Conversion

Aspects from Recent Exegetical Discussion

on the Mission of the Church ..... 207

ARMAND PUIG I TÀRRECH

The Mission According to the New Testament: Choice or Need? .... 231

### *Wirkungsgeschichtliche Aspekte*

DMITRIJ F. BUMAZHNOV

Some Ecclesiological Patterns of the Early Christian Period and Their

Implications for the History of the Term ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ (Monk) ..... 251

ALEXANDER NEGROV

Understanding the New Testament Church

within an Orthodox Hermeneutical Framework ..... 265

CHRISTOS KARAKOLIS

Resümee der Diskussionen ..... 277

Autorenverzeichnis ..... 289

Verzeichnis der Teilnehmer am Symposium in Sankt Petersburg ..... 291

Bibelstellenregister ..... 293

Sachregister ..... 303

Autorenregister ..... 305