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**Βαρναβᾱς καὶ Μᾶρκος: Ἡ ἀποστολικὴ σχέση τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν Κύπρου καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας**

Σωτήριος Δεσπότης[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Εισαγωγικά**

**ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΥΟΥΣΑ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ**

1. J. Gunther, The Association of Mark and Barnabas with Egyptian Christianity, Part I & II, *Evangelical Quartely* 54 (1982), 219-233 & 55 (1983), 21-24.
2. [Markus Öhler](https://www.mohrsiebeck.com/en/suche/search-results?no_cache=1&tx_sgpublisher_pi1%5BauthorUid%5D=3942), *Barnabas. Die historische Person und ihre Rezeption in der Apostelgeschichte.* Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen 2003.
3. Chrysovalantis Kyriacou, **The Barnabas Network: Cyrene, Jerusalem, Salamis and Alexandria. *Orient & Méditerranée*** *est une Unité Mixte de Recherche,* <https://www.orient-mediterranee.com/>
* "On the Origins of the Alexandrian School: *Rhizomes*, *Episcopal Legitimation*, and a Tale of Two Cities", Religions 14:482 (2023).
1. M. David Litwa, ***Early Christianity in Alexandria. From its Beginnings to the Late Second Century*.** Cambridge University Press; Online publication date: December 2023.
2. M. Vinzent, Resetting the Origins of Christianity: Theory of Sources and Beginnings. Cambridge 2022 (**Gregory of Tours – Orosius- Ευσέβιος – Πράξεις)**

Πρόσφατα δημοσιεύτηκε το άρθρο Benjamin Schliesser, Why Did Paul Skip Alexandria? Paul’s Missionary Strategy and the Rise of Christianity in Alexandria. *New Test. Stud*. (2021), 87, pp. 260-283. συζητείται το ανωτέρω πρόβλημα και προτείνονται οι εξής λύσεις:

1. **Θεολογικοί και βιβλικοί λόγοι**

1.1 H Αλεξάνδρεια δεν ήταν μέρος του «Καταλόγου των Εθνών» (Γένεσις 10, Ησαΐας 66,18-29[[2]](#footnote-2) Ιεζεκιήλ 38-9, Δανιήλ 11,)

1.2 Η Αλεξάνδρεια ήταν τμήμα του «Οίκου της Σκλαβιάς» (M. Hengel, A.M. Schwemer)

**2. Πολιτικοί και Πολιτιστικοί Λόγοι**

2.1 Η Αλεξάνδρεια δεν ήταν «ανοικτή» σε μια άλλη «οικουμενική» θρησκεία

2.2 Η Αλεξάνδρεια ήταν πολιτικά πολύ ασταθής κατά τη διάρκεια των εβραϊκών ταραχών

2.3 Η Αλεξάνδρεια «αποκλείστηκε» για χριστιανική ιεραποστολή από τον Κλαύδιο

**3. Λόγοι που σχετίζονται με την (Ιερ)αποστολή και τη Στρατηγική**

3.1 Η Αλεξάνδρεια είχε ήδη τύχει ευαγγελισμού από ανώνυμο Εβραίο Χριστιανό

3.2 Βαρνάβας και Μάρκος

3.3 Η Αλεξάνδρεια ανήκε στο πεδίο της ιουδαιοχριστιανικής ιεραποστολής.

1. Cyprus in Texts from Graeco-Roman Antiquity Volume Editors: [Katerina Carvounis](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Katerina+Carvounis), [Andreas Gavrielatos](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Andreas+Gavrielatos), [Grammatiki Karla](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Grammatiki+Karla) and [Amphilochios Papathomas](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Amphilochios+Papathomas) Brill 2023. (Cyprus and Cypriots in the Greek Dokumentary Papyri and Inscriptions).

**ΠΗΓΕΣ**

* 1. ***Πράξεις Αποστόλων*** (Αιθιοπία, Κυρήνη + Κύπρος, όχι αναφορά σε ιεραποστολή στην Αλεξάνδρεια, μνεία Απολλώ)
* 2. **Ευσέβιος Παμφίλου Καισαρείας** (< έμφαση στην Διαδοχή – [π.χ. Πέτρος ιδρυτής της Εκκλησίας της Ρώμης ?, Μάρκος + Θεραπευτές ?]
* **Επιστολή Βαρνάβα** (80 – 120 μ.Χ.) < Σιναϊτικός Κώδιξ [Κλήμης Αλεξ. + Ωριγένης] // Κατά Μάρκον Ευαγγέλιο.
* [K. Aland, **Synopsis Quattor Evangeliorum**, Wuettembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart 1964, 531-550 (testimonia partum veterum)]

***Α. Ευσέβιος Καισαρείας***

* 2.16. Τοῦτον δὲ Μάρκον πρῶτόν φασιν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου στειλάμενον, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ δὴ καὶ συνεγράψατο, κηρῦξαι, ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας συστήσασθαι. Τοσαύτη δ’ ἄρα τῶν αὐτόθι πεπιστευκότων πληθὺς ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν ἐκ πρώτης ἐπιβολῆς συνέστη δι’ ἀσκήσεως φιλοσοφωτάτης τε καὶ σφοδροτάτης, ὡς καὶ γραφῆς αὐτῶν ἀξιῶσαι τὰς διατριβὰς καὶ τὰς συνηλύσεις τά τε συμπόσια καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἄλλην τοῦ βίου ἀγωγὴν τὸν Φίλωνα.
* 2. 24 Νέρωνος δὲ ὄγδοον ἄγοντος τῆς βασιλείας ἔτος, πρῶτος μετὰ Μάρκον τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας Ἀννιανὸς τὴν λειτουργίαν διαδέχεται.
* Litwa, *Early Christianity in Alexandria. 8* Eusebius’s (sub)apostolic founding of Alexandria may reflect developments in his own time. If we examine his Chronicle, we note that by 42 ce, Eusebius had Peter installed as first bishop of Rome. The very next year, Peter’s “interpreter,” Mark, announced his gospel in Alexandria (43 ce). This was one year before the first bishop of Antioch, Evodius, was installed in that city. Thus we have an implicit episcopal ranking of the churches in Eusebius’s day: first Rome, then Alexandria – who receives Peter’s “son” Mark (1 Pet 5:13) – then Antioch. In terms of chronology, 43 ce seems a bit late for the debut of the Jesus movement(s) in Alexandria. If Acts 2:10 presents a plausible scenario (people from “Egypt” hear Peter on Pentecost), then Jews on pilgrimage from Egypt to Jerusalem should have brought back lore about Jesus to Egypt between **30 and 35 ce – assuming the date of Jesus’s death to be around 30 ce. 34.**
* Litwa, *Early Christianity in Alexandria, 9* One suspects that the Mark legend is a countertradition crafted to oppose the assertion that Glaucias came to Alexandria and taught Basilides, the first known speculative Christian theologian of Alexandria. Both Glaucias and Mark were said not only to be disciples of Peter; they were both named his “interpreter.” Accordingly, both were thought to be (sub)apostolic missionaries to Alexandria. The Glaucias tradition is attested by Clement who ascribed the datum to Basilides himself. Clement wrote more than a century before Eusebius. Basilides, by Eusebius’s own reckoning, was Hadrianic (117–138 ce).

***(α) Τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὰς*** σὺν καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διηνυσμένοις χρόνοις, ὅσα τε καὶ πηλίκα πραγματευθῆναι κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν λέγεται, καὶ (β) ὅσοι ταύτης διαπρεπῶς ἐν ταῖς μάλιστα ***ἐπισημοτάταις   παροικίαις*** ἡγήσαντό τε καὶ προέστησαν, ὅσοι τε ***κατὰ γενεὰν***   (5) ἑκάστην ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τὸν θεῖον ἐπρέσβευσαν λόγον, τίνες τε καὶ ὅσοι καὶ ὁπηνίκα νεωτεροποιίας ἱμέρῳ πλάνης εἰς ἔσχατον ἐλάσαντες, ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως εἰσηγητὰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακεκηρύχασιν, ἀφειδῶς οἷα λύκοι βαρεῖς τὴν Χριστοῦ (2) ποίμνην ἐπεντρίβοντες, πρὸς ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ τὰ παραυτίκα τῆς κατὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιβουλῆς τὸ πᾶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος περιελθόντα, ὅσα τε αὖ καὶ ὁποῖα καθ’ οἵους τε χρόνους πρὸς τῶν ἐθνῶν ὁ θεῖος πεπολέμηται λόγος, καὶ πηλίκοι κατὰ καιροὺς τὸν δι’ αἵματος καὶ βασάνων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διεξῆλθον    (5) ἀγῶνα, τά τ’ ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς μαρτύρια καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἵλεω καὶ εὐμενῆ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀντίληψιν γραφῇ παραδοῦναι προῃρημένος, οὐδ’ ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἀπὸ πρώτης   ἄρξομαι τῆς κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν(3) Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας. ἀλλά μοι συγγνώμην εὐγνωμόνων ἐντεῦθεν ὁ λόγος αἰτεῖ, μείζονα ἢ καθ’ ἡμετέραν δύναμιν ὁμολογῶν εἶναι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐντελῆ καὶ ἀπαράλειπτον ὑποσχεῖν,

Όχι οι Κλήμης και Ωριγένης

One suspects that the Mark legend is a countertradition crafted to oppose the assertion that Glaucias came to Alexandria and taught Basilides, the first known speculative Christian theologian of Alexandria. 35 Both Glaucias and Mark were said not only to be disciples of Peter; they were both named his “interpreter.”36 Accordingly, both were thought to be (sub)apostolic missionaries to Alexandria. The Glaucias tradition is attested by Clement who ascribed the datum to Basilides himself. Clement wrote more than a century before Eusebius. Basilides, by Eusebius’s own reckoning, was Hadrianic (117–138 ce). Obviously we are gazing into the mirror of reception; there is no reliable evidence that “apostolic” missionaries came to Alexandria at all. The push to make Alexandria an apostolic foundation can be traced to the early second century ce. The author of Acts strove hard to find apostolic founders for many areas: Peter and John for Samaria (Acts 8), Peter for Joppa and Caesarea (Acts 10), Paul for Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome (Acts 18–19, 28). If he could have found an apostolic founder for Alexandria, presumably he would have. The fact is, the author of Acts shows almost no interest in Alexandria (see Chapter 2)[[3]](#footnote-3).

**Β. Λουκάς**

(Κύπρος – Κυρήνη αντίθετα σιωπή για την Αλεξάνδρεια, η οποία τον 2ο αι. μ.Χ. έδρα Γνωστικών και της γνωστής Κατηχητικής Σχολής) – Σιωπή παύλειων Επιστολών (Εκεί όπου δεν έσπειρα) – Αθήνα: ΘεόΦιλος και **Πράξεις και Ευσέβιος: Σύγκριση**

Βεβαίως και στις *Πράξεις* ο πρώτος αλλοδαπός, που μυείται στην Πίστη, είναι αξιωματούχος της Κανδάκης, ο Ευνούχος, ενώ ήδη τον σταυρό του Κυρίου σηκώνει ένας *Σίμων από την Κυρήνη*, πατέρας του Αλεξάνδρου και Ρούφου. Επιπλέον μια φυσιογνωμία, που δρα στην Έφεσο, είναι ο Απολλώς – Απολλώνιος, ο οποίος εντοπίζεται αρχικά να γνωρίζει το Βάπτισμα του Ιωάννη, χωρίς όμως να καθίσταται γνωστό, εάν μυήθηκε σε αυτό στην πόλη του ή την Ιουδαία και δη την Ιερουσαλήμ, όπου, όπως μαθαίνουμε, πάλι από τις Πράξεις υπήρχε **συναγωγή Αλεξανδρινών,** όπως και Κυρηναίων[[4]](#footnote-4). Ο Απολλώ – Απολλώνιος φέρει το όνομα

Αφρική: Κυρήνη (Σίμων, Εκκλησία Αντιόχειας)

Βαβυλώνα (Σ. Σάκκος, Υπόμνημα εις την επιστολήν Ιούδα, Θεσσαλονίκη 1970, 98 κ.ε. μετά την δολοφονία του Ιακώβου κατέφυγαν οι συγγραφείς των Καθολικών, στο Κάιρο. Ο Χρ. Βούλγαρης, Υπόμνημα εις τα καθολικάς Επιστολάς τού Πέτρου, Αθήναι 61996, 78 (συνεκλεκτή = σύζυγος)

Πράξεις  18:24-26 24  Ἰουδαῖος δέ τις Ἀπολλῶς ὀνόματι, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, κατήντησεν εἰς Ἔφεσον, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς.25  οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· 26οὗτός τε ἤρξατο παρρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ. ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ Ἀκύλας προσελάβοντο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν ὁδὸν [τοῦ θεοῦ].

* Πράξεις  18:24-26: Ἰουδαῖος δέ τις Ἀπολλῶς (= Απολλώνιος [Όσιρις]) ὀνόματι,
* Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει,
* **ἀνὴρ λόγιος,** κατήντησεν εἰς Ἔφεσον,
* **δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς**.25οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου

 (D: ος ην **κατηχημένος εν τη πατρίδι** τον Λόγον)

* καὶ **ζέων τῷ πνεύματι** ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν **ἀκριβῶς** τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,
* ἐπιστάμενος **μόνον** τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου·
* Οὗτός τε ἤρξατο παρρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ.
* ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ **Πρίσκιλλα (!) καὶ** Ἀκύλας προσελάβοντο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν ὁδὸν [τοῦ θεοῦ].
* Α’ Κορινθίους 1-4: γέγραπται γάρ· **ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν** καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω. (1:19 // Ησαΐας 29,14)

Ιδίως κατά την παραμονή στο κλεινόν άστυ ο Π. αισθάνθηκε έντονα συναισθήματα μοναξιάς αλλά και απόρριψης από τους φιλοσόφους (Στωικούς και Επικούρειους) παρά την προσαρμογή του στα δεδομένα της πόλης. Και ο ίδιος σημειώνει ότι κατέφθασε στην *αφνειό* Κόρινθο *ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ* (Α’ Κορ. 2, 3). Στη διθάλασσο πόλη (από όπου έγραψε και την επιστολή) βίωσε το διαζύγιο από τη Συναγωγή που διαδραματίστηκε με δραματικό τρόπο. Γι’ αυτό και στην Α’ Θεσ. ξεσπά εναντίον των ομοεθνών του με υπερβολικό τρόπο υιοθετώντας τις αντιϊουδαϊκές κατηγορίες, που ήταν συνήθεις στον ελληνορρωμαϊκό κόσμο[[5]](#footnote-5). Η πίστη των Θεσσαλονικέων με την έννοια της fides/πιστότητας απέναντι στο πρόσωπο, στο μήνυμα και τον τρόπο εκφοράς του, επιβεβαίωσαν σε πολλούς και διαφορετικούς αποδέκτες το γεγονός ότι όντως είναι Απόστολος του Κυρίου και έχει κληθεί να γίνει *μάρτυς στα έθνη*. Και ο Λουκάς σημειώνει με έμφαση ότι η έλευση των Σίλα και Τιμόθεου από τη Μακεδονία μετάγγισαν ενέργεια στον Π.: *Ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον ἀπὸ τῆς Μακεδονίας ὅ τε Σιλᾶς καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν* (Πρ. 18, 5).

## Ἡ γεωγραφικὴ σχέση τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν Κύπρου καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας (Γεωγραφία και Θεολογία)

Γνωρίζουμε ότι «Αυγούστου Μοναρχήσαντος επί της Γης», εκτός των άλλων, μετά και την απαλλαγή της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου από τους πειρατές της Κιλικίας και της Κρήτης από τον Πομπήιο, η Μεσόγειος κατέστη «η Θάλασσά» μας και λειτούργησε ως «Διαδίκτυο». Στους Χάρτες της εποχής κέντρο της συγκεκριμένης Θάλασσας και της Οικουμένης κατέστη **η Κύπρος,** με τα βασικά λιμάνια της Σαλαμίς, Πάφος κά. Ομφαλός της Γης είναι η Πάφος της Αφροδίτης, προγόνου και του Αυγούστου και της Ρώμης. Κύπρος και Αλεξάνδρεια – Αίγυπτος συνδέονταν άρρηκτα στο πλαίσιο των Πτολεμαίων. Και στα αυτοκρατορικά Χρόνια όμως η διασύνδεση ήταν άμεση και η ανταλλαγή μεταλλευμάτων. Παπαθωμάς Αμφιλόχιος < Αίγυπτιακοί Πάπυροι: Κύπριος, Κυπρία, Σαλαμίνιος, Ιδαλιάς, Κιτιάς < Ταξιδιώτες, Έμποροι, Μισθοφόροι, Καλλιτέχνες.



Κύπρος: Το Κέντρο της «Οικουμένης» - Orbis Terrarum (‘Ολόκληρος ο κόσμος’) με Ομφαλό την **Πάφο της Αφροδίτης** https://www.olympia.gr/1565657/viral/romaikos-chartis-toy-4oy-aiona-paroysiazei-tin-kypro-os-to-kentro-toy-kosmoy/



Βλ. επίσης: Cyprus in Texts from Graeco-Roman Antiquity Volume Editors: [Katerina Carvounis](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Katerina+Carvounis), [Andreas Gavrielatos](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Andreas+Gavrielatos), [Grammatiki Karla](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Grammatiki+Karla) and [Amphilochios Papathomas](https://brill.com/search?f_0=author&q_0=Amphilochios+Papathomas) Brill 2023. (Cyprus and Cypriots in the Greek Dokumentary Papyri and Inscriptions). ***Paul on Cyprus: Crossing the Divide*** **Thomas Davis, Lipscomb University** **02.06.2024** BIBLICAL ARCHAELOGICAL SOCIETY https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/travel-study/bas-scholars-series-with-thomas-davis/ Recent archaeological work on Cyprus provides a much better understanding of the context of Paul's visit there and underscores the cultural accuracy of the Acts account. A clearer picture of first-century **Cyprus as a complex multi-cultural entity** is coming in to view. When Paul arrived in Paphos, he had left his familiar environment and was open to new opportunities. These newly interpreted internal cultural divisions of the province help explain **the change of Saul, the apostle to the Jews, to Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles.**

1. «Κιττιείς» (< Φοινίκη, Ζήνων) στο Κουμράν o κωδικός των «Ρωμαίων». 2. [Λιμνίτης] Πάφος – Αλεξάνδρεια (7 ημέρες) + Πωμός – Ιεροσόλυμα (Πέγεια: ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ ΝΑΥΤΩΝ)

3. Χρήση του όρου «κυπρ\*»: βότρυς τῆς κύπρου ἀδελφιδός μου ἐμοὶ ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν Εγγαδδι (Άσμα 1,14).

Βασικός κόμβος ήταν η πόλη του Αλεξάνδρου (η Αλεξάνδρεια) με τον **Φάρο** της. Εταιρεία Κυπριακών Σπουδών, Ολκάς ΙΙ: Ταξιδεύοντας από και προς το Βυζάντιο. Μεσαιωνικά Λιμάνια από τον Εύξεινο Πόντο στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο. Αθήνα 2014. Ήταν κόμβος καταρχήν διότι η Αιώνια Πόλη, η Ρώμη, και η σταθερότητά της εξαρτώνταν από τον άρτο και το θέαμα, συνεπώς και από το στάρι της **Χώρας του Νείλου**. Εκεί όμως δέσποζε και η **Βιβλιοθήκη,** το Μουσείο, όπου ασκούνταν η «τεχνολογία» (= γραμματική τέχνη) και εκδίδονταν κριτικά (καθώς υπήρχε και ο πάπυρος). Χειρόγραφα του Ομήρου και του Πλάτωνα, της «Π.Δ. και της Κ.Δ.» των αυτοκρατορικών Χρόνων στόλιζαν τις βιβλιοθήκες της ελίτ της Ρώμης. Εκεί ανθούσε και η αλληγορική ερμηνεία, καθώς από τη μία πλευρά ο Πλάτων θεωρεί τον όμηρο και από την άλλη πλευρά. Έδρα της Κλεοπάτρας και του Μάρκου Αντώνιου, στιγματίστηκε από τον Οκταβιανό ως σύμβολο της Ανατολής. Δύο από τις πέντε συνοικίες της Αλεξάνδρειας, ήταν εβραϊκές.

Αυτό, που πρέπει να γνωρίζουμε είναι ότι τα πλοία δεν έπλεαν κατευθείαν από την Αλεξάνδρεια στη Ρώμη, την περίοδο Μαρτίου – Νοεμβρίου (κατά την οποία επιτρεπόταν η ναυσιπλοΐα). Επίσης η ναυσιπλοΐα συνδεόταν με την αστρονομία. Όπως διαπιστώνουμε και στις Πράξεις, το πλοίο έπλεε μέσω των λιμένων είτε της νότιας Κύπρου είτε / και των παραλίων τόσο του Λεβάντε (όπου έχουμε την Καισάρεια του Ηρώδη) όσο και της νότιας Μικράς Ασίας. Συνεπώς πρέπει να αναδομήσουμε ένα Δίκτυο ανταλλαγής. Διάδραση υπήρχε και με την Έφεσο και την Θεσσαλονίκη.

* **Λιμάνια:** Σίτος > άρτος και Θέαμα της Ρώμης (και αστρονομία)
* Δίκτυο με Έφεσο, Θεσσαλονίκη (Ρωμανιώτες), Κρήτη, Συρία και Ασία
* **Βιβλιοθήκη:** Χειρόγραφα και Κριτική Έκδοση
* Οικίες – Φιλοσοφικές Σχολές
* Εβραϊκές Παροικίες – «Κατοικίες» Δέλτα + Έθναρχος:
* Μετάφραση Εβδομήκοντα
* Φίλων (φιλοσοφικές Σχολές – Οικίες) // Απολλώς
* Ρ 52 + ….
* «Πογκρόμ»
	+ 38 - 40 μ.Χ.: Πρεσβεία προς Γάιον – Εις Φλάκκον
	+ Διάταγμα Κλαυδίου 41 μ.Χ.
	+ Δεκαετία 60 μ.Χ.
	+ Δεκαετία 90 μ.Χ.
	+ 115 -117 μ.Χ.
* **Σημείωση:** έδρα Μάρκου Αντώνιου και Κλεοπάτρας

Είναι όντως εντυπωσιακό ότι δεν μνημονεύεται στην Κ.Δ. ο Ευαγγελισμός της Χώρας του Νείλου, η οποία, χρημάτισε χώρα ασύλου για τον Ισραήλ και για τον ίδιο τον Ι. Χριστό. Ειδικότερα υπάρχει μια περίεργη σιωπή για το πώς διαδόθηκε ο Χριστιανισμός στην Αλεξάνδρεια, την πολιτιστική Πρωτεύουσα της Μεσογείου, η οποία διέθετε την περίφημη Βιβλιοθήκη (το Μουσείο) και βεβαίως. Εκεί άλλωστε εκπονήθηκαν και οι μεταφράσεις των Ο’, καθώς από τις πέντε συνοικίες, οι δύο (και μάλιστα στο Δέλτα) ήταν ιουδαϊκές. Τον 1ο αι. μ.Χ. δεσπόζει η φιγούρα τού Φίλωνα, Ιουδαίου μεσοπλατωνικού.

## Βαρνάβας και Μάρκος

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Βαρνάβας** | **Μάρκος**[[6]](#footnote-6) |
| Ονόματα | Ιωσήφ Βαρνάβας(Υιός Παρακλήσεως) | Ιωάννης Μάρκος (πρβλ. Αντώνιος)«Κολοβοδάκτυλος» |
| Ιδιότητες | Λευίτης  | (Λευίτης) < “ανεψιός” (= πρώτος εξάδελφος!, όχι «αδελφιδούς») Βαρνάβα (Κολ. 4, 10: εκ περιτομής)«υιός Πέτρου» («εκ περιτομής») |
| Τόπος Προέλευσης |  Κύπρος  | Ιεροσόλυμα (μητέρα Μαρία – πατήρ άγνωστος [αποθανών] – «υιός Πέτρου» («Βαβυλώνα») |
| Στάτους Κοινωνικο-Οικονομικό | Κτήμα είτε στην Ιερουσαλήμ, όπως ο Σίμων από την Κυρήνη, είτε στην Κύπρο (σε αντίθεση προς τον Ανανία + τη Σαπφείρα]) | **Οικία ευρύχωρη** και δούλη Ρόδη[[7]](#footnote-7) (= **ἀνάγαιον μέγα** ἐστρωμένον (Μκ. 14:15) + **εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον** ἀνέβησαν οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες (Πρ. 1:13). Ιδιοκτησία: **Γεθσημανή; (πρβλ. μη ονομασία Καϊάφα, Ζεβεδαίος)** |
| Στάτους  | Σε αντίθεση προς τον Κηφά και τον Ιάκωβο: ἢ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρναβᾶς οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι; (Α΄ Κορ.  9:6) | Νεανίσκος και σινδόνα κατά τη σύλληψη (πρβλ. Παπίας: μη «αυτόπτης» μαθητής Κυρίου Ιησού) Ανήρ κεράμιον ύδατος βαστάζων (Εσσαίος) –) –«Ερμηνευτής Πέτρου» |
| Έργα: | Επιστολή Βαρνάβα (80 – 110 μ.Χ.) < Σιναϊτικός Κώδιξ (Αλεξάνδρεια?), Κλήμης Αλεξανδρεύς«Προς Εβραίους» (;)Κήρυγμα προς τους Έλληνες < Γαλ. 2,) | Κατά Μάρκον «Βιογραφία»: Αρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ Θεοῦ]. (65 μ.Χ. Ρώμη ?)* Προφίλ Πέτρου και Μαθητών
* Όχι Τυπολογία – αλληγορία (Σάββατο για τον άνθρωπο + δεν μολύνουν τα εισερχόμενα)
* Όχι δημοφιλές στην Αλεξάνδρεια, σε αντίθεση προς το Κατά Ιωάννη
* Κατήχηση Εκκλησίας

Μυστικό Κατά Μάρκον (Κλήμης Αλεξανδρεύς) – Υπόθεση δύο Μάρκων  |
| «Φυσιογνωμία» - «Εμφάνιση» (?) | 11  οἵ: τε ὄχλοι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησεν Παῦλος ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν Λυκαονιστὶ λέγοντες· οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις κατέβησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, 12  ἐκάλουν τε τὸν Βαρναβᾶν Δία, τὸν δὲ Παῦλον Ἑρμῆν, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου. 13  ὅ τε ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ταύρους καὶ στέμματα ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας ἐνέγκας σὺν τοῖς ὄχλοις ἤθελεν θύειν. 14  Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι Βαρναβᾶς καὶ Παῦλος διαρρήξαντες  |  |

ΠΙΝΑΚΑΣ ΙΙ: Χωρία όπου μνημονεύονται τα Πρόσωπα στις Πράξεις

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Βαρναβάς | Βαρναβάς και Μάρκος | Μάρκος |
| 36  Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρναβᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον υἱὸς παρακλήσεως, Λευίτης, Κύπριος τῷ γένει,37  ὑπάρχοντος αὐτῷ ἀγροῦ πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν τὸ χρῆμα καὶ ἔθηκεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων. (Act 4:36-37 BGT) | 37Βαρναβᾶς δὲ ἐβούλετο συμπαραλαβεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν καλούμενον Μᾶρκον· 38 Παῦλος δὲ ἠξίου, τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον μὴ συμπαραλαμβάνειν τοῦτον. 39ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμὸς ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων, τόν τε Βαρναβᾶν παραλαβόντα τὸν Μᾶρκον ἐκπλεῦσαι εἰς Κύπρον, 40Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος Σιλᾶν ἐξῆλθεν παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. 41  διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ [τὴν] Κιλικίαν ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας. (Act 15:37-1 BGT) | 23 Ἀσπάζεταί σε Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 24  Μᾶρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συνεργοί μου. 25  Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. (Phm 1:23-25 BGT) |
| 26  Παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπείραζεν κολλᾶσθαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ πάντες ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν μὴ πιστεύοντες ὅτι ἐστὶν μαθητής.27  Βαρναβᾶς δὲ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἤγαγεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ καὶ πῶς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαρρησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 28  καὶ ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, παρρησιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, 29  ἐλάλει τε καὶ συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστάς, οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν. 30  ἐπιγνόντες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν εἰς Ταρσόν. (Act 9:26-30 BGT) |  | 10  Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἀρίσταρχος ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου καὶ Μᾶρκος **ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρναβᾶ** (περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς, ἐὰν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δέξασθε αὐτόν) 11  καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰοῦστος, οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι παρηγορία. (Col 4:10-11 BGT) |
| 19  Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ διῆλθον ἕως Φοινίκης καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας μηδενὶ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις. 20  Ἦσαν δέ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ Κυρηναῖοι, οἵτινες ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλάλουν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστὰς εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν. 21  καὶ ἦν χεὶρ κυρίου μετ᾽ αὐτῶν, πολύς τε ἀριθμὸς ὁ πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον. 22  Ἠκούσθη δὲ ὁ λόγος εἰς τὰ ὦτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς οὔσης ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρναβᾶν [διελθεῖν] ἕως Ἀντιοχείας. 23  ὃς παραγενόμενος καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν χάριν [τὴν] τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐχάρη καὶ παρεκάλει πάντας τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ κυρίῳ, **24  ὅτι ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως. καὶ προσετέθη ὄχλος ἱκανὸς τῷ κυρίῳ.** **25  ἐξῆλθεν δὲ εἰς Ταρσὸν ἀναζητῆσαι Σαῦλον,** **26  καὶ εὑρὼν ἤγαγεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν**. ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἱκανόν, χρηματίσαι τε πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. 27  Ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις κατῆλθον ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προφῆται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. 28  ἀναστὰς δὲ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἅγαβος ἐσήμανεν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος λιμὸν μεγάλην μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι ἐφ᾽ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἥτις ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου. 29  τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν, καθὼς εὐπορεῖτό τις, ὥρισαν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς· 30  ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν ἀποστείλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Σαύλου.BGT **Acts 12:1** Κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβαλεν Ἡρῴδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσαί τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. 2  ἀνεῖλεν δὲ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρῃ. |  | 11  Λουκᾶς ἐστιν μόνος μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. Μᾶρκον ἀναλαβὼν ἄγε μετὰ σεαυτοῦ, ἔστιν γάρ μοι εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν. 12  Τύχικον δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἔφεσον. (2Ti 4:11-12 BGT) |
| 22  ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει· Θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου. 23  παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος κυρίου ἀνθ᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὴν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν. 24  Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ηὔξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο. **25  Βαρναβᾶς δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μᾶρκον.**BGT **Acts 13:1** Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι **ὅ τε Βαρναβᾶς καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ** καὶ Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἡρῴδου τοῦ τετραάρχου σύντροφος καὶ Σαῦλος. 2  Λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· ἀφορίσατε δή μοι τὸν Βαρναβᾶν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς. 3  τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν. 4  Αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κατῆλθον εἰς Σελεύκειαν, ἐκεῖθέν τε ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Κύπρον (Act 12:22-4 BGT) |  | 12  Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, δι᾽ ὀλίγων ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στῆτε. 13  Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μᾶρκος ὁ υἱός μου. 14  ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης. Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. (1Pe 5:12-1 BGT) |
| 11  οἵ τε ὄχλοι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησεν Παῦλος ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν Λυκαονιστὶ λέγοντες· οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις κατέβησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, 12  ἐκάλουν τε τὸν Βαρναβᾶν Δία, τὸν δὲ Παῦλον Ἑρμῆν, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου. 13  ὅ τε ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ταύρους καὶ στέμματα ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας ἐνέγκας σὺν τοῖς ὄχλοις ἤθελεν θύειν. 14  Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι Βαρναβᾶς καὶ Παῦλος διαρρήξαντες τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἐξεπήδησαν εἰς τὸν ὄχλον κράζοντες 15  καὶ λέγοντες· ἄνδρες, τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε; καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἐσμεν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωποι εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα, ὃς ἐποίησεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς· (Act 14:11-15 BGT) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Πρόσωπα και Τοπόσημα** |
|  | Βαρνάβας | Βαρνάβας και Σαύλος - Παύλος (Π.) | Βαρνάβας και Π. και Μάρκος και Σιλουανός | **Βαρνάβας και Μάρκος** | Μάρκος και Παύλος  | Μάρκος και Πέτρος | Μάρκος |
| 33 μ.Χ.43 μ.Χ.48 μ.Χ. | Ιεροσόλυμα ΑντιόχειαΟρόντη(«Αφρικανοί») | Ιεροσόλυμα  Αντιόχεια Ιεροσόλυμα (Αποστολική Σύνοδος) - Αντιόχεια (+Πέτρος)  | Κύπρος (Σαλαμίς + Πάφος)Παμφυλία | Κύπρος15:38–40  | Αιχμαλωσία στην Έφεσο ή στη Ρώμη και Κολοσσές (Φρυγία)Και Λουκάς (Προς Θεόφιλον) | «Βαβυλωνία» και Ρώμη | Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (..–) (ἀνὴρ Ἑβραῖος) called Barnabas’ came from Jerusalem, sent by Peter, to preach the gospel in Alexandria.(φασίν) that Mark spread the gospel in Egypt and founded ‘churches first of all at Alexandria itself’ (ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας). But such reports bear clear signs of a later founding legend and presuppose an impossible chronology Historically, only his alliance with Barnabas (Acts .; cf. again Eusebius, HE .) might point to a possible visit by Mark to Alexandria  |

# Συμπεράσματα: Βαρναβάς και Μάρκος (Πέτρος)

**24  ὅτι ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως. καὶ προσετέθη ὄχλος ἱκανὸς τῷ κυρίῳ.**

**ἐξῆλθεν δὲ εἰς Ταρσὸν ἀναζητῆσαι Σαῦλον,**

**καὶ εὑρὼν ἤγαγεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν**.

* ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἱκανόν, χρηματίσαι τε πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς **Χριστιανούς.** (Πρ. 11:25-26)
* 10  Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς (α) Ἀρίσταρχος ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου καὶ (β) Μᾶρκος **ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρναβᾶ** (περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς, ἐὰν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δέξασθε αὐτόν) 11  καὶ (γ) Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰοῦστος, **οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς**, οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν **μοι παρηγορία**. (Κολ. 4:10-11)
* **Μελέτη της «επιστολής Βαρνάβα» και των κύκλων που την απευθύνουν στην επαρχία της Αιγύπτου**

**Μελέτη και της επιρροής Ιουδαίων Χριστιανών στον Χριστιανισμό του 2ου αι. μ.Χ. (< Ωριγένης – Κλήμης) και στο Κίνημα της Γνώσεως**

Alexandria Was Evangelized by Barnabas and/or Mark after the Jerusalem Council Upon the successful completion of their first journey, Paul and Barnabas could have turned to other regions in the Mediterranean. In the winter months after their return, they– together with the collegial leadership in Antioch– probably forged plans for further action, and after the ‘Apostolic Council’ (probably in  CE), the plans needed to be substantiated, fleshed out and executed. Possibly, they had to choose between revisiting the Christ groups they had founded during their first journey, yet another visit to the regions in which the first mission was less successful (e.g. Cyprus), and the expansion of the mission to other areas in Asia Minor, Greece and even beyond. Possibly, Alexandria figured in these plans, but even if this were the case, the idea was dropped. Luke has Paul say to Barnabas that they would set out from Antioch to revisit the communities they founded during their first trip (Acts .). Even if this decision is quite understandable, our initial question can be asked even at this stage in Paul’s career since his travel plans were not carved in stone (cf. Acts ., ) and he was always eager to break new ground. Why did he ignore Alexandria at this point? Luke mentions a controversial exchange between Paul and Barnabas in Antioch, who wanted to add a third member to the team, John Mark (Acts .–), Barnabas’ cousin (?) (cf. Col .). The dispute ended in a division, because Paul was resentful towards John Mark for leaving them in Pamphylia, but the division in turn likely ‘resulted in an expansion … of the mission’. In fact, Luke reports that Barnabas and John Mark continued their mission work in Cyprus, Barnabas’ home country (Acts .; .), while Paul thought on a large scale and wanted eventually to set foot in ‘Europe’. It has been asked whether or not the information about the travel of Barnabas and John Mark to Cyprus is reliable, since the existence of Christian communities in Cyprus remains obscure, but for our purposes we have to turn to an even more controversial question: did Barnabas and Mark think on a large scale as well, and set out to visit Alexandria? Did the controversy between Paul and Barnabas concern not only the missionary team, but also the missionary strategy, with Paul turning to the ‘west’ and Barnabas, together with John Mark, to the ‘south’?

After the incident between Paul and Barnabas, all trace of the latter is lost in Acts. Not so in Paul’s letters: Paul himself indicates that Barnabas is still active as a missionary in the mid fifties ( Cor .). One would assume that he did not stay in Cyprus throughout these years, and a trip from Cyprus to Alexandria would certainly not be seen as odd. Several other arguments have been put forward for Barnabas’ travel to Alexandria, based on a presumably old tradition reported in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (..–) that ‘a Hebrew man

(ἀνὴρ Ἑβραῖος) called Barnabas’ came from Jerusalem, sent by Peter, to preach the gospel in Alexandria. There is a worthwhile minority opinion that is willing to give some credence to an Alexandrian visit by Barnabas. Gilles Quispel deems this ‘an extremely trustworthy tradition, because it contradicts the official version, according to which Mark, the author of the Gospel, had come from Rome to found the Church there’. Obviously, the question of Barnabas’ visit to Alexandria is related to the question of the provenance of the Epistle of Barnabas, which is equally contested. For many scholars, Alexandria remains the most convincing solution, particularly due to its relationship to texts and traditions of Alexandrian origin. There, the continuity with Jewish messianism and other millennial hopes, the anti-Roman bias and the figurative modes of interpretation can be situated in a setting where ‘Jewish literal interpretation of the law is harshly condemned and Jewish nationalistic promises are interpreted in a broadly Christocentric manner’. In particular, the figurative hermeneutics has obvious equivalents among Alexandrian exegetes, both Jewish (e.g., Philo) and Christian e.g., Origen). Apart from that, Clement of Alexandria is the first to quote from the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Codex Sinaiticus, an ‘Alexandrian’ version of the New Testament text, includes it. Citing Quispel’s thesis, James Carleton Paget writes: ‘If Barnabas did in fact visit Egypt, then the ascription of a letter to him written in Alexandria would make sense.’ An even better attested tradition links John Mark with the foundation of theAlexandrian church (e.g. Eusebius, HE .) – ‘they say’ (φασίν) that Mark spread the gospel in Egypt and founded ‘churches first of all at Alexandria itself’ (ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας). But such reports bear clear signs of a later founding legend and presuppose an impossiblechronology. Historically, only his alliance with Barnabas (Acts .; cf. again Eusebius, HE .) might point to a possible visit by Mark to Alexandria

With reference to Rom .– and against the backdrop of an optimistic reading of the Barnabas tradition, John Gunther suggested that in the later stage of his mission Paul excluded Alexandria from his territory, because ‘he did not wish to trespass in the domain of Barnabas, the other apostle to the Gentiles. Why else did Paul not plan to stop in Alexandria and Cyrene on the way from Jerusalem to Rome after delivering his gift to “the saints”? Barnabas stayed out of Paul’s territory, even in Asia Minor where he had been on their

“first journey”. They subsequently acted as if they had made an agreement on the division of missionary territory when they personally parted ways.’ Gunther’s proposal and its numerous implications need not be discussed here, but his main thesis should not be dismissed prematurely: Barnabas (and Mark) could have come to Alexandria, after Barnabas and Paul parted ways, and this would possibly have restrained Paul from considering a visit to the metropolis. Perhaps, a dissent over their mission strategy – indeed over the question about what is ‘gentile territory’ – might have incited conflict. In the end, subjunctive phrasing best reflects our ignorance.

 R. I. Pervo, Acts (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, ) .

 Cf. Öhler, Barnabas, . But see Harnack, Mission and Expansion, II.: ‘Jews abounded in

Cyprus, so that the way lay open for the Christian propaganda.’

 On this complex of questions, see the optimistic, but thought-provoking study by

 Cf. T. Zahn, Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche (Leipzig: Deichert, )  n. .

 G. Quispel, Review of Early Egyptian Christianity from its Origins to  CE by C. W. Griggs, VC

 () –, at . Mimouni, ‘Communauté chrétienne d’Alexandrie’, : ‘On doit

cependant se demander si Barnabé, mandaté par les Hébreux de Jérusalem ou les

Hellénistes d’Antioche, n’a pas joué un rôle important dans la première mission chrétienne d’Alexandrie.’

 Carleton Paget, ‘Messianism and Resistance’, . Cf. ibid., – and extensively idem, The

Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background (WUNT II/; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, )

–.

 Cf. the summary in B. Ehrman, ‘Introduction to The Apostolic Fathers’ (LCL ; Cambridge:

HUP, ), –.

 Carleton Paget, The Epistle of Barnabas, .

 Cf. Harnack, Mission and Expansion, II.. See the summary of the evidence in Mimouni,

‘Communauté chrétienne d’Alexandrie’, –; also L. W. Barnard, ‘St. Mark and

Alexandria’, HTR  () –.

 A. Jakab (Ecclesia Alexandrina, –) attributes Eusebius’s note to the first of three stages in

the development of the Alexandrian tradition about Mark. Making Mark the founding figure of the Alexandrian church connects bishop Demetrius (ca –) to the bishop of Rome by the agency of Peter and Mark. In this context, we should recall Hans Lietzmann’s suggestion (Geschichte der alten Kirche (Berlin: de Gruyter, /) –) that Mark’s relationship with Alexandria reflects the historical truth that the Alexandrian church was founded by Rome as a kind of subsidiary church (on the implausibility of this view, already C. H. Why Did Paul Skip Alexandria? 

**BARNABAS** (PERSON) [Gk **Barnaba"]. An apostle, an associate of Paul, prominent in the church of Antioch-on-the-Orontes in Syria, and an early leader in the mission to gentiles. According to Acts, his name was Joseph, but he was called Barnabas by the apostles. Luke, the author of Acts, translates Barnabas to mean “son of encouragement, ” (from Aram **) but it may simply mean “son of (the god) Nebo, ” or something similar. Acts reports that Barnabas was a Levite whose family came from Cyprus; hence he was a Diaspora Jew. He is first mentioned as a man who sold some land and donated the proceeds to the apostles in Jerusalem (4:36–37). Thus in vivid contrast to Ananias and Sapphira, who withheld a portion of their property (5:1–11), Barnabas is shown to typify the spirit of communal sharing which Luke emphasizes in the earliest Jerusalem community.

**A. Association with Paul**

In Acts, Barnabas receives extensive mention in connection with Saul (later to be known as Paul) and with the emergence of a mission to gentiles. When the disciples in Jerusalem were afraid to meet with Saul after his call, Barnabas brought him to them and gave him a favorable introduction (9:27). Later, when the Jerusalem church received reports that believers from Cyprus and Cyrene were making converts of Greeks in Antioch (11:20–22), Barnabas was sent to investigate. He encouraged them in this missionary activity, then brought Saul with him from Tarsus to Antioch, where they taught together (11:25–26). As leaders in the Antioch community, Barnabas and Saul were sent to deliver a contribution for famine relief to the community in Jerusalem (11:27–30). Collecting contributions of gentile communities for “the poor” in Jerusalem was evidently an arrangement agreed upon between the missionaries to gentiles—Paul and Barnabas, and the leaders of the Jerusalem community (Gal 2:9–10). Such contributions continued to be of great concern in Paul’s later work (Rom 15:25–28; 1 Cor 16:1–4; 2 Cor 8–9).

Next, Acts recounts that Barnabas and Saul were commissioned by the Antioch community for a missionary journey to Cyprus, bringing as an assistant John Mark, who had joined them in Jerusalem (12:25–13:3). That Barnabas was Paul’s senior partner in the relationship is evident from the fact that Barnabas’ name is mentioned before Paul’s name in all Acts accounts thus far. But while recounting their stay in Paphos, Luke shifts to the name Paul for Saul just as he performs a miracle to effect the conversion of the Roman proconsul Sergius Paulus (13:8-12). At this point Luke begins to give Paul greater prominence than Barnabas in the mission narrative, calling their party “Paul and his company” (13:13) and mentioning Paul’s name several times before that of Barnabas (13:43, 46, 50). Upon leaving Cyprus, Paul and Barnabas traveled without John Mark through the southern regions of central Asia Minor, visiting the cities of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Perga, and Attalia. Acts reports that they conducted their mission through preaching in synagogues and performance of miracles. In Lystra Paul’s miraculous healing of a crippled man led the crowd to call Barnabas “Zeus” and Paul “Hermes” (14:8–18). Despite threats from Jews and gentiles (14:5) and physical violence against Paul at the hands of some Jews (14:19), Acts states that the mission of Paul and Barnabas met with success in several cities among Jews, recent converts to Judaism (13:43), gentiles (13:48), and Greeks (14:1). But the summary of their activity reported to the church at Antioch makes it clear that the success of Barnabas’ and Paul’s pioneering work among gentiles is what Luke wishes most to stress (14:27).

However in Antioch the question of how a gentile mission ought to be conducted came to be hotly debated. According to Acts “some” from Judea were teaching there that circumcision according to the custom of Moses was a prerequisite for salvation. Paul and Barnabas argued against requiring circumcision for gentiles and were appointed to a delegation which brought the question before apostles and elders in Jerusalem (15:1–3). During the debate at this Jerusalem Council, Barnabas and Paul reported on their success among gentiles (15:12), and the council eventually adopted a position which must have been largely favorable to them, since it did not require gentile circumcision. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch together with delegates appointed from Jerusalem who carried a letter detailing the decision of the Council (15:22–32).

**B. Separation from Paul**

After resolution of the question of required gentile circumcision, Paul and Barnabas made plans in Antioch to revisit the cities of their previous mission together, but there arose between them what Luke terms a “sharp disagreement.” According to Acts, Barnabas wished to bring John Mark along, but Paul did not (15:37). Consequently Paul left without Barnabas, bringing Silas with him through Syria and Cilicia to the cities of Asia Minor; Barnabas took Mark with him to Cyprus (15:38–40). That there was a close association between Barnabas and Mark is corroborated in Col 4:10, where Mark is called Barnabas’ “cousin.”

But the parting of ways between Barnabas and Paul may well have been occasioned by more than the personal disagreement mentioned in Acts. Although Acts hints at no disagreement between Barnabas and Paul on the conduct of a mission to gentiles, Paul’s letter to Galatia indicates that the two did not share identical views on the observance of Jewish dietary laws. Paul writes that at Antioch he was distressed when Peter refrained from eating with gentiles out of deference to representatives from James. Paul objected to Peter’s abrupt withdrawal from his practice of table fellowship and writes that “even Barnabas” sided against Paul (Gal 2:11–13). On this occasion Barnabas, like Peter, took a moderate position between those associated with James, who advocated a strict separation of Jews from gentiles, and Paul, who strongly opposed such separation. Because Paul does not claim to have persuaded Barnabas and the others, it may be inferred that he lost this debate in Antioch and consequently left. Galatians suggests, then, that the split between Barnabas and Paul arose over different views of proper social practice in Christian communities, perhaps due to a theological disagreement about the continuing validity of Jewish laws. It is uncertain how bitter the rift remained because Paul’s reference to Barnabas in 1 Cor 9:6 seems to reflect a sympathetic attitude toward his former mentor. Here Barnabas is mentioned as an apostle who, like Paul, practiced a trade and earned his own living while a missionary. It is possible that they had established this practice as a joint policy during their early mission work together.

**C. Mention of Barnabas in Extra-Canonical Sources**

Concerning Barnabas’ career after separating from Paul and journeying to Cyprus, we have no early information. Later Christian writers make legendary claims about Barnabas: e.g., that he preached in Rome during Jesus’ lifetime and introduced Clement of Rome to Christianity (*Ps.-Clem. Recogn.* 1.7–13), and that he was one of the seventy (Luke 10:1) sent out by Jesus (Clement of Alexandria *Str.* 2.20). The 5th- or 6th-century *Acts of Barnabas* purports to describe his later mission and martyrdom in Cyprus. Barnabas is also named as the author of some early Christian texts. Clement of Alexandria credits him as the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas,* a treatise which was included in some early biblical manuscripts, e.g., Sinaiticus. Some Western traditions regard Barnabas as the author of Hebrews, and he is also listed (in the *Decretum Gelasianum*) as the author of a gospel.
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**BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF.** An early Christian writing, the significance of which lies not so much in its later influence as in what it preserves of earlier traditions, both Jewish and Christian. The anonymous Christian teacher who wrote *Barnabas* passed on traditional instruction regarding “spiritual” understandings of the Jewish scriptures and God’s requirements. Many issues concerning *Barnabas* are problematic and must remain unresolved.
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**A. Form, Structure, Style**

Although *Barnabas* has several characteristics of an epistle, it is probably best understood as a tractate in epistolary dress. Its contents may be outlined as follows:

I. Introduction (framework), chap. 1

II. First major section:correct understanding of scripture, 2:1–16:10

A. What the Lord requires:not sacrifice and fasting, 2–3

B. Warnings in a lawless age facing judgment, 4

C. Why the Lord endured suffering in the flesh, 5–6

D. The Lord’s suffering foreshadowed in scapegoat and red heifer, 7–8

E. Circumcised understanding, 9–10

F. Baptism and cross foreshadowed, 11–12

G. Correct understanding of the Covenant and its heirs, 13–14

H. Correct understanding of the Sabbath, 15

I. Correct understanding of the Temple, 16

III. Transition (framework), 17:1–18:1a

IV. Second major section:The “Two Ways” tradition, 18:1b–20:2

A. Introduction, 18:1b–2

B. The Way of Light, 19

C. The Way of Darkness, 20

V. Conclusion (framework), 21

*Barnabas* 17:1–18:1a explicitly divides the tractate into two major sections of teaching. The two sections are set into an epistolary framework (Wengst 1971:5–14; cf. Scorza Barcellona 1975:14–21).

The tractate’s stylistic norms resemble those of Jewish literature. Its rough transitions and awkward arrangement have the benefit of making it easier to isolate its sources.

**B. Text**

The Gk text of *Barnabas* is relatively well preserved. The chief witnesses to the text are Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Hierosolymitanus, a family of late Gk manuscripts, and an OL translation in Codex Corbeiensis. There are also fragments of a Gk papyrus and of a Syr translation, and several quotations by Clement of Alexandria and later church writers. Although there may have been a “first edition” which lacked the Two Ways tradition, the “final form” presumably consisted of chapters 1–21. The critical edition by Prigent and Kraft (1971) provides a carefully researched eclectic text.

**C. The Author and His Circle**

*Barnabas* is anonymous. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, Serapion of Thmuys, Codex Sinaiticus, and later manuscripts attribute the work to “Barnabas, ” but few contemporary scholars accept this attribution. Most scholars consider it unlikely that the Barnabas described by Paul as participating in a literal observance of Jewish cult (Gal 2:13) could write the anti-cultic polemics of *Barnabas.*

It appears that the work as a whole is produced by one person, a male, and that he primarily uses traditional materials to which he contributes little more than a framework within which he arranges them and makes simple transitions between them. He is a teacher who wants his readers to see him not as a teacher but as a friend and peer (1:4; 1:8; 4:6, 9; 9:9). He describes himself with conventional modesty (4:9; 6:5), but he participates as one “who is wise and understanding, and who loves his Lord, ” in a community which God has allowed to understand secrets (6:10). In the face of the impending final scandals (4:3, 9), he is concerned to pass on some of the traditional teachings of his circle (1:5; 4:9).

Because many of his traditions retain both the style and the substance of Judaism, a significant number of scholars see him as a Jewish Christian (Barnard 1978:54–58; Manns 1981:125–146). In view of *Barnabas* 16:7, it probably makes more sense to see him as a Gentile who had access to Jewish traditions in Gk (Kraft 1965:39; Prigent and Kraft 1971:28; Wengst 1984:119).

It is often quite difficult to distinguish the teacher from his sources, many of which are much older. He does not rise above his tradition as a clearly defined individual creator; he is primarily a spokesman for a living tradition, even if he has shaped it here and there. In the case of “evolved literature” such as this, it may be preferable to focus on the tradition rather than on the individual through whom the tradition speaks. The circle that preserved this tradition was a “school” in the sense that it had teachers who developed and transmitted teaching materials concerned with exegesis and moral instruction (Kraft 1965:19–22; Wengst 1971).

**D. Use of Tradition**

The teacher indicates in 1:5 that he is passing on traditional materials (see 4:9; 19:1; 21:1). Kraft (1961), Prigent (1961), and Wengst (1971) have examined the sources of these materials in detail.

The traditions in *Barnabas* 2–16 are concerned with understanding the (Jewish) scriptures. Analysis of the quotations show that the tradition represented by *Barnabas* did not use the Heb text (Kraft 1961:57; Wengst 1971:69). Apparently the teacher had access to OG translations in a variety of oral and written forms:complete OG scrolls of a few books of scripture (Isaiah; perhaps Psalms, Genesis, and Deuteronomy), individual sayings, independent collections of extracts, free renderings of narratives, and quotations already associated with midrashic commentary (Kraft 1961:69; Wengst 1984:129).

The Two Ways section (chapters 18–20) is the largest block of tradition in *Barnabas.* It presents ethical teachings under the rubrics of the way of light and the way of darkness. *Barnabas* 21:1 shows that the teacher considered the Two Ways teaching an authoritative written form of God’s requirements. This tradition is found in similar forms in other church writings, notably in *Didache* 1–5. Most contemporary scholars agree that the Two Ways sections in *Barnabas* and *Didache* derive directly or indirectly from a common source. Two Ways concepts in the *Manual of Discipline* show that some form of the tradition existed in a Semitic-speaking Jewish environment. After being translated into Gk and passing through various recensions, it is used independently by *Barnabas* and *Didache.* The teacher incorporates the Two Ways tradition into his writing with relatively few changes (Prigent 1961:20; Wengst 1971:66–67).

The themes of the two ways of darkness and light also pervade the whole tractate. Parallels between *Barnabas* 4:9–10 and *Didache* 16:2 suggest that certain forms of the Two Ways tradition may have had an apocalyptic appendix (Kraft 1965:12–16).

**E. Thought**

The teacher and his circle are not systematic thinkers, and their traditions are occasionally in tension. Whether or not *Barnabas* has a central theological perspective, the following concepts characterize the tract (Kraft 1965:22–39; Wengst 1971:71–99).

**1. Gnosis.** One explicit purpose of *Barnabas* is to supplement its readers’ faith with “perfect knowledge” (*Barnabas* 1:5). This knowledge ** is a central concept for *Barnabas.* The circle seems to use the term in an exegetical sense and a related ethical sense. Exegetical gnosis is the insight God gave to Abraham, Moses, David, and the prophets, and now gives to believers. This gift enables its recipients to understand the secrets of scripture and of past, present, and future events. Ethical gnosis enables its recipients to understand the conduct required by God (5:4; 21:5).

**2. Ethics and Eschatology.** Ethical concerns pervade *Barnabas,* as do apocalyptic eschatological imagery, expectation, and motivation. Salvation is primarily a future reward for obeying God’s requirements in this lawless age. The day of judgment is near (21:3). At that time, the obedient will be made holy and will receive the promised inheritance: the end of lawlessness and the renewal of the universe (6:13; 15:5–9). Believers should not live as if they were already justified (4:10; 15:7). Instead, they must make use of the evil days before the judgment to perform the will of God, because they will be judged according to their conduct and Satan can use his power to drive them from the Lord’s kingdom (2:1, 10; 4:9–14; 19:10; 21:6, 8).

**3. Israel.** According to *Barnabas,* God promised the patriarchs that he would give a Covenant to “the people” but Israel proved unworthy to receive it (4:6–8; 14:1–4). Instead, Jesus gave it to a “new people” (5:7), made worthy to receive it by his suffering and death (14:4–6). In contrast, an evil angel (9:4) misled Israel into interpreting God’s requirements in a literal, external fashion rather than in the intended spiritual manner. *Barnabas* criticizes major aspects of Jewish ritual observance (sacrifice, fasting, circumcision, food laws, the sabbath rest, and the temple) as resulting from this misunderstanding of scripture. Christians, the true heirs of the Covenant, understand the scriptures in their intended spiritual sense.

There is a tension in the circle’s relation to Judaism. On the one hand, it defines itself in contrast to Israel, who never received the Covenant and who err in their understanding of what God wants. On the other hand, the circle has taken its ethical teachings, its citations of scripture, its hermeneutics, and even its criticisms of Jewish ritual observance *from Jewish sources.*

**4. Christology.** *Barnabas* refers to Jesus as Son of God, the Beloved One, the Beloved Heir, and most frequently, the Lord. Preexistent, he participated in creation (5:5, 10; 6:12). The circle denies that he is a son of David or a son of man (12:10–11), but he suffered in the flesh to purify a once-sinful people (“us” ) for the Covenant and to fill up the measure of “their” sins (5:1–14; 6:7; 7:2; 14:4–5). He will soon come to end this evil age, judge the living and the dead, and recreate the universe (5:7; 7:2; 15:5; 21:3).

*Barnabas* is concerned to interpret the suffering and death of Jesus by means of scripture. Apart from his suffering in the flesh, the circle shows little interest in the earthly Jesus’ words and works as found in written gospel traditions. It looks to scripture rather than to Jesus’ sayings for authority in teaching.

**5. Interpretation of Scripture.** The interpretive method is closely related to what is known of Christian and Jewish schools of Alexandria. The “spiritual” (rationalistic, allegorical) understanding of ritual law appears more radical than that of Philo when it excludes a literal understanding. For example, *Barnabas* 9–10, except for the gematria in 9:8–9, resembles the position of those Philo (*Migr.* 89.92–93) opposed for neglecting the literal meaning of circumcision.

**F. Recipients**

*Barnabas* is addressed to both men and women (1:1; see 10:8). The recipients are Christians, probably uncircumcised but not necessarily from the teacher’s own sect.

*Barnabas* gives clues about their community—or at least about his own circle’s ideals for a community of believers. The teacher admonishes his readers not to live as hermits but to assemble together (4:10) and to share their possessions (19:8). He mentions no church functionaries other than teachers, “those highly placed” (21:2), and those “who proclaim the Lord’s word” (19:9). The community celebrates Sunday, “the eighth day” (15:8–9). They practice baptism (by immersion) as a means of receiving remission of sins and new life (11:1–11). They experience inspired speech (16:9–10).

**G. Provenance**

*Barnabas* does not give enough indications to permit confident identification of either the teacher’s location or the location to which he writes. His thought, hermeneutical methods, and style have many parallels throughout the known Jewish and Christian worlds. Most scholars have located the work’s origin in the area of Alexandria, on the grounds that it has many affinities with Alexandrian Jewish and Christian thought and because its first witnesses are Alexandrian. Recently, Prigent (Prigent and Kraft 1971:20–24), Wengst (1971:114–18), and Scorza Barcellona (1975:62–65) have suggested other origins based on affinities in Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor. The place of origin must remain an open question, although the Gk -speaking E Mediterranean appears most probable.

**H. Date, Occasion, and Significance**

Since *Barnabas* 16:3 refers to the destruction of the temple, *Barnabas* must be written after 70 c.e. It must be written before its first indisputable use in Clement of Alexandria, ca. 190. Since 16:4 expects the temple to be rebuilt, it was most likely written before Hadrian built a Roman temple on the site ca. 135. Attempts to use 4:4–5 and 16:1–5 to specify the time of origin more exactly have not won wide agreement. It is important to remember that traditions of varying ages have been incorporated into this work.

*Barnabas* does not provide sufficient clues to identify an occasion for its writing. Neither the view that it is a polemic in response to Jewish rivals (Lowy 1960:32) nor the view that it is propaganda to persuade Christian opponents (Wengst 1971:100–105) accounts for its ethical orientation.

The work appears to have had little impact in the West, although it was translated into Latin in N Africa (or possibly Rome), probably during the 3d century. Clement of Alexandria quotes it as the epistle of the apostle Barnabas, and Origen refers to it as the catholic epistle of Barnabas. Its inclusion in Codex Sinaiticus suggests that it was sometimes considered canonical in 4th century Egypt. Other church writers who mention it (e.g., Eusebius, Jerome, Mkhitar) categorize it with disputed writings or apocrypha.

Although *Barnabas* 4:14 appears to quote Matt 22:14, it must remain an open question whether the *Barnabas* circle knew written gospels. Based on Koester’s analysis (1957:125–27, 157), it appears more likely that *Barnabas* stood in the living oral tradition used by the written gospels. For example, the reference to gall and vinegar in *Barnabas* 7:3, 5 seems to preserve an early stage of tradition that influenced the formation of the passion narratives in the *Gospel of Peter* and the synoptic gospels.

*Barnabas* is also significant for preserving early stages of Jewish tradition. It preserves halakhic traditions about atonement and red heifer rituals from a century before the Mishnah was compiled. It contains midrashic material and the Two Ways tradition in forms not greatly removed from their Jewish antecedents. It also quotes fragments of Jewish religious literature otherwise unknown (Kraft 1965:182–84).
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fragments. Authentic association of these works with the apostle Bartholomew is highly doubtful.

**MARK, JOHN** (PERSON) [Gk ** jIoanne" Marko"]. An early Jewish Christian who assisted with the 1st-century missionary activities of Paul, Peter, and Barnabas and who is associated by tradition with the gospel of Mark. The name is a combination of two appellations, the Heb ** (“Yahweh has shown grace”; cf. 2 Kgs 25:23) and the Latin “Marcus” (or the Greek *Markos*). Dual names commonly were employed during the period as a common custom within Hellenistic Judaism (see Acts 1:23, Joseph-Justus).

The NT provides scant information about the figure of John Mark. He initially is introduced at Acts 12:12, a scene in which Peter returns from prison to the home of Mary, “the mother of John whose other name was Mark.” Both the house itself and the household of Mary probably were significant for the early Christian community in Jerusalem, since Peter seems to have known that Christians would be gathered there for prayer. Thus the role of John Mark in early Church tradition often is associated with the presumed wealth and prestige of Mary, who was a homeowner with a maidservant (Rhoda) and who could support gatherings of early Christians for worship. The common, though most likely errant, belief that John Mark was the “young man” who escaped capture by the Romans at the arrest of Jesus (Mark 14:51–52) rests upon the assumption that the Garden of Gethsemane was owned and tended by the family of Mary. According to this view, John Mark perhaps would have been stationed at the garden as a guard during the night watch. Another tradition, which maintains that the Last Supper (Mark 14) was held in the home of Mary, assumes that the household was familiar with the work of Jesus and was receptive to his activity. Papias of Hierapolis argues against a close relationship between Jesus and the family, however, since he notes specifically that Mark “had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed him” (Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.15).

The only clear comment upon the activities of John Mark that is provided in the NT is the observation that he was one of numerous evangelistic missionaries who circulated during the 1st century (one of the 70 missionaries who are mentioned in Luke 10:1?). Accordingly, he is listed as an assistant to Paul and Barnabas during the first Pauline missionary journey (Acts 12:25; 13:5). Though the nature of that assistance is not specified, he may have served as a recorder, catechist, and travel attendant. Because of his status as the son of a prosperous Jewish-Christian family in Jerusalem and as the cousin of the wealthy landowner Barnabas (Col 4:10; Acts 4:36–37), John Mark would have been a natural selection for such a role. He later separated from Paul and Barnabas “in Pamphylia” (along the coast of S Anatolia), perhaps as the result of some unspecified disagreement. Paul thereafter refused to include him in subsequent travels (though Barnabas took him onward to Cyprus; Acts 15:37–39), and the account of Acts records his activities no further.

Apart from the testimony of Acts, his name (now listed only as Mark) reappears throughout the Pauline literary tradition as a reconciled missionary companion of Paul. Here he is remembered as one who labored faithfully for Christianity (2 Tim 4:11 and Philemon 24). The association of Barnabas with John “who is called Mark” in the record of Acts, on the one hand, and of Barnabas who was the “cousin” of Mark in the witness of Colossians, on the other hand, is an “undesigned coincidence” which suggests that the accounts of Acts and the Pauline Epistles in fact make reference to the same person (Taylor 1955: 29).

Though the figure of John Mark became a casualty of disputes within the Pauline missionary thrust, the Petrine tradition soon adopted an association with the name that has stood for centuries in ecclesial history. The initial evidence for this association appears in 1 Pet 5:13 where John Mark (again listed only as Mark) is mentioned by the author of the letter as “my son.” While the name Mark in 1 Peter cannot be identified definitively with the figure of Mark who appears in the Acts narrative, a consistent picture of the role and activities of John Mark would result if such an association can be accepted (Martin *ISBE* 3: 260). From the testimony of Papias (Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.16) we learn that common ecclesial tradition recognized Mark as the “interpreter” of Peter who recorded the words of the apostle as the foundation for a written gospel (cf. also Iren. *Haer.* 3.1.1). There is no question that Papias here refers to the gospel of Mark as we know it. And again, while the association of Mark (as recorded by Papias) with John Mark of Jerusalem is not above suspicion, this consistent caricature has been preserved by subsequent Christian tradition.

Numerous traditions about the person and activities of Mark soon arose among the Church Fathers. Hippolytus, for example, refers to Mark as “stump-fingered” or “shortened.” The former translation may indicate that the historical figure of Mark possessed some peculiar physical characteristic (as is suggested by the *Anti-Marcionite Prologue* to the gospel from the 2d century). Modern scholars, however, often prefer to use the latter translation as a reference to the abbreviated nature of the gospel text itself (when compared to the other NT gospels) or in support of the manuscript tradition that concludes the gospel at Mark 16:8. Several early Christian traditions suggest that a close association existed between the figure of John Mark and the congregations of Alexandria, based upon the belief that he traveled to Egypt from Rome after the martyrdom of Peter (Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 2.16.1). There is little information about the death of Mark. The claims for the martyrdom of Mark that appear in the *Paschal Chronicle* and in the *Acts of Mark* probably do not predate the 4th century (Swete 1909: xxvii–xxviii). For further discussion see Pesch *Mark* HTKNT.
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ΚΥΠΡΟΣ ; Gk **Kupro"]. A Mediterranean island located 43 miles S of Asia Minor, 76 miles W of Syria, and 264 miles N of Egypt.

The Hebrew name probably derives from the city of Kition (Roman Citium), which Phoenicians colonized on the SE coast of the island. It may also have been known as Elishah in the OT (Gen 10:4; 1 Chr 1:7; Ezek 27:7). Most, though not all, agree that this is the similar-sounding place often referred to as Alashia or Asy in texts from the ANE. It appears in connection with copper (for which the island was well known in antiquity) on tablets from Alalakh in the 18th century b.c. and Mari in the 17th century b.c. The name occurs frequently in the 14th century b.c., especially in the correspondence between the Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaten and the king of Alashia, which also refers to a land that produced copper. In the 11th century b.c., an Egyptian priest, Wenamon, sought refuge in Alashia after suffering shipwreck on his return to Egypt from Byblos. This corroborates the location of Alashia to be in Cyprus rather than in Syria. In the *Iliad* (11.21) and the *Odyssey* (4.83; 8.362; 17.442, 443, 448) as well as the NT (i.e., Acts 4:36; 11:19, 20; 13:4; 15:39), the island is known as *kupros* (Cyprus).

Cyprus is the third largest island in the Mediterranean, after Sicily and Sardinia, and only slightly larger than Crete. Its maximum length, E-W, is 138 miles and its maximum width, N-S, is 60 miles, encompassing an area of 3584 square miles. The W half of the island is mountainous, where the Trodos and Kyrenia Mountains reach a height of about 3300 ft and are snow-capped three months out of the year. The E half consists of the Mesaoria Plain and the Karpass Peninsula.

Favorable climate and topography produced a primarily agricultural society on the island throughout its history. However, its most important resources have always been its copper mines and pine forests. These, coupled with a salt industry that undoubtedly flourished in antiquity (from the salt lakes of Limassol and Larnaca), supported the construction of a number of important harbor towns around the island.

The earliest inhabitants of Cyprus, who settled in the SE part of the island and around its central and E coastlines, have been dated by carbon 14 testing to the Pre-Pottery Neolithic period (ca. 7000–6000 b.c.). Circular houses, called *tholoi,* were constructed of mudbrick on stone foundations, and have been found in several settlements around the coastal perimeter of the island (e.g., Khirokitia and Kalavassos-Tenta). They have floors of beaten earth, hearths, platforms built against the walls for sleeping, and posts in the center of the room to support domed ceilings. The inner walls were plastered, and one of them contained a painting of a human figure with uplifted arms. Their dead were interred in the fetal position beneath the floors of their houses or immediately outside. The infant mortality rate was apparently high.

In the Late Neolithic (ca. 4500–3800 b.c.; there are no carbon 14 dates between 6000 and 4500 b.c.), pottery was developed and houses were constructed with greater diversity of forms including wooden structures, stone buildings both circular and rectangular, and partial or total subterranean dwellings like those in Beer-sheba in S Palestine. These people, like those in the PPN, were primarily farmers, but they also hunted wild animals and probably had some domesticated livestock. There was cultural continuity from the Neolithic into the Chalcolithic Period (ca. 3800–2500 b.c.), but settlement patterns shifted to the W side of the island, the central plain, and the Karpass Peninsula.

The EB Age (Early Cypriot, ca. 2500–2000 b.c.) is represented in most of the island except the W half of the Trodos Mountains. Wealthy tomb offerings and beautifully made pottery in a variety of imaginative styles indicate a prosperous culture, supported by an increasing international trade in copper. Tin was imported, probably from Mesopotamia or Asia Minor, evidenced by the production of the many bronze implements which have been found in excavation. Models of sanctuaries show the worship of bulls (after cattle were imported to replace pigs for economic reasons), and testify to a well-developed polytheism.

The MB Age (Middle Cypriot, ca. 2000–1650 b.c.) was brief and continued the basic culture of the earlier period, although the N began to decline when settlement patterns shifted to the SE with the construction of important harbor cities such as Enkomi and Kition. Several forts have been found in the N half of the island, but are completely missing in the S. Apparently hostilities were internal and/or confined to the N, and the S felt no need for such defenses. A clear separation between the E and W is inferred from the differences in pottery produced in each section. The economy of the W was based primarily on copper, while that of the E was based on agriculture.

An abundance of Cypriot pottery from the MB Age has been found in Cilicia, Megiddo, Ras Shamra (Ugarit), and along much of the Syro-Palestinian coast. From this artifactual evidence and later textual evidence (i.e., Tell el-Amarna letters and the library of Boghazkoy), it is clear that trade between Cyprus and countries such as Egypt, Anatolia, and Syria flourished in both the MB and the LB.

A script was developed in Cyprus around 1500 b.c. and was labeled Cypro-Minoan by Sir Arthur Evans. Three forms of the language (Cypro-Minoan 1, 2, and 3) have been found on clay tablets, incised or painted on vases, engraved on votive objects, etc. Whether its roots lie in the west (Crete?) or the east (Ugarit?, etc.) is debatable, but all attempts to decipher the language have been unsuccessful. The fall of Minoan Knossos on Crete to the Mycenaeans, ca. 1380 b.c., brought Mycenaean settlers to Cyprus, (perhaps the “Sea Peoples,” some of whom settled in S Palestine) and with them a new type of pottery which is found extensively in Cyprus and the Syro-Palestinian littoral.

Aegean influence continued in Cyprus well into the Iron Age (Cypro-Geometric Age, ca. 1050–750 b.c.), when the Phoenicians arrived around 850 b.c. and established colonies on the island. These colonists from Tyre and Sidon (cf. Isa 23:1, 12; Ezek 27:6) built temples to Astarte and tried to establish close ties between Cyprus and their homelands. One of the largest temples erected to Astarte in the Phoenician world was constructed in Kition around 850–800 b.c. on the ruins of an LB temple.

In the beginning of the Cypro-Archaic Period (ca. 750–475 b.c.), epigraphic evidence records the submission of Cyprus to Sargon II of Assyria. This event, which occurred in 707 b.c., is recorded both on a stele from Kition and in inscriptions from the Assyrian palace at Khorsabad. Ten cities of Cyprus are named on the prism of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon (613 b.c.), among which are Paphos, Idalion, Kourion, and Salamis. Extraordinary tombs made of ashlar blocks (perhaps royal ones) were found at Salamis, and date to the 8th and 7th centuries b.c. Life under the Assyrians seems to have been good, and Mycenaean culture continued to dominate.

Egyptian influence was felt for a brief time when Egypt took advantage of Assyria’s decline and invaded the island. In 545 b.c. Cyprus submitted to the rising power of Cyrus, king of Persia, helped him in his war against Babylon, and thereby continued to enjoy considerable autonomy (Hdt. 4.162) until 499 b.c., when the island, identifying with its Greek heritage, joined the unsuccessful Ionic revolt against Persian rule. Two hundred years of slavery followed.

Cyprus suffered often during the early part of the Cypro-Classical Period (475–325 b.c.), when Greeks, who considered Cyprus to be part of the Greek world, attempted repeatedly and unsuccessfully to free the island from Persian control. Greek influence was strong on the W part of the island, while Phoenician and Persian influence continued in the E part. Stasikypros, king of the city of Idalion, repulsed efforts by the Persians and Phoenicians to conquer his city. Archaeologists have recently identified his palace in excavations at Idalion (Stager and Walker 1989). The most influential Cypriot of the period was Euagoras I of Salamis, who introduced the Greek alphabet on the island through his coins. He tried, without success, to unify all Greeks and make Salamis the Athens of the East. He was responsible for spreading the Hellenization at Cyprus into the E Mediterranean world.

Cyprus assisted Alexander the Great in his conquest of Tyre (332 b.c.) and subsequently became a part of his empire, enjoying considerable favor from the conqueror. After Alexander’s death and throughout the Hellenistic Period (ca. 325–50 b.c.), Cyprus was controlled by the Ptolemies of Egypt. Hellenistic culture was dominant during this time, manifesting itself especially in the sculpture of Cyprus. Excellent examples found in excavations include a 3d century b.c. limestone head of a woman from Arsos and a 2d century b.c. marble statue of Artemis. Greek trends are also seen in the production of jewelry, pottery, and terra-cottas.

With the rise of Roman power, Cyprus was made a province after 67 b.c. and, nine years later, was added to the province of Cilicia. After the civil wars ended, Octavian assumed the title of Augustus and controlled most of the area from Britain to Mesopotamia. He combined Cyprus and Cilicia with the province of Syria. After 23 b.c., Cyprus was made a senatorial province and placed under proconsuls. Many of the proconsuls of Cyprus are known for the Roman period (50 b.c.–250 a.d.), although no Cypriot evidence yet exists to attest the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus (Mitford 1979: 1301), who is said to have been one (Acts 13:7) when Paul visited the island in about 47 a.d.

Peace and prosperity existed throughout the early part of the empire, supported by a flourishing trade in wine, copper, shipbuilding, and agriculture. The chief cities of the time were Salamis, Paphos, Lapithos, and Amathus. The Roman way of life is evidenced by the presence of theaters at Paphos, Salamis, Curium, Soli, and Citium, the last attested only epigraphically. Those at Salamis and Soloi are beautifully restored. Further evidence is seen in the presence of gymnasiums preserved at Salamis and Paphos. Others are attested epigraphically for Citium, Curium, Chytri, Lapethus, and Carpasia. There was an amphitheater at Salamis and an odeion at Paphos. A large Roman bath has been found beside the theater and gymnasium at Salamis, and one is also known for Curium.

Roman roads were built around the island, evidenced by numerous milestones and a map drawn up sometime between the 2d and 4th centuries. Inscriptions show that the roads were maintained until the 4th century. Temples of civic gods such as Apollo at Hyle, Aphrodite at Paphos, and Zeus at Salamis, along with floor mosaics such as those in the houses of Paphos testify to the prominence of polytheism. None of these seem to have survived the more immediate appeal of the deified Severan emperors. No evidence exists that any of them outlived the reign of Caracalla (211–17 a.d.). The spiritual vacuum thus created was filled by Christianity, whose presence is seen in the remains of basilical church buildings such as the one at Salamis.

The New Testament mentions two Christians from Cyprus. One was Barnabas, the traveling companion of Paul (Acts 4:36) and the other was Mnason, who lived in Jerusalem and hosted Paul on one occasion (Acts 21:16). Men from Cyprus shared in the evangelizing of the Greek population of Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:19–20). Barnabas and John Mark visited Cyprus following a dispute with Paul (Acts 15:39).
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 John McRay Με το παρόν μήνυμα επιθυμούμε να σας ενημερώσουμε για κάποιες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το πρόγραμμα του Συνεδρίου. Η **έναρξη** του Συνεδρίου θα πραγματοποιηθεί μετά το πέρας της Θείας Λειτουργίας, την **Κυριακή 12 Μαΐου**, ενώ οι εργασίες του (σε ένδεκα συνεδρίες) θα λάβουν χώρα **από το πρωί (9:00) της Δευτέρας, 13 Μαΐου, μέχρι το μεσημέρι (14:00) της Τετάρτης, 15 Μαΐου.** Το πρόγραμμα φιλοξενίας των εισηγητών περιλαμβάνει επίσης προσκυνηματική επίσκεψη στην κατεχόμενη Σαλαμίνα (Μονή Αποστόλου Βαρνάβα, Βασιλική Αγίου Επιφανίου) το απόγευμα της Κυριακής, 12 Μαΐου.

*Σύντομα θα είμαστε σε θέση να σας ενημερώσουμε για το τελικό πρόγραμμα του Συνεδρίου και το αναλυτικό πρόγραμμα φιλοξενίας.*

**Οι αφίξεις των εισηγητών δύνανται να πραγματοποιηθούν από το Σάββατο, 11 Μαΐου και οι αναχωρήσεις από το απόγευμα της Τετάρτης, 15 Μαΐου.**

***Είναι σημαντικό να μας ενημερώσετε έγκαιρα για τις μέρες που επιθυμείτε να διαμείνετε στο ξενοδοχείο, ώστε να διευθετήσουμε την κράτηση δωματίου.***

Η εισήγησή σας (διάρκειας 20 λεπτών) με θέμα: ***«Βαρνάβας και Μάρκος: Η αποστολική σχέση των Εκκλησιών Κύπρου και Αλεξανδρείας»*** έχει οριστεί για την **Ι΄ Συνεδρία**, η οποία φέρει  τον γενικό τίτλο **«Η τιμή των Αποστόλων. Μέρος Δ΄» (Τετάρτη, 15 Μαΐου, 9:00-11:00).** Παρακαλούμε, συμπληρώστε την **Ηλεκτρονική Δήλωση Συμμετοχής Εισηγητή** ακολουθώντας τον παρακάτω σύνδεσμο <https://forms.gle/RRU6zFeHLnU6K9ps5>

Στην ηλεκτρονική αυτή δήλωση θα σας ζητηθεί να επιβεβαιώσετε τα **στοιχεία** σας και τον **ακριβή τίτλο της εισήγησής** σας (στα ελληνικά και στα αγγλικά), να υποβάλετε **περίληψη** της εισήγησής σας έκτασης 200-500 λέξεων και να δηλώσετε κάποιες πληροφορίες χρήσιμες για τη φιλοξενία σας.

***Τελευταία ημερομηνία υποβολής της ηλεκτρονικής δήλωσης: 31 Οκτωβρίου 2023.***

Σας ευχαριστούμε για τη συνεργασία. Με εκτίμηση, π. Χριστόδουλος Χριστοδούλου Γραμματέας Επιστημονικής – Οργανωτικής Επιτροπής

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Εκδόσεις - Ι. Μ. Κωνσταντίας και Αμμοχώστου τηλ. +357 23812456/7 τηλεομ. +357 23812459

web: [www.imconstantias.org.cy](http://www.imconstantias.org.cy/) email: [ekdosis@imconstantias.org.cy](https://webmail02.uoa.gr/src/compose.php?send_to=pndiaconia@imconstantias.org.cy)

1.8.

(1) Ταῦτ’ ἐγὼ λέγων περὶ ἄλλων καὶ ἐμαυτῷ ὡμίλησα λέγων· Τί ἄλλους [@1](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/AT1.html)
μέμφομαι, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τῆς ἀμελείας ὑπάρχων ἐγκλήματι; ἀλλ’ εἰς Ἰουδαίαν
(2) ὁρμήσω, πρότερον τὸν ἐμὸν διαθεὶς βίον. καὶ δὴ οὕτως βουλευσαμένου μου
πολὺς ὁ τῆς παρολκῆς ἐγενήθη χρόνος, τῶν βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων δυσεκλύ-
(3) των ὄντων. πέρας γοῦν συννοήσας ὡδίποτε τὴν τοῦ βίου φύσιν ὅτι ἐλπίδι
[†](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/P.html) ἐκπλοκῶν τοὺς σπεύδοντας ἐνεδρεύει, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅν ποτε [†](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/P.html) εἰσεκλά-
πην χρόνον ἐλπίσιν δονούμενος, καὶ ὅτι οὕτως ἀσχολούμενοι οἱ ἄνθρω-
ποι ἀποθνῄσκομεν, τὰ πάντα μου ὡς ἔτυχεν ἀφεὶς εἰς Πόρτον ὥρ-
μησα, καὶ εἰς λιμένα ἐλθὼν καὶ ἀναχθεὶς ἀνέμων ἔχθραις ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς    (5)
(4) Ἰουδαίαν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἠνέχθην. καὶ ἀνέμων ἀπορίᾳ ἐπισχεθεὶς
ἐκεῖ συνεφοίτων τοῖς φιλοσόφοις καὶ [[](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/SB.html)τὰ[]](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/SB.html) τῆς φήμης μετὰ τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ
φανέντος ἔλεγον τοὺς λόγους. οἱ δ’ ἀπεκρίναντο ὅτι [<](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/SB2.html)τὸν[>](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/SB2.html) μὲν ἐν Ῥώμῃ
φανέντα οὐκ ἴσμεν, περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ γενομένου καὶ υἱοῦ θεοῦ
ὑπὸ τῆς φήμης λεγομένου καὶ παρὰ πολλῶν τῶν κἀκεῖθεν ἐληλυθότων   (5)
ἠκούσαμεν καὶ περὶ πάντων ὧν λαλῶν ἐποίει θαυμασίων ἐμάθομεν.1.9.

(1) ἐμοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος· Ἤθελόν τινι συντυχεῖν τῶν ἑωρακότων αὐτόν, εὐθὺς
ἦγόν με λέγοντες· Ἔστιν τις ἐνταῦθα οὐ μόνον ἱστορήσας αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
τῆς ἐκεῖθεν γῆς ὑπάρχων, ἀνὴρ Ἑβραῖος, ὀνόματι Βαρνάβας, ὃς καὶ ἕνα
τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι λέγει καὶ ἐνταῦθά που καθεζόμενος
τῆς ἐκείνου ὑποσχέσεως τοὺς λόγους τοῖς βουλομένοις ἑτοίμως λέγει.   (5)
(2) καὶ δὴ συνῆλθον αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐλθών, σὺν τῷ παρεστῶτι ὄχλῳ ἔστην
ἐπακούων τῶν λόγων, καὶ συνενόουν τἀληθῆ οὐ διαλεκτικῇ τέχνῃ λέγοντα,
ἀλλὰ ἀκάκως καὶ ἀπαρασκευάστως ἐκτιθέμενον ἅ τε ἤκουσεν καὶ ἑώρακεν
(3) τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανέντα υἱὸν πεποιηκέναι τε καὶ εἰρηκέναι· πολλοὺς δὲ
μάρτυρας τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ λεγομένων θαυμασίων τε καὶ λόγων καὶ ἐξ

1.10.

(1) αὐτοῦ τοῦ παρεστῶτος ὄχλου παρεῖχεν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἀπανούρ-
γως λεγόμενα ἡδέως οἱ ὄχλοι διετίθεντο, οἱ ἐκ παιδείας κοσμικῆς ὁρμώ- [@1](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/AT1.html)
μενοι φιλόσοφοι γελᾶν αὐτὸν καὶ χλευάζειν ἐπεβάλλοντο, σκώπτοντες
καὶ διασύροντες θράσει ἀμέτρῳ, ὡς μεγάλοις ὅπλοις κεχρημένοι τοῖς
(2) συλλογισμοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἀπωθούμενος αὐτῶν τὸν λῆρον οὐ συνέτρεχεν αὐτῶν
τῇ πανούργῳ πεύσει, ἀλλὰ ἀκαταπλήκτως ὧν ἔλεγεν οὐκ ἀφίστατο.
(3) καί ποτέ τις αὐτοῦ ἐπύθετο διὰ τί κώνωψ ἐγένετο καὶ βραχύτατον
ὄν, ἓξ πόδας ἔχον ἔχει καὶ πτερά, ἐλέφας δέ, τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ζῴων,
(4) ἄπτερος ὢν τέσσαρας μόνους ἔχει πόδας. ὁ δὲ μετὰ τὴν πεῦσιν τὸν
ἐμποδισθέντα ἀναλαβὼν λόγον, ὡς πρὸς τὴν πεῦσιν ἀποκρινάμενος τὸν
αὐτῷ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς προκείμενον ἀνελάμβανεν λόγον τούτῳ μόνῳ προοιμίῳ
(5) χρώμενος καθ’ ἑκάστην ἐνκοπήν· Ἡμεῖς τοῦ πέμψαντος ἡμᾶς τοὺς λόγους
(6) καὶ τὰς θαυμασίους πράξεις εἰπεῖν ὑμῖν μόνον ἔχομεν ἐντολήν, καὶ ἀντὶ

 

1. Σ. Δεσπότης, Αναψηλαφώντας τις Ταυτότητες των Χριστιανών της Μεσογείου τον 1ο και 2ο αι. μ.Χ. Η Πολυφωνία του Αρχέγονου Χριστιανισμού. Ανθρωπιστικές Επιστήμες και Τέχνες (Humanities and Arts). Αθήνα: Κάλλιπος 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 18 Κἀγὼ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτῶν ἐπίσταμαι ἔρχομαι συναγαγεῖν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰς γλώσσας καὶ ἥξουσιν καὶ ὄψονται τὴν δόξαν μου 19 καὶ καταλείψω ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν σημεῖα καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ ἐξ αὐτῶν σεσῳσμένους εἰς τὰ ἔθνη εἰς Θαρσις καὶ Φουδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Μοσοχ καὶ Θοβελ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ εἰς τὰς νήσους τὰς πόρρω οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασίν μου τὸ ὄνομα οὐδὲ ἑωράκασιν τὴν δόξαν μου καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσίν μου τὴν δόξαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν 20  καὶ ἄξουσιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν δῶρον κυρίῳ μεθ᾽ ἵππων καὶ ἁρμάτων ἐν λαμπήναις ἡμιόνων μετὰ σκιαδίων εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Πόλιν Ιερουσαλημ εἶπεν κύριος ὡς ἂν ἐνέγκαισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐμοὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτῶν μετὰ ψαλμῶν εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου 21  καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν λήμψομαι ἐμοὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας εἶπεν κύριος [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. […] οῦ Σίμωνος ἀπέσβη καὶ παραχρῆμα σὺν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλέλυτο δύναμις· τοσοῦτον δ’ ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διανοίαις εὐσεβείας φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰς ἅπαξ ἱκανῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοῇ μηδὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ· παρακλήσεσιν δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου, λιπαρῆσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκα- [@1](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/AT1.html) λίας, μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ   (10) ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγ(2) γελίου γραφῆς. γνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθέν φασι τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἡσθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Κλήμης ἐν ἕκτῳ τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων παρατέθειται τὴν ἱστορίαν, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος    (5) ὀνόματι Παπίας. τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ· ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, σημαίνειν τε τοῦτ’ αὐτόν, τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα διὰ τούτων. [«](https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/Q6.html)ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου.»   (10) 2.17. (1) ὃν καὶ λόγος ἔχει κατὰ Κλαύδιον ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἐλθεῖν Πέτρῳ, τοῖς ἐκεῖσε τότε κηρύττοντι. καὶ οὐκ ἀπεικὸς ἂν εἴη τοῦτό γε, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὅ φαμεν αὐτὸ σύγγραμμα, εἰς ὕστερον καὶ μετὰ χρόνους αὐτῷ πεπονημένον, σαφῶς τοὺς εἰς ἔτι νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς πεφυλαγμένους τῆς ἐκκλησίας περιέχει κανόνας·   (5) (2) ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν βίον τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀσκητῶν ὡς ἔνι μάλιστα ἀκριβέστατα ἱστορῶν, γένοιτ’ ἂν ἔκδηλος οὐκ εἰδὼς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδεχόμενος ἐκθειάζων τε καὶ σεμνύνων τοὺς κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀποστολικοὺς ἄνδρας, ἐξ Ἑβραίων, ὡς ἔοικε, γεγονότας ταύτῃτε ἰουδαϊκώτερον τῶν παλαιῶν ἔτι τὰ πλεῖστα διατηροῦντας   (5) ἐθῶν. (3) πρῶτόν γέ τοι τὸ μηθὲν πέρα τῆς ἀληθείας οἴκοθεν καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ προσθήσειν οἷς ἱστορήσειν ἔμελλεν, ἀπισχυρισάμενος ἐν [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Άλλωστε κάποιος *Νέγρος* συναριθμείται στην ηγετική Ομάδα της Εκκλησίας των ελληνιστών Ιουδαίων στην Αντιόχεια. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Βλ. Χ. Ατματζίδη, Υπάρχει Αντισημιτισμός στην Α’ προς Θεσσαλονικείς; *Κριτικές Αναγνώσεις των Βιβλικών Κειμένων. Ερευνητικές Επισκέψεις σε Βιβλικά Τοπία. Τόμ. Β’*, Θεσσαλονίκη: Πουρναράς 2010, 61-104. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. #  <https://www.thecollector.com/alexander-saint-marks-tomb-venice/> Is the Body Of Alexander The Great Actually In Saint Mark’s Tomb?

 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 11  Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος εἶπεν· νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλεν [ὁ] κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξείλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρῴδου καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 12  συνιδών τε ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι.

 13  Κρούσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος προσῆλθεν παιδίσκη ὑπακοῦσαι ὀνόματι Ῥόδη, 14 καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Πέτρου ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς οὐκ ἤνοιξεν τὸν πυλῶνα, εἰσδραμοῦσα δὲ ἀπήγγειλεν ἑστάναι τὸν Πέτρον πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος. 15 οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπαν· μαίνῃ. ἡ δὲ διϊσχυρίζετο οὕτως ἔχειν. οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον· ὁ ἄγγελός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ. (Πρ. 12, 11-15) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)